



Proceedings
of the
House of Assembly

During the Third Session
of the
Thirty-First General Assembly
of Newfoundland

1959

Speaker: Hon. J. R. Courage

Volume I

Proceedings

of the

House of Assembly

During the Third Session
of the
Thirty-First General Assembly
of Newfoundland

Monday, February 23, 1959

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Sergeant-at-Arms: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

Mr. Speaker: Admit His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

His Honour then read the following Speech from the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

Since you last assembled, my Ministers have been informed that it is Her Majesty's intention to visit Her Majesty's subjects in this ancient and loyal part of the Commonwealth during the month of June in the present year. On this visit Her Majesty will be accompanied by His Royal Highness the Prince Philip. All of Her Majesty's Subjects in Newfoundland have rejoiced to hear this news and my Ministers will take all steps consistent with

overriding arrangements made by the Federal authorities at Ottawa to enable as many as possible of the children of the Province to greet their monarch on this happy occasion. Once again the sea has taken its toll and all Newfoundlanders are deeply grieved by the loss of the lives of gallant fishermen in the dragger "Blue Wave."

My Ministers, in common with the vast majority of our people, have viewed with great concern the economic and other turbulence now prevailing in the largest and the most vital of our industries. My Ministers deem it their cardinal duty to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the future of the pulp and paper industry in Newfoundland, involving directly or indirectly the well being of the entire Province, is not jeopardized. You will be kept informed of developments so that you will be in a position to take whatever action you may consider to be necessary.

Since you last met, my Ministers have had further discussions with the Government of Canada with a view to impressing upon them the necessity for more generous consideration than that recommended by the Royal Commission set up under the provisions of Term 29 of the Act of Union, whereby Newfoundland became a Province of the Canadian Nation. My Ministers have felt that, without this more generous assistance, it would not be possible for our public services, especially in the fields of educa-

tion, highway construction and public health, to be continued at their present level. Still less could we hope to provide for the steady improvements in these levels which the people of Newfoundland entered the Canadian Confederation to attain. It is our hope that the Government of Canada will make known its intentions in this matter at the earliest possible date so that you may be in a position to provide adequate supply to Her Majesty.

Within recent weeks my Ministers have announced important transactions relating to the development of the vast iron ore deposits in the Lake Wabush area of Labrador. The Government hope, in the near future, to inform you of still other developments of this kind in the same region of Labrador. These developments are expected to provide many opportunities for employment to our people. Certain measures dealing with these matters will be laid before you in this session.

My Ministers have been able to effect significant changes in the operation of two important industries established with the help of public monies. These changes are designed to bring about improvements to, and expansion of, the operations of the North Star Cement Company and Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Limited.

Within recent years my Ministers, with your approval, have endeavoured to eliminate much of the historic inequality in educational opportunity in this Province. The success thus far attained by this programme has encouraged my Ministers to consider submitting to you future plans for an extension of the bursary and scholarship programme to the end that no deserving children in the Province will be denied the opportunity to acquire a high school education because of their parents' lack of means, or because of the smallness or remoteness of the settlements in which they live.

Since you last met, my Ministers have actively investigated the problems associated with the erection of a new and large university designed to meet the ever expanding needs of higher education. It is expected that during the present session my Prime Minister will be laying before you definite proposals which, if they meet with your approval, will result in an early beginning of this great project.

During the past year our Province has experienced economic vicissitudes which have resulted in some hardship. Our fishery was one of the poorest in our history and, because of conditions in world markets, there was some reduction in logging and mineral production. These economic dislocations would have been felt much more severely were it not for the stabilizing factors which have resulted from the union of Newfoundland with Canada. Nevertheless, the experience of the past year has done much to emphasize the continued need for the development of other resources. To this end my Ministers have taken steps to facilitate the efforts being made by those corporations which have concessions in the Province to bring about development of our forest, mineral and water power resources. It is the belief of my Ministers that several of these enterprises will get into operation during the coming year.

My Ministers have continued to take active measures to assist the fisheries of the Province. Plans have been made for the completion of the great fishery plant at LaScie so that it will be ready to commence production before the end of the present year. In common with the people of the Burin Peninsula, the Government have been deeply concerned by the failure and collapse of the private company that built, owned and operated the large fish plant at Fortune. The collapse of this company caused considerable hardship in some section of that Peninsula. The Government have been searching for experienced and dependable fish plant companies who would be interested in getting this plant back into production upon some reasonable basis. Improvements in the fresh and frozen fish markets of North America in recent months have encouraged all in Newfoundland who have any interest in those fisheries. My Ministers have noted with approval the efforts being made by responsible mercantile interests to regain some of the salt fish markets of the Caribbean.

Many other matters will be brought forward for your consideration. You will be asked to vote supply to Her Majesty. I ask God's blessing upon all your deliberations.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, ask leave to introduce and to have read a first time, a Bill

entitled, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act."

On motion, and by leave of the house, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

Mr. A. Mifflin (Trinity North): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of proposing that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious speech with which His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has opened this assembly today, and I have much pleasure in proposing this motion.

Mr. Speaker, Her Majesty's loyal subjects in Newfoundland are indeed delighted that Her Majesty and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip will visit this Province in June. The loyalty of Newfoundland to the Crown has never been surpassed by any of Her Majesty's subjects in any part of the Commonwealth; and that deep and abiding faith in the monarchy will abide as long as there is a Newfoundland. Our loyalty will be amply demonstrated when Her Majesty and Prince Philip visit here in June.

It was with deep regret that the people of this Province heard the sad news of the loss of the dragger "Blue Wave" and her crew. Many families are grief-stricken by the loss of loved ones; and the towns of Grand Bank and Fortune have lost some of their finest citizens. I express my sincerest sympathy to the bereaved families and relatives and I know every member of this hon. house would want to be associated with me in this expression of sympathy. In the appeal to the public for the dependents of those lost in the disaster, which has already been launched, it goes without saying there will be a generous response from the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne places the present problem of the pulp and paper industry in a prominent position; and because the industry affects the life of every person in this Province, it certainly is entitled to this prominence. I submit, Mr. Speaker, it is the bounden duty of the Government to do everything they reasonably can to assure the industry suffers as little dislocation as possible. It is my belief that this Government will not do anything for

the so-called "vested interests" of Newfoundland that will do violence to the working class of Newfoundland. On the other hand, I also believe the Government will not permit the loggers of Newfoundland to become the victims of the unprincipled propaganda which is being precipitated upon them. All throughout his life the hon. the Premier has been the greatest protectionist of the cause of labour Newfoundland as ever known, and since becoming Premier has not wavered in his sympathy for the working class. We all know his position in this dispute. He has taken this position courageously, because he feels it is necessary for the salvation of the pulp and paper industry and the salvation of the loggers engaged in this industry. I feel sure that if this hon. House is called upon to take any direct action in this unfortunate situation, it will take such action as is in the best interest of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, and will do so with courage and without fear.

Mr. Speaker, reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to discussions between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada in connection with the recommendations of a Royal Commission set up under the provisions of Term 29, of the Act of Union, whereby Newfoundland became a Province of the Canadian Nation. The reward recommended by the Royal Commission has been discussed before, and there appears to be general agreement that it is inadequate. So all I have to say at this time is that we all hope that our Government have impressed the Government of Canada with the absolute necessity of an upward revision of the recommendations of the Royal Commission; so that when the times comes for the making of the act of Confederation complete in every detail, this Province will be in a position so that our public services can be continued at least to the present level. Indeed, we hope that the Government of Canada, in its review of the Royal Commission's recommendations, will be sufficiently generous in its approach to our problems to permit us to improve these levels, so that the Government can then develop our Provincial resources. In short, let us hope that the award of the Canadian Government will be in such an amount that every Newfoundlander will be proud, and justly proud, of

belonging to the Great Canadian Nation. Mr. Speaker, we were all greatly interested to hear the recent announcement of the Government in respect to the development of the vast iron deposits in Lake Wabush area of Labrador. There can be no doubt whatsoever that vast sums of money have already been spent in this territory, to determine whether or not it is commercially feasible to carry on an operation there. It has been proven beyond any doubt that there are large deposits of iron ore, which can be reduced to a high grade concentrate; there is no doubt that within a very short time a railway will be built into the Wabush area and that this railway will cost in the vicinity of \$10 million. There is no doubt but that already, at Seven Islands, dock lands have been cleared for this great project and application has been made to the Quebec Government for railway rights-of-way from the present railway at Seven Islands to a new dock site. With this type of money spent, and the interest which has been shown by people who are putting in this sort of money, there is no doubt, in my mind at least, this tremendous development will be going ahead very shortly. This is the kind of news the people of Newfoundland like to hear; for this development will provide much needed employment for Newfoundlanders and a great deal of revenue for the Treasury. The Government is to be commended on their effort in getting this project underway at this particular time, especially, when there is a general recession in the steel industry in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give credit to the Government and particularly to the hon. Minister of Education (Dr. Rowe) for the progressive and successful program of his department of Government. There is not one person in this hon. house who would wish denied to any deserving child in the province, because of economic or any circumstances, the opportunity to get a high school education. And when plans of the extension of the scholarship and bursary program come before this house, they will certainly receive the unanimous support of the house.

We are all well aware of the absolute necessity for the erection of a new and larger university. The present building is so overcrowded one wonders how the work of the

University can be carried on. We must have a large university in order to accommodate the ever-increasing number of ambitious Newfoundlanders who wish to equip themselves with a university education and thereby better solve their problems in the fields of endeavour which they choose. Indeed, if it went no further than to provide the number of adequately trained teachers required, as times goes on, this alone would justify the erection of a larger university.

Although there are only two matters with respect to education mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we all of us know the prodigious problems which present themselves to the Government and the school authorities in practically every aspect of education in this Province. We know great progress has been made, and that we are pleased with the work which the hon. Minister of Education and his department have done, and are also confident of their ability to look after the future of Newfoundland in the educational field. Another thing we have noted is that the public interest in education has increased in the last few years and an ever-increasing interest is needed. In this respect I would like to say that "CJON", with its varied programs on education, has done a great deal to develop public interest in education.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne talked of the poor fishery of last year and of reduced logging and mineral production. Indeed the fishery in certain parts of the Province, last year, was almost a total failure. Quite frankly, without the benefits resulting from union of Newfoundland with Canada, the hardships suffered by our fishermen would have been distressing. Even with these benefits, I am reliably informed that fishermen have made heavy inroads on the small deposits they have in banks. However, we believe that the poor fishery is not a chronic disease, and look forward with faith to a good voyage this year and good returns. I do not propose to discuss the fishery, nor for that matter logging, at great length. These matters will undoubtedly receive equal treatment during this session. However, there is one further observation I would like to make about the fishery. It has to do with the curing and processing of salt codfish. During the past few years we exported from the province to

Nova Scotia on an average of 200,000 quintals of salt bulk. Every quintal of fish pays to our people \$2.50 a quintal in labour. The need for this in the Province is obvious and the loss cannot be afforded. Ways and means must be found by our dealers in salt codfish whereby they can profitably compete with Nova Scotian buyers, and thus eliminate this loss of wages to our Newfoundland workers.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the hardship that Fortune and the Burin Peninsula have suffered as a result of the closing of the fish plant in Fortune. We are all happy to hear that the market in respect to fresh frozen fish has improved and with this development we hope that the fish plant at Fortune will be re-opened.

In a Province such as ours, we depend so heavily on foreign markets to purchase our fish, pulp and paper and other products, that we must bear the economic hardships resulting from a recession in foreign markets. We can only hope that world conditions will improve, and so bring improved economic conditions to this Province. We cannot dare hope to base our standard of living simply on the bare welfare benefits resulting from Confederation. At best, they only serve as a buffer in hard times and as something extra in good times. We are therefore pleased that the Government have been increasing their efforts to develop the resources of the Province, and we pray that their efforts will be crowned with success. For, unless we can profitably develop our resources in this Province, we have little chance to assure for our people the way of life to which they are entitled; we cannot have the educational facilities necessary, the highways which are essential, and the welfare and health facilities required by our people. In order to develop these resources we will require every effort and co-operation of Government, both Federal and Provincial; of suppliers, fishermen, loggers, miners and labourers, whose interest in the development of this province must be a common interest. .

(Applause).

Mr. G. Clarke (Carbonear - Bay de Verde):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion so ably proposed by my hon. friend, the member for Trinity North. I would like to say at the very beginning how pleased we

are to learn that Her Majesty, the Queen and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, will visit Newfoundland in June of this year. It is indeed fitting that on this Canadian tour, the first stop should be made in this Province, which cherishes the honour of being Britain's first Colony. We know the feeling of loyalty and affection displayed by our people will be second to none that will be evidenced in any part of the Dominion. It is also good to know that, once again, the emphasis will be placed on permitting as many children as possible to take part in the demonstration of this affection and loyalty to their Sovereign.

In common with the proposer of the motion and with every member of this hon. House, I express my sincere sympathy to the families and relatives of those men who lost their lives when the dragger "Blue Wave" went down. Newfoundland in general and communities of the Burin Peninsula in particular have had more than their share of marine disasters; and our hearts go out to these sorrowing people. As has already been noted, each one of us, through the campaign for funds that has now been launched, will be able to express our sympathy in a more tangible way.

I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech the necessity of our using every effort to develop our natural resources, minerals, forests, waterpower and fisheries is stressed. Last year the inshore fishery of the Province was almost a complete failure, and that fact was made even harder because the fishery of the year before was also poor. In spite of that, Newfoundlanders around our coast will once again this year be prosecuting the fishery in probably as great a number as they did last year. In the district of Carbonear-Bay-de-Verde, for instance, which I have the honour to represent, this year will find 200 to 300 boats involving a total of 600 or 700 men once again prosecuting the inshore fishery. We sincerely trust that the efforts to bring economic stability to our fishing industry will meet with every success. At the same time, every effort to develop the other resources that we have must be made, because our ever-growing labour population cannot be absorbed into the fisheries, and must find employment elsewhere. Also the fishermen must be provided with a means of alternative employment, either logging, mining or any other

activities in order that they may augment their income, particularly when faced with a bad fishery such as we have had in the last two years.

I.W.A.

Now Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment very briefly on the current trouble in the logging industry of this Province. For fifty years now, the loggers of Newfoundland have been cutting and hauling pulp wood for that company which first established a paper mill in Newfoundland. For over thirty years, the Newfoundland loggers have been providing pulp wood for the second paper mill to be established in this Province; and it is the hope of every logger, as well as that of every other citizen, that within the not-too-distant future, the Newfoundland logger will get the opportunity to provide logs, pulpwood for a third paper mill.

The logger for the past twenty years has had his own Newfoundland Union representing him at the bargaining table when agreements were being sought between the loggers and the paper companies. He has bargained. He has improved his lot, and down through the years there has been a steady improvement in the logger's lot in accordance with economic and social improvement in our country. He has bargained continuously with the most cordial relations existing between the company and the loggers, and in a spirit of good-will, without lawlessness, hatred and fear, one person for another. There has been goodwill and a noted improvement in the lot of the loggers. But now the picture has changed completely. The logging industry is almost at a stand-still and harmony has been replaced by lawlessness, hatred and fear; and one group of Newfoundlanders indulge in acts of violence against their own fellow Newfoundlanders. Now, how was this brought about? The year before last, representatives of another union came to this province and quietly and efficiently went about their task of enticing loggers to leave their established unions to join theirs. (And, make no mistake

about it, these people were capable, skilled and smooth operators in the art of infiltration). With promises of great increase in wages, the ultimate in living conditions and propaganda (untrue propaganda) fed to our Newfoundland loggers, particularly the young loggers, they succeeded in getting a large number of our men to leave their own established union and join theirs.

Now the story of how this was done, Mr. Speaker, is a long story. It is a terrible story and one which eventually will have to be told, but which I cannot take the time of this House this afternoon even to tell in part. But, as I say, it must at some time be told and told in full. Was it the great interest in the loggers which caused these people to come here and create this chaos amongst our logging workers? Why did they come here? That is a question which is going to be left unanswered right at the present moment, but we feel that their avowed intention of rescuing the loggers from peonage, from servitude, from slavery was not the real intention for their coming to this Province. The question is now, not why they came but the result of their coming and what is to be done about it. We have lost in wages staggering amounts, at a time when the economy of the Province can ill afford it. And worst of all, our law courts are full, some of them working overtime, to deal with this lawlessness and our jails have been filled with Newfoundlanders, these Newfoundlanders who were heretofore peaceful and law-abiding citizens. There has been engendered hatred, ill-will, mistrust and fear, and it will take us a long while to recover. Drastic and quick action is necessary to restore peace and sanity to our major industry and to prevent the whole economy of our province from being wrecked. I was therefore proud and happy that the hon. the Premier took the stand which he did. I was glad he had the wisdom and the courage to take this action and try and restore the industry to normal, and I feel sure he has the backing of every member of this hon. House.

The Speech from the Throne makes mention of an extension of the bursary and scholarship program to help deserving children

in the Province. I know everyone will be glad to hear this and to support any measures which will further the education of our young people. The lack of education, both vocational and academic, has been one of the main factors in most of our economic and social ills. It is heartening, therefore, to see the Government has placed such emphasis on its educational program. Everyone is aware of the great strides made in the field of education during recent years, and I believe that under the wise and capable guidance of the hon. Minister of Education it will continue to go forward. During the last ten years, hundreds of new schools have been built, old schools remodeled and the system of regional high schools introduced, and now it appears we have to discuss the question as to whether we can afford a new and larger university. It is my considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot afford to be without this university. During University Week, CJon, to its lasting credit, gave us an opportunity to learn something of the great work being done by the University, when members of the staff of the University were interviewed. We also learned something of the need for improved facilities, if the University is to carry out the work for which it was intended. Its potentials for the betterment of all Newfoundlanders is so great that we must do our utmost to see that it is a reality in the not-too-distant future.

Comment is also made on the expansion and improvement in two of the industries which were established with the aid of public money. We welcome any such expansion of industry if it will provide additional employment, particularly at this time. It may be noted in passing, Mr. Speaker, these industries usually referred to as "new industries" are presently employing between 2000 and 3000 people and are paying out in wages close to \$7 or \$8 million annually.

TERM 29:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to that section of the Speech which refers to Term 29. I am

glad to hear that the Government have impressed upon the Government of Canada that necessity for more generous consideration than recommended by the Royal Commission set up under Term 29. The pros and cons of Term 29 have been aired so often in this hon. House and elsewhere that it is not my intention to labour the point this afternoon. It is sufficient to say that more continued improvement in public services; that is, in schools, hospitals, roads, etc., will depend to a large extent on the amount which the Government will receive, or this Province will receive, from the Federal Government. The Prime Minister and his colleagues at Ottawa may adopt either of two attitudes toward us. One may be that of politicians looking back at the past, and the other that of statesmen looking to the future. We hope sincerely it will be the latter. However, that it be settled as soon as possible is of vital importance too, and we hope that the Federal Government will follow its own maxim and not "wait until spring." I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion proposed by my hon. friend from Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin).

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion so ably made by the hon. member for Trinity North and seconded by the hon. member for Carbonear - Bay de Verde, I will say at the outset that it is not my intention to take up very much time. I want to compliment these two young members on the able way in which they proposed and seconded this motion to appoint a committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure we were all impressed by the entrance of His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, and his beautiful wife. And I think the hon. the Premier ought to open the house more often, so we can get them to visit us occasionally as time goes on.

I would say I am very glad to see (I think) every member on the opposite side is present today, as far as I can see — No, they are not quite all here, or not all "quite there" — Not quite all here, I meant. What I do want

to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I am sure everybody on this side of the house must have noted on the faces of the members opposite us some sort of vague look or something of that kind, when they looked across here and saw the support which Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition was getting in Newfoundland and saw all the people, all the visitors, on our side of the house. I am quite sure they felt pretty bad about that. But, they are not all "PC's," Mr. Speaker, not all.

I do not intend to touch on anything in the Speech from the Throne because the time is not opportune for that; except just one thing, which strikes me very forcibly, that is the reference to the tragedy which happened on the South West Coast. I refer to that because I am a native, born on the South West Coast. I have seen more tragedy on the South West Coast than I saw in the Great War, almost, not from the point of view of numbers but of stark, naked tragedy, where the breadwinner went out in the morning and did not come back. We on the South West Coast, and indeed, Sir, all along the coasts of Newfoundland, but particularly the South West Coast, have been used to stark tragedy and disaster, not only the sea but on the land. Some of you remember the tidal wave, which I remember, when twenty-eight people lost their lives when the waves came in over them and took away stages, stores, houses and everything else. We have become more or less, unfortunately, accustomed to such disasters. But in late years improvements have been made to such an extent in shipping, navigational facilities, radio and all that sort of thing, that we have not had so much of this, and we were beginning to think that it was a thing of the past. But, Sir, this recent tragedy brought some of us, at least, back to reality. We are not in a position yet to control nature. The storm which took place here in St. John's just a few days ago indicated that, when again tragedy struck on the Battery Road. These are things which we Newfoundlanders, if we intend to live here in Newfoundland, have to meet from time to time, and we must take them as we have historically, with generous hearts and we

must contribute largely to help keep alive those who have been left with nobody to look after them.

Mr. Speaker, there are ten subjects in this very brief Speech from the Throne. I cannot say it is not important, because some of these things here are important. Remember the usual quotation used to describe the Speech from the Throne? — "It was notable for what it did not contain" — or something like that. But in this particular instance there are three or four items, out of the ten mentioned, that are so important to us in Newfoundland, to our welfare as a people, to our economy, so important that they cannot be lightly passed over and decided upon. They have to be considered in every little detail; and this House of Assembly, both the Government and the Opposition, has to devote its time very carefully in an endeavour to bring in legislation which will be to our best interest in Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before with such a distinguished gathering here, I do not wish to delay the house. I just merely rose to convey to you, Sir, the support of the four of us in the Opposition side for the motion which has been so ably presented. Thank you.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded this present motion, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the graceful way in which he too supported this motion. To be frank with you, Sir, I have very little heart for making a speech at this moment, on this particular motion. In the ordinary course of events this motion would be virtually the only business of the day. In the opening session the Speech from the Throne is read, the motion is made that a committee be appointed to draft an address in reply and the two speeches are made in support of that motion. Then the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, by way of comment on it, constitutes, as a rule, about the only business done, traditionally, in this house on the day on which a new session opens.

As I intend in a few moments to bring a matter of great importance before this house, and in doing so proclaim my reasons, I will content myself at this moment with saying that, when the session gets down to business and gets into its proper swing, all these grave matters that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne will, of course, receive the careful, thoughtful and patriotic consideration of my hon. friends opposite and my hon. friends on this side of the house; always in the hope, I believe, and in the firm desire that Newfoundland thereby would be made a better place in which to live.

I know that everyone in Newfoundland is very happy indeed that the Queen and her husband are coming here to visit us this year. We are quite proud that we are Canadians. We are quite proud that we are now the Tenth Province of Canada! But there is something of which we are even more proud, and certainly more intensely proud, and that is the fact that we are Britain's Oldest Colony. We are that one spot on this earth where the Union Jack was first planted and where, please God, it will be the last, if there is a last place where it will fly. We are the first part of Britain overseas. We are the original Colony of the Commonwealth. We are extremely proud of that; that we are Britain's most ancient and most loyal Colony. And to have our Queen come to visit us this year is a matter that gives all Newfoundlanders the deepest possible satisfaction.

The loss of the "Blue Wave" is very shocking reminder to all of us of the kind of economy we have, the way in which so many of our people try to wrest a living, the price of admiralty. They say that tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of people have lost their very lives, in the history of Newfoundland and the operation of our great fisheries. It is a story that never can be told because tens of thousands of them went to nameless deaths. No one will ever know the number of ships that have been lost by crashing into icebergs; just lost with all hands, in the early days of our history, when Englishmen who came here just did not

know how to cope with ice, and learned the hard way, over a period of almost two centuries, before they knew how to do it.

There are extremely important matters in this Speech from the Throne, especially the great development in Wabush Lake, Interestingly enough, there are here in this Chamber this afternoon two men (each of whom is associated actively with two great groups of corporations, Canadian and American corporations) who are actively interested in developing the iron ore resources in the Wabush Lake Area of Labrador. Two great, two powerful, two extremely wealthy groups of companies straddling the boundary of this great Canadian Nation and the great American Republic; who are intensely interested in developing these resources. And we are very glad to know that these particular developments will be carried on entirely within the territory of Newfoundland. That is to say, unlike Knob Lake, Burnt Creek, Ruth Lake, they will not straddle the boundary between Newfoundland and Quebec down there in Labrador but will entirely within the territorial area of Labrador. There will be many important matters to come before the house, the most important of which, perhaps, I will attempt to deal with in a few moments from now. So, having offered my very sincere congratulations to these two hon. gentlemen and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think I should resume my seat, so that I can bring forward this extremely important matter.

Mr. Speaker: It has been moved and seconded that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I will now appoint that committee:

The hon. Member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin).

The hon. Member for Carbonear, Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke).

The hon. Member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf).

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr.

Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Prohibit General Strikes."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act to Prohibit Secondary Boycotts."

I.W.A.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, by leave of the house, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. the Attorney-General, the following resolutions:

"WHEREAS the economy of this Province has, by the present woods labour dispute, been brought to a dangerous crisis, with strong probability of economic disaster:

"The House of Assembly, while unreservedly reaffirming its support of well-organized and well-conducted trades and labour unions, strongly condemns the International Woodworkers of America for its conduct in Newfoundland and Declares that, by this conduct, the said union has become a stumbling-block to the pulp and paper industry and a danger to the public interest.

"The House reaffirms its strong support for the cause of the loggers and woods-workers generally in Newfoundland, and emphasizes the view that they must be represented by a strong union.

"The House calls upon the loggers to withdraw all support of the I.W.A. and to quickly organize a new union to include all loggers and other wood workers; to be independent of the pulp and paper companies; and to be strictly nonpartisan in public affairs, so that the present strike can be brought to a speedy end."

Mr. Speaker, there are people across the Mainland of this nation who just do not understand the shock and horror of the people of Newfoundland over the bloody violence, lawlessness and disorder of this present strike. They just don't understand the feeling that all Newfoundlanders have, all Newfoundlanders, ninety-nine out of every hundred. The reason they do not understand is that they have grown accus-

tomed to it in other Provinces, in certain other Provinces of Canada. It is not a new thing to them. It is something with which they have been familiar for a good many years past. In Newfoundland, on the other hand, this thing has come suddenly. It has come full grown, born boots and all on. We are not used to it. We do not propose to get used to it!

The I.W.A. is the spiritual inheritor of that great and bloody tradition of bloody labour wars conducted in the United States in the coal fields and before that in the hard rock industry, and then subsequently, on the Pacific Slopes, in the forests of the Pacific Slopes. It is a tradition of lawlessness, a tradition of bloody warfare — bloody labour warfare. I have known about it all my life, as a trade union organizer, as a labour man. It is not new to me. And now it has come to Newfoundland, brought here by the spiritual successor of the famous "Wobblies"; the Industrial Workers of the World, the O.B.U., "One Big Union"; ruthless, relentless, unscrupulous! They asked themselves into Newfoundland. They were not invited. Be clear on that. There is an hon. member of this house, present today, who is or was the solicitor for one of the Newfoundland loggers' unions; the hon. member for Fogo, (Mr. Mercer) barrister by profession, who was for years the solicitor to one of the Newfoundland loggers' unions. He knows; he could tell this house, if the need were there, that this I.W.A. muscled in here — muscled in, in the true traditions of gangsterism; in the Hoffa tradition, Jimmy Hoffa's tradition of musceling in. They were not asked. They were not invited. They muscled in here. They strong-armed their way in. They "Jimmy Hoffa's" their way into Newfoundland. Many and many a camp in Newfoundland was visited at two o'clock and three o'clock in the morning by organized bands of I.W.A. members, where the loggers, asleep in bed, were outnumbered two and three-fold by these union members, who came in with their "peaceful" persuasion, peaceably persuading them to join, at two and three o'clock in the

morning, and outnumbering them two and three-fold.

We have seen more lawlessness, more mob-violence, more mob-rule in the last fifty-four days than we had seen previously in all of Newfoundland's history, in all the labour disputes we have ever had, all of them put together — more in the last fifty-four days. And fifty-two days after the strike began and this bloody violence had continued, the leader of this union appeals to the members to be law-abiding!

One of the organizers of this union is a man named McCool. McCool, on a Sunday, visited a logging camp in the vicinity of Deer Lake. He sent out for loggers — certain loggers, to come to that camp from half a dozen other camps within reasonable distance, to come and meet him in this central camp. They did so, and he gave them a talking-to. On the following day, many men poured out of these camps on strike. McCool was asked about it by one of the radio stations. He knew nothing! It was news to him. The first he had heard of it! He would have to look into it. He said he would enquire and find out what it was. He knew nothing about it!

We have had more decent Newfoundlanders seeing the insides of jails and the inside of courtrooms in the last fifty-four days, in connection with labour disputes, than in all the previous history of Newfoundland; good, decent Newfoundlanders; decent, Christian men; law-abiding, honest, simple, unsophisticated men who were being turned into "ghouls", turned into "goon squads" by the I.W.A., befouling our Newfoundland life, to the shock and horror of all our churches, all of them, without exception; to the horror of all our press, with exception; to the horror of all our political parties, without exception; and to the horror of the overwhelming public sentiment of our good, decent Newfoundland people. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the house to take note of that: The pattern of the future is being set in this strike; the model, the mode for the future! If this strike should win, it would be because of the bloody violence, the lawlessness, the mob rule. And in the future

all unions having labour difficulties all unions in Newfoundland, or most of them, about to strike, would turn instinctively to the I.W.A. The I.W.A. then would be the schoolmasters for the labour movement in Newfoundland. They would be the teachers, the tutors. They would be the professors in all future strikes. "Nothing succeeds like success." If you can win with a bloody strike, bloody violence and lawlessness and mob rule, and if you can win and get away with it, and win and force the employer to his knees; if you can succeed, is not that obviously the way to do it in future? The I.W.A., if it won, would not only become the most powerful body in Newfoundland within its own immediate field, but by its prestige, by its standing in the rest of the labour movement, would be unchallenged and almost unchallengeable.

For the first time in our history we are beginning to get a militant class-conscious trade unionism. Now, that is greatly beloved by the Communists. The Communists always feel they can get somewhere when they get militant, class-conscious trade unions to deal with. They know that your God-fearing, decent citizens and fathers and husbands who go to church regularly, go to their lodges; whose kids go to school, the decent God-fearing citizen is poor material for Communism. But your militant, fighting, relentless, ruthless, class-conscious trade union is very good raw material upon which to build a Communist movement. Now I ask this house to try to imagine something very difficult to imagine: Imagine the United States of America, that great country, imagine a foreign union coming into the United States from, let us say, Great Britain, or you might take France, Germany, but let us take Great Britain. In the United States, Great Britain is a foreign nation. Englishmen, Scotch, Irish, Welsh people are foreigners — the United Kingdom is a foreign nation. Imagine, if you can, a union from Great Britain, some powerful union in Great Britain, moving bodily, bodily without invitation, into the United States and beginning to organize (let us say) the coal industry, ignoring the fact that that industry is already organized with an American union. Ignoring that fact, they proceed to organize these coal miners in a foreign union, domiciled in a foreign nation, owing allegiance to a foreign flag. And having by

various means organized all of the coal industry, they then took in the steel industry and the automobile industry and aircraft industry and railroads, by which time they would have organized into this foreign union, domiciled on foreign soil, owing allegiance to a foreign flag, organized into that union in the United States, half of the economy of the United States. Would the United States Government allow that? And if they would, would the Congress allow it? Allow a foreign union to sit astride half of the economy of that country?

And A.N.D. Company and Bowaters, between them, constitute half of our Newfoundland economy. Shall we allow a foreign union from a foreign country — foreign, friendly — but nonetheless foreign? They have their Stars and Stripes, we have our Union Jack. They have their citizenship, we have ours. They have their Constitution; we have our Constitution. They are a foreign country to us, we are a foreign country to them. There is no question of that — friendly but foreign nations. Will we allow a union, a foreign union from a foreign country; will we allow this particular foreign union, the (I.W.A.) to come in and dominate half of the economy of this little Province? Let alone the question of introducing amongst our people these new philosophies, these new concepts, these new ways of looking at things, these new moralities. Leaving all that aside, is it safe for our economy — half of it — to be dominated and controlled by any one foreign union, domiciled on foreign soil and owing allegiance primarily to a foreign flag?

Mr. Speaker, until 1909 our Newfoundland fishermen had one way of making a living, which was to catch fish and sell it. In 1909 the A.N.D. Company began to produce newsprint paper; and for the first time in our history, thousands of our fishermen had a new way of making a dollar opened up to them, which was to go into the bush for the A.N.D. Company. Then the great paper mill came to Corner Brook, and many thousands of our fishermen got an additional opportunity to earn a dollar. So that today, as I speak to you, there are 20,000 Newfoundland men who work in the woods, not at any given moment, any one day, but in a season. There would be 20,000 Newfoundlanders working in the lumberwoods for the two paper companies;

20,000 - 17,000 of them are fishermen. These 17,000 fishermen, or part-time fishermen who are part-time fishermen and part-time loggers, live in 700 different settlements along the 6,000 miles of our coast. Remember the figure: 17,000 fishermen in 700 settlements stretching along 6,000 miles of our coast. These 17,000 fishermen may not all be old-fashioned fishermen with blue guernseys. Some may be producing fish for modern frozen-fish plants and some not producing codfish but salmon, lobster, herring or a combination of any two or more. They have the outlook of fishermen. They have the background of fishermen. But they go in the bush for a fortnight every year, or three weeks or four weeks or five or six or seven weeks each year and thereby augment the income they managed to make, or have not managed to make in the fisheries. In addition to getting this additional cash income, earn a few more unemployment stamps to go into their unemployment insurance books, and take back with them to these 700 settlements millions upon millions of dollars of cash.

Of the 20,000 are left 3,000 other loggers who are not fishermen, who are loggers only. I say to this house this afternoon that the altogether wicked plan of the I.W.A. is to confine the logging industry to this 3,000 or more men. They say: "Equip these 3,000 to 4,000 men with chain saws and otherwise mechanize them, and in four or five months a year in the bush they can supply the A.N.D. Company and Bowaters with all the wood they need. Organize these 3,000 to 4,000 men into tight, well-knit, compact trade unionists earning \$5 or \$6 thousand dollars a year; give the I.W.A. \$100,000 in dues." Let I.W.A. get a million dollars out of it in cash and let 17,000 fishermen be left as they were before 1909, with nothing but fish and dole.

Now, I am prepared to admit frankly that this wicked plan would be a good thing for the I.W.A. I am prepared to admit it would be a good thing for the 3,000 to 4,000 loggers who constituted the membership of that highly industrialized union. I am not prepared to admit it would be good for the 17,000 fishermen and their families, for 700 Newfoundland settlements (that is over half of Newfoundland) not that it would be good for the economy of Newfoundland, for the industries, the factories, the busines-

ses, the railways, for all the rest of our economy and auxiliary industries that go to make up Newfoundland.

That is their plan. And I hold that it is the solemn duty, the duty of Newfoundland to stop that, to stop the I.W.A. in its tracks, to send the I.W.A. out of Newfoundland. That is our duty. It is the duty, I hold, of this house to help in doing that. It is the duty of the Government to do what lies in its power, and it is the duty of the general public of Newfoundland. We have a chance that no other province of Canada has. We can stop it now. We are still big enough to stop it — other provinces are not. It has gone too far ahead in other provinces, it has made too much headway. A mighty machine has been set up in other provinces, a mighty propaganda machine.

I have known about this labour movement and understood it too long to be scared when hired, salary-paid employees of a union, when a button is touched in some central office, begin shooting telegrams to me. If I did not know how they operated I might be fooled into thinking that what was happening was this: that all across Canada, unions were calling meetings of their members, and that hundreds of thousands of good Canadian people were meeting in their regularly convened meetings of their unions, and that they were there considering carefully and debating the speech I made, and were moving from the floor resolutions condemning me; that these resolutions were moved and seconded and debated and finally a vote put to the members and the motion carried and then put on the telegraph lines and sent to me to tell me how the masses of Canadians felt about my suggestion to the loggers of Newfoundland. If I did not know how these things operated, I might be scared. But I say this: that even here in our Province these unions that have called membership meetings have not succeeded in getting resolutions adopted, condemning the suggestions that have been made.

Now, it is time, I believe, for a nonpartisan approach to this thing! I have been deeply touched, far more deeply touched than I would allow myself to say, by the kind of nonpartisan support I have received in Newfoundland, support from just "Newfoundlanders" — Newfoundlanders first, Liberals second, Tories second, Norther-

ners second, citymen second, "Newfoundland First" — just reacting as decent Newfoundlanders, in thousands! When I receive letters and telegrams from branches of my hon. friend's party, (I see he knows I have) when I receive telegrams with offers of support from branches (organized branches) of his party across this Province, I must be touched — And I am! This is a time when we must all speak for Newfoundland. Remember that thrilling thing that happened in the House of Commons at Westminster. (I think it was Earl Winterton who shouted across the floor of the House at Arthur Greenwood, was it? I forget. Some member stood to speak to attack the Government of the day on the conduct of the war, I remember and Earl Winterton shouted — "Speak for England"!) Not for a party, not for any partisan interests — "Speak for Newfoundland"! — and tell this wicked crowd where they can go.

Motion: That this resolution be received and adopted.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, without taking up too much time, I would like to say a word or two with reference to this very important resolution. We on this side of the house are natural opposers. We oppose legislation brought in from time to time by the Government, not so much perhaps because we want to be always opposing but because we want to raise discussion on the various matters. But we have been long-enough in the Opposition now to know that there are times in the history of a House of Assembly, or of a Government or of an Opposition, when to oppose would be the worst possible thing to do in this world. We had an occasion at our last session. Such an occasion arose in connection with the recommendations of the McNair Commission. In that particular instance, you will remember, Sir, that we supported a Joint Resolution of this house. Why did we do that? We did it, Sir, because we believe it was in the best interest of this little country which we love so much. We have here before us, introduced by the hon. the Premier, one of the most important resolutions, I think, that I have ever seen introduced in this house or any other house in Newfoundland. It touches upon unionism. We, Sir, of the Opposition, and I

am quite sure, those on the Government side, believe in unionism. We believe in the right of the people to form unions in their own interest. We will fight side by side with our people to maintain that right to unionize themselves. We believe they have the right to bargain collectively, collective bargaining. They have the right of all sorts of things under unionism as it is today, as it exists today, after many, many years of fighting and heart-rending of the peoples of England and America and Canada, and all over the world. When unionism was first introduced into this world nearly everybody was against it, until it was seen there were many good points in unionism. Indeed if it were not for unionism today, the fate of our workers would be in a dire mess. So, Sir, we believe in unionism! But, Sir, unionism in a country without an economy is useless. And we on this side of the House have considered every aspect of this dispute which is now going on, and we have, Sir, come to the conclusion that what is happening in central Newfoundland and western Newfoundland is something derogatory to the welfare of our people. And we believe it is the duty of the Government and, may I say, of the Opposition, to protest in no uncertain terms when such a situation arises.

I watched one of the officials of the I.W.A. on television some short time ago. And as he spoke, Sir, and as he suggested that the I.W.A. was such a powerful institution in this world that they could get in touch with unions in Great Britain and all over the world and stop the delivery of paper from A.N.D. and Bowaters, if they so desired. That was insinuated. I was nauseated, nauseated to think that any man, whatever his nationality, could go on the air here in Newfoundland and threaten to destroy an industry, which, Sir, is the life-blood of Newfoundland. That radio address sickened me, as it must have sickened many people in this country.

Now, I have every sympathy for the loggers. I lived in Grand Falls for seven years. I know the conditions, and I have every sympathy — and I am prepared to fight for the loggers. But I am not prepared to stand idly by, (and I am quite sure not one of my colleagues is either) and see even the loggers, under the leadership which they have, disrupt the economy of the whole of Newfoundland. And that is what they are doing,

Mr. Speaker! We cannot possibly, as an Opposition, do other than on this occasion agree with this resolution. The wording of it may not be agreeable in certain aspects, but the principle, Sir, is correct — and we are, as I say, not going to stand idly by and see any union disrupt the economy of the 450,000 people in this country.

Nearly everybody in this country is dependent on the logging industry and on the paper industry. The hon. Premier just pointed out that some 17,000 fishermen in this country are in a measure dependent upon the successful prosecution of the logging industry. Grand Falls itself, and surrounding towns, with large populations, people who are not loggers, thousands of people are dependent on these loggers going into the woods and cutting down the trees. Are we going to allow somebody to come into this country and persuade these, I say, innocent loggers (and I say it is not with any derogatory "innocent") and persuade them to stop all work — stop all work — these people in Grand Falls and in Windsor and in Buchans and various other places depending on the logging industry — to heck with them? Then to get a man going on the air, like this fellow, add, saying: "We will get in touch with the union in England and in the States and we will see to it, or at least they will see to it that products produced by the A.N.D. Company will not be allowed to get into the markets." Sir, if we are going to live under tyranny such as that, I say, we are better dead.

I, for one, heartily support, heartily, the fact that the Government has taken the step it has. They have taken the right step. I must say we did get lots of criticism about our support of the resolution in connection with the McNair Report. We got a lot of criticism from our own friends, our own supporters, and I dare say we got a lot from the Liberals and others. We are going to get a lot more on this. But we four men on this side of the house, Sir, stand for Newfoundland. We stand not only for the fishermen, not only for the merchants, not only for the loggers, not only for the P.C.'s and certainly not only for the Liberals, but we stand, four-square, for Newfoundland, and say anything which is introduced into this country which undermines our economy, Sir, that we will fight to the last ditch.

I have seen so much propaganda. I had a

telegram myself from a big union in Ontario, where they suggested to me that the Government were using the R.C.M.P. to break this strike. Now, evidently they did not know what they were talking about. They are not on the scene. They do not know what is happening. Somebody wired them something about the R.C.M.P. arresting some people, and they say — well, that is the Liberal Government down there sending the R.C.M.P. in there to break up the strike. And this man, head of one of the biggest unions in Ontario, sent that message. I had a similar message from Prince Rupert, I believe, in British Columbia. Here we get men as far west as British Columbia telling us what we should do. And what are they doing it on? Just heresay evidence. We here in Newfoundland see what is happening. I daresay if the Attorney General chose to get to his feet today he could tell us things happened in this country which would raise your hair — if you had any — I have not got very much hair, but I am not the only one. But, Sir, I want us to be very sure that we know what we are doing in this thing. We have to handle it very carefully, very, very carefully. I have had many, many, many telegrams from people all over the country — and a lot of them from a district which is represented by the hon the Premier. As a matter of fact some of them indicated he will never land in Bonavista North again.

Mr. Smallwood: I will take a chance.

Mr. Hollett: I have to tell these people today, I sympathize with the attitude they have taken, but in this case must support their representative the Premier, in the stand which he has taken, because I believe it is in the best interest of Newfoundland, in the best interest of these people themselves. And I want to say to them now that we shall do everything we can to assist the economy of Newfoundland and not to break it down. Sir, I could go on for hours, but I had better not. I would like to conclude by saying that we will do everything in our power on this side of the house to see to it that the paper industry is not even slowed up. When you come to think of the economy of this country at the present time, think of the fishery last year, Bell Island with 550 men laid off last week, and now think of somebody coming in and organizing the loggers, 3,000

men (if there are 3,000 men) to go on strike and stop all work unless they get everything they want, Sir, it is time for the Government to take action — I really surprised the Government did not take some action before. We support the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to delay the house at all on this matter. I am merely rising because I think, as my leader has said, it is a time when anybody who is in public life, if he is worth his salt at all, will be prepared to stand up and be counted on this issue. And I do not think anybody can have any divided opinion on it. You are either in sympathy and in approval with the action that is being taken by the Government or you are not. I think for once the Premier is, I think he is probably accurate when he says 99% — I think he is very close to the actual mark. It is not a time for adulation. The situation is too serious for that. But how any Government could be expected to stand by and let matters continue to drift as they were drifting is inconceivable to me. In the action that has been taken there may be certain of the mechanics that are going to be worked out in the legislation we will hear later, that may demand some explanation but with the wisdom of the decision to intervene nobody can quarrel. I merely, Sir, stand because I think a man should stand on this issue and not try to take the protective colouration of any party he is in favour of.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear to the Premier and the members of the Government what our stand is in this very unfortunate dispute. At the same time I feel that we, as members of the Opposition, should individually express our support. The Opposition, as the name implies, opposes what it considers unsound legislation; it criticizes good legislation with the hope of making it better. But there are times, extraordinary times, and this is one of them, extraordinary occasions when I think the ranks have to be closed. And several hon. members have said now't is time for Newfoundland — this is non-partisan — the economy of Newfoundland is in jeopardy. Our way of life, our philosophy are all at stake, and no right-thinking Newfoundlander can take any other stand. We have an obligation, every

member of this Assembly, a solemn obligation to Newfoundland first and to labour. I feel that many of the fine citizens of Newfoundland who come within the scope of labour are confused by clever people, by methods that are very familiar to us. I feel that every step should be taken, and I think will be taken that there will be no confusion at all. We do not want to see brother set against brother in this dispute; and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have to make a very definite stand on this extremely serious matter. It is unnecessary to go into it. We are all familiar with the matter the Premier outlined. I merely want to say, as a member of this house, I strongly support the resolution.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, as the concluding speaker I shall not take too much time in my remarks concerning the resolution. I would say at first that it is fitting and proper that the elements of this labour trouble should be transferred from the Canadian National Telegraph lines to the calm and dignity and importance of this House of Assembly.

We are all conscious of the importance of this issue. We find on the one hand the economy of Newfoundland is being jeopardized. We find on the other hand that we have to be aware of the welfare, safeguarding the welfare and benefits of the loggers of this country. Yet it is important still that we make sure we are acting in the best way so that the welfare of the unions of this country be preserved. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I consider this issue of very great importance, and whereas people do not like being told what is going for them — they do not like being told what they should do. I do submit that there is an element in this dispute, an element arising which will be for the future benefit and future welfare of labour in this country. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have little fear of the Anglo-Newfoundland Company destroying the working people of this country, and the same applies to the other paper company. I feel that labour legislation, or legislation in relation to woods and lumbering business, has been of long standing in this country. Years back statutes were enacted safeguarding the rights, the working conditions and the general elements of wood labour work. I did read with some interest

written matter by Mr. Isaac Mercer, Q.C. who is, incidentally, the hon. member in this house for Fogo, in which he outlined the long list of Newfoundland legislation which has been enacted for the benefit of the loggers and the benefit of the logging industry. I will not recapitulate that in full, but there is an indication that we Newfoundlanders, no matter what side we belong to, can agree that the welfare of loggers has been in the minds and hearts of the various Newfoundland Governments for years and years past. When I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, that nobody wishes to be told what is good for them or what they should do, I had in mind, having read a letter in reply to the same hon. Member for Fogo, about a year ago, when he wrote to the President of the Canadian Labour Congress and told many of the dangers and troubles and confusions and strife that were about to arise in Newfoundland. He replied then. He said, in part, he agreed with Mr. Mercer that a situation like this is not good at any time, be it in Newfoundland or any other Province of our great country. If the President of the Canadian Federation of Labour agreed that strife, trouble, friction, any thing of that nature would endanger the economy of the great country of Canada, I think that is a very significant thing to remember, and I feel sure that in re-emphasizing and bringing up this point, the loggers of this country will probably reflect and may realize that responsible leaders do not want that trouble and restrictions for several reasons. It is not good for unionism; it is not good for labour, and it is certainly not good for Newfoundland.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we now come to the wording of this resolution: "The House of Assembly, while unreservedly reaffirming its support of well-organized and well-conducted trades and labour unions, strongly condemns the International Woodworkers of America for its conduct in Newfoundland and declared that by this conduct the said union has become a stumbling-block to the pulp and paper industry and a danger to the public interest. "The house reaffirms its strong support for the cause of the loggers and woodworkers generally in Newfoundland, and emphasizes the view that they must be represented by a strong union. "The house calls upon the loggers to with-

draw all support of the International Woodworkers of America, and quickly, to organize a new union to include all loggers and other woodworkers, to be independent of the pulp and paper companies, and strictly nonpartisan in public affairs, so that the present strike can be brought to a speedy end."

I am glad to see that this resolution restricts this issue to an invitation to the loggers of this country to join a union not sponsored by any Government. I am glad to see that this resolution advocates and advises an independent union, independent of the companies, independent of any Government, independent of any party. Well, what is there to disagree with? We merely suggest to the loggers of this country that they consider what is best to be done, form a new union which will create harmony. We are all human beings. Harmony can be worked out, with moderation, with a strong, calm purpose. If this campaign to end this unfortunate business can be carried forward with wisdom, with moderation with a strong, calm purpose, we will yet have peace, harmony, goodwill and justice in this country.

MOTION: That this resolution be received and adopted.

Premier Smallwood: Could we have a standing note, Mr. Speaker?

(All members, on both sides of the house, stood).

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion unanimously carried:

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I believe that concludes the business of the day. I would therefore move the adjournment. I am wondering if my hon. friends opposite would help me in this matter. My thought is to adjourn until today week. In all ordinary circumstances, adjournment is taken for two or three days anyhow, to enable the members of the Opposition to study the Speech from the Throne and prepare, do their research and prepare their material. I thought, perhaps we might adjourn until today week. Then it occurred to me that in view of all the circumstances it might be more prudent to adjourn to the call of the Chair, so that Mr. Speaker, could with fair-

ness to the Members call the House together, say with a day's notice. There just might be the necessity for that kind of action. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, nods — I take it, therefore, he and his colleagues are agreeable to that?

Mr. Hollett: I just wonder if the hon. the Premier could set a limit?

Mr. Smallwood: Not in any case more than a week. I propose to leave in the morning for Grand Falls and expect to be absent myself in Central Newfoundland for a number of days, consulting with the unions out there, the unions there now. So it would be inconvenient in the ordinary course for me to attend here. I know my first duty is here. When the house is in session, nothing should take the place of the house or any Member of it. Nevertheless, if it suits the convenience of the house we might adjourn to the call of the Chair, not later than one week from today.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is that this house do adjourn at the call of the Chair for a period of not longer than one week from today.

Motion carried.

The house at its rising then adjourned until the call of the Chair, for a period not longer than one week from today.

Monday, March 2, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR:

PRESENTING PETITIONS;

Hon. J. R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Lomond, Rocky Harbour, Rocky Point, Rocky Cove and vicinity. The petitioners pray, Sir, that a road be constructed from Needy's Harbour to Lomond thereby eliminating the present crossing by ferry, which is essential at this time. They also say, Sir, that the cost of the ferry is excessive and that it is dangerous and somewhat similar to

the Bell Island situation, that in winter time the tickle there between Woody Point and Bonne Bay freezes over and people of the northern part of the district have no access to the main highway there. I have much pleasure, Sir, in tabling the petition, and ask that it be forwarded to the Department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Sops Arm and Jacksons Arm in the District of White Bay South. This petition asks for the erection of a bridge across the Sops River, linking up the road which now goes to the bottom of Sops Arm with the road almost completed, to join up the two settlements of Sops Arm and Jacksons Arm. The house may be aware, Mr. Speaker, that several years ago Bowater's constructed a considerable number of woods roads in the Great Northern Peninsula, and that made it possible for the Government and Department of Highways to link up the people settled in the bottom of Sops Arm and several smaller settlements, and Sops River, a very important river, with a very large volume of water coming down there in the spring of the year and in the fall of the year. The residents of this area feel that a ferry would not be practical, as there would be some weeks during the wintertime when it would not be possible to use the ferry in the ice, while it would not be possible to cross on the ice as the ice would not be firm enough.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting the petition. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Highways will find it possible to make a survey of that river this year. I feel that the building of such a bridge would have an important relationship to the whole economy of that area and, among other things, facilitate the passage of persons wanting to go down that portion of White Bay and the Great Northern Peninsula and would surely increase the tourist industry and have the effect of opening up streams and other resources to tourists as well as to people who might be interested in economic development of one kind or another. I beg leave, Sir, to present the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

NOTICES OF MOTION;

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Finance, who is not here, I would ask leave to table the Public Accounts, and request permission of the house that they be printed.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed

Mr. Curtis: I give notice, Mr. Speaker, I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Protect the Public Interest in the Present Emergency."

ORDERS OF THE DAY LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act".

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): I may say, Mr. Speaker, in asking to have this order deferred, that some of the bills are at the printers and others are still under consideration, and so, under the circumstances, I would ask that the order be deferred until tomorrow.

On motion, second reading of this Bill deferred:

Honourable the Attorney-General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Prohibit Secondary Boycotts."

On motion Bill read a first time and ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

Honourable the Attorney-General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Prohibit General Strikes."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the house do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three-o'clock. At the same time, Sir, I might say for the benefit of the members that, if we find we are not ready to proceed, I will try to notify the members, in which event the Speaker can, if he will, adjourn the house for lack of quorum — but I would hope that we would be ready to proceed.

On motion the house adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three o'clock.

Tuesday, March 3, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Petitions:

Mr. M. Whalen (Harbour Main - Bell Island): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Brigus Junction. The prayer of this petition is for the provision of electricity to that settlement. One particular point, I think, should be considered, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this petition: the people of Brigus Junction, or most of them, work within the Canadian National Railway, and they are obliged to have their homes in that central location, or at least somewhere near the railway station. It would be impractical and almost impossible for them to take advantage of the scheme of centralization or otherwise move to a locality where they would have these facilities. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the prayer of this petition. I ask that it be laid on the table of the house and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Malcolm Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition. I wonder if I could get some information as to just what happens. What is the point of petitioning the Government? Have the Government the power or facilities to give electricity to any place, or just what is done in that connection? I fail to see how the Government can do it, unless they can persuade the power companies to put in that electricity. What procedure is adopted on petitions such as that? I just rise to ask for that information.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps that may be more properly answered when I call the Orders of the Day.

Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

Hon. W.J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Department of Mines and Resources.

Notice of Questions:

Mr. Hollett gives notice of questions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition asked a question a minute or two ago to which I think I can give an answer. As he knows, we have two boards in Newfoundland governing electricity and the supplying of electricity. One is, of course, the Board of Public Utilities, which can, if it sees fit, require an existing company to go into a settlement, if it is economically feasible for the company to go into that settlement. In a neighbourhood, for instance, which has electricity passing through it, if it is economically feasible the Board of Public Utilities will instruct the company to bring electricity to the people in that place. As my hon. friend knows, there is also the Power Commission, recently set up, which is doing much in the way of planning substantial long-distance electrical services. If an application or a petition comes from a locality which is nowhere near an existing line, but will require a transmission line, the Power Commission will look into it, check the cost and assess the situation under the Federal scheme to see if it would qualify for inclusion in that scheme. In any event, they will see if power cannot be brought to that community, if necessary through subsidy by the Government.

Mr. Hollett: I thank the hon. the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a supplementary question? Has the Power Commission, to date, made any suggestions or recommendations to the Federal Department relevant to any areas?

Mr. Curtis: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that question. The Board of Public Utilities is responsible to me, the

Power Commission to the Minister of Economic Development. I am quite sure my hon. friend will repeat that question on an early occasion, when he will get an answer.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

Hon. the Attorney General asked leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Protect the Public Interests in the Present Emergency." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.

I might say, for the sake of the Opposition and for the sake of the members on both sides of the House, I hope tomorrow that we will be able to proceed with some of the "second readings." There are four of them on the Order Paper. The Government is definitely ready in the case of one of them. So, I expect that, by tomorrow, we will be able to settle down and do some business. I might say, we could have asked you not to sit today, Mr. Speaker. We could have read the bill we have read a first time on tomorrow, but I think it is better if things follow the normal course. The rules provide for first reading one day and second reading the next. For that reason, at great inconvenience, I know, to some, we have opened today. I hope tomorrow we will be ready to proceed. I expect the Premier will be here, too.

On motion, all remaining Orders of the day do stand deferred:

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.

Wednesday, March 4, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

VISIT OF HER MAJESTY:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the House of the

general character of the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty the Queen of this Province. Her Majesty, accompanied, as the House knows, by Prince Philip, will arrive at Torbay Airport in the afternoon. From Torbay Airport Her Majesty will drive through the City of St. John's on her way to Government House, driving via LeMarchant Road, Cornwall Avenue, down the Road De Luxe, along Waterford Bridge Road, and New Gower Street or Water Street to Government House. She will arrive at Government House, presumably, about an hour after she has landed at Torbay Airport.

On the following forenoon, Friday, the 19th., Her Majesty will hold a reception at Government House for about an hour, starting at 10 a.m. It is Her Majesty's Government's hope, in this Province, that she will then have the opportunity of greeting numbers of people who will come for the purpose to St. John's from various parts of the Province.

At the conclusion of this reception, Her Majesty will then drive to the new Confederation Building to perform a ceremony there, and then proceed to the Airport to enplane for Gander. Her appearance in St. John's, therefore, will consist of driving from the airport at Torbay through the part of the city that I have mentioned. It is the hope of Her Majesty's Ministers in Newfoundland, that is, Her Majesty's Government, to arrange that every possible opportunity be given to the people not only of St. John's but of those parts of Newfoundland which lie reasonably close to St. John's to see Her Majesty and Prince Philip, and to greet her and show their feelings and loyalty to her, with a special and a very special emphasis on an opportunity being given to the children, the younger generation of Newfoundland. Her Majesty will leave Torbay by the same jet aircraft that brings her from the United Kingdom, for Gander. She will arrive at Gander at 1:00 p.m. Friday. She will drive through the Town of Gander, where the people and again the children particularly, in so far as Her Majesty's Ministers can arrange, in friendly collaboration with the authorities at Gander, will be given an opportunity to greet their Monarch.

From Gander Her Majesty and the Prince will proceed by aircraft to Deer Lake. In Deer Lake, again with the help of the local authorities, Her Majesty's Ministers are en-

deavouring to arrange that the whole of the population, not only of Deer Lake but of all the places nearby, including the great area of St. Barbe's district, at least that part of it which by then will be open to Deer Lake by road, will have an opportunity to greet Her Majesty and the Prince. Again, I say, special emphasis will be placed on providing an opportunity for the children of that part of Newfoundland to greet their Queen.

From Deer Lake the Queen will drive by road to Corner Brook and in Corner Brook will tour the city for about an hour and have a good opportunity to see the superlatively beautiful city of the west coast. Again the emphasis will be placed upon giving the people and especially the children ample opportunity to see and to greet our Monarch.

From Corner Brook, the Queen will proceed by car back over the Deer Lake Highway to Strawberry Hill, Newfoundland home of Sir Eric Bowater, and one of the most beautiful homes in Canada. There Her Majesty will spend the evening and night of that day, Friday. On the following morning, Saturday, Her Majesty and the Prince will drive from Strawberry Hill by car at 9:30 for the airport at Deer Lake. From Deer Lake Airport they will enplane, by the same plane that brings them from Gander to Deer Lake, to Harmon Field.

At Harmon Field Her Majesty will be driven at once on arrival to Stephenville and through the Town of Stephenville back to the airport, leaving Newfoundland at noon on Saturday for her next stop which is in Schefferville, better known to most of us as Knob Lake, in Newfoundland and Quebec Labrador, where we hope she and the Prince will have an opportunity to see the great iron ore development presently carried on by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and at the same time to fly over the great Grand Falls of Labrador, now more generally known as Hamilton Falls.

At Gander Her Majesty will open the new terminal, the great new air terminal that has been built by the Government of Canada over the past couple or 3 years so that the only formal functions that the Queen will perform while on the Newfoundland part of her Canadian tour will be the opening of the great new Confederation Building in St. John's and the opening of the great new

Federal Air Terminal at Gander. For the rest of her visit to this Province it will be extremely simple, merely consisting of driving through the streets of St. John's, Gander, Deer Lake, Corner Brook and Stephenville. At these places it is believed that enormous numbers of Newfoundlanders can congregate, can come to meet her. People from the whole of the Avalon Peninsula, without a doubt, will be present on that occasion at St. John's. At Gander, people from the whole of Bonavista Bay, a large part of Trinity Bay, all of Notre Dame Bay including the great town of Grand Falls and of course the towns of Lewisporte, Botwood, Windsor, Bishop's Falls, Badger, Buchans and Springdale, and most of Notre Dame Bay and especially Green Bay can be present at Gander. It should be the greatest, incomparably the greatest, congregation of people that Gander has ever seen. Similarly at Deer Lake. Not only the people of Deer Lake and Howley and other towns nearby, but the people of the whole of the coast or most of the coast of St. Barbe will be able to go by road and constitute the greatest assembly of Newfoundlanders ever known in that great west coast town of Deer Lake. At Corner Brook, not alone the 25,000 people who constitute our second city but all the people from Bay of Islands, the Great Bay of Islands, will have ample and easy opportunity to greet the Queen and Prince on that memorable occasion. Then, finally, at Stephenville it will be quite feasible not only for the people of Stephenville, that great western town, to greet Her Majesty but the whole, I say, the whole, of the great area known, in this house at least, as the Port au Basques district and that even greater area geographically known here to us at St. George's district, and a very large part of the population of the area known to us in this house as the district of Burgeo-LaPoile can, without doubt, drive by car or bus to Stephenville to express their loyal greetings to Her Majesty.

So that, Mr. Speaker, when St. John's, Gander, Deer Lake, Corner Brook and Stephenville, these five towns at which Her Majesty will visit, are taken together at least two-thirds of the people of Newfoundland should be able to see and greet the Queen on the occasion of her forthcoming visit this coming summer.

One final word: Her Majesty's Ministers in

Newfoundland, that is to say, the Government of Newfoundland, for obvious reasons, have not had the sole decisions as to what Her Majesty's visit should be in the Province. The desire of Her Majesty's Ministers in any case of the 9 provinces must, obviously, fit into the overall Canadian pattern as laid down by Her Majesty's Ministers in Right of Canada, that is to say Her Majesty's Canadian Ministers, the Ministers for all of Canada as against Her Majesty's Ministers for each individual one for the 9 Provinces, or 10 Provinces. (I forgot that we were a Province of Canada) — I do not very often forget that. I appreciate fully the point my hon. friend made — I do not often forget that Newfoundland is a Province of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that nobody envies the task of the Government of Canada in exercising an overriding control over Her Majesty's movements in Canada. Canada is not just Canada. Canada is 10 provinces, and Her Majesty has Ministers in each one of these ten provinces. And it is the duty of Her Majesty's Ministers in each Province to advise Her Majesty on her Majesty's movements in that Province; but obviously there must be a common clearing house for Canada as a whole, and that clearing house is the Government of Canada. So that over recent weeks my colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Chalker) who has been in charge of this work, has had to collaborate very closely with the Federal authorities, as his counterparts in the other 9 Provinces of Canada have had to do, so that a plan for all Canada can be developed, with the co-operation and consent and advice of Her Majesty's Minister of Canada in trying to reconcile for Canada, as a whole, the desires and demands of Her Majesty's Ministers in all 10 Provinces. But I think when it is remembered that this reconciliation has to be made, our desires, as Her Majesty's Government in Newfoundland, our desires, with the over-all requirements of the Government of Canada, — I think it will be agreed that this is the best arrangement that could have been made.

Notice of Question:

Mr. G. Rex Renouf (St. John's South) gives notice of questions on tomorrow:

ORDERS OF THE DAY LEGISLATION: (WOODS LABOUR — I.W.A.)

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Make Provision for the Safeguarding the Public Interest in View of the Present Unsettled Conditions in the Woods Labour Part of the Pulp and Paper Industry in the Province, for Decertifying Trade Unions, and for other Purposes in Connection"

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): There has been a mistake made in the printing of the wording. The wording was set forth on the Order Paper of yesterday — I had intended moving today that the wording be changed, but the wording here is not the exact wording of the amendment I propose. I would ask leave to amend the wording of the bill, to be the same as set forth in the Orders of the Day, stopping at the word Province. The reading should be — "An Act to make provisions for safeguarding the public interest in view of the uncertain conditions in the woods labour part of the pulp and paper industry in the Province" — and the words following to be omitted. I think I should have the consent of the House to change the title. Second Reading of a Bill, An Act to Make Provisions for Safeguarding the Public Interest in View of the Present Unsettled Conditions in the Woods Labour Part of the Pulp and Paper Industry in the Province:

Hon J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill. I would first remind Your Honour, the point just made by the Attorney-General has nothing to do with the Bill. It is only the wording of the title of the Bill on today's Order Paper. The title of the Bill itself is as it appears in this printed edition of the Bill.

The purpose of this Bill is to deal with the present situation in the pulp and paper industry of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, before I come to the actual details of the Bill, in so far as I am allowed to deal with the details of the Bill in the second reading, I think I should first report to the house, briefly, and only briefly, on the events of the past week or so in Central Newfoundland. The day after the House (that is the opening day on which the House unanimously adopted a measure condemning the IWA) I

went to Grand Falls. I arrived there at 2 p.m. In Grand Falls I was in conference with officers of practically all of the unions, not all but practically all of the unions operating in Central Newfoundland. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in passing, that all but one union operating in Central Newfoundland are locals of international unions. The one exception is the Longshoremen, a union in Botwood. That is a purely local union, affiliated, I believe, with nothing, not even, I think, with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. It is almost exactly similar to the Longshoreman's Union in the City of St. John's, in that they are purely and wholly a Newfoundland local union affiliated with nothing. But with that one exception, all the unions with which I met were Newfoundland locals, local lodges or local branches of international unions. I am thinking at the moment of such international unions as the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, of which I was once a paid organizer. Indeed, it was as an organizer and employee of this brotherhood that I came to Newfoundland and reorganized Local 63 at Grand Falls and organized Local 64 at Corner Brook. The present International President of that Brotherhood is a very close friend of my own, J.P. Burke. He is one of the most highly respected labour leaders in the whole of the United States; a man; I believe, who could have been President of the United States Federation of Labour when William Green was elected, had he been representing a union of greater international importance in the United States. The Brotherhood of Paper Makers, since my active days in the movement, has acquired a new name. It used to be called the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers. Since then it has amalgamated with another union of paper makers and is now known as the United Brotherhood of Paper Makers — and something else — but it means practically the same thing. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the International Association of Machinists, the International Union or Brotherhood (I forget which) or Association of Office Workers. These are the 5 that operate within the pulp and paper mill at Grand Falls. In addition there are still other locals of international unions: The International Union or Brotherhood or Association (I forget

which) of Retail Clerks. That is the shop and clerks, warehouse clerks, and the International Brotherhood, Union or Association of Hod Carriers (I do not remember which) — and so it goes.

I sat with representatives of these bodies, officers of these bodies who were there assembled in the hall to meet me and greet me as I went in. We sat and discussed the whole situation in Central Newfoundland. I was not only impressed, but profoundly so, by the completely unshakable character of the determination of those men not to have anything to do with the I.W.A. not to support them in any shape or form. They were adamant, they were unflinching, they were implacable, they were implacable in their determination to have nothing to do with the I.W.A. I have never seen a body of men, trade union men, officers and leaders, in my life so determined about anything as they were to oppose the I.W.A. They regard the I.W.A. as an unqualified menace to them and their families.

Now the proof of that was seen a day or so later when they were all called together in one meeting at which I was not present, a meeting of the Central Newfoundland District Labour Council, at which delegates had been elected to constitute this district. Council delegates from Buchans to Gander appeared. Note especially, they were the regularly elected delegates. They had not been elected just for that meeting. They were the regular delegates, the men who constituted that council. They met and were addressed by a special representative of the Canadian Labour Congress who had come to Newfoundland about this strike. I think his name was Rose. Mr. Rose spoke for the Canadian Labour Congress to these union delegates, those officers, those representatives of all the unions of Central Newfoundland from Gander to Buchans, including Grand Falls, Botwood and Buchans. He told them that they had to obey the Canadian Labour Congress. They had no choice. They simply had to obey the orders sent out by the Canadian Labour Congress. They had to support the I.W.A. They had no choice. Their's not to reason why. The C.L.C. had sent out the order to all international unions — "Support the I.W.A." They had no choice.

One man, representing one union, stood and said: "Mr. Rose, am I to understand

from you, from the Canadian Labour Congress, am I to understand and is my union to understand that we have no choice in this matter?" The answer was: "Right. You have no choice." "Am I to understand that we just have to obey whether we like it or not?" the answer was: "You have to obey, whether you like it or not." The question was then asked by him: "Suppose we do not agree with the methods used, the breaking of laws, the violence, the mob-rule? If we do not agree with these, have we still got to obey the C.L.C.?" He was told by Mr. Rose: "You have to obey the C.L.C. You have no choice but to obey.

Then that delegate said: "In that case I will walk out of this meeting and, with me, my union goes from this council." And he walked out. A second man got up, representing another union. He said: "I will also walk out. We are not taking that." And he also walked out. A third man, representing a third union got up and said the same and walked out, and a fourth and a fifth and sixth and seventh and eighth and ninth. Nine unions walked out, and that was the end of that council. That was the end. The secretary of the Council, Mr. Fred Grimes, said before he walked out — "Well, gentlemen, of course this is the end of this council. It has no quorum. It is disbanded," and he walked out. That left the representatives of 3 unions remaining at the meeting. A day or so later the Canadian Labour Congress announced they had disbanded the District Labour Council. They had done no such thing. They (the unions of the District Labour Council) had disbanded it themselves.

I found that the people of Grand Falls are 99% opposed to the I.W.A., or 99.99%. The same thing applies to Windsor, the Town of Windsor and the Town of Botwood. Gander is about 95% opposed to the I.W.A. and has been, not only today as I am speaking here this afternoon but has been opposed, unalterably, to the I.W.A. So I announced on Saturday past that loggers who wished to form — loggers who were against the I.W.A., loggers, remember, loggers who were against the I.W.A. and wished to form a new logger's union were invited to come to the Town Hall in Grand Falls to hold a meeting. In the hall and on the platform were officers of all the mill unions and officers of 3 or 4 or 5 other unions, interna-

tional unions who were not established inside the mill, not part of the five mill unions, so called. They sat on the platform, and they were amongst the 10 men who sat at 10 different tables to help the loggers fill out their application forms to join the new union that was formed. These men, incidentally, were introduced to the audience by me, by name, and I named their unions. And in their behalf I pledged their warm support and active practical help to the new union. In their name I pledged that to the loggers.

May I say in passing, Mr. Speaker, and the House will note this with considerable interest: one of the troubles in the past, up to now, up to Saturday, has been the fact that the mill unions, the organized workers in and around the mill, have not taken too much interest in the loggers. The loggers have rather been left to themselves by the mill unions. And I believe sincerely today that the mill unions in Grand Falls realize now that it would have been better for all concerned, for Newfoundland, for Grand Falls, if they had taken a more brotherly interest, a more patriotic interest, in the loggers than they had taken in the past. So it was for me (I being merely the catalyst, nothing but the go-between, nothing but the person to start the ball rolling) and as one who started the ball rolling, I was charmed and delighted to be able to say to these loggers — "Brothers, from here to these loggers to have the guidance, the advise, the practical help of the unions in Grand Falls. You are all working for the same employers, you are all working for the same industry, and it will be good for Newfoundland, it will be good for the industry and it will be good for all who work in the industry if the mill unions and loggers union pull together, closely working together." Because the House will appreciate, Sir, that my purpose is to get out of this, get it planned and bow out, get the union going and step aside, get the loggers union launched and flourishing and then return to my parliamentary duties, with every other parliamentarian in this Chamber. So that the one thing which was needed was for the co-operation, active, ardent, sincere, and very sincere offer of help from the unions in Grand Falls to their brother Newfoundlanders in the woods.

I have held many, many meetings in the Town Hall of Grand Falls, I have held at

least 50 meetings in that Town Hall, in my life. I have never seen a meeting that even began to compare with that meeting on Saturday afternoon. Hundreds of loggers (800) were jammed and crowded and cramped inside those four walls. It was unlawful, against the rules of safety. The platform was crowded. The main floor was crowded. The galleries were crowded, and between the rear wall, facing the platform and outside the wall facing the street it was crowded and there were 800 in the hall. The only men in that hall who were not loggers were myself (and I am a logger of sorts but not the kind of logger that forms the union) — my son was there and there were clerks, all people I had there, — Mr. Greg O'Grady, Mr. Elmer Vaters, Mr. Walter Carter from the Premier's Office and there was a fourth one whose name I do not remember at the moment, and Mr. William Adams the lawyer, and Mr. Max Lane. That is all there were in the hall. On the platform were the representatives of the Grand Falls unions, and except for these, every man in the hall was a practical logger. No one else was allowed in the hall. There was only one entrance, one door, and there were a couple of men inside the door to ask questions of every man who came in — "Are you a logger?" "Are you coming to join the union?" If the answer was, "no", to either one of these questions he was not allowed in. It was just a logger's meeting. It was not a public meeting.

Outside the hall there were a number of loggers that could not get in the hall. It was estimated (and the house is familiar with estimates of numbers of men who attend public meetings or who were overflowing audiences and who cannot get in) and I think a realistic estimate, at 300 outside who could not get into the hall. About 150 of these were taken across High Street, to the opposite side of the street up into the union office and signed up. And we only managed to get about half of them, so that it is quite clear there were 300 and there were 2,000 other people on the street. They say that never in Grand Fall's history were there so many people gathered together at one time. They were crowded on the main street of Grand Falls right around in front of that Town Hall. If it had been an outdoor public meeting we would have had 3,000 to 4,000 people.

I may say in passing, the I.W.A. called a meeting for the same hour, 2:30 p.m. Saturday, at Bishop's Falls, in the Roman Catholic Assembly Hall; the same assembly hall my hon. friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources and my hon. friend, the Minister of Education accompanied me and my son, in the holding of a meeting a few months ago, last spring, at the time of the Federal election. We are very familiar with that hall. We had movies taken of it, and these movies were shown on television. We are very familiar with that hall. If you could get 250 persons into that hall you could get 250,000. We know the hall. We are familiar with it. So that they moved outdoors and held an outdoor public meeting, a public meeting remember, a public meeting, to which anyone who cared could come, anyone whosoever would might come. Now I talked with another ecclesiastic, not nearly so high, who went to see what the meeting was like, and I talked to at least 10 persons of high credibility, i.e. highly representative persons, and they all estimated that the big meeting held outdoors ran between 500 and 600 persons, men, women and children, about 500 or 600 souls at that meeting. The Attorney-General (Mr. Curtis) telephoned me at Grand Falls and informed me (he does not know I am going to say this, and I hope I am not speaking out of turn in telling this) the Attorney-General telephoned me at Grand Falls and informed me that an official estimate of the number at the meeting of loggers, the number of loggers at that meeting, was 200. That was the official estimate. I will not spell out what I mean by official, but the house knows what I mean when I got it from the Attorney General. When I was in Grand Falls I was very careful to keep my distance from the R.C.M.P. I did not go near the R.C.M.P. nor the magistrate nor anyone like that — 200 loggers! I heard a very truthful gentleman announce that there 1200 loggers at the meeting, not counting the others and not counting the women; 200 that is the number, and they came from as far away as Deer Lake. They had to be brought from as far west as Deer Lake, and Deer Lake is a long distance west from Badger, and from Bonne Bay even, to gather as much as 200 together. Henri Barbusse, the great novelist said: "The first casualty of war is truth." It is the very first thing that dies.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): All wars?

Hon. Premier: In all wars the first thing that dies is truth. That applies to trade unions, civil wars — 200 loggers became 1200. In addition to the 800 loggers who came inside the hall in Grand Falls Saturday (all of whom joined). In addition to these 800 at least 100 of those 800 came up through the centre aisle to the platform and handed in lists of names of men from their various settlements who wished to join, together with \$1 for each of those men. That was pretty convincing. There were as many as 50 men at one time standing waiting their turn to hand in the names with the money. In addition to that, telegrams came in all that day before the meeting, that morning, Saturday morning, and several times during the meeting a telegraph messenger boy came from the C.N.T. right up through the centre aisle and handed me a wad of telegrams, which I must confess I would open and read out, 30, 40, 70 names; 117 names, 10 names, 2 names, 1 name — I would read them all out and all would be greeted by cheers from the audience. And before Saturday was over even, there were 1,800 loggers who joined the new brotherhood, 1,800. That has never been seen before in the history of this island. Never did any union get born in one day with 1800 members. That makes it at its very birth, at its very birth, one of Newfoundland's biggest unions.

Now, today is Wednesday and the number is somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 members. That is a long way from the 20,000 members it will reach. It won't reach the 20,000 mark for months to come, and maybe not before the fall. But, Mr. Speaker, on the day that the strike took place there were 1200 men in the woods. So that it is about three times as many now as there were in the woods on the day of the strike, now paid up in the new brotherhood. The number who voted in connection with the strike was 815, of which 790 something voted for the strike and the balance of the 815 voted against the strike. The grand total number that voted was 815. The union has now more than four, closer to five, times as many men in its ranks as voted for the strike — more than that. As I speak to you this afternoon there are more men back at work in A.N.D. Company camps, there are more

men back to work than voted for the strike, right now this afternoon. Yesterday Gambo turned completely over — Gambo, Middle Brook, Dark Cove, Indian Bay, Wareham, Hare Bay, Glovertown — Yesterday the loggers themselves went back to work, the picketers went back to work, the picket lines signed up and went back to work. Gambo turned completely over to the new union, and went back to work yesterday, Tuesday, and more of them went back again today. In Terra Nova yesterday, I think, there were 140 men, in one slap, who went back to work. The I.W.A. is finished in Central Newfoundland, not completely finished but on the way out, not completely gone but on the way, in Central Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, this strike in Central Newfoundland could have been ended quite easily six weeks ago by the Government. My hon. friends in this House are entitled to ask, if that is so why did the Government end that strike six weeks ago, and I would say that the people of Newfoundland are entitled to ask the same question. The I.W.A. were certified to be the bargaining agent of the loggers, that is, those loggers who worked for the A.N.D. Company. They were certified by the Labour Relations Board. The house will recall that that was done as a result of a secret ballot, a vote taken by mail. The Labour Relations Board, which is often called a "government board" but which is not a government board, sent the ballots through the mail, and they were received back and counted, and as a result the I.W.A. were certified as the bargaining agent of the A.N.D. Company loggers. There is no question about that. They were certified. This was some months ago. That was lawful. That was legal. There has never been any argument about that at all. There cannot be any argument about that. They were lawfully certified. The unlawful part has come since.

But, Sir, the strike vote was taken not by the Labour Relations Board — please note this — the strike vote was not taken by the Labour Relations Board. It was not taken by the government. It was taken by the I.W.A. It was not a secret ballot. It was not taken without force, violence and threats of force and violence. Please take note of that. That is terribly important. Intimidation and the threats of force succeeded in getting 815 loggers to vote. That is all — no more no less

— There were 1200 loggers in the woods at the time. There were 4000 A.N.D. Company loggers of whom 1200 were in the woods, of whom 815 voted. There is the democracy — the full extent of the democracy. The 815 who voted were not given the privilege to vote quietly without the threat of force nor the threat of recrimination or punishment. Remember that! And I say there has never been a strike in Newfoundland — never in Newfoundland's history has there been a strike so unpopular as this strike is in Central Newfoundland, thoroughly unpopular, thoroughly, I say thoroughly unpopular — and for obvious reasons. If there are 4,000 members of a union and 1200 are in the bush at a given moment and 800 of them are allowed to vote, and they are not allowed a free and unhampered vote, how can you expect it to be a popular strike?

Now of course its unpopularity was greatly accentuated by the violence and the mob-rule which horrified and shocked so many of the God-fearing Newfoundlanders in Central and Northern Newfoundland and indeed all over Newfoundland. A most unpopular strike. Six weeks ago we could have ended that strike, this Government. The Attorney-General too could have ended the strike. But remember even the Attorney General, although he is Her Majesty's principal law officer in Newfoundland, he is the Queen's Legal Adviser — although he is that, he is still a member of the Queen's Administration and the Premier still has a little to say in these matters and all his colleagues have something to say too. The Attorney General cannot act as though he were one government by himself, clearly, obviously, not in the British system. And the Attorney General did not disagree in any case. I say, we could have ended the strike in one purely simple way — enforcing the law. That is all! We just had to enforce the law. Now, that is our duty. That is the duty of every government, to enforce the law. The first duty of a government is not to provide education nor roads nor schools nor electricity. The first duty of a government is to preserve law and order. That is the first duty which a government has. That is why governments were formed since the dawn of history. That was the first reason for the first government, to preserve law and order, so that those who lived inside the

boundaries of a government could feel their lives were safe, their limbs were safe — safety of life and limb. After that, you can begin to have freedom of your conscience, to practice your own religion, to follow your own beliefs, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly. But the first right of all you are entitled to claim as a citizen is that your government will preserve law and order.

That is all we had to do six weeks ago, preserve law and order on the picket lines. That is all! If we had done that much men in thousands, and I say again, men in thousands, many of them members of the I.W.A. and many of them not — Let me put this on the record just in passing; why this was done I do not know, maybe the Minister of Labour will some day tell the inside story. I do not know why it is that when they took the ballot that gave the vote to the I.W.A., gave them certification, when they took that vote only these people were allowed to vote: (Who do you want to be your bargaining agent? Is it the I.W.A. or this or that or the other — Who do you want to be your bargaining agent?) (1) You had to be a logger (of course), (2) You had to be an A.N.D. Company logger (of course, because it was to be a bargaining agent to deal with the A.N.D. Company) (3) You must have worked for the A.N.D. Company in the preceding nine months. Why not 10 months? Why not 11 months? Why not 12 months? Why was it limited only to those who had worked for the A.N.D. Company in the preceding nine months? Why? Is there any good answer to that question? I would like to know what it is. Why is a man who worked for the A.N.D. Company 11, 12, 10 months before barred from voting. Why. Is there any good answer to that? I would like to hear it.

Now secondly, not only had he to work in the previous nine months but in these nine months he must have worked 35 days. Why not 34? Why not 25 days? Why not 24 days? This is a point. 25 working days, you see, is a month, taking off Sundays and so on) — Why not 24 days? If he worked a month before the month in question, and worked only 24 days in that month he was not allowed to vote. The hon. Leader of the Opposition looks doubtful. I am giving him the simple truth. This is the simple truth: If you are a logger in the A.N.D. Company and worked for them in the previous 10 months,

you are not allowed to vote, but if it was nine months, eight months, three months, two months and you did not work more than 25 days, more than 24 days you are not allowed to vote. However, the point is that out of them all there were only 800 men who voted for the strike. That is why it was a very unpopular strike. It was unpopular from the very start. Of course, those who voted for it did not think it was going to last 60 odd days. They thought it would last a week, two days, three days, the mere mention of a strike and the A.N.D. Company would swoon, they would faint, come crying on their knees to Mr. Ladd and Mr. McCool. One day we will tell the story of Mr. McCool and all his previous connections. We will tell that story. We know that story of Mr. McCool and Mr. Hall (his present name — the name he goes by at the present time. The name he goes by since being in Newfoundland. I know his full story.)

Mr. Hollett: He comes from Halls Bay.

Mr. Smallwood: No, he does not come from Halls Bay. Nobody in Halls Bay would be very proud of that. As far as I can learn, Mr. Ladd is the best of the three of them. In common fairness, I think we must say that. I do not think he is in a class with the other two. I do not think he is quite in a class with the other two. Incidentally, I understand that the latest development is that one is blaming the other now for the failure of their strike. Now, Sir, I think that in time the strike will end. It will end. By the way, let me finish that thought I was going on with — it could have ended six weeks ago by enforcing the law. Had we done so, we would have been the "great-grand-daddy," this government, by just enforcing the law, which it is our duty to do. We would have been the "great-granddaddy" of all strike breakers, clearly, obviously. So we refused to do it, quite blankly and bluntly. We refused to go in and clean up the picket lines and make them lawful. Oh, we could have called the House together long ago and passed legislation to end the strike.

Sir, I took a position in this, and I am very proud of the fact that my colleagues have supported me in the position I took. My colleagues, my friends, have supported me and agreed that I was right when I took this position, and I would have been willing to

resign as Premier rather than not take this position. I am not so anxious to be Premier of Newfoundland that I will do what I think is wrong, just to remain as Premier. I just won't do it. It is just as well to face that. I won't do it! But, thank God, what I thought was right my colleagues also thought was right, and that was this: first it was wrong for the Government just to become a big strike breaker, and secondly, the people to break the strike were the loggers. They were the people to break the strike. I also realized that just to say that was not getting very far. That was not accomplishing very much. To ask the loggers just to walk out of the I.W.A. was not enough. You had to offer them something to take the place of the I.W.A. Nature abhors a vacuum. Men do not leave something for nothing. They do not leave even the I.W.A. for nothing. There had to be something, some alternatives. So, I suggested in my original broadcast that they should throw out the I.W.A., abandon, just leave them — in God's name, Mr. Speaker, in God's name, I asked, have they not got the right to do that? Does this become a sin, if the loggers desire to leave the I.W.A.? Is it a sin? If it is, what kind of sin is it they have committed? Is it a venial or a mortal sin? What kind of sin is it if our Newfoundlanders, our own flesh and blood, decide to leave the I.W.A. — What kind of sin is it?

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): An original sin.

Premier Smallwood: "Original" — Alright, if it is not a sin, is it a crime? Is it a crime if our Newfoundland loggers decide to leave the I.W.A. and tell them to go to wherever they want to go, out of Newfoundland? Is that a crime? What law are they breaking? Is it a moral crime? What offence, what kind of an offence is it for the loggers to leave the I.W.A. and form another union? And, by the same token, what kind of an offence is it if the Leader of the Opposition, Her Majesty's Opposition, which is as much a part of the Constitution of British countries as the government itself, Her Majesty's Opposition — not (if I may be excused for using the word) Mr. Hollett's Opposition but Her Majesty's Opposition, if the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition came out and suggested to the members of the I.W.A. to

form another union? Has he committed any sin, has he broken any law, legal or moral, has he committed any offence? No! No more than if I did it, and I am the one who did it. I have not broken any law, although the "Machine" (and I would spell that with a capital "M") the Machine, after pushing button 7C, after Button 7C is pressed begins to whirl, and resolutions are passed, and they suggest somehow, in their deep, abysmal and impenetrable ignorance, that some heinous offence had been committed when the loggers are advised to throw away the I.W.A. and form a new union.

Well, that is exactly what they have done. But, Sir, in a week or so, two weeks, three weeks, I do not know how long, maybe all summer, if they carry on like "Fidel" did — there is a man in this Chamber this afternoon who declared that they would take to the hills, they would carry on guerrilla warfare. He does not know that I know he said it. He said it! He is here in this Chamber this afternoon! He declared that they would 'take to the hills'. They would carry on guerrilla warfare!

Mr. Higgins: Inside the bar?

Mr. Smallwood: Not inside the bar. They would carry on guerrilla warfare, throw pickets around people's houses. He is here this afternoon. So they may; the I.W.A. may bring in men from the four corners of Newfoundland and paying them, they may attempt to keep a picket line going, if the strike is all over — because this very week the new brotherhood, the Brotherhood of Newfoundland Wood Workers will open negotiations with the A.N.D. Company for a new contract to end the strike. And when the strike is ended, and they go back to work, the I.W.A. might indeed try to keep going and have a picket line, and the hierarchy of labour, the hierarchy, the paid hierarchy of labour — I will come to that before I sit down — the hirelings, the paid hirelings of labour may decide indeed that the very fabric of the labour movement itself is in danger, and that they will keep a guerrilla warfare going. Whether they do or not in Central Newfoundland they will certainly attempt to set up a bridgehead, a beachhead (is that the word) on the West Coast. So that all we can see, all we can see ahead is trouble on top of trouble; trouble

and agitation, and danger piling up, one on top of the other, which is why the public interest requires action against the I.W.A. in Newfoundland, and the I.W.A. is only one.

Mr. Speaker, it had been our intention to introduce into this Bill a clause which we have not inserted. It is not to be found here — not here — but it is going into another Bill instead. This Bill deals almost exclusively, in fact deals exclusively with the I.W.A.; but another Bill is before the House and into it we propose to insert a clause, which it was at first our thought to insert into this Bill. I do not know how many Members of the House on Sunday past listened for an hour on CBC Stage 59, I think it was — I know all the people of Grand Falls listened, because, of course, there is a C.B.C. station in Grand Falls and the character of the terrain is such that they have great difficulty in hearing any other stations, so everyone in Grand Falls listened to Project 59 for an hour or three-quarters of an hour on Sunday past. And the people of Grand Falls are horrified. I heard (most of it but not all of it) I was horrified. I could not believe my ears. But the C.B.C. (which is certainly an arm of the Government of Canada) the C.B.C. produced there on the air the actual evidence taken in a senate investigation committee, investigating rackets and the like in the United States, and actually reproduced the evidence at this enquiry.

They put on the Chairman, that great American who investigates the rackets and racketeering unions with particular emphasis on Hoffa's criminal organization. They even had an interview with Hoffa himself, and thereby enabled the Canadian people from coast to coast to hear from Mr. Hoffa's own lips his intentions towards Canada. This Gangster, this criminal, this American criminal tells the Canadian people in this speech broadcast for these Canadian people on the C.B.C., and for this the Canadian people owes the C.B.C. a debt of gratitude that they provided the facilities to enable them, the people, to hear from Hoffa's own lips what his plans are: his plans are to build an empire in Canada — We are part of Canada now — to build an empire here in Canada, the Hoffa Union, the Teamsters' Union is to be brought to Newfoundland, brought to all of Canada,

James Hoffa's Union. It is to take over all transportation.

Now in that case, Mr. Speaker, if you have a limited concept of what that means, Mr. Hoffa clarifies the position — transportation means everything on wheels and not only everything on wheels but everything that serves everything on wheels. That means all the gas stations are to be brought into the Hoffa Empire; the gas stations, the service stations, the garage, because they serve transportation and are therefore part of transportation. If a truck goes to a warehouse and picks up freight and moves off to deliver it somewhere else, the freight shed, the warehouse, from which it is taken must be brought into the empire as part of Hoffa's Teamsters' Union, part of transportation, and the warehouse into which it is delivered is part of transportation and must come into Hoffa's Empire, and the pimps and panderers, the white slaves, the murderers, the manslaughterers, the embezzlers, the extortioners, are to take over in Canada. I am ashamed to confess to you Mr. Speaker, and to my friends in this house that I did not know until a very short while ago that Hoffa has already entered Newfoundland. I did not know.

Mr. Higgins: You did not? It was in the papers over 12 months ago.

Mr. Smallwood: I did not know, I did not notice, until very recently. You see, the job I have, the job any man who holds this job has — will keep him far too busy to know everything that is going on — he cannot — It is impossible! So I did not know until very recently that the criminal had already established two branches of his union in Newfoundland, that he already had a man in Newfoundland, a full-time, paid agent. He is in the Chamber here today — a full-time, paid agent of the criminal, Hoffa, representing the pimps, the panderers, the white slaves. He is their representative here in Newfoundland — the embezzlers, the extortioners, the manslaughterers, the dope peddlers. He is here, their representative, drawing money every week — that is how he lives. And when the previous criminal, Beck, was put out, was sentenced to six years in jail the other day — remember three or four days ago — was it 15 years? I don't know. You know the way they do things in

the United States. If that had been in Newfoundland he would have been in jail for the rest of his natural life.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think I hear an interruption. There must be no interruptions. If there is a further interruption, the Sergeant-at-Arms will remove the person interrupting.

Mr. Smallwood: If Hoffa, or this other criminal, had committed one-tenth of the frightful and unspeakable crimes they have committed in the United States, if they had done that in Newfoundland they would be in jail, they would die in jail. They have a representative here, a full-time representative. And that criminal gang, that gang of criminals who are about to set up an empire in Canada are represented here by a full-time paid agent. Can we, Mr. Speaker, in conscience, regard him as an independent subject of the Queen? Is he a good subject of the Queen when he is a James Hoffa agent in Newfoundland? A paid agent? When Beck was put out and there was the question of electing his successor, this same man went up to help in the election, and he announced publicly before he left Newfoundland — "I am a Hoffa man!" I am referring to Daley, the President of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour — Larry Daley, Hoffa's man. He has not only become the paid agent of the criminal, Hoffa, and his criminal union of pimps and whiteslavers, not only has he done that but he actually got to the very top. He is the president, today, of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. And so, Sir, we proposed putting into this Bill (but have now decided to put it into another Labour Relations Bill) an amendment, this clause, to this effect: Where any union exists in North America (just follow this now) — where any union exists in North America, a substantial number or a substantial proportion of whose superior officers (not the little fellow down in the rank and file, not the fellow that might get into a union and know nothing about it) but a substantial proportion of whose superior officers have been convicted in courts of justice, not accused — convicted — in courts of justice, of such infamous crimes as whiteslavery, dope peddling, manslaughter, embezzlement, extortion, such notorious crimes as these, but not limited just to

these, as there are other notorious crimes; where such a union exists in North America and a branch exists in Newfoundland it will be abolished by law. We will wipe it out. We will not have it. We will blot off the face of this good Newfoundland earth. There will be no Hoffa in Newfoundland, no Teamsters' Union in Newfoundland. They will have to find their living elsewhere. They won't make their living off Hoffa, and Hoffa will get no toehold in this decent, clean Province. We will wipe them out, strip them of all rights. If they are certified, we will decertify them. Let the union members know, members of those locals, these union men, good Newfoundlanders, let us not forget that, the same as ourselves, decent, law-abiding, good, God-fearing — that is what they are, the members of those locals in St. John's and Corner Brook; good, decent, God-fearing, law-abiding subjects of the Queen; who will greet Her Majesty this summer in St. John's and Corner Brook; let these good, decent subjects of the Queen get themselves another union without Hoffa. We will wipe them out. And, Sir, in wiping them out, we will hold up a torch to Canada and ask the rest of Canada to wipe them out too before they build an empire. And as for pickets around this Chamber — Let them try it!

The House will find on the back page of this Bill a schedule, and two items in the schedule — International Woods Workers of America, Local 225 and Local 224; and the whole bill has to do with that schedule, with these two locals of the I.W.A. — if I had said I.W.W. I would not have been too far wrong.

(1) "Whereas a strike has been called in the woods labour part of the pulp and paper industry of the Province, and whereas since this strike was called many loggers have been convicted of offences against the Criminal Code, arising out of the strike, and have been fined or sent to prison"

Mr. Speaker, a man came up on the platform at the loggers' meeting, a young man came up and shook hands with me. As a matter of fact, before he came up someone came up and said a man in the audience would like to meet you. I said: "Who is this?" He is a fellow who has been up in court and was fined too. I said: "Bring him up." They brought him up and I shook hands and

sized him up. A young man of about 23-24 years of age, married. I think he said he had two children. A decent young Newfoundlander, just as decent as I am, and I hope I am decent. An ordinary, common, God-fearing Newfoundlander, 23 or 24, married with two children. He was on the picket line, appeared in court and was fined. Another man came up on the platform and said: "Mr. Premier, can you help me?" "Well, what help do you need?" He said: "I have an injunction against me from the Supreme Court. I was an I.W.A. picket, I was in the raid up in the camps. I did not mean anything. I was led into it" — again a young man. I said: "I will see what I can do." I have not yet mentioned it to the Attorney General. I do not know whether my hon. friends opposite me, lawyers, could tell me. I do not know whether I can do anything about it. All I know is that the poor devils were misled — and that is the gravest crime of this I.W.A. — the fact that they have misled them, succeeded in getting Newfoundlanders growing up with hate in their hearts against other Newfoundlanders. That is success for you, for an outsider to come in here and set father against son. In Springdale Saturday, a young man, with a car that did not belong to him but belonged to his mother, said he was going to go down the line, the Halls Bay Line. She asked: "Are you going down to Mr. Smallwood's meeting?" That is the way she put it. "No," he said, "I am going down to the I.W.A." She said: "You are not going to have that car." But he sneaked off and brought some men down to Hall's meeting, and then when he got back that night trouble started between mother and son. There are countless cases of families split wide open by these outside gangsters that have come in here and were the cause of the lawlessness committed in connection with the strike. Many loggers who are willing and anxious to resume employment in the forests with the companies engaged in the pulp and paper industry in the Province are reluctant to do so.

(2) "Whereas because of those things a state of grave emergency exists in the pulp and paper industry of the province and the economy of the province is in jeopardy;

"And Whereas in these circumstances it is necessary to take extra-ordinary steps

in an endeavour to bring an end to the emergency;

"Be it therefore enacted by the Lieutenant-Governor and House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:" (Then it goes on to a short title.) Then: "Notwithstanding anything contained in the said Act or in any other statute or law the certification as bargaining agent (herein referred to as the certification) granted under the said Act to each trade union named in the schedule to this Act is revoked." (There are two named here at the back — The certification granted to them is revoked.)

(3) "Where the certification granted under the said Act to a trade union is revoked by this Act, the union shall not without the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council apply for certification under the said Act and the Labour Relations Board shall not without the like consent grant certification under the said Act." and

(4) "Where the certification granted under the said Act to a trade union is revoked by this Act, and agreement entered into and in force at the date of the revocation between the union and the employer is not and shall not be deemed to be as from the date of the revocation a collective agreement for the purpose of the said Act." (There is no such agreement. They have no agreement. This is a safeguard.)

(5) — "(1) Where the certification granted under the said Act to a trade union is revoked by this Act, no trade union, including that trade union and no body, group or organization of trade unions and no officer, member, agent or representative of a trade union or body, group or organization of trade unions shall authorize, counsel, procure, aid or abet any person to and no person shall in any way;

"(a) prevent, hinder, delay or interfere with

(1) entrance or access to or exit from an employer's property or place of business; or

(1) an employer's use of any of his property by himself, his servants or agents, and no person shall:

(b) persuade anyone not to enter or

leave the property or place of business of an employer;

(c) persuade anyone not to do business with an employer; or

(d) engage in what is commonly known as picketing."

(The penalty for that is a \$5,000 for the union.)

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Premier, but as an experienced parliamentarian, he must be aware that he is definitely now anticipating Committee of the Whole: I think these points might be well dealt with when the Bill is dealt with in committee.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly agree. I ought not to be reading out. That should be done in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. H.D. Higgins (St. John's East): I wish you would deal with Section (6).

Mr. Smallwood: "Secondary Boycotts": Now the Secondary Boycotts principle here in Section 6 is taken directly from the United States, the Taft-Hartley Legislation, yes. And it provides this: If, for example, there is a strike on against the A.N.D. Company (take that as an example) — the employees of the A.N.D. Company are on strike or some of the employees are on strike against the A.N.D. Company — incidentally it is not a good case because not all the employees are on strike — You see, they are still making union-made paper. Every roll of paper they make is a roll of union-made paper, coming in over a union-operated railway, into a union-operated warehouse in St. John's loaded by the longshoreman's union and shipped across by union labour aboard the boats.

Let us take the case where there is a strike on against an employer and everyone in the employment is on strike, so as to make it simple. Alright, a strike is on — Now, there is another union somewhere else which is not against or on strike against that employer at all. In fact they are employed by somebody else altogether. The secondary boycott means that men who are not on strike against their own employer are not allowed, it is just unlawful, (as it is now in the United States) and so we would make it unlawful here for men not employed by a given employer to take measures against

that employer, unless they are on strike against him, otherwise, secondary strikes. The men on strike employed by a given employer, yes! The right to strike must be observed; the right of an employee to stop work for his employer, whether he does it as one man or 100 men or 10,000 men. The right to stop working is surely a human right you cannot take from men. That is all a strike is, where two or three or more men withdraw their labour simultaneously for the same reasons. But where you have two employers and the employees of one employer are on strike but the employees of the other are not on strike, it is none of their business. Unless you are willing to concede this, and I do not think this House is willing, that wherever there is a vision man in the universe, if he is on strike, then all union men are at his back in that strike, if you are to have that principle, which does not exist anywhere in the world —

Mr. Higgins: Does it not exist here today?

Mr. Smallwood: It does not exist except in this sense: don't go on strike, pass resolutions. "Sticks and stones may break my bones but names will never hurt me." A union may pass resolutions until the "crack of doom" and it does not make any difference. I could show you armfuls of telegrams from unions from here to Timbucktoo (at least, calling Victoria Timbucktoo). I do not bother reading them. They are part of that machine, propaganda machine, when button 7 is pressed and resolutions pour out — I do not even bother to read them. I don't mind that. Pass all the resolutions they like, make speakers get up on their hind legs and make speeches and get indignant and all the rest of it, but going on strike — If a strike is on in Grand Falls the railway is not allowed to strike! They cannot stop handling the products of Grand Falls, because they are not on strike.

Mr. Higgins: That is the very question I wanted cleared up. There was some statement during the last few weeks about the railway men not going to handle logs belonging to the A.N.D. —

Mr. Smallwood: My hon. friend is absolutely right, as usual. I might go a step further and say there were some sugges-

tions — "We will have a general strike" — because in the eyes of some people, Sir, when you begin to attack international unions, it is the great mortal sin. Say a word against the great international unions and it is a mortal sin, in fact a capital crime. People have been shot for less, been strung up for less, than saying a word against the fabric of international unionism, especially Hof-faism.

So, this provides against such a contingency. There is a heavy fine of \$5,000 for the union, and \$500 for individuals. That, Mr. Speaker, will put an end to the I.W.A. It does not put them out of Newfoundland. The loggers must do that, but it draws their claws; it draws their claws and sends them farther west. Now we do not care how far west they go so long as they cross the Gulf. They must get out of Newfoundland. There is no room in Newfoundland for the I.W.A. and this house and the Government and the people and all the decent elements of Newfoundland are as one in agreement in this vital matter.

(APPLAUSE)

Hon. C.H. Ballam (Minister of Labour) (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I move recess for 10 minutes:

On motion the House recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Mr. Ballam: I moved recess, Mr. Speaker, but I understand my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, will now carry on with the debate.

Mr. Speaker: So, therefore, the hon. Minister of Labour has not spoken in this debate.

Hon. Malcolm Hollett (Leader of the Opposition) (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, there is only one word in this Bill which would compel me on such an important matter to get to my feet this afternoon. The word is "emergency" — in the words of the motion — "Whereas in these circumstances it is necessary to take extra-ordinary steps in an endeavour to bring an end to the emergency." The government, I take it, are in a position to say whether or not an "emergency" exists in Central Newfoundland and indeed all over Newfoundland. They have deemed it wise to say an "emergency" exists. This therefore, is suffi-

cient cause for us on this side of the house to proceed with the debate without delay. I would prefer to sleep on it, not, Sir, because I am opposed to the principle of this particular Bill, because I made up my mind several days ago, when I agreed and when we on this side of the House agreed with the resolution which was brought in here, and when we heard reports of what was happening all over Central Newfoundland, we definitely agreed the thing had to stop.

Before I go on Sir, I would like to say here — and I think every member of this House will agree with me — the hon. the Premier made one of the “fightingest” speeches that he has made since 1948. He was in good form. He is just back from Central Newfoundland, from the centre of activities. He has worked hard, he has worked constantly for four or five days, and he has, I am sure, first-hand knowledge of what has taken place in Central Newfoundland. But, apart from being interested in the story, and I take it was a true story, as he sees it, I have to compliment him on the manner in which he delivered most of his speech. There are one or two things there I wish he had not said, but who gets to his feet ever without saying something perhaps better left unsaid?

Premier Smallwood: The hon. gentleman and I know that so well.

Mr. Hollett: We have known that for a good many years. As long as our hearts are in the right place on any legislation brought in here, and as long as we get the general idea across, then I think you will have to forgive us, Mr. Speaker, if we say things occasionally which should not be said.

Now we are all Newfoundlanders. We all know the value of the woods industry in Newfoundland. We all know the position of our economy at the present time. And I say that any man who calls a strike in this particular time of the year and in this particular state of our economy is either mad, or does not care what happens to Newfoundland and its people.

(Applause from the Government Side of the House.)

Mr. Hollett: What is the position, Sir? On Bell Island the other day we had 500 men laid off. Today, I saw a release from the

Minister of Welfare that stated that 40,000 Newfoundlanders are receiving assistance; social assistance and dole — 40,000. There are today, Sir, 25,000 workers in Newfoundland who are drawing unemployment insurance, and if you take half of these 25,000 men and women, take 12,000 and multiply by 4 (that ought to make up the families of half of them at any rate) you have 50,000 added to the other 12,000; 62,000 people drawing unemployment insurance, actually relief — what else is it? Then, you have 40,000 other people in Newfoundland — 100,000 people in Newfoundland today are dependent wholly and solely on relief and unemployment insurance. Yet, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the situation up there.

What have we in Grand Falls? We have in Grand Falls, Windsor, Millertown (not so much Millertown in Central Newfoundland); you have Badger, Terra Nova, Bishop's Falls, Botwood, Lewisporte, all that area, Sir, depending on so many hundred loggers to supply the raw material to keep them from going on the dole, to keep Central Newfoundland from going on assistance or drawing unemployment insurance. There were 1,200 loggers at work at the time of this strike. The I.W.A. comes in here at this particular time, when only at this time would they be hauling in the woods, and suggested to these 1,200 loggers — “get off the job and you will hang up everything — You will hang up everything.” All these people in Central Newfoundland — will some of them go hungry? “What do we care. Get off the job and we will get what we want from the A.N.D. Company”. That is exactly what the I.W.A. have said.

Well, they have a perfect right to say that, under the law — a perfect right to say it under the law. We do not like it, but there is the situation. They had a perfect right. But when, Sir, in doing that thing, they brought about that state of emergency where many of our Newfoundlanders have been encouraged to break the law and have gone to jail (I believe 30 or 40 or them, as the case might be, now in the penitentiary and I believe 117 more to come up) — we have had these men encouraged — they would not do it unless they were encouraged, Sir, to go to a camp and throw so many men out in the snow and say — “Get home” — and some had to walk, I understand, 30 miles.

When these things, Sir, are brought about by the activities of any union, then a government could not be called a government at all if it did not endeavour to do something to put a stop to that. That is the principle of this act: "Let us put a stop to this lawlessness and this condition of affairs now existing in Newfoundland." And we, Sir, on this side of the House, are entirely in agreement with the principle of this Bill. I have quoted the principle, and I tell you we agree with it. There may be some things in this Bill which we shall question in Committee of the Whole, but generally the principle of this Bill is to end the state of emergency which presently exists in Central Newfoundland and in all these places which I have mentioned — good, God-fearing people (and I know some of them) breaking the law but still God-fearing; they are breaking the law but they are good citizens up there. I spent seven years there. I know these people in this area. I know how dependant they are on the work of the loggers. What would you say if you were coming across the ocean in an Atlantic liner and suddenly discovered that the firemen refused to put coal in the furnaces and the steamer had to stay there in mid-ocean?! The same situation exists here. That is not to say loggers should not go on strike. I think they have a right to strike. And I think loggers should get a fair wage, and I do not think they should work too-long hours. But I do think that we all have a responsibility to our fellow human beings, our fellow men, and we ought to be very careful, if ever we go on strike, that we don't bring about a situation which is going to mean that Newfoundlanders are termed lawless people, and that is the idea which is getting across Canada.

The hon. the Premier spoke about messages from as far away as British Columbia. I have had similar messages, scores and scores from all across Canada and particularly here in Newfoundland, and most of these, most of these I will say, supported the I.W.A. and most of them came from that machine. I forget what the hon. the Premier said, "Button C" or something like that. Most of them came from officials in certain unions. Now I do not blame them for that. They have a perfect right. Unions have to exist and workers, insofar as possible, have to be unionized, and have to agree with each other, more or less, to try and gain the point

they need. But I say, Sir in this western world of ours, particularly in Canada, no union has the right to strike simply because it belongs to an international union, to hang up the economy of any country, any area like this, which is only small, with 450,000 people at the present time, and over 100,000 of them today, Sir not working. I say a little more caution should be exercised. If a union is to start a strike and as soon as that strike starts, Sir, I say to the officials of that union: "The union has to be held responsible for any law breaking incurred," and they are not in a position to stop — they did not stop it and therefore could not be in a position to do so; I think more of Newfoundland and Newfoundland people than I do of incurring the displeasure of any union.

Governments Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: Newfoundlanders mean more to you and me than the opinions of some union—I have every respect for them—I said that the other day.

Government Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: I have every respect for unions, and I would fight as our ancestors fought to guarantee the right that unions have today. But, Sir, unions, if they have rights, also have responsibilities and they have obligations to the people. I was horrified! I did not see that TV programme "Close-Up" I believe it was, but I was horrified to hear him tell about what he saw on television, and I know it is right because I read it in "Time" Magazine. But that has nothing to do with that particular act here, and I will therefore say nothing at this moment. But we do agree, Sir, in principle, with this Bill. We want this emergency to be put to an end, to stop, to cease. We want the loggers to go back into the woods and start the machinery going again in Central Newfoundland so that things can get back to normal. To that end, Sir, we support the principle of this Bill.

(APPLAUSE)

Mr. Ballam (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I feel that, at this time, and as a supporter of this Bill, I should, as Minister of Labour, as Her Majesty's Minister of Labour, speak not

only in my defence but in defence of the party that I represent, the people whom I represent and the people of Newfoundland as a whole. I know a deal about labour. I am probably one of the oldest men in this hon. house. I was a member of Local 63 in Grand Falls over 40 years ago when our late, deceased friend, Mr. Ken Brown, was president of that union. Later, I left Grand Falls and still later became associated with what is now known as Bowater's Pulp and Paper Company, at that time in its construction days. I was a superintendent or general foreman with the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. in the construction of that plant. Later, after having a little hike overseas, with my hon. friend in the Opposition — I must say that in this great moment without any question he and his associates are indeed my colleagues — never did I get in trouble that I could not depend on the support and the help of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in the Opposition — and for that I thank you very much! I was saying that I became associated with labour many years ago. I was one of the founders of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, and had the honour to be its president for one year. I was also the president of local 64 of the Pulp Sulphite and Paper Workers Union in Corner Brook. I was the one who, after the famous strike in 1920, where Grand Falls and all of the paper industry (Corner Brook was not built then) the pulp and paper industry and associations, the paper makers and all the rest were on strike. All of these were on strike. All of these were on strike against what was then known as the International Power and Paper Company. I was not at that time at Grand Falls. I had left there and had gone to the Mainland where I became engaged in a job that I had learned at Grand Falls, and that was electricity.

When the Pulp and Sulphite Union was organized at Corner Brook I became its first vice-president and later became its president. I was the president of that union for seven or eight years, and I had the distinction, the honour, to bring into Newfoundland the first contract, the first union contract that had been made with the pulp and paper industry. From the time of the famous strike in 1920 until that day in 1937, I think it was, when I took the International Pulp and Sulphite Union and International Paper makers into the office of the then

International Paper Union and signed the first contract — and that contract is today in existence in Corner Brook and also in Grand Falls — I had the distinction and honour of doing these things, and I can assure you, Sir, since I have left these organizations my interest at that time, and my interest now, is still not only with the members of the union as such, but with Newfoundlanders as a whole. And I can assure you this much, it is very difficult and gives me very much pain in my heart to have received telegrams and letters from some of my dearest friends saying they did not agree with our actions at this moment. I can go along with them in this respect simply because they do not understand. They do not understand the seriousness and importance of this action on the part of this government, and I, as Minister of Labour, can tell you this much — it was not without knowing something about my ability and what I know and do not know that the hon. the Premier asked me to be the first Minister of Labour, and I am still in his most hon. Government. That was a big honour that I appreciated and I will say, without fear of contradiction, I will always remember until the day I die.

After being sworn in as Her Majesty's Minister of Labour, I began to begin in certain legislation, labour legislation that cannot be cried down or held up to ridicule by any Province of Canada, nor any other government on the Continent of North America. We have labour legislation that is equal to any, and it is made for the benefit of labour and trade, and as Minister of Labour I have dealt fairly with both trade and labour. You can question anybody — I do not think that until this thing came about there was any phase of labour, nor indeed of trade, that questioned the work that I have been doing. For that, I am very proud. I can assure you of that! We have brought legislation in here that has been doing tremendous things. We never had anything like it in Newfoundland before. Take our Labour Relations Act, if you like — that is meant and is meant entirely for the use of unions and trade, as a means of conciliation, as a means whereby they can lawfully and legally arrive at a reasonable settlement of any dispute. It was never designed to be used by any union to start lawlessness and the things we have seen before us this last few months. It was never designed for that; But, if these people

concerned had used it in the way that it was meant to be used and in the way that it can be used by labour it would be a good thing for all concerned.

Not only is there the Labour Relations Act but we have introduced here the Workmen's Compensation Act, the Apprenticeship Act, the Boiler Inspection Act; all designed for the safety of our workmen. Our Workmen's Compensation Act is one of the greatest pieces of legislation that ever came before any hon. House, and I am sure that the people know that every accident and every widow, who is widowed because of accident, and every child who is an orphan because of an accident, can be looked after by that legislation. Who can say that is not good legislation? There is nobody on this side of the Atlantic nor on the other side, indeed, who can question it. It is excellent legislation.

Our apprenticeship Act: We know that in Newfoundland we have not enough tradesmen, enough people who know the trades, to go into the jobs they could fill. Today we have nearly 600 apprentices in training — to go into jobs. That training will give them all that is necessary to make them qualified tradesmen and so on. That is not counting part-time. There are two or three hundred who are taking part-time vocational training. That comes under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. All of these things this Government brought in, with the approval of my hon. friends in the Opposition, for the good and welfare of labour.

So we come along now to this terrible crisis, whereby here we are trying to set down something whereby labour can conduct themselves in a manner that is benefitting and that is honoured in any country or any province. Here we find an organization coming into this Province and upsetting the apple cart insofar that, regardless of the economy of the country, regardless of the welfare of all the people in the country, regardless of all of that, they are willing to sacrifice all of these great fundamental principles in order to have their union and carry out their strike. We never had anything like it before in Newfoundland, and I can assure you we will not have it again. I will always, while I have this job as a Minister of the Crown, as the Minister of Labour, be fair with trade and labour alike. I have to be.

I think that has been shown and proven, and I can tell you that my old friends who are old in the labour movement in Grand Falls, my old friend, Duggan, who has gained an "Order of the British Empire" from Her Majesty, the Queen, for his work in labour and other fields is disgusted and horrified at the turn of things. I, myself, remember was the first president of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour.

The Newfoundland Federation of Labour was designed as a Federation of Newfoundland unions. It was never designed as it is now. Now you cannot belong to a local union and belong to the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, unless you join the Canadian Labour Congress. That is something that has been done quite recently within the ranks of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. It was never intended as such. The Federation was intended as a Federation of Newfoundland unions, if international or otherwise. If they wanted to be affiliated with the Canadian Congress of Labour, as they were — but all other unions of the organization did not have to be members of an outside association. I can tell you a great deal about that but at this moment I will not. All I will say now is that it is very necessary for us as Newfoundlanders to take action. I have been abused. I have had more telegrams, more letters and what have you, saying — "Well, you will never have our support any more."

I have had to say to these people, and I say it now before this House and I say it to the people of Newfoundland: when it comes to a question of the economy of Newfoundland and when it comes to a question of whether anybody supports me or whether they do not support me, I am for Newfoundland first, last and always, and I am willing to put the I.W.A. down in the place where they belong because they have no right to come into this Province; a Province of good, God-fearing people, people than whom there are no better stock, better than the best in war and in peace — and to have an outfit like that come in and abuse our legislation, and abuse the rights and the laws of this Province only for their own ends, and who are willing to sacrifice the economy of this country — they are willing; they say every day the sun shines it is better for them because when the sun shines the ice and snow in the woods are melting and

therefore the paper companies cannot get their wood out of the woods. What a scandalous thing! It just shows they are not interested in the paper companies' operations, not interested in anything, only their organizations. They are not interested in the welfare of Newfoundland nor are they interested in our people.

I am first and last and always, as I mentioned before, interested in Newfoundland first, and win, draw or lose, there is where I take my stand!

(Applause from both sides.)

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

On motion (Mr. Curtis) all remaining orders of the day stand deferred.

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three o'clock.

Thursday, March 5, 1959.

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock, pursuant to adjournment. Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

Hon. Dr. J. McGrath(Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Health for 1957. I would like to say it is not as late as it appears, as the statistics were taken many months after the end of the year. The report was ready some months ago. Of course, copies are available for all members of the house and the press if they would like to have them.

Notice of Questions:

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answers to questions on the Order Paper of March 4, in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. In connection with Question No. 2 all the information asked is not immediately available, but that part to which I am unable to reply today is in course of preparation, and will be tabled just as soon as possible.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in connection with Question No. 12 on today's Order Paper, addressed to the Hon. Minister of Finance, I may say I am acting minister in the absence of the minister, and that I see the question now for the first time, but I will have the officers of the Department of Finance prepare the answers. That applies also to any other questions that may have been addressed to me or to the Minister of Finance. I have not seen any of them, frankly, but that really does not matter much because they go through the regular routine in the departments concerned. The permanent officials are the people who prepare the answers, and we do very little more than table them here in the house. As soon as I have any, I will be glad to table them.

Mr. Speaker: I think I might at this time ask all hon. ministers to make certain that at least three copies of answers be made available. Three copies are necessary.

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Question No. 11, the appropriate Minister is the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Smallwood: I can answer that one now. The Royal Commission has completed its work except for the actual writing of the report. The house must be aware of the lamentable fact that the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. G.W.D. Allen, the Auditor General, has been stricken with a coronary thrombosis and has been quite seriously ill. Then in addition to that, another member of the Royal Commission, Mr. Clarke, has also been stricken ill, leaving only one member of the Royal Commission. And in the absence of two of the three through sickness no attempt is being made at present to write and submit the report to the Government. But, as soon as that is done we will, of course, table copies here in the house.

ORDERS OF THE DAY: LEGISLATION. (UNION DECERTIFICATION - I.W.A.)

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act".

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General) (Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill to amend the Labour Relations Act. This Bill is to provide for the decertification of unions in certain cases. One of the main features of the Bill is that it will enable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to decertify any trade union in Newfoundland, if that trade union is sponsored by or parented by or subject to the control of a trade union outside of Newfoundland and on the North American Continent, the leaders of which have become discredited. I think speakers following me will deal more particularly with that particular aspect of the Bill. The other features of the Bill provide for giving the Labour Relations Board the right to refuse certification in certain cases without, in all cases, having to specify the reason for so doing. At the moment, if a trade union represents the majority of the employees, that trade union has the right, of course, to be certified. Under an amendment that is included in this Bill, it is proposed to give the Labour Relations Board the right to refuse certification when in its opinion the union has, either in the steps leading up to the making of application, or otherwise, shown a disrespect for authority or has not conducted itself in accordance with good trade union practise. Indeed in certain cases they may go further and refuse certification without specifying any reason therefore.

At the moment, under the Labour Relations Act, a union can be decertified for one reason and for one reason only, and that is when the union ceases to represent the majority of the employees engaged in any industry. It is felt that the boards powers are too restricted, and in this new amendment which we are bringing forward today, it is provided that additional circumstances may authorize the board in decertifying a union. If officers, agents, representatives of a trade union have been convicted of an offence against the Criminal Code and still retain their positions in the union, then the Labour Relations Board should have the right to decertify the union. In the same way if other offences are committed, and people who are responsible continue to be members of the union, then, in that case too, the union may be decertified.

The whole idea of the legislation, Mr.

Speaker, is to clean up the situation as regards unions. Likewise, should there be an injunction issued against a union by the court and should that injunction be made permanent or final as distinguished from interim injunctions, in that case the Labour Relations Board shall have power to decertify a union. Likewise if there is an injunction entered against a bargaining agent for tort - the Government feels that is not good legislation and we feel that unions ought to be made liable for tort.

If you want an example of what I mean, let me just tell you what happened the other day when a mob of 100 men went into the woods at three o'clock in the morning to do peaceful picketing (peaceful picketing at 3 A.M.) and one of the weapons they used was not even a picket, but a pitprop. At 3 A.M. 100 men, a lot of them unshaven, some of them with dirty faces, so much so that the first report I got suggested that their faces had been blackened so that they might be disguised. These men were unknown. The IWA did not know they were there at all. But they were led in the procession in the woods by a snowmobile with IWA written on it. These men broke into a camp at 3 A.M., smashed up the place, (a cold winter morning with sub-zero weather) smashed all the windows, tipped over the stove, sat down and ate the breakfast prepared for the men, and gave them 10 minutes in which to get out. And a group of 100 men dumped 40 men out in the snow at 3:30 A.M., miles and miles and miles away from anywhere; so much so that when the RCMP came along (some of the mainlanders) they had to follow and watch and so be able to pick up and rescue any who would have fallen by the wayside. It is a Godsend, Mr. Speaker, that nobody died. It is a Godsend that nothing more serious happened. My hon. friend, the Premier, tells me one of the men was bare-footed. I did not know that. The men, the hon. Premier tells me, would not stop to let him put on his socks or shoes, but dumped them out in the cold at 3 A.M. with the temperature subzero, 10 degrees below, I think, miles and miles away, and they had to walk 30, 20 miles to their homes. That is what happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the law? The law, as everyone knows, is that everyone of these 100 men who broke in and attacked must be identified to get a conviction. Some have

been identified, some have been convicted; others have, in their innocence, admitted they took part in the raid and are liable to imprisonment. Others were dishonest and denied they were there. And it is difficult to prove they were there. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that this Act must be amended so that unions will be held responsible and not be allowed to hide behind these men who, because of disguises, because of blackened faces, because of an overgrowth of hair on their faces and one thing and another could not be identified. So that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have decided to act and make unions responsible for torts. This was a well-organized raid, this raid I am talking about; a well-organized raid. You do not get 100 men together and get them 30 miles up in the woods without good organization. And the organization was carried on, and it is a falsehood for anyone to suggest that nobody knew what was going on.

Mr. Speaker, you would be surprised at the multitude of offences which have arisen out of this strike; 192 charges in all have been made up to date. Many have been fined and paid their fines, but there are 30 loggers now in jail, most of them, Mr. Speaker, good, honest, decent Newfoundlanders who were just misled, misled. What happened? The strike got off to a damnably bad start. Notice was given that the strike was to start next morning. What happened? The men were told to stay in the woods. They were supposed to stay in the woods and stay in their camps. Now what did that mean? Mr. Speaker, they had no right in those camps. They had no food to eat. They were told by the leaders to stay in the camps and they stayed in the camps, and they became trespassers from the moment the orders were given to have them come out, and they did not take the orders. They had to eat. They had to eat to live, and therefore they had to rob the food. And they lived for days and days and weeks and weeks on stolen food - a bunch of Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, men from decent areas, men with good families, men of repute, lived for days on stolen food and violated the laws of the land. As I say, 192 charges have been laid, ranging from theft of over \$50 wilful damage to property, common assault, operating motor vehicles without consent, theft under \$50, intimidation by violence, mischief, ob-

structing police officers, obstructing highways, property damage, loitering and assault again. These are just a few. And there are more trials outstanding and more are to be arrested. More charges are outstanding. I might now point out the position in which the company finds itself. I am not personally interested in the company! You are not interested in the company! This House is not interested in the company, except insofar as the economy of Newfoundland is concerned. Under the law, if a troupe of men are holding a building you can apply to the court and get an injunction against these men from holding that building. But to get that injunction you have to make an affidavit, and you have to prove to the court that these men were taking charge of that building. If the court is satisfied, the court will grant an injunction, but the injunction is granted against those men named in the affidavit. When the police go back to serve the injunction, they find the personnel is changed, and they have to start all over again and get a new injunction against a new group of men, and then, by the time they go back for the second group there is another shift on. So that ever since this strike started, at the end of the year, certain gates leading to the property of the A.N.D. Co. are in hands of the IWA strikers. The main gates to the woods operation are still in the possession of the IWA strikers.

We have refused - The Government have refused to order the police to remove them. As my hon. leader said yesterday, there is reason for that. We did not want to be called strike breakers. We did not ask the RCMP to break the strike. We asked the RCMP to act only in cases where there was a breach of the peace. Then and only then did the RCMP come in. You would think, from mainland papers reports, that the RCMP were going into the woods with axes breaking the strike.

Mr. Hollett: They are supposed to have machine-guns.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, even machine guns, some of them said. There has been propaganda of lies and falsehoods throughout all Canada in connection with this strike. The RCMP have been very restrained. They have been as restrained as any human being could be when faced with the situation that was there, and they have done a very, very

good job. There were times when I felt tempted to tell them to go all out and clean up the mess, but we in the Government tried to be patient, and we wanted to be patient. We did not want to be stigmatized as strike-breakers. Therefore we used the police only when there was no alternative. But you must admit, Mr. Speaker, a gang of 100 men attacking a mere 40 men at 3 A.M. under the guise of peaceful picketing - then something had to be done, and something was done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the legislation that is before the house, it will be possible for anybody, including the Crown, to take an action in court for an injunction and when the injunction is granted and served on the union, it will bind all the members of the union and we will have no more nonsense such as we have had during the past couple of weeks. There are a few other features in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, which will come to light when the Bill reaches committee stage. The same clause is in this Bill as was in the Bill that we put through yesterday, (i.e. the clause prohibiting secondary boycotts). That clause will appear in both Bills. If we were sure both Bills would go through at the one time it would come under one Bill, but we thought possibly the Bill put through yesterday might be put through first. We want that clause in the first Bill which comes up. There are likewise clauses to deal with the method in which picketing is to be conducted.

I do not think I need to say any more, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make clear my position on this strike. I am not interested in the company, whatsoever! You would think, to hear the president of this IWA speak over the air, that this Government was supporting the companies. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is a person on this side of the house who cares one continental, on either side for that matter, about the companies. We are not approaching this matter, we are not introducing this legislation, and other legislation that is coming forward, to help the companies. If it does help the companies that is purely coincidental. We are bringing forth this legislation for Newfoundland!

My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, in his remarks the other day, referred to the fact that Mr. Ladd was not a bit worried over the economy of Newfoundland.

He did not care about the economy of Newfoundland. It was the union that came first with him. But, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend has seen "Close Up" since then, and has seen the attitude of Mr. Ladd when Mr. Ladd practically said - "To blazes with Newfoundland and her economy, the union must win this strike" - well then, Mr. Speaker, every honest, every real, true Newfoundlander jumped from his seat and said, "Is that so! Is that so! Since when are unions to be greater than a country? Since when is the jurisdictional dispute in a union to take precedence over the welfare of a country?"

Newfoundland is in a bad position at the moment. We have this difficulty in Bell Island facing us. We have men out of work, on relief. We have five men, 10 men ready to take to the woods to replace every one of the 800 that voted to strike, 10 men for every one, who are willing and anxious to get back to work. I had a man come to see me the other day, and was lucky enough to get him a job at Goose Bay, where he was promised \$1.10 an hour, and had to pay his way from St. John's to Goose Bay and promised to stay 10 months, for the sake of getting \$1.10 an hour. Sitting opposite me he said: "Mr. Curtis, if it were not for this strike I could earn as high as \$25 a day in the woods". And he took out a pay slip from last year and showed me, and true enough, day after day after day this man, who must have been a hog for work, made \$25 a day cutting wood.

Mr. Hollett: A logger?

Mr. Curtis: He was a logger and he was anxious to get back - but, no - he had to go further afield. He had to go down to Labrador to try to earn a dollar so as to keep himself and his family off the dole. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we have to take a look at our labour legislation. Nobody wants to hurt labour! Nobody on this side wants to hurt labour and nobody on that side! But we do not intend to stand by and see labour wreck Newfoundland! We are Newfoundlanders first, and we will be Newfoundlanders, please God, all the time! Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I support this Bill, needless to say,

but I propose to devote my remarks chiefly to one of the two great principles that are set forth in the Bill. The Attorney General has described for the house the first principle, which is one that deals with the grounds for decertifying a union in this province. The other principle, and the one with which I should like to deal, is the principle of abolishing unions altogether in this province when they form part and parcel of a union existing anywhere on this continent that is notorious or infamous by reason of the fact that a substantial number of its principal officers, of its superior officers, have been convicted in court of infamous crimes, crimes, as he recited, such as white slavery, which is about the most horrible crime that a man can commit; dope peddling; trafficking in dope; manslaughter; embezzlement; extortion and similar horrible infamous and heinous crimes.

Now, there would not be any need for this house to set up that principle in a statute if they did not exist, if there did not exist such a union as that. If it were merely a theoretical matter, it would be merely a waste of time. But it is not a theoretical matter; it is a practical one. The "Teamsters" Union is already in Newfoundland! Hoffa the criminal is here already, represented in this province by two local unions of his international, and by a full-time man who draws his salary from Hoffa. Furthermore, Hoffa has already established his union in other parts of Canada, and he has announced publicly his intentions of building in Canada, at once, an empire for the "Teamsters" union.

I have here "McLeans Magazine" for the week ending December 6, past. The leading story in that, written by Peter C. Newman, a well-known writer in Canada, has the headline - "Jimmie Hoffa's Plans For a Canadian Empire" - and the sub-heading of the article is: "The Much Feared and Much Investigated Czar of the World's Biggest Labour Union Boasts He'll Control a Quarter of a Million Key Canadian Workers In Ten Years". He rules 40,000 now - From "Candy Stuffers" to "Disc Jockeys" - And he's reaching for the Seaway, and everything that moves.

And Mr. Newman's article starts off with these words, within quotations: "We're going to spend whatever dollars are necessary for the job". Then it goes on: "The speaker was James Riddle Hoffa, the

chunky potentate of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters - the largest and most powerful union in the world. The job which Hoffa promised during my recent interview with him in Washington to accomplish, could become the largest organizing campaign in Canadian labour history. "Hoffa's ambition is to enlist a quarter of a million Canadians in his Brotherhood within the next ten years. He is prepared to pay \$3 million to get them.

"In the U.S., Senate investigations have squarely charged Hoffa with running a hoodlum empire dangerous to the country, accusing his union of being thoroughly stained by corruption, extortion and gangsterism. One of the things that have made it toughest for those fighting Hoffa is the willingness of other unions and some employers to go along with him. There is increasing evidence that this will be the case here, as his ambitious plans for a Canadian Empire take shape.

"If those who fear Hoffa are right, the drive he is now mounting in Canada could paralyze the whole country. The Teamsters, as presently constituted at the top level, can destroy the economies of both Canada and the U.S. I was told by Robert Kennedy, chief counsel of the congressional committee that has spent the last year investigating the union."

Then the article goes on: "This is how Hoffa has mapped out the Teamsters Canadian strategy: A massive drive for more Canadian members will be started next March. In partnership with other unions which have signed mutual security treaties with them, the Teamsters will try to enlist warehouse and transport workers along both sides of the new St. Lawrence Seaway and inside the Great Lakes. Our drive, says Teamster vice-president Thomas Flynn, 'will stretch from Halifax to the Lakehead.' Canadian shipowners insist that Teamster control of the Seaway would be ruinous for the country. 'We might just as well tie up the fleet and give it to them,' says Captain Scott Misner, who heads Colonial Steamships Limited, of Port Colbourne, Ont., a large inland shipping firm."

It goes on further down: "To mastermind his Canadian operations, Hoffa has chosen I.M. (Casey) Dodds, a deceptively mild-mannered former Windsor bus driver who, as the Brotherhood's Central Conference

director in Canada, has been mainly responsible for doubling the number of Canadian Teamsters' in five years. Dodds will spend this winter setting up a press-gang brigade of 100 full-time Teamster's organizers across the country. "By next spring", he told me, 'we'll launch a campaign that will make a lot of employers lose a lot of pounds!"

Then the article describes how they have been organizing in various parts of Canada. "Join Watson, chairman of the Individual Dump-Truck Owner's Association, recently told a royal commission investigating allegations of Teamster hoodlumism in Ontario that during the union's attempts to sign up gravel haulers around Toronto, many of the drivers who objected had the radiators of their trucks smashed with iron rods, flexible brake linings severed, sugar poured into their gas tanks, and tires drilled and slashed. He charged also that the wives of gravel-pit owners received anonymous telephone threats that their husbands plants would be blown up if they did not sign.

During the St. Thomas dispute, strike sympathizers halted a convoy of the company's own trucks by dipping old tires in gasoline, setting them ablaze, then rolling the doughnut torches in front of the vehicles. Rocks heaved at the driver of the lead truck shattered his teeth and lodged a piece of broken windshield in his eye.

"During a 1953 strike by Teamster locals in Windsor and Hamilton, human chains were thrown across most of the major highways in southwestern Ontario; drivers who tried to run the blockade had bricks heaved at them, the tires of parked trucks were slashed, and varnish and maple syrup were poured into gas tanks. The Cope Transport Company, in Kitchener, which was operating non-unionized trucks, was surrounded one night by men, their faces blackened with burnt corks, who heaved stones at the parked fleet of vehicles and set fire to the warehouse.

"The Hamilton and Windsor locals involved in the 1953 strike were then, and remain today, under trusteeship to Hoffa. This device, a sort of union martial law, is used by the Teamster executive to gain control over non-conforming locals. Under the guise of the broad term "irregularities", which can include anything from the dis-

honesty of a local's officers to their asking too many questions about the finances of the International, Hoffa can place into receivership any local and appoint a trustee (sometimes himself) to administer its funds and decisions. Members and officers lose their voting rights. The trustee is answerable solely to Hoffa, and only Hoffa can lift the trusteeship. Some Teamster locals at Hamilton and Windsor were recently in trusteeship. 'We hope to get rid of them by the end of the year', Hoffa assured me when I talked with him at his headquarters in Washington."

So it goes on: "Room 305 of the Teamster building in Washington, where Hoffa spends most of this time is a tennis-court-size office panelled in Honduras mahogany, with beige wall-to-wall carpeting, soundproof doors, indirect lighting and remote-controlled television. From his burnt-walnut desk, through faintly blue-tinted floor to ceiling windows, Hoffa can regard the Capitol dome a few hundred yards away. His office is the control centre of the Teamsters' \$5.5 million headquarters building, opened in 1955. The main bronze-framed door leads into a lobby exquisitely finished in variously shaded marbles and columns faced in mosaics of Venetian glass tile. The building has a penthouse terrace of Georgian marble, a 40-car basement garage, a 100-seat restaurant, and an acoustically treated theatre which accommodates 474 people; its projection booth is equipped to show Cinemascope and VistaVision."

So, Mr. Speaker, I pass on, and conclude with this final paragraph from this article in McLean's Magazine:

"Undaunted by the revelations of the American congressional investigations, and unabashed by charges of personal dealings with convicted gangsters, both in and out of his heavily muscled Brotherhood, he (Hoffa) is determined to create in this country fully as stout a power-grip as he already holds over the economy of the United States."

And finally, if there is any doubt left in the mind of any hon. member as to the intentions of Hoffa to seize control in Canada, I give you this other quotation from the "Monetary Times" of February 1959, just last month: "You hear talk here that the Hoffa outfit is planning to invade Canadian Labour. Though labour head George

Meaney in the States has thrown out the Hoffa 'goons' south of the line, it is said the mob are planning to take Canada in the way Hitler schemed to grab Poland.

"As part of the camp followers will be a reputed 150 lawyers. These legal luminaries' principal job will be to keep the Hoffa yeggs out of court. In other words, if one of the boys gets in jail, one of the 150 or as many lawyers as are necessary will be drafted to 'spring' the jailed comrade.

"Said to be on this baleful list is one of the big Toronto-Montreal department stores. Hoffa's discredited union officials are said ready to make a try with this one departmental store. Big business is a bit upset that Premier Frost did not pay more attention to a judgment handed down by Mr. Justice Roach of Ontario. If Ontario followed his recommendations, he might have these American labour leaders on the run even before they got started. Slapping women, and pushing around helpless men, is said to be the least of the Hoffa tactics. It remains to be seen if Hoffa can make good his boast, or if Frost will give the baleful 'tourists' the 'bum's rush'."

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Hoffa is out to seize control. Now I have here, Mr. Speaker, a number of magazines. Every one is an American magazine, given to me today. And I spent a good part of the forenoon looking at the references in "Time Magazine", and the "Saturday Evening Post" to Hoffa and the Teamsters union. I have not got them in any particular order. "Time", Oct. 14, 1957: "In Miami Beach Auditorium one day last week, a band bugled out a rousing version of 'When the Saints go Marching In', and in marched nearly 2,000 delegates to the quinquennial convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, as 'saintly' a crew as U.S. labour has to offer. They were there to elect - or rather ratify - a president. The man they wanted was a man they loved: James Riddle Hoffa, 44, pal of gangsters, target of national scorn and innumerable investigations". That is Time Magazine. The same magazine, November 11, 1957: "The enormity of the crime committed against the U.S., and against U.S. labour by racketeering labour bosses has only begun to sink home, despite the procession of headlines from the Senate committee on labour racketeering. Among the first to grasp the full meaning of it all - and the meaning of

the anti-labour kickback that is bound to come - is the A.F.L.-C.I.O.'s blunt President George Meaney. Last week, Meaney told a union convention in Washington just how shocked he was at what he found out over the last two years.

"We thought we knew a few things about trade-union corruption," he said, "but we didn't know the half of it, one-tenth of it, or the one-hundredth part of it. We didn't know, for instance, that we had unions where a criminal record was almost a prerequisite to holding office under the national union. We did not know that we had top trade-union leaders who made it a practise to secretly borrow the funds of their unions. "We did not know that there were top trade-union leaders who used the funds for phony real estate deals in which the victims of the fraud were their own members. And we didn't know that there were trade-union leaders who charged to the union treasury such items as speedboats, perfume, silk-stockings, brazzieres, color TVs, refrigerators and everything else under the sun". That is a quotation from President George Meaney, the top labour man in the U.S., head of A.F.L. - C.I.O.: What a shocking thing it is to get a report from the Puerto Rican labour office in New York City that (exploited) Puerto Rican immigrants are going to the unemployment desk in that department asking to be referred to jobs where there are no unions. Of course you can't get much co-operation from a national union, the officers of which are practicing the same sort of larceny on a national basis as is being practised by their so-called local representatives on a local scale. Some of these things are still going on.

On December 16, 1957 - the same year - Time Magazine says: "In Atlantic City's Convention Hall last week, 879 delegates representing the massive A.F.L. - C.I.O. met with scarcely more than one piece of meaningful business to act upon. The big organization (more than 15 million workers) was clearly a disordered house, thanks to the loss of public confidence in trade unionism engendered by revelations of corruption in the Teamsters Union and other unions. The business: whether or not to boot out the mighty Teamsters (1,400,000 claimed members), who arrogantly elected "Tough Boy" Jimmy Hoffa their president. (Time Oct. 14)." (Elected with the help of Daley, who voted for him and who an-

nounced before he left here he was going up to vote for him).

Still from **TIME** "Under the relentless prodding of President George Meaney, a tough guy of another stripe, the A.F.L. - C.I.O. voted to throw out the Teamsters by a 5-to-1 margin. For four hours the debate droned on. One by one, Teamster partisans pleaded for charity, invoked in lofty prose the memory of bleeding feet at Valley Forge and treachery among the Twelve Apostles". - (as another well-known labour leader does in his broadcasts here in Newfoundland). "It was all useless. Word came, too, that even cocky Jimmy Hoffa had tried surreptitiously to work out a last-minute deal with George Meaney, but Jimmy has been too busy to settle on a date. He was busy, in fact, in Manhattan federal court, where he was standing trial on wire tapping charges. (Teamster ex-President Dave Back was tied up in Seattle, where he was on trial for embezzlement of union funds).

"The A.F.L. - C.I.O. Verdict: Out. Gruff George Meaney let it be known that the door would be open for the Teamsters' return after expulsion if they would get rid of Hoffa. Nonetheless, the delegates were well aware that their decision might plunge Big Labour into a near civil war as they trudged out of the convention hall to a tune barked out by the organ: 'Anything goes'." (Time Magazine of Nov. 25, 1957:) "Starting afresh on his pursuit of shenanigans in labour and management, Arkansas Senator John McClellan and his investigating committee last week lifted the lid on a loaded garbage can. The finding: The \$50 million-plus Refuse Hauling Industry in New York City and nearby Long Island and Westchester County is in the hands of grubby crooks, notable a half-pint (5 ft. 1 in. 122 lbs.) ex-fruit peddler named Vincent James Squillante. The lessons in scavenging poured into the table microphones of the Senate Caucus Room in Washington as, one by one, independent garbage-collecting contractors told how Outsider Squillante used contacts in a Teamster union local to grab control of the Greater New York Carting Association, bring the cartmen into line, even to the point where owner-drivers had to join the union. Squillante's hold became such that he could, at a whim, leave thousands of businessmen and householders with garbage piling up day by day on the sidewalks. "Where did Squillante's power lie? Perched

on the witness chair, the tiny, bespectacled racketeer politely invoked the Fifth Amendment to more than 100 questions, but the committee's evidence appeared to be solid enough. As a member of the so-called Mafia (the ancient Sicilian vendetta society that some authorities claim is running U.S. racketeering), Squillante always managed to avoid deep trouble; although his address book produced the names of such crooks as Joey Surprise, Nanny the Geep and Joe Stutz. He was caught only once, on an income tax rap. He solved that, the committee charged, by having his boys extract \$57,855 from two cartmen's groups, then paying up his taxes." Again, December 30, 1957: "After a fortnight's testimony on operations of the Teamster's Union in Tennessee, Arkansas's seasoned John McLellan was fed up. Snapped the chill-eyed chairman of the Senate Labour Rackets Investigating Committee: 'I do not think even the committee was prepared for the shocking pattern of viciousness, lawlessness and disregard for the laws of the land to which many witnesses have testified here'. Sample testimony: 'Nashville Teamsters negotiated contracts with pile driving fists; Knoxville Teamsters dynamited truckers who refused to bargain with NLRB elections; Chattanooga Teamsters bombed, burned and escaped the consequences by passing \$20,000 in bribes that, by strong inference, influenced the decision of the county judge trying the case.'" It says here, escaped the consequence by influencing, by bribing the judge. It then goes on to say about the judge being booted out.

Now here is the intellectual: They are not all dullards in the Teamsters' union. They have one great intellectual, a man of great culture - and a lecturer of Harvard University. "Time" Sept. 15, 1958: "Hard-Boiled Egghead: The scandal-smeared Teamsters Union boasts no handsomer showpiece than Harold Bibbons, 48, international vice-president and President Jimmy Hoffa's right-hand man. He has been to college, lectured at Harvard. A slim, fit-looking man, he dresses in dignified executive grey, parades a lofty moral code: 'Business ethics are not good enough for trade unions'. But in just two days last week Arkansas John McLellan's Senate labour rackets investigating committee stripped away the veneer, exposed "Egghead" Gibbons as blood brother to the purple-jawed hoods and

goons who have filed before the committee for two solid weeks.

"Billed as a co-operative witness, Gibbons showed up in Washington with two valises and a briefcase stuffed with union records. But the committee was not so interested in his luggage as it was in the dark record of his career, thoroughly documented by committee research and previous witnesses. Items: Far from abhorring violence, as Gibbons piously testified, he is pretty good as an engineer of violence - as the evidence clearly showed. During a St. Louis cab strike in 1953, he used a crew of enforcers that included a procurer, a stickup man, a pimp who put his own wife in a bawdy-house, a Teamster arrested for shooting his mother. Boss of a big, independent St. Louis distribution union, Gibbons in 1949 sold out to the Teamsters, dipping into his union treasury - without informing the membership - to help buy off officers of the Teamsters local who were discarded in the merger. During his 17 years as a labour leader in St. Louis, Gibbons called 250 strikes in an established pattern of violence. Testified St. Louis Police Captain Thomas L. Moran: 'We did not find this violence in other unions - it was confined to the Gibbons locals. "Gibbons admitted that in 1952-53 he armed his union officers with guns - and charged the holster off against 'office supplies.'" That was September 15, 1958.

Now: December 1, 1958: - "Time": "Arkansas Senator John McLellan and his labour investigating committee reconvened in Washington last week to poke some more into the rat's nest of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Into the committee's hearing room came San Antonio's Roy J. Gilbert to tell how the Teamsters had tried to organize his 135-vehicle South-Western Motor Transport, Inc. in 1955. When he balked at the Teamsters' demands, Gilbert said, they stoned and tossed homemade fire bombs at his trucks, planted marijuana in the cars of Southwestern employees, made threatening telephone calls. They also considered shooting Gilbert from ambush and wrecking his home with hand grenades.

"Rounding out two days of testimony, Chairman McLellan zeroed in on a reported plan by Teamster Shafer to jump a Southwestern driver and etch the word rat on his forehead. Scowled angry John McLellan: 'Don't you agree with me that

anyone who would give such orders as that is a rat himself?' Slick-looking Teamster Shafer blushed, swallowed, declined to answer on grounds that the answer might incriminate him." (He might have to admit he was a rat. Rats, crooks, criminals, scoundrels - the greatest collection we have ever had in the world since Hitler. He is the champion, the undefeated champion, collector of rats, scoundrels and villains of every stripe - Hoffa takes the second prize, but a good second)

"Time", December 22, 1958: "Miami Beach's Eden Roc Hotel is suitably sumptuous for a display of the attributes of success, wealth and power. There, successful, wealthy, powerful Jimmy Hoffa conferred with the executive council of his corrupt Teamsters Union. It was a time for plans, expansion and confidence - not for worrying over the long, unchallenged record of Teamster racketeering dug up by Senator John McLellan's long frustrated rackets committee. With his retinue of vice presidents, lawyers and investment advisers, haughty little Jimmy worked on an 8 a.m. - to - 1 a.m. schedule, spending lavishly, granting favours, hearing petitioners, mapping campaigns. Airily, and just like that, he put up collateral for \$200,000 loans. He heard requests for loans from four Miami Beach Hotels, decided he would grant two. (The Teamsters already have \$3,000,000 invested in fancy Miami Beach real estate and plan to double the sum)".

The Teamsters local members in St. John's and Corner Brook should be interested to know that the great leaders of their great trade union, these great and good men, believe in the setting of good example to the working class. They say, 'nothing is too good for the working class.' So they go and take it. They already have \$3 million invested and they are going to put in \$3,000,000 more. Then having done that, he announced plans to organize employees of Sears-Roebuck and of Tampa Breweries. Then came Jimmy's bombshell. He had already begun a campaign to recruit the millions of state, country and municipal employees across the land - including the police. Now, that would be lovely! There would be only one thing left and that would be the judges. If he could bring in the police as his good and faithful members, and then line up the judges, he should be pretty secure. He would still have the Congress to deal

with but might find ways even to deal with that. If any hon. members thought I used extravagant words yesterday to describe the Teamsters Union, I hope the House will note the description in this great American publication.

"The thug-ridden Teamsters": September 29, 1958: "Time", "Teamster Boss Jimmy Hoffa was back at the old stand - the witness stand in the Senate Caucus room in Washington, confronted by a few of his sorely-tried inquisitors: Arkansas' weary, sardonic Senator John McLellan, Chairman of the Senate labour rackets investigating committee; New York's finger-wagging Senator Irving Ives; and Hoffa's most implacable enemy, Committee Counsel Robert F. Kennedy, 32, who would give his celebrated forelock to see Hoffa hammed in the jug. Ducking, snapping and sneering, Hoffa came no closer to the jug. But his performance, laced with an exquisite contempt for Bob Kennedy and the rest of the committee (Q. Why did he deposit \$300,000 in Teamster funds in a Florida bank? A. Because I wanted to) left no doubt that James Riddle Hoffa still regards his morals and methods as being beyond the question of anybody, least of all 1,600,000 dues-paying Teamsters." Teamster morals and methods uncovered last week. It goes on and gives one case after another. I will read just two: "Committee Investigator Pierre Salinger polled all 893 Teamster locals on the methods by which Hoffa was elected President of the union last year, received information replies from 437. Conclusions: of the 1,661 votes cast for Hoffa 47.6% were illegal." Thus ended the latest round of hearings on the Teamsters, which added up to the greatest blot on the record of the U.S. organized labour." As for slippery Jim, that is Mr. Daley's boss—Slippery Jim Hoffa, then there is a quote from Senator McLellan, the chairman: "No family in this country," warned John McLellan, "can escape the repercussions. All our lives are too intricately interwoven with this union to sit passively by and allow the Teamsters under Mr. Hoffa's leadership to create such a super power in this country—a power greater than the people and greater than the Government. This situation even now is critical for the nation."

"Time", September 1, 1958: "Robert (Barney) Baker, liar, thief, union bullyboy and

hash-house voluptuary, plopped his 284 lbs. into a red leather chair, facing the McLellan committee. For the next two days Teamsters' Organizer Baker answered questions. Baker decided to clown his way through a performance aimed at concealing a grimly important fact; Barney Baker is just the sort of specimen used by his friend and employer, Teamster's President James Hoffa, to control the nations biggest, most predatory union." Baker nearly got away with his buffoonery. The hearing-room audience gasped happily at hearing that Barney Baker, at separate sittings had devoured 4 lbs. of spaghetti and 38 lbs. of meat" - (But after a while Senator McLellan and Kennedy went after him. They brought out several facts. Here are some of the facts they brought out about this funny boy).

"For more than 20 years, Barney Baker, 47, has palled with and worked for nearly all the U.S. Hoodlums of any consequence. Among them; Meyer Lansky; Joe Adonis and Trigger Mike Copola in Miami; Bugsey Siegel in Las Vegas; John Vitale in St. Louis." Now he drew the line. He worked for and palled around with gangsters only of consequence. These are the big shots. There are only one or two not in this list, but they are among the crown princes of crime in the United States. Said Counsel Kennedy: 'Everywhere you go there has been violence.' As an organizer for Hoffa's Central Conference of Teamsters, Baker visited Miami, there lavished \$25,000 - in Teamster Union funds, naturally - on a house, swimming pool and Buick for his Doxy." Now in the case the house does not know what "Doxy" means, if there should be any here unacquainted with this classic term, you will find the word "Doxy" in Shakespeare. I am sure the Minister of Education could give a good definition of it. Other words used are "Molls", "Flossies". Baker has spent \$2,200 - also in Teamsters money - for sanitarium treatment that brought his weight down from 420 lbs. to an oafish 284. A slim 284 pounds - money well spent.

Mr. Speaker: Order! There is too much noise in the House at present. I must remind those who are in the galleries that there must be no noise, no sound of approval or disapproval from the galleries.

Mr. Smallwood: In other words, Mr.

Speaker, I take it that our masters the public, when they come into the Peoples' House must be seen and not heard.

Mr. Speaker: That is it.

Mr. Smallwood: That is the rule all over the British Commonwealth. Not a sound is permitted from the galleries. Only the elected members can laugh, but I guess they are allowed to smile. "Kicked out as president of Washington's Warehouse Employees' local 730 after its treasury was looted by its officers in 1952, Baker joined up with Jimmy Hoffa, went to work in St. Louis for Hoffa's Lieutenant Harold Gibbons. Baker's specialty: 'Belly bumping' i.e., using his gross girth to direct or obstruct picket line traffic."

Now picture him before spending that \$2,200 in Teamsters' money from St. John's and elsewhere to reduce from 420 lbs. picture him before spending that money. What an asset he would be for the IWA. "During the 1953 taxicab strike, Baker ordered his wife to provide an alibi for a night spent dumping a taxicab into the Mississippi River. After police found a loaded .38 cal. revolver and seven extra shells in his pocket, he was told he was unwelcome in St. Louis and would be arrested if seen with any hoodlums. Posing as a veterinarian, he once collected \$1,500 for doping a race horse; on other occasions bragged that while organizing carnival workers, he tipped over a bleacher and killed some people. Again, objecting to the size of his bill, he beat up the manager of a posh Chicago apartment hotel. Still again, he threatened to 'put into concrete blocks' a Miami lawyer who failed to fix a manslaughter charge against his mistress (she was given 15 years)." He was going to put him in a concrete block and drop it to the bottom of the water. That is a little game they play sometimes in the United States when they want to get rid of inconvenient evidence.

I will quote only two more. All these I will leave. I will not quote them today. I will content myself with these two final quotations. Here is the "Saturday Evening Post" for May 3, 1958. It is the first of two articles written by Senator McLellan himself, the chairman of the Senate Labour Racketing Committee. He says this, Mr. Speaker, the

chairman who spent two years investigating rackets in the labour movement: "During the first year's hearings our committee gave special attention to the giant Teamsters Union. This was natural. It is the largest union in the country, with some 1,500,000 members. It is also one of the most corruptly managed. Further, it has the power—probably beyond that of any other union—to cripple our national economy. Sworn testimony before us exposed, as never before, the crookedness and criminality pervading the leadership of this far flung organization. Our findings contributed to the retirement of Dave Beck from the presidency of the union, and to the expulsion of the Teamsters from the AFL - CIO. I wish I could hail these as triumphant achievements."

He is disappointed, Mr. Speaker, they have not produced very much remedy, apparently because he continues: "The melancholy fact is that, unless and until Congress passes the needed new laws, there can be only faint hope of improvement. Beck's successor as president, James Hoffa, may well be the more dangerous man of the two—younger, craftier, more ambitious, and with even closer ties to the criminal underworld. The huge union, though expelled, carried on under Hoffa as before. True, by recent Federal Court order, these 'Monitors' have been chosen to check on the conduct of the union. This may make Hoffa and his pals more cautious for a time. But what can three 'monitors' with few legal powers, do to explore and cure the deep infection which runs through wide ramifications of the Teamster leadership! Not much, I fear. "The evidence on the Teamsters has been extensively publicized in the press and on the air waves. Here, therefore, I will touch on only a few high points." And he tells the frightful things Beck did in the Teamster Union. Then it goes on:

"Now as to his successor, Mr. James Hoffa. The testimony before us indicates that he has studied and imitated the methods of the old masters, but has added refinements of his own. He knows more dangerous criminals than Beck. Such thugs have been Hoffa's pals for years; he has placed a host of them in offices of trust within the union, and he has relied much on their help in his climb to the top. Jimmy's warmhearted 'rehabilitation' has paid off, though occasion-

ally our "harsh" society catches one of his 'rehabilitated' friends in the act of extortion, dynamiting, or grand larceny and sends him back to prison. So it was with Hoffa's dear crony Johnny Dio (Dioguardi), that infamous and high-ranking racketeer recently convicted again and sentenced to fifteen to thirty years for extortion and conspiracy. It was to this poisonous scoundrel that Hoffa tried to entrust the destinies of 30,000 New York taxi drivers. The plot was interrupted. Dio is 'away' for awhile. But a legion of his criminal lieutenants are eager to carry on in his stead. We shall see later how and why they move into unions." All the world knows of Johnny Dio!

Mr. Higgins: That is the old acid thrower?

Mr. Smallwood: That is the gentleman! Hoffa never lacks for help from the underworld. One goes to jail for 15 or 30 years and 50 more spring up in their places, all full of ambition! Still quoting the Senator: "Unlike Beck, Hoffa did not take the Fifth Amendment". (He did not claim exemption under the Fifth Amendment.) "At the start he testified freely and suavely. He proclaimed his devotion to union 'responsibility' and assured us that 'the American people will accept my philosophy'. Apparently he did not realize how much solid evidence our skilled investigators had unearthed. When he said that he was quite confident, man to man — I think the American people will accept my philosophy."
 "As the evidence piled up, Hoffa squirmed in his chair. His memory faded almost to zero. He suffered a coma of forgetfulness. I asked him whether he had had phone conversations with Johnny Dio about organizing the New York taxi drivers, 'I honestly don't recall'. We played back several lengthy tape recordings of such long-distance calls, supplied by the office of the New York district attorney. Hoffa continued to squirm and evade. He dodged or equivocated on the answers to more than 200 questions, most of them on matters which no man above moron level could forget. And Hoffa is no moron. Experts have rated his I.Q. as exceptionally high. When not under oath, he is noted for his sharp memory for names, dates, facts and figures, and for his shrewdness in threading the tangled maze of secretive personal business ventures. I refer here

to Johnny Dio because he is the archetype of the army of professional gangsters who have muscled into the labour movement. Such men have never had a grain of interest in unionism as such — except for money and power. For pay, they are as ready to smash unions as to organize them. With their network of underworld connections, they are a danger to the nation. Our evidence indicates that not merely hundreds but thousands of such racketeers have infiltrated unionism. Unless they are booted out by the force of new laws, it is not fanciful to say that we are headed for a gangsterized economy in America".

Now finally, Mr. Speaker, here is "Life Magazine", August 18, 1959. There is a two-page spread of a rogue's gallery of gangsters and scoundrels, pimps, murderers, thieves; all of them high-ranking officers of the Teamsters' Union. There they are! And there is a local in St. John's and one in Corner Brook.

"Alfred Reger, secretary-treasurer of New York Teamsters' Local 522 was found guilty of extortion in 1957 after a shakedown of lumber firms."

"Joseph Glimco, president of Chicago Local 777, has been arrested for disorderly conduct and for suspicion of murder; was convicted of larceny."

"Sam Golstein, the president of the New York Local 239, has been convicted for unlawful entry and gambling, and sentenced for conspiracy."

"Glen Smith, president of Chattanooga, Tenn. Local 515, has been arrested four times, got out on parole after a term for burglary and larceny."

"Louis Babe Triscaro is president of Cleveland Local 436. In the 1930's he was arrested for assault and battery, but got off by paying fines."

"Frank Matula, secretary-treasurer of Los Angeles Local 396 and boss of garbage collectors, was convicted on a charge of perjury in 1957."

"Tony "Ducks" Coralla is vice-president of New York Local 239, has been arrested twice on narcotics cases, once on grand larceny charge."

"Bernard Adelstein, secretary-treasurer of New York Local 803., has been picked up on suspicion of grand larceny and questioned about a slaying."

"John McNamara, secretary-treasurer of New York Locals 295 and 808 was convicted of extortion in 1957 with Johnny Dio."

"William Presser, president of Cleveland Local 410, paid fines for violation of Sherman Act. (I have forgotten what the Sherman Act is)

Mr. M.P. Murray (Ferryland): Anti-trust:

Mr. Smallwood: Oh that is what it is! How could he be guilty of that? He had an interest with Hoffa in vending machine deals. "William Hoffa, Jimmy's brother, is business agent for Detroit Local 614. He has been arrested eighteen times, convicted seven, twice for assault."

"Samuel Feldman is a business agent for Philadelphia Local 929. He was arrested last month for trying to sell \$400,000 worth of stolen bonds."

"Michael Sobolewski, organizer, has been arrested eight times and sentenced twice for larceny. Last arrest in 1956 was for breach of peace."

"Arthur Brown, organizer, is now out on bail on charge of breaking and entering and malicious mischief. In 1955 he was picked up for assault."

"Peter Luscko, truck dispatcher, was given a 5 to 10 year penitentiary term for larceny and attempting to kill a Philadelphia patrolman."

"John Zuroick, organizer, served a three year term in reform school for larceny, served a year in prison for aggravated assault and battery."

"John Myhasuk, organizer, served two years for assault and battery, was paroled for another two-year sentence for assault with intent to kill."

"Edward Walker, local business agent, has been charged eight times. Charges include robbery, attempted larceny, and receiving stolen goods."

"Harry Lindsay, organizer, was arrested twice in 1946 for stealing autos. Second offence included charge of assault and battery with an auto."

"Joseph Cendrowski, alias Joseph Cinders and Joseph Carson, an organizer, has served sentences for larceny, burglary, disorderly conduct." And Life Magazine says: "It has long been known that there were criminals and hoodlums in Teamster leadership. Jimmy Hoffa has boasted that he

himself has a police record 'maybe as long as your arm', but until the current Senate hearings began, few realized how many Teamster executives are convicted criminals, or men with records of police arrest. There are over five dozen (16 of whom I have listed) who have been tried for crimes up to and including murder. "Mr. Hoffa," cried Committee Chairman John McLellan, "has aligned himself with certain underworld characters who are a part and parcel of the most sinister forces in this country."

Mr. Hollett: The Teamsters' Union?

Mr. Smallwood: The Teamsters' Union. Hoffa has done this. "A committee investigator who has made a study of Hoffa's methods says of him, 'Jimmy likes to have guys like that around him. He likes to think he's a tough fellow. It makes him feel tough.'" Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the union that this present Bill would enable the Government to outlaw, to abolish, to wipe out of existence in Newfoundland; not at all because there is anything wrong with the good Newfoundlanders who are members of the two locals in Newfoundland, i.e. the one in St. John's and the one in Corner Brook — THERE IS NOTHING wrong with them — but because this criminal union should not be in Newfoundland. They are only befouling the air we breathe.

I made it my duty last night to contact some of the employees, some of the operators of plants and factories in St. John's at which these members of this local are employed, to ask them this simple question: "If and when the Hoffa union is fired out of Newfoundland and they cease to exist, union contracts that you have signed with that union will, of course, cease to exist. I assume, take it for granted that you will honour in full, in full, you will honour the terms and conditions of these agreements although the agreements die with the death of the union?" And they were very prompt in giving the honourable answer. The honourable answer is, "Of course, we will honour, we will respect and we will carry out the terms of the agreement made." So that Mr. Speaker, the members themselves need not worry on that point. While they are finding themselves another union, they know they will not suffer by the abolition of this gangster and criminal union.

Now, I believe it is not too late, even across Canada, to end this union in Canada. It is not too late to do it. Certainly it is not too late in Newfoundland. There are only two locals here. Incidentally, the house might be interested to know that this Teamsters' Union, which you or I might innocently think meant a union of teamsters, truck drivers, drivers of vans and trucks, and the like is no such thing. It has at this moment all the employees of the dry-cleaning plants, men and women in St. John's, in its membership. They are not teamsters. One might think that when you mention dry-cleaning plants the only persons in those plants who are members of the Teamsters' Union are the drivers of the vans or trucks of that plant. Not so — all the employees except management and salesmen and office workers are members of the union. Similarly at the foundry and nail factory — all but management and office workers — all the garages, or a great many of them; and then, of course, construction workers of all kinds. What they have to do with teamsters and transportation is a little difficult to see. Truck drivers, of course, shovel-operators, bulldozers, warehouse employees, that we can agree with. But all the brewery workers in all the breweries are members. Indeed, their own statement is that they grab anyone they can get into their union. And there are 1,200, so Daley says, in St. John's today. They need a union, and I hope they will find a good union.

And when Newfoundland rids itself of the IWA and Hoffa; when we get rid of these two unions; the air will be sweeter and Newfoundland will be cleaner and the people will be healthier, because they are a scourge creeping into our decent island home. It is our duty, it is the duty of the leaders of the people, all of us here, the 36 of us, regardless of party, regardless of any partisan interests or concern, as Newfoundlanders, as the leaders of all the people of Newfoundland — We are that in the aggregate. Our duty is to use the opportunity we have as the legislators of Newfoundland to drive out of this province these two gangsters, criminal outfits. (Applause)

Mr. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): I had in mind, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the debate, but I feel there is not much point in moving it. I have

not very much to say on the matter, after the indictment which the hon. the Premier has made on certain international unions. I feel that there ought to be some legislation passed by this House which would protect our workmen from such gangsters and gangsterism as have been described by the Premier in his address.

Now, the main principle of the Bill, as I see it, is to give the Labour Relations Act power to prevent unions which are dominated by an executive which is composed largely of mobsters and gangsters from linking up our smaller local unions here in Newfoundland. Since the indictment made by the hon. the Premier — My God, we read these things. But we read them today and forget them tomorrow, and so it goes on day after day. Here we have presented to us this evening, not exactly in a nutshell for it took an hour and a half — it was a very big nut — and I hope the Government is going to do something about cracking it. We have been presented with this in a whole piece, a picture wherein we see this Teamster Union — and I believe this Bill is aimed at such a union — as something which, as is said by Senator McLellan, the head of the investigating committee in the United States, something which would tend to cripple and kill the economy of the United States of America. Sir, if such a body can do that in the United States of America what would it not do in Canada, and more so as far as we are concerned — what could they not do in Newfoundland?

The hon. the Premier quoted from many magazines. I have three. I am not going to say very much because we must be awfully sick of magazines this afternoon. Now the quotes made by the Premier are very apt and very well chosen and certainly indicate a great amount of study and thought on this matter by the Premier and his associates. I want to read one or two which to me, in a way, copper-fastens what the hon. the Premier has already said. He dealt with "Time", I deal in "Life". "Life Magazine", Jan 26, 1959. There is an editorial — "Labour at the Crossroads":

"Like crime and inflation — with both of which it is linked — the power of the unions a top domestic issue of 1959. The President is kicking it off with his union reform proposals this week to be followed by Senator Kennedy's. The McLellan Committee will

give us another round of true-life horror stories. The A.F.L. - C.I.O. convention in Puerto Rico next month will contribute a spectacle of fresh factional strife. Coming wage negotiations, notably in steel, will raise issues affecting the whole U.S. economy. With a confidence born of the November elections, the union executives demand that Congress repeal that section of the Taft-Hartley law which permits the States to forbid the union shop (as 19 of them already do). They want more power. Do the unions deserve more power? As now constituted, they do not." That is from an editorial, January 26th of this year — And they go on: "In a single generation the unions have established themselves as one of the three most powerful forces (along with government and business) in our industrial society."

In other words, government, business and labour are indicated to be the three most powerful forces in the world today, at least in the United States or, as they say, "In our industrial society".

"As Professor Sumner Slichter says, they have turned out to be both "much stronger and much less democratic" than the public expected when the Wagner Act was passed. The lack of internal democracy was a military necessity when unions were fighting a managerial class that hoped to prevent, or bust them altogether. And the paranoid rhetoric of that era may well be turned against parts of the Administration Reform Bill, especially since its sponsor (though not its author) is Senator Goldwater, whom labor considers a union buster." So it goes on. I won't bother the House with reading any more. This is a very sound editorial. Yes, before it reached the crossroads and was struggling, probably in some countries, against government and in some against management and so on, and in some countries against both, labour had to adopt a more or less dictatorial attitude or nature, but labour today has grown to such vastness in our communities, (even here in Newfoundland) that it is time that labour begins to build itself upon a democratic platform, something more democratic than they have in the United States today, where a bunch of criminals, a bunch of crooks who constitute the majority of the executive of the Teamsters' Union, control to a great extent — well they control the labour of 1,600,000 people,

and to a great extent can cripple the whole industry of the United States of America. Here is another editorial — and this also is from "Life" March 2, 1959, a couple of days ago. And "Life" magazine, Mr. Speaker, is a huge thing. It has some of the finest writers and carries some of the finest editorials in the world. It has 8,000,000 subscribers. It is slightly bigger than IWA. At any rate, it expresses a fair opinion generally — Sometimes, I suppose, it does make mistakes. The Life article begins "**Where terror reigns:** "Who is running this country? Is it the legal government, elected by the citizens, or is it an invisible government of hoods, thugs, gangsters, terrorists and murderers? The question is raised anew by the testimony of Sidney Saul, owner of 22 Brooklyn jukeboxes, before the McLellan committee. The three thugs from one of Jimmy Hoffa's paper unions, seeking a cut on Saul's take, slugged him until his nose was bent 'like a horseshoe'. He surrendered. This sounds like the treatment Hungarian patriots get in the dungeons of secret police cells. But it happened in America, in its biggest city, in a public place (a luncheonette called 'Wagon Wheels'), and was observed by others who dared not interfere. They knew who was boss." So Mr. Speaker, it goes on — And I recommend anybody who is interested in this very important subject to read that editorial, connecting Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters' Union with this indictment. I would also suggest reading the Feb. 23rd, issue of Life. I am just going to read a paragraph from it.

"To run a restaurant every owner needs services and supplies. He needs someone to deliver food and drink, bartenders and waiters to serve it, maintenance men for vending machines and someone to haul off garbage. When the syndicate moves in, the owner finds he is forced to pay heavily for these services and even take on additional ones he does not want. If he balks, the syndicate can harass him by ordering pickets to scare off customers. If this fails, the mob, which controls waiters and bartender-union locals, can call members out. Since the mobsters also control Teamsters' locals who deliver, they can put the owner out of business by cutting off his supply of beer or by stopping his garbage pick-up." And so on. I will not quote anymore from magazines, but to support our contention that we on this side

of the House ought to support such a Bill, I thought I would quote those two or three sentenced.

I only read a part of the Bill which contains the principle, and there may be something in it with which we on this side of the House may have some criticism, which we can take up in committee. But I say, this Bill which is to keep such gangsterism, such internationalism as far away as possible has our support in principle.

Mr. Smallwood: Would my hon. friend allow me? So that he won't find himself misquoted when he says "international unions" I think probably he meant 'International unions of this kind!

Mr. Hollett: Oh Yes! Definitely! I am sorry! I am referring to international unions of the kind about which I read here, and about which the hon. the Premier spent a good part of the afternoon describing. We want to keep such unions as these out of the country. This country is not big enough to handle such things. If they ever achieved full authority in this country they could tie up the whole industry of this country in 10 minutes and put all our people in fear and dread — and God Help us then! God Help America if she keeps on getting tied up with them! We only have to look and see what the C.I.O. did with them. They outlawed them — 15 million workers, if I am right, said now to this 1.5 million workers — "We will have nothing to do with them again and shall never have anything to do with them again until they clean up their house." And we too, here in Newfoundland, ought to take that stand, support that movement, in this little world of ours, which is getting smaller every day, and we are becoming more closely bound together every day, more closely related. And we too, although only a small group here, elected by the free citizens of Newfoundland, we ought to take our stand even on such large subjects as this, for the sake of our people.

Just have a look at the names of the people heading up the Teamster Union in this magazine the hon. The Premier mentioned — and I have seen it before — there are many names in there that do not sound like English, American, nor anything else — crooks and gangsters. The hon. the Premier

read out 22 names, and each one of these an executive of the 'Teamsters' Union who have criminal records as long as my arm. These people control the 'Teamsters'. And if they are allowed to exist any longer in the United States and if we do not keep them out of here, these black-handed criminals will control the industry of Newfoundland. I think the principle of this Bill is good. I am quite sure all of us on this side believe it is good, and I am going to ask my colleagues to express themselves, if they so desire. We do agree with the principle of this Bill. There is nothing wrong with it. It is something we ought to do. I regret very much if in doing this we do hurt the feelings of some of our friends in the labour movement. We in this House, Mr. Speaker, put up with lots of things from time to time. I was out last night, and my wife answered, I think, six telephone calls, and each of them had something to say about the terrible thing which we had done down here in this house.

Mr. Smallwood: Both sides have had abuse from their own friends, but we cannot help that.

Mr. Hollett: That is right. I am happy to say that against that, we have had a lot of telephone calls and commendations for the stand we took. Whether we succeed or whether the Government succeeds is not a matter for us to worry about, but it is up to us to do what we believe to be our duty on every Bill brought in here, and everything affecting the economy of this country, Sir, we have to take a stand, even though we hurt for the time being our best friends. It does not matter. We have to stand or fall on our convictions on matters as important as this. I take pleasure, Sir, in supporting a movement of this kind in this House.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my comments are going to be brief. I agree with the idea motivating the introduction of this Bill. There are (and at a later stage opportunity will present itself to discuss them) certain aspects of this legislation which I think will require some examination and conceivably some amendment. But with the idea that prompts this legislation, with the principle behind it, there can, I submit, be no reasonable person found to be in disagreement.

There seems to have gotten abroad, particularly in the press in recent weeks, the strange idea that the legislation that has been discussed in this House and the action that has been approved unanimously in this House are aimed at labour. Now I grant you it is repetitious, but I must again point out to these people clamouring so loudly about the democratic right of labour, and the right of free men and Magna Carta that nobody's rights are being invalidated at all. The rights of honest labour to organize have been respected and publicly acknowledged by both sides in this House. The only thing that has been questioned and the only thing we seek to bar is the small criminal element that has infiltrated into the labour movement, which does hold a danger to Newfoundland, as already demonstratively proven to be a danger to the economy of a much greater country, the United States. That is all we are trying to do.

And anybody who takes recourse, anonymously, to the newspapers to attack people for doing their duty does not deserve to be considered. I have a much greater respect for the man — and there have been people prominent in labour — who has come out openly and disagreed not only with the Leader of the Government but with anybody who showed them support. That man may be right or may be wrong, but at least he is entitled to respect when he comes out in his own identity and does not go behind back doors about it.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Higgins: But I have no regard for, and Mr. Speaker, nobody in this house is influenced by anonymous letter writers. I do say this, Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of people who say this thing is too wide ranging. There is no need for it. We can handle our own affairs and clean up our own house. It may be that in stressing the case, strong language is being used; it may be that the colours in which the picture is being painted are very vivid. I am not too much concerned with that. If there is a danger, sometimes, in order to overcome the complacency of the public it is necessary to draw the picture strongly — I don't mind that. We are all sensible people, and when the time comes in committee to hammer out this legislation I am quite satisfied that the House as a whole,

if there is anything that smacks of abnegating the proper rights of any group — certainly that will be considered and if necessary amended.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Higgins: On the principle of this Bill I am quite completely in agreement, and, as my hon. leader has said, happy to support it.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, much of what we have heard in this Chamber this afternoon is in the main known to us. I think I have read most of the articles the Premier has quoted from, and to disagree with anything that would promote the exodus of any evil agency in our community would be to be false to principles that are fundamental to us all. I have no quarrel with that at all. I think the Teamsters' Union, at the high-ranking level, is evil personified. I am not prepared to agree that this situation exists throughout every level of this union. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must in honesty deplore some of the intemperate language we heard yesterday and today. I want to make it quite clear, as I have said, that I am absolutely behind any movement to remove evil, but there is a very real distinction between that and what I am going to say now.

When an individual is named as Mr. Daley was named — I know Mr. Daley — I do not think it is quite right to say that, because he represents this union that he should be lined up as a Hoffa-Daley alliance. I have known Mr. Daley many years. I am not defending him as a former P.C. Mr. Daley has no sympathy with the P.C.'s. I don't think he has any kindly feelings at all towards the P.C.'s. I am talking about Mr. Daley as a citizen. And I was somewhat shocked to hear the Premier yesterday state that his qualifications as a British subject, as a subject of Her Majesty the Queen should be brought into question.

Mr. Speaker: Order! If the hon. member would forgive me, — we are not now on what the Premier said yesterday — that was in connection with another Bill — but what he said today — unless the other Bill comes up.

Mr. Duffy: Well, I do not want to belabour

the point, Sir. The main purpose of this debate is on the principle of this Bill. I stated my views quite clearly, but I do not think it is proper, and it is always offensive to me to hear the names of people who are not in this Chamber, and the people who mention them can very easily be mistaken to be hiding behind parliamentary immunity. I do not think it is quite fair. I hold no brief for Mr. Daley except in bare justice. I think he is primarily, I am sure, interested in labour itself. In my opinion it is unfortunate that his activities in labour were associated with this international union, this Teamsters' Union. But I don't think for one minute that his association with this union makes him culpable of any of the heinous crimes that have been enumerated and attributed to the Teamsters' Union.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Duffy: I merely want to make that clear. I think Mr. Daley's character should not come into this at all. It is regrettable he is associated with it, and I do not know his personal feelings on Mr. Hoffa, but would be extremely surprised if Mr. Daley did not exactly feel as we do about the crimes Hoffa has committed. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the Bill in principle.

Mr. G.R. Renouf: (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the exposition made by the hon. the Premier of conditions existing in the Teamsters' Union in the United States. I feel, and have felt for a long time, that terrific abuses by this union were running rampant throughout that great Republic. People wondered as they read 'can nothing be done to rectify such evils?' We know most of the details as listed or as quoted by the hon. the Premier. We had almost reached the stage of giving up hope that such a scourge could be arrested. Ordinary, common sense citizens of Canada were in fear that this menace was going to spill over the border and was going to corrupt the veins and the life-blood of the British stocks of Canada. We have been alerted in recent times as to how abuses can arise in labour disputes. Some of us have wondered why some actions were not taken before. One might wonder how it is that this focus on abuses now at the present time.

Why did it not come up before? Were we asleep? Were we unaware of all these potential and actual evils that might be upon us? I feel that there is an explanation for this sudden attention and this sudden focus upon all these abuses. It hinges upon the sincerity of this legislation in being in favour of labour. The labour groups in this country have a deal in their favour, in excess of most of the provinces of Canada. The Liberal Government bent over backwards in giving labour a fair deal. But in the light of the aftermath we might say it was more than a fair deal; too fair a deal in certain aspects. Now a crisis has arisen and feelings are running high throughout this country, and we feel that the time is ripe, for the benefit of labour itself, to take certain steps and eradicate certain evils. I said, when I was supporting the resolution of this house a couple of days ago, that whether labour knew it or not, these steps being taken were to bolster labour, to support labour, to protect labour, to safeguard labour, and as such I was for the resolution.

Now it is a fact that we want our legislation in this Province to be good legislation. We want to have laws for the benefit of all our people. We want to have legislation that will prejudice none but will be for the overall good of everyone. It is not because a long set of facts were related from American magazines that we support legislation, proposed legislation of this sort. It is not because we are blinded by the dramatic sequences of weird and unbelievable stories that we support legislation of this sort. I am not one bit influenced by the long list of crimes by that certain union of the United States. I make this point because I would not wish, and neither would any member on either side of this house wish, to give the impression to the public that we are passing or proposing legislation in immediate sequence of a dramatic sequence of incidents. I feel that was done, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, to concentrate one's thoughts, but it is not the immediate reason why we consider supporting legislation of this sort. In other words, I would not like the public to get the impression that passionately, in high emotion, following a long list of readings we supported anything of this sort. No — in cold, sober, commonsense conviction we want to have legislation that

will bring justice and good to labour people of this country and to all Newfoundlanders.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak now, Sir, on the Bill before this House, I do so because, like my hon. friend who so recently put it, I support the principle too. I rise because this legislation affects a lot of workers in my district, and the very heart of my district. I feel, as my hon. friend has just said, this legislation that we bring in is for the good of labour and labour will be the richer as a result. Now I rise too because we have as an organizer of the Teamsters' Union in Corner Brook Mr. Peter Dicks. I have known him all my life as a gentleman, and I am sure, regardless of the affiliation —

Mr. Smallwood: If my hon. friend will allow me — he is our friend, Mr. Dicks — is not that so? It cuts both ways. We are not thinking of personalities.

Mr. Forsey: The hon. the Premier is correct and I want to bring that point out to the House. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Dicks, and I am sure he will have the full co-operation of this house and the other five unions in his effort to re-organize his men into a new union, acceptable to organized labour and to his men as a whole. And I hope the Premier, and this House, will see to it that the employers of these men will be asked in the interim period to grant the same assurances of labour and working conditions that the employers of St. John's have granted. Mr. Speaker, to all of us there comes a time when we must decide what is right and what is wrong. I feel, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, that all of us here are appalled by the danger that could exist, by the shame that would hang over our heads if we could not rise as men and perform a duty regardless of how unfair those who oppose the action of this Bill and prove it worthy and commendable, and I support it.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Just before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make one or two statements. In the first place we would welcome any suggestions for amendments when the Bill gets into committee stage. In fact, there

are some we ourselves would probably make.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion of Mr. Curtis all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday at three o'clock.

Friday, March 6, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Education) (White Bay South): Mr. Speaker, the house may recall that last summer the Premier speaking on behalf of the Government, announced that the Government was calling a conference on education, a province-wide conference on education, the largest which has ever been called in our history. That conference met on November 3rd, 1958 and it deliberated for a full week on six major topics of great concern to education in Newfoundland. These topics were: Public Examinations, Curricula, Adult Education, Education and Training of Teachers, Emergence of Regional and Central High Schools and finally and perhaps most important of all, the equalization of educational opportunities. The delegates to the conference came from all over Newfoundland, representing Church and State and representing organizations of one kind and another, and representing schools, university, Newfoundland Teachers' Association and representing private interests of all kinds. In addition to being the largest conference called on education it was also the most representative. On the final day of the conference, 71 resolutions were adopted. I may say, a great many more were debated and rejected, but 71 were adopted and one had an even 50-50 vote, and this is recorded in this report.

This report, Mr. Speaker, which I am tabl-

ing in this house today, is in my opinion, the most important document on education we have ever had in this Province, because there we have the voice of all segments of society; the provincial educators, businessmen, people in the professions of all kinds, people representing all departments in the Province. They gave their views, and while not recorded personally by name their views are reported anonymously in this report. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that every person interested in education in this Province should start at the beginning and read right through this report and there see 70 resolutions designed to improve educational standards here in Newfoundland. I might say, Sir, for the information of the house, it is the Government's intention to implement this, to have this report distributed, not just to every chairman of every board but to every member of the 320 boards of education in the Province, every teacher, every member of the Legislature and any other interested persons who wish to acquire a copy of this report, as long as the supply lasts. All they need to do is apply to the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Since this report is not tabled under Statutes, I must ask unanimous leave of the house to permit the tabling of the Report. (Granted.)

BELL ISLAND:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood: (Premier): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will find on their desks copies of a resolution from the Local Union 4121 of United Steel Workers Of America at Bell Island. This resolution which was adopted last night at a mass meeting of the members of that union was telephoned to me today by Mr. Jackman, our old friend of this house, the president of the union. One of my secretaries took it down in shorthand and had it photostated for the members of the house because of the fact that the Tickle is closed and they cannot get over. So this resolution was telephoned by Mr. Jackman and put up in this way so that it could be laid on the desks of the members of the house here this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The only way in which

I could treat this would be as a Ministerial Statement. While I cannot permit debate, I can permit one reply.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, with the forbearance of the house I would read it:

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member can incorporate it in a ministerial statement.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I add nothing to that beyond saying that I know that I echo, I express the feelings of the house and indeed of the people of Newfoundland when I say that whatever lies in our power, practically speaking, we must and we will be prepared to do to help our fellow Newfoundlanders in this very bad situation. I have two other statements to make, one of no great consequences and the other of greater consequences than most things I have ever said in this house.

C.L.C. BROADCAST;

The first is that I have asked the members of the house, on this side of the chamber, to tell me how many people in Newfoundland have communicated with them, arising out of the broadcast last night by the representative in Newfoundland of the Canadian Labour Congress.

From the district of Labrador North — no communications whatsoever; Labrador South, none at all, not a word, not a letter, nothing; Bonavista North, none at all; Carboner — Bay De Verde — none; Harbour Grace district — none; Port De Grave district — none; Ferryland district — none; Placentia West district — none; Burin district — none; Fortune-Hermitage district — none; Burgeo-LaPoile district — none; From Cape Race to Port Aux Basques — not one person; Port Au Port district — none; St. George's district — none; from Petty Harbour clear around to Port Au Port, to Humber West — not one person, not one; in the district of Trinity North 33 persons; Bonavista South 7 persons; Bell Island — 2 persons, a man and wife; Gander district — 94 persons, many of them man and wife; Humber West — 2 names; Humber East — one telegram; one name and another subsequently; Twillingate district — 85 names.

Now the total is 293 names from Newfoundland demanding that we undo what the legislation has done; 293 persons out of half a million people, constituting less than .06%. How much of one percent is that?

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): If it were a driving test a man would be completely sober —

Mr. Smallwood: This is only a small fraction of one percent, and the number of places out of the 1200 in Newfoundland is 27.

CROWN ZELLERBACH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the saddest thing I have had to say since I have been in this house: the Crown Zellerbach deal is off. There will be no Crown Zellerbach deal.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to speak to the more serious of the two statements by the hon. the Premier, and that is the Crown Zellerbach situation — if I may be so permitted?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition may comment briefly, but there may be no debate.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, we are very much saddened, we are very sorry to hear that last announcement by the hon. the Premier in regard to Crown Zellerbach. Great hopes were held out by the Government, who went to great pains to bring in these people, to pass legislation here relative to it, and, as I say, great hopes were held out to the people of Newfoundland that Crown Zellerbach would come in and make it possible for many more of our people to make a decent living in the mills and woods. I think I ought not to say very much. Everybody knows, on this side of the house, and I am beginning to wonder what time the government are going to bring in some legislation we can get mad about, or some statement we can get mad about. Everything which has been brought in recently we had to agree with, and we have to agree now. This is a very, very sad statement. We cannot ask the reason. We can only ask the people across the house and the people of the country to

come to their own conclusions as to why Crown Zellerbach has withdrawn from the picture as far as Newfoundland is concerned.

Coming to the less important thing that the hon. the Premier has said, i.e. the number of people responding to the invitation given by Mr. Chafe last evening, I too would like to state — and mind you, on that subject I want to say that I was last night very much impressed by the speech by Mr. Chafe. It was in moderate language and I did not abhor his speech as I did the one by somebody just a few days before. I thought Mr. Chafe did an excellent job on his speech last night, and as he expressedly said, the only thing left to do was to leave the subject under discussion with the people of Newfoundland, and ask all the people all over Newfoundland to sent in their reactions immediately to the members of the house. We heard what happened, what the hon. the Premier has said. Now, Sir, altogether, we on this side of the house, four of us, have had 14 phone calls and telegrams. I myself had six, and two of them were from outside St. John's. Altogether 14 people took the trouble to reply to the appeal made by Mr. Chafe to members on this side of the house. Whether that is any indication of how the people feel in Newfoundland I am not going to say now. I cannot discuss that at the moment. But I do want to say that we have had 14, including the whole of St. John's, or not including the "North" as a matter of fact and some came from outside St. John's. As to this statement which has been made relative to this appeal by Mr. Jackman and his union; that to me again is something I cannot talk about at length — I am not supposed to do at this juncture.

Mr. Smallwood: There will be an opportunity.

Mr. Hollett: There will be an opportunity, I take it, the Government will try to take some steps to implement the request made by Bell Island people. I want to say right now we will always agree to join the government in any such step taken relative to Bell Island. I lived on Bell Island for six years. I know the people and have a lot of friends still living over there. Many times and often during that six years I had to go down the mine and take first hand statements from people on

the spot, and go down where the bodies were left after an accident and I am telling you, Sir that people who work underground on Bell Island or in any other mine should receive every consideration, from every man, woman and child of the province in which they live, because, I think going down in the morning before sunrise, particularly in the winter, and coming out after sunset and going down again next morning, without seeing the sun for months and months — these people go down and work hard and support their families thereby. Some of them are being laid off and I do hope the government will take the necessary steps to implement the request being made here by Mr. Jackman. Thank you very much, Sir.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Questions Nos. 9 and 12 tabled (see appendix)

LEGISLATION:

On motion that the house go into Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act To Make Provision For Safeguarding The Public Interest In View Of The Present Unsettled Conditions In The Woods Labour Part Of The Pulp and Paper Industry In The Province" and a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clark, Chairman of Committee of the Whole.

On motion Clauses 1 through 3 carried:

Mr. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 is already covered in the Labour Relations Act. Therefore, I move we strike out Clause 5 altogether and also Clause 6. We will talk about it under the other Act. We are going to take that out of this act. Mr. Chairman, I have approved wording here to Section 4, which we have just passed: "Where certification granted under the said Act to Trade Unions is re-

voked by this Act any agreement entered into and in force under the date of the passing of this Act between the union and employers is void as from that date and no longer" etc. The approved wording is as follows and means the same thing — "Is void as from that date and no longer binding on the parties to the agreement." I would ask that be substituted for Clause (4) which we have read:

On motion Clause 4, as substituted, carried:

Mr. Curtis: Then, Mr. Chairman, everything between there and the schedule will be deleted. Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 will also be deleted. Maybe we could go straight on to the schedule.

On motion Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 deleted.

Mr. Curtis: I do not see anything to penalize.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Once this is enacted there is just not anything. Schedule read:—

**INTERNATIONAL WOOD
WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Local 2-254
INTERNATIONAL WOOD
WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Local 2-255**

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): It just occurred to me — suppose they change their number — suppose they just change it to 2251 or some other number.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): It is an international body; it will have to get a charter from the parent body.

Mr. Curtis: They have the Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Smallwood: Alright!

Motion, that the committee report having passed the Bill with some amendments, carried:

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act"::

Premier Smallwood: The Attorney General, I believe, is going to suggest some verbal changes, but before he does so may I be permitted to say that when this clause was first suggested by me I said that the house, I

felt sure, had nothing but good will for the 1,200 men or women in the Teamsters' Union Local in St. John's and the 300 in Corner Brook, and I hoped they would proceed, without delay, to find themselves a new union other than Hoffa's Teamsters. I am more than happy to hear late this afternoon that something of that order is exactly what is happening, or about to happen, and that they are pulling out of Hoffa's union and are probably going to apply for a direct charter from the Canadian Labour Congress.

Now the C.L.C. is made up of unions that existed already and which affiliated with the Congress and also unions which have been, so to speak, created by the C.L.C. by direct charter issued by the Congress. Well these 1,200 and 300 members, through Mr. Daley or someone, could apply to the C.L.C. by direct charter issued by the Congress. Well these 1,200 and 300 members, through Mr. Daley or someone, could apply to the C.L.C. and, if the C.L.C. are not scared of Hoffa, they could charter these members in a specially chartered C.L.C. union. And I believe it is something of that nature that is to happen. If not that, then they are going to apply to some already existing international union for affiliation and thereby have affiliation with the C.L.C. At all events, shortly Hoffa will be just a dirty name, a dirty word, in Newfoundland, and he will not have any followers or members here.

Mr. G. Nightengale (St. John's North): What would happen if the C.L.C. decided they will not have them?

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Chairman, I take it the changes that have been indicated would perhaps include deletion of the spelling out of the offences.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Yes! I was going to suggest that as soon as the Premier's announcement had been made. If we read from the fifth line — "Any body, group or organization of trade unions outside the Province have been convicted of any heinous crime such as trafficking in narcotics, manslaughter, extortion, embezzlement or perjury and any or all of them remain as officers" — I think that is clear.

Mr. Smallwood: Would the lawyers in the

Chamber give us some help in this, to make sure that some clause is in this Bill which will prevent the I.W.A. from escaping the effects of the other Bill just by changing the number of their local or by some other such diversion.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, could I draw the attention of the committee to sub-clause (2) there. I contend members of this particular union are affiliated with other unions here in St. John's — this would leave them open to punishment. I would like the Attorney General to look into this matter.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, we have passed sections (1) and (2). I would ask that Section (3) be deleted. In connection with the point raised by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, that is a peculiar type of construction there, where the organization is dealt with on one hand and individual members on the other. The point referred to by my hon. friend does not apply to any individual member because any individual member would not be affiliated.

Mr. Hollett: Take Mr. Daley's case: he is in the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and also a member of the Teamsters.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, but it is the union he is affiliated with — well, what does "member" refer to? A member can do something prohibited by the Act as well as a union. "That does anything prohibited by the Act" would apply to members or union. "Holding a meeting" — I suppose that would be an individual.

Mr. Hollett: The way I read it — "any member affiliated."

Mr. Curtis: A member cannot be affiliated. I referred this to the draftsmen and they said it was quite clear — but, if the house would rather it.

Mr. Hollett: As long, Mr. Chairman, as it is quite clear it does not affect the individual, I am perfectly satisfied. But if it affects any member who is at the present time a member of the union also affiliated with some other union —

Mr. Smallwood: There is no one person who is a member, for example, of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. A man is a member of a union, and the union as such is affiliated with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. But that does not make each individual man of the union a member. His union is a member of it but he is not. The Federation of Labour is exactly what it says it is, a Federation of Canadian citizens — not individuals — The Canadian citizens are a collective body of unions. It is a union of unions, it is not a union itself. It is a federation of unions.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Would it be the same idea as nations being members of the United Nations instead of members being there?

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, it is not clear to me — According to Section (a) — “Any member, officer, agent or representative of the union is affiliated with any body, group or organization of trade unions” — If it is quite clear it does not affect the individual personally, I am satisfied.

Mr. Curtis: Well, no individual can be affiliated with any body, group or organization of trade unions.

Mr. Hollett: Why have you got “officer” up there?

Mr. Curtis: Just because an officer can do something prohibited according to (a). You see you have (a), (b), (c) and (d) and (e); some apply to each and some apply to one.

Mr. Hollett: I just raised the point — If it is clear to everybody?

Mr. Curtis: As far as I see it, we could dissolve this union but could not automatically dissolve its affiliation with other unions. We could not have that authority.

Mr. Higgins: Mr. Chairman, I think what my leader is concerned with is the position of a man who is a member of the Teamsters' Union, as of now, say, and working (say at Cousins) and after this thing goes through Local 855 has its certification revoked. Is it an offence then to continue on and join the Hod Carriers' Union as it reads now? Sub-

ject to that criticism — he is a member of the Teamsters' Union Local 855 and that is dissolved — suppose then he is affiliated with any other body, group or organization.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): I agree, that is the impression created and it would create, and I think labour would object to that.

Mr. Curtis: Let us go through them one by one.

Mr. Higgins: We do not want to create the position of saying to a man — “get out of the Teamsters” — and then refuse him the right to join anything else. That is the very thing it was announced we are trying to do.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Read it word for word and agree as we go. Clauses read by Clerk: “(2) A trade union which is dissolved in accordance with sub-section (1), which, and any member, officer, agent or representative of the union who, after its dissolution

- (a) does anything prohibited by this Act;
- (b) holds a meeting of the union;
- (c) collects dues from its members;
- (d) is affiliated with any body, group or organization of trade unions;
- (e) in any way holds itself out to be a trade union within the meaning of this Act;

is, notwithstanding the dissolution of the union, guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction.

- (a) if a trade union to a fine not exceeding \$5,000;
- or
- (b) if an individual, to a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.”

Mr. Smallwood: Just strike out (d) and I think it is all covered.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, and make (e) read (d):

Mr. Smallwood: And a member must not do this, that and the other thing.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's West): What is the purpose of having that clause put in there?

Mr. Smallwood: To make sure it is dissolved.

Mr. Higgins: Whatever the purpose was, it served the purpose and it is out.

Mr. Smallwood: That is alright, except for the reference to a member. You could leave it in quite safely, to protect the individual person. This is in addition to a union being dissolved, a member also has something else to protect him. Strike out (d).

Mr. Hollett: I am not quite clear yet. Supposing the Teamsters' Union having been dissolved is still affiliated with some other union here — that is what you are driving at?

Mr. Smallwood: Or anybody anywhere in Newfoundland.

Mr. Hollett: I am inclined to think we ought to leave it there, but it has to be reworded.

Mr. Smallwood: It is clear now: a trade union dissolved under the terms of this Act, if it is dissolved and then does anything prohibited, or holds a meeting or collects dues from its members — in other words, pretends to be dissolved but actually continued to function, then that union defies the Act by subterfuge, and is still guilty of an offence under the Act and is subject to a heavy fine. It is just to make sure that when ordered dissolved, they are dissolved, that is all.

Mr. Higgins: As I see it, the point my leader raised is covered under the all-embracing phrase — "In any way holds itself out to be a trade union within the meaning of this Act."

Hon. Dr. J. McGrath (Minister of Health) (St. Mary's): A trade union subject to a fine. It would be possible for them to say "We are not a trade union, we were dissolved." How would you get after them?

Mr. Forsey: I would like to ask one question, and it is important to ask the question now. It says: "Any member holding a meeting of the union." Now if the former officers of any union were to call a meeting, I cannot quite understand where it applies

there because there is no intention of prosecuting the individual member.

Mr. William Smallwood (Green Bay): There is one point I would like to get straight there. If a union is dissolved and does any of the things forbidden, how do they go about collecting the fine? They cannot send a trade union to jail. It says a fine of \$5,000. Now what means would the Board have of collecting this \$5,000 from a dissolved union? It does provide fines. How are you going to collect?

Premier Smallwood: The question does not arise unless they are functioning — it is to prevent their functioning. If they function in spite of this they could fine them. In other words, they are not dissolved, and they have some assets.

Sub-clause (a), as amended, carried:
On motion Clause 3 stricken out.

Mr. Curtis: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to strike out Section 4, if we could get some way of being sure the I.W.A. would not make any application under a new number. I was wondering if I might have permission. Mr. Chairman, to refer to the former Bill. The Schedule says: "International Woodworkers of America, Local 2-254, Local 2-255". I wonder if there is any way? How can we dissolve the union not here? I was just wondering if we could add, after the schedule of the other Act — "International Woodworkers of America, all locals?" I do not think we could dissolve or decertify something not yet here.

Mr. Higgins: Surely, must you not allow some discretion in the labour board to investigate these things perhaps a little more thoroughly?

Mr. Curtis: That is reasonable. I wonder should we not leave Clause 3 in the Labour Relations Act, which gives the Board the right to refuse certification without assigning any reason?

Mr. Higgins: I would be prepared to let Clause 4 in and strike Clause 3.
Motion, that Clause 3 be stricken out, carried:

Mr. Curtis: In Clause 4, suppose we take

out the word "Members." This is the Clause in the Labour Relations Act which gives the Governor-in-Council power to exclude any person or persons from the Act.

Premier Smallwood: I do not like that.

Mr. Higgins: That seems to do away with the inherent right of any man to put his side of the case. Surely there should be some way.

Premier Smallwood: They may, after hearing representations, revoke the certification or something like that.

Mr. Curtis: That could be easily put in.

Mr. Higgins: My feeling is this: there should be some provision in it whereby the union — "After due enquiry?"

Premier Smallwood: Yes — add the word "may" after "hear".

Mr. McGrath: Who hears it? The Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council?

Mr. Higgins: Would you then delete the words "without assigning any reason?"

Premier Smallwood: Yes.
On motion Clause 4 as amended, carried:

Mr. Higgins: Before you pass it, Mr. Chairman, may I revert to Clause "F"? A judgement has been entered against a certified bargaining agent or any officer, member, agent or representative of it in respect of any tortuous act committed by or on behalf of the agent in connection with a trade dispute. I understand "member" is taken out there. It must come out. Because any one individual member of a union commits a tortuous act is no reason why the charter should be revoked.

Premier Smallwood: It is only in a drastic case, actually, that any government would move. It would have to be an I.W.A. case for any government to use that power.

Mr. Curtis: Take at this very moment: there is a gang which comes from Deer Lake Area, over 125 of them moved in. In other

words they are unable to get pickets from that neighbourhood and brought them in.

Mr. Hollett: But this applies to all unions of the country. You are saying here, if one member of any union — John Jones, Smith, commits a tortuous act the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council may revoke.

Mr. Isaac Mercer (Fogo): No, only if committed by and on behalf.

Mr. Hollett: I do not care what it is in connection with. If it is just one member, anybody outside the union could arrange with John Jones to commit a tortuous act.

Dr. James McGrath (St. Mary's): Could not arrange it on behalf?

Premier Smallwood: It says only where judgement has been entered in court.

Mr. Hollett: He is convicted, then certainly we are not going to take away the certification of his union.

Premier Smallwood: Yes. If men agree to form a union they do not thereby, and they cannot thereby, and they must not thereby, acquire any rights that they do not already have, must they? Is not that agreed? The mere fact that 10 men form a union does not of itself give them any rights that they did not each, individually, have before they formed the union. They do not by forming a union acquire rights they did not already have, whether it be to picket, to do violence to life or limb, or to do damage to property. What rights they had before they formed the union they continue to have after they form, but no more. Now the fact that men formed a union and have decided collectively to withdraw their labour, which is another word for strike, does not give them the rights that they did not already have. And if one of the men who had the bargain made, formed the union up in a strike and beats up somebody, why should not the union, as such, suffer for it? Why should not every individual member of the union be responsible for the honour and good name of the union as such? Why not? That is obvious to us.

Mr. Hollett: After all, unions are humans,

like we are. Any individual, Mr. Speaker, might go up on the wrong side of the picket line and throw stones. Because he has done that, are we going to give the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council authority to revoke the certification?

Premier Smallwood: This is not the Lieutenant - Governor - in - Council, it is the Board. And if it is understood at the outset by every union, and it will be understood when this becomes law — “If we have a strike, boys! If we have a strike, we are running the risk if any one of us breaks the law he is endangering the existence of the union as such!” Now, if that is not a powerful inducement to preserve the law, to keep it — that is what we must do — provide powerful inducements, incentives to keep the law. This will do it. To break it, to commit violence against property, against life and limb, is running the risk of having the union decertified.

Hon. M. P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): It might clarify the situation if, after the word “bargaining” were inserted “agent” in the last line. They are bargaining agents. Obviously this is committed on behalf of the bargaining agent.

Mr. Curtis: Do you not think that is implied? There is no objection to putting it in.

Mr. Murray: Always in connection with the bargaining agent.

Premier Smallwood: Yes! Done in behalf of the union.

Mr. Hollett: That does not clarify the point. You are not going to make Sunday School scholars out of all labour individuals. A strike is called and John Jones (I hope he does not mind. I have referred to him many, many times) goes down on the picket line, had too much to drink, seizes Mr. So-and-So and throws him through the window. That is a tortuous act, alright. Then the Labour Relations Board can take away the certification of that union. That is not right. That man must be punished, yes. Now if somebody leads eight or 10 men to break open a window -

Mr. Curtis: Or the union supplies the liquor.

Premier Smallwood: It is only where he does it on behalf of the union.

Mr. Hollett: It does not say that.

Mr. Murray: Is it not the position, a bargaining agent cannot commit a tortuous act. It is a body and not a human being, and can only commit such act through a human being.

Mr. Mercer: It has to go before the court first, and conviction given.

Mr. Forsey: One little suggestion from a feeble mind, if he were permitted to remain a member of that union or bargaining agency that would protect a union from any liability whatsoever.

Mr. Curtis: In other words, a member might commit murder.

Mr. Mercer: When done on behalf of the union, not in his own behalf in a spirit of temper, an act done in behalf of the union. The agent means union. That is another word.

Mr. Hollett: Union is not the same as agent.

Premier Smallwood: We know what was meant, and to clarify it, the Solicitor - General suggests putting in the word “bargaining” agent, which is the term for union.

Mr. Hollett: I just draw it to the attention of the committee.

Premier Smallwood: My hon. friend's thought is absolutely good. There is no question of that. We must all agree with him. But, the word “bargaining” when put in there in the second last line, before the word agent, as the Solicitor General suggests, in the second last line where it says, committed by or in behalf of the agent; if we put in the word “bargaining” then the act has to be done on behalf of the union — then my hon. friend, I am sure, agrees. Mind you, there has been a conviction in court of having done it in behalf of the union, and then the Labour Relations Board can, when confronted in court of having done something in behalf of the union, then decertify the union. That is all it means. The word “bargaining” is to be in-

served. It has to be inserted. It has to be on behalf of the union and he has to be convinced that he had done it on the union's behalf. The Board then may "may" only "may" not "shall" -

On motion sub-clause (2) of Clause (4) carried:

Mr. C. W. Sheppard (Harbour Grace): Sub-section (a) 3 — If they want decertification, they could dissolve a company or form it under another name. Does not that put a big weapon in the hands of employers?

Mr. Curtis: It would cost a company too much to change its name.

Mr. Sheppard: I think it is a weapon in the hands of an employer, as against a certified bargaining agent.

Mr. Forsey: It has been done, at least in one instance.

On motion Clause (4) passed:

Mr. Curtis: I would suggest, as moved by the hon. the Premier, we strike out the word (43A), strike out the section and renumber (43B) as 43A):

Premier Smallwood: Very briefly, what does this mean now?

Mr. Curtis: An employer can get an injunction, and does not have to chase around after 100 individuals to find out who is there.

On motion Clause (6) carried:

Mr. Curtis: Now there has to be considered renumbering. Clause (6) has to be Clause (5). Clause (5) has to be Clause (4) and Clause (4) has to be Clause (3).

Motion, that the committee rise and report having passed this bill with some amendments; carried:

Mr. Clarke (Committee Chairman): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed Bills Nos. 1 and 2, with some amendments. On motion Report Received. On motion and by leave Bills ordered read a third time now:

A Bill, "An Act To Make Provision For Safeguarding The Public Interest In View Of The Present Unsettled Conditions In The Woods Labour Part Of The Pulp And Paper Industry In The Province," on motion read a third time ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper:

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act," on motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper:

ROYAL ASSENT:

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor arrived to give Royal Assent to certain bills: His Honour the Lieutenant Governor took the Chair:

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present session passed certain bills to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

"An Act To Make Provisions For Sageguarding The Public Interest In View Of The Present Unsettled Conditions In The Woods Labour Part Of The Pulp And Paper Industry In The Province."
"An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act."

His Honour: In Her Majesty's name I assent to these bills:

His Honour left the Chair:
Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that at approximately 5:30 p.m. today His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor was present in the Chamber and gave Royal Assent to certain bills.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at three o'clock.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, before putting the motion, I think it is the desire, or at least the Opposition are prepared, to go ahead on Monday with the debate on the Address in Reply, when the house will revert to the more normal status of party poli-

tics, whereas, up to the moment, we have not been acting as partisans but as the peoples' representatives of the whole population. On Monday we come back to a more customary form of activity.

Mr. Higgins: It was nice knowing you! On motion all remaining Orders of the Day stand deferred:

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at three o'clock.

Monday, March 9, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Petitions:

Hon. S.J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare (Trinity South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of New Harbour, Trinity South. The petition is signed by 102 names. The petitioners pray that the road which runs along the east side of New Harbour and then continues over the hill for a mile or so to the neighbouring settlement of Hopeall shall be reclassified. At the present time it is designated a local road. The petitioners pray that this road may be reclassified as a secondary road, for maintenance purposes. Since the road in question is in the main a connecting road, Sir, between two settlements, I beg to support the prayer of the petition. I ask leave to table the petition and request that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Hon. P.J. Lewis (Minister without Portfolio) (Harbour Main - Bell Island): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the shopkeepers and clerks of the area known as the Conception Bay South Shore Closing Area, which extends from Topsail to Seal Cove inclusively. This petition, Sir, has been signed by practically all the shopkeepers and clerks in that area. They are asking two things: one is that the shops closing area of the Conception Bay South Shore District be extended eastward from Topsail to meet the St. John's Shops Closing Area; and also that the holiday schedule now in

effect, which provides for every Thursday being a half holiday be changed to provide for Wednesday as a whole holiday in each week except in those weeks there is a statutory holiday in effect. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I ask that it be laid on the table of the House for referral to the Department to which it relates.

Mr. M. Whalen (Harbour Main - Bell Island): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this petition I am thinking of the differences in the living and working conditions of people in those places, and of shop-closing hours that would fit in more or less with their working and living schedules. Since the petition is supported by a majority of the shopkeepers in that area it seems to be an indication that it has been well discussed and well thought out and agreed to be in the best benefit of all concerned. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I wish to heartily support this petition.

On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

Mr. Arthur Mifflin (Trinity North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. At this period, Mr. Speaker, I am not speaking on the report.

Mr. Speaker: It is on this motion that the debate known as the debate on the Speech from the Throne takes place.

The report reads as follows:

To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, The Honourable Campbell MacPherson, O.B.E.

May it please Your Honour,

We, the Commons of Newfoundland in Legislative Session assembled, beg to thank Your Honour for the Gracious Speech which Your Honour has addressed to this House.

(Sgd.) A.S. Mifflin.

G.W. Clarke.

G. Rex Renouf.

Assembly Room,
March 2nd, 1959

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier) (Bonavista North): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the house a series of Governor's Warrants issued since the last meeting of the Legislature, a year or so ago.

Mr. Speaker: Before we get along to any other business there is now a motion before the Chair that this report be received and adopted.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, could we have it deferred to later in the day? Motion that the report of the Select Committee to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be deferred to later in the day was adopted.

Notice of Motions:

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney - General) (Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "A Bill, An Act To Amend The Fire Insurance Act 1957."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "A Bill, An Act To Amend The Newspaper And Books Act."

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Mr. Curtis: May I give further notice, Mr. Speaker, that I will, on tomorrow, ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, 1957."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 10 asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The answer is here, but I do wish to make it clear that this figure covers a period of about four years. These figures are large, and run to \$250,000, I suppose, in all, and they represent the total cost to Newfoundland in the four year period of preparing our case for the Royal Commission headed by Mr. Justice McNair.

Hon. S.J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of March

4, a question is asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, question No. 8. I beg leave to table parts (a) and (b) dealing with monthly sick-relief and able-bodied relief in St. John's comprising four electoral districts. The third part of the question deals with social assistance and is not broken down monthly, and I do not have the figures. We are not able to get them before at least April 15. Now I can give the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if he so desires, the total up to this time. If that will be sufficient I could have it tomorrow. I beg leave to table the answers.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a subsequent question to a question asked the other day, and the hon. the Premier gave me the answer to my question. However, unfortunately it was not complete. With reference to the insurance on the Hardwoods Plant, I did ask the amount the Government received for that claim. If the Premier would be good enough to answer the part incompleted — has the claim been paid, and has the Government received any of that claim?

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): I am speaking from memory, but I believe that the amount of money the Government are getting from the insurance company is either \$600,000 or \$650,000. I believe it is the latter figure. I may say for the information of the House that the amount of insurance money that we will receive is just a bit short of the amount that would be needed to put the plant back into full operation again, with brand new machinery; an entirely new plant, new building and a much more modern plant than the one that was destroyed, because the whole process (and it is a process - it is a war invention) has been considerably improved since the original invention was made. The plant that was destroyed was designed and built according to the original invention. Great improvements have been made in the design of that invention out there on Topsail Road. When I say the amount of insurance money would be just less than sufficient to replace the plant, I mean replacing it with the very latest and most efficient plant that has been designed

since the original one was invented. I frankly don't know but the Treasury would know, as to whether the cash has been paid over by the insurance company and deposited to the credit of the Queen in the bank. If not it is a mere formality. The settlement has, I think, been made by the insurance company, but whether the money has actually been transferred I do not know. If my hon. friend wants to know we can easily find out. I do not know myself. I have not bothered to ask the Treasury. That is a mere formality. The settlement has been made, whether or not the cash has been handed over.

Hon. Malcolm Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): As a further question to that, I wonder, has a definite decision been made as to whether or not they are going to rebuild this plant — by the Cabinet?

Premier Smallwood: The Government on the very day of the fire, or the day before, certainly within a day of the fire, received a supplementary report about that very enterprise from the Arthur D. Little Co. of Boston. That was a supplementary report, a second one, and in it they recommended strongly that certain improvements should be made in the plant and certain additional expenditure incurred by the Government, because the enterprise was so promising. Its future appeared to the Arthur D. Little Co. to be so good that they made this strong recommendation. We never had the opportunity to consider whether we would or would not, when the plant was destroyed by fire. We promptly engaged the same company to come and review the whole situation, now that the plant was destroyed, and find out what it would cost. They had to find out for us what it would cost to get the very latest and best plant, what it would cost to get the whole operation moving again.

They made us a report on that and we agreed in principle as a Government; we agreed, we passed an order stating that we agreed in principle to proceeding with the rebuilding of the plant. But that was only an agreement in principle; an agreement in practise would follow a careful, on-the-spot engineering survey to be made by the Arthur D. Little Co. of Boston. That has been proceeding, and I think the latest thought is not to rebuild on the same site, but to en-

large the main building considerably; that is to say the plywood building of Newfoundland Hardwoods, and to integrate the two, leaving the hardboards industry buildings that were not destroyed by fire, where they are, intact, continue to use them, leave all that and instead of building the main building where the old one was, the one which was destroyed, build it as an attachment, and enlargement of the main building of Newfoundland Hardwoods, because there you have a large part of the set-up already in existence, and there you have a case of one company helping the other, with one set of overhead, one set of certain types of expenditures and the avoidance of duplication etc. We think probably that would be the final decision, but that has not as yet been made.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. the Premier if it is possible that the latest report of the Arthur D. Little Co. could be tabled?

Mr. Smallwood: I would want to give some thought to that before giving an answer to it. It is highly competitive business. I may say the company has developed an excellent trade here on this island. Its name stands very high in the building and construction and carpenter trades, very high. They have captured the Newfoundland market. Now, until they get the new plant built, they have rationed their stocks among the dealers in the hope of holding their trade, holding their customers until they can be producing again. And they have very much good will from the trade. But there are other manufacturers, not in Newfoundland, who would like to take this market. And so we must be cautious as to how much information we will give to competitors of this plant as to the economics, the costs of production. All that, of course, is in the report. If my hon. friend wants the information for their private information, their own guidance, we will be happy to make it available. But with respect to making the report public, we would have to give very careful thought to that.

Mr. Duffy: You would not permit us to see it privately before.

Mr. Smallwood: Privately, we would be

quite happy — I think so — privately. I do not think my hon. friend would want — some turned out badly, some fairly well, some quite well — We want to give them every chance to survive, to succeed. It is good for all of us if they do. We do not want to hurt them.

Mr. Duffy: You have already given that concern \$1.5 million.

Mr. Smallwood: That is right.

Adjourned Debate On the Address in Reply:

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the light of the startling events of the week, which took up the business of the house, and the international aspects of this business, it is not easy to get down to more normal routine. I find it very difficult because of the tremendously important implications of the legislation of the past two weeks to put my mind on that which would be normally important routine business. However, although these exciting events have overshadowed the ordinary business of the house, that does not minimize the great importance of the running of the Government and the operation of the Government as it applies to our Province.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to commend the mover and seconder of the motion, that an Address in Reply be drafted, for their very excellent presentations. I would like to associate myself with the expression of sympathy that was conveyed to the bereaved members of the unfortunate fishermen who lost their lives in that tragic disaster a few weeks ago, the "Blue Wave." It appears more shocking for us to hear of these disasters today, because of the tremendous strides that science has made respecting the removal of the dangers of the deep. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Speech from the Throne. On reading it first I think one is impressed with the feeling, one has the feeling that it was hastily prepared, and in view of the unusual circumstances surrounding the opening of the house in this session, that is quite understandable. There are important matters referred to, but I had rather hoped one or two other matters that are of great importance would find a place in the Speech. I had

hoped to see some reference to action on the report of the Civil Service Commission. Now I know from a reply of the Premier to a question I put that this commission has been set up and that, unfortunately, two gentlemen on that board, on that commission, became seriously ill. But I must point out that I think the first reference to this Commission in the Throne Speech was some three years ago. I think I am right there. And I feel that there is no justification at all for this long delay.

I am thinking too of that class of civil servants known as "unestablished civil servants." I think there is a fair number of these men, and I think they should be made aware as to just where they stand and what the future holds for them in respect to civil service pensions. Now I believe I am right when I say the Premier has stated that the report has been completed but is not ready for final printing. But I do hope that in this session we shall hear the substance of this report so that we can see that some definite action has been taken. I think that is terribly important, and I emphasize the importance of that, from our standpoint.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech reference was made to Term 29, and to the hope of the Government that this would soon be finalized and implemented. We hope so too. I deplore the feeling that some people have, that we on this side of the house welcome the delay in implementing this Term 29, because the Government will be embarrassed.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Nobody over here thinks that!

Mr. Duffy: It has been stated. I deplore that. I say, we could not be less interested in embarrassing the Government. We do not want to see Newfoundland embarrassed, and I think I reflect the opinion of my colleagues here, that this Term 29 will be finalized and an adequate amount, whatever that may be — I leave that to the economists — that an adequate reward will be made to bridge that gap between the revenue to operate our public services and the amount needed to bridge the gap to maintain and continue the levels and standards reached.

A brief reference too was made to the new university, which I think we are all very

happy to see. It is badly needed, long overdue, and I do not think anyone could with any reason object to a new university. However, there is one aspect of it that I feel I should refer to, and that is the plans. I am thinking principally of the financial plans in connection with the erection. I hope we will not see the situation that obtained here last year when the Government had decided and begun to erect a provincial building which will cost something in the neighbourhood of \$15 or more million, and we were presented with the position that this had been done and were at the same time asked to consider plans — We, perforce as I have said before, being placed in the very undignified position of being “rubber stamps.” I hope this will not happen in connection with the new university. Because we are small in number here does not remove our responsibility and does not in any way minimize our rights as members of this Assembly, and I think that advantage has been taken of that more than once by the Government and I resent it and we resent it. When I objected to the procedure last year, I was told by the Premier that every Government in the world has to make important decisions when Parliament is closed. I quite agree with that, but certainly no decisions that had been under advisement for two or three years — and when he made that answer to me I had in my possession correspondence which showed that this provincial building, with alternate plants thereof, had been in the possession of the Government for nearly three years.

Mr. Smallwood: My hon. friend, if he will allow me, must surely be confusing plans of the university with the plans of the provincial building. We had no plans of the provincial building even as long as three months before — My hon. friend referred to three years; he must be referring and can only refer to the university.

Mr. Duffy: Correspondence dated 1957, which set forth the various plans for financing this building. It is only a matter of looking up that correspondence.

Mr. Smallwood: This is still on 1959.

Mr. Duffy: 1956, so long ago since it started I cannot even remember the year.

Mr. Smallwood: I think the hon. member is quite wrong.

Mr. Duffy: I know I am quite right. The point I am trying to make (I am not concerned with details) is that correspondence showed quite clearly that an important decision has been made on matters that had come before the Government quite a considerable time before, in two succeeding sessions.

Now the reference to the fishery: — Mr. Speaker, I think we all deplore the fact that last year the fishery was one of the worst in the history of the country — And when I read that in the Throne Speech I could not help feeling that possibly last year, and maybe the one or two immediately preceding years had set another record in the cost of administration in this particular department, which was the highest in the history of the country. I drew attention last year to unnecessary expenses, tremendously unnecessary expenses in connection with the administration of the fisheries here. I pointed out that one particular board — I am not going all over that again — you all know the story on that \$75,000 a year board. I asked the Premier a very specific question on that. I asked if he agreed that the board was worth \$75,000. He said he did not agree it was worth \$75,000. I asked if there was an agreement, and he said there was no signed agreement. I then proposed an amendment to this vote, reducing the salaries of these men. Incidentally I do not question (I have said this several times before) — I don't question their ability. I question the function they are asked to perform. The Premier said that if that amendment were put through, that every member of the Government would vote against it. He warned every member of the Government to vote against it. I find it difficult to understand. Granted the amount of money saved would not equal Term 29, but it would be \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year, and that is not to be thrown away, in my opinion.

There are other experiments, other expenses in connection with the financial policy of the Government that indicate that they are not too concerned about public accounts. In that connection too I might say, Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be an expert on fisheries, but I do keep abreast, as an ordinary citizen, of what is happening

and have an eye to the cost of operations and so on. I think that it is generally admitted that the expenses involved in the provincial experiments in the fisheries is largely money thrown away; expensive plants apparently serve no purpose; plants that have neither experimental nor productive returns. It makes one wonder just what advice the Government is getting.

Mr. Smallwood: What plants is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Mr. Duffy: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that plant at LaScie. I have been told by qualified people in the fisheries — and I don't know, but am just repeating what I have been told by people who should know — that it is completely unjustified, and serves no purpose at all, practically.

Mr. Smallwood: It is not operating yet.

Mr. Duffy: That is one of the reasons it serves no purpose. It should be operating.

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries) (Burgeo and La Poile): It is a prophesy you are making.

Mr. Duffy: Last year the attention of the House was drawn to the Auditor General's Report with reference to loans. I am not going to talk about the new industries, but I am going to talk about something that has to be talked about, and the attention of the house has been drawn to it because the Auditor General's Report last year pointed out that in a number of Government plants, the agreement between the Government and the company required insurance, fire insurance to be carried to the extent of protecting the loan of public money. And the Auditor General pointed out that in many instances this was not observed. That is why I asked the Premier, in a formal question the other day, what amount of insurance was on this Newfoundland Hardwoods Plant, Hardboards Industries Plant. And I find that the amount of insurance carried, at least not the amount carried which was \$1 million, but the amount that was paid arising out of that claim, and I find the amount that has been paid represents just exactly, or almost exactly, one quarter of the loan that was given to this company.

Premier Smallwood: But the hon. gentleman does not think that it was the loan that was insured. What was insured was buildings and machinery. What claim there is against the insurance company is for the amount of damage done to the actual buildings and actual machinery. All the buildings and all the machinery were not destroyed. One building was destroyed and the machinery in it damaged, which in that instance was to the extent of \$640,000.

Mr. Duffy: Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make — even if it were completely destroyed and the Government were paid every cent of the insurance, it would be less than half the amount of the original loan and less than half of the present loan, because nothing has been paid back, according to the figures the Premier gave me the other day.

Mr. Smallwood: \$1 million insurance.

Mr. Duffy: No, I am talking about the loan.

Mr. Smallwood: \$1.5 million; and of that perhaps \$1 million represents actual assets, and the balance was working capital. The actual physical assets were covered. You do not insure a loan.

Mr. Duffy: I am concerned with insuring the agreement made between the Government and that company, which, as the Auditor General pointed out, as was his duty to point out to the people, these requirements had not been met. That is the point I am making, which is another instance that the Government have not been too responsible in matters of this kind. I do not think I have to emphasize that. It is quite obvious.

Mr. Speaker, last year on the estimates, I took occasion to refer briefly to a great evil that exists in the salacious literature that floods our bookstands. This is a non-contentious matter, and I feel that every member of the house feels as I do about it. I feel we have a responsibility to do something about it. I think it is terribly important —

Mr. Smallwood: Prohibition?

Mr. Duffy: If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with the point I was

going to make — Only last week I was told by a certain parent in the city that they were no longer happy about permitting their children to go, unprotected, to many places in this city. I know — I have not any illusions about the fact that we do have our small regiment of unfortunates who require the services of medical science, psychiatry. I am not referring to that at all. I am referring to the ever-growing number of teenagers who are in their behavior just shocking to decent elements of the community. Is this a Provincial matter? Of course it is. Where there is legislation approved it might be ultra vires because it is a Federal matter. But I understand one Province has enacted provincial legislation in this regard, a Province which has the reputation for enacting unique legislation, I think. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we should be very aware of this real evil. I feel the Minister of Education, although it does not come specifically within his limits, he himself is concerned about this, because all the education and all the progress we make in education is completely frustrated and nullified if this ever-growing evil continues to spread. Now, I barely brought this point out last year when the Premier began to talk about wrestling, which completely killed the point I was trying to make. I don't object to wrestling, but I think that we should be aware of a responsibility we have here as legislators. I feel and I think we all feel that this is a real evil. I merely point that out more for the consideration of the house — What can be done about it I do not know.

Mr. Smallwood: What is the Federal position? Could the hon. member tell us? Mr. Fulton introduced legislation when in Opposition, a private member's Bill, which did pass and become law.

Mr. Duffy: I think at the present time the Federal Government is quite concerned about this, and Mr. Fulton himself is spending some time on Federal Legislation. I think I recollect it was pointed out by the Minister of Health (Dr. McGrath) last year the tremendous problems involved with freedom of speech. A lady came into my office from Toronto. She was visiting here with her husband, a lawyer. He was here on official business and she merely came along with him. But she told me something of this

problem that they in Toronto tried to wrestle with, and a group of these people in committees decided the only way to handle it, since there was no legislation to handle it, was to boycott the people that were dishing out this filth. They had quite a job in different communities. They simply told the proprietors of these stores that if they continued to dish this stuff out they would withdraw their patronage. In some cases they were not taken too seriously, but when it hits the pocket it becomes very effective. Now that is one way of handling it, but it is not the most effective.

Mr. Smallwood: It does not last.

Mr. Duffy: It does not last. But, Mr. Speaker, I merely point this out because I feel that we should try to examine any possible cure for this disease that is in our midst. Mr. Speaker, if you would permit me, I would move a 10 minute recess. On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which the Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Duffy: Mr. Speaker, before recess I was talking about what I considered to be a great evil in our midst. I want to conclude that particular part of my talk by commending a service club here (the Kiwanis) who have taken very sensible steps in this particular, and they have met with some success. I am not a member of that club, but I certainly commend the club for this very worthwhile action, and I hope they will meet with every success. Now I would commend to the members of this house, or they may probably have already read an article that appeared in this month's "Readers Digest" which is entitled: "Let us put an end to a vile traffic." I am not going into that at all, but merely recommend it as worthwhile reading.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is desirable and necessary for me to state our position in this unfortunate woods labour dispute, or I should say "we" state our position. We on this side of the house at one point found ourselves with a grave responsibility, as members of the house will agree, and in the period preceding this session feelings were running so high and many communities and sections of our people were so stirred up that it seemed to me not the proper time

for us to state our position. We have stated it, of course, but to elaborate on it, which I think is necessary. I have decided to do so today, and I think my views will represent the views of my colleagues.

It was unfortunate, of course, that the Government had to enter into this dispute, but it was certainly necessary. I think nobody will deny that the Government had not alone the right, but also the duty, to enter into this thing when so many serious factors were involved, not the least of which was the disturbance among our people, which had been, up to now, foreign to Newfoundland. Nobody at all will question that very great duty the Government had. Some felt that they should have acted as mediators to try to bring the parties together. I am not saying anything new, Mr. Speaker, in what I am going to say now, but I have to say what I am to say because it represents the very firm stand — and we want to justify that firm stand from our side of the House. When this unfortunate dispute reached the point where we had to assume some responsibility — and remember, up to a point we did not, we were not involved with it — we deplored it but up to a point we were not involved in the responsibility — the responsibility we had to take came after the Premier had made his speech where he pointed out quite clearly the economic position of Newfoundland, resulting from this unfortunate dispute. We learned that, shed of all the emotional aspects of the case and shed of all the lofty enumerations of principle and high-sounding phrases and high feelings; shed of all that it seems to me not oversimplifying the case to say there were just two factors emerged from this. One was that the A.N.D. Co. could not continue to operate if they met the demands of the IWA, and secondly they would have to close down, and this operation represented one half of our economy. These, I think, are the two factors that emerged from this and from thereon everyone was for himself. But I think it is terribly important for people to be shown the real important, basic issues of this case. We, as you know, had become involved politically. All you have to do is read the "Telegram" to see what some people think of us. Well, we had to assess both positions when we entered the responsibility. Now I am not taking up the cudgel for the A.N.D.

Co. nor Bowaters. I am merely going to point out what is a matter of record; I am merely going to point out facts. For over half of a century, as we all know, the A.N.D. Co. operated here and provided at times, and at the present time, possibly one of the few stabilized factors in our economy. The A.N.D. Co., in their community-mindedness, were years ahead of St. John's. I do not want to make comparisons with other companies here, but it is a matter of actual record. It is a matter of merely using one's eyes to see that these two companies (A.N.D. and Bowaters) were away out in front when it came to plowing back some of their profits and making very model towns where they were operating. The wages were high, and we heard of disputes in every industry in the country, in every phase of endeavour commercially. We heard of disputes and strikes and so on but that was the one section of the country which did not have any serious labour troubles. And we heard, we have learned in the past few weeks, that this company (A.N.D.), is paying the highest wages anywhere in Eastern Canada, with a better bill of fare, lower board rates and so on. Now that is the position as we saw it and as it actually existed. That was that side of the picture. As I said, we had also to assess both sides of the picture to see where our responsibility lay. Now we come to the other factor involved, the other disputing party, the IWA. The IWA is a union that has not been above reproach in their Western Canadian field. Two years ago, when they came here, I heard many people say, 'we are in for trouble.' Perhaps then, if the Government had been able to take steps, a lot of this unfortunate, tragic affair would have been avoided. But at any rate, they came here with some suspicion on the part of many people as to what would happen with the IWA. It has happened and the whole situation brought about through the strike was taken as assumed. Now it was not too difficult for us to realize the stand we had to take. It would have been a simple matter, Mr. Speaker, it would have been very simple on several occasions for us on this side of the house to make politics out of this. Very simply, we could have questioned the Premier's action; after the resolution which was passed in this house we could quite easily have done that. I sometimes wonder if the Premier over there

would have taken advantage. We did not! We had friends who protested our going over with the Government. Let us say we did not make politics out of it because we felt the only important thing was to attain the desired result that this resolution two weeks ago cited — and we hope that, with the legislation that is going through, the worst is over.

We had to take the stand we did with the Government despite the fact some people did not understand our position. But we, as members of this House of Assembly, on this side, have to have the freedom, we must demand the freedom to exercise our judgement and our conscientious decisions even though it may not please our friends. I would like in this regard, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to read just a brief paragraph from a statement that was made by a great parliamentarian nearly 200 years ago, in the British House of Commons: Edmund Burke is talking of and to his constituents: "There wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitting attention. It is his duty, as an M.P., to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But, his unbiassed opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owed you, not his industry only, but his judgement; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Assembly, and realizing the extremely serious implications of this whole unfortunate situation, I think I speak for my colleagues when I say that we have to look and we must demand the freedom to exercise our judgement in matters that come before us. As far as I am concerned my judgement may not be sound, but my conscience is. I must demand that I be permitted to exercise both freely.

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Highways) (White Bay South): Mr. Speaker, I have to begin my comments this afternoon with an apology. Unfortunately, I seem to be the

only victim of last Friday's frigid temperature here in this House. I did pick up a pretty heavy cold. I am going to make a few remarks, and with the concurrence of the House, I would then like to move the adjournment. First of all I want to extend to the mover and seconder of the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne my very sincere congratulations. Now I know it is customary to make an observation of that kind, but in this case I do so not for a mere matter of formality, but because these two speeches were very excellently prepared, very excellently delivered here. I think both these comparatively young and able young men (Mr. A. Mifflin) (Trinity North); (Mr. G. Clarke) (Carbonar — Bay de Verde), may very well look forward to years of successful participation in public life in this province.

I would like also to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for St. John's Centre, who has just taken his seat, after opening the debate for the Opposition. I have never disguised my esteem for the hon. gentleman, who happens also to be my neighbour. His speech was along the line that I had grown to expect from him. There were one or two matters he spoke about to which I would like to make reference later. I would like at this time to draw attention to a statement I made here two years ago, on the occasion of the first Assembly following the general election in October 1956. At that time, after excluding myself, I took occasion to express my feelings that the composition of this house, on both sides, was such as to make every Newfoundlander feel proud. I am familiar, by repute at any rate, and through reading and research, with the process and development which occurred in this historic House of Assembly ever since it first came into use in 1847. I am familiar with some of the great debates that took place here and some of the crises which the house had to face from time to time in our history. I think I can say, without being accused of exaggeration or modesty that in no time in the entire history of this house, since we first obtained Representative Government in 1832 (I think the first Assembly was in 1833), I don't think from that time to this has there ever been a time when the people of Newfoundland could have congratulated themselves more upon the composition of this House, includ-

ing both sides. When one looks around here and sees hon. members who are well-known in the various walks, various professions, men of repute, of high standing in the community, men of great experience in a variety of ways, I do not think that any one can fail to be impressed. And I believe that fact, to which I now allude, was never more in evidence than during the developments of the past few months, starting from the session of last year.

Last year, if I may refer to it for a moment in this Assembly, we had to consider certain developments, certain complications that had arisen as a result of the revision of our constitution, that part of our constitution which unites us with the Canadian Nation; and here faced with a problem, faced with a matter which will affect the lives of our children and our children's children, the two sides of the House once more showed that, when it came to a great matter affecting the welfare and well-being of our people generally, we could suppress any purely selfish or partisan motives of feelings and act with unanimity in a matter that affected the whole Province. The present crisis that my hon. friend referred to a few moments ago has once more brought forth evidence, proof, that we in Newfoundland have not lost that historic characteristic which was shown by our forefathers so often in the past. I was reading only recently an account of the life of some of the former statesmen or politicians who served in this Chamber. I was interested to refresh my mind with the great developments of the 1850's, and I am surprised, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, that so few Newfoundlanders are aware of the great crisis that faced us at that time, in 1850, shortly after the institution of Responsible Government, and over the next two years, when one of the most serious crises ever to face the Newfoundland people developed.

Now, at that time the Premier of Newfoundland was the Hon. P.F. Little, the first Premier, and his party, through an unfortunate development I will not go into now, was of one religious persuasion. And on the other side of the house there were lined up against him a very strong opposition, made up of people of other religious persuasions, and representing in general prominent merchantile and commercial interests of Newfoundland. Feelings were very, very

high. There had been a number of disturbances with which this House is familiar, at the time, resulting in actual blood shed. And at this time that I speak of, the British Government decided that they would not only confirm the hold which the French Nation had on part of Newfoundland but that they would extend that hold, that they would give France even greater concessions with respect to that portion of Newfoundland which spread from Cape St. John right around White Bay, right around the Northern Peninsula through the Straits of Belle Isle and right down the entire West Coast of Newfoundland as far as Cape Ray; that they would confirm that and in fact that they would even extend these rights and privileges to include the coast of Labrador. In fact, they would give the French people rights in Newfoundland which would have excluded the Newfoundland people entirely from this great stretch of coast and from Labrador, and would have finally had the effect of dividing Newfoundland and Labrador between the English nation and the French nation.

That was the crisis that faced the people of Newfoundland, and against them they had almost a solid array of the great British Parliament, who in the interest of their international dealings with France were quite willing to go ahead and sacrifice what they considered virtually worthless territory any way, and would only affect at most a few thousand Newfoundlanders scattered around our coast line. And at that time, on that historic occasion, the matter was introduced here and the two parties once more subjugated all political partisanship and by an unanimous vote of this House, right in this Chamber, a delegation composed of Prime Minister Little, and the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Hugh Hoyles, was named by the House to proceed to England, to address the House of Lords and protest with all the force and all the spirit the Newfoundland people could give them — to protest this deal.

They went to England and appeared before the House of Lords, and they carried on a tremendous campaign. As a result they received from the British Government the assurance that no extension of any kind in French privileges in Newfoundland would be considered by the British Government without the approval of the Legislature of

Newfoundland. I might say that as a result of this historic stand taken in this very Chamber by the unanimous efforts of the two parties represented here, as a result of that, the Newfoundland people were encouraged to go on with that great fight to gain control of all of the Island of Newfoundland, and although it did extend over another almost fifty years, yet the final results was that in 1904 the French withdrew all claims to any part of the Island of Newfoundland. There is, I believe, Mr. Speaker, a historic parallel which we should think of today in terms of the stand which this House has been forced to take in the present crisis. I want then too, Sir, as the first speaker on this side of the House, in this debate, to take this opportunity of congratulating the members of the Opposition who have performed so nobly in this great matter. It is no more than we expected. I have never disguised my feelings, and I do not think any other member on this side has disguised his feelings that, although the Opposition in this House is few in number, they are as able a group, and as sincere a group, and as patriotic a group as ever sat in any Opposition in this Chamber. I would like to congratulate the Opposition generally, and, if I may, I would like to single out the Leader of the Opposition for the stand he has so courageously taken on this and other issues as well where his conscience told him that he had no choice but to take that stand.

If I may for a moment make a somewhat facetious allusion: Some time ago one of my boys asked what time the University here was going to start conferring honours, doctor's degrees. I told him I did not know. He said: "Why don't you, you are the Minister of Education?" I explained to him the University does not come under my department of Government in that regard and that the matter of awarding doctorates and degrees is something which is the prerogative of the University. He said: "Do you think they are ever going to award any?" I said: "I should think so, in the course of time. I don't know. They are waiting, perhaps, to get a new university and will then start." Then he said: "Who do you think would be the first to get an honorary degree?" I said, "Well, I would think, perhaps the first person who would be soon honoured in this Province, (purely personal opinion) would be the Premier." He asked:

"Who else would you name?" And without any hesitation I said: "Mr. Hollett, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition." At that he opened his eyes. "He is against you"! Then I pointed out that in my opinion there are very few men in this Province, and I am speaking seriously now, very few men in this Province who would be more entitled to that honour than is the present Leader of the Opposition, for his roll in peace and in war. For his roll in peace and in war, his record as a scholar and student, his record as a magistrate, his record in public life, sometimes when confronted with tremendous obstacles and handicaps — I feel his record as Leader of the Opposition and indeed his record generally is one which entitles him to the highest esteem, the highest respect and regard from the Newfoundland people.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy) has referred once more, as I believe he did last year, to a practice which this Government has, and singled out this Government as bringing in matters here and asked the House of Assembly, including the Opposition, to "rubber stamp" the proposals. I am afraid that I cannot see the logic of those criticisms. I cannot see the force of them. I am not going to defend the practice, if it is the practice; it may or may not be, if it is true, the practice of Government introducing urgently, shall we say, plans and proposals on which the Government has worked some weeks or some months or even some years. I am not going to defend that, but I am going to say that it is the pattern, it is the pattern under the British form of Government, wherever that form of Government exists, all over the world, it is the pattern in the British Parliament, in the Parliaments of Australia, New Zealand, in the Provincial Parliaments of Canada and in the Government of Canada. Why, this past fort-night we had a very, very emphatic case, where the Government of Canada, without any notice, without any debate whatsoever, brought into the House and made a decision and merely informed the house that it was the Government's decision to cease all work and all expenditure on a great military project, and by virtue of that cessation threw immediately 12,000 or 14,000 men out of employment and threw down the drain, wiped out, as it were, a bad debt of \$600 million spent on that plant. Now, I was interested to note that the Op-

position in the Canadian House made almost precisely the same argument that my hon. friend just made, that this matter should be debated first and even now it is not too late and we should have a debate on it — And the Government, whether it took advantage of the smallness of the Opposition or not, I don't know, but whatever the reason for it the Prime Minister of Canada said there would be no debate on it. So, if it is true, as my hon. friend alleges, that this Government here from time to time takes action on its own and then brings it in here and asks the house to "rubber stamp" it, I don't think we do that. A member of this House on either side has the right to criticize in second reading or in committee, and sometimes does. I don't think anybody is asked to "rubber stamp" anything. The point I do want to make is that if it is true that it is the practice, who are we to be apart from a standard procedure and parliamentary practice wherever it is practiced in the Western World.

I also want to say a word or two with reference to a very important matter, a serious matter that has been raised again and not for the first time, by the hon. member for St. John's Centre, and that is the prevalence of the distribution of undesirable literature, particularly literature of an obscene and salacious nature. I am sure every member in this House from time to time has taken a look at some of the bookstands, some of the cheap, so-called magazines productions, and has been impressed by the fact that this distribution of unfit material is something that should give concern to a lot of people. I am sure everybody has felt that way. I was more than horrified this past week to read an article in the current issue of the "Readers' Digest." I daresay some of the hon. members have already read it. It was written by an eminent American writer, "Let us put an end to this vile traffic" — I think that is the title. The article proceeded to show something which I think is a cause for concern by everyone because, while it is true he is writing about the United States, yet we know from tragic experience what happens in the United States, and these forces in the United States have a pernicious way of extending northward into Canada. He pointed out that the distribution, the dissemination of this literature has become a vile traffic in the hands of the underworld.

The underworld has gotten control and is taking advantage of the weakness in human nature that causes some people to crave narcotics and drugs. And just as the underworld in the United States have the control, to a large extent, of gambling and just as during prohibition years the underworld assumed control of the distribution of liquors and alcohol, so today this distribution of salacious literature has reached the point where it is being funneled and channeled by a number of nefarious men into thousands of schools and tens of thousands of homes; and parents and teachers and educators, at least so far, are powerless to do anything about it. Last year the FBI estimated the value of the take from this distribution was \$500,000.

Now, I do not know what can be done about that any more than I know the answer to gangsterism in the labour circles; any more than I know the answer to the problem of alcohol. My hon. friend suggests there are one or two measures that have been studied and instituted and developed. I am familiar with the Toronto measure. I know of the unfortunate thing that arose there, as does arise whenever we try to solve the problem of alcohol in Newfoundland or anywhere else in the Western World. Immediately you run up against the extremist who knows all the answers and is prepared to lay down the law, and will fight to the last drop of blood in his body to keep you and me from a glass of beer. Now, in the case of what my hon. friend refers to in Toronto, a group there organized in an attempt to try to do something about this traffic in obscene literature, and it increased and began to include a number of those people who know what you should be reading, you and I, and what we should not, not only obscene but other things as well. As a result some of the general bookstands were assailed by aggressive women, "battle-axes," who said — 'You take that book off the stand or we are going to name you.' And they did name them, and as a result, as every member in this house very well knows, he has in his home today books that were ordered off the stands in Toronto.

Now there, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is one of the greatest problems. How do we attack problems of that nature without infringing some of the basic freedoms my hon. friend referred to, and which are so essentially the

basic freedoms we enjoy under British democratic rule, freedom to think, read and discuss? How can we tackle that problem without infringing on those great freedoms? It has to be done, I submit. It has to be done. And I am very happy some attempt is being made right now to change this ridiculous law which existed for some years in Canada, where I could not buy books and no member of this House could buy certain books. Why? Because a great impartial committee looked at them or considered them no good? No, because the customs officer said: "No, this book is not going to come into Canada." We have to be on guard against such a thing as happened in Boston a few years ago, when the leading American Magazine, in terms of circulation, "Life Magazine" was unattainable in Boston because the policemen said it was not good and removed it from the bookstands, on the word of a policeman. Naturally we don't want anything like that to happen in Canada. I think there is too much basic common-sense, too much tolerance in this Nation — But the point I want to make is that in our approach to this problem, and it is the concern of the Province as it is the concern of the Canadian Nation, in our approach to it we do have to try to solve it without destroying our historic rights and privileges. I am happy that the Canadian Government at the moment is wrestling with the problem. On the face of it, it is a simple matter. Nevertheless it is a crucial one of defining what is obscene, what is salacious, what should be removed from the hands and minds of our children, and for that matter, older people as well! Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of the house, I would like to move that the debate be adjourned. I am afraid my voice is not going to allow me to continue, but there are a number of points I would like to carry on with.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply adjourned.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is any further business but if there is, I move it be deferred and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at three o'clock.

On motion all remaining orders of the day stand deferred.

On motion the house adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday at three o'clock.

Tuesday, March 10th, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.
Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tabled the answer to a question that had been directed to me, I think, by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I am not sure. The question asked what expenditure had been made by the government on the Royal Commission, our Newfoundland Royal Commission that was appointed to prepare Newfoundland's case under Term 29. I tabled the figures here yesterday, as they had been received by me from the Department of Finance. There were copies for all hon. members of the house and the press. I tabled them, and they were distributed. Now, in doing so, I remarked orally that this was the expenditure that had been incurred over a period of about four years, and it came to a total of about \$250,000. Now, last night I tuned in to all the radio stations, and I noticed that, unless I am mistaken, no newscast made any reference to the fact that this was the expenditure for about four years. So that, clearly unintentionally, radio stations may have created the impression in the mind of the public that this amount had been spent in the past year. Actually this is the total amount spent from the appointment of the Royal Commission some four years ago. I believe the radio stations would be happy enough to make the correction now that I have invited their attention to the fact. I believe they would be happy to say in their newscast tonight that the figure was for a period of about four years. I did not hear any news during lunch time. Maybe the stations may have made some correction along these lines at lunch time, but I have not heard. I am not complaining. I know they gave what was in the answer given, I only just said it orally and maybe the newsmen were not listening at that time.

Hon. Malcolm Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): If I may be allowed, the answer to the question showed the amount of money

etc., since appointment of said Commission. Now I asked that same question last year. The reason I asked the question this year is that I received a letter from Mr. Goldenberg objecting to the answer, because he did not receive as much, close to \$90,000, and in justice to him therefore I had to ask it this year again so that it could be cleared up. I looked at the Public Accounts and there it was indicated, H.C. Goldenberg and Associates. That is what he wanted cleared up. That is the reason I asked.

Presenting Petitions:

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries) (Burgeo-LaPoile): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions. I suppose I could very well say they are related petitions.

Mr. Speaker: They may be read together if related to the same thing.

Mr. Cheeseman: Well, Mr. Speaker, they both came from the same location. One relates to a bridge and the other to a road, and both petitions have signatures by the same people, and they are referred to the same department.

Mr. Speaker: Alright!

Mr. Cheeseman: The first petition is from the Town of Burgeo. It is signed by 111 electors. The prayer of this petition is that a bridge be built to connect Channel Island with the Town of Burgeo. This bridge is said to be about sixty-five yards in length. The other petition is also from Burgeo, and it is signed by 505 electors of Burgeo, and supported by 321 electors of Ramea and nine electors of North Bay River. The prayer of this petition is that a road be constructed to connect Burgeo with Port Aux Basques.

Mr. Speaker, some of my listeners might be rather surprised to know that the people of Burgeo and LaPoile are anxious to have a road built from Burgeo to Port Aux Basques, in as much as Burgeo is an island or rather a group of islands. But in actual fact that distance between the mainland and Upper Burgeo Island is only a matter of something like a couple of hundred feet. Mr. Speaker, this road is very badly needed.

As you, Sir, are well aware, the whole South Coast is very badly off in the matter of roads. The district of Burgeo and LaPoile, which I have the honour to represent in this House has a coastline of approximately 150 miles and some 25 towns and villages in all. In that area we have approximately 25 miles of local roads and about the same number of miles of a secondary Highway, in all approximately 50 miles of road.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that what is true of Burgeo district is also very largely true of the district that you have the honour to represent. On the whole north side of Fortune Bay, from Terrenceville west to Hermitage, a distance of approximately 100 miles, you have very little more roads in that whole area than I have in my district. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if you were free to do so, that you would support the prayer of this petition.

Mr. Speaker, if you would take a look at that very excellent map that is put out by the Department of Mines and Resources you will see, depicted in a great network in red, all the highroads and secondary roads with which the whole island is covered, except for that area from Cape Ray down to Terrenceville, and there you have virtually a blank. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, what bit of road we have on the Southwest Coast, in the district of Burgeo-LaPoile and Fortune Bay, half of it has been built within the past 10 years. That whole South Coast has been sadly neglected down through (I was going to say down through the years) the centuries, in roads as well as in other public facilities. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that it is only young men like yourself and myself who have the energy and the strength to properly look after -

Mr. Speaker: Order - I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member when he says such nice things about himself and me, but his time has expired.

Mr. Cheeseman: Well then, if my time has expired, may I make one last appeal for the most earnest consideration of the powers-that-be for the building of both the bridge and the road referred to in these petitions. I would ask that they be tabled and referred to the department to which they relate. On motion, petitions received, for referral to the department to which they relate:

Mr. George Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of St. Phillips, but it is a matter which would benefit the people of Harbour Main, Portugal Cove and even the people of St. John's. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is for the building of a new road over Tucker's Hill. Now everybody driving a car over Tucker's Hill in the last 20 years has been actually scared from top to bottom. Millions of tons of aggregate have been poured on that road only to be washed away, and in the wintertime it is impassable. Mr. Speaker, a new road would benefit all the people, including the clergy. The Reverend Father has to travel over the old road to give the people the last rights, of the church, 10 miles around. It is only half a mile to cut off from Ryan's Bridge to the residence of Randal Tucker, and that would eliminate that river bank which they call a road, and which, if eliminated, would save millions of dollars to the highroads division. Now the Highroads Division made a good job of Thorbourn Road. That is a continuation of Thorbourn Road, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure with this 370 names, including two ministers, both my friends on the opposite and my fellow member from Harbour Main will support this petition so they can get to church without going 10 miles around. I have much pleasure in presenting the petition, Mr. Speaker; and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received, for referral to the department to which it relates.

Reports of Standing and Select Committee:

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare) (Trinity South): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a copy of the Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare for the year ending March 31, 1958. This publication came out some months ago, and I believe all members of the house have been presented with a copy. If anyone wishes to have a copy I will be glad to supply it.

Notices of Questions:

Notice of questions given by Mr. Duffy, Mr. Renouf.

Mr. Speaker: I dislike to interrupt the hon.

member, but is not this information which will all come out in the Estimates?

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, it might be needed. I do not know the time of the Estimates. It may come out, but it strikes me as being a logical question at the present time. Is it not in order?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubt about it, because all this will come out in the Estimates. It is rather unusual to ask for information that is likely to come out in the Estimates at the present session.

Mr. Renouf: Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, the time may not be the essence, and I consider it is a question of timing. I don't know when the Estimates may be likely to come up.

Mr. Speaker: There may be some delay. I will admit the question. I might refer hon. members to "Questions" in Beauséjour so they will be able to see for themselves what questions may and may not be admitted.

Answers to Questions:

Question 8 tabled (see appendix)

ORDERS OF THE DAY Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Minister of Education has the floor:

Hon. F. W. Rowe (Minister of Education) (White Bay South): Mr. Speaker, there are several points in the speech delivered by His Honour, to which I intend to make only a very brief reference. First of all, in so far as the impending visit of Her Majesty is concerned, I want to assure the house; and through the house the people of Newfoundland, and in particular the boys and girls of Newfoundland, that the committee which the hon. the Premier has set-up to work in conjunction with the Minister of Public Welfare to insure that as many as possible of the children of Newfoundland will have an opportunity to greet Her Majesty, I want to assure the house, since I have some connection with that committee, that every effort will be made, no effort will be spared by the Superintendents of Educa-

tion, who will be active on the Committee, and by other regional representatives who will be attached to the committee, to see to it that tens of thousands of our boys and girls will have this opportunity, perhaps unique in the lifetime of most of them, to greet Her Majesty and Prince Philip next June.

I suppose it would naturally be expected that I make some reference to education. I am not going to do so today, for two reasons, one of them being that it might be premature, perhaps, to make any reference to any specific points that are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and the second reason is that later on at the time that education estimates are submitted to the house I would hope then to be able to speak in some detail.

The reference in the Speech from the Throne to fishery development is one that gives me some cause for gratification. The house knows I represent a fishing district, in part, the District of White Bay South, where a great many of our people, perhaps 90% of our people, are fishermen and loggers. Several years ago the government decided to begin the erection of a great modern fish plant at LaScie. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat puzzled yesterday at the reference made by my hon. friend from St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy) to this plant. I have a feeling that perhaps he was mixed up in some way or another. This plant has not yet been completed. I understand, in fact the Speech from the Throne specifically states, it is the hope of the government to have this plant completed this year and ready for production late in the fall. It would, I think, be grossly unfair to prejudice this great plant. Certainly, nothing in the government's relations with the other fishery plants of the Province would give any cause for great pessimism. To my knowledge, the only plant in Newfoundland that has closed down, the only fishery plant in Newfoundland that has closed down since this government came into office is the one plant with which the government had no connection whatsoever in bringing it into existence. I refer, of course, to the one at Fortune. The other fish plants have had, of course, their ups and downs; nobody's fault in particular, but because of the vicissitudes of fishery markets of the world, competition from Iceland, Norway and other countries. Nevertheless we have

heard from the first hand knowledge of the Minister of Fisheries that the fresh fish market today is coming along in a most gratifying way. I would shudder to think, in view of the other misfortunes taking place among our people during the past 12 months or so, economic misfortunes, what conditions would be on the South Coast and other parts of Newfoundland if these fish plants were not in operation and pouring out millions of dollars to our people every year. It is my belief this great fish plant in LaScie, when it comes into operation, will be of untold benefit to the hundreds of fishermen in Green Bay, White Bay and perhaps further afield than that.

This past year Newfoundland has suffered one of these periods of recession for which our history has been famous. This past week I have had the opportunity of looking through a most valuable publication, and I want to take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the house to that publication by Mr. A. B. Perlin, who is without a doubt one of the most informed men on Newfoundland affairs Newfoundland has ever produced. I certainly intend to recommend to the government that a copy of this book will be placed in every school in the Province. I looked through the historical section of that book, and in fact went back to an old book of Newfoundland published in 1936, where again Mr. Perlin had a very valuable contribution in the form of a concise history of Newfoundland. And I reread it again this week. As I went through it I was struck by the pattern which goes right through our history, of economic ups-and-downs. For instance, from 1800 to 1812 was a period of prosperity followed by a tremendous depression in the next five or six years. That went on decade after decade. In 1860, one third of the people were living on Indian meal and molasses. There was another period of prosperity and then in the 1890's the "bank crash" and again tens of thousands of our people living on relief. In 1900 again a period of prosperity; in the 1920 period again adversity and 1930's adversity and 1940's prosperity and so on. That is the pattern we have seen repeated. I am referring to it now, Mr. Speaker, not with any intention of attempting to cast responsibility. Our fishery last summer was virtually a complete failure. In my own district of White Bay South it was a blank in

place after place. And, too, during the past two years we had a recession again, I suppose through nobody's fault in particular, a recession in the mining industry. Regarding our fluorspar on the Burin Peninsula, we have found it very difficult, in fact in some cases impossible, to compete with fluorspar coming in from places like Mexico where labour costs less per day than it does on the Burin Peninsula per hour. We also had the disturbance in the steel industry which has led to a curtailment of our operation on Bell Island and even the great mining operation in Labrador, at Knob Lake, was cut back by almost a third this past year. Most serious of all we have a very significant reduction in newsprint production. I hope to refer to that in a little more detail later on. The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that as a result of this and other natural and economic disturbances, Newfoundland has had and is having right now a pretty terrific time. But the picture is not entirely dark. There are some bright spots. An announcement has been made by the hon. the Premier -

Mr. Hollett: Where are the bright spots?

Mr. Rowe: I am just coming to them now, if my hon. friend would give me a little time. We do know - we don't hear very much, as a matter of fact about this particular fact to which I am going to refer: some years ago the Premier was instrumental in inducing a well known Canadian promoter, Mr. Boylen, to come down to Newfoundland and investigate the possibility of mineral discovery for the government. As a result of that invitation, today we have a flourishing mine at Tilt Cove, which employs, according to the last figures received, over 300 men. That is a very significant contribution to the economy of Newfoundland at this particular time. From an announcement made, we understand that the possibility of an expansion at Tilt Cove this coming year is extremely good. There is every indication the production there will be doubled and more than doubled, and many hundreds of other Newfoundlanders will be able to earn a living there. We know, too, from announcements that have been made by very reputable companies, world leading companies in that particular field, the possibility of developments at Baie Verte are ex-

tremely good. A great company like Johns-Mansville would not be spending millions of dollars in Baie Verte if they did not feel the opportunities were good. We have had our historic ups and downs through the years!

Mr. Hollett: Is that all the bright spots?

Mr. Rowe: There are others, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure -

Mr. Hollett: I did not want you to forget them, you see.

Mr. Rowe: I am sure the hon. gentleman does not expect me to cover the whole gambit. There are other things I could refer to. As a matter of fact the Premier has just reminded me - I had known about it before but did not feel it was proper for me to refer to it here; there is every possibility that Little Bay will become a flourishing centre of mining activities this very year. I understand the Premier will be making some reference to it later.

The real matter that I want to get at today, Mr. Speaker, is this crisis which is facing us in the newsprint industry and to which the Speech from the Throne makes very clear reference. I said a moment ago that our newsprint industry has had a decline this past year or so, a very serious decline affecting a great many districts in Newfoundland. Logging has been curtailed in my own district some 50% carried on by Bowaters, and in St. Barbe District, and curtailed in most of Newfoundland. The export of pulpwood has virtually disappeared. That is only a passing thing. That is something we will be expected to go through in any industry. We expect to have these ups and downs. That is insignificant compared with the real crisis in the newsprint industry; the one which concerns this house and has done so for the past fortnight, and which has concerned the Government for a good many weeks. When this crisis developed, the Premier of Newfoundland had to make a choice. There were several things he could have done. He could have said: "Well, the best thing for me is to do nothing, sit back and let this thing work out; assume no responsibility, let it work its way out as best it can." That has been done before by other premiers, both in Newfoundland and elsewhere. He could

have taken the easy way, which is being all things to all men. The other choice was to shoulder a prodigious burden, the tremendous, staggering responsibility which he did shoulder, in the hard way. And for a moment I am going to refer to the career of the hon. the Premier, if I may.

Since 1946, when he started the fight for Confederation, his life has been one continuous struggle, strain and worry. For months right here in this very Chamber he was, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition will recall, one of the dominating personalities during the months that the National Convention lasted. Day and night he worked to prepare the case for union with Canada. And when eventually that cause succeeded, he had to take on the tremendous burden of heading the Government of Newfoundland, a burden which was made all the heavier by the fact that, for a great many years, Newfoundland had had no responsible government. In that 10 years (almost 10 years now) the Premier fought a total of seven general elections as far as Newfoundland is concerned. He master-minded for his party those seven general elections. During that 10 years he has striven continuously to bring development to Newfoundland. He has not spared himself in any way. He has travelled almost to the four corners of the earth to bring that about. It is nice to travel sometimes, but any person who has had to do it month in and month out, year in and year out, under all kinds of conditions, knows that travelling becomes a tremendous burden. And all through those 10 years he strove to raise the general living standards of this Province. I do not think anybody can dispute that. And he experienced great disappointments, some of the heaviest, I would think, being the fact that he was on several occasions betrayed by those whom he trusted. I cite these things, Mr. Speaker, to show that a few weeks ago, the easy thing for the Premier of Newfoundland to have done was to do nothing. That was the easy thing! There is no person who could have gone through what he has gone through in these past 13 years and not feel the strain, I don't care how much of a political genius he may be, how much energy he might have, how much physical strength he might have, he cannot go through that without paying some kind of a penalty for it. And I would think that

his natural inclination, being human, was not to take on himself this new responsibility, this new burden in which there are all kinds of possibilities, all kinds of dangers for this Province, for this Newfoundland which we love so well.

However, he did decide to take the hard way. And from that time he has had more propaganda, against him than at any time in his entire career; propaganda at work on all levels, and at the national level right across Canada. We have heard such things as these said here in this very City of St. John's by people who know they are telling lies. We have heard it said that the Premier's motive was political when he took the stand he did against this IWA and against international unionism in general - that it was a political move. We have all had that charge leveled against us.

Who were the people who elected me in the last election? The loggers, 90% of them. I was not worried about their vote for the next election. My hon. friend, the Minister of Labour, (Mr. Ballam) has he any reason to suspect all his friends over in Corner Brook and vicinity were going to turn against him? He knew when he took that stand that inevitably it would cost him some friendships, cost him some support. My hon. friend from St. Barbe, (Mr. Chalker) another district where 90% of the people there are fishermen-loggers, did he expect to gain anything out of taking the stand he did take? How in heaven's name could the Premier of this country, for that matter, gain anything politically by taking the stand that he and we took? Yet we have supposedly responsible people, leaders of certain segments of our city, trying to drive that down the throats of our Newfoundland people. "This is just a cute stunt on the part of the Premier!" I said before it is a lie, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, they know it is a lie when they say it.

Of course we all know the Premier is a great political figure. We know that. It is known throughout Canada and throughout the world. Beyond that, he is a clever politician and has always been a clever politician. What statesman has not been a clever politician? The greatest statesman the United States ever produced was Abe Lincoln. That does not mean to say that every time a good politician takes a good stand he is motivated by a political narrow partisan motive. The

Premier could not hope to benefit by the stand he has taken, politically. Every person I meet admits that, all except those paid to say otherwise.

Our friends across the House there have been accused in a series of letters, a series of anonymous letters, all of them following the same pattern, all giving the same argument; all of them accusing our friends across the House of having deserted their cause, of having become misled and bamboozled by the Premier, by this side of the House, by the Government. There is not any person in St. John's who can honestly say that, not one, and I would say that practically all of these letters have been written by three men who were paid to do that.

And at the national level — I am not so much concerned at the local level because our Newfoundland people, by and large, are people with innate common sense, — but the most horrifying aspect of this present struggle is the fact that right across Canada we have evidence that newspapers and people in journalism of one kind and another have not the faintest concept as to what is involved down here in Newfoundland. And people like Premier Douglas of Saskatchewan (I don't mind him so much, he is making politics, obviously, politics) but other people across Canada should know better — newspaper editors, radio commentators, referring to this Government and the Premier and this House in terms you could only see if you were thinking of the Nazi Government under Hitler. I will come to that in a moment too. I have read these things and listened night after night to the radio, as other members here have done, I am sure; read these statements by people who have no idea as to what the principles are that motivated this house. We are told, in effect, that the Premier is a sort of Czar down here, and all he had to do was crack a finger and everybody went running. "It is true at some time or another he might have defended labour but has now decided, perhaps as a whim, to turn around and jump on these fine labour — these fine democratic labour organizations, headed by those outstanding men, like Mr. McCool and Mr. Lard" (I will come to them later too). We heard some of those words last night in one edition — I think it was last night — words used about the head of this Province, the elected head of this Province,

elected three times as Premier under our honourable British Constitution: "dictatorial", "tyranny", "autocratic", even the word "potentate". Just think of the word "potentate" — some eastern autocrat who might at whim order somebody's head chopped off. Mind you, by a man of the "CBC" this very word, potentate, was used to refer to whom? Did it refer to Mr. Hoffa? No! It was the reference to the head, the elected head, of one of the Provinces of Canada.

And now, to my great sorrow, I read that a distinguished gentleman in the United States of America, noted for his democratic way of life, his Christian way of life, of impeccable, immaculate character, has made a great statement. What is that statement? "Smallwood is a fascist." And the man who made that statement, that great Christian gentleman is James Hoffa. He has spoken. He has become a friend of Newfoundland. One of the great ironies of this struggle is that we, the people in this House, and the people outside, and the church leaders of Newfoundland and other responsible people in business, industry, education; people who for generations have been regarded as patriotic Newfoundlanders have suddenly become the enemies of the people. My hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, one of the most distinguished families in this whole Newfoundland of our, the Hollett family of Burin, whose father and forefathers contributed to and built up the bank fishery of Newfoundland, some of whose relatives gave their lives on the Grand Banks, and a man who himself almost gave his life in the First World War to defend his natiaveland, he has now become, after almost 50 years in public services of one kind and another, an enemy of the people. His colleague who sits next to him, the hon. Member for St. John's East, (Mr. Higgins) who is not here today, he is a member of the famous Higgins family, noted perhaps as few other families have been in Newfoundland for their dedication to public services of one kind and another (his father's portrait is on the walls of this House), he, also, has become an enemy of the people.

And I look around me and could go on. There on the other side and on this side I see my hon. friend from Port Aux Port; three brothers of them born, sons of a fisherman, in Harbour Breton, and when the First World War started three of them

offered their services and one remained over there, buried. My hon. friend came back, and after a lifetime of service to Newfoundland, he is now an enemy of Newfoundland. I look around this House and there are here 11 members who risked their lives in two World Wars, and some of them bear the scars of it. Behind me here is the hon. member for Labrador North, a member of the "Winsor" family, who for five generations prosecuted the fishery of Newfoundland, and some of them lost their lives in doing so, a man who, himself, risked his life throughout the entire Second World War in the Merchant Marines of Newfoundland, he is now an enemy of the people. So I could go on. But who are now the friends of the people of Newfoundland? We are the enemies here. We are the 36 elected representatives. Who are the friends? Who are the friends of the people of Newfoundland? Well, we have, first of all, the paid labour organizers, paid by sources outside. They have become the great defenders of the Newfoundland people, and they have to help them, to aid them. They have some choice specimens. They have McCool, who is now a great friend of Newfoundland, a great defender of British traditions, and so is Hall (if that is his name), he has become a great champion of British liberty too. I do not know from what part of Europe he absorbed those principles. I am not sure where he did finally become this great defender of Christian Democracy, but he did. And Ladd himself, the man of simple wants — I will come to that in a moment, the man of simple wants — Ladd, he is now down here, the great champion of the Newfoundland workers. We are not interested in the welfare of Newfoundland but Mr. Ladd is. Mr. Ladd! And behind them all, let us never forget that, they have that great Christian gentleman, Mr. Hoffa. He is behind them. He will support them. Now I will say this, Mr. Speaker. These men, the Ladds and the Halls and McCools cannot complain they have not been given any fair play down here, because every time they open their mouths, no matter what they say, they have been given every possible publicity. I do not dispute the right of any paper, radio nor any other news media to do that. I am merely stating that it has been done. Everytime they have opened their mouths, they have been given head-

lines. Every time that a statement comes from him (Hoffa), or any of his associates, it is repeated ad infinitum over the radio. So they cannot complain he has not gotten fair play down here, — that the people of Newfoundland have not had a chance to hear him and his ideas. In fact, I am rather surprised some of the most insane statements that Ladd has made have received more publicity than such a very important and significant fact that a Manitoba union, in the past week, decided to break away completely from the Teamsters Union, or even more important still, that before the British Columbia Legislature today, there is a Bill which is designed to do some of the very things we have done here in the past few days. Our Newfoundland people do not know too much about that. This is not just a crisis in Newfoundland. It is a crisis all across Canada. Very many people are afraid to get up and say so. Many politicians across Canada, every time a labour leader opens his mouth, quake in their shoes. It is a disgusting thing for any Newfoundlander, any Canadian, to see how these politicians, (some of these politicians), shake and shiver every time the word "labour" is mentioned. I am a defender of the rights of labour, and everybody in this house is too. I am the son of a fisherman and logger, and there is nobody here in this house and very few outside the house in Newfoundland who make any pretention to aristocracy or aristocratic upbringing. We cannot help but be friends of labour. We are part of labour. The vast majority of my relatives at this moment are fishermen and loggers in Northern Newfoundland. How else can I be anything but a defender of labour? That does not mean to say we are going to abdicate Government control, either here or across Canada, to a few labour organizers of their gangster friends or their communist friends. Now Mr. Ladd: Mr. Ladd the other night spoke of the few, the simple-minded few, who wanted the few simple things. "Our wants are simple", he said. I will list Mr. Ladd's wants. There are quite a number. I will list four of them. Mr. Ladd wants, first of all, his own way. He is paid for that. He is paid a very big salary, not by Newfoundlanders but by people outside of Newfoundland, to get his own way down here, the way of the IWA. That is No. (1) . No. (2): Mr. Ladd wants a logging elite. He wants 2,000

or 3,000 loggers who will be employed most of the year at logging, and who pay very fine, excellent dues. He wants these dues. They may come up perhaps to \$1 million a year. So it is a good investment for Mr. Ladd down here, and the IWA can afford to spend even \$1 million down here. We have heard that quoted. He can afford it because he will get that much back in one year, just in one or two years. This is the third want he has in mind. I am going back for a moment to that logging elite. He wants to get 2,000 or 3,000 loggers, virtually full-time loggers. He is not concerned about the fishermen of LaScie. He is not concerned about the fishermen of Horse Island, who are also part-time loggers, or the fishermen of Pacquet, Harbour Round, and two or three other settlements in Newfoundland who must, if they are going to make a livelihood, or even exist, have additional work to supplement the fishery. Mr. Ladd is not concerned about them. He is not paid to be concerned about them. They are not in Mr. Ladd's scheme of things. They are too lowly to be considered. (The "fishermen" yes, the "fishermen"). You can almost see his nostrils twitch when you utter the word. And then, Mr. Ladd has a fourth simple want, very simple. I would like to have it myself, and I am sure everybody would want to have the right. His fourth want: It is the right to be able to defy the law anytime he wants; to defy the law of a British country, a British land. The law is all right for me, and for other individuals, but not for a great labour organizer like Mr. Ladd. Of course not, because he is the great labour organizer, the champion of the common man, the champion of Newfoundland, he is above the law and beyond the law, or so he coolly announces. In fact, this House of Assembly here is not very much. It is only the law-making body of the Province. So what! If Mr. Ladd feels like it, he will defy the law at any time. Why should he not? These are his words, his own way of looking at it. He wants the loggers, who will in time pay many hundreds of thousands or perhaps \$1 million into the coffers of the IWA, and the right to do what he wants to at any time. And if that little wish of his involves closing down the Grand Falls mill, so what? Who are we to protest it? Who are we to be alarmed at the prospect that the Grand Falls mill might close or even Bowaters? Who are

we to get in the way of Allan Ladd or whatever his name is? If he wants that mill closed it is going to be closed. — "If I say so and don't you dare to get in my way. You are a tyrant if you do so, Mr. Smallwood, if I decide to close the mill, decide to prevent any wood reaching the mill has to close down and 40 or 50 thousand are made destitute and the economy of Newfoundland is ruined as a result, so what? It is a very democratic, a great democratic cause that Mr. Ladd is fighting for —

Mr. Issac Mercer (Fogo): 200 thousand left destitute, 40 thousand workers.

Mr. Rowe: Of course the simple fact of the matter is that any one of these mills involves the whole of Newfoundland; there is no such thing as pin-pointing Central Newfoundland or Western Newfoundland or 30 or 40 thousand; it is all Newfoundland. Now some of the allegations made against us and particularly against the Premier are obviously based on malice, pure malice. You do not expect a man who is paid to say a certain thing and adopt a certain point of view to sacrifice \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year for such a simple thing, (or maybe \$30,000 or \$40,000) as I understand some of our new-found friends received. You would not expect it, and if, in order to preserve that he has to tell lies or spread misleading propaganda amongst a simple people, we can understand. But much of the allegations hurled against us and against the Premier in particular (but against all of us) have been based on ignorance, complete, unqualified ignorance, not at a local level, because there are very few local Newfoundlanders who do not understand what is involved. If there is a man or woman in St. John's today who does not understand the implications of the present struggle I have not met him nor her. But the people who do not understand are the people who should understand, the molders of opinion right across Canada. Mr. Speaker, I now am going to indict these reporters and journalists who come down here from time to time — I have met some of them — to report on and interpret Newfoundland. We had an example of it the other day in that programme called "Close-Up" when a reporter, I have forgotten his name, interviewed the Leader of the Government of this Province, and the result

was one of the most disgusting, one of the most insulting, patronizing programmes that I have ever seen or heard; a reporter needling and interrupting the Premier of this Province, and then that is put on (because that was not a live show. It did not have to go on the way it was) — I invite the attention, I suggest to the directors of the CBC across Canada that they get the film of that "Close-Up" and sit down quietly and listen and look at it and do a bit of serious thinking about it. Still, I will defend the freedom of speech, freedom of expression as much as any man in this Canadian Nation will. These reporters come down here — I remember some time ago, since Confederation, I happened to be travelling on a plane with a reporter from a great publication of Canada, doing a feature article on Newfoundland so that the rest of Canada would know something about Newfoundland. Because he asked my help I was foolish enough to think I could help him. I took the time to talk to him, gave him literature, showed him things, and showed him around down here, and he went back and produced an article. Mr. Speaker, if the name had not been given there when I read that article I would not have had the faintest idea he was writing about St. John's nor for that matter about Newfoundland. These people come down here and look for something sensational, unusual, spectacular, that is all right if they don't write material which gives a false representation of Newfoundland. St. John's is not made up of outdoor water tanks, with a few women. These pictures which were published — if I were given a million dollars I could not even find them here. I have been here 25 years. There are one or two aroundsomewhere. That was the picture he gave of St. John's women, getting water supplies and showing the occupations of St. John's by showing several fish flakes, and where the people lived by picking out the worst pieces of slums we had. I cite that, Mr. Speaker, because that is typical of what happens when these people come down here. I remember on the visit of Her Majesty here as Princess, I read in the paper about the salt incusted boots of the St. John's fishermen in the Church of England Cathedral in St. John's.

Mr. Smallwood: He was drunk in his room

in the Newfoundland Hotel, that man of great culture who wrote it.

Mr. Rowe: I have no doubt whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that when Her Majesty comes here this June, and we are flooded with a bunch of reporters from the Mainland, of one kind and another —(and there are exceptions to all rules - nobody knows that better than I do) — I have no doubt whatsoever that we shall be reading reports of Newfoundland conditions so bizarre we will wonder what part of the world is being written about. We will probably be reading about how we put on our bear skins and caribou skins and assembled around Her Majesty's plane. Now I refer to that in a half facetious way, but a great lesson is to be learned from it. The lesson is that we must apparently resign ourselves to the fact that the rest of Canada, if it is going to rely on the press and other reports that go out from here, reports given by people who come down here, they will never understand our Province.

I want to take just a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, to refer to what I think are some of the crucial issues in this crisis, which are not appreciated nor understood in any way whatsoever across Canada. First of all (and I have already mentioned this is a public talk I gave last night), apparently nobody across Canada appreciates the roll of Newfoundland's interest in the newsprint industry. Take Toronto, a city I know very well: you can motor for 20 miles outside Toronto, in any direction, and pass factory after factory after factory, great factories employing anywhere from one hundred up to ten thousand workers — in any direction. The same thing is true of Montreal, and to a lesser extent of Winnipeg and Vancouver. In Ontario there are paper mills. I do not know how many there are, but probably a dozen and probably more than that. If one of those paper mills closed down—a paper mill the size of Grand Falls closed down tomorrow — it might affect one hundredth of one percent of the economy of Ontario, and I doubt if 1,000 people in the City of Toronto would even know that a paper mill in Northern Ontario had closed down. How then can you expect Toronto editors when they sit down to think of Newfoundland, to understand? They think in terms of the Ontario paper mills. They do not understand that if one such paper mill closed down here

it would be disastrous to Newfoundland, completely disastrous. Again, they do not understand the historic relationship between the loggers, woodworkers and fishermen.

Sixty years ago, if I may make a personal allusion, my father spent his summers as skipper of a Labrador schooner, and when he came home in the fall of the year, as soon as he had the vessel put away and a few things done, he went into the lumber woods and worked for \$10 a month. That was the standard wage in those days. He did that year after year because it was absolutely essential even in those years when he had a successful voyage on the Labrador, to supplement his earnings in order to support his family. And that relationship exists right down through the years. At the present time it is a simple fact, not known outside Newfoundland, that there is practically nowhere in Newfoundland where a fisherman can, from fishing, make enough money to live and support his family. The simple fact is that he must supplement his earnings in some way, in a saw mill, cutting ties for the railway, wharf sticks, cutting fire wood and selling it or by working in the lumber woods cutting pulp wood. He has to do that! And if you could build up, as they have done in British Columbia and in Washington and Oregon, if you could build up over the next two or three years a logging elite of 4,000 or 5,000 men to do the logging in Newfoundland, it would be a disaster for the 20,000 fishermen. They would virtually all starve, for these fishermen, definitely supplement their earnings by working in the woods.

Now that is another fact not known all across Canada, and I am not saying this at all with any hope it will ever sink into their minds in Toronto and Vancouver nor anywhere else outside Newfoundland. Here is another fact which is not known across Canada: The Premier is pictured as an arbitrary despot down here, who one day decides he is going off on one trail, and the next day goes back and goes somewhere else. He is going to do whatever he wants, and we are all a bunch of rubber stamps, and even the Opposition will go along too. Now that is the picture right across Canada today. I invite my hon. friends to read these newspaper condensations given of reports in other papers across Canada, published locally. They will see that the picture is

being drawn right across Canada by great newspapers, the "Globe and Mail", and the "Toronto Star" and others, ignoring this simple fact that when the Premier took the stand he did he was speaking on behalf of at least 98% of all the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Hear! Hear!

Mr. Rowe: All the people of Newfoundland wanted him to take that stand. Another simple fact apparently not understood across Canada is that this House of Assembly, this historic legislature, by and large is, despite mistakes made, as they are made, this historic legislature when it speaks reflects the mind and spirit of the people of Newfoundland who sent us here. This is a law-making body. It is something I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, how this legislature can break the law. This legislature makes the law. It is hard for some people to understand that. We make the law. We make the law here, whether the law is good or bad we make them. And when a law is made, does it mean that the legislature cannot change it? That is the opinion you get from listening to the melodies of some of these labour people from outside, as if, in some mysterious way, the House of Assembly commits a nefarious crime by changing the law. We are doing so every day of our lives, when the house is open. This session we will be changing some of the education, welfare and health laws, and mines and resources and wild life laws. Every day of our lives, when the house is open, every year, we change the laws. If we were to listen to Mr. Ladd, we would believe that once a legislature made a law here it must stand forever more; if it applies to labour it must remain for ever more unchanged. This one aspect.

Another aspect which again is being ignored across Canada: they do not seem to understand at all that the Premier of Newfoundland announced two or three days ago that he had to make one of the saddest statements he has ever made, a sad statement — nobody felt the import more than I did: I was with the Premier on his mission to San Francisco and our hopes, our aspirations were that we would get a corporation, one of the world's greater companies, to come up here. We knew we had wood in Labrador and some in Newfoundland. We knew we

had waterpower. We knew we had the labour here. And we knew, Mr. Zellerbach himself told us they were prepared, if it were feasible, to invest \$100 million. Crown Zellerbach saying a thing like that means just that. We had high hopes, and so did others here, the Attorney General in particular, because both of us were with the Premier at the time of the negotiations. We shared his sense of sadness. But there is a sadder statement still the Premier could make, there is a much sadder one, and I hope neither he nor any other Premier will ever have to make it; that is that one of our paper mills has closed down. How many people saw the Bank of Montreal Report issued last week? That report showed there in black and white that Bowater's great mill at Corner Brook, the largest of its kind in the world, operated during the month of January on 71% capacity. That is something which should have had headlines right across Canada, just as big as the headlines given Mr. Ladd. Bowater's operated at 71% capacity in the month of January, and operated from 70% to 81% capacity for over a year.

Yet another little fact was in there. I have good authority for this: that great new modern paper machine that has been in existence and completed for two years has not turned out one bit of paper. We know that, from first-hand knowledge, and the A.N.D. Company is showing the smallest profits; and we know from experience that plants do close down. Somehow or other, these simple facts do not seep into the minds of our people. It is possible for the mills at Grand Falls and at Corner Brook to close. And there is a point somewhere along the way where the last straw breaks the back of Bowaters and the A.N.D. What is it I do not know. Sometimes I have a sneaking fear that Bowaters are only looking for some opportunity to close the mill. It cannot very well operate at a profit, at least not much, at 71% capacity.

Mr. Speaker, the simple truth of the matter is, and this I think was illustrated more than anything else, and I regret again that the implication of the Crown Zellerbach's decision has not been interpreted properly even in Newfoundland, nor in the rest of Canada. The implications of that are that there may be plenty of wood in Labrador and a good deal in Newfoundland and

waterpower and labour and the market in the United States, and that great industry was ready to invest \$100 million, and they have said that, as things are at the present time, it would not be an economic proposition. That is what they said, which lends all the more weight to the statement which has been made directly and by implication by both Bowater's and the A.N.D. Company and by others — and it gives me no pleasure to say this — that the newsprint industry in Newfoundland is very nearly a marginal operation, and somewhere, when it gets below that line, whatever that line of economy is, somewhere when it gets below that line we know the result — and we have to take every possible steps open to us to see that that does not happen. Mr. Speaker, I am going to finish with this thought; I don't know how many of us suffered politically on either side of the house as a result of this stand. I have no regrets about the stand I took, none whatsoever.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Rowe: I assured the Premier at the time, and I hope the Premier won't mind my making reference to it, right now he does not know I am going to do it. When he asked my advice and the advice of all other members, as he did, I said: "Mr. Premier, I am prepared to fight an election on it any day, and if I lose the election on that issue I will have lost it in a good cause and I am quite happy". And I am continuing to support and am going to support the action the Premier took, not on behalf of this party, this government nor this house but on behalf of Newfoundland, the Newfoundland he has devoted his life to. I ask you this question: Could the Premier of Newfoundland, could this house, any member of this house sit by and see the economy and welfare of Newfoundland crucified, crucified on the altar of international unionism? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J.D. O'Driscoll (Bell Island): Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for a short recess or break:

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member intend to speak afterwards?

Mr. O'Driscoll: Yes!

On motion the house adjourned for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Bell Island:

Mr. O'Driscoll: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Speech from the Throne I would like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion, the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) for the able and masterly way in which he moved the address in reply and also hon. member for Burin, (Mr. Jones) for the able way in which he seconded the motion. These are the type of men that Newfoundland needs, the coming politicians. I bespeak a brilliant future for both of them.

Mr. Speaker, all Newfoundland, I am sure, was very pleased indeed when the Lieutenant-Governor announced in the Throne Speech that Newfoundland would be honoured with a visit from Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth and her husband, Prince Philip. Newfoundland has had many visits in the past by Royalty. However, this will be the first time since Confederation that we will have the pleasure of paying homage to our ruling queen. A few years ago, as Princess Elizabeth we had the privilege of seeing her and Prince Philip for a short while. On this royal visit Her Majesty has expressed a wish to see as many children as possible. I know that our government are doing everything in their power to fulfill her wishes. That can be helped greatly by declaring June 18 a holiday not only for the schools but for the public as well. We are most fortunate that Her Majesty has graciously consented to lay the cornerstone of the new Confederation Building. I think that all Newfoundlanders will realize what a great honour her gracious act will mean. The Confederation Building will be one of the very few buildings in all of Canada that is so honoured.

Mr. Speaker, what I have just said is about the only pleasant thing I will have to say in this address. All Newfoundland was greatly shocked by the great loss of life in the "Blue Wave" disaster. It was a terrible tragedy, one of the worst in our Island's history. Mere monetary assistance or relief will not make up for the loss of those brave fishermen who lost their lives in the pursuit of

their livelihood. Newfoundland fishermen lead a very precarious life at best of time, but in the winter months it is increased a hundredfold. To the relatives of the men, all Newfoundland extends deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, the logging dispute has already been debated thoroughly so I won't elaborate on it. However, I would like to join with all the other speakers in adding my congratulations and deep admiration to our Premier for the able manner in which he handled the situation. Not another man in the whole of Newfoundland or in the whole of Canada could have done such a splendid job. Newfoundland has a leader that all Newfoundlanders should be proud of. I nominate Premier Smallwood as the Canadian Man of the Year for 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I now come to Term 29, the most contentious term of the Terms of Union. Our premier must have been psychic when he insisted that this clause be inserted in the terms. Little did he realize or think at that time that it would be such a big factor in our present precarious economy. Term 29, the clause that the ex-minister for St. John's South (Mr. Browne) gave as his excuse for resigning his seat in the Opposition — (he wanted to be in Ottawa when Term 29 came up for discussion), to see that Newfoundland got a square deal. Oh, he was in Ottawa all right, Mr. Speaker, but took no part in the discussion. Very little has been heard from that gentleman since he left our shores. Apparently the Colombo plan has more interest for him than his native Newfoundland.

Mr. O'Driscoll: I said "Ex". Mr. Diefenbaker assured us Newfoundland would be given every consideration. Surely he must realize a decision should be made soon. I trust he and his Cabinet, including Hon. W.J. Browne, will accede to the recommendations of our government. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this house, now in session, should draft a resolution to be sent immediately to the Federal Government requesting that a decision be made as soon as possible, so as to enable this house to get on with public works and expenditures for 1959.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to refer to another disaster — thank God, not a disaster that included the loss of life, but

nevertheless a very serious one, one that affects the life of 4,000 people on Bell Island. On March 21, in just 10 days time, the A.V. Roe Co. will close down No. 6 mine on Bell Island and throw out of work 550 miners, maybe a lot more. Mr. Speaker, what is to become of these miners and their families? What assurances have they that the other mines on Bell Island will not be closed down? Mr. Speaker, they have no assurances. The people on Bell Island are facing a very serious situation. A miner is in a very different category to a fisherman or logger. All he knows is mining, and when that type of work stops he has nothing else to turn to. If a secondary industry could be started on Bell Island, it probably would be able to absorb the laid-off miners, but unfortunately Bell Island has nothing to lend to it that could establish a secondary industry.

The A.V. Roe Company, who own DOSCO, are a big concern, with many, many subsidiaries; and before they decide to close down No. 6 mine they should first have given some consideration to what would happen to these miners once they were laid off. Mr. Speaker, I repeat, what is to become of these miners and their families? I personally have no answer. It is now up to the Provincial and Federal governments to get together with A.V. Roe Company before the mine closes — and that is in just 10 days time. Surely, with Federal government help, they could continue to operate No. 6 and stockpile until such time as markets become more favourable. Mr. Speaker, as the member for Bell Island, I ask the Provincial government to do something and to do it quickly. Welfare relief is not the answer. Bell Island miners do not want relief, they want work so they can provide a decent standard of living for themselves and their families. I give my full support to the resolution recently presented to the government by Mr. Jackman, President of Local 4121 of the United Steel Workers of America.

Mr. Speaker, while on the subject of Bell Island I should like to refer to another matter that affects the lives of 12,000 Bell Islanders. I refer to the ferry situation between Bell Island and Portugal Cove. Bell Island mines are considered one of Newfoundland's main industries, in the same category as the fishery or paper industry. The mines are one of our few natural

resources, and, as such, I think the ferry service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove should be classified as a "road to resources" and should be included in the Federal government's scheme of "road resources". Of course, Mr. Speaker, I realize you cannot build a bridge to Bell Island or tunnel from Bell Island to Portugal Cove, but it is no impossible to build a new ferry. I think the ferry service between Bell Island and Portugal Cove should be classed as a "road to resources" and the ferry operation to be considered as a floating bridge or road. I therefore recommend to our government that they give serious thought to either building a new ferry or granting a loan to the Newfoundland Transportation Co. to have them build or purchase one. Oh, yes, the Federal government are building one, and with two new ferries on the "Tickle", Bell Islanders will at least have a decent means of transportation to and from the Mainland. The present ferry system, Mr. Speaker, is a disgrace to this Province and an insult to the people of Bell Island. The fault lies in the boats that the transportation company are trying to operate. The "Elmer Jones" and "Kipawa" are antiquated and hazardous to human life, and should be replaced as soon as ever possible. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland cannot afford to have another tragedy such as the "Blue Wave" disaster, but as surely as I am standing here, if these boats continue to operate there will be a marine disaster in Conception Bay that will mean a great loss of life. I therefore request that immediate steps be taken before it is too late.

(Applause from both sides)

Mr. G.R. Renouf: (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate:

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply adjourned:

Mr. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

On motion all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred:

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, in moving

the adjournment of the house until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock, I wonder if the house would bear with me for a moment while I say two things: First, we feel that we have been honoured here this afternoon by the presence as visitors in the Chamber, of officers and representatives of some 8 or 10 unions from Central Newfoundland. I have never known the representatives of so many trade unions to be present in this Chamber at one time. I am sure that I can speak for the house when I say that we welcome them here. This house takes this opportunity, and I am embracing this opportunity most gladly, to express our most cordial welcome to them, as a very slight indication of the completely friendly feelings we have towards these good, reputable, decent, civilized trade unions. I am sure that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, for once wishes that he were Premier so that he could be the first to say what I have just said. But I am sure that he would be happy to be sound to say it.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, in the next place, may I say that I had a deputation from Bell Island, consisting of His Worship the Mayor, with two of his councillors, the President of the Union, a former colleague of ours in this house, Mr. D.I. Jackman, together with two of the members of his executive of the Steel Workers Local on Bell Island. For an hour and half we have had a very frank and friendly discussion of the calamity that has overtaken Bell Island, in that A.V. Roe (or their subsidiary, DOSCO) have ordered the closing of No. 6 mine permanently, carrying with it the necessary consequence of laying-off permanently 550 men, to be followed soon after by the laying off of another 100 men, bringing the total of 650 men or possibly even more, never again to be rehired. That is the intention of the company, never again to rehire them; their intention being that should they need more production they will get it through automation.

I sent a telegram to Sir Roy Dobson. I dictated it there and then while the deputation were with me, and it was typed and sent to Sir Roy Dobson, the head of the A.V. Roe Company in Canada, and in the telegram I asked that the company would defer for 2 months the closing of Number 6 mine. The mine is to close on March 21, of this month, according to their announcement, and, as

the hon. and gallant Member for Bell Island (Mr. O'Driscoll) just said, that leaves about 10 days to go. But the utterly shocking thing about it is the shortness of the notice. If any member of this hon. house were to receive notice that in one month from today he was to cease to have any employment any employment either as a member or a wage worker, especially if he has a family, especially if he has made commitments for the purchase of a radio or television set, vacuum cleaner or refrigerator or any other household goods. A month is scarcely enough time for notice of dismissal notice that you have lost your job. So, I asked in my telegram which I sent (I have sent for copies of it but they have not yet arrived — I thought perhaps it might be wise if I released my telegram to the press and radio), I asked Sir Roy Robson, as the supreme head of that great corporation in Canada, to defer by 2 months, or until May 21, the closing of the No. 6 mine.

Now, that would give us some opportunity to confer with the Prime Minister, the Government of Canada and to confer with others. I suggested today to the deputation that if they had not in fact communicated with the Newfoundland minister in the Government of Canada, the hon. W.J. Browne, that they were doing him an injustice in not seeking his assistance. That is what he is there for. He represents all of us, every one in this Chamber and outside it in Newfoundland. He is our representative in the Cabinet of Canada. I suggested to them that it was not fair to him not to call upon him now for help in Bell Island's hour of need, and that it was certainly not fair to the 650 men who were to lose their jobs and that it was not fair to the community of Bell Island. I believe, as a result of my suggestion, a telegram has gone forward from the mayor and a joint telegram from the mayor and the president of the union to the hon. Mr. Browne, requesting the minister to come to Newfoundland and sit in with the authorities at Bell Island to consider the matter together. I volunteered at the same time to meet with the hon. minister, if he sees any point in that, and to offer gladly the services of the Newfoundland Government, in any respect in which these services can be of any value.

It seems to me that in the face of a calamity such as this, and it is a calamity, 650 families

suddenly, scarcely without notice, just suddenly flung on the scrap heap, after all the wealth that has been produced on that island — it is a terrible tragedy, and it seems to me that in the face of that calamity we should sink our differences, whatever they may be, and remember only that we are Newfoundlanders first, last and always, and, as Newfoundlanders, when we can afford the luxury we can and may quarrel with each other politically, but only when we can thoroughly well afford it; but when we can't we don't play around with any political nonsense. We stand for Newfoundland first, last and all the time. Now if this telegram arrived I will distribute it to the press. It should be here in a matter of minutes. While we are waiting I know this house will be delighted to hear from my hon. friend across the way.

Mr. Malcolm Hollett (Hon. Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion made by the hon. the Premier, I am delighted to hear the statement he has just made relative to the attendance here today of a number of men, whom I knew and associated with for some 6 or 7 years at Grand Falls. I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, that unionism was entitled to, and had, its privileges.

Mr. Smallwood: Would my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him to ask that while he is speaking he would add the welcome of the house to the trade union leaders here also from the West Coast. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Labour, has been reminding me I neglected to mention those from the West Coast.

Mr. Hollett: I would like to welcome any representation of labour here today, from anywhere in Newfoundland. What I was about to say — I remarked the other day, unionism has its rights and privileges and that these rights and privileges carry with them responsibility. And I am more than proud that men with whom I associated for 6 or 7 years have recognized the fact that they have a responsibility, a responsibility which they have faithfully fulfilled and carried out in the action which they have taken, in my opinion. I may be wrong. If I am wrong every man in this house is wrong, because we have all agreed that what has

been done should have been done in order to preserve the economy of, yes, the whole of Newfoundland, not only Central Newfoundland.

When I think that a small number of men, 900 or 1,000 as the case may be, can deliberately hold up, put a stop to almost the day-to-day living of 50,000 to 100,000 men in Central Newfoundland, as the case might be, and all over Newfoundland for that matter, then I am appalled at the possible danger in unionism which is not controlled unionism. Unionism like every other branch of man's associations has to be controlled. It cannot get control and cannot be dictatorial. This government cannot be dictatorial in governing, making laws they have to see they are carried out. We cannot be dictatorial. The government could, but I would hate to see them dictatorial, and if a union would be dictatorial then it has to be checked — it has to be checked in the interest of the common man, all the men, all the workers, in this country. And these people who have been prevailed upon to write me nasty letters — (I have had several), not one of these nasty letters had a signature, which indicates the smallness of the individual who wrote such letters. I was to go packing, I was no longer of use in Newfoundland and should go with that dictator, Smallwood, out of the country.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Two of you go together?

Mr. Smallwood: Two together, I take it.

Mr. Hollett: I am, Sir, proud to see these men standing up for unions. That is what we are doing too, standing up for unions, for labour. We will respect and honour, but will not allow — while we are here, even unionism to become dictatorial — and that was what was happening in certain areas in this country, and that is what happens in any country when any association gets too much power without any curb. We are all human! We are all human! If this government here was given too much power, if it did not have to go to the country every four or five years, it would become dictatorial over the years. That is why we have elections, Sir. So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see these men here. I am glad they have seen their responsibility, and I know they will

fight for the good of unionism. And they can be assured that they have with them, whether they win or lose the battle, the backing of a large segment of the right thinking people of Newfoundland.

Now, with regard to Bell Island: I also served on Bell Island for 5 or 6 years, and these two groups, therefore, are much closer to me than most people appreciate. I lived on Bell Island. I know the hardship that the men on Bell Island go through to earn a livelihood for themselves and their families. In that 6 or 7 years I have gone down into the mines on many occasions, to hold post-mortems, enquire into accidents and on various other matters. Mr. Speaker, the man who can go down, and is satisfied and compelled to go down into a mine to earn his livelihood deserves every consideration, and if, as the Premier said, such a man is to be deprived even of that chance of earning his livelihood, without an notice, that is something more dangerous to democracy than most people think, because democracy will only survive if democracy can provide for you, for me, and for everybody else a chance to earn a decent living. I was looking at the answer to a question tabled here today — If I am permitted

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is quite in order:

Mr. Hollett: I was looking at the answer to a question which showed me how much money this government has had to pour out over the last 12 months, for social assistance and able-bodied relief and sick relief. This government, this year, 1958-59, paid out \$8 million. That does not indicate a sound economy — and then this thing on Bell Island coming on top of that, 550 or 600 men, as the case may be laid off in the mines. I will say this here, and I am quite sure I have the backing of my comrades in this: anything that can be done by this government or anybody else to assist these men back to work, we can be depended upon to help. Like every other true Newfoundlander I know of, we have the welfare of all Newfoundlanders at heart. Somebody said "hell and highwater" the other day — I would not repeat that. But come what may, Sir we on this side of the House will put the well-being of Newfoundland first, ahead of politics,

because there will be plenty of politics after that. We shall put the welfare of Newfoundland first — And these people in the various parts of the country who have objected to "dictatorial" legislation brought in, and which is being supported by these members of this side of the house, these people have not seen the facts. Probably they have not gone hungry. They do not have to wonder where they can get a job, Sir.

I spent the last 8 months trying to get work for people, who were willing to work and could not get work. And I found a good many jobs for people, a good many, by going here and there, wiring here and there, cajoling and so on. And I know what these people had to suffer. We have 600 people now on Bell Island, I know a good many of them, suddenly cut off from their livelihood in a depressed economy. If everything were going fine and a man lost his job he would not mind very much. But here we have \$8 million paid out for relief this year. When John Jones on Bell Island, who works down in the mine loses his job, he has to go on relief. Yes, Sir, I promise the co-operation of this side of the house in anything that may be done and will be done to implement putting back these men to work.

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three-o'clock.

March 11, 1959, Wednesday
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock:

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

I.W.A. (LABOUR VIOLENCE):

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for this whole house when I say that Newfoundland is deeply shocked by the frightful outbreak of mob rule and brutal violence of the I.W.A. pickets at Badger last night. In four and a half centuries Newfoundland never saw anything like that before. All day yesterday, in Badger, a mob of men, a mob of I.W.A. pickets milled back and forth on the

public roads, the Queen's Highway, in Badger. These were not strikers. Most of them were not loggers. They were not and had not been employees of the A.N.D. Company. They had nothing whatsoever to do with that strike in Central Newfoundland. The I.W.A. through its agents had gone about parts of Bay of Islands, Deer Lake, Cormack, Bonne Bay at midnight and at 1 a.m. Sunday night and Monday morning, recruiting young men to come to Badger, with the result that by yesterday about 300 of them were in Badger. Most of them had never seen the sky over Badger before. They were unknown in Badger. They were strangers from the west coast of this Province. They milled back and forth all day yesterday, all afternoon blocking the roads, blocking traffic, stopping cars, stopping buses, holding up traffic, high-handedly taking over control of the Queen's Highway, obstructing the Queen's subjects, as they passed back and forth the public roads in their lawful business.

The R.C.M.P. seeing a potentially dangerous situation in Badger, brought about by the presence of these strangers from the other side of the Province, and knowing, as they did, of the terror felt by many of the residents of Badger, decided to put into effect yesterday a regular police patrol. So they stationed about 10 men, 10 police officers in Badger to do foot patrolling of the town. And that was the situation throughout most of the day. There was one particular clash right after darkness had fallen. Then the group of 10 policemen, patrolling Badger on foot, came upon the main body of the pickets, the I.W.A. pickets, in the vicinity of the Pentecostal Church at Badger. They, the police, had a "walkie-talkie," and through that means they sent for help, for re-inforcements. So 60 additional police arrived, about 10 or 11 of them being members of the Newfoundland Constabulary and totalling in all 71 men - that is including those who had been there on the foot patrol and those who arrived now as re-inforcements, a total of 71 men in all, the pickets numbering something between 200 and 300 men. These pickets filled the road, the highway from side to side. They filled the road completely. It was a complete blocking of the public highway. Nothing could get by. The police left their vehicles and joined the 10 men who were on foot,

and the 71 of them marched in regular formation, three or four files of three or four in a row, and marched towards the strikers, in procession, heads held up, arms swinging, in a regular form of military marching. The strikers fell back on both sides of the road. They opened up a passageway through the road. The police marched through and beyond the picketers, who had begun to close in again as the police marched beyond them.

Then they (the police) received an order to about-turn and marched back along the road again, through the picketers, for the second time, to emphasize the fact that the road was to be kept open to the public, to emphasize the fact that the road was not to be blocked by the picketers. As they marched back the second time through the picketers, the picketers attacked the police. The police were not armed except with night sticks. They had not drawn the night sticks. They were marching along heads held high, looking neither to right nor left, but simply marching along the Queen's Highway when they were attacked by the picketers. These picketers were armed with pieces of pulpwood, birch logs, axes and various kinds of sticks. One picketer made for a policeman with an axe to attack him. The policeman disarmed him. He closed with him and got the axe away from him, seized it and flung it on the ground. Another policeman picked it up for evidence. Another man, with a piece of pulpwood, struck another policeman, a member of the Constabulary and beat his head in, and the policeman fell like a log. As I speak to you now he is hovering between life and death. Frankly, there is not much hope. That is the word a few minutes ago. If he lives out the day - he is still unconscious after a two-hour emergency operation last night, made in a desperate attempt to save his life. If he should live out the day the hope is tomorrow to bring him to St. John's by helicopter, in the belief that the facilities that exist here in the General Hospital are so much more extensive and the personnel so much larger as to make it possible to give him more constant and careful attention than he can hope to get in a small hospital such as the one at Grand Falls, that is if he lives out this present day. Incidentally, the man who struck our Newfoundland native-born constable flung the stick down,

but another policeman picked it up immediately, and the attacker was seized by two constables and put under arrest and brought to Grand Falls where he now is.

Upon being attacked, the police, who up to that moment were marching in the manner I described, drew their night sticks and fell upon their assailants - fell upon them - 71 men fell upon a number running - somewhere between 200 and 300 picketers. And it lasted for about 15 minutes, and then the picketers, some of them bleeding, blood streaming down their faces, fled into the nearby bush and disappeared and escaped arrest at least for the time being.

Now, Sir, the R.C.M.P. are rather noted for something that is quite unfortunate from the standpoint of their own reputation, that when these incidents occur they either say nothing; they either make no public statement or make a statement of only the very briefest kind. So, last night, before the Government knew that this thing had occurred, the Leader of the I.W.A. in Newfoundland had issued a statement about it - before even the Government knew that this had happened, and while as yet we had no real knowledge of what was the nature of the incident, he issued a statement which is the best example of the "big lie" that Newfoundland has ever seen. He could not possibly have known what happened unless he had organized it, and arranged for it to happen. But immediately he issued the statement that this was the worst police brutality in Canadian history. That lie is almost as bad as the second lie issued by his unsavoury confederate, Hall, who said that innocent and harmless men had been brutally and unexpectedly attacked from behind by the R.C.M.P.

Now, Sir, since last night the I.W.A. have brought in almost another 100 men from the West Coast to Badger, so that today, at this moment the pickets number something of the order of 400 men; and they are still arriving this afternoon, and doubtless tonight. The house and the people of Newfoundland will ask themselves - Is this peaceful picketing? Do you need 400 men brought in from the other side of the Island to conduct peaceful picketing? Or, having lost the strike completely, utterly and absolutely, having lost the strike, are the I.W.A. now organizing a private army of their own, hired, paid men to conduct guerilla war?

The I.W.A. strike is lost. It has collapsed. There are now 1,100 men working in the same camps where the strike occurred. There are more than 300 men working in the same camps, over and above the number that voted in the strike vote. The strike is lost. It has collapsed. The Newfoundland Brotherhood of Woodworkers now has five times as many members in its ranks as the I.W.A. has in Newfoundland; five times as much. The I.W.A. now is nothing more than a band of paid picketers, brought in from another part of Newfoundland. They might as well be brought in from Nova Scotia or Ontario or British Columbia. **Mr. Hollett:** Or Russia.

Mr. Smallwood: They have nothing to do with the strike. They are not strikers. They are not on strike against the A.N.D. Company. There is no strike against the A.N.D. Co. Or do the I.W.A. take the position that they, for their part, month in and month out, year in and year out, with the camps operating perfectly normally, they will go on with their pickets? Now, the duty of the Government of Newfoundland is to maintain law and order. That duty of the Government comes ahead of our duty to build roads, to build schools, to build hospitals. It comes ahead of all other responsibilities and duties of the Government. It has a duty to maintain law and order. That is our first duty. A Government that cannot do that should resign. It has no right to hold office if it is not able to maintain the Queen's peace and see that the Queen's highways are kept open and kept safe for the Queen's subjects to pass freely back and forth without molestation from outlaws, highwaymen or pickets or anyone else or any kind of gangsterism, whether there is a strike or no strike. That is our first duty. The Government are discharging that duty! We are doing it by means of the police. If the police are not numerous enough we will have more police. Having more, if they still prove not to be enough we will get still more! We will go on until we have enough police, whatever the number, whatever the number! We will get whatever number is necessary to maintain law and order, to prevent lawless men, whether they call themselves pickets or by any name, to prevent lawless men from getting the upper hand.

Let it be clear that we will resign, all of us will

go out, if we are not able to keep the peace, to maintain law and order in Newfoundland. We will go out. We will resign. We will not be fit to hold office. We will have as many police as are necessary. The police are re-inforced today by a contingent flying in from the mainland of Canada. If there are not enough, with 400 men now in Badger and more on the way, we will get another contingent and another and another and another, but we will maintain law if it is the last thing we do on this earth. Now we have every confidence in the police. We do not think that there is any need, or that there is going to be any need, for soldiers. We think, we are quite certain, that the police force, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, with or without assistance from our own Newfoundland Constabulary, which is a much older force than the R.C.M.P., will do the job. We greatly regret that the real criminals were not arrested last night. All Newfoundland knows who the real criminals are: Ladd, Hall and McCool. They are the criminals. All Newfoundland knows it! All Newfoundland says it! Up to now, these criminals have been successful in evading arrest. Mr. Speaker, we are confident that 98% at least of the Newfoundland people are now against the I.W.A. and gangster unions and union gangsterism - 98% of the Newfoundland people.

We pray that a charge of murder will not have to be laid. We pray, and Newfoundland prays, that there will be no more violence, that every good Newfoundlander, including those poor unfortunates who have been so cruelly misled, will see the error of their ways and will realize the truth of what the Attorney General said a day or two ago; that all they can hope, at most, to accomplish is to get police records for themselves, that will cling to them as long as they live, standing in their way forever in getting a job and a chance to earn a living, barring them forever from ever entering the United States or working on an American base. We hope these misguided fellow Newfoundlanders of ours will see the error of their ways and realize that it is a hopeless, futile task to which they have been led by these three criminals. Now, Sir, before I sit down I want to relate two extremely brief points to the house.

The "Toronto Globe And Mail" had a staff photographer stationed for some days past

in Central Newfoundland. He took photographs last night, a considerable number of photographs. I know how many he took. And having had them developed, he went through them rapidly, and carefully, to boil it down to one or two or maybe three out of a large number. There were no photographs showing the picketers armed; showing the picketers with pieces of pulpwood, birch logs, sticks or axes - No! The only photographs selected to be sent to his newspaper in Toronto were photographs that showed the police using their nightsticks after they had been attacked by the picketers.

Another fact I would like to relate, (and by the way, this same photographer is the man who attended that great rally of the public of Gambo) that great rally, that great public meeting at which the loggers out of their devotion to Mr. Ladd carried him on their shoulders; this great meeting which was attended by exactly 20 loggers - exactly 20 - and some 200 pickets brought there from the West Coast via Badger, who, when the photographer wanted a striking photograph and asked them to lift Ladd on their shoulders, they did so that he could take pictures.

That is how news is made! That is how it is manufactured! That is how it is falsified! And the readers of the "Globe and Mail" will see first photographs of a vast popular demonstration of loggers - beaten, poor, down-trodden, oppressed loggers in Newfoundland, only fighting to get out of the conditions of slavery, of peonage into which the A.N.D. Co. has plunged them, and all having doglike devotion to their deliverer, Mr. Ladd, carrying him upon their shoulders. Then some days later the readers of the same newspaper will see pictures of the brutal "Cossacks," the "Cossacks," with everything but their horses, trampling the poor peasants under foot - the "Cossacks" - (Mounties), beating them to death with their batons - with their night sticks.

Secondly: The Toronto "Daily Star" has a reporter there, who has already reported to his newspaper. It has been telephoned back to Toronto. He telephoned to his newspaper that this was a group, a small group, not much more than a knot of men on the road, brutally assaulted, without provocation, by these brutal policemen, for one hour beaten and battered on the public

streets by these brutal policemen. Now I say, Sir, that if every newspaper in Canada, outside Newfoundland and every radio station and if every politician condemns us, the Government, in this we hope for the support of the Opposition.

Mr. Hollett: You have it.

Mr. Smallwood: The Government will maintain law and order, no matter who likes it or lumps it. We will maintain law and order or we will resign. And so long as we have the police to do it, we will do it, we will accomplish our purpose. (Applause from both sides).

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if I do not say very much this afternoon it is because I am trying to hold my temper in. I hope every Newfoundlander holds his temper in for the next few hours or days, as the case might be. When we heard last night of this dastardly happening in the Badger area we were all shocked. I know Badger very well. It is near Grand Falls. I was often up there. They are very fine people - and to think that these three communistically inspired recruiters who have come in here from the mainland, should recruit, perhaps in some respect uneducated and certainly unknowledgeable, as far as this strike is concerned, men from the west coast, to come into the district which I served for seven years and stage a riot in which one of our policemen is sent to hospital, (and I pray to God, he will come out of it with his life); if there is any Newfoundlander in this country today who approves of this action, whether he is a union man or not, then I have no use for him, none whatsoever. I have no more use for him than certain individuals have for me. And I want to read this short note from a man who signs himself "Unionman" on Pennywell Road.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think - Summarize it. But the house is not concerned with anonymous letters.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, it is anonymous. But, Sir, I know for a fact that that man, and several other letters which I have had, and my colleagues have had, and some letters from women, these are just a small fraction of one

tenth of one percent of the people of this country. And they don't know the facts. Some of them don't want to know the facts. Some of them express themselves because of their hatred for Smallwood and others because of their hatred and dislike of me. They do not want to know the facts of this strike up there. Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is getting serious. And I want to assure the Government that we on this side of the house, having put our hands to the plow, will not turn back for anybody nor anything, no group or bodies in this country. (Applause from Government side).

Mr. Hollett: Law and order are the substance and essence of good Government, and it is the duty not of the Government but of the Opposition also, to see that they are carried out. And we stand for law and order. If there were not enough striking loggers in the Badger area to picket the road, a very narrow road, why should these three people, who are using communistic tactics be allowed to bring in men from the West Coast. And I shall probably have to get after the Attorney General on that one later. I know the position he is in today, and I would not like to be in his position - a very serious one, in which he has to keep a clear head. We are counting on him to do the right thing, and to see to it that sufficient force is put there by the Government to maintain law and order; to see that peoples' lives are protected and to see that men carrying on their daily occupation in that area are allowed to carry on without molestation inspired by these three people, who the Premier has very well described. I want to know why these three people can't be lifted body and bones across the Gulf and landed on the other side.

Anybody who doubts, let them read this pamphlet here on the activities of the I.W.A.; of its activities across Canada; of its activities in British Columbia; and its tactics were always those which smacked of Communism. And here these three people come in amongst our people and tell them how they are being down-trodden by the Government of Newfoundland and by the Opposition and by the police, for whom I have as great a respect as I have for any body of men in the world; the police not only of this country but of every country, particularly here, our own police. I was associated with

them for 25 years, and I never saw one of them yet use force when he did not have to do so, to save or protect himself. And to think any man in this country could be inspired by the miserable creatures that they have up there, to pick up a log, a four-foot log, and hit a policeman over the head and break in his skull, to think a Newfoundlander could do that goes right to the core of my heart, Sir, and I would be the first one to be willing to take my gun and go up there. That situation has to stop, and we on this side of the house are counting on the Attorney General to put sufficient force in there to send these men back to the west coast, send them somewhere, and take these other three men and put them somewhere else, preferably where they belong. That is all I want to say now, Sir, I am afraid I would begin to lose my temper.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General) (Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, perhaps in view of what my hon. friend opposite has said I should make a brief explanation: First of all I would like to congratulate my colleague and leader, the Premier, for his very excellent story as to what took place yesterday. I may say that I have not received any written report as yet from the R.C.M.P. as to the incident, but I have received oral reports. And the oral reports that I have received carry exactly the story as told by the Premier.

I want to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the support that he has given the Government at this time, and for the confidence that he has expressed in me as Attorney General. I might say, Mr. Speaker, when a couple of weeks ago my leader received a tip (in fact he received a wire saying that there was to be an attack on the jail at Grand Falls) he discussed with me and with others the proper method with which to deal with this situation. It was agreed then that perhaps the best method of meeting this situation, this suggested raid, would be by publicizing the fact that it was about to take place. As a result, Mr. Speaker, of that publicity the raid did not take place. But don't let anyone in this house nor in this country think that that raid was not planned. That raid was planned. That man who sent that telegram intended to carry out that raid. These who were with him in the post office when the message was dispatched,

both I.W.A. men, intended in all seriousness that this attack should be made on the Grand Falls jail. Consequently, the proposed march did not take place, for the simple reason that the publicity which the Premier gave to the message made it inadvisable for them to make any such raid.

Now, on last Sunday I was confronted with a situation. On Sunday afternoon the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P., with whom I had been in touch daily and hourly since this strike began, phoned me and told me that he did not like the situation as it was developing at Badger, that men were being brought in from the west side of the Province and that they were gathering there in unnecessarily large numbers. Most of them came from outside this area altogether. We discussed the situation, and he agreed with me that the time had now come when we should ask for re-inforcements for the R.C.M.P. I might say that, time after time during the past week, I have told him not to hesitate but to let me know if, and when, and to what extent re-inforcements were desirable. He had always assured me that the situation was under complete control and that no reinforcements were necessary. But on Sunday, Mr. Speaker, when the situation developed as it did, he told me that reinforcements were needed. I at once wired the Minister of Justice at Ottawa, and under the terms of our R.C.M.P. contract asked for the necessary reinforcements. In the meantime, the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. had communicated with, and was in continuous communication with, the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. at Ottawa. It would have taken some time, Mr. Speaker, for these reinforcements to be flown in, so that Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. asked me if I could arrange to give him some assistance in the form of help from the members of the Newfoundland Constabulary. I at once communicated with the Chief of Police, (and although I could not reach him I did succeed in getting the Assistant-Chief of Police, and ultimately both of them got together) with the result that at four or five hours notice they had 27 men on the train that night enroute to Badger. Reinforcements also went out on the same train from the R.C.M.P. I want to tell the house just how it was that our Newfoundland Constabulary happened to be there. They were immediately available and

they could be on the spot more quickly than could be reinforcements from the mainland. Moreover, it was thought by us (and by us I mean the Superintendent and myself) that perhaps Newfoundlanders might be more successful and more effective in dealing with the situation that had arisen, than would be members of the R.C.M.P. who are not from Newfoundland.

You all know what has happened. The Premier has told you. And I am sure that the prayers of this house will be that this gallant young lad, twenty-four years old, an ex-member of the R.C.A.F., will recover fully. I am afraid it is too much to hope for, but I am sure we all hope and pray for that. But whatever happens, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the house that I have full confidence in the R.C.M.P. They now see the situation they are up against. Reinforcements are arriving today, and such further reinforcements as are necessary will be available just as soon as they are requested. And I want to assure the house that I will not delay in making any such request when once the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. indicates that they are necessary.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Reinforcements are coming in today?

Mr. Curtis: Reinforcements are arriving by special plane very shortly. Thank goodness they have good weather. Mind you, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in some ways reinforcements are particularly essential because our Newfoundland people are innately law-abiding, and all they want to see is the policemen around. The very fact that they are there is sufficient. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, the area involved is so large, because apart from the Gander or Badger area you have the West Coast, and at any time they might start a diversionary action, in an effort to make us lessen our forces in one particular section. But I think the house can feel assured that the situation is well in hand and that it will be kept well in hand. Certainly, I am throwing the entire responsibility for maintenance of the peace upon the R.C.M.P., and only if they should fail will I advise the Government to do what we can do — swear in special constables to assist — I believe the situation is in hand.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a ques-

tion on what the Attorney General has said? In view of the fact the certification of the I.W.A. has been revoked, who is responsible for collecting the men on the West Coast and bringing them in, housing them and feeding them?

Mr. Curtis: That is the question, Mr. Speaker, to which we all want to know the answer to. How much are these men being paid and by whom? Who is paying them? Who is looking after them? Who is paying them for their transfer? Who is hiring the taxis to bring them up? These are the questions that we all want to get the answers to. I know, now that we have recently made some arrests, we may be able to get that information. That information may enable us to "step on the right toes". In the meantime, however, I might say, with my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition I regret that according to the laws of Canada we can't take these men body and bones and cart them back to the mainland, across the Gulf, or even halfway across the Gulf.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, before you call "Petitions", I am very pleased to be able to inform the house today that negotiations have been going on for some weeks past between officers of the department of Economic Development and officials of the Bowaters Co. at Corner Brook, with a view to formulating a practical plan for using local Newfoundland bottoms to convey pulpwood to Corner Brook from various parts of the Province. The plan was given its finishing touches at a conference held this week in my office between the deputy minister of Economic Development, Mr. Arthur Johnson, Mr. Gordon Pushie, director general of Economic Development, Mr. Ross Young and Mr. Richard A. Harvey of the department of Fisheries, and Mr. Robert Wells, provincial Economist, together with Mr. Albert Martin, vice-president and general manager of Bowaters, and Mr. Jack Roberts, Bowaters woods manager.

This movement of pulpwood in Newfoundland bottoms represents almost \$500,000 in freight charges for a season stretching from June through October. The committee representing the Government and the company, which has been studying this question, is making an immediate ap-

proach to schooner owners throughout the province. These schooner owners will be provided with details of the areas to be served and the quantities of pulpwood to be carried. All owners of local carriers may obtain information from Mr. Arthur Johnson, in the department of Economic Development, St. John's, or Mr. Jack Roberts, the woods manager of Bowaters at Corner Brook. This plan can mean a lot to the owners of local vessels and it is our strong hope that they will take full advantage of the plan that has been worked out. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped today to make a very important announcement on matters of industrial development, but I think that perhaps, in view of the circumstances, that might be left over to another day.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Question No. 15 - Tabled (See Appendix)

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day, could I ask the hon. the Premier if any progress has been made with regard to getting electricity into St. Mary's Bay, electric lights and so on.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows that the Government sometime ago succeeded in getting a very good man to be chairman of the new Power Commission. He also knows that we succeeded in getting a very good engineer for that commission. The Commission has been quite active, quite energetically drawing up plans for rural electrification in many parts of Newfoundland, plans that would take four or five years to carry out. They have not been authorized, as of this moment, to go ahead, to carry out any rural electrification except at one place, Happy Valley in Labrador - the reason being that we must first bring down the budget. Before we bring down the budget we must know what Newfoundland is going to get from Ottawa under Term 29. When we know what our finances are going to be we can cut the garment according to the cloth. Now you can have a \$20 suit or an \$80 suit or a \$150 suit, depending on the cost of

the cloth. You can have a rural electrification programme that will take \$5 million a year or one taking \$500,000, that depends on how much money we are going to have. So we are drawing up alternate plans to carry out, as soon as we know how much we can afford to spend each year, say for the next five years. And in this present session of the house we should be in a position, after we have the financial facts, to announce the actual programme for the next several years, commencing in the coming spring.

Mr. Hollett: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. the Premier say whether a plan has been drawn up for the St. Mary's Bay area?

Mr. Smallwood: It has indeed. A programme has been drawn up for a large number of places in Newfoundland - Out in St. George's district, Port au Port, Humber East, and down in Green Bay and Bonavista Bay and down into Notre Dame Bay, down Lewisporte way and in Trinity Bay and in Conception Bay and on the Southern Shore and up to Trepassey and in St. Mary's Bay and Placentia Bay and the Burin Peninsula and the Bonavista Peninsula. It is quite a big programme. But we cannot carry it out until we know what it is going to cost, and how much money we are going to have to spend for that particular purpose.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Address in Reply (Adjourned Debate):

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to have a recess? On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Mr. Renouf: Mr. Speaker, I am quite conscious at this time that perhaps never in the history of Newfoundland was it more important for a person, in making a speech to have a sense of calm, cool, responsibility. In the light of this, all my following remarks are to be guided and to be interpreted. I have to make a speech on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Of course, according to the time-honoured courtesy and pleasure, I must sincerely congratulate the mover and seconder of the

Address in Reply, namely, the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) and the hon. member for Carbonear - Bay de Verde (Mr. Speaker). I was very taken with the tenor of their addresses, and I would wish that some machinery could be put into force in this house whereby we might have an opportunity to hear more from the backbenchers on the Government side of the house. I do feel that all the talent of the Government is not confined to the Cabinet, and I think that the sentiments and opinions expressed by these two members are very worthy of our thoughts and consideration.

Likewise in the Speech from the Throne mention was made of the loss of the dragger "Blue Wave", and I too wish to be associated with the previous speakers in joining in the expression of sorrow to so many bereaved Newfoundlanders, survivors of those who lost their lives in the disaster. The annals of our Newfoundland outports and their life on the sea is filled with accounts of such tragedy as this. Our grief is none the less great that this is the last of a long line of such disasters, and our tribute to our Newfoundland fishermen and Newfoundland seamen cannot be too great. In spite of all these tragedies, they have in their minds a firm determination to carry on the business of the sea, and their bravery cannot be too highly commended.

We all share as well in the pleasant anticipation of the pending visit of Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip. The significance of a visit of Royalty is very great. They represent the stability, the common sense, the democracy and all that is fine in Britain and in her traditions - traditions shared so ardently in this country. As such, we await her arrival to greet her with open arms. We share the hope too that the children of the Province will have ample opportunity to see Her Majesty and to share in the celebrations and the joy of her visit.

Now I have no speech as such prepared for today. I am going to ramble all over the place. I hope not too inconsistently. But, just to prove that this is a democratic house, I am going to say it how I like, I am going to say some complimentary things. I am going to say some uncomplimentary things. I am going to be pleasant and I am going to be critical.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the hon. member is not going to be out of order.

Mr. Renouf: Mr. Speaker, I want to prove and I want to state that the functions of this house fortunately are such that a man can feel free to get up on his feet and give his honest expressions of opinion without fear or without favour. Now, at the opening of this session I had some peculiar sensations. We met, of course, in an atmosphere of expectations and an atmosphere of alarm but there was another sensation that came upon me, and that was a sensation of something having come out of the grave. That is a sombre statement. But I did see on my desk two volumes, and I said - "Glory be to God - Out of the grave have come two volumes of our Hansard, with 'De Profundis' written largely upon the covers." I was interested in those two volumes, so long expected. And one of the first reactions which I got was a story of anything but bipartisanship in this house. I read accounts of where the hon. the Premier and the hon. Leader of the Opposition had twisted each others tails as hard as ever they could do it.

Mr. Smallwood: In their unregenerated days.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Better buried.

Mr. Renouf: And I anticipate and look for some other shocks.

Mr. Smallwood: In the same series?

Mr. Renouf: Now the element of bipartisanship in politics has some interesting and some possibly amusing features and side lines. We do not always join in a bipartisan way with the Government. We do reserve to ourselves the right to decide when we join in a bi-partisan way, and when we think a cause is sufficiently important to join we do so. We may next time (if there is a next time) join, and we may not. On one thing I may be a very heavy kicker, if the Government should decide to move me out of these comfortable quarters in this House of Assembly. I hope they have no intention of moving this house from its present site, or the Chamber that we stand in, to another site.

Mr. Smallwood: No! It will be left right here.

Mr. Renouf: But we may be told that the fresh air of Gooseberry Lane is better for our lungs, and so we would be better speakers for the move, to the heights of the north. That in itself, however, is only a passing remark, but it is a warning to the Government that not on all issues are we bipartisan. Before I came to the house this afternoon, I had a call from a reverend gentleman, a rector of one of the important churches in my district of St. John's South. He asked me to make some remarks this afternoon which would portray his feelings on the current troubles. I do not presume to be capable nor to be one to moralize too much, but I feel that I might fittingly make some remarks which would portray what was in the reverend gentleman's mind. He said he was sorrowed by the events of yesterday evening and last night, described by the hon. the Premier. He said also that many of his parishoners were very sorely hurt and were deploring the events that were happening in Central Newfoundland. Well, my only way of dealing with that, in view of some of the sentiments that may be expressed by my constituents in my particular district, I think I might pass some remarks which would assure them that they need not worry. I think there is a misconception in the public mind on two things, and not so much in the public mind but in the mind of those that are a bit confused. I think: (1) People do not quite realize the real meaning of Government; and (2) they do not realize the meaning of the Acts that have just been passed by this house.

When I say that a great many people do not understand the real meaning of Government, I have in mind the criticisms that have been levelled at both sides of this house for intervention in this strike. Now, in normal times the machinery of Government goes along smoothly and operates the business of the day. There are times, however, times of emergency, when something more than the ordinary machinery of Government has to be brought into play. The recent occurrence is one of these occasions. The great decision had to be made for intervention. I feel that in the law there is the practical machinery for putting this into effect, but the decision to put it into effect was the

important thing in this case. Law is made up of moral law, and the actual written statutes that we have on our books. I think in this instance, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier acted on the moral law. It is a difficult thing to explain perhaps - but I think that apart from our statute law and our ordinary law there is another form, there is the conscience of law; there is jurisprudence which is the conscience of law, the philosophy of law. And, Sir, I contend that over and above the ordinary law there is a transcendent moral law that is the law that the Premier and leader of the Government adopted when he acted as he did. That is an important distinction, which some people in this country may not understand. Some people may be confused. Let them not be confused. The leader of the Government, with the support of the Opposition took a very decided step. We feel that we followed the proper course - and we had to go right to the heart and the core of the trouble.

Now, secondly there may be criticisms of the Acts that were passed. There, too, there is misunderstanding. There, too, there is a bit of confusion. But, Sir, I would make a special appeal to my own constituents, which equally applies to all the people of this country; to have patience and common sense before they comment on recent events. If they do not understand the reasons, let them wait and study them. If they do not understand the Acts that have been passed, let them wait until they find out about them. Let them wait until they can get an opportunity for somebody to interpret them for them. Let them not hurriedly nor excitedly nor in any sense of prejudice make remarks, nor follow somebody who does not know what he is talking about. I endeavour, as far as I can, to get to a common sense analysis of the situation. I think it is extremely important that our people all over the country settle down and do not get excited, and study the situation in a calm and collected way. And then they will find that this is not a conspiracy to crush their liberties; not a conspiracy to crush their rights; nor a conspiracy to work wilful harm on any living Newfoundlander in this country.

Now, I know too much should not be said perhaps, just in case somebody might say something they did not intend to say. But before I pass from this particular topic, I must get off my mind some of the feelings

and symptoms that may be amongst us here on this side of the house. That is, perhaps, a misinterpretation of this bi-partisan policy of ours. Now, bi-partisan policy is the most civilized form of Government in the British Commonwealth of Nations. This Chamber is composed of Newfoundlanders, everyone. We are a civilized people. We represent the best in the traditions of the past. We take joint action on a very high plane. We take direct responsibility for a very direct action. We take it not because we love the members of the Government on the opposite side. No! But we realize that there is a legally, formally-constituted Government in this country, and as such it is ridiculous for any one to accuse us of any motive in supporting a morally and legally-constituted Government. In Britain there is more bi-partisan action by the enlightened members of that parliament than we know of, than the average person knows of. It is an intelligent, normal state of affairs in a crisis, particularly on an important issue. I would make this statement with the purpose only of trying to get unravelled some of the "tommy-rot" and the "bunkum" that has been spoken and written in our daily press and elsewhere. I also have to clear some other points in this same matter. We have been accused of being everything under the sun, "jellyfish", "putty", "spineless", "numbskulls" -

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Only one member was a "numbskull" and that was the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy).

Mr. Renouf: And every word in the dictionary. Now, that was an attack which we sort of expected. We felt that perhaps there might be some reactions like that, and I suppose that instead of getting angry we should just say nothing. But saying nothing can sometimes be mistaken as being still more spineless. So I feel that there has been unfair comment and criticism, in some quarters, of the leader of our party here on this side of the house. Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition might not have some of the pungent oratory of the leader of the Government, but I want to take this public opportunity of putting on record that there is no man in this country whose opinion, whose sagacity, whose common sense I value more than that of the Leader of the

Opposition. (Applause from both sides of the house).

I have been guided on many times past by the sound wisdom of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I know he does not want me to make him conspicuous in these compliments, but they are not compliments. They are a solemn exposition of the character of a very fine man, and a man who is in danger of being misunderstood at this critical time. I refute every word of insinuation against him, and I just say to him "carry on".

Now you know, Sir, I cannot say that I am not critical of some of the phases of the Government's handling of this crisis. I do not say that in any sense of mischievous criticism. But I would like to see a toning down of some of the legislation and the passionate tenseness of the moment. I give that suggestion as my firm opinion that I think the people now want no more tense excitement or passionate expressions. There is, of course, an understanding in my mind that the situation may have called for it. Heavy emphasis is necessary when dealing with the public, to get your point across. That I admit! Now, the Government has the mandate to proceed. That is all we need. The solemn mandate has been given to the Government, and from now on people expect a strong-handed exercise of the mandate which was so solemnly given.

I had a bit of an amusing experience the other day, when I was out somewhere, and we were looking at "Close-up". We saw that interview between the hon. the Premier and that mainland interviewer. I must confess I was getting a bit irritated at what I felt to be the unfair prejudice that was being exercised against the Premier of Newfoundland. But my temper was somewhat modified when one little boy that was in the room said something.

He was not my little boy. I have not got one. We have three girls only.

He said: "That is the first time I heard Joey Smallwood not get a word in".

Mr. Smallwood: Sounds like a good Liberal.

Mr. Renouf: I expect the hon. the Premier will get a good few words in edgewise between now and the time when we see the end of the situation. But Sir, there is a little lighter side to many things, and I think we now have to try and lighten the gravity of

the situation. We know it is serious. We know it is something not to be trafficked with too much. But, Sir, I do think that the inherent good sense of Newfoundlanders has to somewhere create the balance between passion and the gravity of the situation. Perhaps that is enough for this particular topic. I have no idea whether I expressed my sentiments passionately or consistently or in sequence, but such as they were, they had to come out.

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

Mr. Speaker, the more usual part of an Address in Reply is to comment on the Speech itself and to pass judgement on the shortcomings of the Government in power. Little did we think that the usual platitudes of the Speech from the Throne would be so rudely interrupted by the flaming eruptions of the past week. But I do not think we should allow that particular crisis to overshadow our analysis and our criticisms of the ordinary day-to-day affairs of Government. In other words, they can't hide behind any crisis such as this. We have to say something about them, and we have to speak out with constructive criticism of the shortcomings of their administration.

Now I am not going to go into things as fully as I might otherwise have done, for the reasons (1), that time is growing short and (2), this crisis does seem to overshadow a lot of the minds of the members here, and perhaps my words of wisdom might not get the full recognition that they deserve. But, Sir, I am absolutely aghast at omissions in this Speech from the Throne. I could hardly believe my eyes that, for the second year in succession, there is not one word, one mention, of agriculture or farming in the Speech from the Throne, not a solitary word or reference. Now that is strange not because a great number of our people are farmers. They are a comparatively small proportion of our population, but in importance they are very, very vital. After all, farming represents food, it represents employment, it represents industry; and I cannot understand why some of the drive and some of the dynamics and some of the inspiration of the Government cannot be put into some policy that will vitalise the declining farming industry of this country. There

are serious problems, I know. I do not wish to have it inferred from my remarks that the hon. minister of Natural Resources is asleep at his desk. I know he is not. I know he is studying a great many policies. I know he is making a great number of experiments. But I do feel there is more energy needed to get something concrete underway for the farming communities of this country. The farmers are being sorely pressed these days. It is a hard job to survive in farming in this country. In the first place, the climate is difficult, and secondly, since Confederation, the imports from other provinces are able to undercut our local producers and then the costs of feeds are so high. All these and many more factors make it difficult for our farmers to survive. I think that some steps should be taken to formulate an aggressive and progressive farming policy in this country. Admittedly the Speech from the Throne made references to the weak spots in our economy, and outlined steps which could be taken to rectify the situation. Well, I say the active promotion of farming and the concentrated study of farming is one of the means that would bolster some parts of our uncertain economy.

We have in the past relied to a great extent upon construction work. We have had federal spending. We have had money from other sources, which did nothing except, for the time being, give wages to our people. But, Sir, land is the basis of economics. If we forget about the land, if we forget about farmers, we are taking a very grave risk. Some farmers themselves are inclined to shrug their shoulders, throw up their hands and say farming is not worth working at these days. I think that feeling can be broken down. I think leadership can spark an interest in farming once again in this country. I think it is necessary for the balance of our economy, and I challenge the Government to take an active step that will put heart again into the farmers of Newfoundland.

Premier Smallwood: Before my hon. friend goes on, could he narrow that down a little. When he uses the word "farming" does he mean any and every kind of farming?

Mr. Renouf: I meant mainly, Mr. Speaker, the food producing farmer although not

exclusively so. I think the land and the utilization of it in all its ramifications is the thing that is fundamentally necessary in any country. I do know that other forms of farming, like ranch-farming and live stock and so on like that, in certain areas, are being taken up, which is a very good thing. I think it is safe for me to say that I intended to include all forms of farming.

I note some remarks as well in the Speech from the Throne on unemployment and the distress that has arisen from a recession in our economy. That, we do not want to over-emphasize, but we could not help but make reference to it. I again point out to the Government that they are responsible for doing something, as best they can, to tackle vigorously the unemployment that is here in Newfoundland at the moment. I will not quote the figures of unemployment. I do not think that is necessary. I think that may be misunderstood. We are all too well aware of it. But, Sir, there again I say that a drive and spark and a policy is needed to cope with the situation. Another feature of our economy is rather disconcerting. That is the vast amount of money on which we are depending, from Ottawa. There again is a sign that, whether we like it or not, we are becoming a satellite of the Federal Treasury. I do not know what we can do about it. This has always been a country that has had its ups-and-downs, and we have had our tries at economic development, some of which have failed.

Now, in reviewing the history of the present Liberal Government, which is shortly going to have its tenth anniversary, I do not feel that I can give them any tribute in full for having done what they might have done. There have been too many eccentricities and too many policies ill-considered, which are now littering the economic shore. I know that in some areas they have done their best, but in all cases they did not seek the wisdom of consulting this side of the house. They were not bi-partisan in the days when they were well in the money. They would have done well if they had consulted the wisdom of this side of the house in some of the projects which they started in the past, and we could tell them how to spend it, we could tell them how we would have spent it, we could tell them what wonderful results there would have been had we been where they are.

Mr. J.D. O'Driscoll (Bell Island): Insight is a wonderful thing.

Mr. Renouf: Now in that indictment, which I unfortunately will have to cut short, I feel that I must make comment on a number of other topics which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne and other topics which are not mentioned in the Speech. I could not help but think (when we had the dramatic events of the past week), I could not help but think — What were the young people of this country thinking as these events passed before their eyes and their ears? A very grave thought passed through my mind — Are they weighing or assessing the leaders of their country in the right way? Has this legislation given them the right impression? Did they understand the meaning of the events that were passed like flaming rockets through the sky? Did they understand what unionism meant? Did they understand what management — union relationship meant? Did they understand fully what Government meant? I noticed in the house during recent days some young students, and I was observing them and trying to penetrate their minds and see what their reactions were to the deliberations of this house.

That brings me, Sir, to the Department of Education. I, personally, and I am sure my colleagues here on this side of the house, also have a very keen sense of the importance of education in this Province. I think the hope of the future lies in the education policy of Newfoundland. We see thousands and thousands of students going through our schools. We see the potential citizens and leaders of tomorrow, and we have to make sure that this huge investment which the Government is making in education is a good investment, (which it undoubtedly is) and that its policy will bring the best results. Now, in the light of recent events and the importance of enlightenment and the importance of education in its thought and application to such, I have a few comments to make. Some years ago (I think it was about 1956) the hon. Minister of Education (Dr. F.W. ROWE) wrote a history of Newfoundland, or a history of education in Newfoundland. I read that book. At the time, the hon. Minister was not in this house as Minister of Education, and I do not bring up a reference to that book in particular for

the particular reason of paying him a compliment, but I mention it because it points up a very significant, fundamental interpretation of the background of education of the past, and I was thankful that the pattern of its pages and the paragraphs in it reflected the soundest common sense and the keenest analysis of all the historic factors which made up this story of Newfoundland. Now I will go still further in making these remarks, in relation to recent events, to say that from the lessons of that past, as portrayed in that book, and in many others, we as a Newfoundland people have a great deal of gratitude to those who came before us in the public life and in the educational life of our country.

There is a sound record of common sense, there is a sound record of tolerance and there is a sound record of all the best traditions of our race. Likewise, I believe written afterwards, was another very good volume written by the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. C.A. Frecker. That was a book concerned with a series of lectures delivered by Dr. Frecker, embracing a history of education in the Atlantic Provinces. I was very impressed with that work too. Although the minister and deputy minister were not in the department, they both reflected these same sentiments which are of such great importance in the educational policy of our Island. Now above all things that were expressed in these two books was an acknowledgement of a pattern of life of Newfoundland, an acceptance of the principle that we must honour the differences within ourselves. We must understand the nature and the traditions of our people in education. That book, and the other book too, are a guide to the future people here that intolerance must not form a part of Newfoundland community life. That is the essence and significance of these two books that I refer to. These books have interpreted the form of life which was set many years ago. These two books show how much Newfoundlanders have in common. We have our differences, we can honour our differences and we can work, have a workable arrangement and workable partnership which will preserve in our educational system the precious things that some people are looking to destroy. I feel that, as long as we adhere to the sound policies that we have adopted, or that are set in the educational

pattern of the country, that we will have nothing to fear.

Now I have laboured that point perhaps a little too much, but these are the things that count. There is a struggle in the world today for the minds of men that we are all too well aware of — the struggle for the minds of men. In this country, we are insistent and we demand and we will insure that the minds of our young people will be safeguarded against the poison that is trying to creep in. That is one instance in which I can wholeheartedly dare to congratulate the Government on a very sound, wise policy, namely, the educational policy as it exists today. Now I know that this educational policy has called for a terrific expenditure of public monies. Huge schools have been erected, large grants have been made, great scholarships have been set up and there has been very little if any criticism of that policy for the reason that I have mentioned. All of us wish to invest in the welfare, enlightenment and proper education of all future Newfoundlanders.

Other departments of Government have functioned during the past few years, some of them well, some of them indifferently. We know that there is an effort under way to provide health facilities for as many of our people as possible. Unfortunately, the health program of the Government was offered a bit ahead of the time when we are ready to come in full with the demands which the new health scheme offered. I think a great many people are trying to get into hospital now before there is room to take them. I think there may have been a bit of haste in formulating that policy before the hospital beds were ready to receive patients. I do not know but that we should have waited a little longer until things could be taken in their order and by that means not have some of the weaknesses that exist at the present time.

The fisheries of this country have always formed a hearty annual topic in this House of Assembly. Once again this year, mention is made in the Speech from the Throne of some of the Government's policies proposed for the coming season. The fisheries, of course, have also been changing in this country. The hon. Leader of the Opposition is far better qualified to make sure thoughtful criticisms of the fisheries than am I. But it seems to me that most of the

fishery activities, and the success or otherwise of the fisheries, depends upon private enterprise. I do not think the Government can take too much credit for the success that may come in the months ahead. I think a lot of it depends upon outside markets. When the markets are good and if the fish are there, things will take their course. I do not fully subscribe to the expenditure policy of the Government under the Department of Fisheries. That criticism has been made that, for the money expended, the results have not proved to be a success. In other words, the measure of results is not in proportion to the vast sums expended.

Welfare is a serious matter these days. We know that the Government may have a sympathetic heart to the distress which exists in this country today. We know that there is a great deal of relief being extended, money being expended for relief at the present time. We trust that conditions will not continue that will necessitate these vast expenditures on relief. And it is up to the Government to get busy to make sure that they create the channels of employment that will take the people out of the category where they are dependent upon relief. They will have to get busy, for the short time in which they will be in office, to formulate a policy that will put as many Newfoundlanders as possible back to profitable employment. That is one of the fundamental criticisms as well that I have of the Speech from the Throne; that it lacks in the greatest part any hope of developments or industrial development or plans which will create any new wealth within this country. It is pretty well barren of any policy of a wealth-creating nature.

Other departments: I do not give them priority as (a), (b), (c), (d). I speak of them as they come to my mind. The Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply has a very great task ahead of it in the present and in the near future. The population of the country is growing, and as expansion comes, so do demands. I feel that the minister in charge of this department will have to make serious study, as no doubt he has, of the problems which are confronting him. Plans have been drawn up to cope with the development of certain areas, for sewerage and other facilities, all of which plans are going to call for the expenditure of huge sums of money. It will have to be decided

how best these policies and plans can be carried out, and it will have to be very thoroughly planned, when the money can be found.

My time, Mr. Speaker, is drawing to a close in this talk. I know that I have been lacking in many ways in constructive criticism. I know I have not covered all the departments of the Government. I know it has been a very superficial speech in many ways, but I do realize that it would take far more time than is available now to formulate and tabulate some of the further suggestions and criticisms which come to my mind. But I have some very grave thoughts concerning the immediate future of Newfoundland. We are not too well situated. We are too dependent upon outside factors, mainly economic. There is a time coming when this Province will direly need the assistance which the Terms of Union, under Term 29, involves. That is a problem which has been before us for some considerable time. I do not think it appropriate, in the light of recent events, to raise too many alarms. We have to steadfastly hope that the results will be satisfactory and adequate funds will be made available in the near future. I feel sure that when the time comes, Newfoundland will get what it so justly deserves, and that is the very best that will be necessary to carry on in the dignity which befits this ancient Province. I conclude now, Mr. Speaker, more in the nature of an anti-climax, in having taken what I felt to be the current burning topic first. But, Sir, I do express the hope that the people of this country will have health, prosperity and peace in the days that lie ahead.

Hon. C.R. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to speak on a point of personal privilege?

Mr. Speaker: A point of personal privilege is always in order.

Mr. Ballam: Well, Mr. Speaker, all through the debate this afternoon, not through the debate but from various pickets etc. we have had, we do note there was a lot of people brought from the West Coast into the Badger and Grand Falls area on this strike business. Now I have no patience with them, and I contend law should be maintained, but I do not go along with the idea that the

whole of the fault should be charged directly, completely, against the people from the West Coast. In this paper I have here I see: "West Coast Men Menace to Peace", and it goes on to say, according to a statement from the Attorney General, there were upwards of 100 men brought in from the West Coast to add to the 300 already there. Well, were all the other 300 a menace to the peace?

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): No, they were infected by the West Coast.

Mr. Ballam: The bad lads came from the West Coast. They were there before, don't forget — they may have come from Twillingate. Let everybody take the blame. Don't point the finger of scorn at the West Coast.

Mr. Higgins: You don't see anybody from Torbay out there.

Mr. Ballam: You keep quiet!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

nate between the people of that vicinity and others.

Mr. Ballam: There were 100 men from the west coast and 300 men from the east coast.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question pursuant to what the hon. gentleman said? May the members of the house have the locations of the places from where these men came? Why not?

Mr. Curtis: I would be glad to give my hon. friend the information, Mr. Speaker, when I get it. I have asked the police to give me a list of the names of those arrested and the places from which they come.

Mr. Higgins: I remember, Mr. Speaker, an unidentified town on the west coast that once formed the basis of very spirited comments.

On motion, all remaining Orders of the Day stand deferred.

On motion, the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow March 12, at three o'clock.

LEGISLATION:

Notice of Motion: Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Insurance Act, 1957". On motion, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957": On motion, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow;

Hon. the Attorney General Asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Newspapers and Books Act"; On motion, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred. Just before doing so, Mr. Speaker, referring to the point of privilege mentioned by the hon. Minister of Labour, I would say "West Coast" there was used in a geographic sense. The reference was to districts west of Badger, and was not intended to discrimi-

March 12, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

I.W.A. LABOUR VIOLENCE:

POLICEMAN KILLED:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the members of this house share the grief of the people of Newfoundland over the death of this young policeman. I think we would show our feelings best if we stood for two minutes silence. (members all stand).

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, when Newfoundland became a province of Canada, one of the first decisions that had to be made was whether we would avail ourselves of the opportunity that every province is offered by the Government of Canada, of

engaging members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to do the provincial policing. We had our own Newfoundland police force known as the Newfoundland Constabulary. We knew that Ontario had her own provincial police force as did Quebec, but that all other provinces had signed contracts with the Government of Canada for the use of the R.C.M.P. as provincial police. We investigated the matter and found that it would be best to engage the services of the R.C.M.P. to police Newfoundland, at the same time retaining our own constabulary for duty in St. John's only. That was done! It was done by contract! The contract is made between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. It is signed, as a rule, for three years at a time. And the contract is couched in the same terms in our case as it is in the other seven provinces. It sets forth the rates that the Government of Canada will charge for each constable and officer seconded for duty in Newfoundland. There is one clause in the contract which provides that over and above this number, the regular number, when an emergency arises the Attorney General of the Province can request the services of additional men from the R.C.M.P. That is subject only to one condition, namely, that the Attorney General of Canada (that is to say the Minister of Justice of Canada) has the men to give for that special purpose and that the emergency is certified by the Attorney-General of the province concerned; then the men will be sent. The judge and only judge of whether there is an emergency and the men are needed is the Attorney-General of the province. The only judge as to whether they will be sent or not sent is the Attorney-General of Canada, and he is allowed in the contract one condition — that he has the men available.

that at least an additional 50 men would be required to be brought into Newfoundland to augment the strength of the R.C.M.P. The Attorney-General thereupon consequently asked the Attorney-General of Canada for these 50 men. The word came back from Ottawa that the men were available and indeed that they were being flown down to Newfoundland, to Gander, to arrive at 9:30 last night at Grand Falls, by car from Gander. The plane was in fact chartered, and the men were assembled by the Commissioner - Nicholson, the head of the

R.C.M.P. in Canada. He provided the men. He chartered the 'plane to send them to Newfoundland. So that there is not any question, there just is not any question as to the availability of the men. The men were assembled. They were in fact available, and a 'plane was chartered.

Last night, the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. in Ottawa telephoned to the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. in Newfoundland telling him that the men were not coming, that the plane had been cancelled, and the men were not coming to Newfoundland. The Superintendent tried at once to get in touch with the Attorney-General, but was not able to do so. He therefore telephoned to me and gave me the news. I could not believe it. I could not believe that the Government of Canada would in cold-blood violate, tear up, a solemn contract with another Government. I could not believe it. I succeeded in locating the Attorney-General, who in fact was between his house and his office, which was why the Superintendent had not been able to get him. And he came to my house at once. I telephoned, or the Attorney-General telephoned then to the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. and the Chief of Police (Chief Pittman) and others to come to my home to discuss the matter. I sent this telegram to the Prime Minister last night:

Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker
Prime Minister of Canada
Ottawa.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMS ME THAT THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE OF CANADA HAS CANCELLED TEMPORARILY THE DISPATCH OF FIFTY ADDITIONAL OFFICERS OF THE R.C.M.P. FOR DUTY IN THE PRESENT EMERGENCY IN CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND STOP NEWFOUNDLAND HAS A SOLEMN CONTRACT WITH YOUR GOVERNMENT COUCHED IN TERMS IDENTICAL WITH THE CONTRACTS SIGNED BY CANADA WITH SEVEN OTHER PROVINCES STOP UNDER THIS SOLEMN CONTRACT CANADA UPON REQUEST OF THE PROVINCIAL ATTORNEY-GENERAL COVENANTS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL R.C.M.P.

OFFICERS TO DEAL WITH EMERGENCY CONDITIONS SUCH AS PRESENTLY EXIST IN CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND STOP THE R.C.M.P. IN NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMED OUR ATTORNEY-GENERAL THAT AT LEAST FIFTY ADDITIONAL MEN WERE NEEDED AT ONCE AND THE COMMISSIONER IN OTTAWA WAS SO INFORMED STOP HE AGREED TO SUPPLY THE MEN AND SO INFORMED US STOP AN AIRCRAFT WAS CHARTERED BY THE R.C.M.P. TO BRING THE MEN TO NEWFOUNDLAND TO ARRIVE AT NINE THIRTY TONIGHT STOP THIS DISPOSES OF THE QUESTION OF THE AVAILABILITY OF THE MEN STOP WE ARE ASTONISHED TO LEARN THAT THEIR DEPARTURE HAS BEEN STOPPED FOR A CABINET MEETING IN OTTAWA NOT WITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT THE CONTRACT GIVES THE CANADIAN ATTORNEY-GENERAL THE RIGHT TO REFUSE ADDITIONAL MEN IN AN EMERGENCY ONLY IF THEY ARE NOT AVAILABLE STOP THE COMMISSIONER HAS ALREADY MADE THEM AVAILABLE SO THAT THIS IS NO REASON STOP I NOW ASK YOU TO SUPPLY US WITH THE ADDITIONAL R.C.M.P. MEN TO ENABLE US TO MAINTAIN LAW AND ORDER IN THIS EMERGENCY ACCORDING TO THE CONTRACT THAT EXISTS BETWEEN US STOP IF YOU CANNOT OR WILL NOT DO SO WILL YOU UNDERTAKE TO HAVE THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TAKE OVER THE RISK OF MAINTAINING LAW AND ORDER IN CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND STOP IF YOU WILL NOT GIVE US THE POLICE TO DO IT AS THE CONTRACT REQUIRES YOU TO DO THEN WILL YOU TAKE ON THE RESPONSIBILITY YOURSELVES OF MAINTAINING LAW AND ORDER IN THIS EMERGENCY.

J.R. SMALLWOOD:

I understand the Government of Canada were to hold a cabinet meeting today, and that it would probably be held somewhere around two o'clock Ottawa time. That is about now, as parliament would reassemble I believe at 2:30 p.m. The Attorney-

General, confronted, unbelievably, with the temporary or at least temporary tearing up of this solemn contract was driven to do something which he feared to do; that was to dangerously reduce the police force of St. John's to a mere 18 member shift to do all traffic duty, all criminal work and all general police work for this city of 75,000 which has no municipal police, as other cities do, and to send 50 of the city constabulary (Newfoundland Constabulary) away from the city to arrive in Grand Falls tonight, to augment the small band of policemen, R.C.M.P. and Constabulary in the centre of this island.

Mr. Speaker, the cancellation of the flight last night was announced as being something temporary, until this Cabinet meeting could be held. It may be that the Cabinet will decide, gladly or reluctantly, that they have to keep their contract; that Canada has to honour a solemn contract made, and the police be sent. If they decide not to honour their contract we will have to ask ourselves in Newfoundland, all of us who are Newfoundlanders long ever before we were Canadians, whether we can be treated like dogs even by the great Government of Canada. We will have to ask some very serious questions if it turns out that they can just rip up a contract before our eyes. And seven other provinces of Canada will have to ask themselves the question, whether the contract they have with the same Government, couched in the same language, is worth the paper it is written on. And then, Sir, other Governments outside Canada will be driven to ask themselves whether Canada's word is her bond; whether Canada will honour her own signature on her own solemn contracts. I will say no more on the subject at this moment, except this: We have, the Attorney-General and I (because they poured into me as they have to him) we have flooded with volunteers, with officers from Newfoundland of all kinds to enlist in some kind of civilian force to maintain law and order in this Province, in Central Newfoundland, in this emergency. Now I believe that the Attorney-General is going to add to what I have said. It is all properly his work. He is the Queen's principal law officer in Newfoundland. His is the task in the first instance of maintaining law and order. He can do it only with the loyal support of his colleagues and his friends and the peo-

ple of Newfoundland. I do hope he will have something to say on this.

Hon. L. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 1957, the Government of Newfoundland signed an agreement with Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada for the employment in Newfoundland of the R.C.M.P. This agreement is still in force. Clause 13 of this agreement, and I have it here, reads as follows: "Where in the opinion of the Attorney-General of the province an emergency exists within the province requiring additional members of the force to assist in dealing with such emergency Canada shall, (not may); Canada shall, at the request of the Attorney-General of the province, addressed to the Commissioner, increase the strength of the force as requested, if, in the opinion of the Attorney-General of Canada, having regard to other responsibilities and duties of the force, such increase is possible."

On Sunday, March 8, at the urgent request of the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. in Newfoundland, I, as Attorney-General of Newfoundland, requested by wire addressed to the Minister of Justice of Canada, additional R.C.M.P. personnel. In the meantime, I kept in close touch with the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. here, who in turn kept in close touch with the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. in Ottawa. I was advised by the Superintendent here that my message, addressed to the Minister of Justice, had not been delivered to the Minister of Justice because the latter was not in Ottawa, but that it had been received by the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P., and that it was being attended to. In the meantime, I was advised by the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. that the situation at Badger was worsening rapidly, and that immediate reinforcements might be necessary. As a result, 27 members of the Constabulary were dispatched by train leaving here Sunday at midnight. I had been assured by the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. here that the necessary men would arrive in Newfoundland to relieve these Newfoundland police as soon as transportation could be arranged. Yesterday, Wednesday, March 11, I was advised officially by the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. that 50 R.C.M.P. officers and men were being dispatched to

Grand Falls and would be arriving at Gander at 9:30 last night. I was astonished to be told early in the evening by the Premier, who in turn had been told by the Superintendent of the R.C.M.P. that the movement of these additional reinforcements had been cancelled.

Last night, I endeavoured to contact by telephone the Hon. David Fulton, Minister of Justice of Canada, but it was 11 p.m. before he could be located. I had a most unsatisfactory telephone conversation with him. He pointed out to me that under Section 13, we could not expect additional members of the force unless in the opinion of the Attorney-General of Canada (in other words, the Hon. Mr. Fulton) having regard to the other responsibilities and duties of the force, such increase is possible. The additional men requested by Newfoundland were available; indeed they were at Moncton Airport and their transportation to Newfoundland had been arranged. The Minister of Justice of Canada cannot, and I am sure will not, say that these men could not be spared by Canada, having regard to other responsibilities and duties of the force. Indeed, the hon. Mr. Fulton told me that the matter was before Cabinet and that it would be coming before Cabinet again today. He undertook to let me have an answer by this afternoon.

It is clear that considerations other than those provided in Section 13 are being considered at Ottawa. And, obviously, consideration of matters other than those set forth in Section 13 should not properly be considered. The failure of the Minister of Justice to have these men available to Newfoundland and to continue to make them unavailable is a flagrant breach of the R.C.M.P. contract, and it is doubtful if, under the circumstances, Newfoundland should consider renewing its contract with the R.C.M.P. after it has expired next year. If Canada can avoid its contractual obligations in this manner, there is nothing to assure us that when we wake up tomorrow morning the entire force may not be gone from Newfoundland. The R.C.M.P. is operated by a Commissioner; at the moment, Commissioner N.H. Nicholson. I submit, the Federal Cabinet has no right to interfere with the administration of the R.C.M.P. in violation of the terms of its contract.

The Newfoundland Government has no in-

tion of abandoning the town of Grand Falls and neighbouring towns to those irresponsible elements which would take over control. I have consequently arranged for 50 additional members of the Constabulary to proceed immediately to Grand Falls to substitute for the 50 R.C.M.P. officers and men who have failed to arrive. It would seem, in this case, that the Federal Government is being swayed in this matter by deliberately dishonest reports that have been published in Toronto papers, of the happenings at Badger last Tuesday night. The R.C.M.P., on that occasion, were in full charge of operations. They had not received and were not acting under any instructions from me. I am satisfied they performed their duties honestly, and in accordance with their own best traditions, which are undoubtedly good. Consequently, upon deciding to send additional members of the Constabulary to Grand Falls I wired the Canadian Minister of Justice the following message, so that he might know the true position and act accordingly: The message reads as follows:

RATHER THAN DESERT THE ENTIRE GRAND FALLS AREA YOUR R.C.M.P. AND OUR CONSTABULARY BOTH OF WHOM ARE ON THE SPOT TO THE MERCIES OF IRRESPONSIBLE ELEMENTS WHO HAVE SECURED AND ARE FINANCING FIVE HUNDRED SO-CALLED PICKETS IN CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND AND WHO WILL DERIVE GREAT CONFIDENCE FROM YOUR PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT THAT ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE TO YOUR POLICE FORCE HERE IS BEING DENIED ALTHOUGH TEMPORARILY I HAVE INSTRUCTED THE NEWFOUNDLAND CONSTABULARY THAT FIFTY ADDITIONAL MEN GO TO GRAND FALLS BY TRAIN LEAVING HERE NOON TOMORROW OTTAWA TIME UNLESS ASSURED IN THE MEANTIME THAT ASSISTANCE FROM COMMISSIONER WILL BE AVAILABLE STOP THIS WILL LEAVE ST. JOHN'S WITH FEWER THAN SIXTY POLICEMEN FOR GENERAL TRAFFIC AND CRIMINAL DUTIES AND EXTREMELY VULNERABLE BUT I HAVE NO ALTERNATIVE STOP UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES WILL THE NEW-

FOUNDLAND GOVERNMENT YIELD TO THREATS OR VIOLENCE.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Hear! Hear! Did you send that last night?

Mr. Curtis: A night letter last night so that it would be on his desk this morning. As soon as it was learned by the general public that additional constabulary are being sent to Grand Falls, I received numerous offers of assistance and I am satisfied that all necessary manpower is available. For instance, I had a call this morning from Superintendent Case of Her Majesty's Penitentiary telling me that 12 of his wardens, many of them former police officers, seeing the possible need of additional police for the policing of the city have volunteered their services after their normal day's work is over, in the hours from 7 p.m. to midnight, to do street duty. And absolutely without remuneration. I also have a message from Grand Falls reading as follows: "DUE TO THE PASSING OF THE CONSTABLE THROUGH AN ACT OF VIOLENCE BY THE I.W.A. PICKETS OVER FIFTY MEN LAST NIGHT REQUESTED ME TO WIRE YOU ON THEIR BEHALF ASKING THAT SPECIAL POLICE FORCE BE FORMED TO PROTECT BOTH HOMES AND FAMILIES AND THAT YOU WOULD HAVE NO TROUBLE GETTING REQUIRED AMOUNT STOP THEY FEEL ALSO THAT LADD AND HIS COHORTS LEAVE THE COUNTRY OR WE MAY HAVE TO TAKE SOME ACTION OURSELVES." I also have another wire, this one from Windsor:

"DUE TO RECENT TROUBLES EVEN DEATH OF A POLICE OFFICER RE STRIKE WE STRONGLY PROTEST THE PRESENCE OF I.W.A. OFFICIALS AND THEIR OFFICE IN WINDSOR STOP MAKE PUBLIC THIS MESSAGE BUT TREAT NAMES AS CONFIDENTIAL." Fear!

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Reprisals.

Mr. Curtis: There is a state of fear existing in this little part of God's Vin-yard. I have

read in the newspapers that groups in the city have likewise expressed a desire to assist. I trust that Canada will, in all honesty, live up to the terms of its contract and not make it necessary for us to accept any or all of these offers.

I would like to add just one more word in conclusion. There is an impression abroad - an impression apparently, I see in the newspapers that has now spread to Toronto - that the police in Newfoundland are enforcing some special law that we, as a house, passed last week. Of course the members of the police force at this moment and ever since this strike started, and for the future, are asked to do only one thing, and that is to observe the rules and to enforce the law as set forth in the Criminal Code of Canada. That is all they are doing. And I think this should be given the widest publicity. That is all they have been asked to do - that is all we expect them to do - enforce the Criminal Code, and that, Mr. Speaker, they are under contract to do.

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the Attorney-General a question relative to the statement just made, if it is in order - I am wondering whether copies of this statement made here, and indeed the statement of the hon. the Premier, will be airmailed directly to leading newspapers in Toronto as well as perhaps, certainly, to Newfoundland members of the House of Commons. Otherwise, I ask this question. Is the statement of the Attorney-General going to be received as he made it, by responsible parties in Ottawa, and for that matter Toronto? - seeing Toronto seems to be the place where the I.W.A. is able in some mysterious way to send out propaganda which is arousing the resentment of the entire population of Newfoundland, apart from the poor, deluded people led by this criminal element in there, whom we apparently are unable to dump in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, as most Newfoundlanders would like to do.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I would like to say if George Nightingale incited a riot in the city of St. John's it would not be long before he was arrested. Why are these men, who do not know local conditions, allowed to come in to this country and incite, (by paying the board and fare and

possibly something on the side) these men not only to rebellion but to actual killing another Newfoundlander, a young man with years ahead of him? I am sorry, Sir, I cannot say any more!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Hon. M. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the residents of Admirals Cove, Fermeuse, with regard to the condition of the road from Fermeuse to that settlement. This road, Sir, runs from the riverhead of Fermeuse along the north side of the harbour and unquestionably, during the past couple of years, has not received much attention. Priority, of course, during the past year or so has, of necessity, been given to main highways. But the road, Sir, in question is at the present time in very —

Mr. Speaker: Order! There is too much noise!

Mr. Murray: It is narrow with several blind spots in it, and in one place in particular, just going down into the settlement the road runs along the cliff and there is a sheer drop of 80 feet on the right hand side, which is extremely dangerous, and I think should receive early attention. The petition is signed by all the residents of the settlement, and also by the parish priest. I support the petition, Sir, heartily and I beg leave to lay it on the table of the house and ask leave to have it referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Would the house be willing, I wonder, to allow me to read this:

Mr. Speaker: Agreed: By leave:

Mr. Smallwood: It is a telegram from Grand Falls, and it is signed by Dr. Archibald Brown, St. Matthew's Presbyterian Church; Rev. S. Sheppard, Holy Trinity Anglican Church; Rev. A. Barrett, Memorial United Church; Rev. W. Baker, United

Church, Buchans; Capt. F.A. Jennings, Salvation Army: "Herewith copy of wire sent this morning addressed to Hon. D. Fulton, Minister of Justice, Ottawa: "IN VIEW OF THE ADVERSE CRITICISM IN THE HOUSE (meaning, I suppose, the House of Commons) WE FEEL COMPELLED TO ASSURE YOU OF OUR WHOLEHEARTED SUPPORT FOR OUR PREMIER AND THE LEGISLATION PASSED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY RE LABOUR UNIONS STOP MAINLAND NEWSPAPER SHOULD BE REPRIMANDED FOR SENDING ADDLE-BRAINED NEWS MEN WHO DISPATCH COMPLETELY GARBLED ACCOUNTS OF HAPPENINGS HERE STOP WE PAY HIGH TRIBUTE TO THE POLICE FORCE FOR THEIR COMMENDABLE RESTRAINT AND IMPARTIAL ACTIONS IN THE DISCHARGE OF THEIR DUTIES." This is signed by all of the clergymen of the churches noted. I may say that there are churches who have not signed this telegram who have sent other things just as strong, although their names are not attached to this particular telegram.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Hon. Dr. J. McGrath (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, when I was first asked by the "whip" to speak at this time, it was my intention to confine most of my remarks to matters dealing with my own department, the Department of Health, but at a time like this anyone who has the privilege of having the ear of this house and thereby to some extent the ear of the country could not possibly get up to speak and pass by in silence the situation that we have over in Central Newfoundland. What we have there, Sir, (as we all know except the Toronto papers) has long ceased to have any resemblance to a strike, to have any of the rights of a strike, but is simply planned terrorism designed to terrorize the law of this country and the people of this country and the Government of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many years ago when I was a much younger man than I am now, I lived for quite a time in a country where a

small minority refused to accept the laws of that country or the rules of the majority of the people and, precisely as we have at this moment in Newfoundland, they used the methods of organized violence to attempt to attain their end. And I know what it means to live in a community where this situation exists. I need not say my heart-felt sympathy goes out today to the ordinary, decent citizens of Grand Falls and Windsor and Badger, because I know what it means to be held up by a group of armed thugs, to be battered around, to be insulted and to have the deep humiliation of having to keep your tongue quiet because you know that if you made a protest it would mean the rifle butt or pistol butt in your face.

We know now, we have grim evidence, Sir, it does not need to be a pistol nor rifle butt but a junk of pulpwood makes an excellent weapon, as had been discovered by the "goons" over on the once peaceable West Coast. I have, Sir, with my own eyes seen people struck down in the streets of quiet cities by people who wanted to enforce their own will against the will of the majority. Now, it might be said that shooting is something which could not come to Newfoundland. A few days ago, we would have said this type of thing could not come to Newfoundland. It is only a matter of degree. We may not have the gunmen yet but we have the "goon squads" and where the "goon squads" are the gunmen are not far away; and it is not a big jump from blackmail and violence to bloodshed. And, Sir, we have had one instance of bloodshed, and let us hope we do not have another.

I cannot understand the attitude of the mainland press on this matter. From what I have seen, they seem to completely misunderstand the situation in Newfoundland. They speak as if this were something new, a new Act, a new trend brought in by the Premier alone, for his own purpose. They ignore completely the fact that the Premier has the backing not only of every single person in his own party, but every single person in the Opposition and obviously the backing of 90% of the ordinary, decent people of Newfoundland. Now, if it were admitted even that he had complete domination of his party (the members on this side) certainly he has no influence beyond his own party and certainly does not have complete domination over the Leader of

the Opposition and its members who stand shoulder to shoulder with the Government in this — good Newfoundlanders, I will say this, whatever we have disagreed about in the past and whatever disagreements we will certainly have in the future, nobody on this side of the house, after the support given in this instance, can have any doubt of their patriotism and conscience as Newfoundlanders.

The hon. member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf) in his speech only yesterday suggested that the time has passed for what he called passionate speeches. I know he meant well when he said that. But it is certainly very hard, Mr. Speaker, to be dispassionate. I am not one myself for passionate speeches. I am not very good at it. But I do not see how anybody can be temperate at a time like this when a young Newfoundland boy, in the course of his duty, is struck down and killed, and while struggling for his life for 32 hours, is slandered in the press and on television and radio by lying statements made by this man Landon Ladd, a man who, while the unfortunate officer was still in his last struggle for life, referred to him as a provoker of violence. In this case, my blood boiled, Mr. Speaker, and I make no apologies for speaking as passionately as I do.

I know the pattern we have seen. I have seen it in other countries and we have seen it in some parts of the United States and possibly even in some parts of Canada, but it is new to us here. They have their plausible pretences in the light of day and they talk about peaceful picketing, but we know what happens after dark. The order goes out, the secret, vicious order goes out to "goon squads" that results in what happened in Grand Falls only two days ago. As Churchill would say: "Some peace, some picketing." Mr. Speaker, I won't continue any further on this subject. It has been well covered already by other speakers, but I could not rise to my feet today without making it clear that my support, as is the support of every one on this side, is 100% behind the Premier in his efforts to have this evil taken out of Newfoundland. The evil is not only in the violence, although that is always to be deprecated, and where conditions are tense and men excited, spreading violence can happen and often does. But what is evil and cannot be tolerated and has to be wiped out

forever, if we are to know the Newfoundland we knew and loved in the past, is this planned and deliberate and brutal exploitation of organized violence as a policy, and that is what has been happening. I mean, anybody on the sane side of lunacy would have to know that and admit that. 100 men did not come from the West Coast area over to Grand Falls spontaneously and of their own accord and at their own expense. That was organized and highly organized, just as other disturbances were organized. And it is quite obvious who did the organizing. I do not know what chance the law has of laying hands on the men really responsible and who are, in my opinion, and I am sure in the opinion of this house, more the murderers of Constable Moss than the man who flung the "billy". The men who brought the condition about where such a thing was bound to happen, these men are morally guilty. I do not know whether the law can touch them. I do know that if it can, the Attorney-General will do his best to see that it does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in wartime (and what we have now is almost a civil war) ordinary life had to go on, and we have to deal with the ordinary business of the house and with the ordinary business of Government and the ordinary business of a department. So, I will now go on to speak on the main subject that I rose to speak on today. We all know, of course, that the Address does not contain everything. There were references to the Speech from the Throne by my hon. friend yesterday, regretting that certain things were left out of the speech. Amongst the things that were left out were the references to the health problem of Newfoundland. But that certainly does not mean, because they were left out of the Speech from the Throne, that no attention was going to be paid to them nor does it mean that because many other things had to be left out, no attention was going to be paid to them.

In this country at the present time, I think, the Department of Health is probably the largest spending department of Government, which is a pretty good indication of the attention the Government pays to that subject. Now I do not mean to quote very many difficult figures today. I think the house should fully realize the part that health has played in the work of the Government in the past ten or fifteen years.

Back in 1944, the expenditure on health in this country was only \$2.2 million. In 1949, when the present Government took office it was \$4.9 or nearly \$5 million, and this year it is nearly \$13 million. That is a tremendous jump in the funds that are made available in this Province. I must admit freely that we do not have at the present time enough hospital accommodation. We do not have enough accommodations for mental cases. These are two needs that stand out, and they could be remedied and remedied only in one way, by money. We have the knowledge. We have the men to administer it and if we had the money we could remedy this deficiency, and I hope this deficiency will be remedied in the near future and the money provided. That is all it is. We must all remember Newfoundland is essentially a poor Province. I do not think, I never expect myself to see the day when we shall have everything we need in the way of hospitalization. I do hope to see the day when we will have much better provision of hospitalization. That, I am afraid, is probably the most we can expect. Now, the main new things in the realm of health in the past year: of course, the first one, the adoption of a hospital insurance plan. That came in July, brought in by the Government at the earliest moment it could be brought in, as soon as the Federal Government made it possible. That meant that everyone in Newfoundland, as from the first of July, could receive ordinary hospital care without cost and without being a burden. That is a tremendous relief, I am sure, to the vast number of people in Newfoundland. As I said before, we are not a rich province. There are not many rich people here, and very few people, considering the cost of hospitalization today, did not find it a relief from a great burden to have that burden taken over by the State.

In the six months since that plan has been in force, the number of hospital admissions has been 21,000 and patient days 245,000. The cost, over the six month period, was approximately \$3 million, of which nearly \$3.2 million will be reimbursed to the Provincial Government. The estimated cost for the next year would probably be somewhere around \$5 or \$6 million, or possibly more, because it must be realized, even without the introduction of the hospital plan of this kind, costs of health services have gone up by nearly 15% per year over a matter of a

decade or more; so this increase, which would come in the next few years, is not entirely due to the Government plan. My hon. friend, the member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf) raised a question yesterday, at least not so much a question as a comment, when he said that perhaps because of the hospital shortage we had been rash in introducing this new plan. There are two answers to that. The introduction of the plan itself, while it might throw some extra strain on hospital accommodations, still was not responsible by any means for the amount of pressure there is, which pressure was building up anyhow. Also, not to go into the plan would have meant the people of Newfoundland would not be getting the free services, and secondly, it would mean a distinct financial loss to the Province. Money will be spent in improving public health because we actually were able to provide, through this plan, free service to everyone, without any cost to the Provincial Government for the time being. It is an actual financial gain, for the time being. In other words, if we are spending more money than we were, the amount of the reimbursement we get back is greater than the amount we previously spent, so that we end up actually with what I could, I suppose, call a profit on the transaction, for the time being. That would provide money for expansion of the services in the future. The Children's Health Plan was brought in, of course, before the national plan was carried on. For the whole of last year we had 11,815 admissions of children. While that would not entirely mean that number of children, it would be very close because very few are readmissions. It means something over 10,000 children received free medical attention and, of course, medical services as well. The number of days, 1,130,000, and the cost of hospitalization \$1,150,000, with about one-quarter or a little more capable of reimbursement because the Children's Health Plan has been running for a year and the general hospital plan for six months only. Total cost of health services under the Children's Hospital Plan was \$3,370,000. At the same time we have, as far as possible, expanded the dental services throughout the country, where there can be dental services — again one of the services very, very deficient in Newfoundland. But, Sir, in this case we can plead "not guilty". It is not a

question of funds; it is not a question of the Government nor the department being neglectful. The dentists are simply not available. We are in a position to finance far more than we have. We are simply not able to get them. In Newfoundland today, we have only about one third the number of dentists per population for the over-all average of Canada and I think only about one-fifth or one-sixth of the number found in the two central provinces. There does not seem to be at the present time any way of getting over that problem. What we do is: where we can get any dentists willing to go outside St. John's and in St. John's too as far as that goes, we provide them with part time salaries and provide places for them to work and equipment with which to work. In spite of that we have only been able to get very few. However I am glad to say that the scheme operated in St. John's, of course, and in 39 places outside St. John's for the past year. In St. John's the total of 1506 patients were treated and outside, 4,648. I am glad to mention these figures because somehow or other, the wrong impression has gotten abroad that this arrangement for children applied only to St. John's. It applies to the whole Province where it is possible for us to procure the services of a dentist.

Now last year the Premier announced the five year building plan, and during the past year the building was not so great. Last year, we hoped, would be the planning year, and thereafter, within the following four years actual building would go on. However it was not completely a blank. Some addition to the General Hospital was proceeded with all through last year, and this should be ready for occupation in July of this present year. The plans for the new Nurse's Home have been completed and the plans for the Children's Hospital in St. John's are under way. Part of the Sanitarium, which had been vacated last year is now ready for mental cases, and we hope to have about 200 mental beds available there within a very short time. Expansion has been made to two cottage hospitals; in Old Perlican 40 extra beds have been provided making it now one of the finest we have, and an extra six beds provided in Fogo Hospital.

We also carried out our plan in attempting to attract doctors to the outports. That is one of the continuing worries of the de-

partment — the outport service for doctors and nurses. We found that in order to get doctors we have to provide houses for them. In the past year we provided Gander, Gambo, Jeffrey's, Burin, and St. Joseph's with houses, and a house at Lourdes has been renovated. The situation regarding medical personnel is still difficult, although not so difficult as is that concerning nursing personnel. Last year, I think, I made some reference to that, and will make some reference to it again. As far as medical officers in existing medical stations are concerned we are not too badly off. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries will be glad to know we have at last secured a doctor for Rose Blanche, on the Southwest Coast. The Southwest Coast is a difficult area in any event. The hon. Minister himself referred to the absence of roads down there. It is a difficult place to get men to go. It is isolated and difficult to service. So far we have fortunately been able to keep the service going, and this year we were able to add a new medical station at Ramea Island, where there is now a doctor in residence.

The situation with regard to nurses, however, is definitely bad and has been bad for years, and it is one that is causing us considerable worry. At the present time we have only about four nursing stations vacant. Those have been established for some time, but it is absolutely impossible for us to extend that very necessary service to very many places that need it very badly. We will have about 24 vacancies by July, and I am unable to tell the house how to fill them at the present time.

There is one other point which might interest hon. members. Last year during the sleet storm, some of the hospitals were cut off from electrical power. We did not want that to happen again. We could not risk that. Now practically all hospitals, certainly all in St. John's, both Government, and St. Clare's and the Grace, with Government assistance, have auxiliary power plants, and are more or less completely safe from any interference with power lines due to weather conditions.

The only other remark I have to make at this time is to refer, as I said, to the fact that what we need to develop our hospital services is money, and I hope we shall soon be hearing from Term 29. My hon. friends on the other side, I am glad to know, are just as

anxious to hear from Term 29 as we are. I did hear a rumor going around St. John's (I do not know if it has any validity) that we should possibly hear something about that at the end of this month, the tenth anniversary of Confederation. I hope the only reason it has been kept under wraps so long is that the Prime Minister proposed, on our tenth birthday, to surprise and delight us with the generosity and amplitude of the settlement. I was reminded by the hon. member for Bell Island (Mr. O'Driscoll) that I had forgotten to state a contract is now under process of being completed with the Federal Government for the erection of a new Veteran's Hospital in St. John's, and as soon as it is complete I hope the work will start on that hospital during the current year.

On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes after which the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Clarke) took the Chair as Speaker.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE:

Mr. M. Whalen (Harbour Main): I would like first, Sir, to congratulate the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) who moved the Address in Reply and the hon. member for Carbonear—Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke) who seconded the motion. Both speakers did a very excellent job. I would like also to congratulate the other speakers. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a pleasure to hear the Speech from the Throne, and to hear of the coming visit of Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness, Prince Philip, in June of this year. May I express the wish, Sir, that this visit will be attended by happy and memorable circumstances for Her Majesty and the Prince, and also for the people of Newfoundland. It was gratifying, Sir, to note the concern expressed in the Speech from the Throne for the bereaved families of the fishermen who were lost in the "Blue Wave", and also a source of satisfaction to see the generous response which has been made, and continues to be made by the public of Newfoundland to help to alleviate some of the hardships resulting from this terrible tragedy.

Mention has been made, Mr. Speaker, of further discussions with the Federal Government relative to Term 29. It is under-

standable, Sir, that the Federal Government would need sufficient time to consider a matter of importance, but surely, Mr. Speaker, this period has been stretched to the utmost, and it is high time they did come across with a settlement. I am wondering now, Mr. Speaker, if, considering the amount of this settlement, the fact of the decrease, the continuous decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar has been taken into account. I know this argument has been fully covered many times, but I think, Sir, that it is an important consideration, and I think that the Federal Government should give it some consideration, whether it is in the form of an annual increase or in some other way. It could be said Mr. Speaker, that argument works both ways and we would stand to gain if the purchasing power of the dollar went up, but I do not see much hope of that, Sir, and in fact the experts in finance seem to hold out little chance of any increase in the value of our money during our lifetime. The history of money has been one of consistent inflation, and there have been times, certainly, when the value of the dollar increased, but these were only temporary, and in the long run inflation always seems to win out.

We have also heard, Mr. Speaker, of some new developments in the Lake Wabush Area of Labrador. It will be interesting to see what these developments are. It goes without saying that everything possible should be done to help to expedite any arrangements being made in this area of rich resources if it will be a benefit to the economy and provide some work for our people.

Most encouraging of all, Mr. Speaker, has been what amounts to a determination, an all-out determination on the part of the Government, to increase the standard of education and equalize opportunities for our young people in this field. Few people realize the value of education, and very few people realize that the survival of our democratic institution at the present time depends to a great extent on the ability of our young people to cope with the inroads of Communism and other allied cults and idealisms. These evils, which used to be fairly remote from us, have come right to our very doors and even entered our homes. They take on many different guises and have many specialists in human

psychology who are past-masters in the art of infiltration. They make most gains in sections of society where there is poverty and lack of education, and do their work chiefly with the young mind where they loose no time in the moulding. The hon. member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf) hit the nail on the head when he said there is a battle going on for the minds of our young people. Never before was there such a need for sound training and education to enable people, especially young people, to see these things in their true value and to make them immune to the poisonous venom already seeping into some sections of our economy through the agency of the Kremlin; in fact, Mr. Speaker, to enable us all to continue to breathe the fresh air of our own Newfoundland.

If there is anybody anywhere in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, who has his doubts that this danger is remote, his or their argument is far-fetched. Surely they must have been asleep for the past two months. Anyone who has followed world development or world conditions over the past 20 years, who has followed the methods used by the totalitarian states in their methods of achieving their aim can spot them anywhere. The pattern is the same wherever used, whether in Moscow, Berlin or Badger. Who else, Mr. Speaker, but these masters who have been experts for years could corrupt, could compel our Newfoundland men to assist in sacrificing their young Newfoundland manhood. But, I believe, Mr. Speaker, these young men will come to realize where they are heading and what they have done, and will be thoroughly ashamed of themselves. I do not believe we have so many people in Newfoundland like that, Mr. Speaker. They could never have acted in this way except under some sort of compulsion — Let us in our judgment give them the benefit of that one redeeming fact.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going into the matter of the woods labour dispute. I think the issue is far bigger than the simple signing of a contract between labour and management. The issue is one between our traditions, our way of life under a democratic system and the forces seeking to destroy them. I know that is not going to happen tomorrow or the day after. The issue has been realized, the dangers are very real and the sooner we become fully aware of them

the better we will be able to meet them. I do not think this is exaggerating the situation one bit, Mr. Speaker. I am just going by the facts as I see them. The biggest fact of all, Sir, is that almost half the world's population have become slaves. Most of them in recent years have been tricked by their own complacency in the face of these same tactics used right now in Central Newfoundland. Let us broaden the scope of our legislation to eradicate the evil and establish procedures, if we must. The situation calls for courage. These lawless things must be destroyed or they will destroy us.

Mr. Speaker, since we look forward to the forthcoming Term 29 payments from Ottawa this year, I know this will be welcomed by every member of this house and in all sections of the province. Work that is badly needed has been left undone pending these payments, and there is no doubt that all hon. members will be looking forward to getting some of this backlog cleared up this year. We have in Harbour Main district about five localities lacking electric facilities, all of which are relatively close to power outlets. We sincerely hope to get some of these requirements taken care of this year or at least in the near future. There is also a tremendous increase in traffic, Mr. Speaker, and this has broken down roads, particularly local roads, to the extent that some of them are well nigh impassable. There is also a great hazard where local roads traverse high seashore embankments, making it extremely dangerous for motor traffic. Some of these roads need reclassification, so as to come under the road building and maintenance scheme of the Department of Highways. People have to depend now on motor traffic for their livelihood, which is part of progress. That has been thrust upon us, and we must not back down, but must do our best to cope with it. It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, to get things moving a little faster in this direction this year. In fact, Sir, we will keep badgering, whether those in the department like it or not, to get our fair share of what is to be done along these lines.

Again, Sir, I want to repeat what I said in the last session of this house; the problem of marketing needs more intense study. There is definite need for a farmers' market in or near St. John's and a cold storage somewhere on the south shore of Conception

Bay, and also one, Mr. Speaker, in the north end of Harbour Main District, which could be used for squid, blueberries and vegetables and meat products. Our farmers face almost overwhelming odds. They have not the organization nor the facilities to compete in their own markets. They produce meat and vegetables and find them hard to sell for the shopkeeper next door sells the imported produce. The Government is doing a very fine job of assisting farmers by way of land clearing and bonuses where the farmer clears his own land and in many other ways almost too numerous to mention. It is not the fault of the Government. There is something lacking in organization amongst the farmers particularly on the Avalon Peninsula. As long as the farmer prefers to work alone, his individual problems will be greater as time goes on. There are big things available under Government legislation for farmers if they would only get together in co-operative societies or some other type of community effort. The Government can help a lot where there is a concerted effort on the part of a community, but they can not go out and take an individual farmer and build a cold storage or set up a farmers marketing organization. It cannot be done that way. That is where, as I said, Mr. Speaker, there is room for more intense study, to see what can be done to get farmers organized so advantage can be taken of whatever assistance there is available.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Would the hon. gentleman tell us before he concludes — I notice when driving back and forth Conception Bay highways as I pass through Colliers, what appears to be a new building on the left hand side of the road, which appears to be some kind of a cold storage. It is partly underground and partly over-ground. Is that the building which the hon. gentleman discussed with me, for a cold storage out there? Could he tell us about that?

Mr. Whalen: Mr. Speaker, that is a private building. It is used for vegetable storage, alright. It is not the one.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of the Bill, "An Act To Amend the Fire Insurance Act, 1957."

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is purely a formal measure. As the house knows, each province of Canada has a superintendent of insurance, and these insurance superintendents meet annually. They have superintendents' conferences, and they consult with the insurance firms and usually recommend certain legislation to the various provinces. We have an agreement with the other provinces and with the conference to adhere to the principles of uniformity of legislation, so that the legislation in all ten provinces along these lines, is uniform. The reason for bringing in this amendment to the Fire Insurance Act is purely for the purpose of uniformity and along the lines of recommendations made at the conference of fire insurance superintendents. Briefly, Sir: Section (2) repeals the existing section and substitutes another. In actual fact, all it means is that it excludes certain forms of fire insurance from ordinary fire insurance policies. Under this new section, Sir, fire insurance against aircraft, automobile boiler machinery and insurance arising out of nuclear risks and similar fire insurance risks are excluded definitely from fire insurance policies. Of course, such things can be provided for in other forms. As I said, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is purely a formal one. It is for the purpose of uniformity, and I do not think there is anything whatever contentious about it.

Mr. George Nightingale (St. John's North): Might I ask whether the damage by frost on boilers in residences has to be excluded? At the present time they are covered under the present policies.

Mr. Murray: This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. Nightingale: I thought it might be going to cut the rates for a while. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To

Amend the Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957."

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this is also purely routine for the purpose of uniformity, arising out of the conference of insurance superintendents. This amendment is also very, very minor, and says title as to statutory conditions does not have to be numbered formally.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill: "An Act to Amend the Newspapers and Books Act."

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move second reading of this Bill. It is really very simple. As you know, all the newspapers and or periodicals have to be registered with the Department of Provincial Affairs. That part of the Act has always been in force, but there is no provision whereby publishers must notify the department when publication ceases. The effect of this section is to make provision so that when a newspaper has decided to go out of circulation or ceases to be issued it is supposed to notify the Department of Provincial Affairs, so that, from then on, they will be able to close the file and not wonder at what date the periodical ceased publication. It is purely a Bill to enable the department to function efficiently. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am not against the principle. I am in favour of the principle. Is there any penalty clause attached?

Mr. Curtis: There is a penalty in the main act.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I rise, like my friend the Leader of the Opposition, to support the Bill but also that I may ask a question. It is intended, I think, that one copy at least, of every book and magazine and newspaper published, is by law required to be deposited. I believe one copy of every publication, be it book or magazine, pamphlet or newspaper or anything else must be deposited, by law, in the library of Congress in the United States and

in England in the British Museum, and the University of Edinburgh and the University of Dublin. The result is, of course, therefore, that in both countries there is one central place where you can see a copy of every publication there is. I wonder now — in Newfoundland before Confederation, in the department that used to be called the Department of the Colonial Secretary and which is now known as the Department of Provincial Affairs, every publication issued had to have one copy deposited, and in fact I believe it might have been two, but certainly one copy of every issue of the publication. The daily newspaper meant six copies a week. You can go down now to the Public Library and see the "Newfoundlander" with E.C. Shea (Sir Edmund Shea) in his own handwriting on the first page of every copy. There were also other editors as well, and I myself have hundreds of times signed my name on the front, top margin of a newspaper, as editor, of the copy that was sent to the Colonial Secretary. It just occurred to me, is that still done?

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Yes.

Mr. Smallwood: Newspapers, monthly magazines in every field?

Mr. Murray: Yes.

Mr. Smallwood: What about books? Mr. Perlin just published a book — Is a copy of that placed on file?

Mr. Murray: No.

Mr. Smallwood: Well is there in Canada a Canadian Law which requires a deposit in one central place in Ottawa of a copy of every publication that is issued?

Mr. Renouf (St. John's South): I asked in recent times where there was anything of that sort. I am not quite sure of my facts, but I did hear from a friend of the minister up there that there was something of that sort. Although I am not sure of the details, I had the impression there is something of that sort either already established or underway.

Mr. Smallwood: My hon. and learned friend is probably referring to the archives

of Canada. That is a case where in the first instance they deposit historic documents collected and to be collected, and then subsequently became designated as the place for deposit for contemporary documents, Government documents and reports and everything that could be considered as source material for future historians. But that may or may not be the place in which contemporary publications and books are deposited. I do not know. It would seem to be a very serious omission if Canada has not got such a system as that. Now the Library of Parliament is, of course, a very rich source of material, but there may not be any law requiring that a copy of the "Evening Telegram", the "Daily News", or "Sunday Herald", "Grand Falls Advertiser", "Western Star", "Fishermen's Advocate" etc. each be deposited. I know, as an actual fact, as you go into the reading room of the House of Commons, not the main library, the periodicals reading room, I think you will see just about every Newfoundland Periodical there on display for the members to read. But I do not know if that is true of books — It would be interesting to know. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I would move that all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday, at three o'clock.

March 13, 1959

(Friday Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

I.W.A. (Ministerial Statement)

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this morning I sent the following telegram to the Prime Minister of Canada: "RIGHT HONOURABLE JOHN DIFENBAKER PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA OTTAWA — IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE ORDER AND GOOD GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AND TO

PROTECT THE GOOD NAME OF THE R.C.M.P. THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND INVITES THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO SET UP AT ONCE A PUBLIC ENQUIRY UNDER A SUPREME COURT JUDGE FROM OUTSIDE NEWFOUNDLAND TO INVESTIGATE THE ACTS OF LAWLESSNESS AND VIOLENCE WHICH HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN CENTRAL NEWFOUNDLAND SINCE THE STRIKE OF THE LOGGERS BEGAN ON DECEMBER THIRTY-FIRST FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASCERTAINING THE FACTS AND ASSESSING THE RESPONSIBILITY STOP THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND WOULD EXTEND EVERY FACILITY AND ASSISTANCE TO SUCH A COMMISSION IN ITS ENQUIRY STOP

SIGNED JOSEPH R. SMALLWOOD."

Mr. Speaker, I was authorized today by a very high dignitary in Central Newfoundland to say that, in connection with the riot that occurred at Badger Wednesday night, when some 300 I.W.A. picketers brutally attacked the R.C.M.P. and Newfoundland Constabulary and killed one policeman, the nuns in the convent at Badger, in front of which the rioters had passed a few minutes before the riot broke out, saw the rioters as they passed along the street in front of the convent and took particular notice of the fact that these picketers were heavily armed with clubs, pieces of pulpwood and other kinds of sticks. Now I am authorized to make that statement publicly.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that a large number of war veterans at Grand Falls and Windsor have held a meeting and pledged their support to the police and legal authorities of Central Newfoundland for the maintenance of law and order; 250 fit and able war veterans have enlisted for this purpose. They have divided themselves into platoons under platoon leaders and announced that they are prepared to go anywhere in Central Newfoundland for the purpose of assisting the authorities to maintain law and order. I am further informed that the war veterans of Botwood have also met and have taken precisely the same action. They too had divided themselves into platoons under platoon leaders and have so

informed the police. They are prepared to go anywhere in Central Newfoundland to help maintain law and order. Although I omitted to note the fact in this prepared statement I may add orally, they number about 70 men, fit and able. I am still further informed that the war veterans of Bishop's Falls are meeting tonight to consider the whole situation. And, Sir, since I prepared this statement I am still further informed that the war veterans of Springdale have met and made the same offer of their services to the authorities to assist in the maintenance of law and order.

Applause from both sides of the house:

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that the house will regret to hear I have been informed by His Excellency the Bishop of Harbour Grace — Grand Falls he has found it necessary to move the Sisters of the Presentation Order teaching in Badger from that community and they will not be returning until such time as law and order will be completely restored, and therefore the school in which they have been teaching will be closed to the children.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the inhabitants of Pouch Cove in the District of St. John's North, which reads as follows: "We the inhabitants of Pouch Cove, in the District of St. John's North humbly pray (1) The main highroad to Pouch Cove is very much in need of widening and repair, with special attention to guard rails being erected opposite the regional library building near the edge of the cliff, which has a drop of over 100 feet, and where two men recently lost their lives when their car went over the cliff due to lack of proper hand rails being there. (2) That part of the highway North of Grouchy's Store, which is dangerous and narrow, the bridge not being adequate, the fact that the flow of water sometimes spills over the road to a depth of four, or five feet a guard rail is also essential on the side of the road near the river and the embankment there. (3) A guard rail near Mr. Primrose's residence and the United Church School to safeguard a dangerous embankment.

Mr. Speaker, there are 121 names on this petition. I might say the Government have done quite a lot in that particular respect but did not go far enough. For the last two years I have been asking the Government to complete this guard rail. They have gotten so far, just in front of the Roman Catholic Church in Pouch Cove. We need to continue this guard rail to make it especially safe because the place where it is totally missing is the most dangerous part of this road and the steepest incline and cliff over which nobody would have a chance once a car went over. I have been informed before by the Minister that it was impossible to place a guard rail here, but in further conversation with the highroads foreman he tells me that a rail can be reinforced by going to the rock and building the road and edging practically from the rock up, and therefore widening the road in its present position and making the thing safe for everybody in the district, and anybody who chooses to motor in that district.

I beg to lay this petition on behalf of the inhabitants of Pouch Cove on the table of the house, and I am sure all members of the house will back me in this petition, as well as the Opposition who know the place very well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates:

Questions No. 13 and 16 tabled (See appendix)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my first obligation in conformance with the courtesy of this house is to extend my contratulations to the two hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the motion for an Address in Reply. One of them is entitled to the appellation of "honourable and learned." The second is only about half way along the course. I do not know what to call him. But as one attending the house for a few years I can appreciate the peculiar difficulty that was theirs on opening day of this year. Certainly not for many years have two of the younger members of the Legislature been called upon to

speak in an atmosphere that was quite as tense as existed here on opening day, and despite the fact that any speeches following the opening announcement of the Leader of the house were of necessity bound to be some what anticlimactic, I think it can reasonably be said that both the hon. gentlemen credited themselves with distinction. It has been my happy privilege to know both for quite a few years. It is to be expected that they would do a competent job. The hon. Member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) is, of course, one of that noble self-sacrificing band which laboured for the public and the other in a few years, I trust, will have his licence to prey upon that same public.

However, Mr. Speaker, this unfortunately, is not a time for levity. The one factor which more than anything else has been absorbing the attention not only of this legislature, but of Newfoundland as a whole and to a very great extent the whole Dominion of Canada, and I have no doubt at all a considerable section of the great United States is the situation that was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne with admirable restraint as the turbulence existing in the pulp and paper industry. It is hardly necessary to comment on the fact that this turbulence, instead of diminishing, has become aggravated, that events have marched to the dreadful climax where a young officer was killed in the execution of his duty. I realize, Sir, that anything I might say on the subject would be repetitious but I do not think that one could have too much repetition with respect to the whole picture of this present situation. Our country, (and I use the word "country" now in the sense that we in this Legislature have been using it in the sense of Newfoundland) has been subjected to the press of the Mainland of Canada to a barrage of propaganda (and by "propaganda", Sir, I use the word in its basest connotation). We in this Legislature have been described as either a combination of would-be dictators or else a group of rubber stamps who obediently put their seal to whatever is suggested to them by a power-mad despot.

There has been a lot of "high-falutin" talk going about in St. John's and in other places in Newfoundland and other places outside Newfoundland about the flouting by this Legislature of the basic human rights; of the trampling under foot of the sacred rights of labour. In short, Mr. Speaker, what some of

the younger generation would refer to as a "lot of guff." There are people who know little and who apparently care even less about the facts of this dispute; who were talking through their hats, uttering fine high-sounding words which have no meaning either to themselves or to the people who hear them. There has been, as I say, a great deal of fevered oratory, of injured pointing to the basic human rights, but very few people outside this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, have bothered to address themselves as to what are the basic responsibilities of a government, of any government. I am not talking about this government in particular but of any government. It has been stated here (and I fully concur) by the leader of this house that the first duty of any government, forgetting welfare, forgetting education, forgetting health, the first duty of any government of any country is the preservation of law and order, to ensure that the ordinary people, the ordinary men and women of this Province, should be allowed to go about their avocations in peace. And any government that cannot ensure that right and is not prepared to take whatever action is necessary, within the confines of its authority, to protect that right is not fit to be in office.

Now, Sir, I respect the rights of labour. Everybody in this Legislature, in my honest belief, respects the rights of labour. But, Sir, one can respect the rights of labour and still not be misled and not be cajoled or not be brow-beaten by a lot of the woolly-headed thinking that is all too prevalent not only in Newfoundland, but to a much greater extent, all throughout Canada and throughout the United States. I say, Sir, and I know that I speak for everybody in this house, that labour has a perfect right to organize and a perfect right to expect that the privilege of all free men anywhere in the British Commonwealth, or indeed under the Anglo-Saxon rule of law, to band themselves together for their mutual advantage will be respected; because, Sir, that is all, really, that a union is. A union is nothing more than a group of people getting together, joining together in a union for their mutual benefit, be it to get better working conditions, to get better wages, to get a better recognition of their particular trade or avocation, or if it only be the right of any group of men to get together and form a

club like any of the societies we have here in this country, or even to go to the extent of joining together for the protection afforded by group insurance. As I say, Sir, that right is fundamental but let us not forget the labour or government, that any labour union or combination of labour unions is not an institution of divine origin. It is only a group of human beings gathered together for their own particular benefits. It is not created by the Almighty. It has not got any particular sacred charter. To suggest, therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, that any union or any group of unions has any rights that transcend the national interest is to talk sheer nonsense. And yet that is what we are told by implication today. We hear talk about the sacred rights that are trampled underfoot. Mr. Speaker, in the name of common sense what rights have been trampled under foot?

Sir, for the past 10 years at least, I have been — publicly inside this Chamber, for the last eight years (and outside it before that) on opposite poles from the gentleman who leads the Government of Newfoundland. There has never been any mistake in the public mind, or indeed in my own mind but that our political philosophies differ. But, Sir, when I think back over these years and when I think that this man (who was in his time the master of propaganda in its finer sense is, today — the one time I would say when he speaks for at least 90 percent of all Newfoundland) because of the actions of Mainland news media — strangled practically, and unable to present our case properly to the world; it seems to me, Sir, to be more than a minor tragedy. I think it is sickening, Sir, sickening to see right across Canada, men of stature, men in public life apparently wanting to curry favour with the people who head up the labour movement, slavishly paying tribute to what they refer to as the rights of labour, protesting against the horrible actions of these people in Newfoundland who have violated the sacred rights. When you hear a man like the Premier (I think it is) of Alberta coming out with that stuff and a gentleman who aspires to the Premiership of Ontario; when you hear these people, most of whom have no more knowledge and no more interest in what is happening in Newfoundland than in what is happening in Nyasaland, when

they get up, Sir, there is something about it that just does not add up.

There are 266 members, Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian House of Commons; 266 members, and from time to time during the year I have no doubt that a great many of these hon. gentlemen are prepared to go from here to Rangoon — from here to Timbuku — and they have gone on visits and missions — and that is not confined to any one party. Has any one of these gentlemen considered coming down to Newfoundland to find out firsthand the real truth of the matter? No! But still, we have a gentleman named Hazen Argue, I think it is (he is obviously well-named) — Hazen Argue is the most interested gentleman in the rights of the labour party, the rights of the I.W.A. I wonder, Sir, is Mr. Argue interested in the I.W.A., is he interested in the Newfoundland logger or is he merely taking advantage now of what he seems to be a very good opportunity to mend the political fortunes of a sadly depleted party?

When you heard today, Sir, (some 10 or 15 minutes ago, in this house) that because of the violence that occurred in the community of Badger a few days ago, the Bishop of Harbour Grace found it necessary to remove the Sisters from Badger and that, in consequence, the children there are deprived of the schooling that the Sisters were giving them. Is it not a little bit of mockery, Sir, to then hear the I.W.A. talk about basic human rights, when they deny children the right to education, when they deny these Sisters, whose lives are dedicated to nothing but the services of others, the right to stay in a community in peace? It is rather difficult, Sir, to reconcile that type of action with the protestations of devotion to the interests of the ordinary people to which we have been listening.

Now, Sir, it has been suggested that the legislation which refers to the I.W.A. is discriminatory. There is no doubt about it, it is discriminatory. Why should it not be discriminatory? If I may, Sir, the situation is very well explained by a quotation from an editorial in yesterday's newspaper, and the gentleman says he is referring to the suggestion that has been made in a good many Mainland newspapers that there is no need for this hasty action. Now as the editorial of this paper said, "Mainland newspapers may charge this was not the proper way that it

should have been done. It should have been done by the Labour Relations Board." But, Sir, the fact is that, if the decertification had gone through the regular process, it would take so long that Newfoundland would be ruined before the matter was settled. When a man is bitten by a snake he does not have time to debate what antidote will leave the least possible after-effects — he seizes the first one at hand. And, gentlemen, that is, in my humble opinion, the position that confronted the Government of this Country at the time. It is a poor consolation, you know, when a burglar comes into the house with a gun, to know that if you had time you could call the policeman and have him taken away. We could not afford to do anything other than what was done. The government has simply acted in this case with commendable promptitude, and in my humble opinion, with absolute propriety.

It is interesting to note, Sir, that this legislation that has been denounced so bitterly, whilst it may have for the first time been brought out in Newfoundland, is not without emulation. The current issue of a periodical that has been widely quoted in recent sessions of this House, "Time Magazine" today reports that in British Columbia similar legislation has been introduced by the Minister of Labour and that already the war drums are starting to beat there. It is an extraordinary coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that in the two provinces of Canada that have found it necessary to introduce this legislation, the dominant figure seems to be the I.W.A. Now, Sir, that may be coincidence, but it is extraordinary; the two furthest ends of Canada both of them suffering from the plague of the I.W.A., both of them taking similar measures. I wonder now will the Government of British Columbia be subjected to the same type of propaganda that we in this Legislature have been suffering from. It will be interesting to see.

However, Sir, as the Minister of Health (Dr. McGrath) remarked yesterday, despite all these "alarums and excursions", despite the fact that the principal object of our attention at the present time is the situation existing in the woods, we could not, as he very properly remarked, entirely ignore the day-by-day course of the affairs of government. I grant you that the situation of today certainly does not lend itself to the objective

discussion or even the partisan discussion of the every-day affairs of running the country. On the other hand, Sir, it is our obligation more particularly on this side of the house, as the representatives of the people, not to allow ourselves to be diverted entirely from the other aspects of government housekeeping, if I may use that phrase.

Sir, today we are at the stage where economic development on a grand scale is no longer with us. No more do we see the headlines about the new industries. We are at the position, Sir, where we must take stock; we must examine the situation as it exists. Where are we and where do we go from here? I don't know the figure, Sir, but I do know that the number of people who are today on relief is alarmingly high. I know, and everybody in this house knows, that the employment picture is not good at the moment and we cannot, unfortunately, Sir, look with too much hope for any marked improvement in the immediate future. Because it is a fact that, forgetting for the moment such projects as Crown-Zellerbach, which might have provided in a few years very considerable employment, let us consider, Sir, the position that exists today in the established industries.

We know that Bell Island, despite the short extension of the closing down that has been secured through the good office of the Premier himself, despite that, we know that 550 men are going to be out of work come May 1. There is every reason, Sir, reading between the lines of the manager's statement, that 550 by no means represents the number that will sooner or later be also out of work. Now, Sir, I don't know what the explanation is. It is very easy when one has not got all the facts to jump to wild conclusions. It is an unfortunate coincidence that, subsequent to the taking over of the Dosco Operations by the A.V. Roe Company, there seems to have been a general curtailment in the operations of the company in the Maritimes and in Newfoundland. I do not know whether that is a calculated plan, whether the company has some idea of gradually phasing out. It cannot be, Sir, that there is a lack of ore on Bell Island. We were told (I think it was only 12 months ago) that Bell Island has enough stocks of ore to last for many, many, years, certainly several lifetimes yet. Yet it seems paradoxical that we can be talking in this house about de-

veloping the vast iron ore of Labrador when here we have a proven deposit with established markets curtailing.

We have, Sir, the situation that exists in St. Lawrence. We have not heard too much about St. Lawrence in recent weeks, but we do know that St. Lawrence is definitely in a very difficult position. We know that there was an approach made to the Tariff Board of Canada for some consideration, some protective measures, to be taken to enable the mines at St. Lawrence to operate on a more economically sound basis. If I remember correctly, that application was not acceded to by the Tariff Board. I am sure my hon. friend from Harbour Main (Mr. Whelan) is much more conversant with that situation than I. But, Sir, I believe that is the position. We do know that even, if tomorrow the I.W.A. were to break up and leave our shores, that Grand Falls and Corner Brook are not going to operate at full capacity and indeed I believe it was the hon. Minister of Education the other day who pointed out they have not been operating at full capacity for some considerable time. So then the avenues of employment in the established industries are for the immediate future, and perhaps unfortunately for some considerable time in the future, definitely and drastically curtailed.

Now, Sir, what is in sight? Are we going to become increasingly dependent on public works projects from Ottawa? These may be all right, Sir — good things. Nobody is going to deny it. But public works projects always seems to smack to me, and I am quite sure to a great many people in this house, of election promises carried out and a form of bribery, dole, call it what you like. There is nothing constructive about building a government building, be it a customs house or dockyard or an R.C.M.P. barracks in St. Anthony. That is not creating employment. I grant you it is making jobs for the time being. When that is done it is done. Today more and more of our people have come almost to look upon the receipt of unemployment insurance as a normal incident of life. There is another section of the population that very largely bases its living upon the social assistance and old age pensions payments. Now all these things, Sir, are good in themselves. I am not by any means attempting for a moment to decry them. But I do say, Sir, that there is a very real

danger — I may perhaps be overstating it, but I don't think so — there is a very real danger, Sir, that we are becoming in fact economically, as well as politically, a mere appendage of Canada.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): A poor colony?

Mr. Higgins: A poor colony, yes. As a matter of fact I don't think they ever refer to us as a poor relation. They almost seem to wish they could forget us. Now that the geographical entity has been rounded out, nobody wants to hear about Newfoundland very much — at least if one can gather from the stony silence that answers any questions about Term 29.

Now, I am not here, for obvious reasons, to attack the Dominion Government. They know their own business on that score. But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody in Newfoundland who can blind himself to the fact that we do have to get some understanding and get it very soon, on the financial terms of union. I do not care if it costs \$2 million to prepare Newfoundland's case. That is incidental. We have a case, and we certainly are entitled to expect that any government, and I don't care if it were the CCF party in power in Ottawa, we have certain rights. We are guaranteed them and I for one see no justification for their being overly-long delayed. But, Sir, that gets us back again to the position of — "Where do we go from here?" What is the answer to our position with respect to unemployment? Sir, one can only sympathize with the government to some extent on this. On the other hand, Sir, it is the responsibility of the party that is ruling this country, the government of this country, to come up with some answers to the problems that presently beset us. One has to take, with the fruits of office, the responsibilities. At the present time, Sir, I venture to hazard the suggestion that the thorns are much more plentiful than the roses. But, Sir, the people of this country are looking to the government for an answer to what, if anything (within its power) is going to be done to improve the situation.

Sir, if I may, there are one or two comments on a minor scale that I would like to make on matters that are more or less of particular interest to certain sections of the commun-

ity. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Highways is absent today and also the hon. the Attorney-General because there is one matter to which I would like to make reference that comes particularly within the gambit of both these hon. departments. We have, Sir, in common with all the other Provinces of Canada instituted an unsatisfied judgement fund. To those members of the house who are lawyers it is unnecessary to go into the details. We all know that the fund was set up to protect people who are injured in their person or their property from loss, not necessarily to protect — it could not protect, but to minimize the consequences of injury resulting from being damaged by some person who was carrying no insurances. Now that is financed, Sir, as we all know by a tax of one dollar on each person taking out his driver's licence. The limits are presently set at \$5,000 for personal injury, \$1,000 for property damage — and Sir, that is the point to which I wish to address myself for a moment.

That coverage, Sir, is tragically short. There is not, I venture to suggest, any member of this house who has actively practiced the profession of law today, who cannot give you half a dozen instances of people who have been injured almost fatally, in many cases, who have recovered judgement for amounts as high as \$15,000 and \$20,000 and the most they can get from this fund is \$5,000, and out of that \$5,000, Sir, by the time that hospital and medical expenses have been paid — and I can give you actual cases, there is very little left over for the unfortunate victim.

I am not alone, Sir, in this view. As recently as a fortnight ago, one of the judges of the Supreme Court expressed from the Bench his opinion that there should be some form of increase to this amount. And mind you, when that judge said that, it was not a matter of interest. He had no interest in it. It was a matter of complete indifference to him when he awarded judgement. He is not concerned with how it is to be collected. He merely says that John Jones has suffered damage and can be compensated by an award of "X" dollars. It is not up to him to inquire into the machinery of the recovery of that judgement. But, Sir, as I say, that judge made the comment.

I am sure that everybody in the profession,

as I say, has known cases. I can give you one case in point. I have not forgotten it. I still feel badly about it. A man worked at the railway as a machinist. Some three or four years ago he was on his way to work and stopped by Ricketts' Drug Store to pick up the newspaper early in the morning. The papers were just piled up, and you pick up your paper and drop your five cents, as it was in those days, and go on. This man was doing just that and a car comes down Water Street, goes in over the sidewalk and hits him. He loses his leg. He was in hospital for over six months. His earnings before the accident were something in excess of \$4,500 for the year. His hospital and doctors bills came to a figure in excess of \$3,000. He has been out of work for 12 months. He, because of the loss of his leg, cannot do the same work that he had done before. He was given a judgement for \$15,000. The man who had caused the injury had insurance in the amount of \$5,000. This man recovered from the insurance company the \$5,000, but by the time he had paid the medical and hospital bills, he received, from what was left, enough to amount to less than half, almost one-third of the year's wages he had lost, and had nothing to show for his accident, except the fact that he was minus a leg. Unfortunately, Sir, under the unsatisfied judgement fund rules, the position is, as you are aware, Sir, that any amount to be received from the fund must be diminished by any amount received from an insurance company. In other words, he received the \$5,000 from the policy and therefore he could get nothing from the fund. Now, Sir, it may be said that "hard cases make bad laws." This is not a matter of law, Sir. This is a matter where today we have the situation where we have people driving on our roads who have caused mutilation to others. They have judgement recorded against them and can go up to the Motor Registration and arrange to pay out so much a month. They are still driving and paying out \$25 a month; but some poor devil is crippled for life. To fix it is a simple matter. Instead of being \$1 make it \$20. The government is not prepared, and mind you I don't blame them, or at least the government does not appear to be prepared to introduce compulsory insurance. That is fraught with difficulties. I know Saskatchewan once tried it. I don't know if it was maintained or not.

Hon. Premier Smallwood: If the hon. gentleman would allow — they did more than make it compulsory. They made it a provincial monopoly.

Mr. Higgins: They went into the business. If I remember correctly from my reading on the matter I do not think they found it to be too satisfactory a set-up.

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Would the hon. member explain what were the difficulties?

Mr. Higgins: Because they were in competition, you see, with all the other insurance companies as well.

Mr. Smallwood: I think the answer is that they started off with a premium payment which was quite reasonable, and then had to increase it and then increase it again until they had the whole population up in arms against them.

Mr. Higgins: That, I think, is the explanation.

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would explain what are the difficulties in connection with compulsory insurance. Why would not compulsory insurance work?

Mr. Higgins: Because of the fact, amongst other things, there are a certain number of individuals no insurance company will handle and you cannot say to a private company you must insure John Jones. There are certain people today, certain drivers (I am not looking at the hon. member for St. John's North although he may think so). As I say, I have not gone into the history of it, but I do know that state insurance, as we call it, has not been found to be too satisfactory. But, Sir, the extra dollar on a licence means nothing today. It means what? A couple of gallons of gas. The extra dollar means, Sir, this insurance is able to be increased and then it is going to benefit the other drivers, because what happens today is that all these drains on the insurance fund means that the people who are injured the insurance companies up their rates to protect themselves

against heavier claims. I have gone into the matter with some members of the Law Society, who, I may say, have quite recently made representation to the Department of the Attorney-General.

On this matter of motor traffic, Sir, there is another thing that is sadly in need of attention. I think if I remember correctly I mentioned that informally before in committee, last year. We have, Sir, in our Highway Traffic Act no provisions to cover the situation which I will describe. There are two men driving in a car, the driver and his passenger; a voluntary passenger, a non-paying passenger. The driver is grossly careless, madly, recklessly negligent. They pile into a bridge and are both killed. Ordinarily one would expect, as I did until I went into it, that man's dependents could just sue the estate. Sir, at the present time in our law there is a vacuum. I have a case in point where two men were killed in a joint disaster, both in one car near the Brookfield Bridge. The man driving the car was insured. We applied to the insurance company. They looked at us very benignly and said: "Oh, yes, he is covered all right but we are not going to pay it. Sue." And when the time came to get the writ ready I discovered to my horror you cannot sue, you cannot appoint an administrator ad libitum (as one pleases). The man had no other assets except the insurance. In England that situation was rectified in 1940, I think, by an amendment to the Traffic Act, which provides for the naming of an administrator ad libitum. That is something, I think, which should be considered, if it is not already under consideration by the Attorney-General's department, because it is a pretty poor situation to exist, where the dependent cannot get any recourse merely because the negligent driver has killed himself, and there is no legal recourse when he has no other estate.

My colleague from St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy) very properly drew attention the other day to the question of salacious literature. If it were not for the particular season of the year I doubt if I could support it so enthusiastically. We are now in the midst of a mission, and can speak fully on the subject. Quite truthfully, salacious literature personally never bothers me. I do object to the situation you find today on the newsstands where many a periodical is filthy. I do

remember one book in particular. The story presented a very readable book but there was a most horrible cover on it. There was a lady there and you could see down certainly past her waistline. If you brought that book home your wife would turn you out. It is, Sir, a menace. You have to be almost devoted to the campaign to follow it up. I do feel that my colleague, who feels very strongly on the matter, has grasped hold of the right end of the stick. The ordinary individual, and I am afraid I have to plead guilty to the same thing, is rather shy of being stamped as a reformer. Nobody wants to set himself up as a policeman of another's morals. It is an entirely different thing in my position because my clients have no morals, at least some of my clients don't. There is always a danger in generalizing.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is setting himself up for libel.

Mr. Higgins: He cannot libel himself. Mr. Speaker, I am not yielding the floor. I might say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that the Municipal Council has not been given the same immunity as my colleague from St. John's North on occasional utterances in other places. He seems to confuse his privileges here. I would shudder to skate as close to disaster as he does on occasions. There is one other thing, I think, Sir, I should say in passing. Reference has been made to the University. I think that we are happy to know that at least the University is going to be properly housed. It is a very interesting and very fair comment, I think, which appears in this evening's paper, on the University. The editorial writer (I don't know who he is) referred to the fact that here we have the greatest untapped (he did not say untapped) — not fully tapped — sources of natural resources in the country housed very largely in makeshift buildings, without proper accommodations. I think we are all in sympathy with that position. I do not care how bad the economic position may be. I am quite confident the government will not allow itself to deviate one iota this year from their determination to proceed with the completion of that University. It is undoubtedly something which will pay much greater dividends than mere dollars

and cents which might be derived from any plant which might be set up.

Sir, to get back to my original theme: There are today in this country certain very pressing questions that demand a very urgent answer. I can only say that those of us on this side of the house are only interested in furthering the interest of Newfoundland. If it is necessary from time to time to query the government for the reasons for not doing certain things, or the reason for doing certain things — that is our obligation. We would not be doing our job if we did not do that. But I would say that that must be taken also with the statement that our attitude in this house will be government — tomorrow, as yesterday, by one primary consideration — the interest of the country, which is our joint heritage.

(Applause from both sides of the house)
On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Hon. P.J. Lewis (Minister without Portfolio) (Harbour Main): Mr. Speaker, in conformity with time-honoured tradition I wish to associate myself with the previous speakers on this motion. In joining with them I extend my very hearty congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. I agree with them that the two gentlemen selected for this task on this occasion were indeed a happy choice, happy in the sense that never in the history of this historic Assembly has a Speech from the Throne been brought down under circumstances which call for really representative Newfoundlanders to stand up and be counted. And in the mover and the seconder we have, Sir, two young men of great promise who, if God spares them, will be heard from effectively and well in the halls of government of this country in the years that lie ahead. They both spring from the very best that Newfoundland has to offer. Their families have deep roots in the traditions of Newfoundland and all the noble things for which she has stood in the past. Therefore, it is a great pleasure to me to associate myself in the congratulatory remarks that have been made here about their addresses. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to detain the hon. members of this house very long in the remarks that I have to make on this occasion, but I do think that

the situation is such that this is one time when every Newfoundlander who is in a position to express his views and his convictions should and must, as a matter of public duty, in the words of the hon. member for St. John's East, (Mr. Higgins) uttered by him on opening day, stand up and be counted.

I think, Sir, that those of us who take pride in the fact that we are Newfoundlanders first and Canadians last, or secondly, owe a transcendent duty to justify our position, to express our convictions and to tell to the world at large just where we stand and why we stand there, because it is a regrettable fact, and one that reflects upon various media of expression with which we are so familiar today, that never in the history of this little island has her reputation been smirched, slandered, falsified and defamed in the way that it has happened today. For that reason, if for no other, any person who is in a position to express his thoughts and give voice to what he thinks, owes it to Newfoundland to stand out and put the facts before the world.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the situation which we have seen develop here over the last few weeks is one without parallel in the history of this country. It is one that admits of no divided opinion, and it is one which calls for all Newfoundlanders, whatever their rank or class may be, to close the ranks and stand shoulder to shoulder and give to the world the answer as to what our position really is. It is to be regretted, as I see it, that while we in this Assembly have appreciated the seriousness of the crisis that confronts Newfoundland, have seen fit to sink all political differences and to stand as one in presenting to the world at large what the real position is, that in itself has been taken and misconstrued and held forth as a standard or conduct, movement, call it what you like, which is not directed towards the highest motive but is motivated by ulterior things, politics being one. The position taken by all members in this house is one, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that will go down in history as a shining example of the proper sense of real duty; public duty of public men in the trust that they are asked to accept when they come within the walls of a legislative assembly.

And when the smoke of this thing clears away, when the history books are written, I think, Mr. Speaker, that these who are privileged in this chamber to stand up for Newfoundland, and declare where they stood in relation to her, will be given the proper credit which they actually acquired in the matter.

If I may be permitted to say so, Sir, I think that particular word of commendation should come from this side of the house to the hon. gentlemen opposite who constitute the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. From their respected leader down, they have shown no division of view. They have spoken with one voice, they have sunk any party differences that there might exist as between them and the government of the day, they have been prepared to bury the past, and all for one purpose and with one object in view, as I see it, and that is to discharge what they see to be their transcendent duty, their obligation as public men to their native land. Now, we all know that what they have done has subjected them, even from their own friends in some respects, to certain vilifications, condemnations and criticisms. That was to be expected as long as politics obtain. But they will overcome that, and as the years go by and when truth manifests itself, as it must in spite of the agencies that operate against it, full credit will be given by posterity to that small band of dutiful men who constitute the body that sits opposite us here tonight. Now I want to say this, Mr. Speaker: In my opinion there is a "Samson" in this land, bellowing with chains, and that "Samson" is something that is new to our philosophy and is new to our way of life. That "Samson" is being controlled and is being contained within its lair, primarily and principally because of the bold stand that was taken by the Leader of this Government, when he dared to stand up and declare to the world — "Thou shalt not pass." When the Premier some few weeks ago, from his place in this house, sent forth the clarion call, I think that he even was mortally surprised at the reaction he received, when he sent forth that warning. Smallwood, who is the Premier of this country and who is the honoured leader of this party, has been called a "man of destiny," but never in his career and indeed seldom in the career of any public man either here or elsewhere has a deci-

sion such as his to be taken under such odds, and subject to such conditions as those on which that call went forth. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier, from his place in this house, declared where he stood and where his party stood and where the Opposition to a man said they stood, (beside him) and when that in turn was followed by a wave of reaction from the public in this Province such as never has been seen before, supported by Church and State, by people in every rank of life, he started something that many men, both within and without public life in the Western World, would have liked to have done but had neither the temerity, the sagacity nor the foresight to do so.

In taking the stand that he did, the Premier acted with the highest degree of statesmanship, because he struck a blow for our philosophy of life. And if he fails, then let me say, Mr. Speaker, we all go down too. Let me say this too in passing: on opening day the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, when replying to the opening remarks of the Premier, spoke a noble thought when he said it were better for us to be dead than to continue to live under a system of tyranny such as is foreshadowed in this menace. And where is there tonight a man, woman or child (not alone within Newfoundland but between here and the slopes of the Pacific) who, if true to his conscience and if he has the same sense of seriousness of the situation and who, if he were as well briefed on the facts as the Leader of the Opposition was on that day, would not endorse to the full the sentiments expressed. Because, let me repeat, Sir, what would life be worth either here or in any other part of the North American Continent if the menace that has shown its head in Newfoundland is allowed to prosper and thrive?

The Opposition: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lewis: Where and what would the consequence be if somebody in public authority, someone whose voice would not be heard in vain, would not be prepared to stand up and face that menace? Because there can be no doubt in the minds of any reasonably thinking man as to what the implications are that flow from this menace. This is not a question of unions versus capital. This is not a matter of Smallwood versus

Hollett. This is not a matter of party politics. This is a matter that goes to the very roots of all that we hold dear and all for which many of my learned and honoured associates here have fought in two wars and their comrades have died. The hon. Leader of the Opposition himself shouldered his rifle and underwent all the hardships that were incidental to war in the period from 1914 to 1918. Did he make that sacrifice to have it all now torn up and thrown in our teeth?

When last night I heard on the radio, (and I do not hear very much on the radio, but I did hear this): from the walls of the Kremlin, from the very heart of Moscow, the word had gone further telling and describing what was happening in Newfoundland, and how it was slanted, how the interpretation that had been put upon it and what it meant, that the ordinary man, the ordinary labour was being persecuted in Newfoundland. I suppose it was the first time in history that the word Newfoundland had ever emanated from the walls of the Kremlin. Is it not a significant fact, Mr. Speaker, that today from the floors of this house we have heard announced by the hon. the Premier, from his chair, a message from the Bishop of Harbour Grace as to what happened at Badger, and then followed, almost immediately by the pronouncement from the Minister of Education that the convent school at that place had been closed down? If we want evidence, if the Parliament of Canada today wants evidence, if the Prime Minister of Canada wants evidence, if the Minister of Justice of Canada wants evidence, if the newspaper commentators want to tell the truth, why do they not come, as my hon. friend opposite said, why do they not come down and find out the facts?

We have in Ottawa, I think it is, seven members. Five are on one side of the house and two on the other. As my hon. friend also said, they can go to Columbo and Timbucto but none of them can come to Newfoundland. And I have yet to hear (and I speak subject to correction because it may have been said but I did not hear it). I have not heard any word said nor emanating from the whole of the Parliament of Ottawa defending the actions of this house. Anything I have heard said has been said in a critical vein, and that we are all opposed to the loggers and organized labour. And everybody here knows as well, within and

without the walls of his house, that there is nothing further from the truth. No man, as far as I know, representing Newfoundland, or otherwise has stood up in his place at Parliament Hill at Ottawa and stated the case for Newfoundland. Maybe I am wrong, but if they have done so I have yet to hear it. Nobody has yet suggested that any member of the Government of Canada come down to Newfoundland and find out the facts and go back and tell it to the Canadian people. Why is all this? Practically every paper from the Pacific to here (excluding Newfoundland) has had a crack at the men who constitute this Assembly, and has denounced and defamed the leader of this government, who has dared to stand up and denounce and say to this "Goliath" -- "You shall not pass"! Why? It shows, Mr. Speaker, that the "Samson" of whom I spoke, who has today been bound in chains, in this Province, through the action of this Legislature, is not bound outside this Province, but that his influence and his diabolical works and philosophy are penetrating the very citadels of the Canadian system. It has reached even into Parliament, when even the parliamentarians there dare not get up and speak their convictions.

Mr. Higgins: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lewis: What a sorry pass we must have reached in this country when our own representatives dare not even seek and speak the truth. The truth is here to be found out. It is a simple matter for them to ask. I have yet to see that they have asked it, that they have acted upon it. I do not think they have even sought it. And how fearful must the situation be when a man is even afraid to ask what the truth might be? We know what the truth is. We all know that Newfoundland, the Newfoundland economy, to begin with, was menaced. We know that, without Grand Falls and Corner Brook, economically we are doomed as a people. The handwriting was on the wall, and nothing was ahead of us but destruction, disaster, but worse than that, the thing about which I am now speaking transcends that. I can see, Mr. Speaker, every day brings more to the fore that there is a philosophy afoot which is even more dangerous than the loss of our economy.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lewis: We could not afford to lose Grand Falls, and, as the Premier, said, "this government and any government worth its salt would have to resign and get out before such a thing would be allowed to happen." The consequences were too grave. And what would become of labour in Newfoundland if that which was threatened could be brought to fruition? But, serious and all this is, there still is that greater menace. It has come, Mr. Speaker, in true style. It has been introduced into this country with bloodshed. Blood has stained the hands of those who have attempted to besmirch the philosophy of our people. And it is not the poor unfortunate who is incarcerated in his cell tonight at Grand Falls, who swung that lethal weapon who should be in chains. It is those who are responsible for it.

(Applause from both sides of the house)

Mr. Lewis: Our poor, deluded people who, because of false leadership, have been brought to a pass where even human life is not safe in Newfoundland. Human life and property must be preserved at all costs, and, if this House of Assembly has to remain open until doomsday or as long as we can stand on our feet, then it should be kept open to see that this situation is not maintained.

Opposition Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lewis: What has been done in this house has been classified by some people who pretend to know, is being classified as unconstitutional; as being dictatorial; as being something smacking of Hitlerism. But, Mr. Speaker, why do they say these things? They say them, Mr. Speaker, because they themselves are not prepared to face the facts, not prepared to face the facts of life whether that legislation is unconstitutional or not. And I don't think it is. That, if it is, and if it is set aside let us stay here and pass such other legislation as is necessary to make absolutely certain that what we stand for must be preserved. Life itself, Mr. Speaker, is expendable. There are values to be placed upon it, and these values can be assessed. But the philosophy of life for which our people stand in this country from which they have never swerved, all down

through the centuries, is even dearer than life itself. Consequently, the sacrifice that is required to preserve these things cannot be measured in dollars and cents, cannot be assessed on the basis of human value. Therefore, we stand, Sir, I think with our backs to the wall, united behind a man who has taken a step that will go down in history as an outstanding one, and which is bound to make him in due course, when the facts are established, and mankind all throughout Canada realizes the significance of this issue in Newfoundland, then the Premier of this country will come into his own as a man of great stature, a man of great vision and a man of unbounded courage and one of the very, very few who could be found equal to the task which confronts us today.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that we shall stand to our guns, that the work that has begun will continue until such time as the menace which now hangs over our Province will be eradicated forever, that Newfoundland by its example will have held out to Canada and to the Western World for that matter, a torch, a print, a chart, a course by which the people of this nation can stand as one and face determinedly that terrible scourge which hangs over us and which, at this moment, is even within our own home. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Applause from both sides of the house).

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate, not with a view to being next speaker but in the absence of the member who wishes to be the next speaker. On motion, debate adjourned.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

LEGISLATION:

Committee of the Whole on various Bills.

On motion, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee:
A bill, "An act to Amend the Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957."

On motion, Committee ordered to report having passed this bill without amendment. Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to

Amend the Fire Insurance Amendment Act, 1957."

On motion, Committee ordered to report having passed this bill without amendment. Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Newspaper and Books Act."

On motion, Committee ordered to report having passed this bill without amendment. On motion, the Committee rose to report having passed these bills without amendment.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and passed Bills Nos 5,6 and 7 without amendment.

On motion, report received, bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at three o'clock. In so doing I may be pardoned by the house if I say that I am sure it is the understanding of all hon. members of the house that tomorrow they are attending the funeral procession of the late Constable Moss from his home on University Avenue to the Railway Station. The Constable, of course, is to be buried in his native home of Port Blandford, to which place the body will be taken by train, but the formal procession will take place here. I understand the Newfoundland Constabulary and Royal Canadian Mounted Police are to be represented in so far as they can muster representation in the light of circumstances, so many of them being absent from the City. I heard that the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. is coming all the way from Ottawa, particularly to attend this funeral. I am sure that Newfoundland will deeply appreciate that gracious gesture on his part. The funeral procession to the railway station commences, I think at 2 p.m. tomorrow, from University Avenue, which is in the housing area.

On motion, all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred:

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 16 at three o'clock.

Monday, March 16, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. W. Smallwood (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Harbour Round in the district of Green Bay. The prayer of the petition is for a road leading from Tilt Cove to Snook's Arm, with a by-road down through the settlement of Harbour Round. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the prayer of the petitioners. I have personal knowledge of the area myself. I have walked from the settlement of Snook's Arm up to Harbour Round and Mr. Speaker, I might say it is something like walking from the Lower Battery out around the coastline down to the settlement of Quidi Vidi. I have never walked out around the coast, but I do know that if one did walk out around the coast from the Lower Battery to Quidi Vidi, one could not go through any more hardship than one has to in travelling from the settlement of Snook's Arm to Tilt Cove. Mr. Speaker, there is no road there whatsoever only a path and one has to be quite agile to get over it in its present condition. I do strongly support the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. C.W. Sheppard (Harbour Grace): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Riverhead in the district of Harbour Grace. The prayer of the petition is that action be taken to have the stream known as Southern River cleared of rocks and debris. At the present time, and this has been happening for quite a number of winters when we have had hard frost, this river, due to the blocking of its mouth, backs up and the ice and water have caused floods, causing families to leave their homes and also causing property damage. In fairness to the Highways department Mr. Speaker, I understand that this year a blast-

ing of the ice was done to relieve the situation somewhat. Nevertheless, people had to leave their homes because of the flooding. I strongly support the petition Mr. Speaker. I have personal knowledge of the matter contained therein. I ask leave to table the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received, for referral to the department to which it relates.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Attorney-General if the agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada re terms of the RCMP contract has been tabled or might be tabled.

Hon L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): I have a copy Mr. Speaker, either on my desk or in my pocket. No, I have it here and I will be very happy to table it. (Tabled.)

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder as the Minister of Finance is not here, whether the Attorney-General would take notice of a question to table the Public Accounts. I have heard some extractions. I understand extracts from the Public Accounts were given over the air today. I thought we ought to have a copy before any further....

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly right. The Public Accounts have been tabled, and I would have thought the printed copies would be here by now. I will see that they are tabled.

Mr. Speaker: There was a copy tabled, the original.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. C.M. Lane (White Bay North): Mr. Speaker, my first duty, as is customary, is to pay a tribute to the mover and seconder of the motion to draft a reply to the Address From the Throne. I am indeed happy to be able to say that I consider that the hon. and

learned member for Trinity North (Mr. Millin) and the hon. member for Carbonar - Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke) did an exceedingly good job under perhaps exceedingly heavy clouds. I personally, am very pleased with the manner in which these young men did such a fine job. For myself personally, not to engage the indulgence of the house for too long a time, I thought I might this afternoon, (with a muddled brain, having gone through deep water during the past five or six weeks) make some reference to the Speech from the Throne. I have to make some reference to the district which I represent because they are fearful that they are going to be left once more without a representative for some time. Thirdly, I want to speak to you for a few moments about the work which I have undertaken particularly, and the plans which I have in mind for what I consider to be the good of the loggers in particular, and Newfoundland in general.

Mr. Speaker, we are all looking forward to the visit of Her Majesty the Queen and her escort. We trust that not only will they be favoured with exceptionally good weather, but that the clouds which have covered the horizon in this area will have disappeared before they arrive and our little province, torn so often with different factions, will be back to peace and harmony. I trust that at least the wound has been healed. I am very much afraid the scar will remain for a long time. We are all looking forward to that visit, and I am sure that many of Her subjects, most loyal subjects, will have a chance to see her and to cheer her as she begins that tour of the Great Dominion of which we are now a part.

I would be remiss in my duties too, as the General Secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, if I did not make some reference to the "Blue Wave" disaster, which shocked some of us, and which is such a common occurrence to this island home of ours, where so many of our men go down to the sea in ships and every year the sea takes its toll. I am happy to say that the organization, our organization, to which we made an appeal, the locals of our organization, are responding nobly and some small settlements where our fishermen did so poorly during the past year have sent in contributions (I don't think there was any amount less than \$20) to assist the widows and orphans. I believe that since that has hap-

pened, that we would do well to examine the legislation which we have and the provisions that are made to provide for those who are left behind when the sea takes its toll. I have been informed that the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund has built up a huge reserve. I never believe in building up reserves. I think as we collect so we should spend, and I believe that with the money that has been collected, we would do well to allocate it to those who suffer, to those who have lost the breadwinner, the father, the son or the brother.

I think I should refer too, briefly, to our fishery which was referred to in the Speech from the Throne. In this respect I have jotted down my thinking briefly on the matter because the more and more I think of it the stronger and stronger I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the inshore fishery is and can be, in the future, the backbone of our economy. Our fishing fleets, our Labrador fleets, our banking fleets have disappeared and we are left wholly and solely with an inshore fishery, and I believe that this can be exploited and utilized so that more and more of our fishermen and more and more of our young men will be encouraged to man the boats.

It has always been my contention that the mainstay of any province is its natural resources; its land, its mines, its wood and its fish. If we get from 2,500 or 3,000 fishermen producing all the fish we require and bringing it to central plants, I don't think that we can find the necessary employment to keep up our population. It may raise our standard of living. It is a coincidence perhaps that we have been thinking of the same thing, which effects our economy at the moment - the utilization of small numbers to produce more so that they may make money, a lot more money. But in the foreseeable future, will we or can we give up or cease to support the inshore fishery? In this respect I have just said that the fishery is and can be in the future the backbone of our economy. It is a great resource and we have to develop it, perhaps on more modern lines. No one knows the potential capacity of the codtrap because no one has ever taken the fish, all the fish, that the trap can produce. Here I can tell you that last year when a school of fish struck in St. John's, what the fresh fish plant could not take, the fish meal plant took, and although it seemed a sacrifice, yet it helped the men,

considerably. The price was down, but if a man can produce or bring to land as much as his codtraps can produce and sell, even at reduced prices, then he is going to earn some money - quite a bit. I would say we have to procure more fish-finding devices. at the moment it is only a guess. We never know where the fish are. We never know where they are going to strike. And I don't think that in any other fishing country can we find fishermen fishing under such circumstances. I think that we must carry on experimental work.

It is the duty, true, of the Federal Government, but I believe we too, as a Government should add a few simple mechanical devices to assist our fishermen in finding the schools of fish so that they, in turn, may secure good voyages. I am afraid, too, that in our fisheries we must not, we cannot afford to depend solely on the national Government because I don't believe that in the foreseeable future, that we will have a national Government that will reconcile our problems together with those of the prairie provinces or the North West Territories, which leaves us to do many things on our own. I hope that we will realize that.

Furthermore, in the fishery I think there must be something supplementary. A fisherman can live and live well from the fishery. I know of men who have done nothing but fish down through the years. When there was plenty of employment, they still carried on the fishery. They built up capital accounts, boats and gear and in combination with that they fished. There was combination fishing Mr. Speaker, lobster, salmon, cod, mackerel, herring and sole. They earned a good living. The men who left their boats and fishing gear and went at other work in the Province, (you will find them now quitting by the dozens and with all their earnings) are coming back to the fishery with no money left. But the fisherman has something and he can supplement his earnings with his few crops. There is nothing bad, nothing degrading, nothing disgraceful about a fisherman having a family plot to garden, or his wife keeping a few sheep or hens. It is all in the day's work and I think that we have to encourage more of that type of subsistence living in Newfoundland. I don't think that any fisherman in Newfoundland will starve if he carries out his work and augments his earnings, perhaps, with two or three weeks work

in the woods and produces what he can on his own. We are all looking forward! Hope springs eternal, but hope deferred maketh heart sick or faint.

I am sure that we are all getting faint and getting sick of waiting for news on Term 29. I personally could never understand the Federal Government. I understand them less and less as the years go by. Why? Why are they keeping back, holding back as if they would have this little Province suffer as long as we can suffer - in jeopardy every week - not to know what they are going to do for us? I am very much interested, when the hon. and learned member for St. John's East (Mr. Higgins) said they can go everywhere else in the world, still none of them can come here to Newfoundland to look at us. If they come here, they are something like the mainland reporters - they stay in their hotel rooms, contact a few people by 'phone and then tell the story. Furthermore, this great nation of ours, Canada, finds millions of dollars for Colombo Plans and what have you, but they keep us in suspense, they worry us as to what they are going to do and what we are going to get. Mr. Speaker, from them I think it is most disgraceful, I think the time has come! I don't know whether they are keeping it for the day that we are going to celebrate the tenth anniversary, to make us a really good present. But if they don't do something before that time I personally can't see any reason to celebrate.

I want to refer briefly now, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the district which I have the honour to represent, White Bay North, and the district which we hope within the next two or three years will be coming into its own. I can assure the good people of that district who sent me to this house, that I have their interest at heart. There are certain things which we can do and certain things which we cannot do. We are hoping to connect them by roads right through the province. In the foreseeable future and even this year, we hope to be able to drive from St. John's to St. Anthony. But then there is a mammoth task to be done, roads connecting with the main road, and then only will we, in that great fishing district of the North, be able to do the things that we would for our people. It is rather interesting to note that the district of White Bay North with so few people, so few opportunities, have seven town councils. I don't think we can get another

place in which we can put one. Englee, Roddickton, Main Brook, St. Leonard's, St. Anthony, Griquet and Cook's Harbour; these many, although they have not always received, as they say, their full share, or think they have not - and I don't believe they have from the Government, they have built up their own communities with a splendid spirit of co-operation. It should put to shame other communities in our province to know that these little communities with so few opportunities have done so much to help themselves. I certainly want to thank the Department of Municipal Affairs for the generous support and full co-operation which they have given and I can assure them that our local government in these communities of the North are doing an exceptionally good job.

During the coming season too, I have been instrumental in getting Canada Bay Cold Storage back into full production, in co-operation with the firm of John Reeves Ltd., and H.B. Clyde Lake Ltd. here in St. John's. I believe a five year contract has been entered into, so that people in that area can be assured now they will be able to sell a large quantity of fresh fish and salmon. In Roddickton, through the co-operation of Bowaters, and Chester Dawe Ltd. we have put in a timber cutting operation this year which is giving employment to some 200 men. This, too, has been a great boom. We hope that with the opening of the roads, and betterment of the roads that the industry will be maintained. Bowaters, because they could not export wood, cut down on their operations in Main Brook from 68,000 cords to 16,000 cords, and it was a godsend to the people of that area that somebody else was able to take over and get reserves of timber from Bowaters in order to saw and to sell to other parts of the province. There is still one vital and one burning question and that is the electrification for the St. Anthony area. That is a difficult problem. The Premier assured me, Mr. Speaker, that this year we are going to assess the whole situation and I am hopeful that something can be done, and will be done, I am sure, to give these people electrification.

N.B.W.W. TO REPLACE I.W.A.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to perhaps in the best manner that I can - I never rub wounds

that are raw - I am a unionist myself perhaps in a peculiar situation. I believe in unions. I believe in trade unions. I believe in international unions. I should say here and now that in the great task which we tackled not so very long ago in Central Newfoundland, I received the full support and co-operation of some of the finest men who are members of trade unions and international trade unions that I have ever received. They certainly know their work. They know their unions and they were ready and willing to assist me in a job which I undertook. Why? That question has been put to me by hundreds of people. Why, did you do it? Why were you foolish enough at your age? I felt pretty young but they tell me by bald head shines when I am on T.V. They think I am very old until they meet me and know the spirit that I have. Other people have said - "You've got the grit of five men, why don't you have five salaries?" Be that as it may, people ask, why is it I have taken on this task? I am a Newfoundlander, born in Newfoundland, bred in Newfoundland and now I am very much afraid at my age I will have to die in Newfoundland because I don't think that you can transplant an old tree.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): You can't die in St. John's.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I should tell you first I don't like to speak personally, never like to blow my own horn, but I have accepted - I was a considerable time thinking this over - when the Premier asked me at first if I would tackle the job, I did not think that I could do it. Then when things were so hot and when I saw that the people of Newfoundland were moving and wanted to move and wanted to do something. When I saw their patriotism, I felt that if there was a part that I could play I would play it. And I accepted. Into the record, into the minutes of our executive meeting goes my promise to serve the organization and to serve that union till the first convention, freely. I am to receive no salary but my travelling expenses. I feel it was a call from the central part of Newfoundland, from the people of Newfoundland and I am happy now that I responded. We are always afraid, we are all crossing our bridges before we come to them, but I am more than happy now that I accepted the challenge.

We have gone through difficult days but it is most satisfying now as I look back, and I think if I had to do it again, knowing what we had to go through day and night, I would still accept. It is most satisfactory when you have the feeling your conscience is clear, and that you are doing a good job for the good of your country. It is most satisfactory when that job is partially completed, to know that you have been able to play your part. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that history has been made; whatever happens, history has been made. We have won the battle in central Newfoundland. Reports to me this morning indicate that things are getting back to normal. It is most unfortunate, as I said just now that the scar will remain. Battles, children against children, father against son, "It can't happen here." How often did we hear it? Don't deceive yourself, it has happened here. Mr. Speaker, we should be prepared, whatever it takes in the form of legislation, whatever it takes in the form of labour laws, we should be prepared to see that as long as this generation lives, this situation will not be repeated.

I think that our labour laws need to be overhauled. I really feel that we must, I believe, bring in some one from the old country who has gone through some of this, to have a look at things as they are. I always look eastward instead of westward somehow, because we have been so disappointed with the west. We have been disappointed with the east too, but the wise men came from there. But we are so disillusioned and so disappointed. I recall we visited the lumber camps in Vancouver five years ago. A lumber jack in Vancouver is also a rigger. We must not forget that he is a rigger. He is a skilled man. He must climb the tree. He must top that tree and cut that tree from which sometimes he takes 40,000 feet of lumber. We are altogether in a different position, under different conditions, working under different circumstances. There is no man can fly over Newfoundland and say it is all rock and water and go back to Ottawa and write a report on it, and that is what is too often done. There is no man can come here and tell us what we should do. I have seen them. They have sent them down from Ottawa. They have sent them down here to tell us what we should do in fishery matters. In the past eight years I have the experience of knowing that they think they can solve

our problems. Some day, I am going to write a book: "Experts that I have met!" And these men sicken me. To say that men will come here who know what we want, who are so patriotic about Newfoundland they want to come and help us, and look at what? Look at the mess they brought us into. No that it not the answer!

I should recount briefly what led up to the trouble. Personally, I feel that the four unions of Newfoundland failed the Newfoundland logger. They grew fat and lazy and instead of coming together and forming one strong union they still kept their own place, in their own corner of the woods, and some men in the woods paid two or three of the organizations their fees. There seemed to be no way to check. Now in looking to the future and the present we must not forget the past. Some of these men did an exceptionally good job for the logger of Newfoundland when they started.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lane: I must take off my hat to them.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Lane: But they were too long in the one job and towards the end complaints were made. The men were ignored and the men grew restless. And a restless man, a man when the time comes, when there is nothing for him to do, - a time is opportune - not too many jobs. I think too, that if you get around among small groups of men they have a technique, you know, which we don't always understand or always follow. They have a technique of doing things. They have a technique that Billy Graham has in evangelism. They have a technique Billy Graham has and communism or gangsterism or any other kind of 'ism has as well. You can play on the people, you can take small groups, and I am very much afraid that some of these things have been happening in Central Newfoundland. What do we plan to do with the organization? Personally I plan to carry on with these men and serve them as best I can to the best of my ability until they have their conventions. Today, this morning, we sent into the woods camp of Newfoundland, four loggers, four good men who have gone into the

camps to meet with the men. We are setting up in such camps what we call a camp steward. In other unions they call him a shop steward. We hope that every man's grievance can be heard. It is no good for me to go up and meet 1,200 men at one time. In each camp we will set up a man who will take up the grievances of the men. He in turn will take them to the foreman and if the foreman can settle them, they will be settled. If he cannot settle them, he will bring them before the headquarters of the union and the union in turn will take them to the mill management. In this way we hope to build up a strong union. We hope to serve the men in the woods. We hope to make improvements. Already we have been promised a radio in the camps, either by public address system or radio in each camp. We have been promised a water-cooler, not the old bucket and the old mug, for everybody to dip down and drink out of. These changes are being brought about, to take effect as quickly as we can do it. It is the little things, the little things in life that count, the common touch, which our fishermen and our loggers need. They want to see you.

They want to talk with you. That is going to be our policy. Improvements can and will be made. There too, perhaps, our Government can assist. I feel that many of the men in the camp will be only too happy and too willing to attend Adult Education classes at the certain seasons of the year, perhaps twice a week. I feel that we should be able to provide them with some entertainment. What can the men do in the long winter nights? We are going to provide them with magazines and papers and I can assure you that we intend, with the help of the company, with the help of the Government, and with the help of all civic-minded citizens, to see that the logger of Newfoundland is recognized, and that what has taken place in central Newfoundland will never take place again.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition) (St. John's West): To a point of order, may I ask who is going to supply the logger with papers, newspapers?

Mr. Lane: We are hoping to go to the newspaper managers!

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Not Toronto?

Mr. Lane: I don't think so. The one they are interested in most is the Grand Falls Advertiser, but we will send them weekend copies of the Evening Telegram and perhaps the Daily News. The companies are going to supply magazines. Just a move, just a move, we are trying to make.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think that was hardly a point of order. What the hon. member meant was, would the hon. member who has the floor permit a question?

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I don't want, as I said, to belabour the house. I want to tell you something of what we are trying to do, what we plan to do. It is no use criticizing now. As I said at the beginning, we are a full-fledged union. A Newfoundland Union did what the other unions could not do. The Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood-Workers, after sitting down for days and nights, managed to sign a contract with a company that was practically on its knees, and perhaps, who knows, from ulterior motives. Who knows but that may have been the beginning. It has happened, bringing the company to their knees, bringing unemployment to this little province of ours. What better feeding grounds could we have for any 'isms' than unemployed persons? We can't afford to do that. This little province is poor enough, God knows! We are only just managing, but if we lost the two great paper mills! - What I can't understand is at the moment Corner Brook could be shut so easily and quickly, easier and quicker than Grand Falls: still there are men whose very life and living depend on it, who seem to be opposed, and seem to be supporting what is going on. I know many of the union leaders in the province. I have travelled with them, and worked with them. I certainly feel that their conscience must be worrying them and tormenting them for the part they have had to play. It is most unfortunate when the members of an international union have to go before their international representative and be told that they must vote as they are told. That is the unfortunate part of it in such a thing as this.

It is true the pendulum never stands still. It

is true capital has exploited the underdog. Then the unions came in. But the pendulum swings to and fro. I am very much afraid that it is the real capitalists now who are doing some of the things which we fear and dread, men who are paid huge sums of money, and who are prepared to go to any extremes to save their positions. It is the pattern, and Canada would do well to look and see. I am sure we are all happy, I know nothing pleased me more, (and to me this is not politics) when the Premier asked me: He said: "You may have to sacrifice your political future." I was quite happy to say yes, Sir, if it demands that, I will sacrifice my political future, whatever that might be. I am satisfied to leave it all and I think that I am going to do perhaps a better job for the people. But I hope that in my position, I will never bring politics into it. I have tried to keep politics out of the Federation of Fishermen. Although I am sitting in the house, I have fought with the Government, whatever party was in, in regard to what should be done.

I hope to keep politics out of the organization which I have the honour now of "trying to build" as "Time Magazine" puts it. It is a job we were thrown into. One final word Mr. Speaker. I hope this won't be taken as politics either. Perhaps I might read what I have said to the Citizens Forum, which will appear on Sunday; a prepared question and answer of what I have said which will cover something of what I am thinking. The question was put to me about labour, international labour and local labour, and I answered in this way. 'I certainly do think that the initiative and the knowledge and experience of local labour leaders are at least as good as we can bring in from outside Newfoundland.' But it is not merely a question of initiative and knowledge and experience. It is a question of decency, a question of patriotism. We just don't expect men coming in from outside Newfoundland to have the understanding of Newfoundlanders and the understanding of Newfoundland conditions that our own people have. We just don't expect people coming in to be as concerned for the welfare of Newfoundland as we are ourselves. It would not speak very well for the patriotism of Newfoundlanders if others coming in from outside had as much understanding and regard for Newfoundland as Newfoundlanders them-

selves. So far as the new Brotherhood (N.B.W.W.) is concerned, I am quite confident that it will grow very fast and that it will become the largest and most powerful trade union organization in Newfoundland. Whether it decides in the future to affiliate with some other organization, or whether it stays a purely local organization, that is a matter for its own decision, but I am quite sure it will go on from strength to strength, and from success to success.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just one final word. They say that politics does make strange bedfellows of us all. I have had occasion during the past six weeks to live with a little man, almost sleep with him, and when I say little man I mean little in size. But I don't think that I would be doing my duty if I did not at this time pay a tribute to the Premier of Newfoundland. To begin with, he was so dynamic and so sincere. The only question of politics ever mentioned between us was when he asked me the question. "You may have to sacrifice your political career for this." That was the only time it was ever mentioned. It was never mentioned to anyone else, anywhere. All we had before us was the country. To me, the Premier was always a good politician, but to me now he is something more. To me he proved his statesmanlike qualities, and with new respect I say here and now that the Premier of Canada and all the other premiers of the other provinces would be happy today to stand in the shoes of the Premier of Newfoundland, if they only had the guts.

Mr. Earl Winsor (Labrador North): Mr. Speaker, maybe before I begin, Sir, a recess would be in order. (Agreed, 10 minutes recess.) Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Trinity North, Mr. Mifflin, and the hon. member for Carbonear-Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke) who so ably moved and seconded the Address in Reply. Mr. Speaker, there is much a person would like to say about the events of the past week or so in Central Newfoundland. But, Sir, I think one has to restrain one's feelings at this particular time. The events of the past week or so have stirred the Newfoundland people more than they have ever been stirred before. But

there are just two or three references I would like to make in passing.

First, Sir, I am very proud to be a member of this legislature at this particular time. I am proud, too, Sir, to be a member of a party which has for its leader such a courageous man as our premier. I have every admiration for him. I admire the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues who supported the Government on this particular issue. Now, Sir, we may ask ourselves, why did they support the Government? They supported the Government, Sir, because they realized that a terrible threat was hovering over the god-fearing peace-loving people of Newfoundland, and a threat to destroy the economy of this country. Reports have indicated that this Government and the house are opposed to international unions and its recent legislation is aimed to curb such affiliations. Nothing is further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Premier has expressed the thought that this new union may, or can through its own free choice, affiliate with some international for evil purposes; whose leaders are corrupt, irresponsible and repugnant to all honest, decent citizens. It is that kind of international labour union. Sir, this legislation opposes and we will fight to keep it out of this province and see to it that our Newfoundland union members are protected against this evil.

This house has taken a stand on this issue, Sir, and from it there must be no turning back. There may be some troubled days ahead but our people are more united than ever in insisting that the nightmare of the IWA be driven from our shores. It is now on its last legs, so to speak, Sir. It is wavering, it is breathing its last, and with its departure from our shores peace and order will come once again to our beloved land, with the hatred and tragedy of recent weeks left behind us. It must be the principal aim of this Government to hasten that day and rid our people of the devilish scourge which has come among us in the name of the IWA. In that task, Sir, I stand solidly behind our Premier and the Government with my support and loyalty, and I am confident in the history of this Government, when it is written, no more glorious deed will be placed to its credit than that taken within recent days in this Assembly, supported by all members of it. This house took its stand and had itself

counted as champions of truth, justice, and fairplay, against the forces of evil and wrong which were carrying this province to economical and moral ruin.

Mr. Speaker, as a man who has been closely associated with the sea, as one who has come to know its peril and danger, I now refer, briefly, to the disaster of the "Blue Wave." I know the aftermath of such tragedies and the financial burdens and struggle left with the members of the families who remain. I recall, Sir, that in the past there was a fund known as the "Marine Disaster Fund." I am not sure whether that fund is in existence today or not, but, judging from the hon. member for White Bay North (Mr. Lane) I think it is. From that point, some assistance could be given to such people in need, because Sir, I feel as long as our history is so allied to the sea we shall more than likely continue to have such disasters. I think it might be wiser for the Government to reactivate such a fund, whereby immediate assistance can be given to such families. In spite of all our navigational aids, Sir, the sea will continue to take its toll.

Mr. Speaker, as the representative of Labrador North I am happy indeed to note the reference in the Speech from the Throne to the important transactions relating to the development of the Lake Wabush Iron Ore deposits in Labrador. I hope the people of Labrador will be given the opportunity to participate in this development and to derive particular benefit from it. Labrador ought not to be treated as just a source of wealth for this island but rather, that it will be developed for the welfare of the people of Newfoundland. I am more convinced than ever, Sir, that the vital factor that will influence progress in the development of our island home and Labrador is the immediate development of Labrador's vast iron ore forests and waterpower. Every conceivable means at our disposal should be availed of to hasten this development because Mr. Speaker, I believe when they are taken advantage of, we could well become one of the richest provinces of Canada. Not only will Newfoundland benefit from the development, but it will also add to the ever-extending Canadian nation as a whole. The other provinces will, in the natural process of Newfoundland's development, benefit from it. That leads me to think, Mr. Speaker, to wonder rather, if it would not be

I am naturally very disappointed over the recent announcement by the hon. the Premier just a few days ago concerning the decision of the Crown-Zellerbach Corporation to decide against the establishment of a third paper mill in Newfoundland. Personally I held high hopes for the project. On two or three occasions last summer I was asked by the company survey party, to suggest some of the bays and harbours which I might think safe for large shipping along the Labrador coast. I was very much impressed with the interest shown in Labrador. Many lakes and rivers were surveyed, for it was in Labrador the company had hoped to obtain most of their wood for the operation of their mill. The people of Labrador were very enthusiastic and optimistic and I hoped that within the very near future a new and more important source of employment would be theirs. I know Mr. Speaker, that the people of Labrador will regret hearing of the Crown-Zellerbach decision, and we all hope Sir, that marketing conditions will improve and Crown-Zellerbach will yet find it economically sound to operate in the island.

Premier Smallwood: Here! Here!

Mr. Winsor: Mr. Speaker, I refer at this time to one particular need of my district, one which affects many people in Newfoundland as well as Labrador, and that is the lack of proper transportation facilities from Goose Bay to Lake Wabush or Schefferville. At the moment, in order for a person to travel from Labrador to Lake Wabush, he must travel first from Goose to Moncton, from Moncton to Mont Joli, Que., from Mount Joli, Que. to Seven Islands across the gulf by boat; from Seven Islands by rail to Lake Wabush or Schefferville. That, Sir, is a distance of approximately 1,400 miles. I would suggest a straight-line direct service would cut the distance to approximately 500 miles. I think, Sir, some company should be encouraged to start a direct service from Goose Bay to Schefferville because, one thing sure, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have an overflow of labourers in the Happy Valley area in the not too distant future, and if persons from the Happy Valley have to come all the way to Moncton, Mont Joli, Seven Islands and I don't know where else, it is not going to be very en-

couraging for them to make the move.

I am happy, Mr. Speaker, to note some modern conveniences are gradually coming to Labrador North. I refer to the supply of electricity to Happy Valley and other places in my district, and telephone communications to other parts of the world; something I thought almost impossible three or four years ago. I am happy also to see the continued extension of educational facilities.

Here I have the additional advantage of having the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Rowe) as my predecessor, because he is well acquainted with the needs and he has made considerable effort to bring better educational facilities to Labrador North. Then the medical facilities are steadily improving. All these things are important because they directly affect the lives of those who live in Labrador North, and is a sure sign that Labrador North is gradually, (and rightly so), coming into its own. Further, Sir, it is a sure sign that Labrador North is gradually being interwoven into our Newfoundland and Canadian way of life. I was pleased to hear last year from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs his plan to develop Happy Valley as a Townsite. Might I ask the hon. minister, (maybe I should direct this to the hon. Minister of Highways) if they would consider Sir, seriously doing something to improve the road conditions in Happy Valley?

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources to take a look at a special project known as the Beaver project which is so successfully carried on in the province of Quebec. This would bring income to many Indians and trappers in the north West River area and Davis Inlet and maybe Cartwright. "Today the family cash income of this project of the Indian hunters averages between \$1000 and \$1500 from catches of beaver alone." I am quoting from the "Saturday Evening Post" of January 20, 1959. The flesh of the beaver is almost as important as its pelt. Today, Sir, at this very moment there are 187,000 square miles of beaver preserves in the Province of Quebec alone, and in 1956 these new preserves produced 29,615 pelts. Beaver pelts earn the trappers over \$100,000. The number of pelts taken in 1956 was three times the number harvested in 1950. Last year the figure rose to 43,000. I think, Sir, this pro-

ject could very likely be operated in Labrador. This originated in James Bay. Northern Labrador, like the rest of Newfoundland, is moving forward. The signs in North Labrador may not be too obvious to visitors, but in my 20 years of association with it, I have been able to see them. One of the most demanding needs of all, Mr. Speaker, in Labrador North is still in the field of housing. Much has been done and much remains to be done. I think a concentrated effort by both the provincial and federal governments should be made to bring the benefits of better housing facilities to the people of Labrador. It should be given immediate consideration. I feel, Sir, and I hope that Labrador will continue to prosper. Last year we had a fairly successful season. The fishery in terms of cash was very successful and I hope, Sir, this year the Government will expand its facilities in order that fishermen may sell their fish fresh from the knife instead of having to salt and cure it. By doing this they will be able to take advantage of the longer fishing season, and better returns will be had.

Many fishermen of Labrador North last year, Sir, were eligible for unemployment insurance unlike many places along the Newfoundland coast. I hope Labrador will continue to prosper and I feel confident that this Government under our present leader, who has shown a personal interest in Labrador as a whole, will see that Labrador will continue to grow and prosper and take its place.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate but I do not do so with the view of having the priority in order in speaking when the debate resumes, but only because no one else at the moment wishes to move it. For that purpose only, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion, debate adjourned.

LEGISLATION:

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957.

"On motion, Bill read a third time, ordered, passed and title to be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Fire Insurance Act, 1957,"

On motion, Bill read a third time, ordered, passed and title to be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Newspapers and Books Act,"

On motion, Bill read a third time, ordered, passed and title to be as on the order paper.

Ministerial Statement: Prov. Government to sue Federal Government:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, according to the radio a few seconds ago the Prime Minister of Canada has announced in the House of Commons that the Government of Canada has no intention of interfering in any way in the Newfoundland dispute at this time. The qualification "at this time" seems to have been intended to have some significance because the item went on to say the Prime Minister has suggested a cooling-off period of two weeks - whatever that might mean. At all events, all the suggestions that had been made that our legislation would be disallowed by the Government of Canada, or alternatively that the legislation would be referred, by the Government of Canada, to the Supreme Court of Canada for its opinion, and other suggestions seem - all of them - to be entirely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I have a telegram addressed to me from His Excellency the Bishop of St. George's, Bishop O'Reilly; informing me that he is in full agreement with Bishop O'Neill's letter to the hon. David Fulton, the Minister of Justice in Ottawa. I have here also, Mr. Speaker, another note to the effect that there are 1200 men in the woods at the present time, in the A.N.D. Company camps. The Badger camps are filled, the Millertown camps are filled, and men are pouring into the Brotherhood Office (N.B.W.W.) in Grand Falls, seeking work in the woods. It goes on to say, the only thing we can do is to ask the Premier to ask the company to open up the Bishop's Falls Camps. Now, the Bishop's Falls camps are not open. All the other camps are filled; and men are leaving the IWA (that is men who have no injunction against them) and joining up with the union. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the last and final camp to be filled is at Bishop's Falls, and I will have to make a request to the A.N.D. Company to open Bishop's Falls. In that case, there might be

as many as 1800 men or more back at work in Central Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret having to inform the house that it has come over the air, through Canadian Press and the CBC, that Commissioner Nicholson of the RCMP has resigned, due to the fact that the Government of Canada refused and failed to send the additional 50 police, at Newfoundland's request, to deal with the serious emergency that existed.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Could the Premier give the house more details about any request to the A.N.D. Co. to have the Bishop's Falls camps reopened?

Mr. Smallwood: The camp is closed ever since the strike began and there are no men working in these camps. They are working in the Badger Division, the Gambo Division, and Terra Nova Division, but Bishop's Falls Division camps had been closed from the beginning. The company announced they were closing them and not re-opening them, and the thought expressed in this note amounted to that; namely, that at the request of the Government and A.N.D. may be prepared to open the Bishop's Falls Camps. And we would certainly make the request. I think the Opposition would wish us to make the request so that a few hundred more Newfoundlanders could go back to work after this desperately bad winter, from the unemployment standpoint.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am able to inform the House that the Government have authorized the Attorney-General of Newfoundland to enter an action at once in the Exchequer Court of Canada against the Government of Canada, for breach of Contract because of their failure under a contract we had with the Government of Canada to supply us with additional police in case of an emergency. The failure lies, not in anything they have said, but in their simple failure to send the police. The breach of contract exists in the fact they have not sent them and not in anything they have said about us, not in anything they may have said about it. The simple fact that they have not sent the police is the breach of contract. And we have authorized the Attorney-General to sue the Government of Canada for breach of Clause 13 of our con-

tract with the Government of Canada, for the engagement of the RCMP to do the provincial policing of Newfoundland.

I say again that all Newfoundlanders, all in Newfoundland will honour the name of Commissioner Nicholson forever, that, in protest against the dishonouring of this contract between Canada and Newfoundland, the Commissioner has handed in his resignation to the Minister of Justice, which resignation means that Commissioner Nicholson is no longer head of the RCMP in Canada. I will personally be surprised if his resignation is not followed by others. It is a shameful business.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at three o'clock.

Wednesday, March 18, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, in the chair.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:

IRON ORE DEVELOPMENT:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it is only the pressure of other very important business that has prevented my making before the announcement that I am going to make now. It is an announcement of a very important piece of natural resources and industrial development in this Province. It has to do with iron ore production and beneficiation in Labrador. It supplements a statement I made on February 12 past, when I said that Pickands Mather Co. of Cleveland and Canadian Javelin Co. had completed an agreement for development and mining of the Wabush deposits in Labrador.

The house will remember that it was the Wabush Iron Company that was to do the developing in Wabush Lake, the Wabush Iron Company, the Shareholders of which are the Steel Company of Canada, Canada's biggest steel company; the Pickands Mather Company of Cleveland; the Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company; Inter-Lake Iron

Corporation and Canadian Javelin. That project was one of building a railway 42 miles long from the main north-south railway that presently operates between Seven Islands and Knoblake. At Mile 224 a new 42 mile railway was to be built into Wabush Lake, the total investment of this great development consisting of opening a mine, building a beneficiation plant (that is a concentrating plant), a townsite to house several thousand workers, power projects, harbour and dock and loading facilities on the St. Lawrence, these to be in the vicinity of Clarke City, which lies eight or ten miles to the west of Seven Islands, the whole thing to cost about \$250 million; a quarter of a billion.

Now, today, I have to add to that another great iron ore project in the same area of Wabush Lake, the Carol Lake section of Wabush Lake. This is by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, the I.O.C. of Canada, as the house knows, is made up of a group of very large, rich, famous companies consisting of the great Canadian gold mining company, Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, namely the Timmons Interests in Canada; and in the United States and M.A. Hanna Company of Cleveland. Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, the four great iron ore companies of the world are all at Cleveland - Pickands Mather, M.A. Hanna, Ogilvie-Norton and Cleveland Cliff. Cleveland Cliff is the company of which Mr. Victor J. Fine was once the vice-president. These are the four greatest iron ore companies of the whole world, and are all in Cleveland. So, I say the Iron Ore Company is made up in the United States of M.A. Hanna Company of Cleveland; Republic Steel; National Steel; Armco and Youngstown Sheet and Tube, who are in both companies; Youngstown Sheet and Tube being, I believe, the fourth largest steel company in the United States, the fourth largest of the 21 steel companies. So this I.O.C. made up of Hollinger and these five American concerns, announce the imminent commencement of an iron ore project at the Carol Lake section of Wabush Lake, costing well over \$150 million. This great new project will include, by 1962, the operation of a processing plant to produce six million tons of iron ore concentrates a year. That is ore put through the beneficiating plant, going in perhaps as 10 or 12 million

tons of ore and coming out as six million tons of iron ore concentrates; a town to house the workmen and their families - a town with a capacity of 3500 or 4000 souls. I am told that this project is the third largest of its kind in Canadian history, the largest, of course, being the Iron Ore Company's operation that has gone on for the last four years. Construction will begin practically at once but it will not be until 1960 that all - the town, mine and beneficiating plant - will be in production.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the most interesting feature of all: The two groups i.e. the Wabush Iron Company, which includes as I have already said, the Steel Company of Canada, Pickands Mather, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Inter-Lake Iron Corporation and Canadian Javelin, that group and this group, the Iron Ore Company, which is made up of Hollinger, Consolidated Gold Mines in Canada, and Hanna, Republic Steel, National Steel, Armco and Youngstown Sheet and Tube in the United States, have come together and have agreed, at my suggestion - at my urgent suggestion - pressed home to them with great warmth by me on behalf of my colleagues; at my suggestion they have agreed to come together to the extent of building the one railway, jointly, building only and operating jointly the one railway from Mile 224, 40 odd miles westward into the Wabush Lake section, with this understanding: Should the production of iron ore in there at Wabush Lake, the different parts of Wabush Lake country that is, Carol Lake, Julianne Lake, the different sections of Wabush Lake, rise to the tonnage that would make the continued use of just one railway alone impractical, then the railway built would be owned and operated only by the Wabush Iron Group, and the Iron Ore Company Group would have the right to build a second railway running exactly parallel with the Wabush Iron Railway and indeed certainly on the same road bed. That of course would come only if the tonnage to be hauled on behalf of all the interests going in there, i.e. the Iron Ore Company group, the Wabush Iron Group and the Canadian Javelin Group - because that is another group again - and the German group which might very well be the fourth - different regions of that area, each with its own mines, mills, towns, production and beneficiation facilities, but

all under the necessity to ship their ore eastward 40 odd miles to the main railway, which runs south to the Gulf of St. Lawrence; so that the right will be provided, when the legislation is brought before the house, to the second group, the Iron Ore Company of Canada group, to build that second parallel railway, if the physical need should arise.

Now, Sir, in the Wabush Iron project was envisaged a considerably larger project than the one now announced through me today by the Iron Ore Company, and the house will understand the reason for that. The Iron Ore Company is already operating at Knob Lake, Ruth Lake and in the Schefferville area generally. They have produced from there nearly 44 million tons of iron ore in the four years. That will continue. That operation will continue in the Knob Lake, Burnt Creek and Ruth Lake area generally. That is a direct shipping ore which does not require beneficiation. That is shipped exactly as it is ground up in the great quarter of a million electric shovels and poured aboard the railway trains. That is a direct shipping ore that will continue. The purpose of the Iron Ore Company in going into Wabush Lake (the Carol Lake part of Lake Wabush) is to raise, by beneficiation the standard or quality of their iron ore vastly over the quality there presently in the Schefferville area. So that then the two are blended together, the direct shipping ore with the beneficiated ore at Wabush Lake, will constitute a quality of shipment that will compare favourably with any ore, virtually speaking, in the world. That is why the operation in the Wabush Lake section of the Iron Ore Company of Canada will not be as great as the Wabush Company's operation. The Wabush Iron Company will have that one operation only, i.e. the one at Wabush Lake, whereas the Wabush Lake Operation of the Iron Ore Co. of Canada will be just one of two operations they will carry on in Labrador. And they will carry it on primarily for the purpose of raising the quality of their total shipment of ore out of Labrador.

Now, Sir, this will mean at least two new towns in Labrador, one for the Iron Ore Company, which they themselves estimate will house between 3500 and 4000 souls. That is their official estimation. Don't blame me if it is 100 more or less than that. I am

only repeating the figures given me. The town for the Wabush Iron Ore Company will be perhaps as large again, or twice as large as the Iron Ore Company town.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Any indications when that will be?

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, the I.O.C. project goes ahead at once. The Railway, of course, was partly built by the Canadian Javelin Co. before they sold out in part to the Wabush Iron Company group, and they built the right-of-way for something like 20 miles, rough grading. Then of the 20 miles I think 12 miles are ready for laying the tracks. But the whole route is engineered. A very careful survey has been done and completed for the whole of the distance of the 40 odd miles, and drilling has been done, and they have a contour. They have had crack engineers checking engineering data, so that they are in the position to order bridges, to order equipment and to commence, virtually at once, on the building of that railway. Now, that railway is to be built jointly by the two groups, then presumably there will be greater speed in the commencement and in the completion of the construction of the railway. But the Iron Ore project is going ahead quicker, sooner. Its completion will come about sooner than the completion of the Wabush Iron Company project, which will be a year or so later than the first, so that you won't have the two great groups coming into production simultaneously. I ought to have told the house that the I.O.C. now has control of Bethlehem Steel. In giving the list of names, I ought to have added Bethlehem Steel to the I.O.C. group. Thereby hangs a tale. I believe that there was a battle for the last two years between the two groups to get Bethlehem Steel and the Iron Ore —

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): They are in Pittsburgh?

Mr. Smallwood: They are still in Cleveland, but only iron ore companies, not steel. The steel companies are in different parts of the United States. The winning over of Bethlehem Steel represents a great victory for the I.O.C. There is no question about that. The other groups tried hard to get them. There are still great steel companies in the United States to be won, and I will be surprised if the Pickands Mather, Steel Company of Canada, Wabush, Youngstown

Sheet and Tube Group (that is the Wabush Company Group) if they don't add to their number some other extremely important United States steel companies. So that, Mr. Speaker, we will have this situation.

First, all of this is in Labrador; None of it is in Quebec, unlike Schefferville. The town of Schefferville itself is in the province of Quebec. About one-half, so it is estimated, about one-half of the iron ore of the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company is in Quebec. The other half is in Labrador. The boundary separating Labrador from Quebec runs at that point straight across the great body of ore, roughly about half-way, leaving half the body on each side of the boundary. But in the Wabush Lake Section all of the deposits are within Labrador, all. So that the two towns and any others that might develop in the course of time will be exclusively in this Province. The railway in question will be exclusively in this Province of Newfoundland. The taxation, except for what the Government of Canada will collect, federally by way of Federal Income and Corporation Taxation, will be imposed exclusively by the Government of Newfoundland. Then, secondly, and in conclusion, I have to say that these two groups together, operating exclusively in the Province of Newfoundland will be, without a doubt, the largest number of iron and steel companies operating in one place anywhere in the world.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): Is there any reference to markets, Mr. Premier, for those proposed operations?

Mr. Smallwood: They say nothing at all about markets. My own feeling is, and I am sure the house will agree, they are the steel makers of the world almost - certainly of North America, the Western World - I think it may well be said that they are the steel masters of the North American Continent, and that they may be depended upon to know how and where to market the iron ore. Now, I do not think they are likely to over-produce. The evidence of that is seen in this fact; that the Iron Ore Company, for example, in their first year produced, in 1954 (the house will remember their slogan was "Ore in fifty-four"). About three years went in building the railway, getting ready,

and their slogan was "Ore by fifty-four." In the late fall they did actually ship out a bit of iron ore, but 1955 was really their first year. They shipped 8.5 million tons and in 1956 12.1 million tons and in 1957 13 million tons. But in 1958, the year just passed, they shipped only 7.8 million tons; back to less than they shipped in their first year. That was 700,000 tons less than they shipped in their first year. That is because the steel industry and therefore, of course, the iron ore markets of the world were away down. They are, of course, in the production and marketing of iron ore, so I don't think we need worry too much about their problems, and it is their problem where and how they are going to sell their iron ore.

If the house wonders why it is that Bell Island goes on at a slow pace and greatly lowered production at the very moment when these great iron ore and steel companies are announcing vast new developments in Labrador, I can only say the reason must surely be found in both places. The reason must be found partly in Bell Island itself and in the local circumstances that exist on Bell Island, the nature of the ore, the nature of the process of mining and shipping and perhaps other factors about which we have not heard much, but about which we may hear. I have heard some disquieting suggestions as to why Bell Island is slowing down. As I say, the rest of the explanation would probably be found in Labrador; different kinds of ore, different qualities being beneficiated, some of it being pelletized, more readily usable and desirable in the steel mills. There may be a variety of reasons.

Now before I sit down, may I say to satisfy the curiosity and anxiety of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that I hope he will not take too seriously the big lawsuit that we have read about in the newspapers, instituted against Pickands-Mather and the Canadian Javelin and, I believe, the Newfoundland Government and myself. I think it suggests me too - but I am so used to being sued for large sums of money lately.

Mr. Hollett: John Doyle is sued too.

Mr. Smallwood: I dare say he must be sued too. I ask my hon. friend not to take it too seriously. We were told some weeks ago by the Pickands-Mather people, when they

heard that, it was treated very lightly. I may say I don't think anyone has lost any sleep over the matter, unless it be Mr. J. Fine's lawyer.

Mr. G.R. Nightingale (St. John's North): Before the hon. the Premier sits down, Sir, what will the ratio of employment be? What about Newfoundlanders?

Mr. Smallwood: They will be all Newfoundlanders, if we can supply them.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Better become Newfoundlanders in 30 days and get on the job.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one word. I am very happy to hear that announcement by the hon. the Premier this evening because of the fact there may be some hope that a few Newfoundlanders might get some work down there. I have had dealings with certain representatives of the I.O.C. of Canada. I managed to get one man to work down there in about four years. I don't know whether some members of this side or the other side had better luck than that. You have to have your Grade IX before you need apply. After that you have to undergo a medical and means test and every other test you can think about, and then the application might be received. But we have not been able to get jobs for too many men working with the I.O.C. yet - I do hope this extension of the I.O.C. of Canada, actually will give some more of our Newfoundlanders work. We know there is lots of iron ore down there. We have been told by other persons than John Doyle. He knows all about it. He made a fortune, and is a millionaire. He was named in a newspaper the other day as the biggest producer of iron ore in the world. He has not produced a job yet, but he is doing all right. I do hope, Sir, the hon. the Premier's statement will be backed by plenty of work for our Newfoundland people. God knows they all need it today. I am very happy to hear this announcement.

Giving Notice of Questions:

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the remaining answers to questions on the Order Paper of March 4, in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. In so doing, Sir, with your permission, I would like to draw attention to a couple of the items. In the first place I should like to say that all these statistics are prepared by the Federal Department of Economics. We obtained them from them. I would like to draw attention to the answers, which are given exactly as the questions are framed. (5) What was the over-all production since April 1-58 of fresh frozen codfish? Now, I rather think the hon. Leader of the Opposition probably had in mind the total production of all fish. However, the total production of fresh frozen cod was 30 million pounds, but in addition there were 14,549,000 pounds of other species such as haddock, rosefish and so on, so that the total production of frozen fish for the period April 1, 1958 to Dec. 31, 1958 was approximately 45 million pounds, which was about three million pounds I think, less than the year before.

Another comment I would like to make is in connection with the answer to the question as to how many fishermen were engaged in catching fish during 1958. The figure given is 18,210. Now, I think, Mr. Speaker that figure could probably be misleading. Of the 18,000 I could estimate myself that probably about one half were full-time fishermen and the other half would be part-time fishermen, many of whom were probably loggers and workers in mines and so on, who engaged in lobster fishing and salmon fishing and so on for a short period during the season. But what is generally referred to as the main fishery, that is the cod fishery, I would estimate the total in 1959 was about 10,000 full-time fishermen.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. P.J. Canning (Placentia West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I wish, Sir, in a formal way, to extend my congratulations to the mover

and seconder. They acquitted themselves in a manner which impressed the house and left us with something too - a desire to hear more from them in the future. You will notice the first note in the Throne Speech was a happy one, which referred to the Royal Visit. It is one which gladdens the heart of every Newfoundlander. I am sure, Sir, we will give them such a welcome as to insure Her Majesty and His Royal Highness a welcome on what I am sure will be a happy visit across our nation. The second note, Sir, in the speech is indeed a sad one, as we extend our sincere sympathy to the bereaved families of the crew of the ill-fated "Blue Wave." I shall, Sir, further on in my talk, again refer to this tragedy.

Further on, the speech, Sir, realized the state of unrest in our native home; an unrest, Sir, which unfortunately was climaxed in bloodshed which has grieved and shocked the Province from end to end. As has been said, it is a shocking reality for us living in this peaceful, God-fearing little province, to find in our midst an element which, though rooted in a foreign land beyond our borders, has spread its tempest to our doorstep and has lured some of our people into its grip. Although this subject has been dealt with thoroughly, Sir, by previous speakers, I feel it is my duty to re-emphasize some of the hard, cold facts. In so doing, Sir, I pray that they may not fall on deaf ears, but those whom the cap fits may wear it. Referring to two facts, Sir, in defence of our action, I feel that in this day and age it should not be necessary for me nor for any other member to have to rise in this House of Assembly and explain the basic duties of a Government. Sir, the basic concepts of democratic government is a lesson that should be taught (and is not) in our schools, to prepare a child to go out into the world at large so that he will be ever ready to defend our democratic way of life. Sir, I find it is still more serious when this chamber finds itself in a position that has to remind the leaders of the Canadian nation of its failure to perform its duties.

Its recent attitude, Sir, towards this province, the scrapping of agreements makes obvious this need - Our position, Mr. Speaker, in this recent unfortunate event and our reactions are not difficult to understand. This strike, Sir, was planned not only to cripple our economy but to create hatred

and fear and set class against class and threaten the peace and goodwill and destroy law and order, peace and order, Sir, for which some of our people have died on far-flung battlefields of the world.

Sir, this was not a strike planned by Newfoundlanders nor was it planned by good Americans. It was planned, organized and abetted by the underground gangsters, hoodlums, murderers, maniacs and bullies of a foreign nation whose actions have unfortunately blackened American history down through the years and have hounded the lives of their people for over a century. Those gangster's philosophy is to gain power and wealth at any cost. They would not only destroy industry but would destroy us socially and morally and leave us to exist in fear..

Our duty, Sir, as a decent government is to keep law and order within our ranks and to guard our people against outside elements that may threaten that peace and order. Why the Americans do not clean up those gangsters I do not know, Sir, nor is it directly my concern. But when they infiltrate into our unions and take over their control, it is our duty, Sir, to seek them out and remove them from our soil and then to restore our house to its original state. It is very simple, Sir, and very plain to us that ours is an obvious duty and that it is exactly what we did. We have taken lawful and just steps but unfortunately we were too late to prevent that horrible tragedy, and one of our own Newfoundlanders was slain at his post of duty; a young man, Sir, slain by a mob, by an instrument already carved to kill, yielded by an unfortunate individual who struck the mortal blow, a death blow, Sir, which originated when gangsters threatened and told our queen's representatives that the IWA would interpret our laws.

Sir, in my opinion Ladd, Hall (if that be his name) and McCool, (if that be his name) and all those who followed them are part and parcel of that murder. Like other speakers have said, Sir, the great stand of our leader and those of our Opposition will go down in history and Newfoundlanders yet unborn will laud their courage. This noble stand, Sir, defeated the gangster strike. However, Sir, unrest still prevails in Central Newfoundland. Our leader, Sir, at the request of the R.C.M.P., applied to Ottawa for reinforcements, as was our right by contract.

The Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fulton) flatly refused. The contract was broken by the Government of Canada. What a blot, Sir, on this Diefenbaker administration. Our Premier, our Attorney General, the R.C.M.P., our House of Assembly, all representing our Queen, are ignored, slandered and insulted. As for the horrible scene of murder, there went forth blind and distorted reports, fake pictures blazoned across the mainland, which have even the backing of the Canadian Government, without investigation, to ascertain the true facts. Hazen Argue, leader of the CCF, has proved to Canada and the World that he was prepared to deal with the Devil himself to gain political prestige. As far as Newfoundland is concerned, Sir, that leader of the few remaining splinters is out to stay, and 'Argue need not argue.'

Mr. Speaker, it is my honest opinion, my personal opinion, that any political leader, any minister in a government or any private member who knows the facts (and may I say, Sir, none is excused if he does not know the facts) about the Hoffa-controlled unions, and then takes his stand to defend Hoffa to me is a political heel and a traitor to Canada and to our good people.

Now, Sir, it is quite obvious our Prime Minister of Canada has broken a contract and for us, Sir, he has bent us, rather callously, almost to the snapping point - and I am referring, Sir, to Term 29 of our Terms of Union. In my opinion, Sir, Mr. Diefenbaker is playing with fire, a fire that, should it flare up, will deprive him forever from attaining the stature of a statesman. Sometimes I wonder if he has taken contracts as lightly as he has taken his election promises, all of which (or practically all of which) he has broken. Instead, Sir, Mr. Diefenbaker has shown himself to be just a man of words. Canada has fallen back. Relief and unemployment is rampant. There are reports of mines closing down. We find every day markets weakening and some disappearing, and still Nero fiddles. Our Prime Minister, in my opinion, has become a 'fiddling Nero of the 20th century.'

However, Sir, in this Province we intend to keep law and order. We are not going to be kicked around by outsiders. The torch of freedom is lit, and I hope, Sir, for Canada's sake that other provinces will follow the lead

we have taken. And, Sir, we will protect labour. We will protect unions. We will preserve our rights, and right shall prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I looked forward anxiously to the opening of this session to enable us to get on with the usual business of our Province. I had, Sir, several issues affecting my district and the Province as a whole, which I felt deserving of some constructive comment and debate. But, Sir, our usual business had been overshadowed by recent events, and further delayed by the delay of the Terms of Union. I shall, in the time at my disposal, Sir, touch briefly at least on some of the essential matters.

As a representative, Sir, of some 10,000 people for the past 10 years, I have tried my utmost to be fair and constructive in my appraisals of government administration. I have given praise where praise was due, and I have not hesitated to express my disappointment to that which, in my opinion, fell short of my expectations. I shall today, Sir, take only the departments with which I deal practically every day in performance of my duties to this Province. Today, Sir, for obvious reasons, the first department which comes to my mind is that of Education.

The Education department today, Sir, is of particular interest to all of us. We have the obvious necessity of educating all our youth that they may be well prepared to cope with the evil doctrines which may confront them when they go out into the world. This department, Sir, has made rapid strides in recent years. In raising the salaries of teachers, it has attracted more teachers. We have seen grow up around us quite rapidly new schools, scholarships and bursaries going out to our children giving them equality of education. Sir, in our colleges here in St. John's there are children of widows from my district. That is quite a contrast to when I first went into that district, when these children were neither fed nor clothed. Words cannot express my gratitude nor the gratitude of our people to the Government, the Minister, his efficient staff and all others who have helped to attain this end and made this great achievement possible.

In Health too, Sir, we have made strides and have already reached a standard which I think most of us did not expect. I feel sure that both the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health are both able men who fit their role in Government. And I feel that

if funds are made available to them, in a short time we will find standards of both health and education in this province to equal anywhere in North America. The Minister of Highways too, has, through the most progressive programme, built and rebuilt roads at a fantastic pace, which I am sure surpasses our expectations. I should also like to make special mention of the Department of Labour. The minister in charge has a great record. Legislation implemented by his department in the last decade has proven that he is aware of the necessity to protect the welfare of our labourers. I understand this Government is now contemplating raising the minimum wage. It is legislation that should not be necessary. But unfortunately we have, at least in our outports, some businessmen who, from a wage viewpoint still live back in the '30s. I mention these departments, Sir, because of their importance to our welfare, our way of life. The same may be said of all others. At present, we are handicapped by lack of funds, as we await the final terms. They are improving Newfoundland from day to day and making life a bit better for our people.

Now Sir, I arrive at my pet topic. I have placed it last but it is by no means the least. This is the Department of Fisheries. Pertaining to this department I find many controversial issues and problems which would require a full session of the house to debate properly, and then we would be only scratching the surface for a solution. Today I am going to state facts. I am going to make accusations. I am going to suggest remedies, all of which I know will be debated and perhaps should be debated, if we had the time at our disposal. I have closely followed the work of both Provincial and Federal Departments of Fisheries for the past 10 years. I have never in my life lost contact with the fisheries, with seamen, with boats nor with the sea. I was born, Sir, just a safe distance from the sea. My childhood games were played in real boats - not make-believe. At the age of 13 I was taken to the fishing grounds to help me through school. I was in and out of the boats in the last 20 years. I was in and out of boats in the '30's both summer and winter. In 1939 I left the boat to go to where there would be a little more excitement, and for six years I sailed in every type of boat, every type of ship from

10 tons to the 80,000 ton "queen Elizabeth." Sir, I sailed practically every ocean and sea of the world, and I feel that I have had enough experience and that I am well qualified to talk of boats, the sea, fish, sailors or the sailing fishermen. As I said, Sir, during the past 10 years I have closely watched both the Federal and Provincial Departments of Fisheries. There have been times when I felt that our old traditional and once main industry would be revived. At other times, I saw repetitions of failures and fiascos; some excusable and others for which I could not see the justification.

I have listed here today my estimate of our needs. In my honest and sincere opinion, I give them, not to offend but rather to offer them in a constructive way, and I trust that they will be received with the spirit with which I give them. First I have this listed. We have at our doorsteps a gold mine. Perhaps I should not say gold mine but uranium mine. We have at our doorsteps a mine of wealth from which we should be earning millions of dollars, badly needed by our economy. As far as the various species of fish and their abundance, our fishing grounds both near and offshore, Sir, are without doubt the very best of all the fishing grounds of the world. At least six or seven foreign countries, and perhaps more, are reaping the harvest while our fishery is failing and failing miserably. And everyday, Sir, in my opinion, brings us nearer to its collapse, as it fails to keep want and the fear of want from our doors.

Another fact I have here, Mr. Speaker. The world is short of food. People to the east, to the south, to the west and to the north of us need fish. We have fish in abundance. We have thousands of fishermen. People need the fish. The markets exist and others wait for advertisements. I should say that outside stands a big void. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions during the past decade in this house given much advice. I have told of bad business. I have told of fishermen being exploited. I have told of downright robbery. I have talked of the obsolete plants. But today, Sir, unpleasant as it is to me, I am going to strike to the core, and then, I will have no regrets. My job will be done. In my comments I only can bring to light the failures of omission and commission and those to whom the administration is entrusted must apply the remedy.

My first statement, Sir, goes to the core of the matter. There is no clear-cut policy, either Federal or Provincial. There is no clear-cut policy now, nor has there been in the past. There is certainly not at the present time, nor has there been in the past sufficient co-operation between the Federal and Provincial departments. The Federal Government, both Liberal and Progressive Conservative have failed to give sufficient aid to the fishermen. The Federal Government failed to carry out research and experiments to any great extent, as they should, and experiments by our Provincial Government have availed us next to nothing. What they have done, Sir, was not the responsibility of the Provincial Government and should have been at least paid for by the Federal Government.

The bait situation is a fiasco, and it has lost thousands of dollars to our fishermen, year after year, and put thousands of them on relief. Mr. Speaker, now it is worse than a fiasco. It is really a Liberal fiasco deteriorated to a "PC" farce. Last year the worst example of all was seen, Mr. Speaker. Again a few simple facts: The fishery I am referring to now is mostly the codfishery. The codfish is caught with a bait of a smaller fish. The codfish will eat herring and caplin. A codfish will take squid. Last winter, 12 months ago, there were herring in our bays. There were herring there in the Spring. These were followed by billions, I suppose, of tons of caplin, rolling on the beaches in June and July, and followed again by squid. And what do we find in September? What do we find in the Spring? First our lobster fishermen, with lobster pots, anxious to commence fishing but with no bait in the depots.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition) (St. John's West): Excuse me! Could they not use flat fish for lobster pots?

Mr. Canning: With the lobster fishery operating in the spring, in April, not too many flat fish or others come in to the shore. They usually come in with the caplin. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, why they did not get lobster was that the bait was not there. Anyway, Sir, I should perhaps remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I am afraid the Government ought to be reminded that times have changed. We are

living in 1959. In 1913 perhaps a man was satisfied to go out fishing all day and come back in the evening and stand around stabbing flatfish until after dark, but we now have the 42 hour week or 60 hour week, and we cannot expect young men to get up at 1 a.m. and stay on the fishing grounds until 4 p.m. in a dory, and stab flatfish until 9 p.m. and get four hours sleep.

Mr. Hollett: They have to give up the fishery, that is all.

Mr. Canning: No, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at the day and age when we have depots, engines to freeze bait - These things we must accept. They are with us. Mr. Speaker, I say that one of the big things wrong with our fishery is the very thing that the Leader of the Opposition just said. "Why can't they go stabbing flatfish?" We have kept it too old-fashioned.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Would he tell us his opinion of the new, portable freezers with bait which can be handled and moved from place to place as need arises, assuming there were enough of them?

Mr. Canning: I will go back to lobsters — Given time I can talk fish. I can go on forever. I know what I am talking about. Unfortunately I am never listened to, or seldom listened to. I do know something of the depots to which the Premier referred, and I think it is a very good idea. The moving of them, by truck where roads can serve fishermen and by boat would be ideal.

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): If I may, there are two types. What is known as a portable bait depot is something new that the Federal Government is trying out. They are put in some settlements where there is a necessity or a demand for a sufficient quantity of bait to warrant regular freezing establishments. I think the Premier had in mind, the intention that has been expressed by the Federal Department of Fisheries to put in this year a couple of refrigerated trucks which would move around where there are roads.

Mr. Canning: Anyway, Sir, the principle of

the machine the Premier has referred to is a good one. We must, I think, in future have bait delivered by road or by boat - that is when they have the bait. But, if the Federal people are going to allow the bait to be sold to foreign trawlers, and they are not going to get some means other than squid jiggers to get squid, if they are not going to get some sort of modern seine to go out and get the herring (that is if they know where they are) they won't have any bait to go into the depots.

The sixth item I have written down here is perhaps the one that I think the hardest to make. But, like I said, it is my personal opinion and is to be taken for what it is worth. Anyone who wants to defend those to whom I am going to refer has my good will to do so. Our Provincial Department of Fisheries, Sir, lacks experienced personnel, that is with the exception of two or three men, and what is known by them is in theory only. They have not had the practical experience, and therefore they cannot apply the theoretical. The next item I have is that, within the department, there is a lack of faith in the industry and faith in the fishermen. While that is so, Sir, our department is a ship at sea with a good captain - and I repeat, and emphasize with a good captain - but he has not got the crew and he cannot sail her alone. He can give the orders, but if his crew don't know "port" from "starboard" they will beach her on him. The only solution, and the solution I offer, is to go outside the province; put our pride in our pockets and go outside the province and seek experienced men. And they are available. They can be found, in the vicinity of Grimsby in England; in Norway and they are in British Columbia; and I do not know if they are available but I am sure they are in the New England States of America.

Mr. Cheeseman: We have never been very successful in imports of experts, in my memory.

Mr. Canning: Well, Mr. Speaker, that could have been owing to the fault of the person or persons who imported them. Perhaps they were not qualified to find the qualified experts. I don't know!

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to ask a question? I did not quite hear what

the hon. member said. We could get them in Grimsby?

Mr. Canning: What I meant is that you would find a modern fishery at Grimsby and in that area. The English have modernized their fleets and have kept up with the times down through the years. In England they do not wait for the herring to come in to within four feet of water where they use a herring net 20 feet long - and that is what we are doing. They do not wait for the mackerel to come in between two points of land where 60 feet of twine can bar them off. They go out and get them in the deep water. I doubt at the present moment if I went down to either one of the two departments or the research division of the departments and asked them where the squid are, that come in the Fall, and where they are going to come from and where they go - I am pretty well certain if I went down and asked where the caplin are at this present moment they do not know, and I am pretty well certain if I asked where the mackerel are and the salmon they would not be able to tell us.

Mr. Hollett: And who can?

Mr. Canning: Mr. Speaker, it looks like rather a ridiculous situation when they are preparing to go up to see what is beyond the moon and not know where the fish go in the water. I have no doubt I could contact the Russian research ship and they could tell me. They may have other business in the Atlantic, but I think we could learn a lesson from their research ship which visited this port some months ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for me to admit these things. It is unfortunate we are so backward, but we must realize it, and the sooner we realize it the better, to prevent us from losing that great industry. We are all disappointed over the fact that Crown Zellerbach decided against coming in. We are all disappointed at the closing of a mine. But then, we are blessed with a great harvest of the sea and we are failing to reap it.

Mr. Hollett: Tell us what you are doing down in La Scie.

Mr. Canning: There is only one other thing I want to comment on.

Mr. Hollett: \$3 million dollars.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I suggest that those hon. members who have comments to make and who have not yet spoken will have an opportunity of discussing these matters when they do speak. In the meantime the hon. member for Placentia West has the floor.

Mr. Canning: As I was saying, Sir, we have wealth by our doors. We see the Germans, the Portuguese, the English, French and Russians and what not from other nations, coming thousands of miles and taking that wealth from beneath our noses. I could go on for hours talking but it is not talk that will get us anywhere. It is action we need, as far as our fishery is concerned, and action by governments. We must modernize, we must have investigations, we must have research if we are to save the industry. We must find out where the herring are. We must catch mackerel, the cod and the lobster and the other delicacies of the deep. We must seek markets, and get them and hold them. Because, if we want future generations, future Newfoundlanders to continue the fisheries we have to pay them. The way we are going now we cannot pay them. If they could make \$5,000 a year how many of our young men would go down to the sea in ships? We should no longer look down on our fishermen, but look up to them and help them to improve their lot.

Before concluding, Sir, I said earlier that I meant to mention again the ill-fated "Blue Wave". I am going to make a statement now. I feel it is true but I hope it is not. It is based on my own opinion (the statement I am going to make) but it is the result of conversations I have had with fishermen. The statement is that the "Blue Wave" was lost at sea because she was not seaworthy. As I said, that was based on letters I have received, and comments and discussions from people who have come to visit me. It does not rise, Sir, out of this tragedy, because I have heard rumours of it, I have been told by fishermen for the last three, four and perhaps five years. It appears that those ships, or it would appear to me that those boats, built in England, could have been built for the North Sea or off Scotland or perhaps even Iceland where boats fish. In the case of England, in smoother waters

where they haven't got the swell of the ocean (the ocean swell you find 200 or 300 miles off) and in the case of Iceland, I do think that the ships go, the draggers go not far from the land so they would not have to cope with the distance or the cold - I mean by icing up from the storms that we experience in the Atlantic. Then, men who have fished on the "Blue Wave" and men who have fished in her sister ships (how many we have I don't know), they claim that when you load this type of boat to two-thirds of her full capacity she cannot run before a sea in a storm, she cannot run without being swamped in, say, a 50 mile gale. I don't know if this is the case. It has to be investigated and found out. Captain Walters, when he came to the Grand Banks, could not save himself. He had, I understand, a fairly heavy load for the season, steaming towards home, 50 or 60 miles off. I believe the wind was blowing at least 50 miles an hour. To head into the wind, as he had to do, Sir, if this is right, he had to ice up and when he found her icing up and found her listing, there was no other alternative than to turn around or he would have gone down. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said why I had come to this conclusion. I am just stating the opinion of the seamen who must know. Sir, we can imagine what it is like for the families of these yet sailing. They are uneasy, rumors are floating around, and men have definitely left the other sister ships.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Have left them?

Mr. Canning: I was told, Sir, some men have left the sister ships. And I know we all appreciate the position it puts the families and the men themselves in, even if it is only a rumour. It is just as bad as if it were a fact. However I am not going to move, but I suggest that the Government or the Department of Fisheries could possibly contact the Department of Transport and have these ships yet sailing undergo the necessary stability tests for our waters which may be peculiar in this connection. I don't think there is anywhere in the world (except Newfoundland) where men have to fish as far from land or are exposed to such elements as the storms we have, and especially our winter weather. I do not know of anywhere else where the distance involves 200 and

300 miles off-shore. So I would urge, or request, or demand the Government would investigate the matter as soon as possible. On the motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Clarke, Deputy Speaker, took the Chair as Speaker.

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion that an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne be drafted. Unfortunately I was not present on the day that the house opened, and therefore I did not have the privilege of hearing the mover and seconder. I have not heard their speeches, but from the congratulations that they have been receiving from previous speakers, and from my own personal knowledge of the abilities of the two hon. gentlemen I am quite sure that I would be in order in adding my congratulations.

While on the subject of congratulations, I should like to congratulate my colleague, the hon. and gallant member for Placentia West who finished a very eloquent speech just before recess. The hon. member for Placentia West comes from a fishing district. He has been engaged in the fishery himself, and we all know he spent six years in the navy, so that he is well-qualified to speak on matters pertaining to the fishery and to the sea in general. I, too, can appreciate his impatience on some of the matters to which he referred. We all become impatient at times, but I suppose as we grow older there is a tendency to take it a little easier.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say too that I, like every other citizen of this province, am very happy to know that we will be receiving a visit from Her Majesty the Queen and her Husband, the Duke of Edinburgh, this summer. It is very fitting indeed, I think, that their entrance into Canada should be made through Newfoundland - Newfoundland which was the cornerstone of the great British Empire. In these days in some places it seems to be rather out of place to refer to "Empire", but I think that we in Newfoundland still like to refer to it as the "British Empire", and I am quite certain that by making her first stop in Newfoundland, Her Majesty, the Queen, will be getting off to a good start because she will get the kind of welcome that only Newfoundland is capable of giving to the Royal couple.

Mr. Speaker, I should like too, to refer briefly to what is known as the "Blue Wave Disaster". It was again a grim reminder of the hazards that beset the men who go down to the sea in ships and occupy their business in great waters. Such tragedies, unfortunately, are not new to Newfoundland. We have had all too many such tragedies all down through our history. Of course, no part of the island has suffered as much from marine disasters as the South West Coast of Newfoundland. There is, of course, at least one main reason. The South West Coast is the home of deep-sea fishing and another is that the main inshore fishing is carried on during the winter period. Down in the district of Burgeo and Lapoile, which I have the honour to represent, our principle fishery commences in December and follows through until April. I am sure that I do not need to remind hon. members of this house that that is the most hazardous time of the year and that it takes men of great courage, fortitude and strength to follow the sea under such conditions as these fishermen have to contend with. I frequently grow impatient, Mr. Speaker, when I hear hon. members in this house, and people outside who ought to know better, tell the world that nothing in the world does a Newfoundlander enjoy as much as fishing or going to sea; if only he could get a modest living from that he would not ask anything else. It is a fallacy. Why am I here and several other hon. members of this house? My good friend and fellow-townsmen, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, we, were brought up in the fishing-room. Our forebearers were fishermen. Our fathers and grandfathers were generations of fishermen. I will tell you why we are here, Mr. Speaker. Our parents, in the first place had undergone so much hardship that they were determined to try and give their sons an opportunity to do something else other than fishing. I remember very well if I may be pardoned for mentioning a personal matter, I remember how hard my own mother worked to try and scrape together the few dollars to keep us three boys in school so that we would not have to follow the sea as my father had been obliged to do. The hon. member for White Bay North (Mr. Lane) yesterday referred to the subsistence, and he mentioned, I think, there was nothing derogatory about a woman helping

in the garden, or tending sheep or cattle. Certainly there is nothing derogatory about it. My mother did it for many years, but she died at an early age. And the younger generation of women today will not, and neither can we expect them to, do the kind of work that my mother and grandmother and her mother and grandmother before her did. We might as well make up our minds to that. And, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen are leaving the fishing-boats and have been leaving the fishing-boats for the last half-century trying to get into other avenues of employment where not only the remuneration but also the security is better and the hazards less than in the fishery.

Sir, I shall only refer very briefly to the unhappy events that have taken place in Central Newfoundland during the past couple of months but in particular in the past several days. Of course everyone has been shocked. I only want to say that I am very happy to be associated with a leader and with a party, and may I add, Sir, with an Opposition that had the courage to stand up for Newfoundland and to do what we could to eliminate from this province the forces of evil that appear to be penetrating it. I concur wholeheartedly in all the condemnations that have been made of the tactics that have been employed in recent weeks in connection with the events in Central Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, Premier Smallwood is noted, as has been said on many occasions, for his political astuteness, for his ability as an orator, for his love of Newfoundland but I think that perhaps most of us have been inclined to look upon him perhaps more as a politician than a statesman. But the events of the past 10 days have proven that Premier Smallwood is not only a politician. He has emerged in this crisis as a statesman who will go down in history as one of the finest statesmen that Newfoundland has ever produced. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, we have in Newfoundland produced many good statesmen. I was glad to see that the Liberal members from Newfoundland in the House of Commons finally got around to expressing support.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): At long last.

Mr. Cheeseman: At long last, for the actions

that we have taken in this house. I regret only that the P.C. members for Newfoundland in the House of Commons have not yet seen fit to stand up for their native province. I suppose they will come to it eventually.

FISH PLANTS:

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne referred briefly to fishery matters and in particular to the La Scie plant. That plant will be completed this year and will be ready for operation in 1960. I am happy to be able to tell hon. members that the prospects for the successful operation of that plant are now much more encouraging than they were even a year ago. During recent months, I have had enquiries from several reliable operators about the La Scie plant, operators who have expressed an interest in operating it and I am happy to say, and what is unusual about it is that those who have inquired have told me that they would be glad to have the opportunity of discussing with us, when we are ready, the operations of the plant, without the Government having to provide any additional financing. I might say that prospects for the successful operation of that plant have been improved by the fact that within the last year or so large bodies of rosefish have been found off the coast of Labrador, whilst at the same time that particular species of fish has become very scarce in the more southerly waters. The result is that our own trawlers last year were obliged to go far north. That meant a long haul and a smaller number of fishermen. If that fishery shapes up as it seems to be doing, I have the hope that some of the trawlers will find it profitable to call at La Scie with their catches during the autumn. If so, that would enable the plant at La Scie to continue for a greater number of operating weeks than would be the case if they were dependent upon the local inshore fishery. Canada Bay Cold Storage Limited: Mr. Speaker, in order to enable that company to make an operating arrangement with a local producer the Government agreed to defer payment or request for payment of the overdue installments of principal and interest. Arrangements have now been entered into between the operators of the Canada Bay Cold Storage Company's

plant at Englee and the local firm of frozen fish producers, I believe for a five year period.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder if I might interrupt. I understand the hon. minister to say the company who are the operators would be taking over the debt that is owing the Government - are they buying the plant out or what are they doing, the Canada Bay Company?

Mr. Cheeseman: Canada Bay Cold Storage Plant is a small plant, and the amount of money owing the Government by the company is, from memory, I think something to the extent of \$50,000.

Mr. Hollett: \$50,000, yes.

Mr. Cheeseman: Something like that. There are overdue installments of interest and principal, but, I repeat that, in order to permit that company to operate, the Government has agreed to defer any demand for payment until they are in a position to make payments. Twillingate Plant: It is expected that this plant will be completed this year and ready to operate next year. And so far as I know, all the other fresh fish plants in the province will be working to capacity providing that the necessary supplies of fish are available.

In connection with the proposed South Coast project, I do not intend to deal with this at this time. I will do so when I present the estimates. Some references have been made in this house to the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund. I think that there is probably a good deal of misunderstanding about that fund. I happen to know that it has a very substantial sum of money on hand, but, as perhaps some hon. members know, it is a statutory body and is managed by a committee of citizens who do so without any pay. Indeed there are two members of the executive of this Government on the committee. I think it might be well if there was a little more publicity given to the purpose of this fund, and the present financial position of the fund and what it is doing. I think that would be helpful to everyone. I suggest that it might be well that whoever is responsible takes steps to see that is done.

Mr. Duffy: I wonder if the hon. minister

could tell us how much the capital fund is?

Mr. Cheeseman: Well offhand I can't, but my recollection of it, from the last I heard of it, I think that it probably had something around \$400,000 in bank and securities and so on.

The hon. member for White Bay North (Mr. Lane), in the course of his speech on Monday, referred to the inshore fishery and to the trap fishery. He rather suggested that the inshore fishery, particularly the trap fishery was the backbone of the economy of this province. I am sorry that the hon. member is not here at this moment. During this session I have not been able to hear anything from hon. members opposite that I can find fault with or argue about. But, Mr. Speaker, I think I could argue a little with the hon. member for White Bay North on the opinion that he has expressed. The inshore fishery, as a fishery, can be very important if it is prosecuted with the right type of equipment. But I suggest that, as long as the inshore fishermen are only equipped with boats that will permit them to make daily visits from their own home bases to the fishing grounds, then the prospects of being able to get a good return in that manner seems to me to be remote. As to the codtrap, I remember well when I was a very small lad, my grandfather who was a fisherman said to me one day in the course of conversation about codtraps, that a codtrap was a piece of fishing equipment that was only suitable for two types of fishing: the man who had nothing to lose, and the other, the man who was so well off he could afford the bad voyages that were bound to ensue before he got another good one. That, I believe, is still true. The codtrap is a bit of fishing equipment that is put down in the water and the best fishermen in the world can only wait until the fish come and swim in, if and when they do. Now, they do not always come in. But, of course, like the stock market, or the lotter, if you buy enough stocks or if you buy enough lottery tickets and keep on with it you are bound to win sometime.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): There are hon. members in this house who would not agree.

Mr. Cheeseman: One thing, whether they

agree with me or not, I can say from personal experience that there are times we need to be very patient.

Mr. Smallwood: Oh, a lot of members know that!

Mr. Cheeseman: About the codtrap - there are a number of fishermen every season who have a second voyage, but by and large the codtrap has not generally been a profitable piece of equipment to the fishermen of Newfoundland. I am talking about over the years now. There are exceptions. In my opinion, what our fishermen need in order to give them a reasonable chance of earning sufficient to maintain the high cost of living at the present time and the higher standard of living now part of our way of life, the fishermen must be mobile. He must be fitted with boats and equipment that can be moved from one section to another. As an illustration let me tell you that, down in Burgeo & LaPoile district, the great majority of our fishermen operate at least 7 months and most of them 10 months of the year. They do it in this way: they fish during the seasons when operations are profitable on the home-grounds, then they move over to Nova Scotia and later they move all the way down to Trepassay. They operate at one time or another in the year all the way from Sable Island to Nova Scotia to Cape Ballard on the Southeast Coast of Newfoundland. It is only in that way that they are able to earn sufficient money to maintain their boats and equipment and their families. And if you will take the trouble to look at the records, as my good friend and colleague the hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Heffernan) could vouch for, although Burgeo district is essentially a fishing district the percentage of the population receiving able-bodied relief in that district is amongst, if not, the lowest in the whole island of Newfoundland. I am very proud of that. And the fishermen in other districts could greatly improve their earnings if they were more mobile.

Now, Sir, I was very happy this afternoon to hear the hon. the Premier tell us about the prospects for employment in Labrador. This is good news and we are all very happy about it. In concluding my few rambling remarks, I am very happy to be able to tell you that I have a couple of pieces of good news

too. The first is concerning the favourable outlook for fish prices in 1959. For some unknown reason, fish, particularly cod, haddock, and herring have been getting scarcer in the North Atlantic, particularly in the south-western part of it. The permanent catch, despite the improved equipment by the many fishermen of many nations that are engaged in the fishery has been decreasing. That has been particularly true during the past three years. In connection with herring, for instance, as late as 1950, Norway, I think, produced something like nine million barrels. In 1956 a lesser quantity and in 1957 still lesser and in 1958 it was down to less than half a million. And this year the fishery is not yet finished but the indications are that it is going to be down again. And, Mr. Speaker, the Norwegians have the most modern equipment and the most modern boats. They have airplanes, research boats and use every form of research and exploratory efforts to try and find the herring, but they have not succeeded in finding the main body of herring for the past three years. Now, as a result of the decrease in the catch, particularly of cod and haddock, during the past three years, we have now (and in fact several months ago) reached the position where the demand is greater than the supply. That is an old law. Now, no Government on earth has as yet been able to alter that. Prices are regulated by the law of supply and demand more than by any other methods. The result is that prices have improved in all markets for both salt fish and fresh fish, but it is particularly true of fresh and frozen. Within the past year the price of frozen fish, that is the finished product known as "fish blocks" from which are made "fish sticks" and various types of consumer items, the prices have increased by a minimum of five cents per pounds. As I see it and on the basis of all the information available to me, I would hazard a guess that prices for 1959 should be the best year for our fishermen that we have experienced at any time since World War II. Now, I think that information I have just given, barring any international upset which we cannot possibly foresee at this time, is very accurate and I hope will be some measure of encouragement to our fishermen.

The next final piece of good news that I have this afternoon, and you will be glad to

know that when I give you this piece of good news I shall be able to sit down, this piece of good news is that at last, after a great deal of trying, a great deal of trouble and worry, at last the Government has been able to arrange the sale of the Fortune Bay Products property, and that Fortune Bay Products plant will go into operation again this year. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the house, all of us, and I am sure our hon. friends opposite are very glad that it has been possible to arrange the re-activation of this plant. I should like, Sir, at this point to pay special tribute to the hon. member for the district of Burin (Mr. Jones). I know the closing of the plant has been a great source of worry to him. I know that at times he was very impatient with the Government or with me in particular. He has worked hard and continuously to try and get the reactivation of the plant. The same is true of the Premier and every member of the Government. We have been doing our utmost to try and get that plant re-activated but until a couple of days ago our efforts were without success. On February 25, the Government of Newfoundland gave Booth Fisheries of Chicago an option on all the assets of Fortune Bay Products including the dragger "Comet". We gave them an option to purchase the whole of these assets for the sum of \$50,000. A couple of days ago we received word from Booth Fisheries to say "notice is hereby given that we do exercise said option effective March 30, 1959." Now, Mr. Speaker, I particularly mentioned the price at which we sold these assets because I want to emphasize the fact that at no time since the plant was closed in September 1956 did the Government ever think or expect that we would ever be able to sell the plant to anyone who would operate it, for the sum that would bear any relation whatsoever not only to the cost but bear any relation to the amount that was owing to the Government.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): What relationship does \$50,000 bear?

Mr. Cheeseman: So small I can't figure it out. The main concern of the Government was to find an operator....

Mr. Higgins: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Cheeseman: - who would buy the plant or even take it.

Mr. Higgins: Take it and run it...

Mr. Cheeseman: With the ability - provided they had the ability - to finance it on their own and to operate it successfully. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have now found such an operator. Booth Fisheries is one of the largest fish-producing, processing and shipping firms in the whole of North America. They are well qualified in every respect. In fact I cannot think of any firm more qualified than Booth Fisheries to make a success of it, and I sincerely hope, as I am sure every hon. member of this house does, that Booth Fisheries will make a success of the venture. I am sure that the people of Fortune and Lamaline, who are the ones most concerned with the reactivating of this plant, will be glad to hear that the plant is to be re-opened, and I am sure that they too would join us in expressing the hope that the operators, Booth Fisheries, will make a financial success of the venture. Because, Sir, let there be no mistake about it. Unless Booth Fisheries can make a profit from the operation, then the operation of the plant will not be of very long duration. A company must make profits in order to be able to carry on. It is therefore to the interest of the people in the area and to the general economy of Newfoundland that the operating company make a success. Finally, again I say, with all sincerity and with all my heart, that I do hope, for the sake of the people of the area, that when the plant re-opens that it will continue to operate indefinitely.

On motion of Mr. Hollett the debate on the Address in Reply is adjourned.

Hon. Premier: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.

Thursday, March 19th, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the house that the

Government have decided to create a new annual scholarship in memory of the late Constable William Moss. This is to be known as the "William Moss Memorial Scholarship". It will have a value of \$600. It will be awarded every year to the son or daughter of a Newfoundland policeman who comes highest in the public examinations in Grade X, and can be utilized, of course, for study in Grade XI.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. William Smallwood (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Shoe Cove. The prayer of the petition is for a connection from the settlement of Shoe Cove to the road which is now under construction between the settlements of LaScie in White Bay and Tilt Cove in Green Bay district. Mr. Speaker, the distance from Shoe Cove to LaScie is approximately four miles, but the highroad which is under construction at present comes within a distance of two miles from Shoe Cove. This petition is signed, Sir, by all the inhabitants of Shoe Cove. I strongly support the prayer of the petitioners and request that the petition be laid on the table of the house and referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. Dr. F. W. Rowe (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that petition which the hon. member for Green Bay has just asked leave to table in this house. The area to which he refers is one which of course borders on my own district of White Bay South, and I know of no place in Newfoundland where it is more important that a road be built at the earliest possible opportunity. As the hon. Member said, Shoe Cove is a very short distance both from Tilt Cove, where we now have very large activities and a growing and important mine, and is also a very short distance from the important community of LaScie in White Bay South where, as this hon. house knows, the Government is now engaged in putting the the finishing touches on a great fishery plant, which we hope will revolutionize the fisheries in that part of Newfoundland. It is absolutely essential, Mr. Speaker, that there be easy access of communication between that place and smaller

places in Green Bay and White Bay South so that people may be able to get back and forth to both the mine at Tilt Cove and the fish plant at LaScie, because many people, without doubt, will be working at that plant. And secondly, it is most important that during stormy weather, when boats are unable to go the 15 miles or so around Cape John, (one of the stormiest parts of Newfoundland) it is most important that men and trucks be able to get back and forth from these places with fishery products and persons as well. I give my heartiest support to the petition which the hon. member for Green Bay has asked leave to table in this house.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, for reasons neither hon. gentleman has mentioned I support the prayer of the petition. I was in Shoe Cove once. I ran in there. I had a private boat hired, and I came south from St. Anthony and all up through the French Shore and White Bay and around to LaScie, and then, instead of coming around Cape St. John to Green Bay I sent the boat around and left myself to go from Tilt Cove to LaScie, to Shoe Cove - and I ran the whole distance. I needed the exercise. I was younger than I am now, and to prove to myself that I could do it, I ran the distance, which must have been four or five miles. I remember vividly it was uphill for about a mile or maybe more, rather a steep grade, then it levelled off, and as you got toward Shoe Cove it was downhill. I got into Shoe Cove just at the precise moment when a small boy fell over the head of the stage and was all but drowned. An old gentleman nearing 90 fished him out of the water and saved his life. I believe that boy is now a young man. If for no other and no better reason than that I would like to see that road built, and I would be prepared to give it what moral support I can. I support the prayer of that particular petition, and I hope they get the road.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): You must have given them an awful scare that time.

Hon. Premier: The next time I go there perhaps I can motor in instead of running. I would be less able to run now than I was then.

On motion, petition received, for referral to the department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, entitled, "An Act Further to Amend the Trustee Act." I further give notice, on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, that he will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce two bills:

A bill: "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act."

A bill: "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

I also give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

And, on behalf of the hon. Minister of Health I give notice he will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Pharmaceutical Act, 1954."

Also - a bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Food and Drugs Act," also — a bill: "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland Medical Board Act," and a bill: "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that in the normal course these Bills would be introduced and read a first time tomorrow, but we hope to have them dealt with when the house resumes after recess.

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers of the Nomenclature Board," also, a bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

Hon. E. S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow move that the house resolve itself into a committee to consider the granting of interim supply to Her Majesty.

Hon. F. W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill: "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Pensions Act;" a bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act, 1959;"

and a bill: "An Act to Amend The Public Libraries Act."

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Frobisher Limited (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955;"

A bill: "An Act to Amend the M. James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955;"

A bill: "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Advocate Mines Limited;"

A bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act;"

A bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Questions 1 and 18 tabled (See index)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): **SALMON PAYMENTS DUE (WHITE BAY)** Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might ask the Minister of Fisheries or the appropriate minister if anything has been done in regard to compensating the salmon fisherman in Jackson's Arm, White Bay. I brought up the question last year and did not get a quite satisfactory reply. I wonder if the Minister could give us some idea. These men were promised payment a long time ago. I have telegrams and messages in my possession. It is only a matter of between \$4000 and \$5000. These people feel like they were let down.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be a little more specific now as to just what is in his mind.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Minister does not know the answer immediately, he could take it as notice.

Mr. Hollett: I could explain now.

Mr. Cheeseman: As far as the fishermen of White Bay are concerned, I cannot say now just what the hon. Leader has in mind, what particular shipments, or years.

Mr. Hollett: O'Brien Fisheries, Mr. Speaker: Remember that firm went insolvent and left a lot of fishermen down there. I have the itemized list here, and they did not get paid for salmon like they were promised. The lobster fishermen were paid some 40 odd thousand dollars, I believe, and the salmon fishermen were not paid.

Mr. Cheeseman: Mr. Speaker, now that I know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has in mind I can say, as far as I am aware, the Government of Newfoundland has no responsibility for bills contracted by O'Brien Fisheries Limited, and also I understand O'Brien Fisheries has gone into insolvency in the last year or so.

Mr. Hollett: They were when they were paid for lobsters too.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be as brief as possible in this matter of the Throne Speech because a good many people have spoken already, more from the Government side, I believe, than I have ever heard speak on the Address in Reply. Sir, I am not speaking in any perfunctory way when I offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the motion, because I think the two hon. gentlemen, one from Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) and the other from Carbonar - Bay de Verde, (Mr. Clarke) gave excellent addresses. They are young men and they have their lives ahead of them, as far as service in this house is concerned, if they can ever get re-elected, and I hope they will, because they are good men. I would sincerely hope to see them elected, on our side or whatever side they may be on. But I can say, Sir, that these two men are young, well-educated and have lived amongst the people of this country not only on the Avalon Peninsula but outside the Avalon Peninsula, and they know very well

the needs of our people. I am very happy to extend my congratulations to them for the manner in which they discharged their duty.

The next matter in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, has been noted - the proposed visit of Her Majesty the Queen sometime this year, June, I believe it is. We do hope that at that time there will be no turmoil in this country. We hope there will be no fog, speaking in every sense of the word, and that the visit of Her Majesty the Queen across this threshold of Empire (may I put it that way?) in this year of Our Lord, 1959, will be very pleasant and that as many as possible of our Newfoundland people, particularly our children, may be privileged to join in the welcome which we Newfoundlanders will certainly give to her or any other member of the Royal Family who should visit here in the future.

The next matter which was mentioned in the Throne Speech was the matter of the "Blue Wave" and the loss of 17 men on the South West Coast, all from Grand Bank and Fortune. I am quite sure we all voice the sentiments which were expressed in the Throne Speech. One could perhaps say quite a lot about this tragedy, but, as I have already said here, we are accustomed to tragedy in this Province. We have had, as far back as I can remember and for many generations before that, tragedies year after year. But it seems to me sometimes the nearer we are the harder it strikes. We know, particularly myself and my friend opposite, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, and I am quite sure the hon. member for Burin, we know these people. We knew their fathers and their mothers and we know the dangers and hazards which they have to go through, not only on the Burin Peninsula or in Grand Bank, Fortune, but all over Newfoundland. We know the hazards which have to be faced each year in order to keep the wolf from the door. And when tragedy strikes and the bread winner is taken away, we know how hard it is for those left behind, for the mothers to support their families, particularly today.

I have first-hand knowledge of this because for a good many years I was a magistrate, 13 years in the area, and we had many losses of life during that period. And practically the only help that was forthcoming was from the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund and

that in terms of dollar value to me now does not look very much. We were told yesterday, I believe, that there is some \$500,000 in that fund at the present time. I do hope that whatever is in charge of that fund will be of very generous in looking after those who are left behind in that great disaster in Grand Bank and Fortune, especially if it comes under the control of the government.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): If my hon. friend will allow me. My hon. friend is aware, of course, that the Government have nothing at all to do with the spending of the money in the "PMDF". That is a private fund although we are represented on the board through two ministers.

Mr. Hollett: I knew the government was connected in some way or other, that is, there are government trustees on the board.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes.

Mr. Hollett: I think the government are trustees for the fund.

Mr. Smallwood: No! No!

Mr. Hollett: I see. At any rate we have a government trustee on the board of the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund, and I do hope the government will use its influence to persuade these trustees in charge of the fund to be generous to the dependents of these people. I am quite sure that, all across Newfoundland, our people feel sorry for those left behind in that terrible tragedy. Now, Sir, as I look at the Speech from the Throne, the next matter which was brought to our attention was that of this business in the centre of Newfoundland, I would like to read that part of the Speech from the Throne.

Excerpt:

"My Ministers, in common with the vast majority of our people, have viewed with great concern the economic and other turbulence now prevailing in the largest and the most vital of our industries. My Ministers deem it their cardinal duty to take all reasonable

steps to insure that the future of the pulp and paper industry in Newfoundland, involving directly or indirectly the well being of the entire Province, is not jeopardized. You will be kept informed of development so that you will be in a position to take whatever action you may consider to be necessary."

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been an awful lot said about this situation which developed over the strike of the IWA loggers, a lot said in this house and a lot said in Ottawa and a lot said in the press, much of it said in Manitoba and British Columbia. As a matter of fact, there has been more said on the Mainland than there has been said here, where we have true knowledge of what actually happened. Much more has been said on the Mainland. It seems to me they know all about it in British Columbia and they seem to know all about it in Manitoba where even the Legislature should be charged with a very serious offence, they say.

In view of news I heard today, I think I ought to be very careful over what I say, but it is incumbent upon me to say something because of the attitude which we on this side of the house have adopted towards certain legislation which the Government brought in and in consequence because of the criticisms we have received from friends and foe in Newfoundland and in other parts of the Canadian nation. We received a lot of criticism. As a matter of fact for the time being we seem to be in the same boat as the government, and we are doomed to perdition everlasting because of the action we have taken. I particularly read this paragraph from the Speech from the Throne to show on what that legislation was based. It was based on two things, Sir, turbulence and the economy. In neither case, Sir, should the government take half-hearted steps. When trouble arises, riots, law-breaking, then the government, if it is fit to govern, must take steps which will strike at the heart of it, stop it, put an end to it, and not half-hearted steps. They must not do things to just 'aggravate.' I have heard that word used! The government must not do things just to aggravate the strike situation. No! They must do things just to aggravate the turbulence and violence. No! They have to put a stop to it, and the Government and the Attorney-General have the necessary authority to put down any such turbulence.

The IWA - of course I must say I don't know all the history, but I take it that they know about the I.W.A. in Canada, and they know more about it in this particular place here. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this - an editorial from the "Daily Nugget", where is it, North Bay? It was on March 10, at any rate.

Mr. Smallwood: It is North Bay, Ontario.

Mr. Hollett: In Ontario, not far from Toronto, I suppose - the land of the good.

Hon. E. S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): It is 200 miles from Toronto.

Mr. Hollett: This is the editorial in the newspaper:

"The North Bay District has been watching developments in Newfoundland with more than ordinary interest. Premier Smallwood's all-out attack on the International Wood Workers Association has particular interest for this area because it was the I.W.A. which called the strike last summer at Field Lumber Company." - (this outfit seems to like lumber) - "a strike which is still going on. There were incidents in connection with the dispute in Newfoundland between the I.W.A. and the lumber companies and these incidents prompted Premier Smallwood's action. There were incidents at Field too" (Field is the name of the place) "These are the incidents, the dynamiting of an airplane, the setting fire to the lumber yard right in the Town of Field, the stoning of houses, the threatening of citizens. Out of the Newfoundland dispute has come the formation of a new union, the Brotherhood of Newfoundland Wood Workers...."

(Mr. Hollett read this article from the newspaper, which was then tabled).

Mr. Hollett: Now, these people have knowledge of the I.W.A. and anybody who has read the papers in the last few years back will have heard about the violence which took place in British Columbia and indeed which is taking place even now, in some instances. So that, as far as I can find out, where the I.W.A. settles there arises trouble and violence. At any rate, Sir, certainly trouble broke out in Central Newfoundland, and the Attorney General decided, -

the Government decided - that something would have to be done to put a stop to the situation which had existed there. We know what happened up there. Eventually, peace officers were sent there to do their duty, and we have found in Newfoundland that peace officers, police and R.C.M.P., in carrying out their duties, do so like true Newfoundlanders, in an able and efficient manner with no cruelty whatsoever, no hardship. They have always done that in Newfoundland, as far as history goes, and we feel mighty sure that they did the same thing out there. At any rate, we all know what happened to this policeman. And I am not going to say much about that on account of the things I did hear today. I am not going to say very much about that, but I have here another editorial from the "Globe and Mail," which Mr. Speaker, if you will bear with me, I would like to read: This is in defence, more or less, of the R.C.M.P.

"In Newfoundland the tables are turned right about. In Newfoundland until the middle of this week the middle of this week the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hated by the Newfoundland Constabulary, had been forced in the line of duty to defend the rights, persons and property of non-strikers against attack by members and officials of the International Woodworkers of America. Now, the R.C.M.P. are forced in line of duty to defend the rights of persons and property of I.W.A. members and officials against attack by non-strikers and by the general public. The situation came about as a result of the riot at Badger on Tuesday, when a policeman was fatally injured and several other civilians and a policeman sent to hospital" (it is a little garbled here) - The article continues: "After the riot the I.W.A. found itself at the other end, the receiving end, of the struggle and the violent deeds are being committed against its own members and officials and property, as for example: The mob attack on I.W.A. property in Windsor on Thursday".....

Mr. Hollett: So from that we gather that all Torontonians are not of the same ilk.

Hon. F. W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Some of them learned some bitter lessons, lately, the hard way.

Mr. Hollett: Including our own United Church Presbytery there. I myself am (at least I was born) a Methodist, and sometime during the past years I was transferred, without my consent, to the United Church. I dare say, therefore, the United Church may have the honour to bury me some day. But I am sorry that the United Church in Toronto did not take the trouble to find out the true picture down here before they made the rather awkward situation for our church here in Newfoundland. And I want at this time to congratulate our officials of the United Church here for the stand which they took in endeavouring to present the truth to the Canadian people on the Mainland. And I want to congratulate the heads of the other churches in Newfoundland who have endeavoured to put the record straight with regard to the actual happenings in Newfoundland, Central Newfoundland. I will say this: I never had a greater regard for churches, for all churches. I am one of the faithful sinners, but I do say I have respect for the Church and I have greater respect for all churches in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite sure every member of this house has and I am quite sure every Newfoundlander has a greater respect for the heads of their churches than they had prior to this. But surely it was not necessary for a gallant young policeman to die for us to have that respect for them. No, it was not.

This policeman, William Moss, like a true soldier, died in the line of duty trying to preserve law and order. He had served overseas before, and surely we in this country, surely the people in Canada, will see to it that this man did not die in vain. He died for a principle. He died for the preservation of law and order and he died just as much to preserve the unions as he did to protect the non-unionist. Just as, Sir, every member in this house stands for unionism much more than some of the heads of some of the unions.

The legislation that everybody is kicking up such a fuss about and over which a good many people seem troubled, unable to make up their minds, is quite simple -

"Whereas a strike has been called in the wood's labour part of the pulp and paper industry of the Province, and whereas, since those strikes were called, many loggers have been convicted of offences against the

Criminal Code arising out of the strike and have been fined or sent to prison etc. And whereas because of the lawlessness etc...are reluctant to do so etc....and because of these things a state of grave emergency exists in the pulp and paper industry of the Province and the economy of the Province is in jeopardy and whereas in these circumstances etc....extraordinary steps..."

The Act precisely states the trouble and states exactly what it is going to do - take extraordinary steps - not half-hearted steps, not a futile attempt but extraordinary steps to endeavour to bring an end to this emergency. And, Sir, if anybody wishes to dwell on the matter, to try to make up his mind as to whether or not an emergency exists, I want to refer for a moment to the economy of Newfoundland. What does the economy of Newfoundland consist of? We have the fisheries and we have our mining industry and we have two paper mills. These, in great measure, make up the economy of this country. I think in all probability one half of our economy is dependent to great measure upon the woods industry, the paper industry. I would say that almost half of our population are dependent upon John Jones, the logger, to go into the woods and cut down the trees.

There were, at this particular time, some 1200 men in the woods in Central Newfoundland, and I think 790 of them voted to strike. In other words, this 790 men decided, irrespective of the welfare of the 200,000 people who depended almost entirely upon the woods for their livelihood, that they would strike at this particular time of the year when, and only when, wood could be brought out to feed the mills which produced the dollars to feed the people of Newfoundland. Even at the outset, I remember distinctly seeing this man, Ladd, go on the air on an interview on C.J.O.N., T.V. and I remember hearing Mr. Ladd state, definitely, that if it so wanted they would contact labour unions in England and in the Western World and have them refuse to handle the products of Newfoundland. Was there an emergency?

Hon. F. W. Rowe (Minister of Education): They did contact them.

Mr. Hollett: Was that not an emergency? Did not that have to cease? Therefore the

government, and consequently we, have decided with the government on this particular occasion, for which we have been damned, we too have done what we believe at any rate to be the right and proper thing to do. Sir, referring again to the economy of this country, I asked a question, and have the answer, relative to the number of people on relief. And I want you to listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The number of persons on able-bodied relief in Newfoundland in November was 43,357 - one in every 10. One person in every 10 in Newfoundland was on relief, and the cost, for a 12 month period, at that rate, was approximately \$3,700,000. Then there was a number of persons, Sir, on sick relief, 4,000 on sick relief. That cost \$480,000. Then there was something else; social assistance paid out to 7,000 persons per month, which cost, for the 12 months, a further \$3,881,000 or the total cost of these three services for able-bodied relief, for sick persons and social assistance, all of these, the total cost for the 12 months was \$8,061,000, in a population of 450,000 or less. In other words, during that period, and during last year, there were 54,199 persons receiving able-bodied, sick relief and social assistance, 54,000.

Mr. P. J. Canning (Placentia West): Tory times are hard times.

Mr. Hollett: Tory times are hard times. I am coming to the hon. member shortly, a little later, because I do remember a speech which he made and you will find it on page 14 of the 1950 Hansard, when the hon. Member for Placentia West seconded the motion for the Address in Reply - I shall come to that in a minute. I want him to look back and possibly then, Sir, he may consider coming over here.

Again with regard to our economy, Sir, there are 25,000 wage earners today receiving unemployment insurance, 25,000. Let us take 12,000 of these and say they are married (less than half) and give them a wife and two children each, that is 50,000 and add the other, 60,000 people in Newfoundland today receiving unemployment insurance. And remember, Sir, 54,199 are receiving relief and 60 odd thousand receiving the benefits of unemployment insurance; all together persons in Newfoundland receiving relief or living by means of unemp-

loyment insurance. Can you imagine, 115,000 out of a population of 443,000 people, 115,000 of them today living either on relief paid out by the government, to the tune of \$8,000,000, or receiving unemployment insurance. That is the state of our economy. If we take out the people receiving the old age pension and the 3,000 people receiving old age assistance that would make some 123,000 persons receiving benefits of some kind out of a population of 443,000 - all referring to our economy.

What about our fishery, Sir? How many fishermen have we in Newfoundland today? I think the hon. Minister of Fisheries indicated yesterday, in answer to a question, he got from the economics division of the Federal Department of Fisheries, some 18,000.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): It is 18,000 and some odd.

Mr. Hollett: I would say there would be no more than 15,000. Most of these 15,000 fishermen are compelled, by reason of the fact they live here in Newfoundland, to be idle from October to May, seven months, six, or seven months, at any rate. Look at our economy. Practically all of our fishermen clear of those who go on draggers and trawlers are compelled to be idle as far as the fishery is concerned, catching fish to create wealth, to be idle practically seven months of the year. Now if we put up against that, the catch of fish which was taken this year - and I have the answer here - last year light salted 367,000 dry hundred weights. This year, 207,000. Heavy salted last year, - 509,000. This year 374,000. In other words, this year, 580,000 quintals all together, light salted and heavy salted, and last year 867,000. That is quite a different return, almost 300,000 quintals less than last year. There is our economy again.

Mr. Cheeseman: Or \$2 million.

Mr. Hollett: Over \$2 million. That will give you some idea of our economy with regard to the fisheries.

Again in regard to our economy, we must take a glance across the Tickle over there and have a look at Bell Island, and see what happened the other day when 550 men were told their services were no longer re-

quired after a certain date. Thanks to the intervention of the government, and I would like to think the opposition shared in that too...

Hon. Premier: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: I don't want to be joined up with the government altogether, but I do think we are of the same mind on that particular score as is the Premier.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: Thanks at any rate to his intervention, they have two months grace, but then they are going to be laid off. Unfortunately, over and above that, when they are laid off, the company are going to make up for what they pay them now by having other men afterwards take time out, lay them off as well. That is the state of our economy. That will give us some idea where we are and whither tending. Our fisheries here in Newfoundland - \$12 million less in value than last year and that is just salt fish, and Bell Island with men threatened with lay off. Then we have, Sir, this situation arising - and let us not forget the amount of able-bodied assistance and people on unemployment insurance.

I want to draw attention to Grand Falls because Grand Falls is the hub for the livelihood of practically the whole of Central Newfoundland and a good many places around the coast. Now, as I said, Grand Falls and Bowaters are indeed the support of practically half the population of Newfoundland. If anything were to happen whereby these companies were to close down where would we be? Where would our economy be then? I have here, as I suspect all members have, a copy of a joint statement by the AND Company and Bowaters. This is signed by Albert Martin, Vice President and General Manager of Bowaters and G.R. Moore General Manager, Anglo Newfoundland Development Company. The last two or three paragraphs - and they are only short - read as follows:

"The paper companies do not intend to allow the I.W.A. to further the economy of the industry in Newfoundland by perpetuating its presence in the Province through collective agreements. Under no circumstances, therefore, will the

AND and Bowaters sign any agreement with the I.W.A. If the wood supplies of the company become exhausted through the efforts of the I.W.A., AND and Bowaters will shut down their mills at Grand Falls and Corner Brook."

That ought to be sufficient to wake us up to the danger. I think the AND Company and Bowaters both are bigger companies, bigger corporations, bigger at heart, and I am quite sure of the AND Company because I lived up there for seven years. These people would not dare sign a thing like that unless they saw there was no hope for them if they were to be victimized by anybody, much more a union which would control the loggers who were required to cut down the raw material of pulp and paper. I think, therefore the government had to take on something like that, the way they did.

I am trying to prove to this house that there was an emergency, and that there is an emergency. As a matter of fact there is always an emergency in Newfoundland. But here was one thrust at us by a few people who were impelled by the coming of the I.W.A. Here was an emergency. Well you will remember there was a board set up to determine what agreement might be reached or what could be awarded to the loggers by the AND Company. This board was called a "Conciliation Board". Mind you, this is the same board who recognized what the I.W.A. wanted, but in spite of that wrote this in the report:

"Unfortunately this drastic change in labour - management relations developed at a time when, in the considered opinion of this board, the newsprint industry of Newfoundland is facing very serious difficulties. The difficulties include amongst others, adverse changes in newsprint market conditions, technological advances in manufacture and increased competition from low-cost mills located nearer markets served by the company. It is quite conceivable this situation could react to the serious detriment of the company and of the approximate six or seven thousand wood workers hired by the company during the course of the year."

Having stated that, they then decided these men should get the increases and shorter hours they asked for. Did they not recognize there was an emergency in the woods

industry? Had they not been reading items relative to the woods industry? Do they not know that both these big companies have mills in other parts of the world in which they can produce newsprint much cheaper than they can here in Newfoundland? Yet they said that! As to the rightness or the wrongness (if I may use these terms) of the government's action - mind you, I am not trying to defend ourselves, and when I say "ourselves" I include the Government and members of the Opposition because, as I have pointed out, we have been castigated. Well, I won't go any further into that at the moment.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Not in Newfoundland.

Mr. Hollett: Oh, yes, in Newfoundland, and by some of our own friends too. When you do your duty you don't worry about things like that. I hope the government will take courage from that. Do your duty and you have nothing to fear. Did we do right or did we do wrong? The "Canadian Register" printed this editorial, headed "Not Above the Law"

"Premier Smallwood's action in denouncing the International Woodworkers of America and announcing his intention to form a loggers union independent of the I.W.A. stirred up unionists far beyond the shores of Newfoundland."

Of course in all the indignation and accusations about government interference and loggers alone having the right to form a union some of the basic facts have been overlooked. The loggers or any group of working men have a right to organize a union. That is recognized by any civilized people in the world, non-communist. That is a natural right and the State cannot prohibit such organizations as such. If it did so it could prohibit organizations for church, for formation of churches. It is a natural right, and indeed the State cannot prohibit such for the function of the state is to protect natural rights and not destroy them. But as Pope Leo XIII, that is the Late Pope Leo, pointed out, in his writing on conditions of labour, and not many years ago, and I quote — this is what the Pope said:

"There are times, no doubt, when it is right that the law should interfere to prevent association, as when men join together for purposes which are evidently bad, unjust or dangerous to the State. In such cases the public authority may justly forbid the formation of association and may dissolve them when they already exist." Now, that is from a pretty high authority in the Church.

Mr. Smallwood: That happens to be the basic foundation of the teaching of the church on labour matters.

Mr. Hollett: Yes. And is it not the basic principle of all churches, of the members of this house?

Mr. Smallwood: Yes.

Mr. Hollett: We know unions have the right to organize, the right to collective bargaining, but when joined together for a purpose which endangers the state's welfare and when they join together and commit acts of violence — and God knows there has been violence up there, then, of course, any government has the right to step in. Then they go on:

"If the report of criminal acts by union members is true and these are countenanced by the union even by subtly ignoring them, we believe the Premier is justified in condemning the I.W.A., and so far these seem factual."

Getting back to Grand Falls again, it was there in Grand Falls, Sir, that this strike threatened to tie up the woods operation. As you know, the woods operation in Grand Falls has been there for 50 years. They have brought about \$400 million into the economy of this country in that period. They have a daily production of newsprint of over 800 tons, and the annual payroll in Grand Falls amounts to \$16 million. And, Sir, \$16 million is a pretty nice slice of our economy. They have, Sir, \$16 million for a payroll. There are slightly less than 2,000 loggers in Badger-Bishop's Falls who needed to cut the necessary wood, and these men come from all over Newfoundland. They live in about 27 camps, and most of the logs have to be hauled over company roads, of which there are 450 miles and have cost the company, not the govern-

ment, \$4 million, cost the producers \$4 million; which is one reason why it costs more to put a roll of paper in New York or London from Newfoundland than it does from Tennessee and other places. Practically all our newsprint and pulp wood is exported. And on that depends the livelihood of most of the 2,000 loggers and also a large number of fishermen who work part-time in the woods as well as the populations of such towns as Grand Falls, Windsor, Bishop's Falls, Botwood, Millertown and various other smaller settlements. Grand Falls alone has a population of nearly 7,000 people.

Now then, Sir, let us face these facts and then let us ask ourselves: was there no threat to our economy? I have clearly outlined the condition of our present economy at the present time. I have outlined to you, Sir, the danger of tying up woods work at this time of the year in the Grand Falls area or Bowater's area. I have told you of our fishery, of the people who are on relief. Let us, knowing all these facts, ask ourselves: was the Government right when they said there was an emergency? Was the government right? That was one of the two questions we had to decide. Was the Government right? Is there an emergency?

Mr. Speaker, do not think for one moment - we did not side with the Government without going in and getting these facts, knowing just what would happen if this strike was not ended. Was there no violence? Look at the records in the courts. Is it right and proper that picketers can pick up a car bodily, with a dozen or twenty men, and turn it around and say "Get out of here" and then boast about what they did? Is this picketing? Was not that known to the IWA management, to Mr. Ladd and his associates? I claim, Sir, that was known not only to them but that they instigated it. They instigated that, and that is the same principle which they adopted all across Canada, this American Woodworkers, the IWA. They have done that in the United States and they did it in British Columbia for a large number of years, and they burnt the forests - they did burn forests out there. I read an article a few minutes ago where they dynamited an airplane. Was there no emergency? Any government, Sir, which neglected to try to put a stop to this threatened emergency and actual emergency would not be worth its salt. And we, on this side of the house,

would not be worth our salt if we did not get after the government and tell them to hurry up and do something about it.

That is the reason, Sir, we supported this legislation. There was an emergency and there was violence, and if there is any man or woman in Newfoundland, today, who hearing these things can say "you fellows should be tried for this and not the IWA?" (And we have heard that from away out in British Columbia or Alberta or Manitoba - it does not matter which). There was an emergency. There was even a member of the provincial house out there - I think he was the one who decided we ought all to go to the electric chair, one of the members of that house. What does he know about it? What do they know about it in Toronto? All they know is what these reporters wired up there. Who knows? Who knows? But I won't carry that thought any further. That is the reason why we supported this and would support it again tomorrow. And I say that, if an institution like the IWA is going to be allowed to persist to damage our economy, then it is about time the Government did resign. No union, IWA or any other union, either local nor international will be allowed, Sir, to injure our economy to the extent that was threatened as long as we remain constant in our efforts to put a stop to it.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: For myself personally, Sir, no man in this world even at Ottawa could divert me, could move me, from the stand which I have taken. I am quite sure I have spoken for my colleagues when I include them in that. No interests, no threat from any part of Canada will alter our decision. We have lived, some of us, in Newfoundland a long time and our fathers before us, and we intend to live here. We were elected by the people, rightly or wrongly the people elected us and said to us - "carry out the law, make the laws and carry them out, protect life and liberty and if you don't do that, then get out."

Some people say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the house are disloyal to our great PC Party. Mind you I say this now for the PC Party. It is the finest party that we have in Canada today, undoubtedly. They are in power and they have a vast number of

people in the house. The principles upon which that party is founded are principles beyond which I challenge any party to live up to or build up on higher principles than the PC Party has. Some people say we are disloyal to them and we should be kicked out - "that fellow Hollett should resign immediately and his friends as well."

Mr. Rowe: A very small minority.

Mr. Hollett: I have evidence here, but I won't bother. Yes, a very small number, and they are not all unionists not all labour men. Some of the greatest friends I have are labour men, Sir.

Mr. Smallwood: They are men that hate me more than they love Newfoundland, you know. Their hatred is greater than their love.

Mr. Hollett: Probably the hon. the Premier has something they can get their claws into.

Mr. Smallwood: Their teeth.

Mr. Hollett: I did not say teeth, I said claws. Sir, if putting a stop to law-breaking and violence is being disloyal to our party, I repeat, if putting a stop to law-breaking and violence is being disloyal to our party, then all right, we are disloyal, we will accept the opprobrium. If getting loggers to work in an effort to save the economy of this country is being disloyal to our party, mark us down as disloyal.

Mr. Smallwood: Or mark something down as being wrong with the party.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, put it that way if you so desire. I don't care how you take it. It is my opinion, although, I expect the hon. the Premier to find something wrong with the party anyhow. As a matter of fact, his own party's reactions are not yet quite clear.

Mr. Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: One of the gentlemen in his party has not yet made up his mind as to whether we are right, not yet made up his mind as to whether we are right, not yet. I do say we are grateful to these five men who came out, Pearson or no Pearson - We stand

by what the Government and the Opposition does because if the government are blamed and if they are "going to hell" for this, we are going too. Mr. Speaker, if facing up to a grave emergency in the pulp and paper industry in an effective manner offends the political sensibilities of any political party, then we on this side are prepared to take the consequences. We have been frowned upon by certain people outside Newfoundland, frowned upon - and when I say frown I mean a little more than frown. We have been slandered by certain unions in Manitoba, British Columbia and other places across Canada. We are termed "Fascists" and "anti-union". We are "puny politicians" and "puny potentates". One of our own leaders in unionism, one of our great leaders in unionism here in Newfoundland, described us as "puny politician". I wonder what he would be if he were here. Would he be just as puny? We have been slandered, Sir, called "puny politicians". Why? Simply because we refused to allow Newfoundland to be sacrificed to the interest of racketeers and class - warfare agencies. Mr. Speaker, my friend from St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy) would like a cup of tea.

On motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, before recess I was speaking about Central Newfoundland and what happened up there. I would just like to sum up and say, and reiterate, if you like, that there are no doubts in our mind, there has been no doubts in our minds, as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, as to our duty in this particular thing. I have tried to prove that there is no need of my trying to prove violence. Before the government took any action there was plenty of violence, too much violence. Our people are not built that way, and there would not have been violence without their being enticed to do violence by people who don't belong to this country. I tried to prove there was violence before the Government took any action. I think I did prove beyond any doubt, unfortunately, that our economy, always very weak, today is being crippled by world economy, and strikes of this kind which were likely to spread in this country had to be stopped some way or another, and it was the duty of the government to stop it, and it

was the duty of the government to seize the best weapon that they could use to put a stop to it. As I said, it was no use fiddling around about it. They had to do something drastic. Yes, and they did it, and we, Sir, we did not suddenly jump in our places and say "yes we agree". No, we spent hours and hours going over the various things. We talked about the political aspect. We knew we would offend a lot of people. We knew we would offend a lot of people who had voted for us, perhaps who were in higher places. Where was our duty? Where did it lie in the first instance? It lay right here, Sir, to our own Newfoundland people and not to some union in British Columbia or Manitoba or Alberta or somebody in Ottawa. No. Our duty is here to our Newfoundland people, to our Newfoundland economy, and I proved beyond doubt, Sir, our economy was in a very weakened condition. In other words I want it definitely understood the action of the Government, and the agreement of the Opposition, was based on the fact there was violence that had to be stopped.

There was danger of closing down the mills. That had to stop. We could not allow it to happen if we could do anything in our power to stop it. There was a threat there - I would not say a threat, a statement of fact. Everybody knows the weakness of the paper economy in this country. I have here the "Financial Post" and can quotethings from here to show how weak is the paper industry in Newfoundland compared with that in other parts of the world, but I have done enough quoting. So the action was based on violence, on the danger of closing the mills and the fact also, of course, that our fishermen were being ousted completely. And I have not made that quite strong enough. Our fishermen in Newfoundland were to have been ousted completely from participation in any of the profits which come from the woods. Oh, No! Mr. Ladd wanted to get around him 2,000 or 3,000 loggers, nothing else. Fishermen they might have been at sometime. He was going to call them all loggers and no other fishermen need apply. I think that has been pointed out very forcibly by the hon. the Premier. At the present time, a good many fishermen in this country implement their fishery earnings by several weeks of wood cutting for the A.N.D. Company and Bowaters. They were not to be allowed to do that any more, and

Bowaters and the AND were both at the mercy of 2,000 or 3,000 men organized by the IWA, a union which never yet has stopped in its quest to encourage violence. So that both these companies, that contributed so much to our welfare in Newfoundland, and have, for the past 50 years, would be at the mercy of one or two or more international organizers. I say international - coming from the United States of America at any rate.

Now we certainly have nothing against the United States of America, nothing whatever. The United States of America is another prop as far as our economy is concerned in St. John's and we are glad to have the Americans here in Newfoundland, here at Harmon Field and at Argentia or wherever they are. We are proud to have the Americans here, and they contribute to our economy practically the same amount as does the AND Company, and we are certainly not against having the Americans here. We want to co-operate with them and I am sure they want to co-operate with us. But we are against men of the ilk of Mr. Hoffa and others; we have no truck with them whatsoever. Now, Sir, I don't wish to say any more at the moment on that strike except to reiterate once more - we will not be deterred by anybody from the stand which we have taken.

Now, getting back to the Speech from the Throne: I want to say a word about the fisheries, and in doing so I don't think I need repeat it, but I did tell the house, Sir, a moment ago, our fisheries were some 200,000 quintals down. Our salt fish production last year, as the hon. Minister of Fisheries pointed out, was \$2 million less. It is very interesting to anybody who lived in the past by the sea to notice these figures. I can remember, and there are members on the other side of the house and here on this side who can remember when we did export upward of a million and over a million.

Mr. Smallwood: It was 1,800,000 quintals during the 1st. World War. There were three years when it ran to 1.5 million, to 1.8 million three years running, salt codfish.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, and last year we exported altogether 582,000 quintals - in other words less than one third of the amount which we exported to the various markets of the

world during the 1st. World War. I want to point out that the fisheries last year created \$23 million worth of wealth. And what is being done to see that this decline in the fisheries is stopped? What is being done by this Government? I was referring to an aside to the hon. member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) when he interrupted there during the early afternoon, and I was reminded of a speech which he made in 1950 here in this house, I think probably in the same place in which he now speaks. That was in 1950. If the hon. member will look on page 14 of the Hansard for that year, he was speaking on the setting up of the Fishery Loan Board. He was talking about the fisheries of the past and of how our fishermen had not been helped very much. But now in the setting up of this Fishery Loan Board he saw a sort of a Saviour for our fishery. It was going to be great, like the new industries on which he also spoke. This time it was going to be the salvation of the Newfoundland economy.

He spoke again yesterday. The hon. member spoke again yesterday, and he did not say very much that would be what you would call favourable towards the activities of the present government with regard to results in the fishery, and I heartily agree with him. Actually what has been done? What has been done by the Government? One thing has been done, of course, an awful lot of our people have left the fishery. I don't know exactly why. Whether we can blame the government for that or whether we can blame the government for anything except for their lack of assistance to the fishermen - and when I say the fishermen, Sir, I do not exactly mean Fishery Products or Bonavista Cold Storage or Gaultois Fisheries or many others of these big corporations - I do not at all refer to them. I am talking about the ordinary fisherman. I think I referred last year to a case I had in Portugal Cove where a man had a cod trap and he and his three brothers, I think, had 40 quintals in the trap that morning and when they went in they found the hoist broken and no way to get it repaired, and the fish was likely to spoil. I contacted the Fishery Department, Provincial. I contacted the Fishery Department, Federal. I contacted the Fishery Loan Board and I contacted the Newfoundland Development Fishery Authority. At least four different

departments of fisheries I contacted to try to get them to put up \$185, I believe it was, Sir, to purchase a new hoist for the part that was missing. You know, Mr. Speaker, not one of these great organizations (the Fishery Authority last year was supposed to have spent \$2.5 million in Newfoundland) - they would not even guarantee \$185 for these four fishermen out in Pouch Cove. I say, if our fishery department had been able to help these four men - and they could pay - they had fish enough there to pay for it - but some fishermen are not trusted by the merchants or by the supplier to the extent of even \$2,000. I could not even get even one of these four branches of fisheries to guarantee \$200. Oh yes, they give \$400,000 to a big corporation, and \$150,000 to John Jones or Bill Smith to put up a plant somewhere or present to or want to buy a dragger.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would permit me to make one remark. I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition - is he suggesting that the money loaned by the government to these corporations that he is just now speaking so critically of has not been not only a benefit but a very great benefit to the fishermen, and has been and will continue to be?

Mr. Hollett: It has been a benefit, certainly to the proprietors.

Mr. Cheeseman: To the fishermen?

Mr. Hollett: To the proprietors of these companies.

Mr. Cheeseman: But more benefit to the fishermen.

Mr. Hollett: I know there must be some benefit to some of the fishermen, but I think that a little more attention to the individual in the fishing communities -

Mr. Cheeseman: What about Fortune, \$1 million lost to the people who invested their money.

Mr. Hollett: In Fortune! I was blamed for stopping the sale or the purchase of that

sometime ago by someone writing from Fortune. I don't know who he was.

Premier Smallwood: Whoever it was he must have been talking through his hat.

Mr. Hollett: I don't think he could have had a hat on at all.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition allow - seeing my district includes Pouch Cove, what particular piece of machinery - just a cable?

Mr. Hollett: This was a hoist.

Mr. Nightingale: They never approached me in the matter - possibly something might have been done.

Mr. Hollett: The hon. Minister of Fisheries in the next house? Well I asked four and then got tired of using the 'phone. Anyway, in the meantime they picked up one on the Southern Shore somewhere. I forget where the place was, and they managed all right. Newfoundlanders generally do manage. But what did the Government spend last year on fisheries? What did they spend on the fisheries last year? Not a big lot. I have an answer to a question here. They spent \$10 million for technical services.

Mr. Cheeseman: Ten million? You are wrong.

Mr. Hollett: I meant \$10,000 - Thank you very much!

Mr. Cheeseman: You are getting too careless.

Mr. Hollett: I see that talking in millions is contagious, Sir - and we have had millions thrown at us so often from the opposite side. Technical services, \$10,000; Fishery Demonstrations (whatever that might mean), \$59,000; and for general engineering, \$6,700; and then they gave loans to Newfoundland Quick Freeze, \$18,000; Gaultois Fisheries; \$70,000; Buffett's Fishery; \$70,000; Fishery Products, Twillingate - I believe that is the plant supposed to go into operation this year -

Mr. Cheeseman: No, in 1960.

Mr. Hollett: And at Quirpon, Fishery Development Authority spent \$12,500; at LaScie, they spent another \$97,500; and Merasheen, \$10,000. Now I cannot find out definitely just what the Newfoundland Fishery Authority did spend last year, I mean since April 1, 1958. I am quite sure they did not spend anything like the year before.

Mr. Cheeseman: Are you suggesting your questions are not being answered? You cannot find out, you say?

Mr. Hollett: No! No! No! I was waiting for the report.

Mr. Cheeseman: You can have the answers to questions you ask.

Mr. Hollett: I will say, while the hon. Minister reminds me, I will say that from his department and also the Department of Finance I do get very prompt replies. And I want to thank you very much. As a matter of fact, most of the ministers are nothing less than fair when answering the questions - and in some cases, Sir, we ask a question perhaps in a shape where we don't get exactly the thing we asked. We admit all these things.

Mr. Cheeseman: Tell us what you want and we will give you the answers.

Mr. Hollett: What we want is successful fishery.

Premier Smallwood: We can't guarantee that.

Mr. Hollett: Well, why not put the member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) in charge and he will find the fish. He suggested bringing in experts from Norway and other places, and he would tell us exactly where the fish are.

Mr. Smallwood: He said Grimsby, England.

Mr. Hollett: I am reminded that was tried before by the hon. the Premier when he brought in some Icelandic fishermen. That

takes us away back in the past. I am afraid, Sir, if you look at the new industries, for instance, and see what was done to the new industries compared with what was done to the fisheries over the same period of years, you will find that the fisheries are almost forgotten then in Newfoundland.

I go on to the new industries now, while I am talking of the fisheries as well, for the sake of comparison. A. Adler - I see them advertised on CJON every evening, very carefully and beautifully done too - they were given an advance of \$650,000, and today they owe the government \$891,000. It is a funny thing about these new industries, the more money you lend them the greater rate of increase in the amount they owe us. It has gone from \$650,000 to \$890,000 - that is up to March 31, last year. Goodness knows what they have received so far.

Mr. Clarke in the Chair as Speaker:

Mr. Hollett: Atlantic Films and Electronics now, \$248,000; Atlantic Gloves - and I believe that has gone down the drain, at least gone out of business, that factory -

Mr. Smallwood: Yes!

Mr. Hollett: They were given cash advances of \$670,000 and guaranteed loans to \$170,000; and they now owe \$967,000. Why not wipe it off? It has to be wiped off anyway. I don't think there is much chance of selling that to anybody like the Booth Fisheries. Atlantic Gypsum went from \$1,104,000 to \$1.6 million; Atlantic Hardboards to \$1.8 million and look at Newfoundland Hardwoods; from \$2 million up to \$4,367,000. Now if you put something into the fishery of that nature I say you might get something.

Canadian Machinery, this is a "beaut" - \$2.5 million in the first instance was loaned them. They have not paid a cent interest. I wish Dr. Valmanis had told these people they had to pay interest on money borrowed from the government or banks. They apparently don't do that in the country from which they came. At any rate, they owe today \$3,094,000. Canadian Machinery and

Industries - that was a glorious opening, I was in to that. I am quite sure the hon. the Premier remembers C.D. Howe down here. He gave an address, all sorts of defence orders and Canadian Machinery was to manufacture all sorts of machinery. All they manufactured was a deficit for us, the people of Newfoundland - \$3,094,000. Now here is another one, Canadian Machinery Holding Trust, in other words, the North Star Cement. Remember, Mr. Speaker, two or three years back it was decided that the North Star Cement people wanted a new management. So there was a company formed, Canadian Machinery Holding Trust - I think all foreigners and the North Star Cement was sold to them for -\$4,740,000. In selling, the government gave \$200,000 in order to start the operation right away, and that Canadian Machinery Holding Trust (North Star Cement) today owes Newfoundland \$5.5 million. I believe they have men employed there.

Echart Knitting Mills owe \$387,000. The government loaned in the first place, and guaranteed bank loans for \$600,000 and not five cents interest has been paid and consequently today they owe \$1,105,000. Hanning Electric; \$445,000 first, and it is now up to \$760,000. Koch Shoes; \$750,000 now up to \$1,613,000. So it goes on. Superior Rubber (and I believe that has gone out of existence) I have seen it once or twice as I passed by. What a horrible looking building it is. Mr. Speaker, it turns my stomach to look at that. It now owes the government \$1.9 million, practically \$2 million. As I said - So it goes on. United Cotten Mills and Terra Nova Textiles, formed in competition with local manufactures, at least local producers of clothing. The two of them together were given and owe the government today \$1.2 million. I don't know how people like Maunders and Chafe and one or two others survived all this. They (the industries) don't pay any interest and have not paid a cent.

All told, \$26,758,000 were spent in order to bring in new industries to Newfoundland. Now, as I say, that is like water under the bridge, and I have done my share of criticizing the government for these expenditures and I don't want to prolong the issue. But, Sir, I do say this: if the Government had

only done what the member for Placentia West and myself tried to get them to do then, the fisheries would have been more successful and would have offered a better inducement to our young people. At the present time there is no inducement in the fishery for our young people. In the first place, we are educating our young people away from the fishery.

Mr. Cheeseman: Is it wrong, to give the fishermen's sons an education? Do you deny that the fishermen's sons should have the right to education?

Mr. Hollett: I think the fishermen's sons, like everybody else's son, should earn his education. I had to do it. The hon. Minister had to do it.

Mr. Cheeseman: Not a very good one did I get.

Mr. Hollett: You can't force education down people's throats. I do think it should be possible for fishermen's sons, everybody's sons to attain an education, but what I am trying to point out is that you send a boy to school to 16 or 18 years of age, then where are you going to get your fishermen in 20 years time?

Mr. Cheeseman: You would put the clock back and keep the boys out of school?

Mr. Hollett: Which clock?

Mr. Cheeseman: The clock of progress. Our fishermen's sons are entitled to education, and if they chose to, to go to some other industry.

Premier Smallwood: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would let me take him off the hook for a moment? No, look! Would the hon. gentleman allow me to say in reply to the point - and this is not a Point of Order and not even a Point of Privilege - I am allowed only because the hon. gentleman yields the floor to me - we have lent \$14 million to fishing firms - \$14 millions, we

have lent from the Treasury to the fishing firms. These fishing firms have as a direct result, direct result, paid out \$60 million to the fishermen and to the employees in and around their premises and to the crews of their fishing boats and to inshore fishermen for the purchase of fish, in short for the use of their plants; \$60 millions. We lent \$14 millions and that caused the distribution amongst the people of \$60 million in the same period. So \$14 millions produced \$60 millions. Now what would the hon. gentleman say to that? Mind you the money is still owed. In a good many cases, we get no interest and in some cases we do. The point is that it is \$60 millions now. In another 10 years it will be another \$60 million (for the same \$14 million), then \$120 million, for only \$14 million outlay. I have given him a strong argument. The fishery is the place to lend the money, and if there had been more firms to ask for it, instead of being \$14 millions it would have been \$28 millions - but there just were not the firms to ask for it.

Mr. Hollett: Still the government could not pay less than \$5,000 to the people of Jackson's Cove for their salmon.

Mr. Smallwood: Now, that is not worthy! It is not worthy of the hon. gentleman at all.

Mr. Hollett: Where did the hon. the Premier get \$14 millions? I have here the Fishery Loan Board and private companies, a total of \$8,772,000. Now this is the Auditor General's Report. It may be wrong and the hon. the Premier may be right. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. the Premier would enlighten me on that.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes I would be glad to. I say, regardless of what the hon. gentleman reads in the Auditor General's Report, or regardless of what he reads anywhere, or what anyone says, the fact is that, up to this moment, the Government of Newfoundland have lent \$14 million to fish firms, and that does not include what the Fisheries Development Loan Board has lent. That is loaned directly by the Government, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or by the Fishery Development Authority, the two together, not including what the Fisheries Development Loan Board has lent.

Mr. Hollett: This is the year 1958, the end of March, and if you like I will read them out.

Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	1,257,187.96
Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd.	65,527.41
Billard, Gabriel	17,425.34
Burgeo Fish Industries Ltd.	626,350.69
Canada Bay Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	55,515.46
Collins, Frank	3,422.73
Fisheries Loan Board	673,521.93
Fishery Products Ltd.	3,979,100.40
Fortune Bay Products Ltd.	221,966.85
Fortune Shipping Ltd.	187,499.93
Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.	547,648.45
Manuel Fisheries Ltd.	31,249.32
Merasheen Fisheries Ltd.	159,201.88
Morry, William	8,437.32
Newfoundland Quick Freeze Ltd.	32,110.03
O'Brien, Cornelius	49,696.76
O'Brien Fisheries Ltd.	130,355.25
O'Brien Fisheries Ltd. — Unsecured payments to lobster fishermen	40,339.54
O'Brien, John J.	10,550.68
O'Brien, Ronald J.	20,750.68
Olsen Whaling and Sealing Ltd.	277,934.15
Petite, H. E. Ltd.	7,631.02
Quirpon Producers Ltd.	72,447.46
St. George, Thomas & Son	31,691.10
Tilley, C. Ltd.	15,332.06
Wareham, W. W. Ltd.	149,395.34
Cash on deposit with the Bank of Nova Scotia as security for the Bank's cash advance to Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.	100,000
	<hr/> 8,772,289.74 <hr/>

Mr. Smallwood: The hon. gentleman is wasting his time. He is only reading the cash, not reading the bank loans. The hon. gentleman is only reading the cash loans.

Mr. Hollett: Loans advanced and other assets. All right, \$14 millions, and during the same period the loans to a bunch of people who came from across the total now of some \$26 million. We heard yesterday there are some 18,000 fishermen. How many are working in these new industries? How many get their livelihood from the new industries? I say, and I agree with my friend from Placentia West. (Mr. Canning) not enough has been done by this government, not enough has been done by the Federal Gov-

ernment to aid our fisheries by way of boats and gear and by way of markets.

Mr. Speaker Courage returned to the Chair.

Mr. Hollett: Of course marketing is a Federal matter. Now the Fishery Development Authority has been - mind you I believe they spent \$2.5 million down in LaScie and we are told that plant will shortly come into operation, and we are told that rose fish, having learned the new plant has come into operation there, have decided to school along by LaScie.

Mr. Smallwood: No, by Labrador.

Mr. Hollett: No!

Mr. Smallwood: They are friendly to this government.

Mr. Hollett: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, what the government do or what the government cannot do depends on finances of the government, and the finances of the government, in my opinion, have been in a sorry mess for a number of years. I do not want to be too repetitious about this. The government was left with \$40 or \$50 million, mostly cash. They were left with no debt. The cash is all gone, the debt is about \$60 million today. This was tabled today, and I hate to have to say it, but it is information which everybody must know. We have a bank overdraft today of \$13.75 million.

Mr. Smallwood: Almost exactly the amount Ottawa owes us.

Mr. Hollett: I was about to come to that. I take it the bank advanced loans to the tune of the McNair recommendations.

Mr. Smallwood: That is it.

Mr. Hollett: Beyond that, I take it, they will not go.

Mr. Smallwood: The amount has been higher than that in the course of the current financial year. That is what it stood at on that date.

Mr. Hollett: In other words, the Bank of Montreal, this Government, and I would think it would be fair to say, the people of Newfoundland are looking towards the McNair Recommendations for succour in our financial trouble. I don't want at this moment to say anything about the McNair Recommendations. We have said that before here. I will say this — in my opinion the Confederation Contract is not yet complete. I don't think we are real Canadians yet. I don't think we are bound yet. Mind you, I am not talking against Confederation. We are into Confederation. We are part of Canada, and there is nobody today, or very few people today, who would want to see the scene changed. But Term 29 — “in view of the difficulty of predicting...”, this is a term of the contract. In other words, every term in this contract has to be carried out, and has not been as far as Term 29 is concerned. “In

view of the difficulty of predicting with sufficient accuracy the financial consequences to Newfoundland of becoming a province of Canada, the Government of Canada will appoint a Royal Commission within eight years from the date of Union to review the financial position of the Province of Newfoundland and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance, if any, that may be required by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland to enable it to continue public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of Union, without resorting to taxation more burdensome, having regard to capacity to pay, than that obtaining generally in the region comprising the Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island” — “Going to recommend”, it did not say “to give” — “that may be required by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland.” (They said we required \$8 million.) “At the levels and standards, having regard to capacity to pay”, — and these four or five words are something which I think the Royal Commission should have been very, very careful about — “Having regard to capacity to pay.”

I have pointed out today, Sir, the state of our economy here in Newfoundland, and I think in writing that into the record I am showing that it is almost next to impossible for this government or any government to collect any more taxes than they have already collected, and our economy is not at all today equal to what it was 10 years ago. Yes, we've got some things coming in, like returns from the American bases and things coming in from Ottawa, grants and all that sort of thing. (I will come to that in a minute).

Our economy today is not so good, Sir. This McNair Commission said, we needed \$8 million. That was two years ago. Now it is brought to my attention, very forcibly, we owe the banks \$13 millions. That was the amount due this country last March 31st. In other words what we are going to get we don't know. Then again, I noticed from the answer to questions, our capital expenditure up to the present time was \$18.5 million, and our current account expenditures was \$56 or \$57 million. That is \$75 millions. Our revenue was; current account \$54 million and capital account; \$4 millions — in

other words, \$59 millions. We have collected and we have spent — (59 from 75) — \$16 million up to the present time. This answer indicated that we have a deficit of \$16 million on our expenditure. And on top of that we owe the bank \$13.5 millions. I don't call that a healthy sign for this Province. I regret to have to say this. I regret it very much. But you will remember how we were promised everything from the stars down. We would run this country on very little and the income would be marvelous. But, Sir, the picture as painted then and as it appears today is not encouraging. In addition to that, Sir, \$18.5 million bank overdraft; \$500,000 temporary borrowing, and last year, remember, this house passed a loan bill authorizing the government to borrow \$14 million. How much was borrowed on that to date? \$4 million only? Why? Why only \$4 millions?

I look at the Special Warrants. That also was in answer to a question — Special Warrants of the last year. Sir — this house passed estimates authorizing the government to spend under the various departments various amounts. The government, in addition to these expenditures which were allowed them have by Special Warrants, obtained permission to spend a further \$8 million. Most of this was for existing services only (only \$44,000, I believe, was for non-existent services.) Last year the government budgeted, and that was only September, I believe it was, the government budgeted last year for an expenditure of \$59 million on current account, and according to these Special Warrants, the over-expenditure was \$8.1 million. In other words, they spent, on current account, \$67 million. Total expenditure on current account was \$81,768,000. Therefore, if the government used up all the money granted by Parliament, plus the \$8 million Special Warrants, they have spent to the tune of \$90 million against an estimated revenue of \$8.2 million. That would leave a deficit of only \$8 million. But unfortunately, included in the \$82 million, Mr. Speaker, was an amount of \$13.5 million from the McNair Commission reward. Unfortunately again, this money was not yet arrived, and March 31st, the end of this fiscal year is not far off. If this money recommended by the McNair Commission does not come from Ottawa by the end of

March, the deficit of \$8 million will become an estimated deficit of \$21.5 million.

Now, no government to a Province of this size can afford to overspend to that extent. I grant you money is needed for many things, education, health, welfare and so on, but we can't afford to go on overspending to the amount of \$21.5 million, Mr. Speaker, or did they spend what they were allowed to spend on capital account? They were allowed to spend, \$22.5 millions on capital account. They have spent to date, I think \$18.5 millions, \$18.6 millions. They won't be far off by the end of March, by the time all the bills are in.

Now, Sir, I want to draw to the attention of the house something which I think every Newfoundlander should know. And I just want to show just how dependent we are at the present time on Ottawa, financially. If we turn to page 10 of the Estimates, we can see just how dependent we are on Ottawa. Our total revenue this year from all sources is estimated at \$74 million. If we deduct the \$13.5 million award of the McNair Report the total current revenue estimate would be in the neighbourhood of \$60 million. So, forgetting that award we have not got our estimated revenue was \$60 million. Let us take a look and see what proportion of that estimate came from Ottawa or will come from Ottawa. Statutory Subsidies; \$1.5 million; Tax Rental Agreement; \$18,647,000; Transitional Grant; \$1,050,000; Atlantic Provinces Grant; \$7.5 million; Civil Defence and Local office; (that is important) \$34,000; Education; (that is what they are paying in Ottawa under these various headings) \$96,000; Attorney General; \$100,000; (I take it that is for the RCMP) Limestone etc; — I don't know what that is for \$7,600; Land Clearing; \$260,000; Health; \$1,090,000; Welfare; \$4 million; (I will come back to that) — Hospital Insurance; \$1.5 million; Fisheries; \$21,000; Apprenticeship; \$21,000.

I have gone through the Estimates very carefully, and picked out every cent to come to the Province from Ottawa to the end of March this year, and the total adds up to \$36,231,400. Or 60% of our current revenue in the year of Our Lord 1959 comes from Ottawa — 60%. In Capital Account Revenue (on account of highways) Ottawa contributed \$41 million — that was over — 60%.

Now, Sir, we are left to ask ourselves; is any of that money wasted? Has any of it been wasted? I don't want to go into that at the present time. When the Estimates come down I will talk of that. But there is still a certain amount of waste, too much waste on the part of the present administration still, nothing like there used to be. I will say this. When you consider we only raised \$13.5 million in this country by taxes last year, yet the government spent \$700,000 of that on travelling expenses, surely there is some waste. Does our government need to spend to the tune of \$700,000 on travelling expenses or over \$2,000 a day of every month of the year. The government is spending over \$2,000 a day on travelling. I would say there is a lot of waste in that. That is just one example, one small item. Other items we will pick out later on. I don't want to go back to the McNair Report but I will say, to remind the house, our public services are the main problem of government, and considerable monies were awarded here last year, and when we look at them we see the need for a generous award from Ottawa. We do hope we will get it. On services last year — for Health; \$13 million; Welfare; \$12 millions; Highways; \$17 million; adding up to a total of \$56 million in this little Province, where one in every four receives relief or received unemployment insurance. It is just as well for this Legislature to come to the conclusion we must definitely draw in our horns as far as expenditure is concerned. We have to begin to learn to cut the garment according to the cloth. We cannot go on spending \$20-odd million more than we are taking in.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier must have gone out for a load of ammunition. However, now that he is here I want to say we are very glad to hear the announcement yesterday with regard to Lake Wabush. We have been hearing about Lake Wabush for a long time, a terrifically long time it seems to me; Lake Wabush, Javelin, Stahl Miles and Company (that is the fellow going to raise \$16.5 million for NALCO)

Mr. Smallwood: Not NALCO. Javelin.

Mr. Hollett: No. It was for the Wabush Lake Railway.

Mr. Smallwood: That was Javelin.

Mr. Hollett: Yes. And I remember about NALCO. We got back \$1.2 million from that, and the government was so used to dealing in millions they laid that to one side and forgot all about it. Last year they made up their estimates — \$1.2 million they forgot.

Hon. E. S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): That was the one I had was it?

Mr. Hollett: That is the one you went to sleep on when you got those other estimates there. I am going to put this in the museum, the two together, the one gotten out earlier in the year and the one that came out in September. It was \$1.2 million sleeping all that time.

Mr. Smallwood: In the bank drawing interest, not sleeping.

Mr. Hollett: I doubt if it drew any interest. It went to the bank to pay off an overdraft. We have heard some famous names, Mr. Speaker, — Rockefeller.

Mr. Smallwood: He is now Governor of New York.

Mr. Hollett: Sir William Stephenson. Valdmanis — He is in Montreal. All these names, and every one cost a lot of money, every one without exception. But that is done — another matter under the bridge. It seems to me that the whole policy since 1949 has been a sort of hit or miss. We are going to do it, win, lose or draw. We are going to develop or perish. And, Mr. Speaker, if we are not now perishing financially, it is a strange thing to me. I may be considered disloyal but I am going to say it here and now, publicly, so that the government may please take into consideration the condition in which we find ourselves. We will never be able to keep up our public services even to the present level, as intimated in the McNair Commission, if that is not reviewed from time to time, even with that award which we all agree is not sufficient to keep up our present public services.

I was glad to hear the statement regarding the Iron Ore Company of Canada. They have proven themselves, there is no ques-

tion about that. They went in there and opened up the mine and built that railway and exported ore taken out of Labrador. Now they are going to expand that operation. I am quite sure they will be successful because their whole financial future is at stake. They have done it all themselves, borrowed the money and they have to make good. They did not borrow money from Newfoundland at any rate. I would at some time too like to have something to say about Brinco. I have a great admiration for them. I believe they are going to be the pinpoint around which will grow and revolve all sorts of new industries. They have vision. Last year I was privileged to take a trip with the hon. the Premier —

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): And some other tycoons.

Mr. Hollett: I think that is very unfair. We went to that area to see these people who are there putting money into that place and building 105 miles of road, which only cost about \$1.2 million. They are going to have a mine up on the coast, and they are doing all sorts of things. What is there to show that they are justified in doing that? Nothing but their faith in the natural resources of that territory. And I am quite sure their faith is going to pay off. We flew over the area. We, most of us in Newfoundland, have not the foggiest notion of the extent of our Province. We know Newfoundland all right. I am quite sure my hon. friend from Labrador North (Mr. Winsor) will agree that Labrador is something so far untouched, virgin territory and with enormous wealth there, if it can be exploited economically. And that is a big problem, bigger than in any other section of this world of ours. These people have faith enough to build 100 miles of road. I drove over it. It is as good as any in the country, I think the hon. the Premier will agree. They were wonderful to me and answered all sorts of questions. Incidentally, I have wonderful photographs of the Hamilton Falls. I took them and had them enlarged in colour. That Hamilton Falls, what a huge source of power there is there. I am very grateful to those people who made it possible for me to go there. There is one thing I would like to come back to, and that is the matter of North Star Cement and CMIC. Since the

question has not been answered I will leave that open.

Premier Smallwood: All that has to be debated in this session. As the legislation is brought forward there will be a thorough debate on that whole matter.

Mr. Hollett: Their agreement?

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, all these things will be tabled.

Mr. Hollett: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have a few other things to say, but if it is agreeable to you I would like to adjourn the debate until tomorrow. I won't take very long tomorrow.

Mr. Higgins: Don't rush, now. On motion debate on the Address in Reply adjourned.

Mr. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE:

Mr. Cheeseman: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the house, I wish speaking on a matter of privilege, I wish to draw attention to an item appearing in the lower left-hand corner of Page 39 of today's Evening Telegram", column 6, where I am quoted as having said — and I quote" "Mr. Cheeseman said the contract the Government has with Booth Fisheries stipulated the company must make a profit or the operation will be revoked". Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said. That was a misquote. And as it is such a serious matter I wish to have it rectified. I happen to have here what I did say. "It is the hope of all of us that this venture will prove profitable for them (the company) because, let everyone be assured that, unless the company can make a profit the operation will be short-lived".

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, I remember that.

Mr. Cheeseman: I just wish to make that correction in the statement in connection with this, and I hope that, if any reporter

from that newspaper is present, the necessary correction will be made.

I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move the adjournment of the house until tomorrow, Friday, at three o'clock.

Friday, March 20, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three of the clock, in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Hon. J.R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Trout River. The petitioners pray, Sir, that the road that was originally constructed by this Government eight or nine years ago be changed in several places so that snow will not gather to the extent that it has gathered there this year. The road has been closed now, Sir, for I think approximately two months. They contend that with a little alteration in its layout, even with the heavy winter we had this year, the road could be kept open for normal use by a plow. This petition is followed by another petition from the community of Woody Point, asking that consideration be given to the first petition. I have pleasure, Sir, in supporting the petition. I ask that it be tabled in the house and referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I went over that road with the member for the district some two years ago, for the first time in my life. I would say that that road from Bonne Bay to Trout River goes through one of the most scenic pieces of country that you will find anywhere in Canada today. It is absolutely spectacular. There is nothing else like it in Newfoundland. It is entirely untypical of Newfoundland. In fact, I don't know what it is typical of. It is high country. As you leave Bonne Bay you are rising steadily until you reach a considerable altitude, and then go along through a great valley for miles. It must be five, six or eight miles long, a valley formed by towering mountains. The Great Table Mountains are on your left and on your right another range, not so high.

Now, the road, as I recall it, for the most part goes along quite high up the side of the slope, leading up to the mountain. Then, as it nears Trout River, it falls down more or less into the lowest part of the valley. You can imagine that what they have in mind is to shift the position of the road where it goes through low land to bring it more up on the side of the hill and thus get away from the deep snow falls. I would advise any hon. member of the house who goes out on the West Coast to be sure to drive down over that road to Trout River. It is an extremely beautiful fishing settlement, extremely beautiful, and the whole drive is one of the most exciting from the visitor and tourist standpoint that you can find anywhere in Newfoundland today. For that reason I certainly give the petition my warmest support. It is a beautiful and fantastic country.

Hon. E.S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must take a minute or two of the house to refer to this matter about which my colleague the hon. Minister of Public Works has presented a petition, and the Premier has spoken so warmly. It so happened that it was my privilege to recommend to the Government to get the road built. That was due largely to the demand from the people in the area and the fact that I had personal knowledge of the matter, through working with the people there many years before a road was connecting these two settlements.

Trout River lies approximately eleven to thirteen miles from the main settlement of Woody Point, Bonne Bay, and it had no other connection except over these mountains or by water. In many places in Newfoundland, unfortunately, history tells us (and I know the record) several people have died traversing that valley prior to the days of the road. The road was scarcely built when we had a landslide there, due to the terrain upon which the hon. the Premier commented. A landslide occurred and literally tens of thousands of stones were thrown down across the road so that it had to be re-opened with great difficulty. That drive is referred to as the "Snow Drive" because of the high mountains on either side — If the matter can be taken care of by a diversion, I confess at the moment I am at a loss to see how. If it can be then I would say the Superintendent of Highways, who has

had the difficulty of trying to keep it open in recent years has knowledge of it, and would be very helpful. I heartily support the prayer of the petition in the sense that I feel the necessity is very great, and I feel the house would be better informed with this little knowledge I have endeavoured to give with regard to the terrain. It is almost impossible, as the Superintendent of Highways told me from time to time, physically impossible and especially this year because of great snowdrifts, to keep it open. I sincerely hope that the diversion, if ever constructed will find a way to overcome the great snowdrifts. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition, I would like to say a word or two. I understand the hon. Minister of Highways would take the responsibility for having built that road in that particular area and that particular alignment and at that particular height. I would like to ask just why the Minister of Highways recommended that the road should be built in that particular part?

Mr. Spencer: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition mean the Minister of Finance?

Mr. Hollett: Did I say Highways - The Minister of Finance, the last member who spoke, the Minister of Finance. I see! I am so used to addressing the hon. gentleman as the Minister of Highways. He was, I believe, previously that. It was a slip of the tongue. But as the Minister of Highways is not here, I do believe the hon. Minister of Finance takes some responsibility. As a matter of fact the whole Cabinet should take responsibility. Now they are appealing to the Government to see that no snow falls there in the future. I am afraid they will have to appeal to a higher authority for that. They have a mountainous terrain and wherever they put the road there will be snow, definitely. I do hope the Minister of Finance will take a good look at it before he gives any money from the Treasury to have it done. I support the petition.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

GIVING NOTICE OF MOTION:

None.

GIVING NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:
None.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Hon. W.J. Keough (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the answer to No. 21 on the Order Paper of March 19.
(See Appendix)

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Premier, in connection with this Memorial Scholarship, if this would be applicable to members of the families of retired policemen or just men on active service?

Hon. Dr. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, on that question, if I may, Sir, it is customary after the principle of a scholarship has been announced by the Government for the scholarship committee of the department to take the principle, and work out the details, which are subsequently referred to the executive council again for final ratification. In this particular case we will follow that procedure, I would think. And we will shortly be able to refer back to the executive council the details in regard to the award of that scholarship. If I express a personal opinion, I think shared by the hon. the Premier and the Attorney General, every latitude would be given to see the children of policemen, both deceased policemen would be included, as well as policemen on service.

Mr. Duffy: There would be a fair number involved.

Mr. Rowe: I would think every latitude would be given to make it available to as many deserving children as possible. I think that is the idea.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY:

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to

delay the house much longer on this motion. I made reference yesterday to several matters. I gave to this house an explanation as to why we on this side of the house had the temerity to support certain legislation, because I thought (the government) they ought to be entitled to that, otherwise they might have a shock of some kind and think we were leaning towards them in a political manner, which of course we are not. We have already told them in the past that legislation brought in here which ought to benefit or should benefit our people we are going to support. I pointed out yesterday, Sir, the main reasons why we supported the legislation relative to the IWA, and the strike situation up there was one, on account of the violence which occurred prior to the legislation and because of the economy of this country. I pointed out yesterday here that the economy of this country is in what I would call a precarious position at the present time.

Fisheries, as we saw yesterday, were down 200,000 quintals, and \$2 million less was coming in to the economy by way of the fisheries. On Bell Island, anywhere from 500 to 600 men are to be laid off on the first of May; the mines in St. Lawrence closed down. The woods operations A.N.D. and Bowaters' operations, I think, at 75% capacity, and bedeviled now by strikes which would tend to, and indeed endanger and bring about the possibility of complete closedown. And we had to consider, and we did consider, if such a thing as that should happen in Central Newfoundland or on the West Coast, on top of our present ailing economy then God Help Newfoundland. So that when the Government brought in this legislation, which appeared to us and does so now, as the proper tool to use in saving and preserving the economy of this country, then we decided to support it. And I reiterated we would stand by the decision which we had taken. I don't want to go into that any further, but I do say that any legislation which is brought in here, we on the Opposition will study it and point out any thing we deem to be defective or should be changed, and when it is good and we think it is in the interest of our people then we are bound to support it irrespective of the opinions of anybody else in this world. We are here for that. We are independent. Call us independent if you like. The people sent us

in here to use our minds in their behalf and we are going to do it. Come what may we shall do it, and we hope we shall always do the things that are in the best interest of Newfoundland.

I further went on, Sir, to discuss a few other matters, our financial situation — and I don't want to go into that now because we will hear more about that at the end of the month and probably today, and indeed shall probably have another opportunity to do so and say a few things about the financial situation. I believe I was talking about the fishery at the time I closed. Perhaps some people are right. I heard the opinion expressed the other day, we should forget the fishery and calling the fishery the backbone of our economy and that sort of thing — “Why don't you forget that and talk about something else?” Well Sir, it would be well nigh impossible for people of my age to forget the fishery. I was brought up in a fishing boat. I said this before. I was on the Labrador fishing when I was thirteen years of age. As a matter of fact, I put myself through college on the fishery. I was lucky. Each year I came home I went trapping in my father's trap boat. Luckily, fish was a fairly good price in these years, and I made enough in two months to put me back in college. So I went on until I got my degree. That was from Mount Allison.

Mr. Smallwood: A “B.A.”

Mr. Hollett: Yes. Lots of other people in Newfoundland did the same thing. I cannot say “Forget the fishery”. I was brought up on it and my father and my grandfather and God knows how many more. I have a bill of sale in Burin today, dated 1829, made out in Old English copper plate, with the indenture on the top. We were all brought up on the fishery, and why should we forget it? Fish is a form of wealth, and it is the only form of wealth our ancestors were acquainted with, and they lived, and God Knows, they lived, they worked and died in the fishery, but they did not go hungry too often. I don't think they went hungry as often as some of our people go hungry today. I think they worked harder. They raised vegetables and raised their own cattle, had their own meat and milk and everything else. They got it themselves. That was in the outports, which I am speaking of, in

places where there were facilities for doing these things. But they fished — that was their mainstay, and therefore the backbone. And I feel that today, Sir, the fishery is still the backbone of our industry. When a man goes to labour now and the job he is at closes off, where does he go? Nine times out of ten he goes back in his boat, to the fishery. It is the only thing he has to rely on. In this country, along the fringe of our rocky coast, how can they live if they don't take part in the fishery and get something out of it?

Therefore I criticize the Government strongly for not pouring some of the millions of dollars into the fisheries rather than to outpour it in some of these so-called new industries. I am quite sure of the members opposite, in the Government, would agree to that. We said that years ago, advised them to do that. They said: "No! We are going to create new industries, take all the fishermen out of the boats and put them in the new industries." That was wrong and they now know it was wrong. I am not blaming them now, but just reminding them of it. And I say it is unfortunate that more money was not put into the fishery. When I say the fishery I do not mean more money dished out to big corporations. I mean to the individual fishermen who wants a small loan to build a trap skiff or buy a codtrap. I have here a letter which I received today from a man on the fringe of our coastline, who has lived all his years and his father before him on the trap, and he wants enough money (\$1,500 to help build a trap boat and go towards the purchase of a new trap. He wrote in to the Fishery Loan Board. What did they say? "No, we can't do it." Why? "How much money have you got to put down? You must make a cash payment on it." That man has only \$50 dollars to put down. He said: "That is all I have." They said, no they could not loan it. But, did the Government ask Fishery Products or Mr. Hazen Russell or Andrews Fisheries or any one of any dozen, did they ask them to put down a cash payment before they gave them this huge loan, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Smallwood: We took a heavy mortgage on everything they had.

Mr. Hollett: This man was prepared to mortgage his house, stage and all the fish was brought there and the trap. He was

prepared to mortgage that. They would not take that. And there is where I say, Sir, if we are going to keep hold of our fisheries we must help the individual. I am not saying you are not helping the individual by putting money in these huge corporations. No! But the man who has guts enough, I say, to be individualistic and get his own trap and boat and go out and put that trap in the proper berth and catch fish. That is the man who is going to make a decent living at the fishery. And in these times he does not find it too easy with the banks to raise the necessary capital to rebuild his boat or to purchase a new trap. I say, if you just had a few cases like that with good records as fishermen, and if they want to expand give them help, I think then that would be an incentive to other young men to take an interest in the fishery.

Talking about these corporations — what do our fishermen get for the fish they bring in now in the trawlers and draggers, if you like, here in St. John's for what they sell to the fresh fish plants? Two cents and a half and I think it is nearly up to three now in some cases. That is not Boston and other places in the United States of America. I am inclined to think it would be much better to have the price varying according to the price being received abroad. I would like to see the statements from these companies — two of the biggest companies. One of them owes the Government about \$4 million and has a company in another name in the United States of America; one has a company in Cleveland. These are the companies that are making the profit, these companies in the United States of America, and the largest shareholders in some cases in these companies are the very people here who have received big loans to build up fishery plants along our coast.

Now, I don't blame them for making a profit. You have to have profit to continue in business. But, Sir, I do wish some more of these profits were spread among the individual fishermen and crews of draggers and trawlers. I am saying right now, Sir, and this fact will be proven before I am dead and gone. Unless something of that kind is done, then you will have to import men from abroad to prosecute the fishery. There have to be inducements for our fishermen to continue at the fishery. Otherwise we will have to import people

from across the ocean somewhere who are not used to living as some of our people are. Our people are not going to fish unless there are bigger inducements than at the present time. Yes, the men of my age and younger who are already at it will continue, but their sons who are 18 and 20 before leaving school and can take almost any job then, unless some inducement is offered, they are not going to keep on fishing. We have to have some of these young men go fishing and make a good living because I am telling you here and now, if our fishery goes down, if our fishery fails completely, then there is very little for us to hold on to, very little for us as a country.

Oh yes! People depend on the newsprint and they will live there as long as the mills are not closed down — and I have made some remarks about that, the men working on Bell Island will stay there, most of them, as long as they can, but when you see the developments which are taking place on Labrador — and I must not say that — I must not say what I had in mind — I will still come back and say, if we want to have good, decent, law abiding communities like you will find every few miles around our six thousand miles of coast, then if they are going to stay there, any of these people, they have to get some of the wealth from the sea. Anything this Government or any other Government can do to assist these communities, either as whole communities or as smart, able-bodied fishermen, must be done and the quicker we get at it the better. We have some of the hardest men in the world on the Southwest Coast, particularly that part of the coast represented by the Minister of Fisheries, (Mr. Cheeseman). These men fish all winter long. The frost does not make a bit of difference to them, nor wind, if it does not blow too hard. They go out in the middle of the winter and catch their catch of fish, when the rest of us are snuggled up in our blankets, metaphorically speaking. That is when these men fish up there, and any that can be done to help these men will redound to the credit of any country that can do it. I take my hat off to these men up there who make their living in the way they do.

I had a telegram today from a fellow, I believe in your district, Mr. Speaker. I know you are surprised to know that any man up there would wire me but they do occasion-

ally. He did wire me. Here is the story! He had 20 stamps for fishing, and when he stopped fishing a job offered. He did not apply for unemployment insurance although he had enough stamps. A job offered in Deer Lake and he took the first boat from your district, Sir, and he reached Deer Lake and went to work in the woods. Two or three weeks afterwards you know what happened. A strike came about, and he was sent home. Now then, he had nothing else to do so he applied for unemployment insurance. That is since away back in January or February, I think. He was told he could not get it because he was working in the camps and therefore he was on strike and could not get it anyway. Very Good! I made enquiries at the Unemployment Insurance Office and his case is being considered and he will receive unemployment insurance. I had a similar message yesterday, from your district, Sir, Hermitage, and from another man from Bonavista. Both these claims have been settled. They were denied unemployment insurance because of that disturbance up in the woods — but they are going to get it.

Now, Sir, I just want to say a word about education. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Rowe) laid on the table of the house the other day a report I regret to say I have not had the opportunity to read it all, and I am not in a position to criticize it. I do say from looking through it that an immense amount of work must have gone into it. It is on first appearance a credit to the minister and his associates, and I am very glad to see it. I guarantee you I shall read it from cover to cover, as I am quite sure every other member will too, because education is something which we all believe in. But, Sir, I want to say this: I think we ought not to spend all our time on that sort of education which leads to degrees and which leads to the study of Latin and French and this, that and the other thing. We should do a lot more education along the lines of what is being done on the South side of the Vocational School. Yes, more of that should be done and made available to a lot of our people outside of St. John's; education along that line — handling machines, building machinery, that sort of thing rather than study for degrees and Latin and so on. Sir last year we spent \$14 million, I believe it was, on education. That is more than we

took in years back in total revenue. Why, I can remember back when we did not take in half that for our total revenue — \$14 million spent on education, Sir, and I am glad to see from that that it is easier for our boys and girls all over Newfoundland to get an education — easier than it was in my day. I am glad that the plant at La Scie is going into operation soon, and I do think rosefish will find their final resting place there. Don't forget that we have spent \$2.5 million in La Scie on fishing, and I want to see that a success, even if it costs another \$500.00 to bring it to fruition. Then it will be money well spent along that coast. But, Sir, it is an awful lot of money to be spent in one particular place — but we all wish it success. Sir, there are other notes that I have here, but I don't propose to go into them now. We are going to have lots of opportunity to criticize the Government, to blame the Government and if necessary to praise them, I hope. As a matter of fact, I would rather be praising them than criticizing them, if they would do the things we think they ought to, but we are going to blame and criticize them when the occasion arises. I want, before I sit down, Sir, to congratulate the people who have spoken in this house since it opened, and the high standard of public speaking. I am delighted to see that so many of our members are no longer reading speeches, but giving forthright speeches from their hearts as they stand to their feet. That is the best way for us all to try to do it. It is not easy sometimes, without appearing invidious. I want to say a word of praise for one speech which was given here a few days ago, which was made by a member of the Cabinet in the person of the hon. Mr. Lewis (I don't know if that is the correct way to address him).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

Mr. Hollett: The Senior member for Harbour Main — I have him pinpointed now — I have listened to a good many speeches, orations if you like, talks if you like, by various members on that side of the house and on this side Sir, and I have heard a good many from the hon. member for Harbour Main, but I do say now it was the best speech, the best expression of opinion that I have heard the hon. gentleman deliver since I have been here. I want to congratu-

late him very heartily, not only for the high sentiments which he expressed but for the able and efficient manner in which he grouped his thoughts to express those things. I want to say I am very happy to have heard the speech of the hon. member for Harbour Main.

Premier Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up any more time. I want to thank you for bearing with me so long. I do hope that, as the session progresses the Government will bring in legislation, as I know they will in some cases at any rate, which will rebound to their benefit and for the good of the people of Newfoundland. I want to assure them now that we on this side of the house are not going to be weaklings in any way. If legislation is brought in which we don't like we are going to tell them in no uncertain terms, Sir. But, Sir, I do repeat, we will speak with one voice when it comes to speaking on matters which would pertain to the welfare of this little province of ours.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to close the debate because any hon. member who has not spoken already will, of course, be free to do so before the motion is put. But, Sir, this afternoon I would like to speak a few words of praise, a few words of blame and a few words of warning.

My words of praise are first for the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the members of the Opposition for the patriotic stand they have taken in this woods labour dispute. I would say that their conduct in this whole thing has been perfect from the standpoint of Newfoundland. I don't think there ever was an opposition in Newfoundland, in all her history, that took a position on any grave issue that was so right as theirs. They acted and spoke as true patriotic Newfoundlanders. They took a great political risk. If they had wanted to do so, they could have embarrassed the Government very gravely. Our position has been made infinitely stronger in this woods labour dispute by their conduct. Our position as a Government would have been made far less strong if the Opposition had wanted it to be that way. I say here that just about this time now, if the Opposition had wanted it to be

that way — if the Opposition had taken a partisan stand, I would be announcing a general election in Newfoundland on this issue. The Opposition knew nothing about that, but I was fully resolved. My mind was completely made up that if this strike in Central Newfoundland showed any danger at all of being treated as a partisan matter, then I would recommend to the Governor the dissolution of the House of Assembly and the holding of a general election, so that people could decide between the two parties, the two political parties. But, Sir, there is nothing for the people to decide now on this issue — not on this issue of the strike, for the people to decide between the two parties. The parties see perfectly, eye-to-eye. The Leader of the Opposition has said publicly on CBC that, if he had been Premier of Newfoundland when this matter came up he would have done exactly as I did, as Smallwood did. There is no issue between us on this strike. Oh! the old issues remain. We still disagree on pretty well everything else. But, Sir, on this strike neither side of this House has acted or spoken as political partisans, but only as Newfoundlanders. I praise the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues for that and so does practically every living Newfoundlander in the world. Oh, there will be an occasional fanatic, there will be the occasional person, blinded with bitter hatred, who will condemn the Opposition for not seizing with joy, a Heaven-sent opportunity to knife Smallwood and his side of the house. They are Newfoundlanders but not the best Newfoundlanders.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word of praise for two men who are not in this house; Joe Thompson in Grand Falls, the President of the Old Newfoundland Lumbermen's Association, and Pierce Fudge in Corner Brook, the President of the Newfoundland Labour's Union. I want to say a word in praise of these two men because, as long as Newfoundland lasts, Joe Thompson and Pierce Fudge will live in our history as two pioneers in the uplifting of our Newfoundland loggers. This scoundrel, Ladd, and this gangster, Hall, (if that is his proper name, which it is not) have had the audacity, the brazen gall, to speak publicly in Newfoundland against these two Newfoundlanders — Sir, Joe Thompson and Pierce Fudge. These I.W.A. gangsters say that our loggers

are down-trodden, without friends, without a break, a chance in life — Twenty-two years ago these loggers were that. That is what they were.

I remember Gordon Bradley in 1934 or 1935 being appointed a Royal Commission of one man, by the Commission of Government, a Royal Commission of one man, to investigate conditions in the logging camps of Newfoundland. Now remember that, Gordon Bradley and I at that time were very close friends and I was in the closest touch with him while he investigated those conditions. Sir, the conditions that he investigated were so bad that the Commission of Government never did and never would publish his report, the famous Bradley Logging Report.

Then Joe Thompson, a poor and not very well-educated logger, started to organize a union of loggers. He was joined almost at once by Pierce Fudge and these two men worked like dogs. They travelled tens of thousands of miles. They worked and lived under terrible conditions in those years until every logger in Newfoundland was a union man, until these loggers unions had gotten union contracts with both paper companies and had built up conditions in the woods from the terrible state they were in, twenty-two years ago (the worst in North America) until twenty-two years later they were the best in the eastern half of Canada. And these scoundrels, to serve their own thoroughly selfish purposes spread this damnable lie about two noble pioneers in the uplifting of our Newfoundland loggers. This is one of the greatest crimes that these criminals have committed, the way they have belied Thompson and Fudge.

As the President of the Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood Workers (Max Cave) said here in this house the other day, Thompson and Fudge, twenty-two years after commencing this great task, are no longer as young as they were. They are no longer as energetic as they were. They are no longer able to go plowing through the snow and visiting thousands of loggers in the camps. And, Sir, I can see how young men in the lumber camps, men who know nothing, nothing about the conditions of twenty-two years ago, I can imagine how such young men, green horns, would listen to the lying propaganda of these IWA scoundrels. But not the older men! They

know! They remember! When the history of organized labour comes to be written in Newfoundland, as it will, the names of Thompson and Fudge will shine as brightly as the best in our history. When the history of organized labour comes to be written in Newfoundland, as it will, the names of Thompson and Fudge will shine as brightly as the best in our history. When the Leader of the Opposition and I sat here for a year and a half in this same room with Pierce Fudge we knew him as a good Newfoundlander.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Smallwood: We know that to be made the victim of these unscrupulous rascals is an absolute outrage against these decent Newfoundlanders. Now that is the word of praise I wanted to say for the Opposition and for Joe Thompson and Pierce Fudge. Now the word of blame. The blame for the latest lies of the IWA, Mr. Speaker. The strike against the A.N.D. Company is over. There is now no strike against the A.N.D. Company. The camps are filled to overflow. There are more men in the camps today than there were when the strike was called. Does that sound like a strike? Between 85% and 90% of them are IWA members, who have left the IWA. There are men, there are IWA members who have left the IWA and have now become members of the new Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood Workers.

Mr. Hollett: That is the men in the woods?

Mr. Smallwood: I say that between 85% and 90% of the 1300 loggers who are at this moment working in the camps of the A.N.D. Company are men who were members of the IWA and who have left the IWA and have joined the Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood Workers, and are working now with the A.N.D., with an increase in pay under a union contract. Where is the strike? Is there a strike just because the liar, Ladd, says there is one? Does that make a strike, because a liar says there is a strike when there is no strike? They are working at this moment in the A.N.D. camps, not one, not a dozen, not a score, but hundreds of IWA pickets, hundreds of men who were not only members

of the IWA but pickets on the picket line. And many of these came to the Brotherhood office in Grand Falls in person, voluntarily, and announced who and what they were, and said — "I have had enough of the IWA. I am through with it forever. I am a sorry person that I ever saw them. I want to join the new Brotherhood, if you will admit me, if you will let me". Dozens of the pickets have said that and done that.

Mr. Hollett: If I may interrupt, may I ask the hon. the Premier a question? What legal right have the present pickets in Central Newfoundland who don't belong to Central Newfoundland, what legal right have they to be there?

Mr. Smallwood: They have the same legal right to be there, although, as the hon. Leader said, they are not domiciled there, they don't belong in Central Newfoundland, they are not on strike against the A.N.D. Company, they are not former employees of the A.N.D. Company, they have the same right to be there as any subject of the Queen has to be anywhere in Newfoundland.

Mr. Hollett: Picketing?

Mr. Smallwood: The fact that they are paid so much a day by the IWA, the fact that they have been brought from a distance of 100 miles and more on the West Coast, to the Central Newfoundland area, the fact that they are just hirelings of the IWA does not make it in any way unlawful for them to be there. My direct answer to the hon. gentleman is therefore: they have as much right to be there as any of Her Majesty's subjects have to be anywhere under the Union Jack.

Mr. Hollett: They can fill the place up with them?

Mr. Smallwood: If the IWA can collect enough money to pay them, there is nothing in the law to stop them bringing in 50,000 men to Central Newfoundland. There is nothing to stop them bringing in 100,000 from say, Nova Scotia and the mainland of Canada. It becomes unlawful, I contend, when they are there in such numbers as to constitute a threat to law and order. And I imagine in those circum-

tances the hon. the Attorney General would tell us. Now I am no lawyer. They would be treading on very thin ice.

Now, Sir, I may be asked this question: if the strike is over and there are more men back working than there were when the strike was called and thousands more to go back, if that is the case, (and it is — the strike is over) then why are the IWA continuing to maintain pickets in Central Newfoundland and when they cannot get them in Central Newfoundland but must bring them in from Western Newfoundland and pay them to come? Why do it in that case? Why do they maintain an office in Bishops Falls? Why? Does not the house see why? Is not that as plain as daylight? If they were to remove their pickets from Central Newfoundland altogether, if they were to close their office in Central Newfoundland altogether and just move out, that of course, would be a frank admission of the truth — that the strike is over. And the moment the IWA admits that the strike is over the game is up. The money game is up, the money fame is up — the Bingo — it comes to an end. While they maintain a token force, that is all — a token force of pickets and a token office, while they maintain that they can continue to pretend across Canada and in the United States that there is a strike of the loggers against the A.N.D. Company. They dare not talk about a strike on the West Coast. They are stuck with that. They can't say there is a strike, just as they cannot admit that there is a strike in Central Newfoundland, so also they can't admit that there is a strike in Western Newfoundland, because the strike that there is in Western Newfoundland is unlawful and they cannot make it lawful. So therefore, they cannot admit that they have a strike in Western Newfoundland against Bowaters' Camps. They cannot admit that and they cannot admit that they have not got a strike in Central Newfoundland, because then the game would be up, the collections would stop.

Mr. Hollett: Why not an injunction against picketing in Western Newfoundland?

Mr. Smallwood: Picketing is never unlawful. Picketing — I will tell the hon. gentleman what picketing is.

Mr. Hollett: The strike is unlawful, you said.

Mr. Smallwood: The strike is unlawful but they don't admit there is a strike. It is not a strike. A thousand men have, by some telepathy now, because this gangster McCool, this criminal gangster McCool has gone up to the camps and organized a strike — no, that is not it; it is because of mental telepathy. A thousand men without any suggestion from any one have decided they will just withdraw their labour. They won't have a strike. They just will stop working — a thousand men. By some mysterious process it is not a strike, do not let anyone suggest that. Just stop work — that is not a strike. But a lot of the money that is collected, that is where it is going. That is where the pickets are being found, the paid pickets.

Now, to help maintain that lie, as it is obviously and every Newfoundlander knows it is a lie (every Newfoundlander knows the strike is over) but to help maintain the lie that the strike is still on Ladd was shown on CBC, and last night on C/JON, and hon. members and scores of thousands of Newfoundlanders saw and heard him on TV last night, and Hall, (if that is his name, and it is not) said in Central Newfoundland yesterday the same thing that the scoundrel Ladd said i.e. "Oh! Yes! We know there are men up there in the bush, sure! yes! but wait until they go back to their fish and ships, wait until these imitation loggers, these fishermen go back to their dories" (he said dories - not punts, not trap-skiffs, back to their dories) — "Wait until this 1300 men go back to their dories and then the A.N.D. Company will be on their knees, then they will be crying and begging to the real loggers to go back to work and then the strike will be over."

That is just a lie, just a plain lie. Let us take a look at the divisions. Terra Nova Division camps are full, and those men will go back from Terra Nova to Port Blandford. How many dories will they find in Port Blandford? How many punts? How many traps-kiffs? How many fishermen are in Port Blandford? Are they in Traytown? Are they in Glovertown? That is where they come from, these loggers, these fishermen that are filling the camps of Terra Nova. And when these other fishermen in the Gambo camps come down, as soon as the snow is all

melted and the instinct arised to get back to the fishery, when these fishermen in the Gambo camps come down to Gambo, to Middle Brook, to Dart Cove, to Hare Bay, to Indian Bay, what kind of fishing are they going to do in Gambo? They catch a few sea trout and a few smelts.

Mr. Hollett: Not in dories though.

Mr. Smallwood: Not in dories. And the loggers in the Badger camps, when those fishermen go back to Norris Arm and Lewisporte and Botwood and Windsor and Grand Falls and Bishops Falls, they are going to have a bit of a job earning a living this summer fishing, while the real loggers are up working for the A.N.D. Company. And when those other fishermen that have filled the camps at Millertown come back to Millertown and Millertown Junction and Buchans Junction and Badger and Botwood and South Brook and Point Leamington and Springdale, those are going to be strange fishermen too. Just lies — lies — propaganda.

Mr. I. Mercer (Fogo): Mr. Ladd must make a living.

Mr. Smallwood: He has got to make a living. He has got to keep that strike going across Canada and down in the United States; \$50,000 a week, he says — just the IWA — leave out all the other unions of Canada and the United States — just the IWA are going to pour \$50,000 a week into Newfoundland. What for? What for? What is that for when there is no strike in Newfoundland? The Newfoundland Government may be obliged to enquire into those funds and see if there is any embezzlement, see if there is any misappropriation of funds, see if there is any downright robbery. Another reason why the IWA are compelled, and I say compelled, to go on pretending that the strike is still on in Central Newfoundland is this. The IWA, with its long record of Communism, with its long record in socialized politics, (the unspeakable Hall was once a Socialist Candidate for election — what Canada escaped!), with its pre-occupation with the launching of the new party, political party, the IWA and the Canadian Labour Congress, who are actively working, both of them, and many of

the unions affiliated with the CLC; I say, with their strong pre-occupation, their strong concern, their strong interest in the formation of a new political party in Canada (and this is no secret I am revealing, everybody knows, it is published and common knowledge, Stanley Knowles is the brains of it, the brain trust) they can use the pretended loggers strike in Newfoundland, the pretended loggers strike, as a means not only of collecting money which will probably end up, if it is not robbed in the meanwhile, paying the election expenses of the Socialist candidates, some of them with strong Communist sympathies; but at the same time they use this strike in Newfoundland to promote actively the launching of the new political party.

So I say, what was a strike against the A.N.D. Company?; an unpopular strike — Don't forget the figures: 4,000 IWA members who were A.N.D. Company loggers — 4,000; of these 1,200 were in the camps, of these 815 voting; of these, fewer than 800 voting for the strike. Don't forget these figures: 815 out of 1,200; 1,200 out of 4,000 — This unpopular strike, I say, is over. But the IWA has a Klondyke in the strike, and it is something like the saying of Napoleon — "If there had been no Gaul it would have been necessary to invent one." The house will remember — if there had been no IWA strike in Central Newfoundland it would have been necessary to invent one. Now that there is not one they have invented one, a sheer invention, a sheer fabrication. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker — What will the IWA say, what explanation will they give? I ask this question. I would certainly like the question to become public. I would like the IWA to hear it now. What will they say, what explanation will they give when the 1,500 or 1,600 loggers in the camps by say Monday next, (because Bishop's Falls camps are the only division not yet filled up. They are cleaning up the camps, getting them ready for men to enter); when these 1,500 or 1,600 men come out of the camps two or three weeks from now, and another 1,500 or 1,600 men are needed to fill these camps at once, when that happens and the Newfoundland Brotherhood of Wood Workers provide the men (as it will) what explanation will the IWA give them? Oh, yes, they will say — "it is alright now. They have the fishermen up in the bush, but they will be

coming down soon, then you will see the A.N.D. Company on their knees, pleading and begging with us, to go back to work." What explanation will they give when the Brotherhood supplies another 1,600 men, and when they come down, then supply another 1,600 on top of that? What explanation will they give? What will they invent then to keep the fund flowing in?

Now, Sir, let me say this. In all Newfoundland today there is not one full term logger. Let us get the truth of this — not one full time logger in Newfoundland, not one in the whole province. All loggers in Newfoundland are part-time loggers. And let that be understood clearly. If there is not one full-time logger then all the loggers have got to be part-time loggers. There are some who are railroad-loggers, men who get seasonal work on the railroad. There are construction — loggers who get work on construction projects for part of the year and as loggers for another part of the year. There are road-construction, road worker-loggers who work part of the year in the woods and part constructing roads for the Department of Highways. All loggers in Newfoundland, all of them, are part-time loggers who work for other parts of the year at other occupations. And, Sir, to think as the IWA does, to try to make out that you have a bunch of fishermen who are not loggers on the one side, and on the other side a bunch of real loggers, as they call them, is just a lie, just a lie. It is just a plain lie.

Mr. I. Mercer (Fogo): They said the A.N.D. Company a few weeks ago were importing fishermen.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes. If fishermen were imported from Twillingate into the woods, what word would you use for Ladd and Hall or whatever his real name is and McCool, the scoundrel? How did they get here? Who imported them?

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): There is another man — this man, Skinner. He has not been mentioned in dispatches at all.

Mr. Smallwood: He is a Newfoundlander, so I have never said a word against Skinner. He is just one of the misled Newfoundlanders. I don't know the man. I don't know him from Adam, but he is a Newfoundlan-

der, so I will say nothing against him. This strike, Mr. Speaker, that did occur in Central Newfoundland is the first strike in Newfoundland history, the first one that was born in criminal lawlessness. Does the house realize the enormity of this? That when the strike was called by the IWA on December 31 last, the first order that the IWA gave, Hall (to use his assumed name, his non-deplume) Hall made an announcement publicly over the provincial radio network, all the radio stations. Mr. Hall's announcement was directed to the loggers, who were now on strike, directing them or ordering them not to leave the camps, to stay in the camps until the union ordered them out. In other words — until Hall ordered them out.

Now, if there were no strike and one of these loggers discontinued working, (say his wife is sick and he wanted to go home or he was sick and wanted to go home, or did not want to work any longer), if for any reason he quit working, he would immediately leave the camp. He was not going to stay on in the camp and pay 35 cents a meal for three meals a day if not working. He might do so for a day or two or something like that, but ordinarily, when men stop working they leave the camps and go home, because to stay there they are occupying the property belonging to another man. In his case the A.N.D. Company. They have to eat or starve to death. And when Hall, this unspeakable character, ordered them on the radio, the public radio, to stay in the camps until he gave them the order to leave, what was he actually telling them? Let us put it into words. Break the law, commit a criminal offence, occupy these camps that you don't own and the union does not own, occupy them. If the company tells you to leave, forget the company. Listen to me. I am boss. You stay until I tell you to leave.

You need food — take the company's food. You have no money to pay for it — to hell with paying for it, just take it and eat it. And for a period running from three weeks to one month, hundreds and hundreds of men did exactly that, and they took food and other things belonging to the A.N.D. Company worth tens of thousands of dollars. I happen to know the value. I won't state the exact figure, but I can tell the house that it ran to tens of thousands of dollars. It cost the A.N.D. Company that,

when these men took and ate or used, as the case may be.

Now what they did not find in the camps in which they stayed, they found by going to other camps and taking it and bringing it to the camps they were staying in. Three or four weeks of utter lawlessness, theft, robbery on the advice of the union. And they were ordered not to leave until the union gave them permission to do so. So that, I say, the strike was born in an act of criminal lawlessness, and from that moment on, when at last they came down from the camps (not because they were ordered down but just that the union failed to keep them up there, they would not stay, the men got fed up, browned off, and they came down — the last of them came down about one month after the strike began) from that moment the lawlessness took another form — the form of relentless violence. You will find, if you look up the newspapers, that the first violence was January 6. You will see a "CP" message to that effect, where the IWA pickets invaded the public highway, stopped privately-owned trucks owned by citizens, subjects of the Queen who were going about their lawful business, hauling pulpwood to the A.N.D. Company, (which is not lawful but perfectly lawful, just as lawful after a strike starts as before the strike — the strike made no difference to that at all, no difference in the lawfulness of a truck driver hauling pulpwood), they stopped them and dumped the wood out on to the Queen's Highway and took the drivers, in some cases, and flung them out of the cabs. On January 14, 15 days after the strike started, this gang of pickets seized Walter Fudge, a man of 64 years, demanding the ignition keys of his snowmobile, flinging him out, wrenching his arm, bringing the blood through, throwing him on the roadside, taking over his snowmobile and going off. Three of them were arrested and charged with theft and violence.

Mr. I. Mercer (Fogo): That was after the warning from the Attorney General.

Mr. Smallwood: That was after a very severe warning issued by the Attorney General. Then, February 7, the first big raid. So that, Mr. Speaker, this strike, from the day it started down to the riots in Badger, when

the policeman (William Moss) was slain on the night of March 10, from December 31 to March 10 that strike was conducted with utter lawlessness, criminal lawlessness, which finally ended in death. But, Sir, that was not the first death caused by this strike.

It was the fourth. Four men are dead today who would probably be alive but for the strike. The first three were pickets of the IWA who lost their lives by drowning returning from picket lines and the fourth was a policeman slain in the riot at Badger — Four Newfoundland lives so far.

Now, the Prime Minister of Canada today, Mr. Diefenbaker, has been good enough to tell Canada, from his seat in the House of Commons, that the Premier of Newfoundland had aggravated the violence. The full statement that he made appears in tonight's "Evening Telegram" I think it is, or it might have been this morning's "Daily News". His statement appears there in full. I have not commented on that statement until now because I had not seen the full statement that the Prime Minister of Canada made.

"Premier Smallwood has aggravated the situation", aggravated the violence. Now that sounds in my ears something like this kind of statement: "The British Premier aggravated Hitler's violence", because after all if the British Government, the British Prime Minister had not opposed Hitler's violence there would not have been nearly as much of it. He aggravated it by opposing it. You can think of so many instances in which violence would never have been as great if someone had not opposed it — the Civil War in the United States. If you leave violence alone, if you just keep hands off, if you don't oppose it you won't aggravate it, it will probably be less violent then if you do oppose it. You won't aggravate it.

We had 48 days of violence and lawlessness, three to four weeks unlawful occupation of the camps. On February 15 (the strike began on December 31), on February 15 the I.W.A. pickets refused point-blank, by offering physical force, to permit the inspectors and officials of the A.N.D. company to go up into the Millertown Camps and inspect them and see what condition they were in. I don't mean those pickets stood there and said in all politeness, in a decent way as Newfoundlanders will, "Excuse me, Sir, But I suppose you know that we have a strike on and you know that we don't like to

see people going up into the camps." Is that the kind of peaceful picketing they did? For 48 days and night, lawlessness and violence; 48 days unlawful possession of the camps, the theft of tens of thousands of dollars worth of food and other property, the seizure of trucks, the seizure of wood, gangs of pickets sitting on the wood and daring any one to touch it or load it, unlawful possession of A.N.D. Company gates leading from the Queen's Highway up to the private roads to the camps; raiding the camps, five or was it six separate raids of men numbering from 100 to 300 per raid at two and three and four o'clock in the morning. Violence, lawlessness and bloodshed for 48 days and nights before I even opened my mouth, before I did or said anything — 48 days. And what did I do then?

On the 48th. day, I went on the radio and I made a speech. The Premier of the province of Newfoundland made a speech on the radio. Ladd had made several and issued statements continuously. I went on and made a speech to the loggers telling them that, in my opinion, the strike had failed and could not succeed, the IWA had failed and could not succeed, that they had been misled by the IWA. That they, in my opinion, should get rid of the IWA and send them packing, but that they could not do without a union — they still had to have a union, and if they followed my advice they would form a new union, and if they wanted my help to do it I would be glad to offer my help.

Now, that is what I did. That was my intervention. That is how I intervened. That is the only intervention I had made, nothing else. Mr. Diefenbaker thinks I aggravated the strike. The heat was on me for 12 days to intervene. Who put the heat on me? Let me tell the house. First and foremost Mr. Jodoin, the politician, labour leader of Canada. He telephoned me from Ottawa and asked me to intervene. He was the first. Then he came to see me at the hotel in Ottawa when I went up to see the Prime Minister. Then who else intervened? The Canadian Labour Congress, represented in Newfoundland by Mr. Chafe. Mr. Chafe, who came to see me and asked me to intervene. Then who else? The President and Treasurer of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour, who came and asked me to intervene. Then who else? The CLC's representative, Mr. Chafe, together

with the officers of the Federation of Labour jointly asked me to intervene. Who else? Scores of telegrams showered on me, written by the IWA, because they all had the same phraseology but signed by picket lines, demanding that I intervene. And when I said only that I was observing the situation, keeping careful watch on it by the day and by the hour (the house may remember the phrase, I used it several teims), they then changed the propaganda and began sending me telegrams saying: "Never mind watching now, we want you to act". This went on, starting about a fortnight before I did at last intervene — days after the strike began — 48 days of lawlessness and violence. Yet I aggravated it according to Mr. Diefenbaker, who does not think there is any need of a Royal Commission to find out the facts. He does not see the necessity of a Royal Commission. He is sure that he knows the truth. There is no need of a Royal Commission to find out the facts and assess the extent. He rejects that and says that "Smallwood aggravated the situation". I do not think there is anyone in Newfoundland who agrees with him in that statement. I don't believe there is. I am sure the Opposition don't. I am sure the people of Newfoundland don't agree that I aggravated it except in the same sense that bigger and greater men than I could ever dream of being aggravated violence by opposing it. Then we have this extraordinary situation, quite extraordinary. Let the hon. members of the house think back and try to remember a bigger thing that happened in Newfoundland than this strike, this whole IWA strike, since we became a province of Canada ten years ago, let them think of something bigger that has happened. This thing has aroused attention across Canada from one end to the other. You had the Manitoba House of Assembly stopping their business the other day and having a debate on us, on this house.

Mr. Hollett: Yes!

Mr. Smallwood: They debated our legislation. They debated the strike — extraordinary. An extraordinary thing! It never happened before in Canada's history. The Premier of Saskatchewan, Canada's Socialist, Tommy Douglas, a very pleasant fellow, felt as a Canadian, as a Socialist, as a

Canadian Premier, felt an obligation to comment on Newfoundland and on this house and on the Government and on our legislation. And all across Canada it has aroused more attention than anything else in the whole history of Newfoundland. Never in our history did anything in Newfoundland attract so much attention across Canada. Newfoundland's name has been slandered. The name of this house has been slandered, this house.

Mr. Hollett: Besmirched!

Mr. Smallwood: The Government of Newfoundland, the Queen's Ministers have been slandered all across Canada. The Opposition has been slandered all across Canada. Now we have a champion in Ottawa, our Newfoundland minister. We have only one. Newfoundland has one minister, one minister of the Crown who represents Newfoundland in Ottawa — Mr. Browne. Has Mr. Browne come to the rescue of Newfoundland? Did he come to the rescue of this house where he sat as a member a year and a half ago? Did he come to the rescue of the Opposition who were members of his same party and who are hon. colleagues of his, the men who have borne the brunt of carrying the Opposition burden for the last 10 years — had he said a kindly word for the Opposition?

Mr. Hollett: He was sick for a while.

Mr. Renouf: We don't know yet.

Mr. Smallwood: He has announced in the "Telegram" today the statement he would be making is now off. He won't be making any statement.

Mr. Renouf: Until he comes back.

Mr. Smallwood: The time to have made it was when our backs were to the wall. Every one else had made it, even young Mr. McGrath, even that young gentleman felt he had to say something. He did say something. Just exactly what it was I don't know, but he said something. He did not altogether agree with the Prime Minister, but on the other hand he did not altogether agree with the Newfoundland Government. He did not altogether agree with the

people who did speak up. They were all out of step but Jim, every one, the Prime Minister, the Premier, the Liberals, Tories, Newfoundland, Ottawa, everybody else. He has an original slant of his own — "The Lone Ranger". He has, so I am told, made a personal study of the legislation which we passed here in this house. He made a personal study. That was flattering to us because it is gratifying to know that our legislation is receiving careful scrutiny at the hands or at least the eyes of young McGrath. But he, having made a study of this legislation, which the Government of Canada has not disallowed for a very good reason, or have not referred or seen the need of referring to the Supreme Court, again for a very good reason, but young Mr. McGrath, after giving careful personal and individual study to it pronounced the verdict that, in his considered opinion, not lightly made or lightly arrived at, but in his considered opinion, this legislation was ultra vires. And he knows how to spell these words too, don't be in any doubt about that. It was ultra vires and unconstitutional.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt and remind the hon. the Premier that at the outset, we on this side said we would not allow politics in any form to intervene.

Mr. Smallwood: I could not agree more, but there is a case of Newfoundland's good name at stake, the wolves howling from one end of Canada to the other. Newfoundland's name was being slandered, Newfoundland's good name. My hon. friends in the Opposition were described as "captives of Smallwood". The whole Opposition were a captive opposition, prisoners of this dictator, Smallwood. The whole house was a captive house. My hon. friend, the former Magistrate of Grand Falls (Mr. Hollett) is now my captive. He will be proud to know too that the gallant Major from Harbour Grace (Mr. Shepard) is told he is my captive — Joe Smallwood's captive. These two master marines, used to giving orders all their lives now have to take orders from the boss, the big boss, according to the slander.

Mr. Hollett: Why don't you go out and capture Ladd?

Mr. Smallwood: Whatever disagreement there might have been as to whether or not Mr. Browne should be elected, the moment he was elected and was sworn in in the Privy Council as a member of the Government of Canada, he ceased to be just the member for St. John's West, he ceased to be a Liberal or a Tory, he became the one and only representative of Newfoundland in the great Government of Canada. He represents me. He is my representative, the only one I have in the Government of Canada. He is yours and yours and yours, the only representative of all of us in Newfoundland, of you, Mr. Speaker. We have one representative in the great Government of this great nation of Canada and that is Mr. Browne. And when Newfoundland's good name was at stake, when we were being slandered all of us in this house of which he was a member, who ornamented this house, one of the ablest men who ever sat here, (we did not always agree — I did not always feel completely at home with him, but he was a very able and brilliant member), he has not said a word in defence of this house. Our legislation is not disallowed. Why does he condemn it? It has not been referred to the Supreme Court. Why does he condemn it? What have we done besides passing this legislation? What is this house to be condemned for if not for passing this legislation? What else have we done that is to be praised or blamed? What have we done to be praised or condemned except pass the legislation. While the legislation has not been disallowed, it has not been referred to the Supreme Court. Why then does he condemn us? What have we done that deserves condemnation? So that the record will be straight, had Mr. Pickersgill or Mr. Carter or Mr. Batten or Mr. Granger or Mr. Tucker similarly failed or refused to stand up for Newfoundland, I would condemn them just the same, just as readily I assure the house of that.

I ask the house to believe that. And I will say this here this afternoon in the hope that it will reach him and he will read it in his newspaper tomorrow in Ottawa or listen to it tonight on the radio, if it gets on the radio — I am not too proud of the position Mr. Pearson has taken, not too proud of it — None of us here are too proud of it. If he had stopped at one point, after saying that the legislation Newfoundland passed, the

legislation they passed unanimously, and they are answerable to the Newfoundland people — If he had stopped there, or if he had not stopped there but had gone on to say — "Now I don't know enough about the facts that caused them to do this. I don't know just why the Newfoundland legislature adopted this legislation and did so unanimously. I don't know why. That is why I am disappointed that the Prime Minister of Canada has not seen fit to set up this Royal Commission, then I might know whether the Newfoundland Legislature did rightly or wrongly. But in the absence of a Royal Commission I have not got the facts and as I have not got the facts how am I to judge the rightness or wrongness of the Sovereign House of Newfoundland?"

Don't forget, Mr. Speaker, this little house here is just as sovereign within its own jurisdiction as the Parliament of Canada. We are the Sovereign House of the Newfoundland people and we must not be treated by Mr. Pearson or Mr. Diefenbaker or Mr. Browne, we must not be treated as irresponsible fools who don't know what we are doing. We know what we are doing. We know too well what we are doing. We know that we have stood up for Newfoundland. This, I think the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Higgins) called it by an old Newfoundland word — "guff" — this propaganda that they are spreading across Canada, that the Newfoundland loggers have had something precious taken from them, something they were given in a Magna Carta, their right to have a union of their own choice which has been taken from them by this nefarious legislation which is nothing else but an attack at the very roots of British Freedom; this propaganda has gone all across Canada. "It is an attack on Democracy itself."

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): On basic human rights.

Mr. Smallwood: "Basic human rights" — Now what rights have we taken? None! Not one, not one at all! What we have taken away is a monopoly, nothing else. The IWA came into Newfoundland and they organized a lot of loggers. They had that right. They still have that right. They had the right to come and form a union. We passed certain legislation here, but they still have that right. The

legislation does not take away from the I.W.A. the right to be a union, the right to exist, the right to function, the right to negotiate with employers. We did not take away any of these rights in this legislation we passed.

Now, what did we take away? We took away the monopoly from the I.W.A. — just the monopoly, and a monopoly is an executive right. When the I.W.A. was certified by the Labour Relations Board, exactly what was done? What do we mean when we say that the I.W.A. were certified? Exactly what does that mean? Now, I am sure there is no member of this house unable to answer that question. What it means is merely this. The Labour Relations Board said to the I.W.A. and to the A.N.D. Company, they said this — “So far as the A.N.D. Loggers are concerned (about 4,000 loggers), so far as they are concerned, there is only one union in the world that has any right at all to negotiate with you, Mr. A.N.D. Company, in behalf of the loggers. Only one union in the world has that right to negotiate or to make a contract with the A.N.D. Company, and that is the I.W.A.” That is the monopoly which was given them. The A.N.D. Company was not permitted under the law to deal with any other union, therefore of course, it would be useless for any other union to exist.

But 58 or 60 days after the strike began, this house met and we passed a statute. About 60 days after, or to be exact 65 days after the strike began, the people's house passed a law taking away from the I.W.A. this monopoly. Remember now, they had not taken away from the I.W.A. the right to negotiate with the A.N.D. Company. They still have that right. We did not take away the A.N.D. Company's right to negotiate with the I.W.A. They still have that right to negotiate with the I.W.A. and the I.W.A. with the A.N.D. Company. This legislation did not take away the right of the I.W.A. to sign a contract with the A.N.D. Company. They still have the right to do that just as much as they ever did. This legislation did not take away the I.W.A.'s right to exist. They still exist and they are still lawful. This legislation did not take away from the I.W.A. the right to conduct a strike. They can still conduct a strike, if they can get anyone to strike. (I may not be quite right there. I will put a question mark on that).

The legislation did not take away from the I.W.A. the right to picket, to maintain a picket line, a peaceful picket line, a lawful picket line — and no union in the world has any right to conduct any other kind of line, just a lawful line. So, what rights did we take?

We have taken the monopoly! Now the minute we took the monopoly away it meant that any other union there might be could lawfully negotiate with the A.N.D. Company. That is why we had to take it away. That is the reason we had to take it away — so that another union, that the A.N.D. Company was willing to negotiate with, could negotiate and sign an agreement and put an end to the strike, because what had been reached was an impasse. It was a case, you might say, of an irresistible force meeting an immovable body. The I.W.A. said they would carry the strike on to the crack of doom. They said: “Look at the sky. Look how high the sun is getting. Soon the snow will be gone. Time is on our side.” They were the irresistible force. The immovable body was the company. What did the company say? They said we will close her down before we will sign with the I.W.A. It was an impasse. Now, what were the people of Newfoundland to do in that situation? What were the people of Newfoundland, 500,000 people, what were they to do? There were 815 men who voted on a strike, and just under 800 of them voted to have the strike.

Mr. I. Mercer (Fogo): Were told to vote!

Mr. Smallwood: They voted however — about 800 men voted, amongst 500,000 people. We are here representing the 500,000 Ladd and Hall and McCool represent 800 men, say there were all married men, call it 4,000 people. We represent 500,000. Now, what were we to do, sit back like fools and let a war of attrition go on? Were we to go on letting the irresistible force go on trying to move the immovable body? Were we to sit back like fools, like traitors to Newfoundland and see Newfoundland brought down to economic disaster? Were we to do that? To ask the question is to answer it. But, someone may say; “Well, if it was a matter of decertifying the I.W.A., if that is all the legislation did, decertified them, took the monopoly from them, why did you have to take the drastic

position of doing it by legislation? Why did you not have the Labour Relations Board do it?" Well, that is a good question. But there is a good answer. It would take many months, quite probably four or five months and maybe longer to get the I.W.A. decertified by means of the Labour Relations Board, and in the meanwhile there would have been this economic disaster. Then again we might have done it, as the Attorney General has pointed out, by a simple Order in Council. In fact there are two Orders in Council we could have passed, and either one would have done it. We could have passed an Order in Council decertifying the I.W.A., and the Government of Canada could not touch that. They could not deny an Order in Council made under existing law, no matter how much they might want to. We could have done that. We could have done this: We could have passed a simple Order in Council removing the A.N.D. Company from the ambit of the Act. Then you would have had the I.W.A. still certified to deal with a company that did not exist under the Labour Relations Act. So that then what would be the good of their being certified? Any union could then form up and the A.N.D. would be free to deal with them. They would not be blocked by this uneven marriage with the I.W.A. We had these two ways to do it. We chose the way the house knows about. We asked the house in the broad, open daylight, with free debate, to pass it as a piece of special legislation. Now that was thoroughly democratic, the most democratic way in which it could have been done.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak at such length today, and I did not intend, in any case, to deal with the points that some of my hon. friends opposite had touched on in this present debate. But, Sir, there is one thing I do want to say, and I want to say it in a tone and with words that are as little provocative as possible. I can give it in a very few words. It is intensely interesting. I have gone to the trouble to get this prepared for quite another purpose all together. Here it is:

Since Confederation, since union 10 years ago the Government of Newfoundland have paid out on assistance to the fishing industry, a total of \$20 million. The exact figure is \$19,904,000, around \$20 million. Some of it was paid out in cash, some of it in

guarantees to the banks, and as a result the companies to whom the money was paid (now this was not \$20 millions paid out to companies; of that \$20 million about \$14 millions was paid out to companies, and as a result of the spending of that \$14 millions in 25 loans to the firms who received this money from us to build plants or to enlarge them) they as a result spent \$62,028,000. Leave out the \$28,000 and you have a round \$62 millions. Now that does not include the Fishery Development Loan Board, which is another table all together.

Mr. Hollett: \$5 millions.

Mr. Smallwood: It is \$4,900,000, around \$5 millions. And as a result of that amount here is what was accomplished. These are not big fishing companies now, but small fishermen. The number of boats receiving help from Fisheries Loan Board in those years: the first year 27, the next year 44, the next year 61, the next year 113, the next year 161, the next year 224, and in 1958 310 boats. The number of fishermen involved from 1951 to 1958, 36, 88, 176, 248, 425, 644, 896, and this year just passed 958 — and they had produced, as a result of these loans in that period, \$4,110,000. So that it is \$14 millions — \$5 million — \$19 million we have lent, (public money) to fish firms and individual fishermen and small groups of fishermen — \$19 million; in round figures \$20 millions, and as a result of the \$20 millions, in the same period of time, they have paid out \$62 millions and \$4.1 millions — \$66 million.

Mr. Hollett: Paid out that to fishermen?

Mr. Smallwood: They paid out that for fish, for labour and for the crews of boats and crews of draggers. In other words, this cash, \$66 millions, in those years, i.e. the years 1951 through 1959, nine years, \$66 million cash has passed into the pockets of fishermen, plant workers in and around various fish plants in wages — you see — and the crews of draggers and the like — \$66 million in nine years. That is an average of \$7.5 millions a year.

Now the point about it is this. Suppose that the Government were to get back from the \$20 millions never a single dollar. Let us take the worst. No, I suppose it could be

even worse than that. I suppose that in addition to not getting back any we might have to give them more. That would even be worse. But let us take it as fairly bad and say we never get back a dollar of the \$20 million. Already in nine years our lending the \$20 million has caused \$66 millions cash to be paid out in wages and for fish, and presumably, in the next nine years, for the same \$20 million another \$66 millions more or less, will be paid out. Now, I don't for one moment say that that is enough, that we should not have lent more. I say we would have lent more if there had been more people to borrow it according to the terms and conditions that were laid down. We cannot lend it to everybody who just asks for it. It is not because a man has strength and energy to ask for a loan he should necessarily get it. He has to be prepared to meet with the conditions that the Fisheries Development Authority or the Fisheries Development Loan Board or the Executive Government will lay down. He has got to be prepared to meet these conditions. And for everyone who received a loan for fishery purposes there are probably five who do not. And my hon. friends may hear from some of these five to every one. But if he will, at any time he cares, go down to the Fisheries Loan Board, if they are the ones who turned him down, or the Fisheries Development Authority, if it happens to be they, and if not, if it is the Executive Government, or come to my colleague the Minister of Fisheries or come to me and I am sure he would be satisfied that had he, that is, the Leader of the Opposition, been the one himself to pass the verdicts, the verdicts would have been the same as ours. Because, Sir, we have been eager and anxious to make the loans, just as eager as he is to see that the fishery is carried on. The greatest need in the fishery today, whether there would be fishermen in the boats or merchants on shore, the greatest need is for ever more and more and more enterprising men who will work hard and take chances.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Smallwood: And wherever the Government meets men like that we are happy to make loans to them, always providing they will meet the conditions, because it is public money and we have had a lot of ex-

periences lending money like pouring money down the drain. Perhaps we will never see it again. So we have to be a little careful about that.

I close as I began — I am very sorry I have taken so long. I close again by saying that the Leader of the Opposition, if he went out of office today, if he retired from public life today or tomorrow, he can go out with his head held very high. As a proud Newfoundlander, as a man who has done his duty again, as he has done so often in the past. Again in this issue he has done his full duty to Newfoundland and he needn't be ashamed to look any man in the face in this world. The same applies to his colleagues, patriotic Newfoundlanders. We have been proud to have been in the house with them. We are proud to share with them the responsibility for carrying on the business of this house.

Now, when this issue is over we will be back at each others throats, we will be condemning one another, we will be attacking each other because we only agree on this one thing. In all the rest we have agreed to disagree. But, Sir, I imagine that for most of the present session there won't be very much snarling, because after this issue is over we have the question of term 29, and there again, I think, we will all be obliged to put patriotism before our partisanship. Thank you!

On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Hon L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate. I do so not because I intend to speak at the next sitting but so as to have an adjournment.

On motion debate adjourned.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

Hon. E.S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you that I have a letter from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, to be read to the house. Letter read by Mr. Speaker.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance:
I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit Es-

timates of sums required for the Public Services of the Province for the year ending 31st. March, 1960, by way of Interim Supply, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend these Estimates to the House of Assembly.

March 19th., 1959.

(Sgd.) Campbell MacPherson
Lieutenant-Governor.

On motion that the house go into a Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

Mr. G. Clarke: Chairman of Committee of Supply.

Resolution read by Chairman.

TO BE SUBMITTED TO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE IN RELATION TO THE GRANT OF SUPPLY TO HER MAJESTY.

Be it resolved by the House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened, as follows:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to provide for the granting to Her Majesty for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending the 31st. day of March, 1969, the initial sum of ten million, seven hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$10,780,000).

Mr. Curtis: If we read the Bill now, Mr. Chairman, we won't have to go into Committee again.

Motion, that the Committee rise and report having passed the Resolution, and that a Bill be introduced to give effect to same, Carried.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have directed me to report having passed certain resolutions and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion report received.

On motion resolutions read a first time — Read a second time.

A Bill, "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service." Read a first time,

read a second time, read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 31, at three o'clock.

Tuesday, March 31, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: (TERM 29):

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every member of this house has been shocked and disappointed, bitterly disappointed as the people of Newfoundland have been, by the announcement of the Prime Minister of Canada in the House of Commons last week. This is, of course, a matter of life and death importance to us and one therefore that will have to be thoroughly debated in this house. Ample opportunity will be made for such a debate. I suggest to the house that the time for that debate is not today, for the reason that certain prominent members of the major party in the House of Commons, that is to say, the hon. W.J. Browne, who is Newfoundland's Minister in the Government of Canada, and Mr. Jim McGrath, who is the member of Parliament for the riding of St. John's East and whose presence in the chamber today will be welcomed, I am sure, because of the terribly strategic position he occupies at the moment, as a Newfoundlander, by all of us here today. He is proceeding, so I understand, to Ottawa tomorrow for the purpose of conferring with the Prime Minister on this very matter of the Prime Minister's extraordinary pronouncement of last week. In view of the fact that they are doing so and in view of the fact that we must not miss any opportunity or what may appear to be an opportunity to get Newfoundland's case put right to the Prime Minister, the debate on this whole matter

ought to be deferred until after these two Newfoundlanders have conferred with the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister has had some considerable time in which to make any new statement he may wish to make or else our Newfoundland Minister and Mr. McGrath have had an opportunity to make some statement to the people of Newfoundland.

Now the house and the people may feel some little disappointment over a failure to debate the matter today. But, Sir, we have waited for eight years, indeed we have waited now for ten years, for the announcement that was made last week, and we can wait a little longer before we debate the matter. I just want the house to know ample opportunity will be afforded for a thorough-going debate, but in the interest of Newfoundland, in the interest of Newfoundland's welfare, today is not the time for that.

Members Of The Opposition: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Smallwood: I hope that can be concurred in.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.
WOODS-LABOUR DISPUTE: AFTER-
MATH:**

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I have two statements which I would like to make to the house. The first is that, early last week, I received a petition through the solicitor of the newly-formed Newfoundland Brotherhood of Woodworkers, in which they asked that my department would give sympathetic consideration to the cases of some of the loggers who have been convicted and were in the Penitentiary. I am very glad, Mr. Speaker to get the petition and as a result the case of every one of the 30 loggers who were in the Penitentiary was taken under consideration. It was found that 15 of the 30 had served half their term, or more than half their term of their respective sentences. So that in those cases I was very happy to negotiate with the Department of Remissions in Ottawa, and as a result they took my recommendation that leniency be extended, and 15 of the men were released from the Penitentiary on Saturday and sent home to their homes in

Central Newfoundland. I think it is only fair that we should have dealt kindly and leniently with these men because I do not think they were hardened criminals. In fact, Sir, I think they were rather sinned against than sinning, and I feel that, having been released will impress upon them the desire of those concerned with the administration of justice to see that justice is done and the law, in exercising its prerogative can be lenient in proper cases.

The second statement I have to make, Mr. Speaker, is that at 10:15 this morning in Ottawa, a statement of claim was filed with the Exchequer Court. This is an action arising out of the failure of the RCMP to respond to a call for reinforcement three weeks ago. The claim is for damages and for a declaration as to the meaning of the clause in question, which has been read to the house and of which we all have knowledge. The Newfoundland Government wants to have it determined, one way or another, whether or not we have the right to seek and expect to get reinforcements. The object of this action is to have a decision from the court (and interpretation of that clause) so that not only Newfoundland but the other provinces who have an agreement for policing with the RCMP, so that we and they will know just what the fair and proper interpretation of this clause is.

We are also charging damages, which, of course, at the moment cannot be set forth in their entirety because the matter is not yet closed. Our counsel in Ottawa is E.G. Gowling, Q.C., former President of the Canadian Bar. He has with him a large firm of counsels with whom I have been in constant touch over the telephone during the past week or so, and I feel quite sure that under the guidance of Mr. Gowling and his firm this matter will come before court very shortly and that a hearing and a judgement will be rendered which will be satisfactory to the Government.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, arising out of that statement, would the hon. the Attorney-General elaborate on what he means by "very shortly", this year or next year — the hearing of that action?

Mr. Curtis: In a matter of this kind, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty will undoubtedly

come. In this case, the Government of Canada and the Attorney General of Canada will probably raise every trick in the book to keep this matter from coming up for hearing. As to just how far this will be successful we cannot at this moment say, but I do expect all kinds of preliminary objections to be raised.

Mr. Higgins: So that the phrase "very early" does not mean anything?

Mr. Curtis: I am hoping Mr. Speaker, "very early" will mean before the court rises, before the end of June.

Mr. Higgins: This year?

Mr. Curtis: Yes. I understand Government cases, Mr. Speaker, get certain priority.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Give it 10 years.

Premier Smallwood: As long as it is not eight years.

Mr. Curtis: We will leave no stone unturned, Mr. Speaker, to get the matter before court just as quickly as it can be arranged.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Too Good Arm, Green Cove, Pike's Arm, Cobb's Arm. This petition asks, Mr. Speaker, that the road which is presently about to be completed to Herring Neck be continued to these four settlements. The petition is largely signed, by some 231 people, which represent almost the entire voting population of that area. I think the petition is a fair one and a proper one. The people of New World Island have recently found out just how beneficial roads can be. I might say that when I first went to New World Island in 1949 there was not a mile of road there and the entire travelling had to be done by schooner, with the result it took pretty well two weeks for me to canvas that district. Now, Sir, in the course of one day you can go from one end of New World Island to the other, and the blessing of modern transpor-

tation has been enjoyed by and appreciated by all the people of New World Island. The object of the prayer of the petition is that the road may be continued from Herring Neck, or a point just outside Herring Neck, to these various places. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Curtis: I also beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the residents of Herring Neck and Merrit's Harbour, all of whom wish to support the petition that I have just presented from the people of Too Good Arm and Cobb's Arm, Green Cove and Pike's Arm. The petition from Herring Neck is signed by 250 people, which represents, I am told, the huge majority — in fact, over 80% of the residents of that area. The people of Herring Neck express themselves in their petition as being very happy indeed to be linked at least with the other settlements on New World Island, and they would like to share these blessings with the people in the other four coves which at the moment are not connected. I would ask that this petition too be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in presenting a third petition. This one also is from the people of New World Island and Twillingate Island. There are two petitions in fact. The first is for a causeway linking New World Island with the mainland of Newfoundland and the second is for the establishment of a ferry service linking Twillingate Island to New World Island. Although this is the first time Mr. Speaker, that a petition to this effect has been presented to the house, the matter of a causeway linking New World Island to the mainland of Newfoundland has been before the Government for some years, and indeed my leader has already told the house that one of the aims of the present Government is to have this causeway completed.

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is a huge petition signed by some 3000 people, and they set forth that there are many reasons why this causeway should be constructed. In the

first place, they say the area in question contributes financially and otherwise to the general economy of the province. It has over 4000 taxpayers contributing as required, and both islands feed essential manpower to our two chief industries. In the second place, they point out, the motor vehicles registration runs over 300, representing not only considerable income in registration fees, licenses etc. but also constituting a costly operation for the owners who, because of the lack of such a causeway, never derive maximum benefit from their investment. They also estimate that within two years of the completion of the proposed causeway and ferry service, the number of vehicles registered in this area could be doubled. Then, Mr. Speaker, the petition points out that this area is the location of a fine hospital which because of its reputation draws people from all over the province. Lack of highroads communications adversely affect the work of this great institution because of their insular position. They suggest, too, that this inconvenience is not readily acceptable in this modern day and age. Mail services are irregular and erratic too, depending on the whims of the winds and weather. Lack of cheaper transportation gives them the dubious honour of having the highest cost of living in the province. And lastly, they say that the general cultural, and educational, and recreational efforts of the people in the area are being retarded by lack of road communications. They request, if the Government's policy is to end the curse of isolation (and this is true isolation) they hope the Government will see its way clear to proceed further this year on the causeway to link New World Island to the mainland and then, when that has been done, Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure the Government will be very happy to give proper attention to the establishment of a ferry service between New World Island and Twillingate Island, so that the people on Twillingate Island may take a ferry, go across to New World Island and from there by causeway to the mainland.

There are considerable difficulties in connection with this causeway due to the fact all the men up in Cobbs Arm have to pass down Dildo Run, and this Run will have to be bridged in such a manner that schooners will still get through. But the petition points out, Mr. Speaker, this is not an insurmount-

able difficulty and they feel that in view of the size of the settlements involved the Government should —

Mr. Speaker: I must inform the Attorney General his time has expired.

Mr. Curtis: And that the necessary work will be proceeded with this year.

Premier Smallwood: I rise to support very heartily the prayer of this petition if it is practicable. That, of course, has yet to be determined and can be determined and will be determined only by having engineers go there and look at the channel of water between Boyds Cove and Chapel Island. If that is proven to be practical, and the Government of Canada does not prohibit some form of causeway across that channel, on the grounds that the waters are navigable, then this ought to be done, and I have no doubt will be done. Out there on Twillingate Island you have a number of extremely old and interesting settlements. Two of the settlements, Twillingate and Back Harbour were founded in 1731 by three Englishmen, and they have been continuously occupied since, and are amongst the oldest settlements of North America, although not amongst the oldest settlements of Newfoundland. But they are important. Twillingate Island is one of the most important fishing areas of the whole of North America. And then, on New World Island there must be eight or 10 other fishing settlements, and then on Chapel Island, indeed I am not sure there are any settlements, but that whole area down there, constituting virtually a whole constituency of this house, electing as its member the Attorney General to this house, is one of the oldest and most important fishing areas of Newfoundland.

Three weeks ago, when I was in Grand Falls about 80 men came to Grand Falls by motor car. There were 16 taxis filled up with loggers who drove from Twillingate to Grand Falls, a distance of 110 miles. Most of that distance was over the salt water ice, and these cars drove over four or five feet of salt water ice intervening between the island and the mainland of Newfoundland. Indeed, one man came all that distance on a bike, peddling in 110 miles and back the

same way. The road presently goes from Lewisporte to as far as Boyd's Cove and Birch Bay. Now Boyd's Cove is at a place where the water, the channel to Chapel Arm is the narrowest, and at that point the proposal is to put in a causeway and a road across Chapel Island to the north shore of the opposite shore. Then, using some islands and rocks that are either above water or just below the surface of the water, another rather long causeway to get to New World Island, and then using the road already there to go on up to the north-east corner, or approximately the north-east corner, of New World Island, and then get to Twillingate Island by means of a regular ferry, at least a ferry that would operate when the channel is open. When the ice comes, of course, they can use the ice as a highway. If this is done, and it seems to me it will be done if it proves to be practicable from an engineering standpoint and the Government of Canada does not disallow it (and they have not so far adopted any habit of disallowing here in connection with Newfoundland) then I think that this project can and ought, and therefore will, go ahead before this present year is over if it becomes possible. And I believe it will become possible to get aboard a car in St. Anthony and drive to St. John's or Sydney or Ottawa — although why one should ever wish to drive from St. Anthony to Ottawa is more than I can understand at the moment. But, Sir, if you can get in a car in St. Anthony, before the year is over —, (and St. Anthony is the capital of the Grenfell Enterprise, and up to a very few years ago was regarded as being just about as far north as it is desirable to go — St. Anthony indeed was a sort of symbol in Newfoundland of the far north) and to get aboard a car and drive to any other point, almost, in Newfoundland is an astonishing accomplishment, and if that becomes feasible it is no longer justifiable to keep the people of New World Island and Twillingate Island and that whole area isolated and deprived of the general benefits of roads.

Now, Sir, if that can be done it will become entirely feasible to run a transmission line down through there by the same route exactly and carry mainland electricity to those settlements. I am sure that if the Federal Member for the riding that includes Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill) were in this

Chamber today, inside the bar, i.e., occupying a seat here, he would be an ardent and strong advocate of this road and causeway and electric transmission line. But, Sir, the Attorney General and I between us should equal one Federal member, surely, and should be able between us to get that road and causeway and electric line built down to Twillingate, especially in view of the fact that virtually every man in Twillingate is a fisherman or logger or both, and, of course, it is the policy of this house to give most ardent support to fishermen and loggers of Newfoundland.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition — and it is a prayer for the moment, I think. I must be very much asleep and dreaming. I dreamed, Sir, of getting aboard a car in St. Anthony in February, for instance, and driving to Ottawa or some place. And this canal or causeway — I was reminded of the causeway to be built, I believe, on the entry of New Brunswick into Confederation. But it is a dream worthy even of the hon. the Premier and the Attorney General — a lovely dream, and I think it could come true. I am rising to support the prayer of the petition anyway. And talk about Ottawa stopping it — Ottawa can't stop this Government from doing anything at all. I have seen that, these last few days.

I think I should, on this occasion, if I may, Mr. Speaker, say how happy we are in supporting this petition to have here today, in toto, almost all the representatives of Newfoundland in the Federal house. We are very happy to see them here. We are sorry we have not got something which we could hash up to give them a nice time this afternoon. The hon. the Premier apparently put a stop to that. At least they will know that we have the interest of Newfoundland at heart and we even have the interest of the electors in the Twillingate Federal Riding at heart. And, I am quite sure, as the Premier has said, if the hon. representative of that riding were here today he would be happy to know we are thinking of his riding and his people. I support the prayer of the petition. I am longing to go down and go over that causeway out to New World Island. I am quite sure the hon. the Attorney General would pay all the expenses to take me down and

show me. Incidentally, before I sit down I would like to suggest to the Premier I did hear that suggestion before because I believe it was a promise made to the people of New World Island away back, was it eight or 10 years ago?

Mr. Smallwood: If the hon. gentleman would allow me — I make no point of privilege. I think I would be allowed to say that the promise which was made was made at Rattling Brook a few months ago, when I had the honour to throw the switch to turn on the power. I said then we would get engineers down to see if it was practicable, and if it was practicable we would do the rest, provided we were not stopped by the rules of Ottawa. The hon. Leader of the Opposition must be aware, surely, what happened before we can build a bridge or causeway or any other obstruction, across navigable water. We are under an obligation to advertise our intention in the newspapers, and if sufficient objections come, Ottawa will not give the necessary permission. That applies to any navigable water;

Mr. Hollett: That applies to Placentia Gut?

Mr. Smallwood: Including Placentia Gut, yes. It applies to all navigable waters. So I said we would send an engineer — and providing it is sound and practical, and we are given permission, we could even begin it this year.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition I have this afternoon is also from the residents of Twillingate and New World Island, and it is signed by the same people as signed the last petition. But my hon. leader, the Premier, has forestalled me in this petition when he referred to electricity because this petition is for electrification. Mr. Speaker, there is not a settlement in my district that has electric connection from water power — several people have their own private generators and supply their own current and several churches and halls and schools have their own private equipment. They however, find this equipment very expensive to maintain and very expensive to operate. The petition that I have and which I am now presenting asks the Gov-

ernment if it would see to it that under their scheme of electrification expansion Twillingate could not be included.

I might say, Sir, that this matter of electrification has been in mind ever since I went to Twillingate and was elected by that district in 1949. I have seen the situation down there where electrification must be provided. There is a huge hospital at Twillingate, a fish plant in the course of construction (goodness knows when it will be finished but it is in the course of construction and has been for a number of years) so that there is room on Twillingate Island for electrical development. Now, up to a year ago there seemed to be no alternative but to generate electricity on Twillingate Island with diesel power, but now, Mr. Speaker, that electrical power is coming from Rattling Brook to Lewisporte. I can see no good reason why it should not proceed from Lewisporte up through Campbellton, up through Birchy Bay and on to Boyd's Cove, across the causeway, if one is built. And if there is no causeway, by poles because those who know the area will know it would be no trouble to put poles and towers across the Dildo Run and from there across Chapel Island and from there to New World Island where there are about 10,000 people.

Now, all along the route there are large settlements, Campbellton is a large settlement, Birchy Bay is a large settlement, Birchy Bay, North and South, and Boyd's Cove is a large settlement. These are large settlements and when once you get across to New World Island there are about 10,000 people. It would be a simple matter then, Mr. Speaker, to run a cable from New World Island across to Twillingate Island. At the end of that cable, as I said a few minutes ago, you have a large hospital, which would be glad to use this current. You will have a fish plant and you have thousands and thousands of people. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this electrification program need cost the Government any money whatsoever. I believe there are more than enough houses to be connected with this system to make it a paying proposition. Indeed, as long ago as 18 months I had the Crown Lands Department prepare a plan of the entire area. I had them map out the route of this proposed electrification program. I had the number of residents of each place marked out and I gave it to the presi-

dent of the Newfoundland Light and Power hoping that he would study it and work on it. Three months ago I gave a copy of the same plan to Mr. Ryan, who is presently engaged on the Power Corporation. So that, Sir, I anticipated this petition, but nevertheless present it in the hope that this petition, added to the one already presented will encourage the people interested, and let us hope that in a short while the people in Twillingate district will enjoy the benefits of electricity. I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition and ask that it be accepted and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Hon. J. R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition somewhat different from the ones which have just been presented. This petition is from the residents of Bartlett's Harbour in St. Barbe District. This petition, Sir, prays that a law be enacted prohibiting dogs in the settlement. I think, Sir, this is the first petition of this kind this year and one I wholeheartedly support it, as these dogs are not entirely like the ones seen around St. John's at the end of a piece of string.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): The St. John's dogs are educated.

Mr. Chalker: It is quite possible always, with the progress in roads and modern transportation, the modern motor car will do away with a lot of these animals in the not too distant future.

I heartily support the petition, Sir, and beg that it be accepted and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

REPORTS OF STANDING

AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

Hon. C. H. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for the year ending March 31, 1958. I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have sufficient copies here for all concerned if they care to have them.

Mr. Speaker: Leave does not have to be asked since this report is tabled under Statute.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table regulations made under the Urban and Rural Planning Act, known as the Urban and Rural Planning Regulations. Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the answer to Nos. 4,5, 13, and 14; No 5, directed to the hon. Minister of Economic Development and No. 13 to the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources and No. 14 to the hon. Minister of Highways. I wonder could we have these answers?

Mr. Speaker: Before calling the Orders of the Day I must point out to hon. members and the Leader of the house in particular that one item has been omitted in printing — the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. This debate has not been concluded, so that this item, the Address in Reply, should have been on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Premier if he is in a position to inform the house when the report on the Civil Servants Pension might be available?

Mr. Smallwood: To be very frank about it, I don't know. The house is aware of the fact that the Chairman of the Royal Commission, Mr. Allen, has been quite seriously ill from, I believe, coronary thrombosis, and that Mr. Clarke, one of the commissioners has been quite ill, leaving one member of the Commission functioning. Until at least Mr. Clarke or Mr. Allen is back on deck I don't see much chance of anything being done.

Mr. Duffy: The report is completed?

Mr. Smallwood: I don't know if the report is completed. I have not heard that. I certainly have not been informed. In fact, Sir, I have

the contrary impression. I have the impression the report is yet to be written.

Mr. Duffy: What I mean — I am sorry — the report only has to be written.

Mr. Smallwood: Oh, the work is done, the enquiry has been made and they have gathered all the material needed. They have travelled across Canada and examined the pension schemes, including of course the Federal one, and they were ready to write the report. And then, just as they were ready, two of the three members of the Royal Commission fell quite seriously ill, and are not back at work. I understand the Chairman, Mr. Allen, has been ordered by the doctor to stay in bed, or at least stay at home for months. Mr. Clarke, as the house knows, is a former manager of an insurance company and therefore a very valued member of the commission. He was not nearly so seriously ill and is expected to be back long before, and then perhaps the work of the writing of the report might begin. But, Sir, quite frankly I have heard nothing in recent weeks, and I am beginning to be a little pessimistic about the chances of our getting the report in time to consider it here in this present session, with a view to adopting legislation based on it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY:

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned for recess a couple of days ago, I did adjourn the Address in Reply, so that it comes to my lot to be the next speaker. Since that adjournment we have had the announcement from Mr. Diefenbaker with all its implications — implications not alone for this generation of Newfoundlanders but to all who come after us. So, Sir, I had intended, as I suppose any speaker would have intended, in my remarks, to deal practically exclusively with Term 29. However, this afternoon we had decided on another procedure, perhaps a better procedure, to postpone any debate whatever on this momentous question for a day or two. So, Mr. Speaker, I have to recast as I go along

what I have to say and get down to more mundane affairs.

First of all, Sir, as is customary, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. After this lapse of time I would hate to be put on my oath to say what either of the hon. gentlemen said at the time, but I do remember that when they made the speeches I thought they were good speeches. Also, Sir, I would like to join with what other members have said. I know the people of my district would like me to do that, i.e., join with what other members have said about the visit of Her Majesty, the Queen. The people on the Southern Shore are devoted subjects of Her Majesty. She has been reigning now for something like six years and during that time she has shown high qualities of mind and character and she has shown devotion to duty and has set an example to all of us. It is, I think, a very happy thought that when Her Majesty comes here that emphasis will be put on the celebrations by bringing the children of the Province into prominence. I think it is a happy thought that those responsible for the arrangements will try to make it possible for as many children as possible to have an opportunity of seeing Her Majesty, and I know that the children on the Southern Shore, in common with children from all over Newfoundland are looking forward to this great occasion and I know many of them will remember it all their lives.

There is another thing, Sir, I would like to say, and that is, sincerely and honestly, to congratulate the Opposition on the stand they took in the recent distressing affair, this unrest in Newfoundland. I know that the hon. gentlemen only acted after a great deal of heart-seeking, only after being fully convinced that what they were doing would be for the benefit of Newfoundland. It was, as we know, a critical and crucial time in Newfoundland's affairs, and the hon. gentlemen opposite could quite easily have played party politics with it, but they did not choose to descend to such a level. I believe myself, very firmly, that Newfoundland will always remember them for taking that attitude.

As some other hon. members have said in their addresses, there has been such an atmosphere of sweetness and light during this session, I think it would be almost unbecoming to take issue with anything that any of

the hon. gentlemen said, indeed with a great deal of they have said I find myself in hearty agreement. The hon. member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy) mentioned something which I find of particular interest, i.e., when he made mention of the accessibility of pornographic literature in Newfoundland. I myself have two boys growing up, just at the age when these things are particularly alluring to them, and I do believe we should do something to keep such literature out of our homes. The Minister of Education (Mr. Rowe) in referring to it has pointed out the difficulty of censorship and has shown that censorship can be too absurd, but I do think that some common-sense approach should be able to be worked out, some method that would keep those things out of our children's hands without either putting censorship on thought, or interfering with freedom of speech.

The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Higgins) has just gone out. He made one remark during his speech with which I find myself in complete agreement, i.e., the damage that is being done on our highroads by irresponsible drivers. I know if it were suggested by anyone that an irresponsible man with a loaded revolver were to go around our roads, every one would agree he should get very short shrift. But there is no question about it, Mr. Speaker. In the hands of irresponsible people a car is a much more lethal weapon. Many, many people are killed on our roads and in the United States and in Canada annually. There are more people killed by cars than were killed in the Korean War. There is not alone this destruction of life, but the destruction to property against which we should take some measure. I know of a case where last summer in Trepassy, at the fair there, a driver under the influence of liquor, with five people in his car, ran into another car containing five people. Eight of the people had to go to hospital. A taximan had to bring them in. The driver of the car was found absolutely judgement-proof. The finance company seized the car right away and he had nothing left. Here were eight people in hospital, the taximan out money, apparently nothing whatever able to be done about it. I do believe there is a lot of merit in the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John's East, that we should at least step up the contributions to the Un-

satisfied Judgement Fund, if not "go the whole hog" and bring in a law making third party insurance compulsory.

Dealing, Sir, with the Speech From The Throne—I notice that mention was made that, during the past year, our province has experienced economic vacillations that have resulted in some hardship. There is one part of Newfoundland which seems, during the past year, to have been particularly hard hit—the Burin Peninsula. There we find the mines closing down at St. Lawrence, the collapse of the fish plant at Fortune, and a more irrevocable loss still, the loss of the "Blue Wave", with 16 men lost at sea. These are striking blows to that part of Newfoundland. The loss of the "Blue Wave" is irreparable, but I do think economically things are looking up a little. I think it was arranged, a few weeks ago, to have the fish plant taken over, and I believe there is some ray of hope for the mines at St. Lawrence. We will all be glad to hear of that.

But, Sir, our hardships or recession in Newfoundland has not been localized, and has not been confined along the Burin Peninsula. As the Speech mentioned, even before this unrest arose in the newsprint industry it was a very marginal industry and industry subject to intense competition in world markets. And there are more favoured parts of the world, such as the Southern States, where the wood is not alone faster growing, but also is much, much more accessible. That does have a very, very adverse effect on the cost of production of wood here in Newfoundland.

We also have had the stunning blow of the closing down of the mine at Bell Island. The history of Bell Island has been one of ups and downs over the past 50 years, mostly downs, but it did seem that, during the past eight or nine years, the people over there had attained something like permanency in their work and something like security. It becomes, therefore, all the sadder that just as this community, these 12,000 people, were embarking on a programme of civic improvement, which God knows they needed very badly, just as those people were about to better their conditions over there, this pressing blow should come. I suppose, Sir, a lot of this is unavoidable. Mines do get worked out and economic conditions make it necessary to lay off men, and automation is a thing which is inexorable, I suppose,

and here to stay. But, Sir, I do think when such things occur, an effort should be made to soften the blow. It came as a shock right out of the blue to 570 men, I think, Bell Islanders, that on the next day they were to be laid-off. I know the Premier has intervened, and I hope some beneficial result will follow. But, Sir, even so there should be some heart, some heart in their dealings with men like that, and when a lay-off becomes necessary, at least some effort should be made to cushion the blow.

Our fishery, Sir, also as the Speech says, was a failure last year around large sections of our coast. When that happens in Newfoundland, just the same as years ago, the effects are devastating indeed. As the Speech very well pointed out, with all these blows, these stinging blows we have experienced in the past year or so, it is not too much to say, I think, that were it not for the benefits we derive from Confederation, we would be back in the old days of the 1930's. It is a good time to say this perhaps. We are inclined very much at the moment to look askant at all things Canadian. I think this is a good time, particularly on this 10th anniversary of Confederation, to remind ourselves how great the benefits of Confederation are. We have Family Allowance by which, I think about \$17 million a year are coming into the province. We have Old Age Pensions whereby something like \$2 million a year, or rather \$2 million a month come in. We have unemployment insurance, about \$17 millions. We have increased veterans pensions. We have the employees on the dock and Federal employees all over Newfoundland. Sir, take last year, with the vacillations in our employment, take all these things out of Newfoundland and I think we would go back to the 30's again. I think that is a thing we should keep in mind very much at the present moment. I don't know this year what we would have done without fishermen's unemployment insurance. Sure it is only three years since the measure was brought in, and it is difficult, in winters like this to realize how people got along before, without the unemployment insurance. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Pickersgill has left the house, because eaten bread is soon forgotten, and the fishermen in Newfoundland should never forget the work Mr. Pickersgill put in, when a Minister, to bring about this measure. It is one of

the greatest things ever to happen to Newfoundland.

So that, Sir, on this tenth anniversary of Confederation I think it is well for us to remember some of these things. I am one of those who still believe that our true destiny lies in the great Canadian Nation, in the Commonwealth of Nations, and under the Crown. We have heard some idle talk, I grant you it is idle, about secession, but I think such talk, even the very mention of it, is frivolous and pernicious and we should not ever hear of it. Just because we are getting a cold shoulder from one man in Canada at the present time we should not turn our backs on all things Canadian. I do firmly believe, just as firmly as I did 10 years ago, that our true destiny lies with the great Canadian Nation.

That being so, Sir, it is all the more deplorable and distressing to think of the press that we have received in Canada during the past couple of months. There has been an unmitigated, sustained period of vilification in some sections of the Canadian press. We have been blackened and maligned. I think, Sir, that is all together disgusting. I do know myself, certainly it was always my experience whenever I have been up on the mainland, that the large majority of Canadians have nothing but good feelings and goodwill toward our people. I do really believe that. That has always been my experience. And, Sir, I think it is very deplorable and very distressing to see ourselves blackened and maligned in our own house; because it can, I am afraid, do us irreparable damage. I believe the truth is beginning to emerge gradually. I believe the situation is being rectified to a great extent. Obviously, Sir, the blame does not lie with the people who read these things, but with the people who wrote them. And I believe that millions and millions of ordinary Canadians wish us nothing but well and will be only too delighted when the truth does emerge. I think the proper attitude for us is not to sulk nor draw ourselves into our shell, but I think we should use every effort we can to make our case known. I think, myself (perhaps I am ill-advised) I do believe that in the regrettable thing that happened in the last couple of months our cause has been absolutely justified. We have the unanimous support of all members of this house, of our local press, the clergy are behind us almost to a man.

Surely in an issue like this, when practically all Newfoundlanders 90% of Newfoundlanders, feel this is the right thing for us to do in our own house, surely we are doing what is right and eventually the Canadian people will realize it.

There is one piece of this vilification Mr. Speaker, in particular that I think is very capable of being repudiated. This Government and this house have been held up to vilification. We have been called little Hitlers and Fascists and tyrants. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that in particular is one piece of calumny that can be very, very easily refuted. One glance at the record will do it. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Premier is by way of being an expert on trade unionism. He has more than a nodding acquaintance with it in all its phases, the history, development, philosophy, its aims and objects, the techniques. The Premier, as I said, and I know this of my own knowledge, one of the first things the Premier did on coming into power was to direct that our labour legislation was to be overhauled and that the best and most modern, progressive legislation then existing should be studied and used for our guidance. As I said, I happen to know this of my own knowledge. I was working at the time in the Department of Justice and know the directives we received to overhaul the best legislation in the world to look for our models and draft measures along these lines and have them put before this house for enactment.

We had, Mr. Speaker, tremendous resources at our disposal. We had at our disposal the accomplishments of the labour movement in Britain for over 1000 years. We had at our disposal all that new deal and the fair deal that had developed in America in the Wagner Act. We had at our disposal the labour legislation of nine provinces of Canada. The result was that there was drafted and brought into this house for enactment, and enacted, a series of measures which gave us the most progressive labour legislation in the entire English-speaking world. That was 10 years ago; that was almost the first thing after Confederation, when this house met. These were practically the first measures brought before the house.

We brought in Mr. Speaker, a new Workmen's Compensation Act in place of

the antiquated monstrosity which was on our books before. We brought in a Trade Union Act modelled on Trade Union Acts of Great Britain, following almost verbatim, and giving the local trade union all the privileges and rights which labour had struggled 100 years in Britain to attain. We brought in a Minimum Wages Act to prevent exploitation of Newfoundlanders by Newfoundlanders, a thing not unknown in our history before. We brought in a Labour Relations Act making possible collective bargaining, conciliations, and setting up the Labour Relations Board. For the first time in our history a Department of Labour was set up to promote the welfare and well-being of our workers. We set up an apprenticeship board and vocational training school. New emphasis was placed on adult education. Safety regulations in mines and factories were overhauled and a new holiday schedule brought in.

In the face of all this, Mr. Speaker, is it possible to maintain that this Government is anti-labour? As a matter of fact, the bald facts are that this Government has been the best friend that labour ever had. There is no question about that at all. Look what we gave to labour. All that labour leaders clamoured for hundreds of years in Britain, and we gave it to them on a plate. What MacDonald and Hendrick spent a lifetime struggling to attain was given on a plate to local trade unions. What labour leaders in the United States dedicated a lifetime to attain was handed to labour without asking for it in Newfoundland. One of the first things he did as soon as he came into power. And in the fact of this, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it can be maintained that this Government is anti-labour. As a matter of fact, as I said before, we are the best friend labour ever had.

These, Mr. Speaker, were very potent weapons we put in the hands of labour, and let us admit it freely, labour used them well, used them reasonably, used them with restraint, up to a couple of months ago. And some of our Newfoundlanders get better wages, better working conditions, better hours and even greater benefits than the old trade unionists ever dreamed about—fringe benefits, pensionable holidays with pay. And we were well content to see our fellow Newfoundlanders get more money and better working conditions and

better hours and safer conditions in which to work. I am sure the great body of Newfoundlanders were very delighted and happy to see their fellow Newfoundlanders in the trade union movement improve their conditions.

Mr. Speaker, if it is said now that we were anti-labour, look at our dealings with the Federation of Labour itself. Every year the Federation of Labour, the Council of the Federation of Labour came and presented its brief to the Executive Council of Newfoundland. They were received with every courtesy. They presented their brief. Their briefs were studied and many of the recommendations made in these briefs were put into effect. And, Mr. Speaker, time and time again these briefs referred with approval to the way the Government of Newfoundland was doing a good job. Time and time again these briefs praised up the Department of Labour and its Minister, and said what a good job the Department of Labour and its Ministers and the Government of Newfoundland were doing for labour in Newfoundland. In the face of this, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for any one to maintain or to suggest that this Government was anti-labour, when, as a matter of fact, I repeat, we are the best friend labour ever had.

Mr. Hollett: "Puny politicians," that is what labour said.

Mr. Murray: Puny politicians, that is only one of the names. I don't think that is a general feeling among labour in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I think it has been pointed out there are a group of reactionaries in labour now, something we are not used to—paid organizers. That is where a lot of this vilification comes from. But, Sir, I believe myself that, by and large, the ordinary worker in Newfoundland does not believe such things. I believe quite firmly the ordinary working man believes there was good government in the past 10 years and more was done for the working man and trade unionism in the past ten years than was ever done before.

Mr. Speaker, I am going over briefly now, just in bold outline, what happened during the past few months. One of the things that did happen and that is very disturbing—we have seen something strange, a strange new

element introduced into labour in Newfoundland. It might not be new in Canada or in the United States, but it is new to us, and recent events have brought it sharply to the attention of the people of Newfoundland. For the first time, in Newfoundland at any rate, we have heard a curious doctrine promulgated. We have heard the doctrine promulgated that one group of the community under the guidance of trade unionism has the right to paralyze the entire community. We have heard the doctrine expressed openly that, under the umbrella of trade unionism, the small group has the right to put itself above the law and substitute mob rule. In places we have heard the slogan—"The Justice of Our Cause Makes it Legal." We have seen trade union organizers assert the right to extract dues from good Newfoundland workmen, and put them in jeopardy because of men convicted of unspeakable offences.

After the McClellan Committee's revelations (in America) Mr. George Meany, the President of AFL-CIO threw out the "Teamsters union. We have a labour organizer here, Mr. Daley, who in spite of this maintains he has the right to lead Newfoundland workmen into alliance with these fellows, with Hoffa, and Johnny Dio and all the rest of them. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland will tolerate that. I don't believe the community has reached the stage in Newfoundland where it will tolerate it. I have heard of an old doctrine in the history books—"The King Can Do No Wrong." Well, Sir, we seem to have gone full circle and here is a group asserting in Newfoundland and on the mainland of Canada, they can do no wrong. Whatever happens on the mainland about it, I suppose we are not in a position to do much about that, but I don't think, Sir, the community of Newfoundland will ever tolerate such a doctrine.

Going on to a broader field, Sir: The events I mentioned before have been confined mostly to Newfoundland, but in the broader field of Canadian politics we see events even still more disturbing—events which must be causing concern not alone to Newfoundlanders but to all, to millions and millions of good Canadians. This house, there is no question about it, is the sole arbiter of matters within its jurisdiction. Yet, Sir, when this house decided on a purely

internal matter, purely domestic matter, when certain measures were necessary to prevent collapse and chaos, when that was done we found ourselves branded on the mainland, in the mainland Press as Hitler-tryants. Apparently the IWA or CLC or somebody in Canada is able to control the press and mould and fashion the public opinion of Canada. If that is so it is a very disturbing thought, Mr. Speaker, not alone to Newfoundlanders but to all Canadians. We have seen the R.C.M.P., just for doing its job, one job only, just to see that the Canadian Criminal Code was enforced here in Newfoundland, we have seen the R.C.M.P. held up to ridicule and scorn, and sections of the public press branding the R.C.M.P. as a "goon squad" — "Billy boys" with sticks, beating up defenseless citizens. Mr. Speaker, when we see such things happen it must cause concern not alone to us in Newfoundland but all thinking Canadians. The R.C.M.P. through its Superintendent here (Superintendent Parsons) after 43 days of violence in Newfoundland, and seeing the violence coming to a head, applied to the Attorney General for reinforcements. That is all that was done. The Premier had nothing to do with it. The house had nothing to do with it except knowing the situation. Using the contract which he knew existed between Newfoundland and Canada, he applied for reinforcements for his men in a critical situation. And we have seen a contract torn up and these reinforcements not sent. Mr. Speaker, that is very disturbing not alone to Newfoundlanders, I say, but to all thoughtful Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I have very little more to say. After all I am labouring under disabilities. The field of the Terms of Union, under which I intended to speak, is taboo, the R.C.M.P. Contract is subjudice and I cannot refer to it, and besides that most of us here are looking forward to events of more than ordinary importance which take place to-night.

Mr. Hollett: What is that?

Mr. Murray: You will hear about it in the press, no doubt, if the hon. member will take up his newspaper, or he could listen in to the commentary. Mr. Speaker, I have very, very little more to say. As I said before, the people of this community have very lit-

tle control of what goes on in Canada, but I do think we can put our own house in order. And I do think there is in Newfoundland a remarkable unanimity at the moment as to what we should do to put our house in order. I think we are all agreed this community will not tolerate Newfoundland workmen joining up or making an alliance with the Teamsters Union, or the unspeakable characters who run it. I don't think this community is prepared to tolerate pressure groups. I don't think this community is prepared yet to tolerate any group trying to put itself above the law and substituting mob rule in its place. I think all of us are for unions. All of us are only too delighted to see Newfoundlanders get better pay, better wages, better working conditions. After all, a lot of them are our brothers, our friends, and we are only too delighted to see Newfoundlanders get better wages, either in Bell Island or in Corner Brook or in St. John's, or in Grand Falls. But with that reservation, Sir, I think we have done right in passing the legislation we did pass. It was necessary and that was the only reason we did it. There is nobody on this side of the house, and I am sure on the other side, nobody against the labour movement, nobody against trade unionism. That is not what actuated us. It was only to, as we saw it, save ourselves from economic collapse and chaos.

On motion of the hon. member for Burin District (Mr. Jones) the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned.

Giving Notice of Motion:

LEGISLATION (NEW):

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Trustees Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Provide for the Suspension of the Rent Restrictions Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend The Local Government Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend the Public Utilities Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act To Amend the Pharmaceutical Association Act, 1954." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further To Amend The Food and Drug Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland Medical Board Act." On motion Bill read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend The Health and Public Welfare Act." On motion Bill read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers of The Nomenclature Board." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further To Amend the Automobile Insurance Act." On motion Bill read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Education asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further To Amend the Education (Teachers' Pension) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Frobisher Limited (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Amend The M. James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act To Approve and Give Statutory Effect To An Agreement Between The Government and Advocate Mines Limited." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further To Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill: "An Act Further To Amend The Wild Life Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred

and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.

Wednesday, April 1, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.
Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Presenting Petitions:

Mr. P. J. Canning (Placentia West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the voters of three settlements on Long Island in Placentia Bay. The prayer of the petition is, Sir, that a road be built to connect Spencer's Cove with Harbour Buffett, Kingwell and Port Royal and Harbour Buffett are already connected by road and the people of Spencer's Cove now petition that they be connected with the other settlements. Mr. Speaker, this petition to me today has great significance, and there is a coincidence attached to it. It happens to be my 10th. to present to this house, Sir, within the same number of years. I have averaged a petition per year, and I am happy to say, Sir, that in the other nine, the prayers of the petitioners have been answered.

When I went to Placentia West first, "roads" was the word that I heard most often. And when I looked over the district and checked on the population and settlements within a distance feasible for building road to the highway, I found there were some 5769 people whom I hoped at that time would be later connected with the high road and relieved of isolation and enabled to get on to the other parts of the province. I am now quite happy to be able to say, Sir, that out of the 5769 people there are only 750 (that is on the mainland of my district) who are now waiting for roads. By that I mean, Sir, where it is feasible and humanly possible to build roads. There are other people beyond mountains and cliffs who unfortunately cannot have roads built to them. Now, Sir, apart from that 750 on the mainland I find this, which does not at all surprise me, and I heartily support the petition. I feel sure that, if I can keep my district to the standard we have attained in building roads, as the economic future gets brighter I feel sure the people of Long Island will have their set-

tlements connected. I pray, Sir, that the petition be received and referred to the department, etc., etc., concerned.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy indeed to support the prayer of this particular petition. The hon. member for Placentia West who has presented the petition has given some very startling figures. He says that 10 years ago, when Confederation came and this present Government took office, there were in Placentia West 5769 souls living in settlements along the coast of that district that were unconnected with each other by road and unconnected with anything by road; settlements that were entirely remote. There would be one settlement on the coast, and then go along the coast for three, four or five miles and come to another settlement and again two, three or four miles further along another, one after the other, containing in all 5769 souls, and each settlement entirely unconnected by road with the other or with any other place or any other highway. And that in these 10 years of Confederation, the number has been cut to 750 souls—it seems to me that that is a remarkable development, quite remarkable. I suppose it would be true to say that, in those 10 years, there have been more roads built in Placentia West, and more settlements connected by road and more people opened up to the rest of Newfoundland by road, than in all of the previous history of Newfoundland. Would that be true to say?

Mr. Canning: Yes.

Mr. Smallwood: That is incredible. Can that be said of any other part of Canada, I wonder? I wonder can it be said that any other part of Canada exists, in any one part, where 20, 30, 40 settlements along 100 miles of coast-line have been there hundreds of years and that in the past 10 years, more roads have been built than in all the previous 450 years of our history. Of course, we know Placentia West has not had, notwithstanding the able representation it has had at the hands of the hon. member for the district, any special attention, has not had any favouritism — not any more attention than all the other constituencies of the Island. It is, I think, a very great tribute indeed. I think all hon. members of the

house will agree it is a greater tribute than anything else, almost, we can think of. I could not believe this would happen. I thought the number of miles would be reduced, the number of isolated people reduced but that the number be reduced from 5769 souls to 750 in 10 years in Placentia West! I remember the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in the National Convention, where we had the honour to sit beside each other, at least close to each other, I remember the hon. Leader of the Opposition praising the Commission of Government for the beginning of the road that opened up the Burin Peninsula, but I bet neither of us then thought that 10 years later, we could stand in this house and say that one part of that Burin Peninsula has been so improved from the standpoint of roads built that there were now left only 750 souls not connected by road. It is good that we should remind ourselves that, in spite of everything, we have made pretty substantial progress in Newfoundland in the matter of road building and other things in the last ten years. I support the prayer of this petition and I hope things will so develop that even on the islands off the coast of Placentia West we can get road connections joining two, three and four settlements, which you can find on any one island, so that even they too can communicate with each other.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the prayer of the petition I will say I have thought all the enthusiasm of a week ago was finished after last night.

Mr. Smallwood: Did the hon. gentleman hear it? Did he listen in?

Mr. Hollett: Sure I listened in. I heard the hon. the Premier was there all night. But in rising to support the prayer of the petition I do say that I am glad to see byroads or connecting links from the west side of Placentia Bay to the main roads. I was afraid the Government was going to take the praise for building that road — I thought to myself — "here is my chance!"

Mr. Canning: We finished it; we widened it; we straightened it and are now paving it.

Mr. Hollett: Who are we?

Mr. Smallwood: Don't be partisan now. There is no partisanship in this house.

Mr. Hollett: I want to say that I would have much preferred it if the hon. member for Placentia West would rise to his feet and state that the economy of the people who live on the shores of his district, Placentia West, had improved anywhere compatible with the road situation. Then I would be a proud man indeed. I come from Placentia Bay, the Burin Peninsula, and I know that 90% of them up there at any rate have to live off the fishery and I am quite sure the hon. member will agree with me when I say, I don't think even Confederation has done anything to improve the status of our fishermen, the economic standing of our fishermen, the economic welfare of our fishermen, anywhere along that particular stretch of coast. I regret to have to say that, but I say it now only to direct the Government's attention to that part of the coast and, as a matter of fact, the whole Burin Peninsula, which I know they have been doing in connection with Fortune which is not in that particular district. I would like the Minister of Fisheries, the Department and that big Fisheries Authority — (\$25,000-a-year-men) to give some attention to the west side of Placentia Bay, Placentia West, and endeavour to improve the economy of that area to a standard at least partly comparable with the road situation. There is no point in building roads unless you can improve the standard of living of the people there, the welfare of the people, unless you are going to build roads for the people to walk out and go to some other part of the country. I do say we should all pull together, and this is another time when the Government and the Opposition would be happy to pull together to try to improve the economic conditions of our fishermen, not only there, but the whole coast, the North east Coast too needs a lot. They have had Confederation down there for 10 years, and a good representative down there and good representation in the Federal Government, but there is a lot of need for improvement. Pardon me for speaking of the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, but roads and the fishery go together in this country.

Mr. Speaker: I might say at this time, any-

one speaking to a petition is allowed to speak only for five minutes. It is not a full scale debate, and whatever is said should relate to the petition. I think there has been some slight infringement.

Mr. Hollett: They carry the fish by roads, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is a very "fishy" excuse.

Mr. Hollett: Nothing fishy about it.

Mr. Smallwood: A good effort.

On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Giving Notice of Questions:

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

Mr. Hollett: I might say while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, there are several questions that have not yet been answered, and I again direct them to the hon. Ministers concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Will hon. ministers please note there are several questions which have not yet been answered.

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. E. Jones (Burin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, I wish to assure you I do not intend to take up too much of your time or the time of this house. As a matter of fact this is the fifth time I have been slated to speak, and my desk is full of some of the best speeches that will never be heard in this house. I think, Mr. Speaker, that none of us in this house will forget the opening day of this session. It was probably one of the most momentous days in our history. The feeling was tense, it was electric. We were labouring in very, very difficult time, and I think every member of this house and every member of the gallery outside this house admired the restraint with which the proposer and second of the motion handled their job. A few days afterward, this house, this old and honourable House, showed Newfoundland, and showed the rest of Canada that

when the chips were down and the going rough Newfoundlanders could and would stick together. We heard things such as — "This is no time for partisanship"; "Let's stand up and be counted"; "This is not the time to be divided". And, Sir, I think that, when the history of this season is written, historians will say this was their greatest hour.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very pleased to hear the very kind remarks from both sides of the house in connection with the relatives and friends of that great disaster that happened just a few months ago, the loss of the "Blue Wave". I feel the people of my district, and particularly the people of Grand Bank and Fortune and their many relatives scattered throughout Fortune Bay were pleased that this house could find time, both in the Speech From the Throne and in the speeches following, to pause and pay tribute to the gallant and great number of men who lost their lives. Some members made reference, Mr. Speaker, to the work that the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund will do in this connection. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that both this Government and the members of the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund will have this matter under full consideration, and I am confident that, when the deliberations have been concluded, no one will be disappointed in the results.

The hon. member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) has made certain reference to the "Blue Wave" itself, based on information that he had received. I have no reason to doubt the sources of his information. He has posed the question as to whether or not the "Blue Wave" was unseaworthy. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, he posed a question as to whether or not the "Blue Wave" was unseaworthy. It is not my intention this afternoon here to dwell to any great extent on that topic. The "Blue Wave" was passed by CSI inspection. She was commanded by an excellent young skipper. Many of her crew, the ordinary seamen and fishermen on her had many years of experience. Some of them even had "mates" tickets. I know many of these men personally, or I knew them. I have worked with them and I have played with them and I know they were second to none. But, Mr. Speaker, we have lost 16 of a fast disappearing race of men in this country, our bank fishermen, and regardless of whether or not the "Blue Wave" was unsea-

worthy, we in this house must take all possible steps to see that this thing does not happen again. A total of 16 men disappeared without a trace! Lifeboats were found empty! There has been no answer! We cannot have this happen again. We must do all that is humanly possible to see that it does not happen again. And this evening, Mr. Speaker, I am asking this house to institute immediately a full-scale public enquiry into the loss of the "Blue Wave".

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I have just been informed that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, is due to give Royal Assent to certain Bills and that he is now in the house.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland assembled to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of Interim Supply granted in the present session:

A Bill, An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Services For the Year ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty and for Other Purposes Relating to The Public Service.

ROYAL ASSENT:

His Honour: In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its Present Session passed Certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bills entitled:

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Insurance Act, 1956."

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Accident and Sickness Insurance Act, 1957."

A Bill, "An Act To Amend The Newspapers and Books Act."

His Honour then said In Her Majesty's Name, "I assent to these Bills."

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform hon. members that at approximately 4:40 this afternoon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor visited this chamber and gave Royal Assent to certain Bills.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, in referring to the "Blue Wave" disaster I had begun to say that it was my intention to request this house to institute an inquiry into the loss of the "Blue Wave". I will say that the greater majority of the people of the district are, in one way or another, directly or indirectly connected with the deep sea fishery, and there is a feeling in the district of an unknown fear about going afloat. I do not think that it would do any harm if this house were to institute an inquiry in this connection, Mr. Speaker, not only an inquiry which is normally held into all sudden deaths, but to an inquiry which will cover the whole scope of the bank fishery. If there is anything wrong with our draggers, for heaven's sake, let us find out. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the operators of the dragger and people concerned will take this suggestion — this request of mine — in the spirit in which it is made. My only wish in making the request is to see that the lives of our people are safeguarded to the fullest extent.

Mr. Speaker, various speakers in this house have made reference to our fishery and to our Department of Fisheries. Some of the references have been far from complimentary. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the fisheries today have not passed beyond our existing regulations and legislation. It is a very simple matter for us to criticize people in permanent positions of the Civil Service, whose only work and chief work is to carry out the laws made in this house. If we do not provide them with the proper legislation, then what can they do? We all look back and can recall the days of the Walsh Report. I think it was meant to be the "bible" of the fisheries. I think today, Mr. Speaker, the

Walsh Report is like some of our family bibles and the silver butter knife, which only come out when visitors arrive. I am afraid about the only time the Walsh Report is used today is when we have visitors from Ottawa or some other far away place. I speak with particular reference, Mr. Speaker, to the legislation governing the operation of our Loan Board. The Provincial Subsidy I think that is the term, and federal bounty are very, very generous in their terms, but not all of our fishermen need or want longliners, nor can they man nor handle draggers. The capital required today, generous as the bounties and subsidies are, is far beyond the means of many of our inshore fishermen, and believe you me, we still have a lot of inshore fishermen. Furthermore the terms and conditions of repayment of these loans are based on the capital outlay rather than on the productivity of the boats, and, Sir, I know from experience that many men have felt—I am not saying Government required them to do it—but they have felt obligated to repay their loan and meet their commitments, when they have had a very poor voyage. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, it would be much better if the amount of repayment was based on the productivity of the voyage. If a group of fishermen have a good voyage, let their repayment of the loan be in proportion to their earning, and not on the capital expenditure alone. Furthermore, I think it is time that legislation, both Federal and Provincial, governing small boats not large enough to reach the long liner status be changed. I have many men in my district who want to get loans for small trap skiffs, open trap skiffs, and it is not easy today for trap fishermen to do that. I am not saying it is impossible, but it is not considered in the same light as loans for men who require the larger loans.

In connection with the bait situation, Mr. Speaker, reference was made I believe by the hon. member for Labrador North (Mr. Winsor) to the use of mobile bait-holding stations. One of these units was used in the district of Burin last year, and once during the summer I had an opportunity to see it. There was no bait in it, but another fisherman had some bait in his deep freeze in his kitchen. He told me that the squid came from California. He did not say whether they were "Del Monte" or "Sunkist".

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that during the past summer the price of fresh fish in the American market rose, the demand was good. It is very difficult for me to explain to any of my constituents, anywhere in the district, and I have tried but have been unable to do so, and I am still at a loss to know why at the same time that prices were increasing in the United States market the price to the fishermen dropped.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Jones: It is an imponderable why. When everybody knows the price of the commodity increased, why is it our fishermen must be asked to accept reduced prices paid for fish? The price to some fishermen in Burin was so ridiculously low I would hesitate to mention it in this house. Before I leave the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two words in connection with the re-opening of the Fortune Fish Plant. Whether or not we agree with the final settlement made in connection with the Fortune Fish Plant (the hon. Minister of Fisheries has been criticized and I have been criticized for giving away the Fortune Fish Plant to Booth Fisheries Limited) nobody knows the history or the story of Fortune since the closing of the Fortune Fish Plant any better than I do. I worked with these people during the past two or three years, incidentally, and if we gave away a fish plant we have saved a major proportion of our district. Mr. Speaker, in this connection, too, I think that the people of Fortune and the area in general owe a debt of gratitude to the Premier and the Government for finally agreeing to dispose of the plant. I am not saying they sold it, I will still say they disposed of it. You will recall my original release to the Mayor of Fortune a few weeks ago when I said they disposed of it. But, Sir, in this connection we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Mayor and Council of Fortune and the Citizens Council. They worked unceasingly. They made trips to St. John's, almost always at their own expense, and the people of that area owe them a great debt of gratitude. Had it not been for their consistent effort I doubt that the plant would be open today.

I have one or two comments to make, Mr. Speaker, in connection with roads. At the present time an effort is being made to open

the roads to the Burin Peninsula; at the same time the roads on the Burin Peninsula are blocked with snow. We have 100 miles of road on the Burin Peninsula. I said last year in this house and I say it again, it is time that we change our emphasis on road snow clearing. I see no useful purpose served in trying to open 100 miles of road connecting Burin to the Avalon Peninsula when the 100 miles of road connecting up all the larger centers on the Burin Peninsula itself, where the men have to move and work and get back and forth to hospital, schools, fish factories and what have you, are closed. This, Mr. Speaker, brings up another point. Unless and until we get a road depot on the Burin Peninsula, until we have a centralization of authority on the Burin Peninsula for the control of our roads, much of the money spent by the Department of Highways will continue to run down the drains every spring. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, today we open the first page, the second chapter of our life as a Province of Canada. For 160 odd years the "Cornerstone of Empire". We have written our first chapter, and are on page one, Chapter Two today. Mr. Speaker, it has been 10 momentous years and the last three months, I would say for more reasons than one, have been three tragic months. The history of Newfoundland has been such that I don't think that three months or 10 years can get us down. And I believe, and I think every member of this house believes, deep down in his heart, in the years that lie ahead we will progress and become a really true part of this great dominion. And who knows, Mr. Speaker, as the first chapter of Confederation was written on a small sister province of ours, possibly the last great chapter of Confederation may now be written here on this island, and possibly right here in this chamber.

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate I recall first of all, about 10 years ago today, a group of men called together by, as he was then, Mr. J. R. Smallwood, and which was sworn in at Government House to form a Provincial Government; a caretaker Government, an interim Government, call it what you will, the first responsible Government in Newfoundland after a suspension of 15 years. Today on the Government benches are some six mem-

bers, including the Premier, of that original number. I cannot help but reminisce a little over the beginning to us at any rate, of "adventure in Government". Very few of us knew anything at all, apart from academically, of Government work. We knew very little of the administrative details; we had little realization, as a matter of fact, of all that was involved in the task which at the request of one whom we were proud to call our leader and had been our leader for some two or three years preceeding that date to take part in the task which confronted us at that time. It has been argued repeatedly that the Government came into a situation which was gilt-edged in many respects. It seems they had a quite large sum of money at their disposal, plus the situation in which they had no appreciable tax. But as, day-by-day and night-by-night, we met in meetings and sessions we realized that the assets, the liquid assets which had been left with us were not entirely an unmixed blessing. We realized more clearly perhaps than most people did, that although the Commission of Government had left us or left to someone, and we happened to be the fortunate ones, some \$40 million in the Treasury, they had left to us also a very, very long list of important omissions, work which should have been done during their years of office but left for someone else to take up and carry on.

That omissions was extremely serious in their implications and consequences. We were fortunate in that we had someone with us, who, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Rowe) said last night, had tireless energy and a genius in many, many respects for organizational details, and for the broad schemes or policies which he felt (and we concurred) were essential in the economic development of the province. We were there merely on a care-taker basis. We knew that, within three months of our taking office, we should have to face an election and put our plans before the electorate before we or anyone could get a mandate for the ordinary affairs of Government. Well, perhaps we expected that the small margin that had brought us into Confederation would be considerably increased in the July election, or June or May election, because of certain benefits which were already beginning to flow into Newfoundland during April and May because of our

union with Canada. We realized, too, there was considerable opposition during the last days of Commission of Government, during the days of the referendum. While we felt that the party would be elected, very few individuals felt sure of their own personal election, particularly when most of them were confronted by an electorate for the first time on the hustings. Your Honour, it is interesting to recall some of the fears and apprehensions, some of the hopes and aspirations, some of the expectations, some of the great plans which we conceived and tried to put into execution during these early days, particularly after we had gone to the people and had come back with a mandate to carry on the things which we had promised we would try to do.

A great deal of material has been written during the past 10 years on what we expected from Canada and what Canada is doing for us. Not too much has been made of the fact that, although we went to Canada looking, perhaps, for a greater amount of security, because we felt we could no longer live in isolation, we did not go empty handed. We had gone to Canada, carrying with us some 152,000 square miles in land space, not very important perhaps to Canada with the third largest land space in the world. We carried with us some 350,000 people, 98% of whom were from the British Isles, and in that, of course, I include Ireland. It was no inconsiderable segment to add to the homogenous population of a growing nation. We carried with us two very important air bases, which had played their part in the national defence of Newfoundland and Canada. We rounded out the Confederation dream of 1867, important air bases, which had played their part in the national defence of Newfoundland and Canada. We rounded out the Confederation dream of 1867, in giving to Canada a bastion along her Eastern Shoreline. We carried with us the bases which had been put here a few years ago by the United States, and gave to Canada a bargaining point in future dealings between Canada and the United States of America. Prior to 1949, we had bought in an open market, and certainly the major part of our imports did not come from Canada.

Sir, the issue of union surmounted, we became one with the Dominion and we opened up to Canada a market for her ex-

ports which today probably reaches \$230 million annually. Very little of our exports go to the Dominion of Canada. I do not know their value. Normally, exports and imports are about the same, and that means as a trading concern as a market potential, the trade of Newfoundland is in the vicinity of half a billion dollars, making Newfoundland one of the biggest markets that Canada has. So, Sir, when people talk glibly of the benefits which we have received from Canada, let us not forget we did not go in empty-handed. We rounded out Canada in many ways, strategically and economically. Two years ago the people of Canada were somewhat enamoured of what I consider to be an illusionary vision propounded by the Leader of the Conservative Party. Had Canada used its intelligence and reason and looked eastward, rather than to the North it would have seen that it already has within its nation something which, given the proper attention (I almost said "respect") could have redounded to the credit of the Canadian Nation, and made happier by far the section of it acquired on March 31, 1949. (Newfoundland):

When we were elected in May 1949 and called together in the first session of the house in the following July, a glance at Hansard of that session will reveal something of the problems which we had to face and something of the work which had to be undertaken and carried out by those who formed the interim Government and then the first elected Provincial Government. It is of particular interest to recall that there were six legislative measures introduced into this house and enacted in the interest of the welfare of labour and the working people and unions. When we hear, Sir all the nonsense that has been reported and repeated during the past two months, one has only to go back to the records and note, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Provincial Affairs (Mr. Murray) said, the measures that were enacted in this house on behalf of the very people whose leaders today proclaim that we are anti-labour, anti-this, that and the other thing.

Labour, Sir, is only one of the many things which confronted us at that time. The Speech From the Throne speaks of education. One of my clearest memories, of which I have spoken before but which I think bears repetition, was an occurrence which

happened on March 31, 1949, when at 7:30 in the evening, I was the leader of a delegation which left the office of the then Commissioner for Education, after being turned down flatly because we had asked for a moderate increase in the teachers' salaries of that period. When one looks at the salaries of teachers today and realizes the great contrast between the salaries which are being received now and those which were paid out in 1949, just 10 short years ago, one is amazed at the manner and the degree to which things have progressed during these past 10 years.

Mention is made in the Speech From the Throne of the new University. We have been talking about it for some considerable time. A very proud moment in my life was 1950, I believe, when I had the proud privilege of putting through the house a Bill to create the new University of Newfoundland. It was a long step in the fulfillment of a dream which had been kindled in my mind by Dr. Arthur Barnes, in my teacher training days in 1915. I was particularly interested to hear, on Thursday of last week, the promise of our Premier that a start will be made on the new university buildings this year. I shall be very happy indeed, and I am quite sure everyone in this house will be happy indeed, to see the consummation of something which originated some 40 years ago, and which we hope may be completed rapidly during the early days, the early years of our second decade of Union with Canada.

There were other things, Your Honour, which engaged our attention. In those early days there was one over-riding consideration we always had to bear in mind. We knew that this union with Canada meant the gates of egress were thrown wide open, and we had no desire whatsoever that these gates should become blocked with people hastening from Newfoundland to take up residence on the mainland. So then and never-ceasing since, one of the biggest problems always confronting us, and which must always confront any Government, is trying to find ways and means to find labour for the people, trying to strengthen the economy of the island or province or state in which it is elected, to try and make it possible to have a share in the work going on in the larger community of which he has become part and parcel. These, Your Hon-

our, are some of the thoughts which naturally come to one's mind, I think, who has played some small part in the early days and the succeeding days of the history of these 10 years.

Your Honour, when I come particularly to the Speech From the Throne, it is inevitable, I think, when many speakers follow one after another, there just be much repetition. As far as I can I want to avoid repetitious comments, but there are certain things in that Speech from the Throne to which one must refer. The first one is the impending visit of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh. It is with pride and gratification that we know that they intend to pay us a visit sometime in June. We know, Mr. Speaker, that it is impossible for Governments to legislate for good weather during their stay. We feel it is beyond our province to propitiate the weather god, and yet we will pray that, when they come to us in June, the weather gods may be a little kinder and more considerate than they were on their visit some years ago. Whether it be sunshine or rain, whether it be calm or stormy, there is no doubt whatsoever of the welcome which we shall give to them during their stay in Newfoundland and the pleasure that we shall derive from having Her Majesty and His Royal Highness spend a few hours once more with us. Summer may not greet them in all its warmth and glory during which time they are here, but our welcome will be none the less keen and appreciative, and I am sure they will carry away with them pleasant memories of their all-too-short stay.

Mr. Speaker with your permission, I would suggest we have a few minutes recess.

On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Hefferton: Your Honour, in the last 10 years I think the Government has been extremely fortunate in its supply of speakers to move and second the Address in Reply, and I think that particularly applies to the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mufflin) and the hon. member for Carboniar-Bay de Verde, (Mr. Clarke) who performed their function so ably and eloquently this year. I was particularly happy to listen to and appreciate the remarks of the hon.

member for Trinity North, probably because of my memory of years ago when we occupied entirely different positions. Be that as it may, the tenor of the remarks made by both the mover and seconder and the manner in which these remarks were delivered redounded very creditably indeed to the speeches which have been delivered in this House of Assembly.

In the Speech from the Throne, Your Honour, may I read two or three sentences? "During the past year our Province has experienced economic vicissitudes which have resulted in some hardship. Our fishery was one of the poorest in our history and because of conditions in world markets there was some reduction in logging and mineral production. These economic dislocations would have been felt much more severely were it not for the stabilizing factors which have resulted from the union of Newfoundland and Canada. Nevertheless, the experience of the past year has done much to emphasize the continued need for the development of other resources."

It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, that our salt fish industry last year was down some 25% lower than that of the preceding year. It is a matter of record that in mineral production, our dollar value is down somewhere around \$4 million, or roughly 20% of that of the previous year. It is a matter of record the pulp and paper operations were curtailed considerably with loss of revenue to the people engaged in that particular industry and to the province at large. It was probably these and other factors which induced the hon. Leader of the Opposition to refer to the very large number of people last year who were dependent wholly or in part on assistance of one kind or another. I do not intend to deal in detail with the welfare figures. These can more properly and profitably be deferred until the Debate on the Budget or until the Estimates are brought down, but I do want to refer to one set of figures—Public Assistance: In January of this year, the last figures, I believe, which were given to this house. The number of families on able-bodied assistance were 6900 and in February a month later these figures had dropped to 6400. But from the period from April 1958 to January 1959 our monthly average of families receiving public assistance was 5300 or roughly 25,000 or 26,000 persons, and that figure

was just double what it has been in the previous year.

These people were helped considerably by the fact that we are able to give assistance on a much higher scale than could have been possible had we to do it from our own resources. But I was not thinking of that factor so much as I was of the tremendous amount of work which we had devolved upon our welfare staff during the past 12 months. It is a simple, easy matter requiring little time and difficulty, to issue an order for assistance; it is not easy, it requires a tremendous knowledge of human nature, human relations, it requires common sense and tact on the part of the welfare officers to do the preparatory and preliminary work before assistance can be given. And it says much for the welfare officers in the field that sometimes work has been attempted and done with so little real source of complaint. As a matter of fact, the amount of work in the field has grown so largely that for the winter months, January, February and March we were compelled to engage 12 additional assistants to help welfare officers in certain areas. At the best of times, Mr. Speaker, I consider that welfare officers, perhaps above other Government workers, have an extremely difficult job to do.

And Sir, I am glad indeed to pay tribute to those people who are doing such a fine job. Although normally their work may not be so extremely onerous, the conditions in Newfoundland during the past three months have aggravated very much indeed the normal work of the welfare officers. It is easy enough to deal with unemployment as such; it is not easy to deal with applicants when you know that, in addition to the labour shortage and work shortage, he has a strike, receiving strike pay; unemployment insurance benefits deferred for a while, and uncertainty as to whether they will be restored or not. All these things complicate the task which lies before the welfare officer and makes great demands upon his tact and his judgment. That brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the events of the past few months. I am not going to refer to any particular detail, to the strike and the consequences or actions arising out of the same, but there are two or three things which I think need to be said, even at the risk of being repetitious.

It is no new thing to be misrepresented in the press; it is no new thing to have a thing

distorted, but very often the misrepresentation and distortion arise because the facts have not been understood or because the facts have been ignored. There has been criticism of the press as long as there has been a press. Jefferson, the father, if you like, of American Democracy, said in his talk that nothing could be believed in the press; and yet he himself was an upholder and a strong upholder of the liberty of the press itself. Apart from the distortions and misrepresentations, there was another factor which should be borne in mind, i.e., when the Government was confronted with a position in late February in which it knew it had to take some decision, there was considerable discussion amongst us, not because we did not know what the decision must ultimately be, but because we wanted to analyze the situation as best we could and arrive at a decision which would deal with the crisis which faced us and yet at the same time be best, as we thought, for all concerned. I can appreciate very much indeed the position of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his associates as they were informed of the decision which the Government had taken. I can understand some of the consideration which they had to weigh and some of the implications which they had to face. Therefore, Sir, I appreciate all the more deeply the decision, followed by action, on their part to join with us in a common front against what we considered the direst threat that had ever faced our economy in our province.

Sometime ago I read a new biography of Elizabeth I, Queen of England. Some months after she had caused to be executed one of her trusted advisers the Earl of Essex, her courtiers and counsellors, in her presence, were discussing a recent action which had been taken by King Henry IV of France in which he had been compelled to take similar action to that taken by the Queen Elizabeth, and execute for treason one of his trusted advisors. The remark which she made was: "One cannot indulge one's personal inclinations when the welfare of the country is at stake." On March 4 of this year, 1959, President Eisenhower of the United States held a press conference and during the course of that conference, in answer to a question, he said: "When you have certain circumstances that can put your nation's life at stake, whatever is necessary the President

would order." Your Honour, that is a quotation from the Canadian Hansard, March 16, 1959.

In the latter days of February and the days that followed, this province was faced with an emergency which threatened to destroy, at one fell blow, at least one-third of the economic resources of this province and which would effect at least one-third of the population of Newfoundland. It was not a decision as to whether we were anti-labour or pro-labour, it was not a case of taking a negative policy on unionism, but the case of declaring a positive policy pro-Newfoundland. And, Sir, I am happy to be associated with the house which on that occasion threw down the gauntlet and said — "We will, as far as possible, protect our native province."

During the days preceding the last federal election, and for a little time before that, there was considerable agitation in the House of Commons at Ottawa, and in the Canadian press, particularly by the Conservative Party, about the dangers of Canadian industry being owned and controlled by American capitalists. And those of us reading anything or knowing anything about these financial concerns, knew that in many of the great factories and industries and mining concerns and all such ventures in Canada, as much as 60% and in some instances more, of the control is vested in American capital. Within recent months we have seen some evidence of that when Canadian subsidiaries are prevented from selling motor cars to a foreign country. We have seen a more recent incident when aluminium represented by a Canadian subsidiary is prevented from being exported, and there have been numerous other instances in which the influence of the parent concern, domiciled in the United States, has prevented, directly or indirectly, very often indirectly, the exploitation and expansion of Canadian industry. There have been many instances known to all of us where people, with some justification, have argued against these things.

And yet, over the years, a far more insidious factor has crept into Canadian history — American unions spreading into the Canadian Mainland directing and controlling Canadian labour, reaching out its talons. — It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, and I am quoting from responsible enterprising pub-

lications. Mr. Letter, a Canadian now living in England where he has become the member of Parliament for Sommerset, delivered some home truths to a meeting of B.C. loggers recently in Vancouver. Mr. Letter said: "There is no other country in the world which tolerates the labour movement being dominated by foreigners. It is a most peculiar and strange form of colonialism. It is a strange irony that U.S. Labour, which consistently achieves the world's worst effort in industrial disputes, should be the only labour movement in history which ever found itself called upon to run the labour movement in other peoples' countries." I say, Mr. Speaker, that a far more insidious influence is creeping into Canadian life — the influence of some of the worst elements of trade unionism, dominating and controlling the industries of a country of which we are a part. When I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do not contend that I am anti-labour and anti-unionism, but I do feel, and feel strongly, that just as it was necessary to form a Combines Act in Canada and an Anti-trust Act in the United States of America, in order to prevent exploitation of the consumer by cartels and monopolies, so it is equally necessary for legislation to be effective to deal with international combines in labour. No one would deny for a moment that labour has certain rights, but no one would be crazy enough, except some labour organizers, to argue that these rights do not carry with them corresponding responsibilities.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): To a point of order, Mr. Speaker — I hope my learned colleague is not trying, even inferring, all the labour movements in Newfoundland are guilty of that practice. I think that would be very erroneous.

Mr. Hefferton: I did not say — I was not, as a matter of fact, referring to Newfoundland labour at all. I agree generalities are very, very dangerous. I was making a general statement. That does not detract from the statement I made. These rights have no prerogative which places labour above the law and carries with it the responsibility; and the law for the labourman, the striker, is exactly the same as for John Jones going about his ordinary peaceful business.

During the course of his speech the hon. member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf) referred to something which I think has given a great deal of thought to those who think anything at all about the pernicious practise of the day — a great deal of concern. He referred to the sale of what is called "literature" but could be termed very much worse, and which is a disgrace to the markets. With my colleague, the Minister of Provincial Affairs (Mr. Murray) I do not know the answer. The disgraceful part of it is it does not stop at comics. A great many of the high-priced books today, which come to us recommended by this, that and the other one as being works of great literary value, destroy the pleasure of the reader in the gloating detail in which they paint some sordid and lewd, in many respect, pictures. Far worse indeed are they than the pictures and comics which are bandied around.

For a moment, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to another book entirely, of an entirely different kind, to which reference, I believe, has already been made by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Education, (Mr. Rowe). A short time ago there appeared in the book stores of St. John's a book by a Newfoundlander, Mr. A. B. Perlin, dealing with the history of Newfoundland. It is not in such detail as that of "Prowse", and has a different content, to some extent, than the "Book of Newfoundland", of which the author was our Premier; but it serves an admirable purpose in filling in many of the gaps which exist in our literature about the economic history of Newfoundland and social history of Newfoundland and to some extent the commercial history of Newfoundland. It fills a gap which needed to be filled. And whilst I am quite sure the author himself would not contend that it fulfills entirely all the purposes to which he would like to give his attention, it is worthy of the serious attention of all members of the house.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I think I am more of a Canadian than I am a Newfoundlander. I have always felt that one should never just take part in thinking and praising and blasting it and considering it, instead of looking at the whole. For that reason, long before I became actively associated with politics I studied very closely the financial and economic policies of Canada. My interest for the last few years has naturally

been greater, and that has been particularly so during the last two years, because the platform introduced by the Conservative Party at different times, the policies which they advocated, the things which they attacked lead me to wonder what would happen if the shoe were on the other foot — if they themselves should become the Government of Canada. Well, that happened, and today we have the Conservative party in power. I just want to deal with one or two of the things which have happened during the last two years without infringing in any part upon the labour subject.

During the years in Opposition, the Conservatives had attacked the Liberals time and again for what they considered the unfortunate and unfair way in which the Government in power at that time was carrying on fiscal relations between the Government at Ottawa and the provinces. In the fall of 1957 the Conservative Party, elected to power, called a Dominion-Provincial Conference on fiscal relations. And, when we met in conference one of the first things we were told by the Prime Minister was that there would be no clear-cut decisions handed down by him or his party to those assembled at the conference to take or to leave; and there was a free and open discussion with no clear-cut decisions arrived at and taken. One of the things that occurred at the beginning of that conference was the announcement that help was being expanded by means of a special grant to the Maritime Provinces, but due to the prompt and vehement arguments of our Premier at that time, that grant included Newfoundland. That conference ended without any decision and was to be reconvened in January of 1959. There has been no reconvening in the normal sense of the word since that closing in November 1957.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the hon. Minister a question? Is he prepared to state how much Newfoundland is receiving as a result of that first conference? At the present time, he has not done so!

Mr. Hefferton: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to answer the question exactly. But \$25 million was given in special aid to the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. Hollett: We are getting \$7.5 millions now.

Mr. Hefferton: And by means of an arrangement made between the representatives of the four Atlantic Provinces, subsequently the decision was 30-30-30-10%, i.e., 30% for Newfoundland, 30% for New Brunswick, 30% for Nova Scotia and 10% for Prince Edward Island. I am talking in percentages of course. But I mention that because it is so much in contrast with the statements which had been made on so many occasions by people before they assumed the office of government themselves.

A far more disturbing thing, Sir, about the Canadian economy, because of its effect upon us, is the question of inflation versus unemployment. Now, the question of inflation is so involved that it is pretty difficult for a layman to talk intelligently on the subject. We do know that inflation means that general rise in goods and services are above the ordinary level, i.e., things become dearer and we do know that there is a continuous rise in the cost of pretty nearly everything to the consumer. The price index went up in 1959 by 3% and it had gone up by 3% in 1958, or a little over 6%, 6.2% in two years. We know that last July a policy was headed up by the Government at Ottawa whereby any loans that were maturing, or were about to mature were converted and that the cost of that policy over the next 25 years was to be something over \$50 million per year. That is something which must be added to the current expenditure of the Ottawa Government. Now, that may not be too serious, but it is effecting lower levels of Government in their attempt to sell bond issues and in the interest rates which they have to pay on borrowed loans. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, which we should not forget is that, in 1949, prior to Confederation we had only one Government to consider. It is true St. John's was incorporated as well as some six, seven or eight other places around the province. Today, we have some seventeen places incorporated, and many of them with water and sewerage plants installed, and many of them have raised bond issues in order to put in these amenities, and several are at the present time trying to find ways and means in order that they may install these services. And be-

cause of these things, and because of the expenses of carrying on the provincial Government, it is necessary in the interest of the economy and the interest of the province that money should be as cheap as possible.

There are several other matters here, Mr. Speaker, which could very well take our attention, but before I take my seat I want to do something which I don't usually do. I have always found a difficulty on my part to express what I consider, deeper feelings, whether deep or not, I don't know. A few days ago, when I listened to my colleague the hon. the senior member for Harbour Main (Mr. Lewis) express so eloquently and fittingly a well-deserved tribute to our leader, the Premier, I envied him his ability. I wish that I too could do something of the same. Last night in another place another colleague paid tribute, perhaps in a different category, although equally well-deserved, equally well-merited, but not commending itself so to my attention, i.e., I did not envy him. It was a prepared speech to some extent, whereas the hon. member for Harbour Main had gotten up and in his own special way paid tribute as tribute was deserved to be paid to the one who, particularly during the last three months, has borne the heat and the brunt of the day.

I started my remarks this afternoon by referring to some of the difficulties which confronted us when we came into Confederation and when we formed the first Government, and some of the factors which we had to face in order to deal with the many problems which beset us from day to day, as we were trying to do the things which we thought best for the welfare of this province. During all that time there was a man who never failed to give us the necessary leadership and never failed to give us the necessary encouragement. The past 10 years have not been easy. Several onerous blows have fallen, and each time he has risen courageously to the front. Perhaps the decision which faced us a short while ago was in some ways one of the heaviest that had fallen to his lot. It seemed at face value, on the surface, to be the negation of all he had fought for over the years. I have known the Premier a long time. Just 40 years ago we were associates, in some small measure, in a fight to try and elect the first three labour candidates running for general elec-

tion for the district of St. John's West. To the best of my knowledge, that was the beginning of his activity and interest in and struggle on behalf of labour. And down through the years it has been shown, as organizer, as supporter, as a fighter he has constantly, in season and out of season, worked on behalf of what we very often call "the toiling masses." Then, to come before this house and introduce legislation which, as I say, at the moment seems to negate all he had fought for — it was not an easy decision. Now, we know that it was not a negation of what he had fought for. We know that his interest in, and support of, genuine trade unionism is just as strong today as ever it was; and labour today, in spite of what may have been said during the last month, has just as strong a friend and supporter in our Premier as it had at any time during his career.

Although, during the last 10 years I have been associated, naturally, fairly closely with him, I am unable to pay a tribute to one who in many ways has been as inspiration to all Newfoundlanders, who has some attributes which I am unable to define or describe. I recall not long ago reading a biography of General Gordon: Just a few days before the last mass attack in which he was killed and beheaded, a deputation of his officers came to him and said: "Look the food is nearly all gone, the ammunition is nearly all exhausted. Why don't we put up sand bags around the windows to afford a little extra protection and shelter from the mob?" And Gordon replied: "Light 24 candles" (why 24 I don't know) - "Light 24 candles and put them in the windows and let the light shine out and tell the mob Gordon fears nothing." I don't know whether these words apply to the Premier or not. I have seen him take some very weighty and onerous decisions during the last 10 years, where his absolute fearlessness was equal to the words of Gordon. As I said, I don't know. When he is convinced he is right he will never falter nor fail to make a decision, and, Sir, under a man who has that courage, that devotion to duty, that leadership, I am proud to be a humble follower.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate. On motion debate on the Address in Reply adjourned.

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act."

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this is apparently a minor amendment to the Memorial University (Pensions) Act; which is designed to take care of those persons who may have had to their credit time in the Civil Service and subsequently become associated with the teaching staff of the University. As I am sure the house knows (although teachers are not civil servants in the ordinary sense of the word) we have a working arrangement whereby teachers who move into the Civil Service get credit for their years of service, and whereby teachers who move into the University under the University scheme are given credit for their service, and always were. It would be most unfortunate if civil servants or teachers could not move from one category to another — for instance magistrates drawn from the teachers, where boards of education have been able to entice them back again. All this amendment does is make it possible for teachers, or former civil servants who have joined the University staff, to become pensionable while in the employment of the University. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

Mr. Rowe: Mr. Speaker, here again we have a comparatively minor amendment to the Public Libraries Act. As the house knows, the Public Libraries Board is embodied as an independent body, appointed by the Government but independent of the Government in the same way that the Board of Regents of the University is. This amendment will make it possible for employees of the Public Libraries Board to come under the ambit of the Workmen's Compensation Fund; it will make it possible for the Board to pay the regular assessment into that fund. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered

referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education (Teachers) Pension Act."

Mr. Rowe: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. members of the house are aware of the fact that, in recent years, a group of private citizens have been doing some very excellent work in the hitherto untouched field in education, i.e., education of certain classes of retarded children. A school has been set up and it has been operated, doing excellent work. In some parts of the world, that work has been (or part of the responsibility has been) assumed by municipalities and in some cases by states or provincial government. It is a very heavy problem. In the operation of that school it has been found necessary to employ highly skilled teachers. However, one of the handicaps which the committee experienced was in attracting teachers who would not have any pension rights while teaching in such a school. This Bill makes it possible for teachers who are employed in the teaching of retarded children by that organization to participate in our Newfoundland teachers' pension scheme. That has not only been recommended to us by the Board of the Retarded Children's School, but approved by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and by the various educational denomination authorities in the Department of Education. It may be recalled, recently it was announced on behalf of the Government that the Government was going to recommend to the house that teachers who had reached the pensionable age of 60 and who normally would be forced automatically to retire, would be permitted to carry on teaching until the age of 65 provided such teachers could satisfy the appropriate Superintendents of Education that they were in a state of good health. This is the second amendment in this Bill and will make it possible for such teachers to do so. I don't think I need to emphasize the fact that a great many of our teachers at the age of 60 are still in full possession of their mental and physical faculties, and in view of the grave shortage of qualified teachers, although not so serious as a few years ago but still grave here in Newfoundland and everywhere. I should say it seems a futile

waste to have good teachers forced to walk the streets, as it were, and pensionable, when they are quite willing and quite happy to go back into our schools to teach again. This Bill will make it possible for such teachers to go back into the schools without prejudice to their pensions, without effecting their pensions in any other way. This will not in any way modify the pension scheme drawn up after so many years of laborious study. It will enable such teachers to continue to the age of 65. And at that time, or any time in between that they wish to resume their pensions or to take their pensions they may do so.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill — "An Act To Amend the Pharmaceutical Association Act, 1954."

Dr. J. McGrath (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to correct an error in the original provision of that Act, which allowed the Pharmaceutical Association to set the payment and amount of registration fees, annual fees and registration fees to be paid by members etc. This was mistakenly interpreted to mean they could set the fee to be paid by pharmaceutical business houses. In fact, for the past several years, that has been imposed and paid. It has been pointed out they have not had that power under this Bill, so this amendment will give the Pharmaceutical Association the power to assess business houses for annual fees. I am informed by the Association that everybody is in agreement with this and ask it for their own purpose: The purpose of the fees is to provide for the training of pharmaceutical students as assistants. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland Medical Board Act."

Dr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to provide a limit of time beyond which action may not be taken for

malpractise, in cases of medical practitioners. I am not sure of province of Quebec, but all the other provinces of Canada except ourselves have such provision, most of them limited to a year. The province of Nova Scotia is limited to three years. I think last year the house agreed to limit the time under which any action, of various kinds, can be taken. It is not in the public interest that the length of time should be unlimited. After discussion with the Attorney General's Department, we decided to recommend a time of two years. That is half way between Nova Scotia's three years and the one year limit. Three years we feel is a bit long and on the other hand one year might be considered a bit short. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, move the second reading of this Bill. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Food and Drugs Act.

Dr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. Under the Public Health Act the medical health officer can exercise all the functions of inspector. Under the Food and Drugs Act, however, that is not so. Therefore, an action could not be taken by the medical health officer under the Food and Drugs Act. There are many circumstances under which that is desirable. This simply gives, under the Food and Drugs Act, all the authority of an inspector to the medical officers; the same authority as is already obtaining under the Public Health Act. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

Dr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, when the Children's Health Act was brought in a couple of years ago, provision was made to prevent people who wrongfully injured children — such as running down a child in a car, to prevent people from being absolved from the consequences of the Act by the fact that the state provided free treatment for children. It was the intention of the provision at that time to insure, in the case of wrongful injury of a child normally treated free, that it would be possible to proceed

against the aggressor and make him responsible for any medical bills or hospital charges occurring. We also have, under the Adult Hospital Insurance Act, an arrangement with the Government of Canada that we will pursue these cases. Now one came up before the Court and the judge decided that under existing law there was no power whatever to effect the purpose we intended. This amendment therefore is designed to remedy that complaint in the Act. It is really a lawyers Act, and it is the Attorney General who should probably bring it in, because I am not in a position to tell the house whether this Bill has that effect or not. It is intended to see that in the wrongful injury of another person, the guilty party cannot just go out and cause persons to be hospitalized and have the state pay the Bill for him, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading of this Bill.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would have anything to say about Clause 3 of that amendment; not the clause itself but the principle. Is clause 3 included in that principle?

Dr. McGrath: No, that does not refer to this amendment. Clause 3 refers to an entirely different matter. I am sorry; I neglected to mention it. It simply gives the Department of Health power and authority to control the use and so on of the sanitation of swimming pools so that there may be inspection and proper control for health purposes.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Prohibit Secondary Boycotts."

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Now that you suggest it, Mr. Speaker, I would move that item No. 2 and No. 3 these two at any rate, be removed from the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: With the unanimous consent of the house, the motion is that Bill No. 3, be no longer proceeded with and dropped from the Order Paper. On motion Bill No. 3 "An Act To Prohibit Secondary Boycotts" dropped from the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: With the unanimous consent of the house, the motion is that Bill No. 4, be no longer proceeded with and that it be dropped from the Order Paper. On motion Bill No. 4. "An Act To Prohibit General Strikes and Lockouts" be dropped from the Order Paper. By the consent of the house these two motions have been agreed to and Bills No. 3 and 4 are accordingly dropped from the Order Paper.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, might I move also, with the unanimous consent of the house that Bill No. 13, (Item No. 8) be dropped from the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: Motion is that this item be dropped from the Order Paper and the Bill be no longer proceeded with, with the consent of the house. On motion Bill No. 13, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act," be not proceeded with and dropped from the Order Paper, carried. Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Trustee Act."

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, this is a very unimportant Bill, but it is a Bill which would enable trustees to invest trust funds in sinking fund bonds or debentures issued or to be issued by the city of St. John's or the city of Corner Brook. We think it is only fair that these two communities should be permitted to have their bonds treated as trustee investments, and I move second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, we have not seen that Bill yet. Oh yes!

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Suspension of The Rent Restrictions Act."

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally known that the Rent Restrictions Act has been in force in this country since the war, and was in force during the war. The time has now come when we feel that there is very little need of this Act on our books, and it is proposed that the Rent Restrictions Act be suspended, by proclamation, and if the

need should arise for this Act then it can be re-instated, by proclamation.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned about this Bill. Frankly I cannot support it because I think that the Rent Restrictions Act was one of the greatest things we have had and one of the fine things we copied from the mother country. Maybe in St. John's the Government has gone into a good housing scheme, has gone into some slum clearance scheme, and possibly there is not so much movement of people back and forth. But in the city of Corner Brook, where I live, it only applies in private dwellings and does not effect business people. Where I live in Corner Brook it could be detrimental to many people because of money matters, because of inability to arrange loans from the banks, because, if you like, of the uncertainty and troubled situation. At the moment this would give an open road to unscrupulous landlords to start raising the rent, and on any complaint to tell you to get out. Even today, Sir, in the city of Corner Brook, within the last two weeks, landlords have refused people who have requested reasonable things such as paint allowance; and I know of persons who have been given notice to get out because they requested clean and decent surroundings. What would happen to these people once the restrictions were lifted? Up would go the rent, sky high, and where will the people go, where the Government has no slum clearance, no housing programme like St. John's? Unfortunately we have not been able to receive that consideration. And, Sir, I say this will be detrimental, if not in St. John's certainly in certain sections of the country with high rents and because it would be detrimental to a lot of my people I cannot support it.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the position that the hon. member has taken and perhaps it might be possible, when the house gets into committee to modify the amendment so as to enable the Government in council, in suspending the Act, to suspend it in certain places and not perhaps suspend it entirely. It is the feeling of the Government that the housing situation should have cleared itself by now; that this was emergency legislation brought in during the war and that such legislation should

not be kept on the Statute Books of the Province longer than is absolutely necessary. I am sure, however, that the act is an enabling act only, and that the Government will not lightly name a decision one way or the other without first looking into the whole situation. But it is recommended to the Government by the Department that there is no further need of a rent control board. Very few cases have come before it of late, and the time might well have come to have it removed. But, Sir, as I say, the act is an enabling act, and it may be possible when we get into Committee of the Whole, to consider whether or not we should not permit a piecemeal suspension of the act, rather than a wholesale suspension throughout the whole province. I submit, Sir, that might be the answer to the position taken by my hon. friend from Humber East.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a brief word about this too. I feel that a number of parties have studied the position of the existence of this act, and I do agree with the hon. the Attorney General that things have gotten back to a degree of normality and this process is no longer needed to the degree it was when introduced. I do think, however, that the suspension should be piecemeal. The change might be a good one — and in any event I think my colleague might like a day or two in which to study it a bit further. But in general principle, I think some changes might well be thought up.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of this particular motion to study recent restrictions before commenting. If I must do so now I will do it, but I prefer to have it postponed. On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

Motion, that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, carried.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment until tomorrow, Thursday, might I have the unanimous leave of the house to give notice of a Bill. On motion leave given.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Labour Relations Act".

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three o'clock.

Thursday April 2, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, before you call the business of the house, may I be permitted to invite the attention of the house to the presence in the chamber today of four very brilliant young Newfoundlanders who have participated today in the annual oratorical or public speaking contest under the auspices of the Rotary Club of Newfoundland. That annual event which brings together a number of very clever and very promising young Newfoundlanders in an oratorical or public speaking contest has been gaining in importance year by year since it began, so that today it is undoubtedly the most notable event of its kind that takes place anywhere in Newfoundland. Just as the Music Festival has been bringing together an increasingly large number of young Newfoundlanders every year to enter that musical contest, so also this annual event, where young Newfoundlanders are brought together to show their ability as public speakers and orators, has been increasing and gaining importance. And, Sir, we have here in this chamber this afternoon four of the contestants. Now these contestants are the champions of their respective regions; then these champions are brought together by the Rotary Club at St. John's and the champion of champions is chosen. But all those who take part are champions in their respective regions — in this way the champion for Newfoundland is selected.

The four who are present in this chamber this afternoon are: Lewis Pelley of Deer Lake; Robert Evans of St. John's; Kenneth Barnes of Gander; and Lionel Clarke of St. John's. The champion of these four is Lewis Pelley of Deer Lake. I am sure that all the members of this house, and indeed all New-

foundlanders in general, will be very proud of Mr. Pelley and will wish him every possible luck and success in the future. Indeed I think I can speak for the whole house. There may be some little contest in this between the Leader of the Opposition and myself — we can agree we would like to see these young Newfoundlanders continue to be interested in public speaking — the Leader of the Opposition and I can agree that we would like to see them come into this chamber and take their seats as elected members, but we may not all together agree as to what side they should sit on.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): They are over here.

Mr. Smallwood: No! The contestants are sitting on that side at the moment so they could get a good view of the good looking members of this house. But, Sir, whatever side they may take when they come in here, if they come in, I am sure they would receive a warm welcome indeed, if they ever became elected representatives of the people, and that is about as high an honour as men can seek — to be the representatives of their fellow citizens.

Hon. members of the house will be especially interested to know that Lionel Clarke of St. John's, who is one of the four, is already almost a member of this house, because he is the son of our Deputy-Speaker and Chairman of Committees, and so I would imagine that he has politics in his blood. He will have to put up a pretty hard fight to stay out of this house, I would imagine, in the years to come. I am sure that I speak for the whole house when I say that we welcome them most warmly here now. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up I want them to know before he says a word, I want them to be aware of this plan: He will try to persuade you when you come in to come in on his side. If you are inclined that way, all I will say is, keep an open mind on the matter. Don't make up your minds yet. Just keep an open mind and I always say: "While the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return."

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we on this side of the house are very happy to join with the hon. the Premier in congratulating these four young men who have done so

well in this contest. We are very, very glad indeed to congratulate them. I think the opportunities young fellows have today are many compared with some of us hoary-headed, as we did not have much chance for oratory in those days. I remember when I was a magistrate, and the first time the Governor came to Burin. I had a beautiful speech all ready prepared; I had it off by heart. I got up, Sir, to make that speech and do you know, my mind became a blank and I remembered not one word. So I started off myself. That is just to show you oratory is a pretty good thing in its place. We have seen two exhibitions and we heard a lot of oratory on television and radio, such as we have not heard in a long time. But there is a shortage soon to be made on the opposite side — the hon. the Premier is thinking of retiring. I hope not just yet, until you boys get a little older. I don't want him to stay there all that time, of course.

I do welcome these young men here, Sir, and I am quite sure they have a brilliant future. I do want to congratulate also the Deputy-Speaker, personally, on his ability to have a son here to win such a contest as that. Yes, we are very happy, and are glad these boys are on this side of the house, and we are going to try to keep them here where they rightly belong. The country is so sick of the make-up of the opposite side of the house, by the time these young men grow up they will be glad to sit over here. I may not be here, but I may. They will be all gone in a year or so anyway.

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, as the representative from Gander District I am delighted to hear that Kenneth Barnes is one of the speaking champions in today's contest. I should like to congratulate him and indeed his parents, and also the other contestants as well. We do hope that in the not too distant future we will hear of them in a yet greater sphere.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, I would like too, to extend my congratulations to the young contestants from Deer Lake.

Mr. Speaker: I hope hon. members are not expecting me to award a prize today for all this oratory.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Hon. E.S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in presenting today, a petition in connection with a section of my district, Badger. The petitioners request me to present the petition to the House of Assembly. The Town of Badger has a population of some 1200 people. The petitioners pray for the facilities of telephone connections and electric light extensions. The petition states they have some 1200 people, approximately 200 families, with some half dozen or more commercial houses or places of business. This town has been without the facilities of telephone connections, with the exception of the A.N.D. telephone and that of the Canadian National Railway telephone in the Railway Station. This town of Badger is only 19 miles from the paper town of Grand Falls which has existed from upwards of 50 years, and yet these people associated with that great industry are still without these facilities of electricity and telephone connections. The people of the town note with interest the announcement of the hon. the Premier of Newfoundland regarding the proposed development of the Light and Power facilities throughout the island. They have further noted that power facilities throughout Newfoundland have already gone into some of the outlying districts.

They presented this petition to me, Mr. Speaker, in October, when poles were already being laid into Lewisporte and some other sections of Newfoundland. They are naturally disappointed that no move has as yet been made to light the town of Badger or to provide them with telephone connections. The petition is signed by practically all the adult citizens of the town, and they are requesting that an immediate effort be made to provide them with these blessings. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, immediately upon receipt of this petition I acknowledged its receipt to the persons in particular who forwarded it to me. This petition, as I have already stated, is signed by practically all the adult citizens of Badger, and as their representative in this house of Assembly I speak with full knowledge of the great need for both the facilities requested.

With regard to the telephone services, I am happy to state that immediately upon receipt of this petition I contacted the Cana-

dian National Telegraph people and I am proud to announce that the Superintendent began at once, and did provide some measure of relief to the public of Badger by setting up a public telephone in the Canadian National Telegraph Office to take care of long distance telephone calls. This service did in a large measure facilitate the businessmen, and of course also took care of emergency calls, but does not provide the public service required. However, the superintendent informs me further that he is hoping to have a more complete service for these people in the not too distant future, in fact he pin-points it to this very year or certainly in the next year. He is endeavouring to take care of a complete telegraph service for Badger.

Now a word with regard to electric power: There are those of us who know that the A.N.D. Company for many years have had a very small lighting plant, diesel plant, operating there in the town for the purpose of providing electric facilities to their offices, which were operating at that time, and a few of the businessmen. They could not extend these facilities to all the people of Badger because, like most of our outlying towns, they stretch out like a spider web and the houses are in some cases as much as a mile from the centre of the A.N.D. Company office. However they went as far as they could. But, Sir, what the people now are requesting is light facilities for all concerned. I have contacted the Hydro-Electric Commission set up by this Government last year, and I am informed by them that Badger does really present one of the major difficulties as far as hydro-power is concerned. Unfortunately, it is some distance away from centres where hydro-power can be developed. And because of the great expense of developing diesel power, there has been some considerable delay in determining just when they may be able to go ahead with it. Nevertheless, Sir, the Commission have informed me that they are not losing sight of it, and the endeavouring to provide the service to the greatest number at the present time throughout Newfoundland who are in reach of hydro-electric development.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Minister.

Mr. Spencer: I am pleased to be interrupted by the hon. the Speaker. I may say I am mighty close to the end of my remarks. There are exactly two lines I want to refer to. I will merely say this, Mr. Speaker, the need is great. The need is well-known, and I heartily support the prayer of the petition and ask it be tabled in the house and referred to the department to which it relates.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I gave the people of Badger my own personal promise that they would get this hydro-electricity. That was when I opened the new hydro-plant at Rattling Brook last fall. I pointed out at that time that the electricity would go eastward from Rattling Brook to Gander and from Gander to Gambo, and at Gambo would branch off towards Happy Adventure and then down the North Side of Bonavista Bay, the other way; and from Rattling Brook it would go west also to Badger and down to Hall's Bay to include South Brook and Springdale, King's Point and South West Arm and branching off down there, having come down from Badger. That is the program. That is the program of rural electrification in that part of the province.

Now, as the Minister has said, there are difficulties in the way of realizing that program. The distance from Rattling Brook to Badger is pretty considerable, and requires a long line that will have very few customers. Then again, from Badger to the next nearest place in Hall's Bay, that is to say, South Brook, is a pretty considerable distance, of some 30 odd miles, which is a long distance for a line to go without a single customer. Then still further to complicate the matter is the fact that the town of Springdale, in its impatience to have electricity, recently installed, at a very substantial cost of \$15,000 a diesel plant. I believe that their transmission line or system within Springdale is so constructed that, when the diesel plant is taken out and electricity is supplied by hydro-power, there will be no dislocation. But, Sir, in the meantime they have gone to great expense to supply diesel power. That is a still further complication. But there is the program, Mr. Speaker. The power will go from Rattling Brook, the new power house at Rattling Brook westward to Badger down to South Brook and on to Springdale, branching off and going to the

westward, so to speak, to Southwest Arm and to King's Point and places in that vicinity, and branching off to the east and going down to Robert's Arm and in that direction. That is the program. It will cost a considerable sum of money. It just would not pay any utility company to do it, and it must therefore come under the Rural Electrification Program. That is going to cost a lot of money. And, Sir, it is only one of many areas in Newfoundland in which rural electrification is so badly needed, and about which every member on this side of the house and some on that side have been clamouring for years, but not clamouring as much as the people in these areas concerned. A lot will depend on the financial assistance we get. We can't say how rapidly we can go forward or how extensively with rural electrification. The people are getting very insistent about it and are not going to be satisfied very much longer to put up with kerosene lamps. It is a little unreasonable to expect them to put up with it, and we have to provide far more electrification than we ever dreamed of in the past. And in that sense we did promise the people of Badger that electrification would be brought to them, and in the sense that it is part of the program, at any rate, I support this petition very much. On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Shoe Cove in the district of St. John's North, all hardy fishermen, about 35 of whom are petitioning for a new bridge, which is constantly washing out, year after year. It is at the entrance to the fishing stages, it is built of rock; and constantly gives trouble when needed most, in the spring fishery. All they have down in that particular section is a road which was built in the good old days of the long cart when you could turn a corner on two wheels. To get down that road with a half ton pickup to pick up fish, you take one swing to the right and back down a half mile and back into another stretch and go on down again. They tell me the fishery down there cannot be beaten in any section of this country. They cannot get to the fishery quickly enough.

Now, Sir, they give the exact figure of what the route would cost. For 150 bags of ce-

ment, \$600; Labour, \$391; a total of \$1,000. Of course, the bulldozer will straighten the road, which will cost about \$500, and the local road board would take care of the rest. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in laying this petition on the table of the house to be forwarded to the department to which it relates — which I don't know; the Fishery Department, the Federal Fishery Department or the Department of Public Works. They all could help if they get together and do a good job, and our fishery would be very much improved. On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Giving Notice of Motion:

LEGISLATION:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

A Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into an Agreement with Canadian Javelin Limited."

A Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into an Agreement with The Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation and Canadian Javelin Limited and provide certain Statutory Provisions for the same purpose."

A Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into an Agreement with the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, Canadian Javelin Limited and Wabush Iron Company Limited and provide certain Statutory Provisions for the same purpose, and to make certain Amendments to the Nalco-Javelin Minerals Act, 1957."

If I may, Mr. Speaker, so that the house will know the Bills in the net aggregate will give effect to the recent changes made in the characters of Nalco, and the changes that arise from that change in agreement between Javelin on the one hand and Wabush Iron, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Pickands-Mather and the Steel Company of Canada, for the development of Iron Ore in the Wabush Lake Section; and the still later agreement made between that group on the one hand and on the other the Iron Ore

Company of Canada, (consisting of M.A. Hanna & Company of Cleveland, Republic Steel, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, AMCO Steel and the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mine Company of Canada) to build jointly, a new railway from Mile 224, - 40 miles westward to Wabush Lake. All of this whole iron ore development will be covered in those agreements, which will be tabled together, and if not considered together, will at least be introduced by me in one explanatory speech, outlining the whole picture involved in the four statutes.

I am ready for second reading, I think, at almost any time. Tomorrow will be first reading. I think one of them is still in the process of drafting. The lawyers for all the companies are here, and they are supposed to be here or are due here to work with the Attorney General's Office to draft the final railway Bill. But for that one, I think they are all drawn up, and I am prepared, I think, to go ahead at any time. Then again, Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be better if, when the Bills are printed and presented to the house, that the house had them for some time so that the Opposition can have as long as they need to study them before we proceed with the debate.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Question No. 26 tabled by Mr. Keough. (See Appendix):

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I might say there are various questions which have not been answered. If possible we would like to get these answers tomorrow on account of the recess coming up.

Mr. Speaker: Will hon. Ministers concerned please note?

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, as far as questions addressed to me are concerned, I pass them on. I am not aware of having any that I have not handed to me, I pass them on. I am not aware of having any that I have not handed on to the house. Question No. 5. — I have already said, while I am quite prepared to give these reports privately to the Opposition they will not be released to any news paper or radio station. These deal

exclusively with economics and to reveal them to their competitors would be a highly unfair thing to do.

Mr. Hollett: We have to remember Government money is involved to a great extent.

Mr. Smallwood: That is true, to a great many millions of dollars. Still, I think the hon. gentleman will agree that our disinclination, and even our refusal to table the intimate details of these firms is a thing that would be very, well precedented. I think it is the practise of the Government of Canada, whoever may be administering that Government, to refuse the House of Commons certain types of information concerning certain Crown Corporations, on the grounds that these corporations although owned by the Crown are in fact in competition with other concerns, or for other reasons refuse to table certain types of information concerning them. In this case now, we are dealing with straight commercial concerns in and out of Canada, and to throw open (because we have lent them money) to the whole world all the intimate details of their internal affairs would seem to be a little unreasonable; the publication of reports which the Government, to serve its own purpose in attempting to make public policy, the reports that they had required this large American Company to make, to table them publicly.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): We can see these reports privately?

Mr. Smallwood: Certainly! But it has to be on conditions that are purely private. And I would be happy for the members of the Opposition to see these reports, so that, as public men and members of this house, they could satisfy themselves the Government has made a very genuine attempt to get one of the greatest firms in the world, Arthur D. Little of Boston, to get details and to advise us if we should be justified in lending more money to any firms which appear to have a fair prospect, with good prospects and with no prospects.

Mr. Duffy: May I ask the Premier if, in all cases, the Arthur D. Little recommendations have been carried out?

Mr. Smallwood: In every case. Now I say that promptly in reply — I am pretty certain that is so. I had a surprise today. One of the firms that the Arthur D. Little Company said we would not be justified in supporting any further with loans was the tannery at Carbonear. Today I had a visit from Mr. Dorn who came in. Frankly I did not know he was in Newfoundland. I would have assumed, if I had thought of the matter, that the tannery had closed and Mr. Dorn had gone off to try his luck in a larger part of Canada, instead of which I find that, though he has received nothing from the Government for a couple of years or so, he has not closed the tannery but is operating it — true on a smaller scale, but breaking even, employing some men, giving him a living and keeping the factory going.

Mr. Duffy: It might be a good idea to try that with some of the others.

Mr. Smallwood: As a matter of fact, as the Leader of the Opposition will discover, we have answers to the hon. gentleman's question to the Minister of Finance asking for the loans, and he will discover very few loans or advances have in fact been made to any of these companies for the past year. We have not reached, but we are getting within sight, of the point where we will not need to lend any more money to those companies. That will be a happy event when it comes. They are struggling along, and some of them making a little money or breaking even or losing so little it is not too serious.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): I am afraid I cannot accept the verdict of the hon. the Premier relative to any publication of the records of the Arthur D. Little Company. We have to remember there are some \$36 million owed to the Government, and that means the people of Newfoundland, by these various companies (or at least \$32 million). That is no small sum including interest and all.

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid I must inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition he is out of order. Answers, or non-answering of questions, cannot be commented on. Perhaps at a later time the hon. Leader of the Opposition may comment on it, but not now.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, surely if the hon. the Premier can get up and make a half-hour long speech on question he has not tabled and tell us certain things about it, then surely somebody on this side can say a word back.

Mr. Speaker: Not in answer to questions.

Mr. Hollett: Some other time! The money the government is paying money for people to investigate and the people can't find out. I am sitting down!

Hon. E.S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): In reply to the request for further answers to questions, I note one referred to by the hon. member, Question No. 24 on the Order Paper of yesterday. In that connection I checked with my department this morning. As the hon. the Premier has already stated, a very small amount need be added because the major part of this question has been answered before. However, I am happy to say it is in course of preparation, and it is my sincere hope I will have it for the hon. gentleman tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. W. Smallwood (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the speech in reply to the Speech From the Throne. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all the previous speakers who have taken part in this debate, and particularly such congratulations are in order, in my opinion, for the members of the Opposition. Sir, that recent development in the labour situation gave the Opposition a wonderful chance to blame the Government, but like true Newfoundlanders, as they are, they knew that this situation was above politics and acted accordingly. I think, Sir, that the speech given in this house by the Leader of the Opposition was one of the best I have ever heard here, and I have been here now for three years. I think, Sir, that the people who elected the four members of the Opposition can be well proud of their choice. These men, in my

opinion, are truly serving Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, in addition I would like to congratulate the member for Harbour Main (Mr. Lewis): on his excellent speech. It really surprised me!

Now, Sir, to get down to other matters. I would like to go back to the year 1956. During that year, I first had occasion to visit the district of Green Bay. That was in the summer of 1956, during the months of July and August. At that time, I travelled from one end of Green Bay district to the other, and in every community which depended upon the fishery for its livelihood everything was a hustle and a bustle, everyone worked. Then, Sir, as I made my way around throughout the various settlements, especially those which depended upon the forests, the situation was exactly the same. Every able-bodied man who needed work and who wanted work had the opportunity to get work. Then I progressed further north; down on the north shore of Green Bay, down around Tilt Cove, and there was a terrific amount of construction work going on. Mr. Speaker, I saw every available able-bodied man in Green Bay had the chance that year. I don't know what it was like in previous years but during 1956 every man in Green Bay district who wanted a job had it. As a matter of fact, Sir, there was so much employment in the district that men were coming in from surrounding districts and working in Green Bay. I visited the district again in the fall of 1956. The situation was the same at that time. It was during the election, and in the vast majority of the settlements there was hardly an able-bodied man over 21 to be found. They were all working, except, of course, in places where they depended upon the fishery for a livelihood, and even then, during the daytime the men were out fishing. I saw very, very few men in most of the settlements. Everyone was working.

In 1957, the situation had changed quite a bit, but during the year 1958 a really big change took place. During 1958, Sir, I was in Green Bay district, and in the vast majority of settlements during the winter. I was back again in April and once more during the summer and early fall. Well, Sir, I never saw such a change in my life, especially in the month of September. I went from community to community and everywhere I went, for the first time I really began to

meet the male voters of the district. In one sense I was happy to meet them, of course, but the reason, Sir, made me very sorry that I saw them, because they were home due to the fact that there was lack of work. That was why I saw them. In community after community that I visited in the fall of 1958, in most cases 95% of the able-bodied men were home without work — without any chance of work, and at that time without any chance even of obtaining seasonal benefits when it became available in the month of September. In place after place, I met men who had only three or four unemployment insurance stamps towards the 15 needed for seasonal benefits. Now, Sir, that situation in the month of September meant that, since the months of April, May, June, July, and August, and right up to the middle of September, hundreds of men only had three and four, and some were lucky and had eight and nine stamps, but the vast majority of these men at that time were not entitled to seasonal benefits which would be available in October; for the simple reason that, in over a six month period, they had not been able to procure 15 weeks work. I tell you, Sir, it was a grim situation.

Now, I understand that representation has been made to the Federal Government on behalf of the fishermen, so that despite the fact that they did not have the required number of stamps they would be able to obtain seasonal benefits. As you know, Mr. Speaker, 1958 was just about a complete failure in the fishery. Another thing I noticed, Sir, was that the number of fishermen in the district had increased considerably over the number back in 1957, and especially over the number in 1956. There were two reasons for this, Sir. One was the coming into effect of Fishermen's Unemployment Insurance. That, of course, gave hope to a great number of men who had left the fishery to go back. The second reason was that the number of jobs in the lumbering industry had greatly decreased. This, of course, forced them to go back to the fishery. One thing I did notice, Sir, was that these men who formerly had been fishermen, and who had in recent years abandoned it, at least temporarily, and were now forced to go back to the fishery, in most cases these men did not have the proper equipment. During the time that they had abandoned the fishery their premises had

gradually deteriorated, their boats had become useless and unusable. And, Sir, in a great number of cases these men could only go out with a jigger and jig the fish. When the fish got out into deep water they had to leave it. Of course I must admit that, in a good many cases, even if they had been able to follow the fish out, there were no fish to get.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition said here a few weeks ago — and I quote his figures — I believe they are right — he stated that approximately 100,000 Newfoundlanders today are either on relief or dependent upon unemployment insurance or other social assistance to keep them from starving. Now, with a population of somewhere in the vicinity of 450,000 people, this means, of course, approximately or slightly more than one out of every four people in Newfoundland are dependent upon Government assistance of one type or another, whether it be old age pensions, family allowances, unemployment insurance or sick relief. This is the situation, Sir, in 1958. It is far different to what it was back in 1956.

As I then visited the district in the summer months the great complaint, Sir, of the fishermen in Green Bay District was that there was only one bait depot in all the district.

Premier Smallwood: Where was that?

Mr. W. Smallwood: That was situated on the north shore of Nipper's Harbour. I would say Sir, that Nipper's Harbour is the largest fishing community in the district of Green Bay today. I do not know what it was in the past but it is today and has been since 1956; and the settlements immediately north of it depend exclusively upon the fishery. When you go further south and east, however, there are a large number of people who have to go, in some cases, 10 and up to 20 miles across the open bay, really out on the Atlantic, to get bait. Now, Sir, undoubtedly it is impossible for the fishermen to do that, because bait in the summer time is something that will not keep for any length of time. I am no expert on it but I can imagine, if a man went to the bait depot on Monday he would not be able to use the same bait on Wednesday morning. The great need, of course, is for a bait depot. Now in the central part of the district

even roads cannot help very much because Green Bay is so situated that there are many bays like Conception Bay where the road follows the coastal line. There are more indentations. They have really large bays in Green Bay district, New Bay, Seal Bay, Halls Bay, Green Bay and one or two more. I think the district of Green Bay is made up of approximately one-fifth or more of people living on islands. I don't think there is another mainland district with so many of its people living on islands. I do realize there are two more districts, the districts of Twillingate and Fogo, that have large island populations, but if I am not mistaken they have more on the islands down there than on the mainland. Sir, it is my understanding that during this current year the Federal Government are going to bring into Newfoundland seven mobile bait depots. I also understand, Sir, that approximately 40, I think it is, applications have been made, or if not applications, 40 places have been suggested where bait depots should be placed. I do sincerely hope that Green Bay does get one of these seven, because I must admit there is only a slight chance when only seven will be installed this coming year.

Now, Sir, there is one thing the Federal Government has inaugurated i.e., the building of community stages or as some people call them "fishermen's fish-landing wharves", because that is the purpose — to land fish on them. I think, that we are going to be a little more fortunate in that respect. In Green Bay, the Federal Government, I understand, have decided to build three, one at Leading Ticks, one at Long Island and the other at Brighton Island. There again, Mr. Speaker, this goes to show the large proportion of Green Bay which consists of islands. These three places are in reality islands. Fortunately, Sir, they are going to have these community stages. If we could only get one of these mobile depots, my understanding of these depots is that they are not freezing plants to freeze the fish, which is used as bait, but to hold the bait in after it has been frozen, which is really a holding plant.

Premier Smallwood: Why are they mobile?

Mr. W. Smallwood: I imagine, Sir, so that they can be moved from settlement to settlement. They can, in some cases, I think, be

placed aboard large trucks and taken from community to community, where there are roads.

Premier Smallwood: Would they be filled at a bait depot and taken from place to place, or would the bait be brought from a bait depot to the harbour where the holding or mobile depot happened to be? What is the point of their being mobile?

Mr. W. Smallwood: My understanding is, Mr. Speaker, they class them all as mobile, whereas in some cases they may not in reality be mobile. I think it is capable of being mobile and therefore, I think, they call them mobile. My understanding is that, in some cases, they can be built or constructed and placed aboard a large truck.

Premier Smallwood: Refrigerated trucks are a separate thing. All the trucks will be mobile. There are a few freezers that are perhaps mobile but are the holding units mobile and, if so, where?

Mr. W. Smallwood: I am not familiar with it, unfortunately. Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Fisheries could answer that question. I am sure he is in a much better position to do so than I am. I would suggest that. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1957 and in the spring of 1958 the long distance telephone line was constructed and brought into the town of Springdale. As you know, Sir, Springdale is the largest community in the district of Green Bay, and is situated approximately in the centre of the shoreline which makes up the district of Green Bay. I think, Sir, there are over 1,200 people living in Springdale. For the first time, in the summer of 1958, the people were given the benefits of long distance telephones. It was only today, Sir, that I was speaking to the Superintendent of CNT to construct a local telephone system in Springdale as soon as weather conditions permits. Although this long distance telephone system passes through the settlement of South Brook on its way to Springdale, unfortunately at the present time the people of South Brook are not able to use the long distance system. I was informed that as soon as possible this matter will be taken care of, and that possibly later on in the fall of this year, or maybe it won't be until 1960, CNT are going to

extend the long distance telephone system on from Springdale down to King's Point, Rattling Brook area and if possible over to Roberts Arm.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of electricity, of course, in Green Bay as elsewhere has arisen within the last few years. The Premier today said that it was the Government's intention to extend the lines from Rattling Brook (I take it the Rattling Brook he talked about is Rattling Brook out around Norris Arm, between Norris Arm and Bishops Falls). As you know, Sir, down in Green Bay district, we also have a Rattling Brook.

Premier Smallwood: We mean the present power house.

Mr. W. Smallwood: The electricity from this will be extended from Springdale down to Roberts Arm. Although I think this has been announced before, I am sure that the people of Green Bay district will be much pleased with that. In addition, Sir, on the eastern end of the district of Green Bay is the settlement of Point Leamington, which is approximately 16 to 18 miles from Botwood. It is quite a large settlement, Sir, and at the present time it is without electricity. I do suggest that the Government give it further consideration when they are extending the present system.

Now, Sir, a day or two ago the member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) mentioned the amount of roads which had been built in his district since 1949, and the number of people who in 1949 were isolated compared with the number of people today. Well, Sir, I don't know how many settlements in Placentia West have been connected up by road in 1949, but this I do know: In the district of Green Bay back in 1949, as far as I can make out, there were only two roads, one leading from the town of Badger to South Brook, and one leading from Botwood down to Point Leamington. That, as far as I know, was the total extent of roads in all Green Bay district, two settlements.

Premier Smallwood: Out of how many?

Mr. W. Smallwood: Well at that time, I guess, there must have been around 47 or 48 communities. About seven or eight communities have since then been com-

pletely abandoned, leaving around 43 communities today.

Premier Smallwood: How far apart would they be?

Mr. W. Smallwood: Well, following the coast line from Point au Bay to Shoe Cove, at least 1,000 miles, or nearly so. As a matter of fact, Green Bay has a terrific amount of coast line because, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there are so many bays, large bays. It is not like Conception Bay or Trinity Bay there on the map. These are just more or less one bay. But in Green Bay there are so many bays that I would say there is nearly 1,000 miles of coast line. As I said, in 1949 there was a total of two roads in all the district, at that time around 47 or 48 settlements. Today, Sir, over 21 of these settlements have been connected by road and most of the remaining settlements are unfortunately located on islands and of course it is impossible to get roads to them. So that on the mainland of Green Bay today there are, I think it is, 11 settlements still isolated with no road connections. Now a few of these have connections between each other. But, Sir, the vast majority of them are only a few miles from being taken out of isolation. Most of these settlements are in what is actually known as the Green Bay part of the Green Bay district — in other words, on the north shore, down around Middle Arm, Burlington, Nipper's Harbour down to Shoe Cove. That section contains most of the mainland section of the settlements today in Green Bay which are still isolated. As I said, Mr. Speaker, most of these would only take a few miles of road to connect one to the other. The main problem of course is getting the road in from Baie Verte itself down to LaScie and Tilt Cove. That would take care of the roads in the northern section of the district.

Unfortunately, Sir, on the eastern end of the Green Bay district there are large settlements and three or four small places close to these large settlements which are still isolated. The unfortunate part about these places is that in each case it will take 17 or 18 miles of road to bring them out of their location and in each case through completely empty country, and once the road gets there it would be a dead end right at the settlement. You cannot go along from one

to the other as they are out at the head of a long peninsula really. Out at the head are New Bay, Fortune Harbour and Cottrell's Cove which are at present connected to each other by about two miles of road and separated from the highroad system of the rest of the country by about 17 miles. The same situation applies to Leading Ticks, another large community, exclusively fishing, I would say, but for a few men working in the woods. It is a large fishing community with two or three smaller communities nearby on the mainland right opposite that. Again, Sir, it is a distance of approximately 10 miles to the highway. One thing I can say as far as I know every community which is still isolated in Green Bay at the present time has snowmobile roads leading to it.

Mr. Hollett: May I interrupt? Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member had related in any way the present economic situation in these what he calls isolated settlements? Is the economic condition of the people in these isolated settlements worse or better than those which have been connected by road? I am not referring to places like Springdale, but I mean ordinarily.

Mr. W. Smallwood: Well, in most cases I would say yes, although there are still large settlements in Green Bay completely isolated, such as Burlington and Nipper's Harbour, where the people, I would say, are, in comparison now with other isolated settlements of Green Bay, comparatively well off. Of course, if you compare that situation of being well off with St. John's or any mainland community, there is no comparison whatsoever, but I have found that isolation tends to deprive the people of the opportunity of making a living.

Mr. Hollett: Are the people of Fortune Harbour, for instance, worse off economically because of isolation?

Premier Smallwood: Yes.

Mr. W. Smallwood: Oh, definitely! I don't know why it is you picked on that settlement, but Fortune Harbour is a settlement which at one time was, I understand, one of the largest and most progressive fishing communities in the Notre Dame Bay area, and it was completely isolated, and still is.

But today, Sir, the situation is completely different. It must have happened back around 1954 or 1955, I don't know for sure. It was before I went down to Green Bay. The merchants pulled out of the settlement. There are no stores there, no shops. It has, Sir, one of the largest Roman Catholic churches I have seen in the country, except the Cathedral here at St. John's and in places like Carbonear and Harbour Grace. For an outpost it must have been at one time a prosperous place. But in 1956 I did not see an able-bodied man in the whole community, a place which was once exclusively a fishing settlement. All the men are now working in places like Buchans and Harmon Field, and some of these men seem to have left the fishery and gone mostly into mining.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, they are worse off than they were when fishing. Is that correct?

Mr. W. Smallwood: Well in some cases in Green Bay I have to admit that where the men have gone and the families are still in the settlement, where they have gone outside to make a living, they are worse off in some cases than the fishermen who have stayed home. That is true, yes. But I would say that with caution. I would not attempt to say that too quickly.

On motion of Premier Smallwood the house recessed for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. W. Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of where I was when I left off.

Mr. Hollett: Green Bay.

Mr. W. Smallwood: In Green Bay somewhere. Now, Mr. Speaker, getting right back to the road situation in Green Bay district. I figure, Sir, at the present time, whereas back in 1949 there were only two communities connected with Grand Falls by road, today there are over 21 taken out of isolation by means of highroads, and there are approximately 11 settlements on the mainland still isolated as far as roads are concerned. Now in the number of settlements which do have roads, the population, I think, would include slightly over two-thirds of the population of Green Bay. Of the islands; most of these islands, Sir, are in

a very short distance from each other and mostly all of them are within a very short distance from the mainland. There are, I think, six or seven islands altogether. Sunday Cove Island is the shortest distance from the mainland, approximately a quarter of a mile. Pilley's Island is no more than a quarter of a mile from the mainland. Opposite Robert's Arm, Triton Island is no more, even if it is a quarter of a mile from Pilley's Island and Brighton Island is no more than 200 feet.

Premier Smallwood: How deep is the water in these channels?

Mr. W. Smallwood: The coastal boat can come down through them. So that there you have four of the islands, all within a few hundred feet of each other, and the distance from the mainland within a quarter of a mile. There are two more — one is Long Island. This is not much more, if it is a mile from Pilley's Island. Then you have Little Bay Island, the most northerly island, which is no more than a mile from the headland coming out from Springdale, Halls Bay Head, on the east. Then you have Leading Tickles Island. Again, Sir, that is only a couple of hundred yards off from the mainland. Thus six of these islands it seems will never be taken out of isolation unless, of course, it would be possible to connect them all by roads with the mainland. Of course at present the people of Little Bay Islands have the choice of going into Wild Bight or into Little Bay or into Springdale and the people on Long Island, Brighton, Triton, Pilley's Island and Sunday Cove Island can all go to Roberts Arm and from there, of course, connect up right into St. John's, or at least they will be able to when the highway is finished through the National Park.

There are the remaining settlements on the north shore of Green Bay, where you have the greater number of settlements and the greater population. I think the people should keep in mind that, on the north shore of Green Bay, there are over eight settlements, and approximately 20 miles of road would take them all out of isolation, whereas on the eastern end of Green Bay there are three large settlements and two small ones and it would take approximately 40 miles of road to take these out of isolation. Once that is done, Sir, all the settle-

ments on the mainland of Green Bay will have been taken out of isolation, and will have been connected with the Trans-Canada Highway across the country. I think, Sir, this progress which has been made in 10 years in the district of Green Bay has been phenomenal.

Now, Sir, there is one thing which the people of Green Bay still may not realize. When I went down there in 1956, especially in those places which were isolated at that time, and I guess today you will still hear it in the places still isolated, it was always this: "Roads are always built on the Avalon Peninsula." Now, I think that is untrue because I have shown today what has been done in the 10 years in the district of Green Bay, and that is one of our most northerly districts in all of Newfoundland. There are only five districts more northerly, the two districts of Labrador and the two districts of White Bay, and, yes, northern part of the district of St. Barbe. So I think that any people who are still under the impression that all the road building is being done on Avalon can forget that, because, at least in the district of Green Bay, I have shown that within the period of 10 years approximately two-thirds of the whole population of that district have been taken out of isolation and have been connected up with every settlement of Newfoundland which is now connected up with the Trans-Canada Highway. Of course I realize that in the settlements which still have no highroads, as far as they are concerned (and maybe I would feel the same way myself if living in one of them) I know as far as they are concerned, no road has been built in Newfoundland until they themselves get that road. The Government may take 100 settlements out of isolation in this year 1959, maybe more and maybe less, but for the people who are still living in those settlements which will be isolated as of December 31, 1959, as far as these people are concerned no roads were built until they themselves get them. Now, I do say that, more than likely, if I myself were living in one of these settlements I would feel the same way.

Premier Smallwood: As a matter of fact, it only infuriates them to hear about the roads elsewhere.

Mr. Hollett: How would you feel if you lived there yourself?

Premier Smallwood: Green Bay? They don't know how to vote any way but Liberal.

Mr. W. Smallwood: I don't know if any other member said it, but when I went out to be elected, this I can guarantee you, during the election of 1956, the first time in my life I went to Green Bay, I went into certain communities where the people said to me: "Are we going to have a highroad? Are we going to have the road any time now?" I knew very little about Green Bay but I had looked at the map and saw where the roads were, calculated the distances from the isolated settlements to the nearest roads, and I told the people (this was before I was elected) if they elected me they would not be guaranteed they would get the roads, not simply by asking for it, I said "If I am elected I will be representing all of Green Bay and what I will have to take into consideration and what you would have to take into consideration if you were the member is, what road was the shortest mileage and would serve the greatest number of people. If you have two settlements, one with 100 people and another with 500 people, each needing a road 10 miles long, which do you think should get it first?" Then I would say to them: "It is unfortunate that you people live in settlements where there are only 100 people, needing 10 miles of road, and across the bay there are other settlements with 500 people needing 10 miles of road." That is the way I put it, Sir, before I asked them to vote. And I think that anyone using any reason, any justification, for building new roads, knows that the larger settlements should be taken out of isolation before the smaller. As I said, I know that on the north shore of Green Bay there are 11 settlements with very large populations and approximately 20 miles of road would take them out of isolation; and that in another part of Green Bay there are a few settlements that would take approximately 40 miles to take them out of isolation. It all cannot be done in the one year no matter how much you wish it. The way I see it, there is only one way to do it and that is to build the mileage of road to places where that mileage of road will serve the most people.

Mr. S. K. Smith (Port au Port): Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the previous speakers in congratulating the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) the proposer, and the hon. member for Carbonear-Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke), the seconder, on their splendid speeches in moving the Address in Reply. There is no doubt whatsoever in my mind but that the future of these two brilliant young men will be bright.

I am sure all Newfoundlanders were pleased when they learned that Newfoundland would be honoured with a visit from Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, and Prince Philip. We hope and trust that fair weather will prevail during Her Majesty's visit and that as many people as possible especially the children, will be given an opportunity to see Her Majesty. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked by the great loss of life in the "Blue Wave" disaster. It was one of the worst disasters in the history of Newfoundland. To the relatives of these brave fishermen who lost their lives — all Newfoundlanders — deep sympathy goes out and with it, our prayers that God will give them strength to bear their great loss.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of trying to elaborate on what has been said by the previous speakers about the loggers dispute. I fully agree with what they have said and the stand the members of this house have taken. However, I would like to join with the other speakers in congratulating the Premier for the able manner in which he has handled the situation. We know he has the vast majority of the Newfoundland people behind him, and we trust and hope that this dispute will soon end.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed by the speech from the hon. member for White Bay North (Mr. Lane), and especially his reference to the fisheries. I agree with what he said about getting the fishermen back to the fishery and that the fishery is the second largest industry in Newfoundland or should be. I know there are many Newfoundlanders on the mainland of Canada as well as in Newfoundland who would like to go back to the fishery, but have not got the money to buy the equipment to do so, and don't know how to go about getting it. I suggested in the last session of this house that someone from the Fisheries Loan Board should visit the fish-

ing settlements and tell the fishermen of such loans as could be arranged. The district which I represent is one of the finest fishing districts in Newfoundland, and all that is necessary is the equipment and the fishermen to catch the fish. Last fall and this spring, the herring fishery was a failure, not due to lack of herring but owing to storms of wind. The lobster fishery was ruined almost from the start, because gales of wind destroyed 90 percent of the lobster traps, and most of the fishermen had no insurance on their traps. The cod fishery, as I said last year in this house, is very plentiful. The cod fish came into the shore with the caplin and it is no trouble to see Americans and others catching them with bamboo rods.

Mr. Speaker, the fishermen in the district of Port au Port, on the Cape St. George shore and Port au Port Bay are particularly handicapped for want of harbour and wharves. I know surveys have been made and also recommendations have been made by prominent businessmen who are interested in the fisheries. I know this comes under the Federal Government, but I hope this Government will do all in its power to support the present federal member for Humber-St. George's (Mr. Batten), who is doing his best to get the work done. I would also strongly recommend that small cold storage plants for bait be set up on the Port au Port Peninsula. I think last year it was mentioned here that they were going to put salt sheds for the people to get their supplies of salt. Well, so far a person whom I know in Ship Cove, a merchant there, with two sons, had to truck salt from Curling, a distance of 80 miles. He had to take his codfish to Curling to ship, a distance of 80 miles. Well he still has a trap. What would happen if we had harbours, where they could take the boat and encourage the fishermen to come there and catch the fish instead of having to truck it on this one main highway, and the same applies to everything that goes from the Bill of Cape St. George (as my hon. friend (Mr. Keough) would say), to the head of the mainland.

In my humble opinion, the Port au Port has a lot to offer. Now that the unemployment situation is bad, if the men had the equipment to go fishing, and a harbour to shelter their boats, and electricity and a small cold storage plant, not only for the fishermen we have there but for others, it should be no

trouble to make a good living. Besides the fishery we have there good farming land, pulp wood, timber and so on, so that it should be no trouble whatever to make a good living. I recommend that the Government send someone to make a survey of the Port au Port Peninsula, to see first hand what it has to offer in regard to the fisheries and farming. I have no doubt if we could help the fishermen to go back to the fishery they would be glad to go because of the lack of employment.

We were very pleased with the way road work was done last summer, but we hope an early start this year will accomplish much more. In the district of Port au Port, the people have to depend on roads and roads alone. They have no railway. They have to truck all their goods to and from Stephenville Crossing or Corner Brook, a distance of from 150 to 200 miles.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that this year electric power will be made available for Port au Mal and the rest of the Port au Port Peninsula. We are fortunate because we can get the power from St. George's, and to complete the whole of the Port au Port Peninsula is only 41 miles, but from Port au Port to Point au Mal is seven miles; from Ship Cove to Cape St. George, 15 miles; from Lourdes to the mainland 14 miles; and from Lourdes to Black Duck 41 miles. That is by road. In fact, it could be cut much shorter. I feel that we have over 400 dwellings, which includes churches, schools, and other buildings, and I doubt if it would cost the Government anything to have this important work done this year.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word of praise to the town council of Stephenville for their splendid work. I watched and admired that energetic council, giving so much of their time voluntarily, and without compensation. The town of Stephenville has much to be proud of with its paved side walks, paved streets, water and sewerage, street lights, stop signs and playgrounds. I know the Government will give the same credit it has in the past, and do all it can in its power when asked for financial assistance. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. Ministers and staffs of all Government departments for their courtesy and help given me at all times.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate on the Address in Reply adjourned.

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act."

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally known that, under the Urban and Rural Planning Act, a Board was set up known as the Provincial Planning and Advisory Board. This Board, of course, is made up of senior officials of the Department of Mines and Resources, the Department of Highways and the Department of Health, and Mr. Albert Perlin. In addition to the general planning problems and corresponding work with other departments, the Board also exercises control over the sub-divisions of land, the protection of highways and the development of the localities known for natural beauty. Now, this Board, having all these duties to perform, is desirous of delegating or transferring some of its work to the director of the Planning Board. For that reason this amendment is brought in. Furthermore, the Board, having received numerous applications outside of the city of St. John's, finds it necessary for some authority to be given to the setting up of boards outside of the city. We have an amendment therefore, to cover that. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill. "An Act To Amend The Local Government Act."

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, at the present time this Act provides for the changing of a community established under the Community Councils Act into a Municipality provided, of course, the population is not less than 1,250. This amendment proposed to eliminate reference to population. Furthermore, we find in the election of councils, very often there are a full slate elected. Usually the member receiving the

highest number of votes administers the oath of office to the other councillors and then, of course, one of the councillors administers the oath to the first officer or officer who had received the highest number of votes. Now the amendment is to see that a Justice of the Peace or Commissioner of Oaths administers the oath to all the members of the council. Furthermore, there is an amendment whereby the Public Utility Act makes provision for the setting up of rates of water tax, rates charged to municipalities, but there is no provision in the Local Government Act whereby the municipalities are mentioned in it, so far as setting their rates according to the Public Utilities Act. So the advantage of this amendment is quite clear in this respect. There is another amendment, of course, which refers to the minimum property tax. The Minimum Property Tax now imposed under the Local Government Act is \$5.00, while the minimum service fee is not less than \$5.00, and not more than \$10.00. It is proposed by this amendment that the minimum property tax be not less than the amount imposed from time to time as a service fee. In other words, Sir, one will not exceed the other. These are the chief features mentioned in this Bill. There is one other amendment which makes provision for a tax on propane gas in addition to fuel oil and coal.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers Of the Nomenclature Board."

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is not a contentious Bill. It merely brings up to date the organization of the Nomenclature Board, which is a board designated by the Government for naming and renaming places in Newfoundland. The principal innovation is to tie in the Board with the Department, and for that purpose, the accent there is that there shall be seven members on the Board, one of whom shall be the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs, and he shall also be the Secretary of the Board. That is really the

only purpose of the Bill. This is an Honorary Board, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if some of the double names will be eventually renamed. We have "Herring Necks" and "Shoe Coves" all over the place. I suppose the hon. members will be busy for a while changing these names, or correcting them, because I know there is quite a lot of places in Newfoundland which have the same name.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday at three o'clock.

Friday, April 3, 1959
(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have to announce, with very great regret, that that Government of Newfoundland finds that the Government of Canada has once again violated a contract, a written contract, between that Government and the Government of Newfoundland; and that this Government intends to take all the legal action in court that we are able to take to ensure the enforcement of the contract. If my hon. friends opposite would take note of Chapter 86 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1952, "The Slum Clearance Act", Section 4:

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order constitute corporations, and every such corporation shall consist of such number of persons as shall be determined by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council who shall appoint them, one of whom he shall designate as chairman and one as vice-chairman.

"Every corporation constituted under this Section shall be known as "The St.

John's Housing Authority' and shall have and be bound by the powers and duties vested in and imposed on a corporation or body politic and corporate by Section 30 of the Interpretation Act, (Canada).

"Every member of an Authority constituted under this section shall hold office during pleasure and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make appointments to fill any vacancies occurring in the membership of an Authority. "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may vest in and impose on any Authority such powers, duties, and restrictions as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out any of the terms of an agreement made under Section 3 including without limiting the generality of the foregoing power to plan, construct and manage any joint housing project undertaken under any such agreement, power to acquire and dispose of in its own name any lands required for any such project, power to make, provide and lay out on any land held by its streets, sidewalks, firebreaks, parks and playgrounds, and to lay water and sewerage pipes through such land and power to enter into any agreement with any person, partnership, firm or corporation or with two or more of them.

"Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the Minister or an Authority may appoint and engage such clerks, accountants, engineers, surveyors, architects or other staff of any kind whatsoever as may be deemed by him to be necessary or desirable to carry out any of the terms of an agreement made under Section 3, and may fix their remuneration."

Under that statute, we appointed the St. John's Authority nine years ago. The present membership of the St. John's Housing Authority: Mr. Campbell Eaton; Chairman, an extremely well-known and highly respected businessman of St. John's; Councillor Geoffrey Carnell of the St. John's city council, vice-chairman; Miss Stella Burry, a social worker of the United Church, a member; Mr. Alex H. Crosbie, Director of A.H. Murray, one of the leading businessmen of Newfoundland; Mr. Paul Johnson, insurance agent; Mr. Hubert Kelly, contractor and Mr. John Murphy, merchant. The

St. John's Housing Authority consists of these seven. They serve without pay. They are the St. John's Housing Authority. Mr. John Murphy is a director of the Arcade, and I think a director of Halley and Co. I am not sure but I think he is. But he is a highly and extremely respected merchant of St. John's. The Housing Authority serves without any remuneration at all. I think that is correct.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Supply): That is correct.

Mr. Smallwood: And under this authority comes the management of the subsidized rentals and I suppose the economic rental housing built in St. John's by the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and the St. John's city council, jointly.

How came the management of these houses, built jointly as economic rentals and as subsidized rentals housing, to be under the control of the St. John's Housing Authority? By contract made with the Minister of Public Works of Canada. I am going to distribute copies (not of the whole contract) of the first page showing the day and date this agreement was made in triplicate. It is dated the fifteenth day of August, 1956, between Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, represented by the Minister of Public Works, here-in-after called the Minister (That is the Minister of Public Works of Canada) Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada of the first part and Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Newfoundland, represented by the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, here-in-after called the "Province" of the second part; and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, here-in-after called the "Corporation" of the third part. Those are the parties to the agreement, and it gives the date as August 15, 1956. Now I have had copies made of pages three and four, because they contain the relevant clauses: Clause 5 and clause 6. I am going to distribute these.

Clause 5: General: operation, management and administration of the rental housing units constructed pursuant to this agreement shall be the responsibility of the St. John's Housing Authority or such other local authority as may be ag-

reed upon by the Province and the Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "the local housing authority").

Clause 6: As the construction of each building or group of buildings is completed by the Corporation, and the housing units made ready for occupancy, the possession thereof shall be given to the local housing authority for control, operation, management and administration, pursuant to an agreement between the local housing authority of the one part, and the Province and the Corporation of the other part."

Now, I distribute these copies of the relevant parts of the contract, the front page because it shows the day and the date and the names of the contracting parties, including the Minister of Public Works of Canada and our own Minister of Municipal Affairs; and the other pages containing the two relevant clauses, which are clauses 5 and 6, saying the control and management and operation of these houses is vested in the St. John's Housing Authority. Do not confuse that with the St. John's Corporation, which existed long before Confederation and is another thing altogether and has nothing to do with this — the St. John's Housing Authority.

Now, Sir, on July 18, 1958, Mr. W. J. Browne, the hon. W. J. Browne, writing on Privy Council letterhead from Ottawa, wrote to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This is the original letter — I have not had copies of this made, as there was not time. It says:

"Dear Mr. Abbott: You may recall that the Hon. Howard C. Greene, Minister of Public Works, asked me to represent him in the selection of five appointments to fill vacancies on the St. John's Housing Authority." (The St. John's Housing Authority is a Provincial Board set up and created by the Newfoundland Statute, the Slum Clearance Act of 1952; and under that act the Newfoundland Government appointed the St. John's Housing Authority and has always done so since its creation and no one else has ever done so.) But suddenly, out of a clear sky, our minister received a letter from Mr. Browne informing him that Mr. Green, the Federal Minister of Public Works, appointed him, Mr. Browne, to represent him — in what? In the selection of five appointments to fill vacancies on the St. John's

Housing Authority. It is just as though I had written to Mr. Green to say I have appointed Mr. Pickersgill to represent me in filling appointments to fill some vacancies on some federal board appointed under authority of a Federal Statute, by a Federal Minister or by the Federal Cabinet.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): How many members were originally planned for the board?

Mr. Smallwood: Seven.

Mr. Renouf: Would the Premier mention whether these were federally suggested representatives?

Mr. Smallwood: "Asked me to represent Mr. Greene in the selection of five appointments to fill vacancies on the St. John's Housing Authority. Mr. P.S. Secord, the vice-president of Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation advised Mr. Clarence Powell, your Deputy Minister, on 22nd of May that I would be in St. John's between the 25th and 30th of June and I would call on you to discuss the appointments to the St. John's Housing Authority. Unfortunately you were absent when I called at your office on the 27th. I am sorry I missed you and did not get an opportunity to talk to you, however I did discuss the matter with Mr. Powell. I was surprised to learn, on my return here to Ottawa, that the appointment of Mr. A. H. Crosbie, Mr. John Murphy, Mr. Hubert Kelly, Mr. Paul Johnson and Miss Stella Burry to the Housing Authority had been gazetted by the Government of the Province before my arrival at all in St. John's."

The Government at St. John's would not even wait for him to get there to appoint members to its own board. The Housing Authority in St. John's acts on behalf of the Federal-Provincial partners. It is desirable therefore that the Housing Authority be representative of both the Federal and Provincial partners. Unfortunately, this is not the case with the St. John's Housing Authority. In other words, this provincial board is made up of members appointed by the Government of the Province, which is what the Statute requires.

Now he goes on to request further that two of the following be omitted from the ap-

pointments gazetted. He asks now that there be stricken off two of the four — Mr. A. H. Crosbie, Mr. John Murphy, Hubert Kelly and Paul Johnson; strike off two of these and as substitutes he requests that the following be appointed to replace the cancelled appointments: Mr. Otto Byrne, his campaign manager in St. John's West in the last election (in fact in both elections) Otto Byrne takes the place of Crosbie, or maybe of Hubert Kelly; and, then Mr. A. Butt, business manager of the "Daily News", Cowan Ave. When these two changes have been made the Housing Authority will be acceptable to the Federal Party — to Mr. Browne.

Now, while there would appear to be merit in confining membership on the Housing Authority to seven members (remember, Mr. Speaker, this letter is from the Federal Minister, Member of Parliament, the House of Commons, domiciled in Ottawa, writing to the Provincial Minister, offering, free of charge, advice and information as to what he thinks our provincial board should be, while there would appear to be merit in confining membership on the Housing Authority to seven members, you may feel the cancellation of two appointments recently announced is undesirable. To get those two friends of his on, it may be undesirable to strike off two of these others. He does not ask, he tells us which two to strike off. He says strike them from these four. He gives us the four: He says, keep two of your own appointments and two we want you to strike off. If you do not want to do that, increase the membership of the Housing Authority to include four additional members. If it is your wish to expand the Housing Authority rather than cancel, make the additional appointments of Mr. Byrne and Mr. Butt to the Authority, and also Terry Trainor, salesman, Victoria Street and Mr. Herbert Morgan, Lawyer, St. John's. Mr. Browne writes further: "I would appreciate confirmation from you that the seven member Authority has been re-arranged to include Mr. Byrne and Mr. Butt."

Mr. Speaker, I can only say he has the face of a "robber's horse." That is all. What else can I say about it? The man has the face of a "robber's horse". Only Billy Browne has skin that thick — thick as a rhinoceros.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr.

Speaker, may I ask what reply was sent? Even then you were not writing Ottawa?

Mr. Smallwood: Not writing Mr. Browne on that matter, that impertinent interference. On August 8, following, Mr. Browne wrote again. He tried it again.

"Dear Mr. Abbott: I wrote you on July 18 concerning the membership of the St. John's Housing Authority. I have not heard from you since then. I wonder if you had the opportunity to consider this matter and whether I may expect a reply from you soon? In the meantime I hope to be in St. John's toward the end of August and may have the opportunity of seeing you and discussing the matter with you further." He is nothing if he is not pertinacious. On August 25 Mr. Browne thought he would bring up some of the big guns, and a letter came from Mr. Greene, the Minister of Public Works of Canada. This was addressed to me.

Mr. Higgins: The big league now.

Mr. Smallwood: The big league now started. August 25th. This letter reads: "Dear Premier Smallwood: You are no doubt aware that at present there are in St. John's three housing projects consisting of 192 units, which are fully constructed and occupied, and in addition two projects of 192 units presently under construction. These projects are jointly owned by Federal and Provincial Governments with a Federal investment of three-quarters of the cost. The administration of the housing projects, involving the projects of partnership of approximately \$6.75 million to date has been of some concern to Provincial and Federal authorities. The Housing Authority which was appointed pursuant to Provincial legislation did not prove entirely satisfactory as administrators of the project" They did not prove entirely satisfactory. How did he know that? How did he know? He only came in a few weeks before that.

Mr. Higgins: No, he was there since June, 1957.

Mr. Smallwood: Alright, a year. "The province has recognized the need for improvement, and in this respect, I am told, recently replaced several members of the Authority." That was only because mem-

bers resigned. We did not push anyone off to make room for anyone else. They resigned or left the province. The former General-Manager of Imperial Oil went off to live on the mainland and we replaced him with Mr. C. Eaton, and so on. The Federal Authorities, however, are not entirely satisfied with these changes on this provincial Board. Mr. Green's letter continues:

"My colleague, the Hon. W.J. Browne, wrote to the Provincial Minister of Municipal Affairs in July suggesting some additional changes in the composition of the Authority. I am informed no reply has as yet been received from the Province. We have given very serious consideration to the steps we feel should be taken to improve the situation, and have concluded that, for the time being, active participation by both of the partners in the administration of the project is..." (He forgets there is a contract and not his whim nor opinion. What counts is the written contract. He evidently forgets that, however) — "We hope that arrangements might be made to bring this joint operation into effect not later than September 30th....".

I did not answer it. I thought it was an unwarranted and impertinent interference by this gentleman who had recently come into prominence as a minister of the Crown, unwarranted and impertinent interference with the authority and jurisdiction of the Government of this province. So that he wrote me again on October 2nd. — "Dear Premier Smallwood: I do not appear to have received a reply to my letter of August 5th with reference to the administration of the Federal Housing Project in Newfoundland. You may recall that in this letter I requested the name of the agency which would represent the Provincial Government to co-administer these projects in conjunction with the local officials of Central Housing and Mortgage." And to that I vouchsafed no written reply. He was not aware the matter was already covered in a written contract.

Mr. Higgins: He must be puzzled by this time.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, because he wrote again February 20th, no doubt not without a little prodding from the Minister without Portfolio. Mr. Browne wrote again: "You

will recall that some considerable time prior to June 1958 the Federal Provincial Partnership has been concerned about the administration of the Federal Projects in St. John's, Newfoundland, as a result of which it was decided some change in the membership of the St. John's Housing Corporation was desirable."

It was the first I had heard of it. I never considered it. It never came into our minds that any change was desirable. If it came into anyone's mind it was doubtless Mr. Browne's, and the only change he thought of was to put Mr. Otto Byrne and Mr. Terry Trainor on the membership of the authority of this provincial board. "In accordance with the customary procedure I requested my colleague, the Hon. W.J. Browne, to discuss with the Minister of Municipal Affairs the selection of new members for the authority. Mr. Browne phoned Mr. Abbott's office, and in the absence of the Minister discussed the question with the Deputy Minister, Mr. Powell. It was a great surprise to Mr. Browne and myself to learn the province had made substantial changes."

In the composition of its own provincial board! He does not say that. They dare not change the composition of any board up there now without our being consulted, I presume. Again, I did not answer! So then they answered with an advertisement in this morning's "Daily News". No, I am a little ahead of myself. They first sent a letter to Mr. Powell. Here it is:

CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION:

St. John's, Nfld.
P.O. Box 805,
April 1, 1959.

Mr. C. W. Powell
Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs
St. John's, Newfoundland.

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am instructed by my Head Office to inform you that the Corporation shall retain possession and administer the Federal-Provincial rental housing projects F.P. 5/54 and 6/55 with a total of 192 units.

It is proposed to charge the Federal-Provincial Partnership a fee of 5% of rentals earned for the management of these projects. This charge is to cover all overhead expenses such as Corporation office supplies, rent, telephone, heat, light and the salaries of Corporation office staff employed in the management of these projects.

In addition, the Partnership will be charged for the cost of any direct operating and maintenance expenses including.....

(Here there are a lot of details that do not really matter. The essential thing is:) "I am instructed by my Head Office to inform you that the Corporation shall retain possession and administer the Federal-Provincial rental housing projects..." (The Housing Corporation are going to take over and tear up the contract. Now this is the letter notifying us the contract is torn up. And in the "Daily News" this morning and, no doubt, in the "Evening Telegram" tonight, this advertisement appears:)

CENTRAL MORTGAGE & HOUSING CORPORATION ANNOUNCES

It is now accepting application for rental accommodations in two new housing developments.

192 apartments and houses will be available soon for families with children and for couples receiving old age security payments.

Units will be allocated only to families whose total income is within the range of \$80-325 per month.

Applications are to be forwarded to:

Manager:

Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation

Centre Building, Church Hill."

Now, all that this letter says they are to do, and this advertisement says they are to do, are in fact to be done according to the contract we have with the St. John's Housing Corporation — and by not even physically tearing up the contract but just ignoring it and removing the whole operation for these 192 houses from the body which they were under contract to have manage them....

Mr. Higgins: Mr. Speaker, would the Premier allow a question? Unless I am completely incorrect, the City of St. John's made available the land on which these buildings are to be put. It would be interesting — I do not know if the Premier could advise whether or not the St. John's Municipal Council received any notice?

Mr. Smallwood: Of the change of management? I don't know. The people behind all this, the people who rigged it (and I use the word rigged advisedly) are evidently unaware of the fact they are bound by a written contract, made August 15, 1956. They are unaware of that. They are unaware of the fact that the St. John's City Council is (morally at least) a party to this whole business, as they provided the land, and they ought to be notified of any change of management even if legally made. When illegally made, maybe they are ashamed to tell the Council now. I have already said we are going to take the maximum legal action open to us to take for breach of this contract.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): We have always understood in City Hall from His Worship the Mayor there is a third partnership. We are always looking for a parking lot in the central area — We always need it. We know it is all up to the tri-partnership—Federal, Provincial and City Council. We supplied the land, expropriated buildings.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a question?

Mr. Smallwood: It is a statement made in a questioning tone of voice, with a note of interrogation! Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am right in assuming that there is a personal grudge in back of all this. I do not know what is back of all this, but perhaps the hon. the Attorney General, who is much more familiar with this, and above all the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will care to amplify, to make subsequent statements by way of amplification of this whole thing.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the minister concerned with this information I should like, with your permission, to make some comment.

Mr. Speaker: It is in order.

Mr. Abbott: I would like to inform the house of the different concepts of the appointments to the Housing Authority: the concept of Ottawa and the concept of Newfoundland. When the Housing Authority was appointed in 1951, the men appointed to that authority were as follows: Mr. Powell, Mr. C. Crosbie, Mr. F. W. Ayre, Mr. Campbell Eaton, Mr. W. J. Ashley, Mr. J. C. Carnell and Mr. Earle. Mr. Powell, as the hon. Premier stated, was the chairman, and Mr. Powell, being a retired official or manager of Imperial Oil and his health not being very good, found it difficult to give adequate service to that authority, and for a long time the authority was more or less dormant. When I assumed the portfolio of Minister of Municipal Affairs, I discovered that the authority consisted really of my deputy minister, Mr. Crummey, and the deputy minister of Supply, Mr. Powell. People requiring apartments would simply apply to these two men, Mr. Powell and Mr. Crummey, and of course, they would decide who should receive the apartments. In a great many cases they were being pestered by, I would say, politicians, members of both sides.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, I pestered them lots of times, but was never provided with an apartment.

Mr. Abbott: I felt the authority should be taken out of the realm of politics altogether. I think hon. members will agree. I therefore set about to inquire from the gentlemen I named as to whether or not they intended to take active membership in this Authority. I did receive a reply from two or three members. I may say I omitted one name here, that was, Mr. Isaac Mercer, Q.C. He was a member of the old authority. Mr. Mercer was prepared to carry on as a member, but I felt that, being a member of this house, Mr. Mercer should not be a member of the Housing Authority. Mr. Leo Earle, having been engaged by the Provincial Government in the civil service, or having become engaged, I felt he too was no longer in a position to be a member of this authority. But I did approach Mr. Eaton and ask him if he would be prepared to take on the job of chairman of the Authority. After quite a bit

of consideration he did consent, and we two decided we would select men for the authority.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read an extract from the President of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation at Ottawa, the same Corporation now asking to take over. This is an extract from a letter. It was suggested to central Housing and Mortgage at that time that the Housing Corporation which we have here in St. John's would do both jobs but did not approve of anything of a political nature, and this is what the president said in his letter: "We have followed the policy throughout Canada of endeavouring to have, and at the same time it has been a cardinal principle, that members of the authority be independent of the three levels of Government concerned, so that they may operate the housing in their jurisdiction within the terms of reference agreed upon by the partnership and the minister involved. We think this principle has real value and therefore would not wish to depart from it..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that indicated very clearly that Central Mortgage and Housing disapproved of anyone on that corporation with political affiliations. For that reason, after the authority had been gazetted, I was very reluctant to have any disturbance whatever of that set-up, and without having included on that any political supporters or any supporters of a political party either in Ottawa or Newfoundland.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): What would the minister call Kelly and Murphy?

Mr. Abbott: At the time I did not know Mr. Kelly. As the hon. member knows, I only entered the political arena in 1956.

Mr. Higgins: The same year as Mr. Kelly.

Mr. Abbott: Was he a candidate?

Mr. Higgins: Against Mr. Browne.

Mr. Abbott: Whoever Mr. Kelly was, he was suggested to me as an engineer.

Mr. Higgins: And a good one — a competent man.

Mr. Abbott: He was suggested as an engineer and not as a political supporter. That

is why Mr. Kelly is on the Authority. I did not enquire into his politics. I may say, Mr. Speaker, this Authority was appointed by the Cabinet, and approved and gazetted in March, and the letter I received from the hon. Mr. Browne was in June; and it would certainly appear very ridiculous for me to have the name of any member of that Authority removed, after having been approved by the Cabinet and then, of course, gazetted. — to have someone removed from the list, some way.

Mr. Speaker: Ministerial statements are not debatable. However, the hon. Leader of the Opposition may reply to the ministerial statement.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I may say it was only this morning that this agreement made between Newfoundland and Canada was brought to my attention. It had, of course, been brought to my attention when signed in 1956. And I might say it is only one of two agreements, which are almost identically worded. This agreement that the hon. the Premier referred to is dated August 15th, 1956. This is No. 6. There is another one known as No. 5, which would be dated previously.

Mr. Abbott: The 26th of May, 1955.

Mr. Curtis: So there are two agreements, but each of the agreements is identical on the points referred to by the Premier. Section 5 of this agreement and the corresponding section of the other agreement reads as has been circulated: "Control, operation, management and administration of the rental housing units constructed pursuant to this agreement shall be the responsibility of the St. John's Housing Authority, or such other local housing authority as may be agreed upon by the province and the Corporation (hereafter referred to as "local housing authority")."

Now then Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of that and my feelings as a lawyer in the house is that under this agreement, unless there is some other local housing authority accepted and agreed to by both parties, that the parties responsible are the St. John's Housing Authority. I think that is clear from the wording. And the agreement further goes on to say that as the construc-

tion of each building or group of buildings is completed by the Corporation and the housing units made ready for occupancy, the possession thereof shall be given to the local housing authority for control, operation management and administration, pursuant to an agreement between the local housing authority of the one part, and the Province and the Corporation of the other part.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is in my opinion no doubt at all but that this agreement is a binding agreement, binding on both parties. And I have today given instructions to my subordinates that an action shall be immediately taken against the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the Minister of Public Works, asking for a declaration and injunction; because I consider this advertisement in this morning's paper and the letter referred to are both breaches of a contract made between Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada and Her Majesty the Queen in right of Newfoundland. The action, of course, will have to be taken against the minister.

Mr. Higgins: The Exchequer Court again?

Mr. Curtis: I think, Mr. Speaker, we can bring this before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, but that is a matter we need to be sure of, and if we are to have many more of these braches of contract we need a fourth judge. I am beginning to wonder whether any agreement we have with Ottawa is worth the paper it is written on. Newfoundland has undertaken to contribute \$500,000 towards this proposition: 192 units at \$12,000 — we pay 25%. I think you will find that comes to over \$500,000 and under the terms of the agreement made we were the management, which was to be entrusted to a local body, not a Federal body. So we are in the position now of just being told by Ottawa where we get off — and we are not going to take it.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Take it or leave it!

Mr. Curtis: We will take it kicking — We will fight it.

Mr. Higgins: How many Cabinet ministers are in Ottawa? About 22?

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Browne said he could not ram his opinion down the throats of 20 colleagues.

Mr. Higgins: There are not many left to sue. Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. gentleman, while he is on his feet, just how far is the construction of these housing units? I understand they are almost ready for occupancy.

Mr. Curtis: I understand that is the position.

Mr. Higgins: What about the people already promised by the other authority? People who were told by the other authority they could move in.

Mr. Curtis: That is the point I was trying to remember when my hon. friend was good enough to interrupt. The idea of the Newfoundland Government is that all these units should be co-related and not acted upon by a separate body. No. 2 was a subdivision of land only. That is out of the picture, but Nos. 1, 3, and 4 have been dealt with by this committee; and I know in all conscience they are the best people to handle it, and handle Nos. 5 and 6, because they are carrying out a uniform scheme, which will take into consideration the schemes which have been acted upon before. I think the house will agree, without question the proper authority to administer Nos. 5 and 6 are the ones under question now, those that have been handling the other four.

Mr. Higgins: And the people given accommodations in the present units by the present authority — what is going to happen to them? A man is told by the present authority he is going to have a house in September and makes plans accordingly; and now he is not going to get it.

Mr. Curtis: All we can do is refer him to Mr. Diefenbaker. He has taken the power out of our hands. Up to the present times, as you know, the houses were apportioned under certain terms and conditions. Instructions were given by the present Government to the effect these houses should be made available in certain cases only, when there was another unit being demolished. In other

words, in the Nos. 5 and 6 project, 192 units were to replace units that were being taken down. It was a part of a definite slum clearance. But, you see, Mr. Speaker, that has been dropped in the advertisement. The 192 houses and apartments will be available to families with children and receiving old age security payments etc. There is nothing there about tearing down.

Premier Smallwood: It is an abandonment of the Slum Clearance scheme.

Mr. Curtis: It is as the Premier says, a complete abandonment of the plan of the Government, agreed to with them for slum clearance. The local Government authority is solely responsible for who gets the houses.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): What responsibility has the Provincial Government in this, apart from the 25% of the cost?

Premier Smallwood: All in pursuance with the slum clearance program. We have the best slum clearance program in Canada — the best. This Act is the first Act passed by any Government of any province of Canada. The other provinces copied our Act. We had the original Slum Clearance Act of all Canada. We were the first province of Canada which availed itself of the new federal slum clearance legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition:

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time someone gets on his feet and says something, not cross-conversation about this thing. There was a letter sent by a member of the Privy Council (Mr. Browne) to the Minister of Supply on July 18. So far Mr. Browne has not been honoured with a reply from the Minister of Supply. Other letters followed, one on August 8th and again to the Minister and still he did not deign to reply to a member of the Cabinet in Ottawa. Then there were other letters: August 25 to the hon. the Premier and October 2 to the Premier and February 20 to the Premier and not one of these letters merited, apparently in the opinion of the Provincial Cabinet, a reply. What is the situation? Central Mortgage

and Housing is putting up units and paying 75% of the cost. The Federal Government is paying 75% of the cost, and all Mr. Browne's letter asked at the time was that there be representation of the Federal Government placed on the local authority. Simply because the Liberal Government here did not want anything other than liberals on that Board, on that Housing Authority, they did not deign to reply to Mr. Brown or anybody else. Now the houses are built. Hundreds of people have no place to live and are making application to Central Mortgage and Housing; and they have preforce, therefore, to take matters into their own hands and say: "Very well, you apply and we will see what we can do about it." That is all they have done. I do not see any breach of contract. It is true Section 5 says control, operation, management and administration would be placed in the hands of the local authority. That does not mean to say that Central Mortgage and Housing has not the right to say to John Jones or Mary Smith —

Premier Smallwood: Yes, it means exactly that.

Mr. Hollett: They ought to have the right — the Federal Government puts 75% of the money in. Surely they ought to have some say as to who should or should not go in there — but the Liberal Government says "No".

Premier Smallwood: They contracted not to have any say.

Mr. Hollett: The Liberal Government says: "No, you must apply to our Board."

Premier Smallwood: The contract says that.

Mr. Hollett: I know, but no one has been living up to contracts, no one. The Authority consists of Eaton, Carnell, Burrage, Crosbie, Johnson, Kelly, Murphy — Well they are not "PC's" I can assure you.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Good citizens.

Mr. Hollett: You keep quiet.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I reserve that right.

Mr. Hollett: Over the past several years I have had on many occasions to apply to that very Board, and various members of that Board to consider the application of so-and-so to live in certain of these houses. Not once yet have I been successful in getting any person in. It looks rather fishy.

Premier Smallwood: Should politicians have any say in the matter?

Mr. Hollett: No they should not.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Browne wants to have a say.

Mr. Hollett: This administration on the other side is so long in power they think they have to have their fingers in every pie ever mixed, and now they find someone else in the Federal Government in Ottawa who might put a finger in and they don't like it. And on every occasion — use the Supreme Court, because the Federal Government interferes. It is lovely, fine, but making asses of us here. I am speaking as much in favour

Premier Smallwood: The hon. member is speaking for his colleagues?

Mr. Hollett: I am speaking for myself, they will have opportunity later.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader is speaking as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Hollett: My colleagues will have the opportunity when the vote comes down for housing, whatever it is. I say now we ought to go slowly with these writs against the Federal Government.

Premier Smallwood: And let them ride rough-shod over us?

Mr. Hollett: They always did, even when the Liberals were in power. They always rode rough-shod.

Premier Smallwood: No one broke a contract. We would have sued them just as quickly if they had.

Mr. Hollett: Not at all. You would not have even tried to sue them. Lots of things were done, lots of things were not done, and left undone that should have been done by the Federal Government.

Premier Smallwood: That is true! Both are true!

Mr. Hollett: In connection with fisheries and everything. What was done in regard to marketing? Nothing at all, even though this Government asked them to do it. There was no talk of rights then. I say, be reasonable. This silly little thing — All it appears to be is an advertisement — asking people.

Premier Smallwood: What about the letter? The letter tells the story — that is more than an advertisement in the newspaper, telling us they are taking over the running of the housing. They have signed a contract that the Housing Authority will do it; and they have done it for eight years. Now they have torn up the contract.

Mr. Hollett: They say: "I am instructed by my head office to inform you..."

Premier Smallwood: But the contract says the Housing Authority shall administer housing.

Mr. Hollett: Well, Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Government cannot get a reply from a cabinet minister here, what are they going to do? They paid 75% of the cost.

Premier Smallwood: They knew that when they made the contract.

Mr. Hollett: That does not give an excuse for the Government to ignore them.

Premier Smallwood: If we ignored every letter from them up to now, they still have to live up to their contract.

Mr. Hollett: Try to make them do it! What about the people waiting for houses? Are they to be kept out until the Supreme Court decides?

Premier Smallwood: What do we do, allow them to break their contract, and do nothing?

Mr. Hollett: Trying to keep 192 people out of homes in St. John's simply because of being peeved by some cabinet minister in Ottawa!

Premier Smallwood: Simply because they broke a contract. Is that so light a thing?

Mr. Hollett: Let it go ahead and put the people in.

Premier Smallwood: Let us break the contract.

Mr. Hollett: So used to breaking them, and not only them — every Government up there. This Government will break them too. Let us do what we are going to do in the interest of those people looking for houses, out in the cold practically. Let them get a place fit to live in. It is now going to be held up over a technicality, brought about, I say, by the neglect of the Minister of Supply and the hon. the Premier in failing to reply to a letter which was written by the proper authority at Ottawa.

Premier Smallwood: An impertinent letter.

Mr. Speaker: Where is the other statement?

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, the hon. Sir. Albert Walsh died in December past. This left a vacancy on the Supreme Court bench, which, when full, consists of three judges: the Chief Justice and two puisne judges. The filling of this vacancy is the responsibility of the Prime Minister of Canada, the Government of Newfoundland having nothing at all to do with the matter. The Prime Minister of Canada has not to this moment recommended the appointment of anyone to fill the vacancy, and the court still has only two of the three judges it is supposed to have.

Several times throughout the past winter, in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister has been asked when he intended to fill this vacancy in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. His answer on each occasion was that he hoped to do so soon, or quite soon. Then, a week or so ago, the Prime Minister gave a new twist to his answer when he said that he hoped that Mr. Pickersgill would use his influence with the Govern-

ment of Newfoundland to get the Newfoundland Government to proclaim a certain piece of legislation enacted by this house a couple of years ago. This is a piece of legislation which, if the Government of Newfoundland proclaims it to be law, will create a fourth judgeship, or one more than our Supreme Court has ever had in its history. The Newfoundland Government have not seen fit, to this moment, to proclaim the Act in question that would create the fourth judgeship. The Prime Minister's latest statement goes still further. He told the reporters in Ottawa yesterday, as he came out of a Cabinet meeting, that he would appoint the third judge as soon as the Newfoundland Government proclaimed the law creating the position of fourth judge.

This is, of course, an inexcusable attempt by the Prime Minister to interfere in a matter of strictly Provincial jurisdiction, a matter that affects the Legislature and Government and people of Newfoundland, and one over which the Prime Minister has not authority at all. In effect, what he is saying is that he will fulfil his duty to Newfoundland if certain conditions are met, conditions which he presumes to lay down. He will appoint the third judge, and fill the existing vacancy, if the Government of Newfoundland will accommodate its policy to suit his purpose.

I take this opportunity to inform the Prime Minister of Canada that it is one of his business at all whether we proclaim this Act or not. The Government of Newfoundland will make this decision, and make it without any help or advice from the Prime Minister. I tell him now that the Government of Newfoundland will not proclaim this Act creating a fourth judgeship until after he has unconditionally discharged his duty to fill the existing vacancy. I give no promise that we will proclaim the Act even after he has filled the existing vacancy. We will not be bullied by Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I need say after such an emphatic declaration by the Premier. But I would like to point out, and I was about to ask a question on the Orders of the Day: On June 12, 1957 the Judicature Act was repealed and the following substituted therefore:

"The Supreme Court shall be composed of a Chief Justice and three other judges,

who shall be registered barristers of the Province, of at least ten years standing" etc. etc. But, under Section 13 — section 2 (the one I just read) the legislation shall come into force on a date to be fixed by proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Now, we would all like to know, and the whole of Newfoundland would like to know, why the Act has not been proclaimed. That was on the first of June, 1957. I take it that the Prime Minister of Canada is not in duty bound to appoint a judge or Chief Justice until he is quite ready to do it any more than the present administration in Newfoundland are compelled to proclaim this particular Act or any particular section of the Act. I don't think, however that any credit would go either to the Government, here nor the Government at Ottawa, for dilly-dallying and fiddling around over a silly thing like this. It is not silly in one sense of the word, but silly to be fooling around with this Act which was passed in June, 1957, and definitely states the composition of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland shall be composed of a Chief Justice and three judges. Why is it held up?

Premier Smallwood: It is not law yet.

Mr. Hollett: Why is it held up? Why not proclaim it? Will the Premier or the Attorney General tell the house right now why the proclamation is held up? The salaries are paid, I understand, by the Federal Government. Why is it that this Act is not proclaimed? Why cannot another judge be appointed? Will the Government make a statement on that, as to why they have refrained from doing it? I ask the Government now, Sir, in replying to the statement made by the hon. the Premier, will the Premier or the Attorney General tell the country of Newfoundland why this Act has not been proclaimed and why we have not had a fourth judge since June 12, 1957?

Premier Smallwood: I can only say in reply: If the Prime Minister of Canada persists in depriving Newfoundland of the third judge, such as we have had since 1825, then we will not proclaim this Act, if it takes a week, a month, a year or as long as he is in office. We will not be bullied by Mr. Diefenbaker. If we had been on the very trembling

edge of proclaiming this Act, it would be withdrawn rather than be bullied. I will answer that question after Mr. Diefenbaker fulfills his duty to carry out the law as it is. As the law is, it says there shall be three judges, a Chief Justice and two puisne judges. That is the law, the only law there is is that one. And that law requires the appointment of a third judge. After he has fulfilled his duty to Newfoundland, after he has appointed the third judge, then I will answer the question as to whether or not we will proclaim the Act and make it law, creating a fourth judge. But first let us get filled the vacancy there is before we talk about another vacancy.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, if I may say one more word — I do not think the people of this country should be allowed to suffer because of the battle of personalities going on at the present time, and wish it would cease right now.

Mr. Speaker: I may say, I allowed the hon. the Premier to speak a second time because the hon. Leader of the Opposition yielded the floor to the Premier and therefore has a right to speak now.

Premier Smallwood: Of course, Mr. Diefenbaker could resign.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

MINIMUM WAGE:

Hon. C.H. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House a report on matters transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1958, according to provisions of the Labour Relations Act and report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for 1958 and report of proceedings of the Minimum Wage Board established under the Minimum Wage Act, covering the year 1958.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Question No. 3 tabled by Mr. Curtis. (see appendix)

ORDERS OF THE DAY: LEGISLATION: NOTICE OF MOTION:

Hon. the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

On motion Bill Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement with Canadian Javelin Limited."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement With Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited and Canadian Javelin Limited, and To Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For the Same Purpose."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement With Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, Canadian Javelin Limited, and Wabush Iron Company Limited, and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For The Same Purpose And To Make Certain Amendments to the NALCO-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

The Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Labour Relations Act."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time presently by leave of the house.

On motion the house recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

LABOUR RELATIONS ACT:

Mr. Speaker: Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Labour Relations Act." The house will recall that it was ag-

reed, by leave, that this Bill should be read a second time at this time.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, we are between two minds as to whether we will move the second reading of this Bill or not. At this very moment it is touch and go whether we move it or not. In absolutely good faith, we gave notice of it. I suppose I ought to go forward, moving the second reading. But in the meanwhile, Mr. Claude Jodoin, the head of the CLC, promptly rushes in to announce that — he does not say this house, or this Government, but that I, personally, am bowing to pressure. Now, the only pressure there has been that we have paid any attention to at all, is advice given to us by Mr. Pickersgill. I say that quite frankly. Mr. Pickersgill, together with the four friends from Newfoundland in the House of Commons has backed this house's stand strongly in this affair, and without reservations, but he did say when he came down here: "If you make one simple change in just one part of your Act, the one dealing with gangster unions, run by criminals, the white slavers and dope peddlers, murderers and extortioners and embezzlers and perjurers, that kind of union — we all know what union it is — in connection with that, just one clause — if you make just one simple change, that the judge of the facts of the case be the Supreme Court, that one simple change, that the judge of the facts would not be the cabinet. The cabinet may indeed disband the union — that it is guilty should be in the hands of the Supreme Court."

Now there never was and never has been the slightest chance in this world by this house, or anyone in this house, that it would ever be used except against a criminal union, a union admittedly, obviously criminal. But that is the advice of a man whom I regard as my friend, and I passed that advice on to my own friends. And in this matter we have all been friends together, and passed it on to the Opposition. They may not be particular admirers of Mr. Pickersgill — I don't suppose they are. He is an able man, nevertheless I think he is sincere in this. I think he has given what he believes is good advice.

Therefore, what the amendment does is this: It says that where the Attorney General of Newfoundland goes into the Supreme Court and produces evidence of a type and

in an amount that satisfies the Supreme Court that this is a criminal union, a substantial number of whose superior officers or agents or representatives have been convicted of any crimes such as trafficking in narcotics, etc. and the Court so declares, then, but then only, will the Lieutenant-Governor in Council take action.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Is that not just a matter of checking the records?

Premier Smallwood: It is left entirely to the court to determine the nature of the evidence they want themselves, not what the Government wants, the Attorney-General wants, but what the court wants as evidence. It is left in their own hands and they determine exactly what they want. Anyhow, once the court so declares upon the evidence that has been put before it and it is its own judge of what evidence they want and will have — and having gotten what it wants, if it then so declares, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may as from such date as he sees fit, ("may or shall") decertify the union in Newfoundland, that is such a union, or is a branch of such a union or group of unions. Now, as I say, no one in this house feels a bit over-awed by any mainland propaganda. We do not feel subdued in the least. We do not feel frightened nor subdued nor influenced nor over-awed by what Mr. Blank says, only to repeat "Well, he had better not say it too freely or we will bring in another one before the session is over, bring in more repealing legislation. We are not being frightened by any Mr. Blank or any Mr. Anyone. I won't mention any names. I do not want to offend anyone. We are not being frightened by anyone. We think we are acting on behalf of Newfoundland and in the best interest of the people of this province. And our responsibility here in this chamber is a responsibility that begins and ends with the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Cape Spear and Cape Bonavista and Cape Norman and Cape Ray and the Labrador Peninsula. We are answerable to the people of Newfoundland. The authority we get we get from them. We must answer to them for what we do. So, we do not need to be frightened when the machine starts grinding and the wheels of that machine start whirling, and they start pressing buttons, 7B, 7C and 7D and telegrams start whirling out. That

does not scare or impress us in the least. It is on that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Now, I wonder if it is asking too much to ask the representatives of the press and radio to take note that this amendment is an amendment to only one clause of a whole series of clauses that were enacted here earlier in this present session; only one clause, the one dealing with criminal, gangster unions. The power to dissolve them is still here. The power to wipe them out is retained, but the procedure for doing it is changed by having the Supreme Court constituted the judges of the fact — but the action is still taken by the Government.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, in this particular thing we might almost be considered part of the Government because we supported this legislation brought in here and it would perhaps appear that we ought to support this particular amendment. Speaking personally, and I believe I speak the mind of my colleagues (at any rate they will have an opportunity for saying otherwise): in the first place I object to it (the amendment) on the grounds it seems to me to be unnecessary — an unnecessary burden to be placed on the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, like all Supreme Courts, generally, takes a very long time to consider the pros and cons and sometimes a year or six months goes by before a decision can be reached. Now this legislation was provided in order to preserve the dignity of man, to persevere that, in Newfoundland, no union would be allowed to operate, the majority of whose heads or officials had been convicted of heinous crimes. Surely to goodness that should not be offensive to anybody in this world.

Premier Smallwood: Who is to be the judge of the heinous crimes or the number of the crimes?

Mr. Hollett: The Act says, as so passed: when it has been proven that the majority have been convicted. Well, convictions are registered. All convictions are registered. And there is no reason why the Government can't secure a certified copy of a conviction in any court, in most countries at any rate. And so I see no reason, therefore, why

the burden should be placed on the Supreme Court. That is only one thing.

As a full-blooded Newfoundlander (I hope) I would hate to do anything in this house which would give aid and comfort to these people on the mainland. And I do not give a hang who they are, Mr. Speaker, and what walk of life they are, whether members of a union or members of a cabinet. I hate the idea of passing legislation and then making an amendment which appears, on the face of it, and is broadcast across Canada, in such a way as to give aid and comfort to the critics of this Government, and in that sense I speak of Government and Opposition, on this particular Bill alone. No. 2: I would hate to lend my voice to an amendment which would give aid and comfort to any body anywhere when I think that we did the right thing in the first place — and we would not have voted for that thing in the first place if we had not thought it was the right thing.

Premier Smallwood: Only say the word and we will pitch it out. I do not want to go one inch in this without the ready, and glad, and willing consent of the Opposition. I do not want to part with them for one inch, nor a fraction of an inch, on this whole question of this great labour dispute in Newfoundland. So far we are as one body here, only divided physically; in spirit there is no division at all between us.

Mr. Hollett: There is just one thing I would like to mention because it has humour, and if I do not have a little humour I do not enjoy myself. The humourous part is this: This man in the Privy Council, what is his name? This man, without portfolio, would presume to give advice to one of our local cabinet ministers — Now we are informed by the hon. the Premier that the very presence of an amendment here today is the result of advice of his friend, the hon. Jack Pickersgill. Now I do not think that Mr. Pickersgill ought to be allowed to influence legislation in this house too much. But, after all, I am glad to know that even the Premier would listen to a cabinet minister on some occasions.

Mr. Higgins: Yes, he was a full-fledged cabinet minister.

Mr. Hollett: That is right, but not now. I don't see any reason why we should, Sir, and I am sure we have the support of my colleagues when I say we do not intend to support this legislation, and if the hon. Premier wishes to withdraw it we will be very happy.

Premier Smallwood: Then, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues here feel as I do, we withdraw it. We have got to find out whether they do or do not agree with the Opposition. I know I do. Will we withdraw the Bill?

On motion Bill rescinded and withdrawn from the Order Paper, by unanimous consent of the house.

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber East has the floor.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, following a time-honoured custom I too wish to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I notice too, Sir, we are going to have a visit this summer from Her Majesty the Queen and His Royal Highness Prince Philip. I am very glad their visit to our province will take them to the town of Deer Lake and down through the beautiful Humber Valley. My colleague from Humber West (Mr. Ballam) always says we are as one. I am sure, therefore, he won't feel offended that the Queen's visit touches only on the District of Humber East and not on Humber West — and I extend to him a hearty welcome to be with us in this way.

Mr. Speaker, tragedy seems to be a part of our lot in Newfoundland. We had in my district the tragedy of the little settlement of Cormack, where three people lost their lives by fire. And now again, down on the South Coast, the tragedy of the loss of life on the "Blue Wave". I speak for all in the District of Humber East, indeed I speak for all Newfoundlanders when I say that those of us left behind mourn the loss and mourn the tragedy and mourn the conditions of the livelihood which cause our men and our young boys to engage in such hazardous work. I know that, if our prayers are any comfort to the bereaved, they have them at this time from all of us. Mr. Speaker, I can-

not now but wonder how often, when people as soon as they have expressed sorrow, feel they have done their duty.

I know that in this house last year I mentioned the struggle for the right to represent the loggers interests. It fell on deaf ears. No reporter in any local paper reported it (and we cannot blame the mainland papers for not reporting that either — we must be fair about it) and there was nothing done in this house about it, while a disgraceful condition of unrest and discontent existed within our local loggers unions. I make no excuse, Mr. Speaker, I say that the conditions of our local unions in the woods were deplorable, yet nobody took an active concern, an active interest. We saw the whole economy of this island threatened and, yes, it would have been ruined but for the brave action of this House of Assembly.

Now we have our fisheries. I sit in this house as a young member and a new member and listen to hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars being poured into these fish plants. I think we should make a law that no member, sitting here, should ever be on a board of a fishing organization. Everyone then probably would not be so enthusiastic about it. Because I think the whole concept of the fishing business has been lost. We have lost the whole concept of what is needed, Mr. Speaker. What is needed is a better way of life for our fishermen — a little pot of gold at the end of the rainbow for our fishermen, and not for the directors of fish companies. What we need is a fund. (Mr. Speaker, I know I speak your sentiments. You come from that great district down in Fortune Bay). What we need is a fund to assure the fisherman that he is going to have something to look after him if his equipment is lost, or something to enable him to carry on the fishery when unforeseen disaster over which he has no control strikes. Granted we have these in slight measure, but in reality they just scratch the surface. All we are doing is scratching the surface.

We hear of labour unrest, and the rights of labour, the rights of loggers and the rights for workers for minimum wages. What minimum wage has the fisherman in Newfoundland? What guarantee has he when he leaves to go to the inshore fishery or on the banks that he is going to get a decent day's catch? He has no assurance what-

soever — freezing nights in the wintertime, strong currents, strong tides and the losing of his nets and twines and gear. Nobody seems to wonder, though everyone is concerned. We have to look after the Arthur Monroes, and the Pennys & Sons, and look after the Lakes, and all the rest of them. I have not made a thorough study of it, but what appears to me from what I have seen and read, Mr. Speaker, is this: What we have done by lending money to the fish plants in this province is we have provided an escape hatch, so that the directors can retire with a fair bounty when the going gets tough or the road rocky. Think! Before we did this sort of thing, did we hear tell of fish plants closing and fish merchants going out of business? No! Not those who knew their trade, because they never were financially, well enough ahead to be able to retire in the luxury of Florida. They had to stay in Newfoundland and contribute their part to the fishing economy of this province, and that meant too that they were able to buy their fish in small places.

I suppose every member of this house, Mr. Speaker, when he gets up and speaks for his district, feels he has done his duty. This may be my last time speaking in this house. If it is, I do not intend to let the opportunity go by without saying that I too have been guilty, and guilty of the very thing for which I accuse others: staying within our own little garden, failing to realize that the fellow on the other side of the fence would like to have a garden too. And we cannot have a prosperous Newfoundland with fishermen who know that once their physical ability fails; there is nothing else left except spiritual confidence.

I went down to the South Coast in 1944. I travelled all down through that coast on my insurance business, walking, getting rides in boats. I found then our young men were going across to places in Nova Scotia and even New Brunswick. Why? Because there was no future. I have seen, year after year since I have been here, petitions brought in for roads here there and somewhere else. And there is that great South West Coast part of Newfoundland — Rose Blanche — with fish all winter, and yet the ice piling into the harbour of Port aux Basques has stopped that fish from coming up. All down through Fortune Bay, if we had roads, by-roads, linking up that area, we could aid

greatly the welfare of the fishermen. Now, if you want to see what a small man can do with limited capital and his own guts, Mr. Speaker, or internal fortitude, look at James Hardy in Port Aux Basques. He is not going to the wall. He had no Government loans, and yet he is providing money to the fishermen of that area because he is staying in business, and is staying in for the simple reason he cannot make enough to get out. But, if you gave that man a couple of hundred thousand dollars of a fishery loan, he probably would not be in business today, and his plant would be up for sale to somebody else.

I know that a Government which tries to accomplish nothing does just that. And I know this Government has not been guilty of not trying to give a better way of life to our people. Indeed, and I say this kindly, probably the greatest weakness of our Premier in the past 10 years is his desire to make every Newfoundlander wealthy and prosperous. And he has worked untiringly to that end, and those who criticize his policy cannot but admire his initiative and his ambition. But then, too, I think we have reached the stage where we have to pause and have to look and have to consider, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see any future in the fisheries of Newfoundland with additional monies being granted to fishery plants. I cannot see it. What we need, what we need is bait depots. And let us not wait for the Federal Government to do it. Let us set them up ourselves, if necessary. What greater return could we have from our money than to put bait depots in different places. The different speakers here advocated them. And knowing that people are able to fish and make a living, there is no greater return that we could have. That would be money well spent, and money spent in plants that would be under Government control. Mr. Speaker, I hope what I have had to say for the fishermen has not been wasted. I hope it has not fallen on deaf ears because, you know, a back bencher is so mildly regarded. Yet there are very few I see on this side of the house could not fill the shoes of some of their colleagues very ably.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Hear! Hear!

Mr. Forsey: And consequently, if some of

the cabinet ministers feel they have not the initiative, the desire nor willingness to tackle a good job, for goodness sake, give the seat over to someone who has. I have no ambitions but I hear the whispers from some of my colleagues that have. That's being included in my speech, not because I am lamenting their ambitions, but because I really and sincerely think that a member of the cabinet of this house should be in his seat at least one-third of the time, particularly when he has an important portfolio. I came in here last year to see one cabinet minister and, but for the hard work and efforts of the Premier, I would have had to go back after waiting five days, at my own expense, not able to contact the man, through a stupid, stupid and irresponsible act, irresponsible to the province and the people of my district.

Well, these are the things I have to say, and I say them. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If there is one thing we have learned in this house this year it is the weakness of those who would fail to realize that, wherever we sit in this house, we represent the people. And I am sorry to hear that the Leader of the Opposition could not get a home for some of his friends, and I would not be surprised if some were "liberal" friends, he was trying to provide homes for. One thing, Mr. Speaker, that comes to my mind — I do not know if it is right to bring it up now. It is this, Sir: Surely to goodness we should take steps, while this struggle is on, to see who has priority over these houses, and we should take steps to see that those who have already been promised housing accommodations will get them, regardless of who should provide them.

In my province and in my district, there has been a hue and cry in the past days about accommodations at the Western Memorial Hospital. Well, it is blamed on the Government hospital plan which has brought so many people into the hospital that it is practically impossible to handle it. Well, is not that a wonderful endorsement of the policy of this Government, one of the greatest endorsements we have had? It shows that with all the prosperity of the past 10 years, we have had people who could not afford necessary hospital care and attention. Now I don't know what we are going to do about it. I may be shot for recommending what I am going to do, but, if the sanatorium is not

filled, if there is one floor vacant, I say, if an emergency exists, let us use it.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is one problem, and if we keep getting disappointments from Ottawa, it is going to be a great problem and may effect some of us here. I am very tormented myself to think that what I fought for could turn so sour in my mind. I will say no more — We agreed not to speak on that — But I do say, with our standard of living today, with the turmoil of the higher standard of living and higher pace of living, there is a great need for improved facilities in our mental hospital. There is a crying necessity for a mental hospital on the West Coast. I have had appalling cases, desperate cases of people who had to quit their jobs and stay home with a mentally ill member of their family, to look after him, and bar the windows and bar up a room and make it look like a concentration camp, not because the Government would not do anything but because the Government was powerless to do anything — there just was not room. Now somehow, through some magic way, the Minister of Health reminds me, he manages to get into the mental hospital those who have some chance of cure. But how about the senile, those for whom there is no cure? As I say, Mr. Speaker, with all the problems that we have at the Western Memorial Hospital today, the greatest social need we have at the moment is improved and enlarged facilities for those who are mentally ill. I am willing to find a special place for a building.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know, at this time, if I intend to adjourn this debate and speak later. I do not know if I should speak on the labour situation or if I should wait. But I do not think there is any member of this Government nor this house who has been more actively concerned, apart from the Executive Council, than I have been. And I have been concerned because I feel it is the duty of every member elected to this house to make a stand, and to play his part, regardless of whom he offends, or regardless of where the chips may fall.

Now, I am convinced as I stand here, had the International Woodworkers of America conducted themselves as a decent, law-abiding union, with respect to the economy of this province, with respect to the basic necessities of employment, they would not have received the treatment which they did

receive and so well-deserved. The tragic part, Mr. Speaker, of our labour situation in Newfoundland today is that our local labour executive lacks wise leadership. We have none! The Newfoundland Federation of Labour met in St. John's. What did they do? They dallied around until Mr. Ladd appeared, who was not even a member — But through some excuse of the man behind the curtain in Corner Brook, who is not even a member of one of the executives of the present time, Mr. Ladd was invited to defend the statements about his union by his sister union delegates from Grand Falls. Now, is not that a ridiculous situation, when the labour leaders of Newfoundland today are brain-washed by three men who four years ago were unknown to us?

They were going to have a big rally in Corner Brook, to get the armoury, and one of the principal speakers was to be Jeff Hall. Jeff Hall was to be one of their principal speakers. And they were to discuss the Bill passed in this house. I do not know if any of them knew the amendments, just the Bill — a narrow, biggoted, hieratic attitude by the executive and by the Humber Trade and Labour Council against this House of Assembly. Without any reason except the one reason, except the blind reasoning, we are being reproached. I would not stand in this house and curry labour support by supporting something I thought was wrong. And in the beginning I was one of their biggest supporters — and I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, what is happening in the labour movement of Newfoundland today is this: It is losing its democracy. They were dalliating about signing an agreement with Bowaters Paper Company for weeks and weeks and weeks. One union was holding it up. The executive of that union knows its membership had a meeting at the United Church Hall about six months ago. In fact, there could be no agreement but for the fact the company granted extra time. At that time one man (with 25 years in the mill, 25 years a member of his union — and I do not know if the executive had the many years together of seniority in Local 64 — it is very questionable if they have, together, 25 years of union seniority, altogether, all three) made a motion that Local 64 should accept the agreement. A friend of his seconded it. There was ranting and roaring and objec-

tions from some of the executive, and some of the executives wanted to close her down and bring the Bowater Company to their knees. They were forgetting the women and little children they would bring there before that. And that motion was carried by a vote of 240 in favour, of the 288 there.

That is a terrific example, Mr. Speaker, that the common, ordinary, decent labour man in Corner Brook does not support the blind thinking of labour executives. That does not say he feels right in passing these Bills. But I think any decent Newfoundlander, whether a union man or not, must realize that nobody would be foolish enough in this house to pass a Bill that is going to put labour behind for 50 years. What we are doing in this house, as I see it (and I must confess I had to see it — I did not see it in its proper prospective in the first instance), what we are doing is protecting the democratic rights of the ordinary labouring man, his right not to be dominated and domineered by a minority executive. And that is the message I would like to go out to labour in this little province today. That is the job we are doing. (I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for my hands on my hips, because most people who do that are proven to have no backbone. I think I have one).

Mr. Speaker, I attended a rally in Corner Brook. It was on a Sunday. I was asked to sit on the platform with the principal speakers, including Mr. Ladd, Mr. Daley and Mr. Greene the lawyer for the IWA. There were seven other prominent speakers. At the tail end, I was asked if I was going to speak. I said: "No, I had just come here to listen, but, politician like I was not afraid to speak." We all seek the opportunity to express our views and take the consequences if we get ourselves into hot water. What I said then I would say now: I said that I supported the loggers and their democratic right to have a union of their own choice, but I would always fight, to my life, to take from the loggers a union, if that union were going to use the loggers as a communistic influence, or an influence to destroy the economy of this province and thus destroy themselves.

Members of the Opposition: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Forsey: I made that stand! (Mr. Ladd, incidentally, did not know about what had happened in Deer Lake). When I made that

stand, we were told by the IWA, a fraction of the men walked out in disgust, fed up. They did not know who they were working for. But I wonder, did anybody stop to look at the record? When our Labour Relations Board certified these independent contractors of Bowaters, they were the real employers. Mr. Ladd had two courses open to him: One course was to take it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland for a legal ruling, and the other was to accept it. He accepted, because by doing so, the union of Pearce Fudge automatically was decertified and their contract with Bowaters, and the Deer Lake Union also because of their contract with Bowaters. Now he goes out and gets certification for some 14 to 16 contractors. The Minister of Labour and his department went to no end of trouble to assist the loggers union, the IWA, in getting certification. They forced the contractors, sent Magistrate O'Neill to Deer Lake for the contractors, under threat of jail told them to stop the beating around the bush, stop defying the law and produce the books for the checkout. Was that an indication this Government did not want the IWA? I say that this Government or this house wants any union, if it is a decent union — any union for the welfare of the people and the welfare of the individual member. That was done. Now there is not one logger in Deer Lake but went to the contractors to get his job. They hired him, took out his union checkoff, paid his wages, listened to his grievances. But all of a sudden there was a walkout because they did not know who they were working for. It was like working in a bank and being told that if you did not know who organized the bank you are going to quit as you really do not know who you are working for. I am satisfied that there was one thing that we must realize, and one thing the Premier must realize: 99% of the loggers were misled and the others were rogues and hoodlums. They misled the 99%, along with Ladd, Hall and McCool. Landon Ladd proved to me that the man was insincere, that he had no desire to reach a peaceful settlement in Newfoundland, that he gloried in the chaos he created, because he was going to build himself up as a great Messiah of labour in this province — the man who put everything on the rocks, and dared anybody to stand in his place. He got his surprise. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I did

too, as the Premier (a man who has been labour-conscious all his life, whose main concern was — “How do you get on with labour?”; “Be friendly with labour, they are with us, they represent the working people”), stood up and made that speech that night. I did not hear it. I had no inkling of it. I did prophesy it to a very close friend of mine, the first citizen of the city of Corner Brook. He did not think my prophesy would be right. I did prophesy it! I did not know how he was going to act, whether I could stay with him or not, whether I could support him or not, but I felt that this man who knew labour from the inside must know what he was doing, must have some reason for what he was doing, must have basic facts to take the stand he has taken. And, Mr. Speaker, with the record of his career, with the record he has behind him, there is not one man in Corner Brook's Union today who has done so much for the union as Premier Smallwood has done for Local 64 — not one man.

Unfortunately, in this house the debate is not reported and the facts are not cited. But he paid as fine a tribute to John P. Burke, during this present session, as has been paid to any member of this house, or any other fellow Newfoundlander that I have ever heard. Unfortunately, this was not reported. Now I am not a reporter, but I suppose that, at that time, there was something more sensational and so that great tribute to John P. Burke, the great leader of the International Pulp and Sulphite Union was missing and lost. And what happened? We have poison being spread in Corner Brook today — poison! There was Mr. Stephens. He aspired to be J.P. Burke's successor. I do not know if ever he will be. I do not know if he can ever fill his shoes. John P. Burke, from all I have heard, is a great man. He came in here to meet the Premier, with Mr. Albert Martin. And if he did not tell him then what a man says he told him, the man who told it is a liar — and it is up to the Premier to say whether Stephens is a liar. I do not believe that the Premier said what I am going to say — what I was told Stephens said he said. That is what they are telling the rank and file in Corner Brook, trying to turn them. They sort of feel they did a good thing in protecting them from something getting bigger than they, their own hierarchy. The ordinary labouring fellow wants a

union for better working conditions, shorter hours, more pay, but does not want the union to dominate him, tell him where to live and where to sleep and when to get married. They do not want a union to own them. He said to the Premier: "Now, Mr. Premier, let us forget Mr. Martin is here. This legislation means that you can turn around if we have a strike tomorrow and decertify us." The Premier said: "Yes, exactly."

Now, there is the poison that is being spread in Corner Brook against the Premier of this province and the Opposition because they supported it. You know, I heard many kids, babies not yet out of their diapers, literally, in Corner Brook, talking about the Leader of the Opposition. And I have looked over this situation, and done a lot of thinking, and said as much as I have said. I think it is a great chance! The Opposition's stand, I think, is realistic, in that on a vital issue, an issue vital to Newfoundland's interests, the Opposition, to a man, stood up and supported the Government. And to say that Opposition is weak...

Premier Smallwood: If the hon. gentleman will allow me. I remember the visit of vice-president Stephens and Mr. Albert Martin to me in my office a couple of weeks ago. I remember it well. No such statement was made by me. That is a complete fabrication, completely made up, completely invented. I have two very good witnesses to that: one is Mr. Martin and the other Mr. Stephens, who, if I had said it, must have heard me. I said no such thing. I never said it. That is a complete lie. I am not a fool.

Mr. Forsey: Thank you! I will accept that because it did not even make sense. Of course I never said Mr. Stephens said it, but this man, this individual, this agitator, he said Mr. Stephens told him. Now, after I attended this meeting on Sunday, in which I said that I would support the IWA if it was the union of the loggers, just as I would be against it if the loggers did not want it, I rightly said that I felt Bowaters were the real enemy of the loggers and unjust in trying to hide this. I still say that, but the Labour Relations Board says, no. So who am I to defy the Labour Relations Board?

So things went along, and I had my ears and eyes open in Deer Lake too, and I found out

some of the things that were going on. I found out that McCool was leading the raids, not only on the camps that were certified, but on the camps for which they had no certification whatsoever, because the majority of the workers were not IWA men. I met a friend of mine. (I hope you will bear with me in what I am going to say). He and I belong to the same fraternity — a contractor, working for a contractor. He took a fraternal oath to me that what he told me was true. And I said then, if that is what is going on I withdraw my support. I went up, and people said that I was bought off, told off by the Premier, I never received any more criticism for my stand from the Premier than from the Leader of the Opposition and he knows exactly how much that was — nothing.

I turned around and went up to Mr. Martin's office. He is solicitor for the independent contractors. He was busy. I asked the receptionist to tell Mr. Martin I would like to see him. He said to come in. I went in. There was Mr. Powell, a reporter for the Western Star. Thank Goodness nothing transpired between us that did not transpire in the presence of the young writer, who unfortunately through misguidance is not with the Western Star today. But he, in my opinion, cannot be classed in the same class as Mr. ?(research) or Mr. Cahill. I leave out Mr. Finn because, regardless of my feelings, I have felt that, while I could never agree with some of his philosophies, he is sincere in what he wrote and meant what he said.

Premier Smallwood: I am inclined to think that myself.

Mr. Forsey: He himself branded that strike illegal. He branded it after my statement. So I sat there. Mr. Martin said — "Look over the affidavits". I told him: "Look, I am not interested!" (probably IWA affidavits). "What I want to know, if I reach Ladd are you willing to have your loggers re-open the camps if they would go back to work?" He said, "yes, on one condition, except for two or three because they would only go out again. We cannot afford that. It would be ruinous." I told him that would be fair enough, "Will you give it to me in writing?" And this is the letter I received, dated January 29th: "Dear Mr. Forsey: — This will confirm our conversations of the morn-

ing of Jan. 29, at which time I advised you I am prepared and willing to negotiate with the IWA in accordance with the laws of this country, at any time and for any contractor, and for hours of work, wages and camp conditions, as I have always been. These negotiations now, however, in view of the illegal strike called by the IWA, will be subjected to IWA instructing the men to go back to work where work is available for them.

Yours very truly,
A. Martin."

I told Mr. Powell I would give him a statement to make his deadline. "I am not supporting lawlessness. If I lose all labour support I will not support lawlessness." And I gave the statement you read in the telegram and which you read in the Western Star and heard over CJON. The reason I gave it to CJON is that it was supposed to be given to CBC, however it was not. So I phoned CJON and they took it on tape. You heard it here in St. John's. I said then what I supported and did not support. And I was the first member, publicly, of this house to call the strike against Bowaters illegal, and said I could not support it because they were breaking the laws of the province. And I appealed to them to go back to work, and told them Mr. Martin agreed — And I contacted Mr. Ladd to see if he was sincere in trying to get the workers back to work. I contacted Mr. Ladd at Bell Island. I telephoned Frank Chafe, (I should not say that. He represents the CLC and has a job to do), but he said too, in this conversation (and I could make a sworn statement) that he agreed with me the strike in Deer Lake was illegal, and anything I could do would be appreciated by labour. I got hold of Mr. Ladd at Mr. Jackman's house at Bell Island. I told him the story. I said: "Now I want you to confirm by telegram to me whether or not you would meet with Mr. Martin. He agreed verbally and I asked him if he would confirm it. He seemed sincere. Truthfully I thought he was honest. He lost control of the union when the hoodlums took over. I do not know whether he allowed or permitted it in the beginning and could not control it in the end. I do not know. This is the wire I got back: "Have arrived back from Bell Island. Again: confirm very willing to negotiate with authorized person in proper manner on any fair and reasonable basis.

Signed: L. Landon Ladd, President District 2, IWA.

In the meantime, in the afternoon I had informed Mr. Ladd about the statement I gave the Western Star. I asked him if he still wanted me to continue negotiations for him, because of the statement I had made. He said: "Mr. Forsey, I am not a politician. I am not involved. If you felt justified in making that statement, alright, but I doubt the sincerity of Mr. Martin." I said: "I don't know. As far as I am concerned the only way you can do it is to sit down and negotiate." So I phoned CJON. I think Mr. Ladd had an interviewer call about this release of mine, and wanted to know what was going on. I waited until 6:30 p.m. to get his answer. It did not come. I wanted to let the people know I was still interested in bringing a solution to the problem and better conditions for the loggers.

So, Mr. Ladd said in the conversation: "Mr. Forsey, I have a letter here from Mr. Martin. He does not want to negotiate. I will try to get it. Hold the phone a minute." He went to get it and could not find it. He told me what it said, that Mr. Martin did not want to negotiate because he was appealing the decision of the Labour Relations Board. I told him I would take it up with Mr. Martin, if he liked. So I went down to Mr. Martin next morning and told him about this letter, and he produced his copy. He said, in part, (I believe to Mr. McCool) that if he insisted on negotiations he would have to do so because of the law of the land, and the Labour Relations Act compelled him, but seeing that he was taking action in the Supreme Court to protect the validity of the certification of the contractors by the Labour Relations Board, he felt it would be futile to negotiate and it would be better to wait until the Supreme Court ruling to continue negotiations. I told him that Mr. Ladd sort of felt he was insincere. "Alright", he said, "we will meet." So I worded a telegram in his office: "Met with Mr. Leonard Martin... Assures me he can and is empowered to discuss the items as listed in his letter and will meet you at your convenience. Please advise your decision on time and place of meeting..." etc. Mr. Ladd wanted me to get an interview with Mr. Martin and I did. And Mr. Martin said they had nothing to do with the contractors, and there was no point in meeting with him then, and felt that things could be

better if left quiet. If he and Mr. Leonard Martin met quietly, he suggested I sit in on the negotiations. I think Leonard Martin suggested the same thing. I agreed, provided I was not bound by one party or the other from making any statement and that I could make what statement I liked. Well, from that day to this I have not heard from Mr. Ladd, although we agreed to subsequent conversations on Saturday. I phoned him I had been wrongly attacked by this chap Cahill, accused of insincerity and attempting to make political hay on the strike. I phoned Mr. Ladd and told him that, if this was his policy he was stating, "you will lose all friends in Newfoundland. If this is your policy the Government will not accept it and won't accept a union that has a policy to bring the two paper companies to their knees." That was long before the Premier took his stand, long before he made up his mind on that plan. That is the story — Why Mr. Ladd did not negotiate with Mr. Leonard Martin I will never know. He never came to see me. I never refused to see him.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to say — in this conversation he was having — he said, "this is really your stand?"

Mr. Forsey: Cahill said; this is not my opinion. This is actually the stand of the union.

Mr. Higgins: What reply did Mr. Ladd make at that time?

Mr. Forsey: He said he did not want to get involved. Cahill was hitting back at me because I took Cahill to task for trying to slur the good office of the Attorney-General and the Premier, and I refuted the statement Cahill made that the Attorney-General was taking sides with the company, just because he was telling the loggers of Newfoundland that was the law and what was lawlessness. From what happened, he did not tell them often enough.

Mr. Higgins: He did not deny the statement of Cahill?

Mr. Forsey: He did not deny it. I said: "You must take action. In my opinion you must take action against Cahill. He is stating this

is your policy. Until you deny it you agree by saying nothing." I said I would like him to come out with a release to indicate his sincerity in trying to do something. He hemmed and hawed. He did not know if the situation in Deer Lake was illegal. He had Mr. Greene coming in as his lawyer. He questioned it. That was his right, I suppose. Now, one little bit of information gleaned from Deer Lake: Hank Skinner, Public Relations Officer, gave a release. It went in part something like this — The loggers of the IWA met at Deer Lake and by standing vote of 270 voted not to go back on the job in the woods until they had a contract with Bowaters, until Bowaters signed with the IWA. That is the union which accused this house of taking away its rights and violating the laws of this province, the union which says: "To heck with the Labour Relations Law, to heck with the fact that the Labour Relations Board ruled the union negotiate with the contractors; we are telling the Minister of Labour we are not going to go back in the woods until we have a contract with Bowaters." And Bowaters, Mr. Speaker, could not sign if they had wanted to, because of the ruling. The ruling was that the union must sign with the independent contractors. And the union in Deer Lake met and issued a statement like that, and the president is now on the Mainland decrying the injustice of this house — a man who allowed himself to stay president of his union when his members voted to defy the laws of this house and this province.

I am not against the loggers. I would fight just as hard against Max Lane's union (NBWW) if it does not do the loggers justice, as I would against anything else. But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the IWA in Newfoundland is a political platform for the CCF, because after Sunday's meeting, what did Ladd tell friends in St. John's? "There is no longer a picture of Joey Smallwood in the outports of Newfoundland." That is the information I got second hand. Let him deny it if he did not say it. Then I will say to the man who said he said it: let them fight amongst themselves and see who will turn out to be the biggest liar.

Now, I received a message from the Corner Brook District Labour Council: I want to tell you they are meeting again this Sunday. It is signed P. Fudge, Secretary. This is the wire. I did not read it to you in its entirety. It is

similar to one the members of the Opposition received and one my colleague, the Minister of Labour received. Taking the threat out, assuming they had something sensible to offer — this is the wire I sent back: "Thank you for telegram. Would appreciate meeting with your executive to have them tell me how they can justify their continued support of the IWA after the concrete evidence of irresponsible actions of the IWA in permitting and supporting the unlawful strike in Bowater's camps. The last paragraph of your telegram seems to indicate your organization may have some suggestions that would be acceptable to organized labour and the Government of Newfoundland. If this is so, I am willing as always to do all in my power for the welfare of organized labour and the economy of our province especially the west coast of Newfoundland. Your suggestions may be mailed to me, or should you desire we can discuss this at a joint meeting. Yours sincerely J. Forsey, MHA Humber East." Up to this moment, neither verbal nor written reply was received. How sincere was Mr. Fudge, the President of the Corner Brook District Labour Council in trying to get labour's point across, if he felt we did not understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I say now, it is unfortunate sometimes the biggest issues are lost, and the big issue is this thing in Corner Brook — Corner Brook is different from Grand Falls — The same international unions in Grand Falls are against the IWA, and they accept them as long-lost brothers from a strange land. They did not know they existed before, but are so glad they are here. The strangeness is this — Now I would not be small enough, I would but I won't. I had to search my conscience — My own dealings personally with the management of this company in the past four months has been disgraceful on their part, as far as I am concerned. Yet, on the other hand my dealings with the company as a member for my district have been excellent and on that as a member for Humber East I must base my decision. But I say this: There is a pathetic situation existing in Corner Brook today, such that, if something is not done about it, if labour, the international labour leaders, do not try to do something about it, we are going to have one of these things, a blow-up, unnecessary strikes and probably the Bowater

Company not operating in Newfoundland. Now whether labour is at fault or management is not for me to judge, but I do feel that in their policy of stream-lining their mill to cut down costs, the company has abruptly and brutally (and I use that word advisedly) torn away the good relations that existed between them and organized labour. And, Mr. Speaker, this house should enquire into the cause — The economy of this province rests on good relations in that mill. There is not one worker out of five with a union card in that mill today who has any sense of loyalty to his company. It is disgraceful. It is our very bread and butter — I don't work there. It is not entirely the labourers fault now, by a long shot. The labourer has certain rights and certain principles, and his job has to be a place to go where he feels happy and content. Men laid off, fired out after 27 and 28 years of service with this company — one year's salary for 30 odd years of devotion then; "Good Bye, farewell." How can you work and give loyalty with feeling like that? If Bowaters must cut down their costs, let them do it in a friendly manner, take labour into their confidence rather than have labour become a bitter enemy; because this is what they created, an unfortunate situation in my district. What has caused all this trouble, Mr. Speaker is that none of us has stopped long enough to consider the real trouble, and now that we stop to consider, and now that I have told it, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the house at its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, April 27 at three o'clock.

Monday, April 27, 1959

Afternoon Session

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Clarke in the Chair as Speaker:

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Hon. Dr. J. McGrath (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition

from the people of North Harbour, St. Mary's Bay. The petition asks that the House of Assembly take into consideration the state of isolation of the people on the West side of North Harbour by the building of a bridge over North Harbour River to connect with the main highway which runs within a few yards of the stream. The people request that this bridge be built during the coming season, so that they, in common with the rest of the people of the Avalon Peninsula, may be able to enjoy the benefits of the general road system of the area so greatly developed within recent years. I wish to support this petition, Mr. Speaker. It is one of the few places on Avalon with no road connection. The road goes within a few yards of the section and there must be 30 or 40 families completely cut off, as much as if in Labrador, from the use of any vehicles, and the only way to get out of there at the present time is on the back of a gull. I sincerely hope it will be found possible to remedy this and link up that settlement with the rest of the Island. I therefore ask leave to present this petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates. On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

LEGISLATION:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Wabush Lake Railway Company Limited, Northern Land Company Limited and Carol Lake Company Limited, and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions for the Same Purpose".

A Bill, "An Act the Notaries Public Act, 1957."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

A Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited and American Smelting and Refining Company".

A Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Use of Sound Recording Machines for Taking and Recording Evidence".

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wabush Lake Railway Act, 1955".

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Provincial Affairs, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act".

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act".

Hon. J. R. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Coasting Vessels."

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Labrador Lands (Reservation) Act."

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Validate Assessments Made in the Towns of Harbour Grace, Placentia and Freshwater".

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1955".

Hon. C. H. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels and Pressure Plants."

Hon. E. S. Spencer (Minister of Finance):

Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act, 1958."

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting a Private Mining Carrier Railway in Labrador".

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Hon. E. S. Spencer (Minister of Finance): Question No. 24 tabled. (See index) I should like also at this time if permitted, to lay on the table of the house copies of the Report of the Civil Service Commission. In this case there are only five copies.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Questions Nos. 23 and 25 tabled (see index)

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform the house that since our last sitting, in fact as recently as Saturday, the writ against the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was issued. It was decided after consultation with counsel in Ottawa that the Supreme Court might have jurisdiction, and in that even a writ was issued out of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland against Central Mortgage and Housing. The value of that, of course, is that we will now be able to get a hearing more quickly than if we had proceeded as we originally planned.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is sought by the issuance of this writ? What is the object of it?

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, we claim seven different remedies. I am sorry I can't detail the whole seven of them now but amongst them is: first, a declaration that the agree-

ments are binding and obligatory; and then claims a declaration that these properties should be forthwith handed over to the St. John's Housing Authority for management and control; and thirdly, of course, we ask an injunction to stop Central Housing and Mortgage from taking upon themselves the administration of the projects. Then of course there are damages and costs and various other things that lawyers alone can think of.

Mr. Hollett: That is before the full bench?

Mr. Curtis: No, any judge.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE

ADDRESS IN REPLY:

Mr. L. Strange (Port de Grave): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to associate myself with previous speakers in congratulating the mover and seconder, the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) and the hon. member for Carbonear-Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke) on the excellent way they handled that address. I am sure it was appreciated by everyone present.

The second thing mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is that Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip, will be visiting the Dominion of Canada during the coming summer. We are glad to hear that Newfoundland is going to be the first stop on the tour. Now I am sure that when they arrive on this Island and during their brief visit here they will be given one of the best welcomes they will receive in the Dominion of Canada — that is Newfoundland hospitality, particularly to Her Majesty the Queen. During the past few months the members of this house and particularly the hon. the Premier have had a very hectic time over the transaction of things that happened during that period, and apparently it does not seem to be all over yet. In my opinion, Sir, I do not think a man of the calibre of the hon. the Premier should have to undergo such worries, personally, as he has gone through. Really, Sir, I do not think he deserves it. And I hope that very shortly the worries will be limited enough to allow him to sit down awhile, anyway, and rest as an ordinary human being.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Who is this?

Mr. Strange: The hon. the Premier, and it is time for him to get a chance to do it.

Mr. Hollett: What is he doing now? Where is he now? Is he sitting down now or not?

Mr. Strange: I have no idea. I know this much. He has been subjected to a lot of worries and torments during the past few months.

Mr. Hollett: Who hasn't?

Mr. Strange: Any man who did have them, I guess, would realize it. Now my comment today, Mr. Speaker, is going to be very brief because when a number of speakers address this house on the same subject, whoever comes last or nearly last does not have very much left to say.

First, Mr. Speaker, in my district, which I am interested in and interested in the people connected with that district. As most people know, when a man represents a district, most of his time is taken up with the needs of that district and trying if possible to give the people some satisfaction, and trying to do your best. My district, Port de Grave, is a district where practically all that is required over there at the moment is employment and road work. Now probably, I might say, I am a bit disappointed in connection with road work. First, when I was elected as representative of that district, I made plans in connection with certain things to be done in the district, and I did it from an economic stand point, too. I was born in one part of the district over there. I have been, for the past 50 years at least, travelling over that district time and again, and I have seen some thousands and thousands of dollars spent in firing clay and gravel over the road in that district.

The spring before last, when I started as a representative, I knew the roads. Since then I have had some considerable work done, as far as gravelling roads is concerned, and I have heard complaints on what is being done. I consider I was treated half decent in getting what has been done, but that is not the program I was interested in too much. My program was that if I was in the government for four years, if I could get a piece

of paved road done each year, I would be able to retire saying I had four roads completed. I am sensible enough to realize everybody else is asking for that too, all over the island, and it takes an awful lot of money when it comes to paving roads. I am well aware of that. But, Sir, if it is not done, if it is not done, you only go back next spring and find it just the same as you did the spring before. You will still find the roads in practically the same condition or with very little improvement, because, after the winter months and winter weather, you will get pot holes and plenty of them and the road deteriorates an awful lot every winter, particularly one such as the last one. So that, Sir, without taking some money and without trying to do something in connection with paving, you are going to have the same thing year after year. But, Sir, if once you got far enough ahead to be able to do some little paving, what is paved is a completed job and the money is well spent, and the first cost will always be the greatest.

Well, I am sorry to say that is the condition of the roads in Port de Grave district. I know we have a highway which goes around the bay, and it is a paved highway, and I am grateful and thankful for having that, because that is more than a good many of the members in the present government have in their districts. Fortunately, we have a highway around Conception Bay and that road has been paved, and everyone in my district does appreciate it too. But the principal places in the district, like Brigus, all the places — I have been driving down to those places in the past two or three years, particularly this year, and find in places like Brigus pot holes. Now I am not blaming the highroads for that. They did a good job in Brigus last year, but after the winter months and winter weather it is impossible to have anything better when it comes to gravel roads. But the Brigus roads once paved — it is only a mile in and out of Brigus — once that is paved, Brigus is finished as far as road work is concerned. I think the cost of doing a job like that in Brigus would be good money spent. It is an historical place, and any tourists who come to this country, to St. John's, are going to Brigus and around Conception Bay. And, Sir, I would like to be in the position — I am representative of the people over there — to see something for my labour. And, Sir, I am one who

is not going to ask anything from this government which will affect the economy or take unnecessary money from the Treasury — Not while I am here. But, Sir, I do not think that is unnecessary spending. I think it would be good money spent if you could get it done.

Bay Roberts is the same. The Town Council of Bay Roberts, with whatever other assistance they had, paved Bay Roberts. It is a credit to the place. And there are other places which, in my opinion could be a credit too, and it would not take nearly the thousands upon thousands of dollars which have been spent for gravel. I hope before this season is over, that my request will be given consideration enough to get something done in connection with that, so that I will be able to go back and get out of the government when the time comes, and be proud of my services while I was there and can look at something I left behind me.

Now, Sir, part of my district is a fishing district. I do not refer to it so often because it is the place where I was born, and I don't want to be personal. I have just as much regard for any other part of Port de Grave. I was born in Port de Grave, and I am not ashamed to say it either. Port de Grave is a fishing settlement. During the past three years that I have been connected with this House of Assembly, I have not had one request from a fisherman in Port de Grave for five cents worth of anything towards their livelihood — not five cents worth! They are industrious. They have stuck to the fishing boat all through the depression, when some of them were on dole at six cents a day. They never gave up the water. They never gave up their boats. They have proposed, so much so that they are not asking anything from the government as far as relief is concerned. And those that are fishing out of Port de Grave take their boy in the boat with them, or two if they have them. In the winter they go into the country. They cut the frames for their boats right out of the country. They bring them out to Port de Grave, and a man and his boys will start in and put the frame of that boat up, up to long liner boats too, and build them from the keel to the gunnel. Then when the spring opens they just walk aboard them and go fishing. Mr. Speaker, when I go over there and see these men trucking over roads not as passable as they should be, it certainly

hurts my feelings. It is just as well to be frank about it.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): If you were in the truck it certainly would.

Mr. Strange: Not when I was over there. In Port de Grave today there is not a man over there but has a truck, and they haven't got them for pleasuring around. I can tell you what they have them for.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to ask the hon. member how many fishermen there are in Port de Grave?

Mr. Strange: I would say around 50 boats. And they have those trucks for carting the fish they bring in to anywhere from Cape Spear to Port de Grave, for carting their fish out of Port de Grave to Harbour Grace or wherever they can sell it. That is what the truck is for. And they are turning revenue into the country, and I think men like that should receive special assistance, there is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, might I again interrupt to ask the hon. member if he knows whether or not these fishermen managed to get sufficient fish last year to merit their receiving unemployment insurance? I just ask for a matter of knowledge.

Mr. Strange: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, if not all then definitely the majority that fished out of Port de Grave last summer got fish enough to receive it. I am pretty sure of it, because there have not been any requests from any of them for any assistance. Therefore, they must have gotten enough to go along on and enough to get their unemployment insurance. Now, there are other men over there in that part of the district who have been fishing their lifetime. But as everybody knows, when the road work started some years ago a good many of these fishermen gave up their fishing work, gave up that trade altogether and went out for the days work, so much so that the boats deteriorated, the engines went and today over there, there are a number of those fellows who have not got anything to go afloat in. Now, Sir, what I am thinking about is this: If we have a hundred men over

there, fishermen — I don't know the exact number — a boy when he gets to be nine or ten years old is in the boat over there, but there are a number of good fishermen and I am going to throw out a suggestion in connection with these fishermen, those men who cannot go and purchase boats or marine engines to go into the boats. In my opinion it would be better to cut down on the big amounts that go to others and give out small amounts to those individuals, up to say \$500. I know people who can start tomorrow with \$500 worth — one man has a boat and another an engine. They don't want long liners or diesels, these men can go out with five to seven horsepower engines, but they just have not the finances to buy that engine or buy the boat.

Mr. Hollett: That is not in Port de Grave?

Mr. Strange: Port de Grave proper.

Mr. Hollett: I thought they were all independent.

Hon. J. T. Cheesemen (Minister of Fisheries): May I make a comment? I would like to say for the benefit of the hon. member and this house, quite a few fishermen, certainly in recent years, have received loans from the Newfoundland Fisheries Loan Board for assistance in procuring boats and engines. I just want to keep the record straight!

Mr. Strange: I am aware of that. I know a number in Port de Grave who received loans, but the loans have been large loans, up to over \$1,000. And I took the trouble to go down to the Loan Board and know how they are getting on paying back loans they have received.

Mr. Hollett: Do I understand the hon. gentleman is suggesting they are getting too big loans in Port de Grave?

Mr. Strange: No! I will expand what I have in mind. Those are men who went into the country, cut and brought out and built their long-liners, which need large engines. That engine, I think, you will find costs anywhere from a \$1,000 to \$2,500. Some of them received loans for that purpose. As I was going to say, I was down to find out how

they were getting on with the payments of those loans, and I was told by the Loan Board that the fishermen from Port de Grave who received loans have some of the best serviced loans in the island of Newfoundland, and are paying off their loans.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to ask the hon. member, is it a fact that the Loan Board informed him as to how people were paying off their loans?

Mr. Strange: The Loan Board never informed me of anything at all about the amounts. I know there are so many. What the amounts are I do not know. But I asked the question, how the Port de Grave Fishermen pay off their loans, whatever they might be, and I am informed they are among the best to pay off their loans in the country. Now, Sir, the point I want to make is this: (I spoke about it to other people) There are fishermen over there who have not got these long-liners. They can go and earn their living but won't have to go to Cape St. Francis and off Cape Spear in long-liners, whose men go there and set their traps at Cape St. Francis and bring their fish in. But there are other inland fishermen that can go out and earn their living in motor boats with seven horsepower engines. But I know of some who came over here looking for \$500 loans, and could not get them because the Loan Act did not call for small loans.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear! I know of similar cases.

Mr. Strange: I made enquiries about that. You see, \$500 would put these fellows fishing, enough to earn a living, and I wish I had another hundred like them over there this spring to go out in the fishing boats and earn a living. My opinion is that with all these large loans going out to different people in connection with firms and everything else, the Board they should take part of that and give it to those individual fishermen, to earn their living. That is a suggestion I am throwing out, and I think it is a reasonable one.

Mr. Hollett: They should ask for a million and then they might get it.

Mr. Strange: No! I am proud to say that the people in my district — fishermen, the people over there, anyway — are not out for millions or half millions, and they have conscience enough to know what they are asking for, and expect to pay for. And they do not want to affect the economy of this country, because they are governed by their intelligence and common sense, and they earn their living by the sweat of their brow, and they can do that if they get a chance to do so. You can go to any part of Conception Bay, anywhere from here around Conception Bay, South Shore, Holyrood, right down through Clarke's Beach, Bay Roberts, and see what they will tell you about the fishermen of Port de Grave. They don't know what it is to get a fish to eat, without it coming from Port de Grave, because they live on the water, get their meals from the water when out, and they get the fish and they are not short of a meal — There is no question at all about that. I am so proud of them over there that, to tell you the truth about it, I go to extremes to try and get something to help them out to earn a livelihood, good men, good men, not men to sit down and wait, all they want is to stand on their own.

Now, in the other part of the district over there they are not fishermen, they are looking for a days work. They have no other way to earn their livelihood but to get a days work, which means employment to be found. Now I am 100% behind the Premier of this Province. I don't care how many millions he has wasted (if you call it wasted), I don't care how many millions he wasted trying to promote industries. He did care how many millions he wasted trying to promote industries. He did more than anyone else for the people — the Premier of Newfoundland, that man who went out and tried to bring in industries and everything else.

I went to Labrador one year myself, and went down with one motor boat and engine. I went for 15 summers, but went one year, the first year, when we had a motor boat and an engine — one motor boat — that is all we had, and fish were so plentiful I was persuaded the next year to get another one. All right, I ventured — I took the money out and ventured to get the second one. The next year half a boat would have done me instead of two, a rowboat would have done me just as well. That was a venture! I say the

Premier of this country ventured out with the sold intention of trying to find employment for people of this country. If he failed it was not the first time —

Mr. Hollett: You would still be happy?

Mr. Strange: Sir, I hope he keeps at it. Now, there has been some controversy over Term 29. I am not going into that very much, but I will tell you this much, and I am going to express myself just the way I feel about it —

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Strange: Now, Sir, it appears to me, whatever we get up to 1962, or whatever we received, it is definitely no surprise to me whatever. My reason for saying that is; what can you expect if the good will is not there and good friendship is not there between the Ottawa Government and the representatives from Newfoundland and the government of this country? How can you expect any better? I am not surprised. I think it is very good — I am not a bit surprised. Another thing I want to refer to is this — that strike we had. I am particularly interested in so far as the strike is concerned, because I take it one of my own friends has lost his life over the strike. Had there not been a strike that boy would be alive today. He is not alive, unfortunately and all because of the strike. But I wonder was the strike justified? I wonder often to myself. I am not against unions! If there was anything tabled here today in this House of Assembly for condemning unions altogether, I would be one of the first to come to my feet and say something for the benefit of the people and ordinary labour.

But, Sir, I am against irresponsible persons being in charge of it, and I speak from my own knowledge on that subject. I think if they were really responsible persons, with good sound judgment, that racket in Badger would never be allowed to go as far as it did. If a person is responsible and can start an ordinary strike he can stop one, or, if he is responsible, he can oversee the conduct that goes on afterwards. A young man in the prime of life goes out there on duty to do as he is told, ordered there like the hundreds and thousands of times I was so ordered during the depression, going all over this country with bunches of men. Nothing

like this happened in the depression days. I was responsible, the one sent to take men and go, but I had nobody killed. Fortunately nobody was killed, and little damages were done. I went to one incident down North, with 20 men at one time, right in the height of the depression, with everything going sky-high when we arrived; you could not hear your ears. We formed in two ranks in front of the crowd and when it became "lull" enough to hear me speak, I went over to the first rank, took my uniform cap off and made a collection through the two ranks. Why? There were youngsters there by the dozen dressed in flour sacks. I collected an amount from my men and pushed my way into the crowd and said: "Anybody here looking after relief?" One man shouted: "Yes, Sir! I am. Come this way, Sir!" I gave him whatever I had collected and said: "See that every cent of that is spent on these youngsters there, half-clad, naked." That is why I did it. That is what it is for and in 10 minutes from that you could drive a horse and carriage through the crowd. And I never heard a word, and came out of the place the same as I went in, and that was because sympathy got the crowd, like that. The same thing could have been done in Badger by anyone in charge out there.

Mr. Higgins: Men in charge of the police?

Mr. Strange: Not hot-headed.

Mr. Hollett: You mean police or RCMP?

Mr. Strange: If you want to put it that way.

Mr. Higgins: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would not suggest the people in charge of the police or the RCMP did not conduct themselves in a proper way at that time?

Mr. Strange: These people called a strike and they should be able to take care of it without violence and death — Certainly not — these people called a strike. That is the reason and the great reason about the ones responsible. I helped pass the legislation that went over that desk. I certainly did not approve of what happened in Badger, and in my opinion it should never have come to what it did come to.

(Applause from both sides of the house)

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, I do so with a feeling that most of the joys, sorrows, turbulences and other matters of vital interest to the common good and economical stability of this Province of Newfoundland, as stressed by His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor in his Speech from the Throne, have already received the attention of the hon. the Premier and the Government, with the support of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and its leader in some aspects.

As we look forward to the Queen's visit in June, I am sure it is with a feeling of pride that she will land first in Newfoundland, the youngest province of Canada, which was known in former years as Britain's Oldest Colony, with the assurance that the people of this Province of Newfoundland are just as loyal to the Motherland, in spite of infiltrations, which in the fast moving world of ours are boring into the very hearts of our communities — but more about that later. I have been quoted as saying we should hang flowers from the light poles along the route, but then, I have been quoted as saying a lot of things. I know it is impossible, with such a late spring as ours, to raise flowers to beautify the route, but what more beauty could her Majesty see then the flower of our youth in this new Canadian Province. And Sir, I sincerely hope and trust that our youth will get a front-line view, and that everybody will co-operate with the committee and the police in their duties along the route, and avoid the usual crowding and crushing which is all so evident on these special occasions and follow the no-parking instructions as issued by the committee in order to avoid incidents.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the most sorrowful note of the Speech from the Throne was the loss of the dragger, "Blue Wave". This Province mourns the loss of these gallant men and all of those who have gone down to the sea in ships and never returned. We can turn back the pages of our history and recall many disasters at sea. To those, Sir, left to mourn, our deepest sympathy goes out. If in any way they require help or education, without a breadwinner, I am sure that they will be looked after by the funds which have

been set up over the years. It has been stated in this house that these draggers are faulty. Well, I know nothing about that, nor about boat design, but I am sure that the weather we have experienced this winter, on land, sea and in the air, was not anticipated by any boat builder, road builder, transportation company nor any other public utility company through this Island, and I pay tribute in this house to the splendid work done throughout the country, our cities and townships, to those men who kept the traffic lanes open, and to those hardy men who look after our electricity, telephones and telegraph communications, for the job well done, both day and night, during one of the worst winters we have had for many, many years.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): What about the newsboys? They gave out the papers too.

Mr. Nightingale: They had to be printed first, and had there been a strike they would not get them.

Regarding the concern over the economic disturbances which have spread through out vital paper industry, I would like to congratulate this hon. house as a whole, and also the church leaders of all denominations for their combined stand and support against an insidious canker which is striking at the very heart of the paper industry. These companies have supported and built up the cities of Corner Brook and Grand Falls and their surrounding areas, making it possible for modern homes with electrification, water and sewerage, and above all churches and schools. Should we, as a province, see these cities and adjacent areas turned into ghost towns to satisfy the greed of International Unions? Have we in this Province lost all respect for law and order? If so, Mr. Speaker, let all law-abiding citizens see that it does not back-fire on ourselves.

We must have laws and they must be enforced if we, in this fast moving world of ours, wish to remain alive. I refer now to every law, including health, traffic, municipal and provincial laws. When one hears of the strife and the hatred, of friend against friend, and comrade against comrade and in many cases brother against brother, I can only wonder what kind of insidious prop-

aganda this is and where it originated. I can only present to those leaders who have broken the sound barriers of unionism, and tipped the scales from decent negotiations for that of mob rule, the words of a now famous hymn:

"Show me the way to conquer hate and greed — Your guiding hand is all I'll ever need — Please teach me to love this world that thou hast made — Hear me Lord, and show me the way — Show me the way to make my life worthwhile — Help me today to go that extra mile — Let someone be glad that I am alive today — Hear me Lord and show me the way."

Mr. Speaker, it has been said in the mainland press that this provincial government is against unions. This is not the case, and I am personally not against unions. I have worked with unions all my life. But, Sir, when the leaders of these unions cannot control them, it were better that they had not stirred up the emotions and hatreds which have been manifest in this crisis. Every man is entitled to a living wage, and every business the right to run its own business, with certain benefits for the worker. Unions originated from guilds, where only an expert in the craft was admitted, and where the worker was worthy of his hire. It is hoped that, in future, in a free world where every man has a right to work, unions in this Province will get down to the more sincere method of negotiations, rather than that of brute force and mob rule.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Government was deeply moved by the Prime Minister's (Mr. Diefenbaker) rebuttal of Term 29 of the Terms of Union. Nobody knows better than the government itself, who have raised the standards of health and education in this province comparable to other provinces of Canada (but we are still in many, many cases much lower) what the loss of our \$8 million grant will mean to these two departments alone, in their effort to keep up to the standards they have set. Regarding highroad conditions: Much is being done on the Trans-Canada Highway, but due to our weather conditions progress has been retarded. But, Sir, in and around this Capital City of St. John's, roads such as the Logy Bay, Torbay, Pouch Cove and across the Juniper Stump Road to Portugal Cove and the Thorburn Road could be paved at a very small cost in comparison to

the constant refills and grading necessary to keep them in fair condition for the vast amount of traffic which flows over them. I am sure the Prime Minister already knows of the vast influx of Canadian automobiles into this Province over the past ten years, but does he know of the high rate of mortality of these same automobiles due to the poor condition of our roads? One has only to see the derelicts lying around the countryside and in the yards of people, which have been worn out through the most terrible road conditions on the North American Continent. I know the Prime Minister means well when he tries to clean up our "Terms of Reference" by 1962, but in his remarks I feel he is quoting one of the familiar songs — "I can Give Nothing Else but Love, Baby!" If at all possible, Sir, the roads in the District of St. John's North and St. John's East should be paved, and, Sir, I am sure if the government cannot back a bond issue on a "Toll" road, then the Federal Government should. The residents of these districts would pay a nominal flat rate for perpetual use while the residents of St. John's could get a change of scenery from November to June.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Is that an invitation to the Federal Government to take over the paying of roads in the St. John's area?

Mr. Nightingale: No! Not at all! We would be delighted to get our own contractor if they would back a bond issue. At the present time; we can't get the government to back a loan. I know you would appreciate taking a little change of scenery from Topsail Road, over a nice smooth road for only 50 cents a trip in a car. Why, that is no more than is thrown away on a package of cigarettes. It can be done and should be done! This is a modern day and age, and we can't go on gravelling and raking and gravelling again.

Mr. Renouf: That is one of Mr. Diefenbaker's special projects, roads over the Province.

Mr. Nightingale: I have not heard, but would be very glad. I am sure the inhabitants of these districts would not mind paying a reasonable toll and saving themselves tremendous depreciation on their care,

while enjoying a change of scene. Cars and truck suffer tremendous depreciation and are literally shaken to pieces. Day after day, you can see them piled up everywhere around the countryside, which is becoming nothing but a dump heap. What we are going to do with them, I don't know. It is a disgrace to any community. And here is Ottawa spending \$20 million to put a green belt around that city. While we are building beautiful houses on the best land around this city, the countryside is full of garbage and what have you, when we should be able to drive over beautiful toll roads. That is the vision I have — at least we can hope, and I have always hoped.

Now, in 1958 the registration of cars and trucks for St. John's alone was 20,000 which is a great potential for a toll road. And it would be surprising what a difference it would make to the people of St. John's and vicinity who have only one road to travel over from November to June. Once November comes when people say — "Let us go for a drive" where are they going to go? Topsail, Manuels, Seal Cove and back again, and there they are bumper to bumper. So that the potential toll is right here in St. John's. Newfoundlanders don't want anything for nothing, and I am sure motorists would not mind paying a reasonable toll to save themselves depreciation on their cars while enjoying a change of scenery. They pay more for their cars due to the freight rates coming here, insurance rates are higher and instead of a normal depreciation the vehicles in this country depreciate 75% in two years.

Mr. Speaker, I have already presented petitions to this hon. house from the district of St. John's North, which I have the honour to represent, from the people of Shoe Cove, Pouch Cove and St. Phillips and last year I presented a petition from the people of Portugal Cove for a well. After considerable cleaning, testing and many reports I find that the water in that well is Grade "D". Like all the water in Portugal Cove, it cannot be anything else. People put down septic tanks and the lower part of the river is contaminated. But if the people piped down the water from the top of the hill it would be pure. It is the most beautiful water in the world. There are no people living around there. I am sure the people of Portugal Cove and my fellow member for Bell Island

(Mr. O'Driscoll) would appreciate it. They need water on Bell Island; we could even pipe it to Bell Island. While still on Portugal Cove, there is a small piece of land running down through Portugal between the rocks there, since they blasted the rocks. And it is too bad that one stretch of road should remain in a rocky and pothole condition when it is not more than a mile, if it is that, down from where it breaks through the wall. I really think Portugal Cove should be done this year, but I don't know whether we can place that on a future petition for the Minister of Highways at some future time and get it done while the weather is still warm.

On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, if I may take this opportunity of saying something to the house, which I had intended to say at the beginning: The Premier is expected to be in his seat tomorrow afternoon. He tried to get here by plane and there was a chance he might have reached here this morning. I was in touch with him by telephone last night and told him it was safe to stay until tomorrow. There is no need for him to break his neck to get here today. So, Sir, I expect the Premier will be in his place tomorrow. I might also say I was in touch with the hon. Member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Duffy), and I think he probably will be here.

Mr. Nightingale: Mr. Speaker, I think I left off at Portugal Cove Road, that beautiful stretch of road which runs down through the rock and which I insist should be finished. It is, I think, in the plans for nearly three years now and is not yet finished. It should have been part of the contract, whoever got the contract. It is a great inconvenience for the people of Bell Island driving up from the boat into that stretch of road.

Now, Sir, regarding the rest of my district, I must go now first of all to the Master Plan of the City of St. John's and rural extensions, of which the Minister of Municipal Affairs has released just a certain amount at the present time to the public, and I don't want to take away any of his thunder. But, Sir, a good many of the people live in that "No-Man's Land" Amherst Heights (neither in the city nor under provincial

jurisdiction) but tucked in between. And nobody wants it, nobody bothers about it. Why the city does not want to take it I do not know — we do collect garbage.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): I have had complaints.

Mr. Nightingale: Take the north side of Topsail Road, to McDonald's Fruit Store, I might say it is a pity these people in Amherst Heights are left without a proper road. Now I take it that the Minister of Municipal Affairs might answer us as to whether we, in the city of St. John's, are going to take in this piece of land along with the other rural districts surrounding St. John's, which are part of the master plan, and that includes not only St. John's West but St. John's East. It goes out to Mt. Cashel and takes in half of that district.

Mr. Hollett: Are you talking about the federal, now?

Mr. Nightingale: No, provincial. St. John's West is stretching out as far as Mount Pearl, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs has this beautiful plan which is going to cost a lot of money to organize and to finish. Therefore, Sir, I think it is going to be done in small pieces, but one of the pieces they have left out is the little section of Mundy Pond. You have often heard me say before that Mundy Pond is nothing but a stinking open cess-pool in the city of St. John's. It absolutely smells, Sir, the whole summer, and it is time to fill it in. There is a beautiful church and Sister's school and convent right opposite that stinking cess-pool. It is no big engineering feat to harness the river and cover that open sewer, cover it right down through the city, instead of having it open. As I said before, the average fellow who does not want a spare wheel just throws it in the river, and when a fender comes off he puts a new one on and throws it in the sewer. So by and by it all becomes choked up, and all the garbage that can possibly be thrown in this river is thrown in. If you stand on the bridge on Empire Avenue West, where the river enters the pond, you will find it is literally filled with tin cans and garbage of all descriptions. I think it is a crime. I cannot understand why the Minister of Municipal

Affairs has not included, in this new plan, at least as far as Mundy Pond and take that in.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is not here to defend himself.

Mr. Nightingale: If he were, he would not defend himself anyway!

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. member: The plan he refers to, is that the Provincial-Federal Plan?

Mr. Nightingale: That I think is the plan —

Mr. Higgins: It is the plan for the Metropolitan Area.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It is provincial — Probably you would like to have it federal.

Mr. Nightingale: Can't afford to go too far, therefore they are not including Mundy Pond, but I am hoping and sincerely trusting the government will see their way clear to fill in that stinking cess-pool, Mundy Pond, and close in that sewer right down through the city, and the city would possibly meet them as they came through.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Probably mislead them as they came through.

Mr. Nightingale: Once they had done it, at the same time they could control the river with regard to building. I know one house is right over the river, and all they have to do is lift a board in the kitchen and land a fish for breakfast. I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is a terrible state of affairs when people can live over a river. It is worse than the rice fields of China, anytime that happens. All river sites and ponds should be kept clear, I don't care in what part of the country or Province. With these thoughts, Sir, I will leave to your good authority Mundy Pond. It is a stinking cess-pool, but I feel that built in, the field there on the eastern side could be turned into a playing field, when covered over it could become a lovely park, and the whole place cleaned up. It is the one sore spot in the city of St. John's and I hate to see it.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Nightingale: I might also say, if you proceed down LeMarchant Road to Amherst Heights those poor people (many of them are very rich) are waiting to pay taxes and we can't decide between ourselves and the government who must own that piece of land. When you ask the city, they say it is the government, and ask the government they say it is the city. I think they should make up their minds right now who is to collect the taxes, fix the streets and plow them next winter. I hope the people in Amherst Heights leave that name to the very historical heights there, and continue to stay there under most trying conditions. I might also say the watershed, leading to James Street in that particular district, is on the other border line or fringe area and is causing most of these upheavals on Topsail Road.

Now, Sir, there is not very much more to say about that particular thing. Let us now proceed to Mount Pearl. I really appreciate the fact that the municipality is doing a real job in Mount Pearl with the sewerage system, which is badly needed, and the city of St. John's is going to send water boys out to supply it with water, i.e. water meters, and I am sure that these people in Mount Pearl will appreciate the fact when they get water and sewerage; what a wonderful thing it is. And when it comes down, as it will, to the new interceptor sewer in St. John's, which must supply both the sanitorium and mental hospital, and go right out and take the main sewers from the city of St. John's, and must be pumped out by three pumping stations to the Chain Rock (which as we all know is the place we used to put chains across to keep boats from coming in during the war) this is where our garbage and debris will be pumped into the harbour. During meetings I have had with the experts and with the mayor himself I have asked several times — "Are we going to spend millions of dollars, with the Federal Government, I believe, in this pumping station to pump our sewage to Chain Rock and is it then going to just flow back again to the bottom of the harbour or can anybody tell which way the current flows, and when it flows does it go with the tide? Up to the present time nobody has told me exactly what is going to happen to that garbage.

Well, Sir, we now see gulls in St. John's Harbour. They fly around, but don't perch here very often. It is a very clean harbour as a rule. But this sewage will possible flow back. I am going to say it is just as well to know, before they start to build the sewer, whether they should proceed further on into Quidi Vidi Gut and empty, instead of at Chain Rock. The Mayor suggested I throw out a bottle, I did not have an empty one, all were full. At the same time, the current should be followed hour by hour and watch the results. A gallon of dye could be thrown in at Chain Rock and the direction would be noted by experts to find what way the current would take the garbage, instead of spending a million dollars only to find the garbage back where it started.

With these few words, Mr. Speaker, I now close, and thank the hon. gentlemen for their kind attention in listening and hope and trust that millions of dollars will not be wasted, and this Mundy Pond will be taken care of by the Minister of Municipal Affairs — Thank you!

(Applause from both sides)

On motion of Mr. Sheppard (Harbour Grace): the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned:

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955":

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, this Bill, and indeed the next one on the Order Paper both are designed to facilitate the financing of the development of the asbestos discovery at Baie Verte. In 1955, the legislation authorized an exclusive mineral exploration right with Mr. M. James Boylen, covering 775 square miles of the Burlington Peninsula, and 20 square miles on Pilley's Island. Subsequently, and as he had the right, Boylen assigned the Burlington Area, 775 square miles, to Advocate Mines Limited and assigned the Pilley's Island portion of the concession to Lead Mines. That 1955 concession was a concession for four years, and carried obligations of requiring the concessionaires to spend \$60,000 a year in exploration, and at the

end of that period the concessionaire was to have the right to select 60 square miles for further development. Now, up to the end of March 1958 \$1.25 million had been spent on the concessions, mostly explorations. What came out of it is well known. The principal thing which came out of it was a substantial discovery of asbestos in Baie Verte.

Then arose the matter of arranging financing to develop that asbestos finding, and to arrange the financing the concessionaires would require to come to the government to ask for an extension of the period for which the concession agreement would be effective. Originally, the agreement was signed April 1, 1955, and the concession would have expired April 1, 1959. The house authorized an amendment on the concession agreement to this effect; that Boylen would have a one year extension of his 1955 concession for every 1,000 tons of mining capacity that he brought into production anywhere in his enterprise in Newfoundland. Now, since he has subsequently brought in 2,000 tons per day on the operation at Tilt Cove, the effective date of the 1955 Concession Right would be 1961. But as I have said, in order to arrange financing to proceed with the development of Baie Verte deposits, the concessionaire came to the government and asked for an extension of the period of the concession.

This first Bill is a Bill to surrender, out of the 1955 concession agreement, the area of the Burlington Peninsula, 775 square miles on the Burlington Peninsula that were assigned to Advocate. Now, what is to be done with that area when it is surrendered is the subject matter of the Bill that follows. I presume, Mr. Speaker, I will have to wait until that Bill is before the house before I can indicate what that is.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Advocate Mines Limited":

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to authorize the exclusive mineral exploration concession authority to Advo-

cate Mines Limited for a period from September, 1958 up until December of 1962. If the area on the Burlington Peninsula in question is not to be surrendered, the effective date of the termination of the concession area would be April 1, 1961, so that actually the purpose of this Bill is to extend the concession agreement in respect of the Burlington Area for another two and one half months. As I have said, that requirement was necessary in order to achieve the financing to bring about the development of that asbestos deposit. The schedule to the Bill, which is the amendment, provides that the concessionaire shall spend another \$1 million on exploration and development of the concession area before December 1, 1961. The concessionaire will have the right to select 50 square miles. The other conditions that apply in the proposed agreement are the same as apply in the agreement now in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I understand Advocate Mines Limited would be subsidiary to Mr. M. James Boylen; am I correct in thinking that?

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): An assignee of Boylen.

Mr. Hollett: I would like to have the matter cleared up. I was under the impression it was a subsidiary.

Mr. Curtis: It could not be subsidiary.

Mr. Hollett: Probably the Minister would explain that when he replied.

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, I may have to correct myself later, but I think the situation is that Advocate Mines have arranged with Johns-Manville to assume control. In other words they are to develop, operate the mines, bring them into production and actually produce. Also I think it is a matter of public knowledge a group consisting of Johns-Manville, and one or two others named here in the agreement, have financial control of the company. They have the major stocks in other words.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest an adjournment of second reading until tomorrow:

Mr. Curtis: The debate is closed, Mr. Speaker — the Minister spoke.

Mr. Hollett: I don't see it is closed — I merely asked a question and he answered. I am certainly not satisfied and would like to have an explanation before we go on. In any case my colleague from St. John's South has —

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): My brief is, Mr. Speaker, this is purely subject to the Minister's statement, this new financial arrangement has been circulated amongst the brokerage people in the last few months. The general impression is that the financial situation is much stronger. I have seen some reference to it recently in a private circular sent out to shareholders. I know some people bought a lot of stocks. I understand it is a standard thing. I believe that enquiry would reveal that the new set-up will be stronger than the initial.

Mr. Speaker: When the hon. Minister replied, strictly speaking, the debate was closed.

Mr. Hollett: Okay! Okay! The people of Newfoundland and we can get the particulars alright. Never mind Parliamentary rules.

Mr. Keough: I would like to make a suggestion to one or two things.

Mr. Hollett: To a point of order — is not the debate closed?

Mr. Higgins: The Minister is trying to help.

Mr. Hollett: Don't mind about that.

Mr. Curtis: I suppose we could waive the rules.

Mr. Speaker: A debate is closed when the hon. Minister replies.

Mr. Hollett: We will do without the information and get it otherwise.

Mr. Higgins: And buy a few shares.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act":

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with this Bill in two parts: The first part of the Bill, the part with which Section (2) is concerned, arose out of the desire on the part of the Department of Mines and Resources to have in the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act a similar provision to Section (10) of the Crown Lands Act. Section (10) of the Crown Lands Act reads: "Whenever a grant, lease or licence has been issued in the name of the wrong party or contains any clerical error, misnomer or wrong or defective description of the land thereby intended to be granted and there is in such grant, lease or licence, an omission of the conditions of the grant, lease or licence, the Minister may, (there being no adverse claim) direct the defective grant, lease or licence, to be cancelled and a correct one to be issued in its stead, which corrected grant, lease or licence, shall relate back to the date of the one so cancelled, and be of the same effect as if issued at the date of such cancelled grant, lease or licence." There is no similar provision in the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, and it is thought in the department it would be desirable to have such a provision. Therefore, the Department of the Attorney General, when the legislation went to them for drafting, considered our wishes might best be met as suggested in Section (2) of this proposed bill whereby all of the beneficial provisions of the Crown Lands Act are made to apply to the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act.

The second portion of the Bill, from Section (3) to the end, is designed to remedy that situation in the Province of Newfoundland today, when a man stakes a mining claim he automatically ties up all surface rights. Neither the government nor anybody else can deal with them until the matter of staking is resolved. In other words, it is possible for a man to stake 5,000 square miles of Newfoundland tomorrow, and he can tie up the surface rights providing he is able to finance the maintenance of his claim for

three years, and take out a development licence and can continue that development licence in effect in perpetuity if he is prepared to lay out the amount of monies involved. That is not a desirable situation, and it is proposed in this bill to correct this by providing that, where in the future, a man stakes a mining claim he will have the right to apply for and get such surface land reasonably necessary to conduct mineral operations.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I have not had much time to study this although I must admit I have had the Bill for some time. I did not get the time nor the opportunity to read it over. But, Sir, do I understand from Clause (3) that the leasee can hold this land indefinitely by paying an amount, I think of two dollars an acre or something for so long a time and then 10 cents an acre thereafter? Is that possible? If that is so, there is not much relief given because he only has to spend \$10 an acre on development. I may be wrong, but I would like the Minister to comment in reply. Otherwise, I have nothing against it.

Mr. Keough: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite a long while since I did my homework on this, and I would like to take some legal advice myself before replying to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, so I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate on Second Reading adjourned.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Suspension of the Rent Restrictions Act":

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): I understand, Mr. Speaker, that Bill has already been moved and I think some members spoke on it. I just wonder if anyone else wants to say something.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act":

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, in 1953, principally in the interest of preserving caribou population, it was necessary to prohibit by

regulations the keeping of fire arms in logging camps, mining camps and construction camps during the close season for big game. Now, during the past year we had occasion to investigate a complaint that fire arms were being kept in a certain camp during close season, but when we started to investigate the question arose as to the right to search for fire arms in these camps. The matter was referred to the Department of the Attorney General and they advised us that no right existed to search logging camps, mining camps or construction camps for fire arms and that no such warrant could be issued under the Summary Jurisdiction Act. So, therefore, the purpose of this amendment is to enable a search of logging camps, mining camps and construction camps to enable them to be searched during the close season for firearms. I move second reading:

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the words there that worry me a bit — "Where firearms are kept contrary to the Act". I have not had a chance to look at the Act. It seems to me this gives the wild life officer the right to enter into a mining camp or construction camp or logging camp, whenever he so pleases, and search for fire arms. It seems completely unnecessary in our country. It is well known of course in our country we have such predatory animals as bears, and it is often necessary in these camps to keep fire arms in order to protect the property and to protect the individual. Is it possible this Act would prohibit the keeping of a rifle or firearms of any kind in a camp? If it does, I think I am opposed to it. I can quite see the necessity for firearms or a gun in such camps, but think it should be necessary for the proper person there to procure a licence to have the gun or rifle. If that is provided for in the Act, I am perfectly satisfied. If it is not, I am definitely opposed to this amendment. I do not think either that we ought to give the wild life officer the right to go and search any camp, as far as that is concerned. We have police officers and we have all sorts of wardens. Under certain circumstances, I can quite understand why they should be given the right to go in — police officers, of course, have the right, but are you going to make police officers out of wild life officers; who are, as far as I can find

out, mostly brought in from other countries to Newfoundland. I don't see why we should give them the right to go in and search a mining, logging or construction camp or any camp. I fail to see the necessity for it. Is it the insinuation of this amendment that these camps are breaking our game laws to such an extent that this is absolutely essential? Are they going out and feeding their men on wild game shot by rifle and gun? If so, possible there is room for some regulation. But, Sir, I do think, if you are going to pass this amendment, you must make it possible for the camp owner to have in his possession a rifle or gun at all times, if he so desires. I don't think you should disallow that, because I do know, and I have seen cases myself, where it was absolutely essential in a logging camp to kill a wild bear or two in order to make it possible for men to go to work and cut logs. I know that to have happened. Are you going to prevent that? These are just rambling objections, but I think they are valid, and I do hope the minister will look into that before this becomes law, if it is possible for the camp owner to keep a gun in his possession in his camp. If so then I am perfectly happy. If it is not possible, I do not think we should prohibit his having it, and I don't think we should allow wild life officers to go in and seize the camp owners gun without cause. If it is proven the camp owner killed a caribou or shot geese out of season, then there is cause and a complaint made and a summons issued and the man brought before court. If you are going to allow wild life officers to go into camps at any time looking around under the bunks and see a gun there, you won't get some of our men to go in the woods because they want some protection. On the face of it, I am opposed to that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, in general I would agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I know the good purpose of the proposed Act is for the protection of the caribou herd. But is there not some way that inspection can be made? Surely a gun is not the final evidence of anything. Would not the remains of a caribou carcass be more conclusive evidence than a gun, that caribou were being illegally shot or destroyed?

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Supposed he dropped dead?

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, the law already provides the wild life officer, who may be any accredited wild life officer of the Department, any RCMP, any local police with the right to enter any of these camps in close season and search for wild game, wild meat, that is there. And if it is found and conviction follows, it is confiscated. The chances are (let us put it this way) if it is against the law, at the moment it was found desirable to prohibit the keeping of guns in close season in these various camps, that was based upon good experience, and this year we had at least one specific instance where we had reason to believe that a gun was being kept in a certain camp illegally, and we had no means of finding out. This legislation is not necessary in order to provide the right to find out.

Now, as regards the other point raised — the law as it presently stands does provide the Minister may, at the request of the camp foreman, issue a permit for the keeping of firearms and whatever firearms are necessary in a camp during a close season.

Mr. Hollett: That is the point I wanted brought out.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion that the house go into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

Mr. Clarke took the Chair as Chairman of Committee of the Whole:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Trustee Act.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without Amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act.

Mr. Hollett: In Clause 5 (3) — "discontinuance of water on failure to pay on due date" — In other words, if I fail to pay today I am likely to have the water cut off tomorrow. That is a little bit stern.

Mr. Higgins: That is the same power as exists today in other places, but they never

do it — Johnny Burke tells the famous story about the fellow got the water cut off.

Mr. Hollett: Take for instance Green Bay or over in Port de Grave, which my hon. friend spoke about so well. I was happy to hear him talk about Port de Grave. They are fine people. I would be happy to see them get water, but don't want to see a man cut off when he can get his fish sold today and does not have enough money to pay it. We have heard a lot of talk about tax lately, school tax — If we are going to put on a tax make it easy to pay, make it easy to survive — and the very idea embodied in this section, if you don't pay your water tax in Port de Grave today you won't get water tomorrow — That is hard stuff and stern, you know.

Mr. Curtis: I think my hon. friend is overlooking the previous subsection "may make regulations respecting" — We are just allowing them to include that amongst the regulations they may make. We are not making any regulations.

Mr. Nightingale (St. John's North): Nevertheless, I think this is discriminatory, if people cannot afford to pay it at the time I think they should be allowed a certain limit of time.

Mr. Higgins: This is not the City of St. John's?

Mr. Nightingale: Any city. I would say the City of St. John's is a little more humane than that.

Mr. Hollett: I have to agree with the hon. member for St. John's North — for the "Outport Government", such as we see on the opposite side, to bring in or make a regulation like that — it is terrible. I do hope the general public outside St. John's will know exactly what this government is doing. I object very strongly to that.

Mr. Higgins: It must be the first ward day or something — everybody gets addled. This is a perfectly simple thing. Somebody in control has to give authority to do that. It does not mean they are going to — They never do that. The same applies to the City of St. John's and the City of Corner Brook. I think honestly, the hon. Leader is just pull-

ling the leg of the hon. member for St. John's North.

Mr. Hollett: What an idea! I am between two Municipal fires, and I seek your protection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nightingale: I might say, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is between two worthy fires, and I may say also, it would take a lot of water to put the two fires out.

Mr. Hollett: It is all right if it is not cut off. Motion that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers of the Nomenclature Board":

Motion that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could refer back to Section (8) of that Bill: By leave, Committee referred back to Section (8):

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, here I can visualize the Board, especially one appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, suddenly becoming intoxicated with the idea of modernizing Newfoundland by renaming 90% of the settlements in the country. Now, what I am trying to suggest is, should not the idea of renaming any settlement or any community come from the community itself rather than from the Board which is going to be set up. I am going to suggest, if I am not too late, that there might be an amendment there — "the Board may recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, on request of the citizens therein."

Mr. Curtis: There may be none if it is a mountain peak or something like that.

Mr. Hollett: It says nothing about peaks. I am thinking about many settlements and villages and other populated areas. I don't think we ought to make it possible for a Board of decent men to sit down and say — Take Burin for instance. That is where I come from. That is a terrible name! What does it mean? Very few people in New-

foundland know what "Burin" means. It is a terrible name! They could say; "let us change it to something else".

Mr. Curtis: What does it mean?

Mr. Hollett: And make recommendations to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that the name "Burin" be changed to something else, or rename Port au Bras.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): No! No! No!

Mr. Hollett: That is possible, if the Board recommends it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. You might possibly find a stupid Lieutenant-Governor in Council. It is possible they could rename Burin "Catrock" or something like that.

Mr. Curtis: It must first be advertised for two months.

Mr. Hollett: Never mind the advertising — Why should not the recommendations to the Board come from the people in the community? I think I would like to see that incorporated.

Mr. Higgins: What is the meaning of Burin?

Mr. Hollett: Don't ask me. I know what it is, yes!

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to defer the Committee stage so that the matter my hon. friend referred to could be examined. I think he can feel assured that as long as we are in the government there is nothing to worry about. I can see he may be worried about the day he may be there, and wants to protect the people against himself. So I think Sir, the Committee might rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Higgins: We never did find out the meaning of Burin though!
Mr. Speaker (Deputy) returned to the Chair.

Mr. Sheppard: (Committee Chairman): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered the matters to them referred and

passed the following Bill without amendment:

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Trustee Act"
"An Act to Amend the Local Government Act, 1956"

On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow:

Mr. Sheppard: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered other matters to them referred, made progress and asks leave to sit again:

On motion committee ordered sit again on tomorrow:

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at three o'clock.

Tuesday, April 28, 1959

Afternoon Session

The house met at three o'clock.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. L. Strange (Port de Grave): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the citizens of Coley's Point, Port de Grave district. The prayer of the petition is for the widening and repair to the road on the south side of Coley's Point. I am well acquainted with the place. I know it very well, and the road needs widening in different places, particularly for the purpose of snow-clearing. During the past and previous winters, and the past winter particularly, the snow plow could not efficiently operate on the south side of the point. The prayer of the petition is for the widening of this road. I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and ask to have it referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

GIVING NOTICE OF MOTION:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Memorial University Act."

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I might ask the hon. the Premier — It is always good to see him back, of course — I want to know what he was doing while he was gone. I might ask the hon. the Premier if he is prepared to make a statement relative to his recent trip to Europe?

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his kindly reference to my absence or to my return rather. I can only say that I don't think it would be in the public interest at this time to indicate the exact nature of my business in London. I was not in Europe. I was in England, unless England could be counted as part of Europe. I was there three or four days and had some interesting discussions, but it would not be in the public interest at this time to indicate the nature of the discussions, topics, nor the names of those with whom I held them. I am sure the hon. member will not press the matter when I assure him sincerely that it would not be in the public interest at this time to give the information he has asked.

While I am at it, I think that my hon. friend will agree also with me when I say that, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister recently made a speech on television, I believe, and radio, probably, about Newfoundland that was, so I am told, of a conciliatory nature, it would be best if we refrained in this house, all of us, from any remarks that might turn the Prime Minister in his feelings towards us in a less unfriendly direction than they appear to be, I have not read nor heard the speech. I hope to do so, but I am given to understand that the Prime Minister appeared to be anxious to restore friendly relations with this province. If that is so, I am sure that no one in this house, nor in this Province, would wish to say a single word to show lack of appreciation, as Newfoundlanders, of that attitude.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply.

Mr. C. Sheppard (Harbour Grace): Mr. Speaker, together with previous speakers in this debate I too offer my congratulations to both the hon. members who proposed and seconded the motion that a Committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply. Both of the hon. gentlemen are well-known to me, and their excellent effort came as no great surprise to me.

In June we are to be extremely honoured by a visit from Her Majesty. And I suppose in this province of all provinces across Canada no greater loyalty will be stirred. I think almost to a person in this province we regard the Sovereign as something that appears very much apart, and one to whom we have always shown extreme loyalty in peace and in war. I feel sure that, when she arrives here in June, she will receive a welcome second to none of anywhere in this country. Coming at this late date, my public expression of sympathy to the bereaved on account of the marine disaster on the South Coast will probably seem a little late, but having some personal connection with that part of the country in that one of my ancestors came from Grand Bank, and having also lost an uncle myself in somewhat similar disaster, only 21 years of age, my personal feelings are mixed with public ones when I express my most sincere sympathy to those left behind because of this disaster. Very little remains for me to say. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this terrible labour dispute that we have witnessed during this year, I, like the other members of this house, gave full support to the Premier in his actions, and I gave my full support to the actions of this house. I think it is regrettable that a dispute of this nature had to occur and that it took the form that it did. I, for one cannot see how we could have acted otherwise. Undoubtedly the scars will remain for some considerable period, and it is the bounden duty of each of us, and I think of every citizen of this Province, to do what he or she can do in the future to help remove the scars and to heal the rift which has been caused. The district which I have the honour to represent was not affected directly, but like all the rest of the Province, it

was affected indirectly by this upheaval. I only hope that as time goes by we may see the brothers and the sons and the fathers who have been torn asunder by this calamity brought together in Christian harmony once again.

Out of respect to the wishes expressed by the hon. the Premier, I will not say anything about Term 29, except just this: I sincerely hope that, between now and 1962, the Government of Canada will seriously reconsider the opinions expressed by the Prime Minister. I don't think it is too much to hope for that, and probably within a few months or within a few years, we shall receive what we all consider, and what the greater part of Canada considers, to be our just deserts under the solemn obligations under which we entered (both countries) in 1949.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to developments which are proceeding in Labrador, and, since the Speech from the Throne, we have had further elaboration from the Premier. Labrador seems to some of us a good distance away. I suppose it is because we have been so completely out of touch with Labrador it sometimes seems so far away that it might not even be a part of Newfoundland. But, in the past 10 years, these developments which have already begun, mean much to our economy and as the years roll by, will mean more and more. Expenditures such as these great steel companies are making and are about to make in Labrador cannot but help to strengthen the economy of this province and the economy of Canada as a whole. I have not had the opportunity of visiting any of these developments personally, but did have an opportunity to read the booklets put out by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and I was truly amazed to read and see there, in pictorial form, the amazing developments which that company, out of many, has already accomplished. While on that subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to a matter that has been raised in debate before, that is the manner under which our Newfoundland labour is recruited to serve with the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Hear! Hear!

Mr. Sheppard: I have had occasion, as had a

good many others of this house, to recommend and to refer men to the Iron Ore Company for employment, ranging from ordinary unskilled labourers to skilled men such as operators of various types of heavy equipment, bulldozers, etc. A good many of these men and I will say most of them have been known to me, some of them I have recommended with a little hesitation but the greater majority I felt could certainly take on most of the jobs which this company was offering on the Labrador. I was amazed and I still am amazed at the number of bright, intelligent, not too well educated men who took the examinations set by this company and who failed. I cannot see — I cannot see especially for a labourer why he should have to pass an examination or a test which is equivalent, I understand, to around Grade VII or Grade VIII.

Mr. Hollett: Grade IX.

Mr. Sheppard: Yes! In some cases the test are about Grade VII standard, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hollett: He has to know his fractions too.

Mr. Sheppard: That amazed me, a man going down there as an ordinary labourer. I do not think he would be at all interested if he had Grade IX. Then he probably would not be going down there to swing pick and shovel or a hammer driving spikes. And I take the word of the company that this is a standard procedure, to take the exam; but I wonder — I wonder if the exam itself throughout the recruiting province is a standard exam. I have my doubts on that point.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Sheppard: In the field of education, Mr. Speaker, the Speech makes reference briefly to the Memorial University, that great institution which stands there on the old Parade Grounds is a perpetual memorial to those men and women who gave their lives in the First World War. It is a great institution and in the past few years it has become greater than it was previously, and in the years to come it is going to play an even greater role in the training and mould-

ing of our youth, who, Please God, will be given the opportunity to put their knowledge to the test within the realms and territories of our own Province can quarrel in the slightest degree with out education policy as it has been administered through our Department of Education. We don't always agree about everything. That, I suppose, is as it should be in a country where we have free speech and a reasonable democracy. I am sorry the Minister of Education (Mr. Rowe) is not here. There was one point which I feel, Sir, the minister knows of but which I had hoped to talk over with him before I mentioned it, and that is within the field of vocational training.

I notice this year, this present calendar year, that one of our great communications companies, operating within the province and right across Canada, has started a training school for the technicians to work in connection with the new microwave development, which is being brought across the province. I understand from reliable and responsible authorities that the Philco Corporation of America undertook to run a training school for this communications company. If my memory serves me right, there was an enrolment in that school. Apart from a Grade XI academic education, the student must have some knowledge of basic electricity. Pre-testing was done to determine the knowledge that an individual student had. Applicants were invited from all over the province for that training school. Because the future of that field is bright, and even while under training the students were paid a very reasonable amount, and if they graduated they were assured a good position at good pay with this company. Now, it was found that a large percentage of the students had to be brought into the province from as far west as the province of Alberta. I understand that the majority of the students who have now graduated (the school finished I think within the past 10 days) from the school were brought in from provinces on the mainland.

Mr. Hollett: By whom?

Mr. Sheppard: By this company, because they received applications, but our own students did not have the basic knowledge, or the knowledge of basic electricity, to pass

the pre-test to qualify for the training course. I was about to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that probably here is a field for exploration in our vocational training programme. This expansion which is going on in telecommunications across Canada is not going to change even within the foreseeable future, and there are numerous opportunities for young men to get into this field now. But, Sir, if our high schools are not teaching students the principles of basic electricity, then, in all probability, it should be done at the vocational training school, where I understand no course in electricity is available. At least the responsible authority of this company tells me that they could not get any students from the vocational training institution. I further understand that this company is very anxious to assist in any way possible with the training of such students at the vocational training institution, or under any other scheme which the Department of Education may think desirable. That is only one company. There are other companies, of course, in this business too, within the country, and they too are interested.

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel too qualified to talk on the subject of the fisheries. I grew up in an area which was predominantly an area where people went fishing to the Labrador in the summer time. I remember hundreds of crews going, from the settlements around where I was born, in the spring of the year and returning in the fall. A good many of these men, while they did not become millionaires, apparently made enough to get by on, and some of them I know who are living now in retirement must have saved a little nest egg. Last year in my district I don't think (and as a matter of fact I am sure) that there were any more than 12 crews altogether, whereas, as I have said, I can remember in my own lifetime seeing at least 30 crews going from the place where I was born.

Now, I have been told, and I suppose it is correct, that the Labrador fishery is not an economically sound fishery. Some of the fishermen with whom I have spoken agree somewhat, and others disagree. There are still some men fishing and tell me they can still make a half decent living fishing on the Labrador. At any rate, I have not been able to induce any of these men, who are good fishermen, to change from the Labrador and start fishing out of Conception Bay. I

don't know what the alternative is for these places in my district. A lot of the fishermen switched to "base" work, and other forms of employment. There are quite a few of them now there, literally hundreds, not hundreds of fishermen but I have hundreds of men in my district now looking for work. I feel sure that quite a few of these men would return to the fishery if they had the where-with-all to commence afresh, and I was interested in some remarks made by the previous speakers when they recommended or suggest that probably this type of fishermen should be given small loans to rehabilitate themselves. I am inclined to agree that that should be a basic part of our fishery policy. However I do think, having watched over the past 10 or 12 years the fishermen of Port de Grave and the fishermen of Bay de Verde, and knowing that the fish plant in Harbour Grace is capable of taking a great deal more fish and processing a great deal more fish than it now processes, I do believe that there is room for further expansion of the inshore fishery in and around my district.

We have heard the criticisms of the Department of Fisheries and its policies and the amount of monies which it makes available for fishermen now. I am only speaking, not taking a very broad view, but narrowing myself down to my own district. I don't think there can be a successful inshore fishery not within the confines of Conception Bay itself. The fishermen of Port de Grave and Bay de Verde prove they have to go further afield than Conception Bay. I wonder if it is commonly known that, under our present fishery scheme, a fisherman who wishes to build a 40 foot boat, or over, can receive today in provincial and federal bounties the sum of \$360 per ton - \$325 - I stand corrected. Now, a 40 foot boat, I understand, runs somewhere around 26 to 16 tons.

Mr. Hollett: More than that surely!

Mr. Sheppard: Well I am being a bit on the conservative side. But I know of instances, Mr. Speaker; I know of two instances at least in my district where fishermen have built boats under this scheme and their outlay in cash has been less than \$1,000 for boat and engine combined, because they have built the boats themselves — And, Sir, they are

fine boats, they are good boats! They speak highly of them! I am not a boat man. I sail a punt but would not classify myself as a fisherman or expert on boats, but these men tell me they are quite satisfied with their boats. One man told me, "I am really fishing in luxury." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the fishermen in my district that probably a lot more of them (and they are good fishermen over there) could take advantage of this scheme. There is a plant looking for more fish, generally the fish is out there to be caught, and we have our Department of Fisheries willing and prepared to assist these bona fide fishermen. I prevailed on one man to take advantage of the scheme. I tried to prevail on another, but for some unknown reason he won't take advantage of it, probably because he is afraid of the unknown. I do think, Sir, that a lot more men in my district could make a decent living if they would take advantage of this scheme.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend will allow — I was just wondering if the Provincial Department of Fisheries or the Federation of Fishermen is doing anything to make this knowledge available to the fishermen.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): They know all about it.

Premier Smallwood: There must be at least several thousand fishermen all over the province who have applied for loans. They did not all get the loans — So it must be pretty generally known.

Mr. Sheppard: I think it is pretty generally known, Mr. Speaker. The reason I raised the point is that I am rather surprised, and I have expressed my surprise to a good many people, that more fishermen do not take advantage of it. We have here my hon. friend from the District of Port de Grave (Mr. Strange) who represents what, in my opinion, is one of the best fishing communities possibly in the world. I have seen them! I have watched them there in Harbour Grace. I have seen them come in and handle their fish and I have also been present in the office of North Eastern Fisheries when they received pretty fine cheques. And they deserved them because they are pretty fine people.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Speaker, might I ask my hon. friend exactly what type of motor they put in these boats that cost \$1,000? The average price of an in-board-motor for a fishing boat of that size?

Mr. Cheeseman: It depends on what type of boat.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Harbour Grace has the floor, and only he can answer a question or speak at this time. He was good enough to yield the floor. That does not give anyone else the right.

Mr. Nightingale: I don't want to take the floor, but I am interested in the fishery as much as my hon. friend here. I was just wondering. I would be just as glad if you answer the question — How much will it cost, and why we have not more? Really today the fishery should be a nice luxurious job, inside a nice cabin, pressing a button to start the engine.

Mr. Sheppard: I have heard, Mr. Speaker, the matter of an engine is something like buying a car. You can pay \$1,700 or pay \$17,000, I suppose, for a car. I understand the prices of these engines range somewhere from \$1,000 to \$2,800, according to the preference in engines. Some of the more successful men start off with the cheaper, smaller, less powerful type of engine and later, after having some success, go on to a more powerful and better type engine, and their boat has progressed in size. But my hon. friend here from St. John's North (Mr. Nightingale) says that the fishermen should have a nice cabin and press a button. Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend and other hon. friends here would come to Harbour Grace when the fishery is on, they will see these fishermen enjoying just that.

Mr. Nightingale: I am glad to hear it!

Mr. Sheppard: These boats have good sleeping accommodations, they have covered cabins and wheel houses and they press a button to start the motor and a handle to put her into gear, a deck winch, commonly known as a "girthy" which hauls in the trap, and last year I saw one man even

had (and I hope he has it patented by this time as it would probably make money) a large size dip net rigged on a boom with which he dipped up fish from his trap, pulled in the line and dumped it into the hold of the boat. He told me himself that he even had a little shelf in his cabin where he could put a bottle of rum. They are ranging anywhere from Harbour Grace Island to Cape Race. Mr. Speaker, I understand one boat over there in 1957, as an example, went down fishing off Ferryland and in six weeks netted \$1,500 — down in the district of the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs (Mr. Murray). But I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is room, we have a plant which calls for more fish, and there is room for more fishermen and a scheme they can take advantage of.

My district geographically is a small district, in population not so small. It is not one of the biggest but not the least in population. I want to run quickly through some of the things which I see are needed in my district. Before I start, I would like to say that the majority of the people in my district know and appreciate the services which they enjoy, and when I hear members like the hon. member for Green Bay (W. Smallwood) and other members stand up and ask for small connecting roads and when I look around my district, while everything is not perfect, and see a paved road and reasonable secondary roads I am inclined to forego some of the fringes being put on what we now have, if the people in Green Bay, White Bay and other isolated districts can receive some benefits. We are not asking for much. We don't want too much. What I am going to say now of my district is not a tale of woe and it is not at all a tale of hand-out, looking for something.

I would like to start with that very old and historic little settlement, Bristol's Hope, a name which sounds so sweet and which brings up such a picture of our historic past. Bristol's Hope is a small place, dwindling probably in population, only about a mile from the main transmission lines of the United Towns Electric Company, surrounded by other communities enjoying the benefits of electricity, and yet denied the benefits themselves. For Bristol's Hope I make one plea and that is that the United Towns Electric Company should see fit, even if it means a loss for that company, to provide electric-

ity for that small place, should see fit to run a line from its main transmission lines down there to give the people the benefits of electricity.

In Harbour Grace I suppose I would be remiss in my duty if I did not make reference to the great events which have been taking place in the sporting world in the past three or four days, the past week or so. The hon. member for Humber East (Mr. Forsey), I know how much it goes against his grain, making himself heard over the radio and doing a very good job of it. I know he had to be pushed into it and they had to stick a pin into him to make him talk. He did a very good job. At this time I would like to pay tribute to the young boys, most under the age of 21, who went forth from Conception Bay during the past 10 days to do battle in the sporting field and together with the Grand Falls boys, both of them together, have proven that there is such a thing left in this country as good, clean amateur sport, played in a sporting manner. Now, that might sound trivial, Mr. Speaker, but to me I regard what has been going on in Harbour Grace over the past couple of years as a great compliment to other fields and other endeavours in the education field, and that is the physical training which the youth from Trinity South, Conception Bay North, right up around to Kelligrews, Holyrood, have been receiving in that new recreational centre there in Harbour Grace. I feel sure, Sir, that the spirit that is being engendered there amongst these boys, and the training they are receiving is not going to fail them. Again I pay tribute to the Conception Bay team, who just returned defeated but who played in a very sporty manner. I would like to pay tribute to the team from Grand Falls which did so nobly also.

Harbour Grace South, I suppose, is the home of the greatest number of qualified shipwrights in Newfoundland, a race of men which now it seems, are doomed to lose their skills in other fields of endeavour because at the present time there is not much work for that type of man, such as we had in the field of shipwrights in Harbour Grace. But I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Fisheries and any other minister who may be interested, that with the growing fleet of these larger boats around Conception Bay, maybe it is time to give some consideration to the reactivating or rebuilding

of the slipway and dock at Harbour Grace, which served our coasting fleet for a great many years and which served them, I think, rather nobly. I should also like the Minister of Fisheries to take under consideration, and use what influence he can with the Federal Government, the matter of the dredging of Harbour Grace inside of King's Beach. There, for very little expense, it is possible to provide a safe anchorage for boats which have to run into other ports much further afield when it becomes very stormy.

I suppose the most maddening thing which has happened in my district in the past year is the effect of the closing down of the mine on Bell Island. Upper Island Cove, which has a population of over 2,000 people at the present time had over 80 men (eighty families) employed on the island, some of them with service as long as 18 years and some with services of only three years. The vast majority of them, Mr. Speaker, war veterans of either World War I or World War II, one of the other, or of both of the world wars. I think of the other places, Island Cove, every second man over there is a war veteran. Out of approximately 80 men who were employed, 38, according to my latest information, have received their dismissal notice and will be going out now on the first of May, jobless. A good many of these men are senior men, Mr. Speaker. I see very little opportunity of employment for some of them. Some of these men are in their early 50's and some are in their early 60's, and even if the job opportunities were available there are not too many employers now prepared to take on men of that age. That is a sad situation! It is bad enough for the younger men, but I feel very sorry for these older men. As far as Upper Island Cove is concerned, I suppose, above any other community in Conception Bay, apart from Bell Island, it is the saddest blow which has befallen it since the days of the great depression and the great lay-offs on Bell Island. In places like this, like Upper Island Cove, since the war and before the war, they have pulled the community up. They have nice schools. Unfortunately one was burnt, a new school they had there. They have put their money into their community. I can see, in the past four or five years, a vast improvement. Now I suppose probably 50 or more of the major breadwinners in this

community will be laid off. I don't know what the answer is to it. I have been like my hon. friend here, from Carbonear — Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke), my friend from Bell Island (Mr. O'Driscoll), with the Premier, exploring the possibilities, but I have so far not been able to come up with any solution, any answer for these men except to tell them; "well, you have to take your chance with the other 150 men now coming to me looking for employment and I will do the best I can to get you a job, but it is not easy". And, Sir, I feel very sorry for these men, very sorry for these communities. I pray and I hope and I am striving and I am working in the hope that this disaster can be alleviated.

Bishop's Cove, adjoining Upper Island Cove: — Their major consideration there, their major want is a wharf, Federal, I know — a fishermen's wharf and the usual attention to the roads. Spaniard's Bay, another community with close to 2,000 people or over 2,000. I am glad to report last year the department of Highways made alterations and improvements to that piece of road commonly known as "Lassie Road," bringing back shades of the past when it was built, and the pay received was molasses and Indian meal. That has been widened, and New Harbour road received attention and I hope it will receive more this year because that affects not only my district but it affects the District of Trinity South over which a great deal of fish is brought from Dildo, New Harbour barrens over to the fish plant in Harbour Grace. We are endeavouring to fix up this road. A great deal of work was done last year, and I hope, with a little extra drive this year, this road will be made better than it is at the present time.

Shearstown — Shearstown, Mr. Speaker, sits there like a little jewel, where the main occupation is farming, farming of a different nature such as sheep farming and poultry farming. Last year I think, when I spoke I offered an invitation to any member who would like to accompany me over there to see the result of the experiments that have been taking place there under the guidance of the Department of Natural Resources, in connection with a community pasture for sheep and cattle. Now, Mr. Speaker, I offer this invitation again this year. I know hon. members are probably a lot more interested in their own districts than in mine or a little

part of it, but I think if there are other districts interested in sheep raising that it would be a great benefit to the members if they could come to Shearstown, either soon now when the dipping will be starting, or better still in the fall when the sheep fair takes place over there. There is an experiment going on over there, Mr. Speaker, which, as far as I can see from my own observations, and as far as I can learn from people who should know, is going to mean a great deal not only to the community of Shearstown but to a lot of other places in Newfoundland where sheep raising is practicable.

Last year, a very successful fair was held there. The success, Mr. Speaker, of that effort, in my opinion, is due to the fact that the Department of Natural Resources has, with the help of the shepherds over there, provided a good community pasture. Again it is not all one-sided; the Department, with the help again of the farmers, have provided permanent experienced shepherd. The department is giving every encouragement to that venture. I don't know what acreage is presently under fence but I suppose it must be running up — I would not like to venture a guess — probably 200 acres.

Premier Smallwood: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would spell out as far as he can the nature of this experiment, as he has called it, the experiment of community pasturing of sheep with a commonly employed shepherd and all that follows, because if the hon. gentleman spells it out I believe newspaper men would be glad to go over there with cameras and do a good illustrated story on something that is almost unique in all Canada. Since it was started over there it has been copied in Nnova Scotia and Cape Breton but originated in Shearstown — The hon. gentleman might describe it.

Mr. Sheppard: Mr. Speaker, as far as possible I would be glad to. Again I am Sheppard by name but not by nature. I do not classify myself as an expert on raising sheep. As far as I can gather (I would like to check with the minister, I think, after I pass my remarks I might do so) I understand the Department of Natural Resources, with local labour, fenced at the start I think, approximately 75 to 100 acres of Crown Land, situated on the highland between Country

Road and Shearstown, i.e., land to the south of Shearstown. The Department employed a full time shepherd who, in addition to looking after husbanding the sheep at the community pasture also has, I understand, under him the bogland pastures at Colinet. Now, the experiment, I understand, works something like this: If a sheep breeder wishes to take advantage of the pasture he applies to the shepherd and he pays, I understand, a nominal sum per head of sheep for husbanding a sheep. The sheep are taken to pasture and the first thing is the cleaning (I will call it the cleaning) of the animals, a proper dipping pit — I am not using technical words — a proper place to dip the sheep is provided and first of all before the sheep are brought into the pasture he sees that they are dipped and dewormed, deparasited and properly husbanded, then the breeder himself undertakes to assist the shepherd. And, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion is one of the key notes of that programme, because the shepherd himself is learning how to properly handle his flock by assisting the shepherd. And that man over there, I don't know him, but as described by the sheep breeders over there, this man Robertson, what he does not know about sheep is not worth while knowing. And they say he is a very likeable person, and I feel quite sure that he is inculcating into the sheep breeders of Conception Bay an awful lot of knowledge and know how that they did not have before, because they did not have the opportunity to learn.

Mr. Hollett: They have lambs.

Mr. Sheppard: Like other sheep some do and some don't, most of them do, I hope.

Premier Smallwood: How many owners have sheep in the community flock?

Mr. Sheppard: Last year at first, if my memory serves me right there were at least 12 exhibitors in the fair.

Premier Smallwood: How many in the community flock did or did not exhibit?

Mr. Sheppard: I am only making a guess, but I would say it probably runs to 40 or 60.

Mr. Hollett: We should not have guesses! We can't learn with guesses.

Mr. Sheppard: Well I allow myself to guess, Mr. Speaker, I am making an estimate.

Premier Smallwood: How many sheep?

Mr. Sheppard: On the pasture I understand there are somewhere between 400 and 500 sheep rotated between the community pasture at Country Road, Shearstown and Colinet. Also, I understand the sheep owners themselves assist the shepherd at the lambing. They also assist him in such other matters as shearing and pasturization of the male lambs and so on, selection of breeding stock. The shepherd tells me that is one of the finest flocks of breeding sheep in the whole of Canada, which is being built up in that small community of Shearstown. And I think it is a great tribute to these men who organized into an association and who are doing such good work in this field.

Premier Smallwood: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Sheppard: I don't want to harp too long, Mr. Speaker, on sheep raising, but it is an experiment worth seeing, and next year when the sheep fair is on I would be very glad to take a car load of any hon. gentlemen who wish to see. I would take them over at any time. It is a sight for sore eyes — and there is not too much smell around the pasture either.

Mr. Speaker, I did not make a note of it, but at the beginning I meant — and I hope the Honourable the Premier will forgive my inadvertance in forgetting to refer to it at the start — I meant to refer to the fact that I am sure all members of this house are glad to see him back in his seat again, after what must have been one of the best deserved and most deserved holidays that any Premier of this country had coming to him. We are glad, Mr. Speaker, to see the Premier back and looking so fit. We hope we won't have to face what he had to face in the last four or five months, but he looks prepared to take on anything. I feel quite sure he is physically fit and I am glad to see him looking that way. Thank you very much, Sir.

On motion the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. G. Sellars (Labrador South): Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation I venture to pay my contribution to the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, because coming events and rapidly changing conditions disturb and arouse men's minds and provoke their feelings to a point where it is difficult to maintain rational thinking and procure sound judgement because of these conditions. We have had splendid speeches from the hon. members who have preceded me. I would like particularly to refer to the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) and the hon. member for Carbonear, Bay de Verde (Mr. Clarke) who made such splendid speeches when they moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I believe, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will look forward with pride and pleasure to the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip to Newfoundland, and I am quite sure that wherever the royal visitors may go they will be accorded an abundant supply of devotion. I would like to add too, our people of Labrador will not have the honour or privilege of seeing their sovereigns still I can say without any fear of contradiction, nowhere in the great British Commonwealth of Nations is there a more devote and loyal people to be found than those of Labrador.

Only a short time ago, Mr. Speaker, we celebrated the 10th. anniversary of Confederation. It does not seem as long as that, in fact it does not seem 10 years since the days of Commission of Government and when the first letter appeared in the Evening Telegram suggesting an alternative form of Government. It was suggested that three prominent men of St. John's be appointed to organize a Newfoundland independence restoration. The idea was that every magistrate would call a meeting in his district, appoint a committee, and that committee would suggest a representative to this organization, that would be eighteen members, of which three would be appointed, to take action. I think there were two or three from the City Council. And those were supposed to spend their time in St. John's getting what information they

wanted from the Government departments and then taking a train for some secluded place along the railway line where they could debate the situation and bring in their report. But, instead of that agreement we subsequently got the National Convention, with all its fanfare and propaganda the newspapers, radio and speakers could give us, and were eventually talked into Confederation. It did not make very much difference, in the long run we were doomed to become a part of Canada anyway —

Premier Smallwood: Is doomed the right word? Destined?

Mr. Sellars: Well, I said doomed or destined to become a part of Canada anyway. Anyway, at the time we thought it would be better to negotiate ourselves into Confederation than to perhaps ultimately be forced to go into it. We felt we could accept Confederation almost any time. We are sure that Quebec wanted our Labrador and did not want anyone else to get it, but I do not quite know what the rest of Canada wanted, I don't know if they knew themselves. Moncton, I know what they wanted, to become the Capital of Newfoundland. I can very well remember the fine morning, Mr. Speaker, I think in July, as several of us wended our way to the polling booth to vote for Confederation. There were several good Britishers amongst that bunch, and some said they felt guilty having to go and vote themselves out of the environment of the British Empire and into a country where they were not sure of. Anyway, we reassured ourselves, and we all went and voted for Confederation. I think some of us retained a little bit of loyalty to the British Empire just the same.

Now, Sir, when we entered into Confederation with Canada we brought to this nation a population of hard-working, honourable people of reputable origin, who had been tried and proven on many battlefields, on every ocean and every sea. We brought with us no reservations of our loyalty and certainly gave no thoughts to any delayed action whatsoever, if and when danger threatened our country. We also brought to Canada huge and immensely rich territorial possessions consisting of almost inexhaustible resources of minerals, timber, water power, and as well, the best fishing grounds

in the whole world — and only a very small portion of all this had been developed. So that, Sir, when we came to Canada we did not come in a pauper. We naturally expected and believed Canada would make some effort to improve our very low standard of living by developing at least some of these resources, and that was the understanding and indeed the meaning of Confederation to our people. We believe, and had every right to expect, we would be made comparable to the Maritime Provinces.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): You were told that, were you not?

Mr. Sellars: We believe it.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, but you were told.

Mr. Sellars: In addition to this very material contribution to the Canadian Nation, we brought a much greater thing, the greatest any people can contribute to any nation, that of accepting the responsibility, and indeed perhaps the enviable position of to stand in the forefront of Canada's defences, using our Island Home as a bastion to fight to protect her against all enemies that may assail her. We transferred to Canada all our possessions and laid them at her feet, free from all incumbrances, and without any obligations whatever that she would have to assume on our behalf. We held our heads high, full of courage and hope for the future as becomes our race. Our confidence in Canada was unbounded and the determination on our part to justify partnership was never more sincere and many Newfoundland prayers ascended from our bedsides, thanking God for Confederation and Premier Smallwood for bringing us to the promised land. We pursued our way of life.

Mr. Hollett: "Promised Land", is right. Term 29.

Mr. Sellars: We pursued our way of life with renewed hope, confidence and energy, striving to overcome what obstacles and adversities stood in our way. Mr. Speaker, we were not a province of Canada very long before we found out the mainland was trying to take away from us some of the advantages we ought to have had for ourselves. They took over our railway, and produced

all the railway ties, nearly all of them on the mainland with millions of ties procurable in the province and plenty of men on the verge of starvation and destitution, with nothing to do, who could have produced these ties for us. They took over our telegraph services and operated what was revenue producing for them, and what was not they discarded. Now, Sir, there are some other things here which perhaps I had better leave out.

Mr. Hollett: Go on!

Mr. Sellars: But I want to say this — The smooth, artful way in which events in Newfoundland are distorted and misrepresented almost deceived the Government of Canada; and I don't know but totally deceived, certainly deceiving some of the very elect of Toronto. Anyway, amongst those deceived are possibly included some sanctimonious individuals who recently came here to Newfoundland and tried to purge and cleanse us from all unrighteousness by the simple process of the elimination of "Bingo". It would appear to me some of these ministers of the Gospel would be much better employed administering to their flocks in Labrador instead of leaving the conduct of their religious services to the chairman of the local road board while they themselves are sitting in luxurious offices in the West of Toronto, sinning against us. Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to the members of the House of Commons who represent men of good-will all across Canada and ask them to stand up like men in defense of Newfoundland, and help us to achieve the kind of Confederation which was anticipated and expected and is enjoyed by other provinces.

Mr. Hollett: And that we were promised.

Mr. Sellars: Well if we were promised, I would say we have in the Government of Canada today men who are going to redeem that promise.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear! I don't doubt it.

Mr. Sellars: I would like to ask the men of good will of Canada to help us get rid of the men causing us so much trouble. We have only two paper mills in Newfoundland today, the third has been all but frightened

away. And both of these have gone on record as saying in undisguised language they will never have any dealing with the IWA while they remain here. Why are the other provinces of Canada backing them up with money, trying to keep them here to do all the injury they can? That is one thing I don't understand.

Now, Sir, some 50 years ago, a lot of our people went to different parts of Canada in the spring and worked in the mines and on the railways and all that, and came home again just before Christmas. The people of Canada resented that and they practically drove us out. They made a song one time about us, and the song was written in a jeering manner. I do not propose to recite that song because I can hardly remember it, but I know the last words were "Pack your rags in canvas bags and get back to Newfoundland." They drove us out of Canada. Is it not possible for us to do the same thing, treat them to a dose of their own medicine and drive those people we don't want away from here?

Mr. Hollett: They have no rags, that is the trouble.

Mr. Sellars: Mr. Speaker, Confederation with Canada can only be accomplished by mutual agreement and understanding, and such agreement must become part of the Constitution of Canada. The original agreement stipulated we would be given eight years in which to raise the standards, and then a Royal Commission would determine what amount would be needed to enable us to maintain these levels. We went along with these arrangements. The Royal Commission made their report and told us what they would give us until 1962, and there after \$8 million per year. But, Sir, these \$8 million may be alright to maintain the standards of the Gander area, Grand Falls, Corner Brook and several other areas, but will never do very much to elevate the Labrador and parts of White Bay and Geen Bay and St. Barbe Districts to a standard comparable to any of the average Canadian Provinces. So that we must either stay in conditions we are in now or deteriorate. We can't get more money to help build up the standard of living. Before Confederation can be effective, Newfoundland and Canada must get together on mutual grounds and make a

mutual agreement satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. Hollett: That is what should have been done in the first place.

Mr. Sellars: Now, Sir, I would like to say a few things about my district. I don't want to take too long, but a lot of things in Labrador don't seem to be what we would like to have. First, I want to say with reference to my district, the District of Labrador South is by far the most backward district in Newfoundland and perhaps in the whole Dominion of Canada. The reason for this is that the district depends absolutely on the fishery. There is no other industry whatsoever in my district. My remarks must therefore be centred on the fishery, and matters pertaining thereto. From the large amount of money spent on the fishery in this province, the district of Labrador seems to be given the smallest share. The fisheries of Labrador, and indeed perhaps of the entire province require a lift, particularly at the individual level if we are ever to increase production. There has never been much assistance of this kind given to the Labrador fishermen to help them improve. The day is gone when merchants can give a fisherman a piece of line and twine and a fish hook and say — "Here, boy! go fishing! Fish from two in the morning until ten in the night." The fishermen should have better boats with good engines. There are engines used by the fishermen in Labrador today hardly qualified for a respectable scrap heap. My conviction is that every fisherman's boat and every fisherman's engine should be inspected, and if the boats are not considered seaworthy and the engines not in good running order, they should be condemned and suitable arrangements made for a man to be provided with proper equipment. The Fisheries Loan Board should be told to desist from the practise of encouraging dealers in Labrador supplying fishermen with second hand engines, when they apply to the board for new ones. Further, Mr. Speaker, I believe all fishermen's codtraps, herring nets and all such equipment should be examined, and when it is determined that they are worn out and quite worthless for fishing purposed they should be condemned, if they cannot be effectively repaired, and new ones substituted for them,

so that fishermen would not be labouring in vain with worthless fishing gear.

Our economy can never be improved unless such conditions are remedied. Our fishermen will become disheartened and will soon give up altogether, unless more effort is made to improve conditions. The answer is not found in continually advancing large sums to cold storage operators who do not seem to have any intentions of repaying even the interest. It is not to be found by encouraging experiments, or by the elimination of NAFEL, so that mainland fish dealers get the privilege of buying the fish from the fishermen here and operating against us in that way. Loans should be made to fishermen or groups of fishermen to enable them to get the kind and amount of gear they need. They cannot do effective work with defective tools. Some of our Labrador fishermen have codtraps and salmon nets not worth putting into the water. They only waste that time and energy trying to catch fish with them.

Last summer in Labrador the weather was stormy most of the time. For years previous the fishermen were unable to get the necessary amount of twine to make their traps strong and in good condition, so that when they met with stormy weather and got the fish in their traps, in the process of hauling the traps they broke away and the fish was lost. Now, I submitted this information to the Minister of Fisheries of Canada, and the reply I got from him was, that sort of problem was completely outside the terms of reference of his department. Mr. Speaker, I suppose everyone has heard the old slogan — "One swallow never makes a summer." This is particularly true of Labrador. Scarcely had some arrangement been made for some Labrador fishermen to get advances of twine to repair their traps when the greatest storm in the history of Labrador came upon us, and swept away nearly all the stages and wharves belonging to the people on the Southern part of the Coast, stores, fishing gear and material and utensils in storage during the winter in most places all completely swept away. It was a catastrophe, and most fishermen won't be able to go fishing this summer unless some assistance is given them, and given early in the year. The matter was referred to our own minister of Fisheries and also informa-

tion has been forwarded to the Minister of Fisheries of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, this devastating disaster almost obscured everything else pertaining to my district. I must of necessity, however, make some reference to other matters pertaining to the life of our people. Last year a comparatively small amount of money was made available for building foot paths and improving winter paths and komatik paths. Effective work was done on these projects. These roads are not necessary along most of our coast line, because summer travel will always be by water, but a winter path or trail is imperative and more so now than ever before, as the old mode of travel by dog team is fast disappearing to be replaced by the snowmobile, which requires wider and better trails. We hope to make adequate improvement year by year until satisfactory improvement is made along the coast. Five emergency winter camps were built last year and the people were appreciative of it.

Now, Sir, I would like to say something about health services: I must say here I hardly know where to begin. I cannot refrain from saying that Labrador has the poorest health services you can imagine anywhere, because there is not a single doctor in any district there, no communication system, or very little that you can use to summons help. I know that at St. Anthony a plane service is available to bring a doctor to any part of the coast when he is needed. But, Sir, with no sort of communication I don't see what benefit that plan can be.

Hon. Dr. McGrath (Minister of Health): If my hon. friend would allow me to interrupt, to correct what might be a false impression when he stated and quite correctly, there are no medical officers in Southern Labrador itself — That is not due to neglect but is due to the fact advisers on the spot feel there is no place in Southern Labrador where a resident medical doctor could be of much use because the settlements are small and widely scattered. And we have been endeavouring to service by plane, but I would like to point out, we are servicing from St. Anthony and North West River. We are spending at the present time for the medical plane service for 12,000 people in Labrador more than twice that is spent in my department for the nearly 500,000 people in Newfoundland. I really think that

should be taken into consideration. As I said, skilled people on the spot feel the future of medical services on the Labrador has to be patterned on the idea of taking the doctor to the patient and not have the doctor in some small settlement where he serves only a few people.

Premier Smallwood: What is the answer to the hon. gentleman's point they cannot let the doctor know he is needed?

Dr. McGrath: I may say we have been endeavouring to establish a system of communications, but as you know the question of communications is Federal not Provincial, and it is not entirely within our power to do it, although the matter is certainly under consideration. We have had what we thought fruitful conversations with the Federal authorities, who this season may be able to do something about it. It is basically a matter for the Federal authorities. They are in charge of communications and not my department. We can only implore, but not implement.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Labrador South has the floor. I don't know whether he wants to be interrupted again or not.

Mr. Sellars: I would like to say that, 40 years ago there was a doctor at Battle Harbour and that doctor travelled from there to Cartwright and from there to Forteau. While it is all right to have a hospital at St. Anthony, St. Anthony is a long way from Labrador. What about treating a patient in places like Spotted Island or somewhere like that whom they want to take or get to hospital by the time they try to get a message through to St. Anthony the patient is either going to be better or dead.

Now, Sir, the existing telephone lines between Blanc Sablon and Red Bay is practically useless. Under agreement between the Department of Public Works of Canada and the Gulf of St. Lawrence Telephone Company, provisions are that, under the authority and jurisdiction and supervision of a provincial transportation commission board of the province of Quebec, the company shall give telephone or telegraph services, or both, to places and communities in the province of Quebec, but so far as New-

foundland is concerned a letter from the Minister of Transport tells me that, under the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, the public telecommunications system of Newfoundland become the property of Canada, and or improve that system as it existed as at April 1, 1949. And further, he says he considers the provision of public telephone communication systems as primarily a private, provincial or municipal responsibility. Now the hon. Minister of Health says it is a Federal matter. The Minister of Transport tells me —

Premier Smallwood: Surely he is wrong.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): May I ask a question, with permission. In the matter of communications, I noted on a recent date the hon. member for Labrador South seemed to be very successful with the Federal Government in having secured additional mail services to his district. I am not quite familiar with the details of it, but would like a word of explanation as to exactly what that meant. I read in the press that Labrador South had secured additional mail services or something of that sort.

Mr. Sellars: That is not mail services I am talking about but telegraph and telephone. The telegraph services that existed in Labrador when Newfoundland became a province of Canada (if she is a province of Canada) was perhaps I can say 200% better than what it is today, and I am expecting next year it will be 200% worse than it is today, because, for the past 50 years, we maintained direct communications between Battle Harbour and St. Anthony, and now Battle Harbour Station has been taken away, and a telephone has been installed there this summer, and our Labrador communications now have to go down the coast to Cartwright and Cartwright has to communicate with Goose Bay, and between Cartwright and Goose Bay there are the highest mountains in this country, called the Mealy Mountains. Communications over these mountains are very difficult and always have been. I know, because I have had experience myself. So that if we have to send messages down the Labrador Coast up to Goose Bay, then across Canada to Montreal somewhere and then all down through, what is a telegram going to cost us?

And here is another thing, Mr. Speaker. I ask the hon. Minister of Transport if he could provide, I think I asked for six or seven portable radio telephones, which don't cost very much to purchase and nothing at all to install and not one cent to operate. He replied that if the people of the community wanted these telephones they could organize a communications system and buy the set, and they would give us permission to operate it, provided the set was reasonably good and, if we applied to Moncton and paid \$10 for a license. Why apply to Moncton for a license to operate a radio station in Labrador? That is something I do not understand. Well, Sir, if, as I learned just now, the Federal Government is responsible for telephone communications in Labrador, then I think it is time we got after them to get something done, because they certainly do not intend to do anything for us.

Now, I think I ought to say something else there in regard to what the hon. Minister of Health said about the planes. I know the planes and doctors are doing well, but they cannot do any good for a patient in an isolated place when you can't get any information from it. I know of one instance this year where a girl in Spotted Islands, I think it was Spotted Islands but could not be sure, but in that area anyway got blood poisoning and they did everything in the world they could to get a doctor, but the doctor did not get word and the woman died. Sir, what the situation is going to be I don't know between the Department of Health and the International Grenfell Association, and I am prepared to say there that I do not want, and neither do the people of Labrador want me, to create any discord between the Grenfell Mission and the Department of Health, but if anything mutual can be done between them I am sure that both the people of Labrador and I will very much appreciate it. Now, Sir, I was going to say something about education. That is very important too. The situation is difficult, I know, but I think it can be improved. Since the Minister of Education is not here I don't want to say anything, but when he comes I am going to try to see him and discuss the matter and see if he can't do something for Labrador. There are some schools down there where the teachers are of lower grade than some of the pupils they are teaching. I would like to

say here that the Roman Catholic School Board do not seem to have much difficulty in securing good grade teachers as do other schools, but I believe this is due to the interest and effort of the Rev. Father Tessier, who is a very active man in looking after his people on that coast.

Mr. Speaker, before I left the matter of communications in Labrador I thought I had here somewhere a letter from the Minister of Transport, where he told me that the problem of adjusting communications to Labrador was the responsibility of the Provincial Communications Authority.

Mr. E. Winsor (Labrador North): If the hon. member would allow me one moment — Would the hon. member distinguish between Labrador South and Labrador North — because in Labrador North we have had a good educational programme, as good as in Newfoundland today, and the same thing applies for communications — So that, just for the press, I would like the hon. gentleman to distinguish between Labrador North and South, in considering all his problems, and I am sure they are many; but problems which fortunately for me I am in a better position as far as communications and education. Just for the press, if the hon. gentleman does not mind —

Mr. Sellars: That is what I said — We are the worst of the lot and even Labrador North is better than we are. The hon. member for Labrador North asks me to distinguish between Labrador South and Labrador North, as he thinks members of the press would want to distinguish between the two, as I do — I am a big man, he is only a small one.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me most of the speakers on the opposite side today are addressing themselves to the press, and not to you, Sir. They have been instructed on one occasion to address themselves to the press.

Mr. Speaker: I think the honourable members have addressed me from time to time.

Mr. Sellars: I would be very glad to represent Labrador North since it has such good medical facilities. Now, Sir, there is one

point I would like to make, for the benefit of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, while I am on my feet. I was speaking on education when I was interrupted. There was one school in Labrador when I went there, there were four pupils up in the corner on the left-hand side and about 15 or 18 on the other side. I said: Why have you got your school organized the same as the House of Assembly in Newfoundland? Why have you got it that way? Well, Sir, he said; "This side is all leaky and that is the only dry place there is, up there where these four pupils are, that is the only dry spot over on that side."

Mr. Hollett: The leak was on your side over there, in that case.

Mr. Sellars: I am going to say a word of encouragement to the hon. Leader of the Opposition — They promised to repair the roof on that side and when the roof is repaired he can have more than four on that side.

Mr. Hollett: They won't be all wet any more.

Mr. Sellars: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the steamship service in Labrador. The coastal service was well and effectively carried out during the past season and the people are most appreciative of the extended service supplied late in the season. The S.S. Kyle, after 50 years of service, is to be taken off the service and replaced. I am sure the people of Labrador will learn of this change with regret, because the Kyle and her fine crew were well liked by the people along the coast. The coastal service seems to be keeping up a good reputation, and is one of the best departments of the CNR. Perhaps this is due to the fact that practically all of the personnel are Newfoundlanders, with not too much interference from Moncton or the mainland — anyway the coastal service is maintaining outstanding efficiency. Sir, I would like to commend the coastal postal department for the efficiency of the winter mail service. I think that is what the hon. member for St. John's South (Mr. Renouf), referred to just now. Particularly would I like to compliment the EPA pilots for their skill and ability to contribute so much to the

effectiveness of the service. If the postal authority would only recognize the desirability and necessity of having mail landed for each port of call from coastal steamers, it would add much to the usefulness of the service and eliminate a lot of inconvenience and dissatisfaction especially for our fishermen. Newfoundland should not have to take instructions from the mainland with respect to adjustments of services pertaining to our needs.

Now, Sir, I want to say a few words on housing. There is desperate need for better housing in Labrador. Many houses are not half large enough to accommodate the number of people living in them, and most are not very well built. Few of them are built on concrete foundations, most of them do not have chimneys, only sheet iron piping, and many of them are neither water nor wind tight, and few if any of them have any water or sewerage facilities. Most of the people in Labrador get their water from wells, and many of these are contaminated and the water unfit for human consumption. In the winter, they have to cut ice from the ponds and very often they have to melt snow. That was the condition when I lived there, and I do not think it has changed very much since. There is only one admirable thing about the housing in Labrador, and that is whenever you go there you are accorded a very warm welcome. I would like to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, to the Government of Canada, if they want some housing they can control and operate to their heart's content, they would do very well to build some houses in Labrador.

Mr. Hollett: After 10 years of Confederation? Now the houses are leaking?

Mr. Sellars: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have something to say about unemployment insurance benefits, that problem that I have had to deal with almost every mail during the last winter. It appeared deductions are made from the catch to cover extensions, but no account whatever is made for the effort and expense and time used getting ready for the fishery. The fishermen have to get ready two months before they catch any fish. When they catch the fish, so much is deducted from what they catch to pay for stamps. Sir, the average fisherman must begin in April to prepare

his nets and traps and stages and so on — that is if he has anything to repair them with. He must repair his boat, his flakes and stages and overhaul every item he uses in the fishery. When the winter is finished and the spring comes the fishermen begin work and never finish until the snow is on the ground and the water is frozen. I don't know if he stops even then, as he has to spend the rest of the winter trying to get unemployment insurance.

I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker, one of the best departments I find in this country is the department of the Unemployment Insurance Commission. They always try to give the very best satisfaction they can, and to give us all the information they can, and they go through a lot of trouble to get information for us. I wish I could say the same as that for everything. Now, Sir, everything seems to have come out of the fish before the fisherman gets anything. He only gets what is left over, and that is small indeed. His standard of living is always low. If, therefore, there is to be any increase in the standard of living or in wages and salaries in Newfoundland, if there is to be any improvement in any conditions of our people, any available employment that would elevate any of our people to a higher standard of living, let us see to it that such improvement begins with our fishermen and that those whose standards are far away below that of our own, let us wait until the fishermen are looked after.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other items I would like to speak about but I think I will leave them until some time later because time is getting on. In conclusion, Sir, I would like very sincerely to compliment the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his three colleagues on the honourable and dignified manner in which they stood up in defence of Newfoundland.

Government Members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Sellars: They have maintained the best traditions of British statesmanship and integrity, and I sincerely hope they continue to maintain such an enviable reputation inviolate. I should like also to express my deep respect for the steps taken by that great Canadian who forfeited his position for Newfoundland. We are all pleased and very thankful to Divine Providence for having

protected and brought back our Premier safe and well. I would like to congratulate him on his success attained since leaving this province and I feel confident he will go on to achieve more triumphant victories for the glory and honour of Newfoundland, with the full support and backing of Newfoundlanders in every walk of life. (Applause).

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

LEGISLATION:

Notice of Motions:

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wabush Lake Railway Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Notaries Public Act, 1958." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Provide For the Use of Sound Recording Machines For Taking and Reporting of Evidence." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council To Enter Into An Agreement With Wabush Lake Railway Company and Northern Land Company Limited and Carol Lake Company and To Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For the Same Purpose. On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs (Mr. Murray): asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further To Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act

Further To Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Hefferman): Asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children's Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Welfare asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Cheeseman): asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Coasting Vessels." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Keough): asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Labrador Lands (Reservation) Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement With Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited and American Smelting and Refining Company." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply (Mr. Abbott): asks leaves to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Validate Assessments Made In the Towns of Harbour Grace, Placentia and Freshwater." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1958." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Ballam): asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels and Pressure Plants." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Spencer): asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Act, 1958." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting a Private Mining Carrier Railway in Labrador." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.

Wednesday, April 29, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received part of a reply to Question No. 24. With regard to subsection (5) of that question, it was referred to the Minister of Fisheries. I do not see why I should be referred to the Minister of Fisheries with regard to special grants, and loans. I wonder if the Minister of Finance could tell me why?

Mr. Speaker: I think the Minister of Finance said that was the comment put on the question by his Department. Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries can take notice of that Section (5) of the question.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, may I say that the moment any answers are prepared (and as the Leader of the Opposition is aware) these answers to questions are almost invariably prepared by

the permanent staff of civil servants in the different departments and handed to the different Ministers who have the responsibility to table them in this house. As soon as any answers to any questions directed to me have been handed to me I will certainly have them tabled in the house without a moments delay. I may say no answer has yet been handed to me.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

Mr. John Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, by leave of the house, if I have permission, I would like to continue the debate. I did not finish when I adjourned prior to recess.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed? The hon. member was not in his seat when the debate was resumed, consequently he did not finish his speech.

Mr. Hollett: Can the hon. the Speaker inform the house how long the hon. member spoke?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has a considerable amount of time left; 42 minutes, I believe.

Mr. Hollett: We agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Forsey: Mr. Speaker, I suppose in doing so I must thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition also. We have been doing that so much I hope the Premier does not ask us to take him over here. One reason I want to continue to speak (not that I want to be heard, I have no trouble getting that done) is because I wanted to speak primarily of my district before finishing my address. Yesterday, I made comment to the press, and Mr. Speaker, I say it now, before we throw stones we must make sure we do not live in glass houses. I listened to criticisms, one of them by a mainland newspaper, which did not give proper coverage to recent events in Newfoundland. Yet, I was amazed and hurt to find that I, in speaking on a very serious matter, the I.W.A. in my district, that not one word I said was carried by the Western Star, which is a daily paper

in my riding, my district, to which everyone subscribes; and neither was it carried in any daily paper here. I ask no favours personally, Mr. Speaker, but, as the representative of the people of Humber East and the representative of Her Majesty's Government here in the Province of Newfoundland for the district of Humber East, I must say that the local radio stations, one by its own initiative, carried a good report (radio station V.O.C.M.) and another C.J.O.N., after I gave it to them.

Mr. Speaker, my remarks were not taken too well, apparently, by the manager of Bowater's Paper Mill, Mr. Albert Martin. I am sorry for that. I repeat now what I said before; if I had to speak regarding our personal relations not being what I would like to see them be always when I went to him as a representative for the district, for my people and for this Province and for the government, at such times as I did, his courtesy and the courtesy of the company was outstanding and left nothing to be desired. I have no doubt in my mind Albert Martin is as good a true Newfoundlander as any member who sits in this house or outside. I think he has a difficult job and I believe he has done that job magnificently, according to the wishes of his company and according to the wishes of his board of directors. But I think that his board of directors have overlooked the all important thing; that a human being is not a piece of machinery. The human being needs the oil of friendship, and the oil of consideration, and the oil of courtesy, if you are going to get productivity. Surely that is the key to what our company and paper town wants, productivity, economically. Nobody denies them that right. No sane nor sensible labour leader in Newfoundland would deny them that right. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bowater Pulp and Paper Company have, through the kind favour of the Government of Newfoundland in the past (the Commission of Government) and the continued favour of the Provincial Government seen fit to reap great harvests of profit from their enterprise in our Island home. No one denies them that either. I would say it is the profit made in Newfoundland which made their extensions in the United States possible, their mill at Tennessee. Today, if they find that now Newfoundland, with things not so rosy, the income tax situation not nearly as

favourable as it was prior to Confederation, they have to cut down and economize, we all agree. But I do know that Mr. Martin, if he would take time to speak to the workers of his mill like I have, and I do, he would find there is a growing resentment. And surely if anyone was to be annoyed, anybody was to be insulted, by the fact that I said not one union man out of five goes to work with any loyalty to the company from whom he gets his employment, it would have been labour. And not one word to this minute or this hour has been uttered in condemnation of my remarks by labour in the Corner Brook area, and I have made it a point to 'phone one of the labour local presidents, whose name I will not reveal, telling him I asked no favours, but if he felt I was wrong in making the statement I would like to be publicly condemned.

This is not a time to try and stir up trouble. The fact that an agreement was signed has no bearing. It was 10 months, Mr. Speaker, 10 months of wrangling over things not important as they looked, 10 months of wrangling back and forth, and it was not an agreement that today has been signed with good feelings by the union, because the unions consider it is their right to negotiate for what transpires inside the mill gates, and they are afraid that contract work being leased to outside companies, at lower rates of pay than they are receiving, can creep like a cancerous sore. I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to try and appease labour, nor is labour stupid enough in any district to feel that this government, under the wise leadership of the Premier and this house, and under the wise support of the Leader of the Opposition, is trying to stir up anti-labour feelings in this Province. If so, then, in their stupidity, they must reckon without my support. I have always been grateful for the support they have given me. I will never let them down. I have stated that I will support them fully, legally, but I do not intend to be stupid enough to seek the support of labour solely for the votes, knowing in my own heart and soul that this would make me a hypocrite in my own conscience for life. Maybe the things we did were drastic. I don't deny it. But at that time, and in that hour, that was the only action we could take. When we start to look at who is right and who is wrong, we often think if some of the labour leaders involved had made less criti-

cisms, and some of the company officials had made less speeches, and less critical statements after the dispute was over, that the officials of a certain company did, they were not contributing to the betterment of the situation, like the boastful boy who, having defied his mother, gets away with stolen cookies. Surely goodness if I could not, Mr. Speaker, get up in this house and speak conscientiously on a problem without somebody being small enough to think I am hitting at them personally, then the thinking of these people who take it in the wrong light certainly needs to be adjusted, or brain washed. My concern is not to throw blame. Labour is as much to blame as management. But, Sir, the point is, from a little infection has developed that growing seed of indifference, that growing seed of lack of concern, that growing discontent towards the company that I am afraid of. I hope that if nothing else, repeating my remarks this afternoon makes labour a little less indignant towards me, that they will mend the break and sit down together to be sincerely interested not only in cheap production of paper but in the entire economy of the west coast, I will have accomplished my purpose. We have a lot to be thankful for to Bowater Pulp and Paper. Without them where would we be on the West Coast of Newfoundland? A barren land of lakes, tracks and muddy roads. They have brought to us tremendous prosperity. I don't suppose there is one man in labour or outside who has not the greatest regard for Sir Eric Bowater. We think of him with love in our hearts and kindness in our words. We will never allow anything that happens to take away from what we know is his real purpose; a deep desire to make the name of his company loved and respected in the hearts of his employees. Surely those who are honest too must realize that, if there is a rift in relationship between labour and management, he would want to mend the gap himself. I offer my services to labour and management, however little it may be. Certainly goodness, if something is not done to mend the situation, we are not going to have what is necessary economically for production of newsprint in order to keep the mill running full time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague of the riding of Humber West (Mr. Ballam) received a lot of criticism and abuse in his district and

in mine, which is very unfair and unjust. There is not an active man in labour in Corner Brook today, in an executive capacity, who has given the time and the hours that he has in their own interest in by-gone days. He is prepared to do that even now. I am not making apologies for him because, in his position as a member of the Cabinet, he had no choice but to remain silent, no choice but to follow through. He is a man more noted for his deeds than for his words. I always said, before I became active in politics, that one of Charlie's (Mr. Ballam's) weaknesses was that he did not let everybody know what he was doing. That nobody can deny. If I were to pinpoint Charlie Ballam in this dispute, I would have to say his greatest weakness was that he tried too hard to make this Province the greatest friend of labour or any Province of Canada. Because he tried so hard, because he never provided the stop-gaps and safety valves to protect the government, the employer (because we do not deny the employer has rights as well) he has been condemned today by the very people he went all out to support. I can tell you now, Sir, that if labour chooses not to support him, they can also choose not to support me.

I want to say this too, Sir — I never came into politics primarily as a Liberal or as a Progressive Conservative or any other — I remember I used to listen to the voice of the "BARRELMAN" — "Making Newfoundland better known to Newfoundlanders." I listened too to the National Convention. And, Sir, I decided, without knowing anything about that person previously, that this was a man who had purpose and who could fulfil that purpose well. So, I followed Premier Smallwood, looking for nothing, except there was a time when I tried to get into Federal Politics because the remuneration was such that I felt I could make politics a firm career. (I see now these fellows need a 50% increase. I hope we here in this house bear that in mind and not let these fellows beat us to the gun). However, I did not succeed there, but I still went on to support him. At times, I have not always agreed with my Premier and his policies. Probably my arguments for disagreement have been feeble, silly and childish, but I never refused to give him my loyalty.

When the labour dispute happened, there was nobody more torn between conviction,

desire and indecision than I was. I never grasped the situation, of course. I was in the very heart of a peculiar situation. I originally supported the loggers and their union, and I equally denounced their crazy and insane and senseless tactics, not because I supported the company, but because I supported common sense and full employment for those in the mill and outside; not because of any reprimand I had received from the Premier. I received exactly from him what I received from the Leader of the Opposition — nothing — silence! I was on my own, paddling my own canoe. If the current was rough and I was carried down stream, I could survive alright. I have stood up in this house, as everybody else, to support the legislation which I felt to be necessary. I don't think any member of this house felt that it is complete, permanent, irremovable legislation. I think we all felt it was the only legislation to bring in at the time, to fulfil a purpose. If at any time a union is tainted with political influence, I will denounce it as strongly as I support it. This much I will say; labour has to grow up. The blind following of any policy by any of us in any field of life can only lead, in the end, to destruction. I am sure that there is not a working man today who does not realize that his betterment has come about because the wages of the working masses have increased and their working hours have diminished. Then, too, if they get down to doing no work, and all pay we are going to be driven out of the markets by the competition of those who want to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am not always in agreement with the policy of the federal government. I am not always in agreement with the policy of my federal colleague (Herman Batten) but I have always agreed he has lent quiet dignity to our Province, to our riding. I have always agreed he is a man who could represent us with respect, holding his head high with any of the other members of the House of Commons. I want to say now that we co-operate when the chips are down, and I want to publicly in this house, Mr. Speaker, assure him, not because he sits as a member of the Opposition, if there is any problem of a provincial nature that needs my support or that he feels I can best do for him, he can count on my help fully, as he can count on aid from my colleague, the member for Humber West (Mr. Ballam),

and my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Smith) and also my colleague the member for the district of St. Georges (Mr. Keough); of course not forgetting the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Chalker): These members comprise the five portions of his riding, the five districts of his riding. We will work with him. We will work with any member of the federal government, under Mr. Diefenbaker, for the betterment and improvement of conditions in these riding, whether they be provincial or federal.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Forsey: I was not elected to represent just the Liberals who voted for me. I was elected to represent each and every one in my riding, and I will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. I have no intention of being pressured. I have not perceived very much. I have been home the past few days. Up to then, I have had about seven telegrams. Even if it were 1,000 it would be no different. My stand is clear, my policy made, and they might as well save the postage stamps and donate them to some worth-while fund, like the "Cancer Fund."

I want to touch now on some parts of my district. I want to say to the people of Howley that I think, under their Community Council, they are slowly but surely doing a good job. For the first time since, I suppose, Howley has been Howley, the equivalent of the Newfoundland Government has been there trying to do some work. Now as to the pattern of requesting roads, Mr. Speaker, there are times when a member has to think not so much as a politician but as a responsible person, concerned with the spending of the public money. And I will do all I can for the people of Howley to connect them by road with the Trans-Canada Highway or with Deer Lake, but only while Howley continues to remain an active community, only while Howley shows a promise that it can justify my fighting for it. But I can promise them now, Mr. Speaker, that I will continue to fight and continue to support them in their effort to rid themselves of isolation. Now we go around to the settlement of Cormack. Originally Cormack was a veteran's settlement, a settlement to look after the veterans of World War II, the navy, army, airforce and foresters, and was

established as an encouragement by the Commission of Government for Newfoundlanders to take up farming. But the principles of the undertaking were never, and have never, been carried out. I do not know today how many people in Cormack are sincere farmers. A lot of them became discouraged and a lot of them had other ambitions and went elsewhere. We have, the Premier and I, promised the people of Cormack electricity. I had hoped through long negotiations, not an over-long period but long hours with the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, to arrange some deal whereby they could supply electricity. I believe the relevant department at Ottawa was willing to contribute to the extent of \$25,000 for putting the line through there. I was not able to interest the Newfoundland Light and Power Company in taking action within the time limit. Evasion was the answer, and of course no deal was the result. Maybe they had reasons for it; finances perhaps, or it could be something else. It could be they are waiting to tie-in with the government electrification policy. But because of the failure, the ability to give electricity to Cormack by last Christmas was impossible. I apologize for that, and I tell the people now that, in promising them electricity, and in promising to see that that promise was carried out, we did so not under pressure, but we did so because we felt that, surely goodness, if they are going to farm they must have electricity to farm with and to carry out improvements. And I can tell them now, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment we are faced with having to review our position, we were faced with the harsh words of reality in the House of Commons in Ottawa regarding Term 29, and the soft words of promises uttered in a television interview by Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I sincerely hope, without speaking on Term 29 any further, that the words of endearment will be enacted into words of legislation, because that is all it can mean to the people of Newfoundland. I am sure the Prime Minister of Canada is sincere in saying he is guided by the opinion of the people of the Province, that he must have an overwhelming number of letters asking that Term 29 be continued in perpetuity in consideration of our needs.

Coming along to Deer Lake — We have a problem there of an airstrip on which Her

Majesty the Queen and Prince Philip will be landing in June. This airstrip needs lights, it needs modern, routine facilities for an airstrip of its size, it needs paving. All that costs money. We have been fortunate in the past year in receiving financial assistance from the Province of Newfoundland. I understand financial assistance is available at Ottawa. Whether it is up to the Minister of Highways to ask for that I don't know. I think the agreement, if any agreement still exists between the Province and the federal government, it is on a 50-50 basis. But I now make it known publicly that, prior to the Queen's landing, the federal government is going to have to inspect the airstrip to take precautions that are not now in existence; to provide a permanent patrol of at least one person to keep horses or other animals from straying on the field. I do hope, and I know, that somehow my words will reach them up there in Ottawa; and they can count on the full co-operation of the Mayor and his council at Deer Lake as we can count on their full co-operation with equipment and materials and men. The only thing that is necessary is financial assistance. In any event, I do hope that every effort will be made to make sure that the airstrip will be brought up to the highest degrees of safety. Coming down through the Humber Valley, my vision is to see the Department of Highways carry through the Trans-Canada from South Bridge on to Deer Lake before the Queen arrives. If they don't dally along too long calling for tenders I am sure that the work can be done in time, to save the embarrassment of a cloud of dust following them. I do hope, and have promised the people of the settlements of Midland, Pasadena, South Brook and Steady Brook that every effort will be made to provide paving leading into their settlements, not to an extensive degree, but to a degree within the realm of the financial position.

Coming down to that portion of the City of Corner Brook, which I represent, and which contains the Western Memorial Hospital, I can assure the staff and the doctors that both my colleague, the member for Humber West and I are both concerned with the need, the crying need for larger hospital accommodation, not only because we want it for the people of our two districts, but because this hospital also caters to people of St. Barbe district and the West Coast.

If there is any possible way to have funds available to carry on extensions this year, it will be found; and if not every aspect of extra accommodations for patients will be looked into. I assure them, as I assure any other committee in Corner Brook, they do not have to wait until I am in the House of Assembly to make urgent calls — I am available any time in Corner Brook, if they want to call me any hour of the day or night, or if they want to see me. I am sure my hon. colleague from Humber West (Mr. Ballam) would leave his office and come out too if the occasion demanded it. I am sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself, Mr. Speaker, knows and concurs with our effort in providing hospitalization to the people of the area which is a growing area. If we are overcrowded because of the free hospitalization plan, as I said before and not wishing to repeat, it is a sign of a great need too long neglected.

There are many problems which concern our people. The greatest problem is to live together as free Newfoundlanders with a common-sense purpose. I read recently where the Canadian Labour Congress has appointed a special representative to Newfoundland. I hope that gentleman will carry out the duties and realize there is a task ahead, a task of understanding and common sense. We are prepared to go more than halfway — You cannot build a bridge across a stream if you only just try to build one part, so that when the hue and cry of who was right and who was wrong is over, let us hope that the wheels of industry will keep moving and let us hope that the threatening letter in today's "Evening Telegram" to destroy our forests by fire was the writing of an insane person, who can be safely stowed away before the folly of his words are carried into action. Surely if there is any decent labour man in this Province today who will hear these words, he will decry, he will block with his life if necessary any such violent attempt to bring the tactics such as we saw last night on television to this Province. If there are going to be disputes between management and labour, let them be settled peacefully as sensible men, decent human Christians living under the realm of God and not under the demands of idiots. (Applause from both sides)

Mr. U. Strickland (Trinity South): Mr.

Speaker, in rising to make my contribution (and I assure you it is going to be a small one) to the motion that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne I have two things in mind: First of all the hon. members of this house have already listened to more than 30 speakers on this motion, some of them long-winded, and because of certain happenings in this Province this year, happenings which had to be brought to the floors of this house, of necessity there has been quite a bit of repetition. I say that advisedly. I have no desire, whatever, this afternoon to further test the patience of the hon. gentlemen on the floors of this house by still continuing to repeat phrases used on more than one occasion in this house this year. So, Sir, I am going to try to steer away from controversial issues as much as I can, and I am going to deal with two or three things I see as having a bearing on the economy of this Province, perhaps in a small way, but nevertheless having something to do with the economy of this Province.

I would be rather remiss if I did not offer congratulations to my hon. colleagues, the member for Trinity North (Mr. Mifflin) and the member for Carbonear-Bay De Verde (Mr. Clarke), on the splendid job they did in moving and seconding the motion. I am sure that they will be heard from a great deal in days to come, and undoubtedly serve the people of Newfoundland very well if they continue in the field of politics.

In thinking about the forthcoming visit of Her Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth and His Royal Highness Prince Philip, I am sure that as Newfoundlanders and as loyal subjects of Her Gracious Majesty, many of us are already praying Divine Providence will endow her and the royal party with good health, good travelling, and I am sure none of us would wish to have a repetition of the Portugal Cove and "Maneco" affair Her Gracious Majesty had to go through during the last Royal visit to Newfoundland. We hope the Newfoundland Weatherman will be extremely kind, in his best mood, so that Her Majesty can travel amongst her subjects here in Newfoundland without undergoing any hardship whatsoever. I am sure that, as Newfoundlanders, the people of this Province will go all out to show Her Gracious

Majesty how much they respect, and how loyal they are, to their sovereign. The loss of the "Blue Wave" came as a shock to Newfoundland, but to me, Mr. Speaker, it came as a tremendous shock. Captain Charlie Walters and I were the best of friends. We sailed as Masters in sister ships out for the same firm for some considerable time. I happen to be a little bit older than Captain Charlie, and very often he came to me for advice when he came up against a problem, when he did not know what best to do at the time or when he thought I might have a little more knowledge and be able to impart something I had learned to him. I don't say that boastfully, but I feel that I had some small thing to do, or probably made some contribution, to help make Captain Charlie Walters what he really was, one of our best known and well respected skippers. I knew some of the crew of the "Blue Wave" very, very well, and Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland can ill afford to lose such men, because they are the kind of men who made the reputation of Newfoundland seamen so well known and respected throughout almost the entire world. We can ill afford to lose them, and we can only pray that Divine Providence will be very, very kind to those of their relatives who are left behind. I have been forced to recall a statement, Mr. Speaker, that I made the first time I spoke on the floors of this house. During that session, some of my colleagues and possibly some of the members on the opposite side of the house, had a bit of a kick out of the statement I made when I said I was not going to try to fool anybody by saying we did not have any problems. I then went on to say we had not reached the land of Canaan yet, Mr. Speaker. I regret to have to say this afternoon that I believe that Canada as a whole, not only Newfoundland, is further back in the economic wilderness than we were more than two years ago, when I made that statement. This government has been criticized, and criticized severely, inside the walls of this house and outside, just recently outside, for their spending of public monies — And as I look towards Ottawa, My! Oh My! Oh My! — just a few months ago a surplus of close to \$500 million and then the Minister of Finance in Ottawa has to tell us, just a week or two ago, that we face a deficit of more than \$600 million. Where do we go from here? Not as a Province but as a Na-

tion, where do we go? Enough said — I might say too much. Mr. Speaker, I would so as good a job as some of the ones have had, and that goes for Ottawa too.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): The next finance Minister!

Mr. U. Strickland (Trinity South): I was a little bit surprised some time ago, Mr. Speaker, when I took up one of the newspapers (I don't recall which one) and read a statement attributed to one of the great labour leaders, or supposed to be a great labour leader in this Province. He said, according to that newspaper, that the members of this house are marked men. Why? The first thing I had to ask myself is; 'why are we marked men?' The only answer I could get to the question was that we are marked because we dared to do the right thing. Well then, thank God for the marking and thank God because Newfoundland still produces men who are satisfied to be marked, if it is for the betterment of Newfoundland. And, Sir, I think if we are ever spared to live to an old age, in our olden days when we sit down and reminisce and think back, one of the happiest memories we will have as Newfoundlanders, and men will be to think back to the very day when some thirty odd men on both sides of this house forgot their party politics and dared to stand up for Newfoundland when the chips were down. I know I am happy myself to be one of them. I am going to let some of the labour leaders in on a little secret — Sometime ago we were told by the press, (again attributed to some of our labour leaders), and over the radio, that the only way that they could beat the legislation that has been introduced by the Government was to write their members and bring pressure to bear on members. Out of a voting population of 7000 people, I received ninety-three names; and some of these were boys and girls going to school. I have been in certain sections of my district and I discovered that some of the names were of boys and girls 16 and 17 years old. If this is the way labour is going to beat this government, they are going to be a long, long time beating it with that percentage. I don't want to kick the federal government too badly, Mr. Speaker, but I have to kick them when they do things that affect the economy of this Province. We had a local

marketing organization, if you wish to call it, for our salt codfish, and they are told by Mr. Churchill that the exclusive franchise was going to be taken from NAFEL and replaced with something better. What have we got? Nothing! Absolutely nothing! Was that not an indication Ottawa knows very little about the problems we are confronted with in Newfoundland?

Mr. Hollett: The same exporters of fish as before.

Mr. Strickland: It is different altogether, and the hon. Leader knows it.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Ottawa thinks we know it all, that is why.

Mr. Strickland: No they do not, but they could do well to take some lessons from us. I know something about fishing. I am the son of a fisherman, thank God for it! And I know a little about fish. I have had sore hands, with blood running out of them more than once. I am not ashamed to stand on the floors of this house and say it. And I would suggest that if we could have a local marketing organization consisting of some of the present members of NAFEL — as far as I am concerned they are tops — with some representation from our Provincial Department of Fisheries, some from our local trade and then some representation from our Federation of Fishermen, I think it would be a good thing for the fisheries of Newfoundland. But as it is now, I claim Ottawa has set the clock back another 25 years, and the moment that supply becomes greater than demand (It might be all to the good while getting a bad fishery) but the moment we get excessive fish we are right back onto the cut-throat days that put so many of our good fish merchants out of existence and forced them into bankruptcy — That is what we are heading for!

I was a little bit thrilled (I suppose that is the right word) a few days ago when my hon. colleague here behind me gave notice of a Bill for the payment of bounties for construction of vessels. I do not know what is in that Bill, but would have liked to have been able to see it. I will see it later. Do you recall, Sir, that some time ago I suggested that it would be a good thing for the Provincial

government to pay bounties for repairing and rebuilding of vessels. Happily the government saw their way clear to do that. And, Sir, I understand several have taken advantage of it — 20, my hon. colleague tells me. Now the Government is to give a bounty for construction of new vessels. But, Mr. Speaker, that brings up a big question to me. I think it was my hon. colleague, the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Shepherd) who made mention of it a day or two ago, speaking on the Address in Reply; the question in regard to slipways, marine docks, marine slipways, whatever you wish to call them. You recall that, once during this year, the dry dock here in St. John's was tied up for a period of six or eight weeks or something like that because one vessel went aground, from Fortune, and not another vessel could be put on dock during that period of time. And, Sir, the more boats we get the greater the need for more slipways. Whoever visualized the improvements for St. John's Harbour, I would have liked for them to have had one more dream. If they had come up with the idea of a dock or marine slipway on the North West side or Western side of the present dry dock in St. John's, by upper Hickman's, I think they would have been doing a tremendous thing for vessel owners of this Province.

Mr. Hollett: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Strickland: I think it would have been one of the best things. Why they slipped up on it, I will never know. Certainly nobody with any marine knowledge in Newfoundland, or elsewhere, was ever asked for an opinion on it, because there is room up there, and vessels up to 500 tons or more could be taken up on a marine slipway right there, with facilities right on the job for doing any kind of repair work, with the drydock tied up as it had been this year.

Mr. Hollett: It may not be too late yet!

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): A fishermen's wharf?

Mr. Strickland: That is not the idea. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is something else — I understand a certain gentleman, and I am not naming any names, in Newfoundland is prepared to put a marine slipway in Man-

uels. I think he should be given the go-ahead because to me it would be a God-send for the vessel owners of this Province. And if the federal government would only dredge out the harbour of Manuels, you could have one of the best harbours in Newfoundland for an anchorage for vessels during the winter season. Because, Sir, when the new harbour development in St. John's is finally completed there will be very, very little room for tying up vessels during the winter months.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Bay Bulls is closer.

Mr. Strickland: Bay Bulls is not a harbour. If you had the experience I have had in Bay Bulls you would not want to be caught there in a gale of wind. Again, the dock at Harbour Grace could be easily repaired and the dock at Burin. When I think of the number of vessels operating out of the Southwest-Coast ports of Newfoundland that have to go to Sydney or elsewhere to go on dock, it almost makes me sick. It is a great loss of money to this Province and loss of time during the harvesting season.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a pessimist, at least I don't think I am and I hope I am not, but I like to look facts squarely in the face once in a while. And, Sir, I am going to make a prediction now that it would be all right for everyone to put in their note book — This year we are going to have the worst situation in Sydney for coal that we ever experienced in Newfoundland — this coming year — and I will tell you why. The federal government have just decided to pay subventions for the moving of coal into Ontario and Quebec. Newfoundland has been discriminated against in this matter — subventions for everywhere but Newfoundland — But, Sir, with that outlet it will mean that there will be very, very little coal for Newfoundland. Now, I know the trouble in Sydney this last two or three years. Three years ago I was sent to Sydney for two months on this same matter. I discovered that no matter what they say, the trouble is production. That is the whole trouble at Sydney, they are not producing the coal. And, Sir, I am going to say right now, if we just leave this alone and do nothing about it until September or October or November of this year, our vessel owners in Newfound-

land will lose their shirts in Sydney this summer. Why? Why criticize unless we have an alternative? I have an alternative, and I am going to throw it out in the form of a suggestion. I hope somebody takes notice. I think the Provincial government, not in September month but now, should set up a committee, with some government representation, Mr. Johnston or somebody else. He would be a fine man for the job, and somebody from the trade, those in the coal business. They should be formed into a committee now to go to Montreal — You are not going to beat this matter in Sydney, gentlemen — It cannot be done. If you are going to beat it, it has to be done in Montreal. I suggest a committee should be set up to go to Montreal now, and first of all fight for the subventions to come to Newfoundland, as well as to Ontario and elsewhere.

Mr. Hollett: In Montreal?

Mr. Strickland: The marine salesman for all of the East coast has an office right in Montreal.

Mr. Hollett: Surely you must go to Ottawa?

Mr. Strickland: No, Montreal; whatever he recommends is agreed to by the Coal Board. I discovered that in Sydney. I had the privilege of meeting with the Coal Board and know whereof I speak. If, and I repeat, if, we just do nothing only sit by and do nothing, it won't be the bounties for construction of new boats we will want in Newfoundland but a grave yard to bury what we have. Because the men who operate these boats will never be able to carry on. Now, there is another danger — More and more of our coal dealers are turning to the United States for coal. And, Mr. Speaker, for every boat load of coal that comes to Newfoundland from the United States of America, a half dozen or more of our small boat operators are put out of a living. So what? If there are three or four thousand tons coming from the United States of America in steamers, if that can be brought from Sydney in small boats it would mean something for the economy of this Province and the people who own small boats. I suggest the government look into this and do something about it.

Mr. Hollett: Would the hon. gentleman allow a question? Could the hon. gentleman tell the house approximately how many suitable coasters we have to go to Sydney and bring back coal?

Mr. Strickland: I could not without giving it some thought. I would say now, without fear of contradiction, there are 40 or more, over a hundred tons and from there up to 400 tons and 300 tons and so on. I think the hon. Minister of Fisheries would confirm that, 40 or more, and every one carries six to eight men, multiply six or eight by forty, over 240 men. Mr. Speaker, I think we should have some definite commitment from the coal company as to what we are to expect with regard to coal delivered to Newfoundland during the present season. Let us get it on paper. Over the telephone is no good, but when we something definite on paper at this time of the year from the coal company, then we would know what to expect and our vessel operators can govern themselves accordingly. Mr. Speaker, could we have a 10 minute recess?

On motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair:

Mr. Strickland: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow.

On motion the debate on the Address in Reply adjourned:

LEGISLATION:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, Item No. 3 on the Order Paper (A Bill, "Act to Amend the Local Government Act") — I find there has been a slight omission in the Bill, which passed committee. I therefore move the third reading set for today not be proceeded with but that instead, the Bill be recommitted now, and at the same time that the house go into committee on Items No. 4 to No. 16. Motion, that this Bill be recommitted, carried:

On motion, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair:

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Pharmaceutical Association Act, 1954" —

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Newfoundland Medical Board Act" —

Mr. Hollett: Why three years?

Hon. Dr. J. McGrath (Minister of Health): In this case, I think all the other provinces or if not all, nearly all — except the Province of Quebec — the limitation is one year, in Nova Scotia three years, and we struck a balance and made it two, as appropriate for Newfoundland. It could easily be one or three, but it seems to us two would be the correct period.

Mr. Hollett: Could the hon. Minister tell us what happens to the practitioner in the case of any malpractice?

Dr. McGrath: Well usually, of course, it is only a civil action against him. As a matter of fact, it does not mean criminal action necessarily, but still it could be included. It commonly means, if a doctor shows lack of skill, if he attempts to do perhaps a type of operation he is not fully qualified to do, or in the opinion of the patient, perhaps if he gets bad results the patient takes action, bad results are not necessarily a result of lack of skill — It is usually a civil action for damage.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Chairman, suppose the patient dies who takes action?

Dr. McGrath: Under those circumstances I don't suppose he does.

Mr. Hollett: Does the Medical Association take note of such malpractice?

Dr. McGrath: Oh yes, and if there is anything of a criminal nature, of course, the Medical Association very definitely takes action on that. It could take action, I suppose, in any case of malpractice, should any definite neglect, real neglect or, of course, anything criminal. In any case there would not necessarily be anything blame-worthy. It could, for instance, happen a patient could

die quite suddenly, without warning, under an anaesthetic, no amount of skill in the world can prevent that sometimes. When that happens a relative, for instance, might feel the doctor was unskillful and might take action, but the hearing of the action might show no lack of skill.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Food and Drug Act".

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney—General): I have an amendment here to Section 2 — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill.

Motion, that the Committee report progress on this Bill and ask leave to sit again, carried:

Dr. J. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on that Bill? — The purpose of this other amendment is simply to permit, under the Food and Drug Act, the Department of Health recommending the manner in which foods are distributed; in other words, to satisfy itself the description of food and containers shall be thus and so, indicating the nature of the food; particularly when brought in for the purpose of reconstituted milk, recently on the market. The effect would be to allow the Minister authority that all reconstituted milk must be marked as such on the container. That is the general purpose. That is the only thing it does, prescribe the manner in which packages should be marked. In other words, Sir, the public should know exactly what they are buying. We do not have the power to deal with it at the present time. It really re-enacts the present paragraph, but adds this factor of having the control of advertising and descriptions.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that Section (2) as read is not desirable I would move that Section (2) be reconsidered and that this takes its place.

Dr. McGrath: This is not Section (2) in the Bill. Section (2) in the Bill remains, this refers to another matter there, two separate things, dealing with an addition to the bill as printed, which becomes Section (3) of the Bill.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, I would move that Section (2) be renumbered as Section (3) and a new Section (2) be inserted.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we could have a copy of that to look at, and have the matter postponed until tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Of course! I move that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act"

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act":

Mr. Curtis: I move, Mr. Chairman, that Section (10) be reconsidered and that there be inserted immediately after Sub-section (4) the following as sub-section (5)

"For the purpose of this section, owner includes the operator of trailer parks." The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply can perhaps explain this amendment.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Chairman, this sub-section is included specifically for the town of Stephenville. Hon. members may know that at Stephenville they operate trailers. Out there people live in trailers and the trailers parks are owned by certain people. The trailer is owned by another party, and that party rents the trailer to some of the American servicemen. Well, the Town Council of Stephenville is having some difficulty in collecting the taxes from the tenants of the trailers. So that now, for the purpose of collecting the taxes, as sometimes they find it difficult to get the owner of the park to pay it, they make it apply now to both the operator of the trailer park as well as the owner of the trailers. That is the idea.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): The purpose I take it of the Bill, as the Minister explained, is that if the actual occupant or owner of the trailer, an American service-

man, fails to pay, the owner of the land pays it.

Mr. Abbott: Yes.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill with some amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act":

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act":

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers of the Nomenclature Board":

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, this Bill was completely read, and my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, asked that we reconsider one of the sections, or that it be deferred so that the house might consider the advisability of writing in a clause to the effect that the government, before making any change, would be compelled to find out the wishes of the people of such settlement. It is the feeling of the Government that, if we wrote in such a clause, it would create a difficulty which might involve even a plebiscite, and we think that the Committee might well leave it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to ensure, before making any change that the people do not object. I think that can be safely left to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, who are not sufficiently anxious to change the name of a place so as to upset the people by so doing.

Mr. Renouf: It might also mean, Mr. Chairman, it could refer to unpopulated areas: It might be called "Nightingale's Rest" or might be turned into "Murray's Peak" or something like that.

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Chairman, actually I think the policy of the Board has not been to name any locality after any living person. That is the policy of the Board.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): He did have a father.

Mr. Murray: The Board will consist of not less than nine members. We propose to get the best men we can on the Board, educated and with a knowledge of the history of Newfoundland, and I think it would be better left to this Board to make decisions — and there are provisions for advertising in the Gazette.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I am more worried than ever since the hon. member has spoken — They are going to get nine intelligent men on the Board. That, Sir, in itself is some job. And the hon. Minister said we ought to leave it to the Board. It certainly has to be left to the Board. I agree with that. My only intention in raising the point, in places where people live, i.e. inhabited villages, a move to change the name of that place should come from the people and not the Board, before the Board takes it upon itself to recommend to the government a new name for that settlement. That was my only idea. Now, I don't want people to go to the Board and say we want changes, but only when the Board gets such a hint from the people in the area should the Board attempt to change any of the names of the places in this country. They are very historic names, some of them. Even if we had intelligent men, they might develop foolish ideas about changing certain names. The move ought to come in the first instance from the people in the village or settlement. I am quite sure my hon. friend from St. John's North agrees.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I might say, I back the hon. Leader of the Opposition in this, not only for this particular reason but because of post offices and changes of address. It is done too much. Maybe some silly name can be changed, but if the Nomenclature Board says, "let us clean the whole works up", there would be some job in the post office. I have people on the old part of the Topsail Road, where the division is still called Topsail Road, and people don't know where it is. They did get a name from the Nomenclature Board, I think — "Greenback" Road, or something like that. Some peculiar things have happened with names. I know the Nomenclature Board to name "Park Avenue" and the Traffic Committee put up a sign "No Parking".

Mr. Hollett: Under that section, the Board may recommend to the government the naming or renaming of municipalities, settlements, villages or other populated areas, and it also says geographical features and highways.

Mr. Curtis: That is the objection to putting in — “on recommendation of people living there”. Who would rename a highway or geographical feature? It would mean redrafting the section.

Mr. Hollett: That would not take much time.

Mr. Curtis: If it is thought important, of course, that could be done. But I think my hon. friend could be assured that no attempt would be made to rename a place just because somebody liked a name. And obviously the government would not offend a whole settlement by renaming.

Mr. Hollett: Offend the whole country sometimes.

Mr. Curtis: I think we might let it go for the moment. If we find anything in it we would be glad to reconsider it.

Mr. Hollett: I may be a little bit stubborn, but I don't want to see a bunch of men sitting down, and have to do something to justify their existence; a Nomenclature Board has to do something. They say; “Alright, let us take a place up in Burin, “Morris Gut”. It is now called “Hell's Mouth”. I don't like “Hell's Mouth”. That is going on all over the country. The Board may recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the naming or renaming of a geographical feature and highways, and upon petition from any populated areas — That is all we have to do.

Mr. Renouf: Mr. Chairman, perhaps something could be put into the Act saying that with respect to areas, highways or new locations that at present have no name, some machinery should be set up for the Nomenclature Board to go into operation then, but the point the hon. Leader of the Opposition made in changing a name to a new name is a valid one.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, my hon. friends over there remind me of the story of the Jew who wanted to change his name, and first he called himself Mr. O'Rielly and then he wanted to change his name from Mr. O'Rielly to Mr. O'Flaherty and when the registrar asked why he wanted to change from O'Rielly to Mr. O'Flaherty — He said, “Well I want to be able to say what my name was before I changed it”. So, Sir, I don't think the point is worth too much. Personally, I don't think any member of this house cares very much whether we have to refer to the people or not on this, but I do think it is just confusing the issue. Here we have a Board of nine men. They are going to make recommendations. They recommend certain changes to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council has to advertise these changes for two months, and then they have to decide whether or not they continue with the renaming.

Mr. Hollett: And the people in the community have that chance?

Mr. Curtis: The people have two whole months.

Mr. Hollett: There is no use raising any objection.

Mr. Curtis: Why?

Mr. Hollett: I think the hon. gentleman just said that nobody in the house cares. Who cares whether they call a place up in Burin “Hell's Mouth” or “Hells Flames”? Who cares? I care. I have gone through “Hell's Mouth” and have had a pretty rough time. I nearly lost my life once.

Mr. Curtis: I think, Mr. Chairman, unless my hon. friend has some explicit and written amendment to offer we should put through the section as it is.

Mr. Hollett: Well, if the hon. the Attorney General would give us the opportunity we could produce a written one.

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Chairman, may I add a word or two. I might say I do not favour the amendment as suggested by the hon. Leader of the Oppos-

ition for the reason that quite a few of the changes made in place names during the last 20 years have been made because, in very many instances, a majority of the people in that particular settlement wanted to rename it, and the new name has certainly not been as picturesque as the original one. I recall very well a place in the district of Trinity North where a considerable furor has been going on for the past two or three years. Happily the name is not changed yet. A considerable number of the people in this place have a mistaken idea, as far as I am concerned, of wanting to change the name. That has not been done. There is nothing like holding on to the old names. And, Sir, I hold that any place loses much by not holding on to some tradition, there probably as long as it has been settled. I think it would have a better chance, the Board is not going to make changes lightly, not as lightly as the people themselves, carried away by a wave of enthusiasm, trying to get a new-fangled name for their settlement. Personally I think the Nomenclature Board, composed of nine people, limited to a certain extent by tradition, stands a much better chance of holding on to what they think should be held on to, and also have the opportunity, under this Bill, to advise the people of it.

Mr. Curtis: I might say, Mr. Chairman, I had a request recently to change the name of "Herring Neck" — Obviously I gave it no support, no consideration, although that suggestion came from the people, nobody would consider changing the name of a place without representation from the people.

Mr. Hollett: You had representation and did not change it?

Mr. Curtis: But, would my hon. friend favour the change? I mean would one or two names be sufficient to satisfy the amendment? All it would need would be for one man to write in and then we would have a request from the place, otherwise you have to have a plebiscite, and that is ridiculous.

Mr. Hollett: Not so ridiculous as it might appear to my hon. friend. The attitude of the Attorney General and also that of the Minister of Welfare goes to show, in their

very statements, which will appear in Hansard, I am quite sure, that they ignore what the people of a community want — don't do it, but let it be done by a Nomenclature Board of nine sensible men appointed by a stupid government — that is the attitude.

Mr. Curtis: Reserve that for when my hon. friend gets in.

Mr. Hollett: I made the point. It may be considered trifling, but it is not trifling in my mind. After all, I, like the rest of the people in this house, am a Newfoundlander and I hate like blazes to see historic names changed simply because some brain on a Board wants to change it. I agree with the Attorney General, I would not like to see the name "Herring Neck" changed. But if people vote as a whole to have the change I think we ought to listen. After all, the people voted to change the constitution of this country from a part of Great Britain to the 10th Province of Canada. We listened to that on a very small majority, and didn't have any hesitation in mind about that.

Mr. Curtis: I would listen to the change in "Herring Neck" upon a majority.

Mr. Hollett: I said, "If the people wanted it".

Mr. Curtis: I said, "If one or two people".

Mr. Hollett: Oh sure!

Mr. Curtis: I think we can safely leave this.

Mr. John Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the debate on this, but I am a little bit confused by this thing. On this Board of nine, four can be a quorum, that is a minority of the group can control the meeting — four can have a meeting. It is rather ridiculous to have a membership of nine with four controlling the meeting. I would normally assume they would be appointed from the larger St. John's area. I would not want to think this Board could decide on their own to change the name of "Deer Lake" without consultation.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, they cannot do that. They only have power to recommend.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, four men.

Mr. Forsey: I would like the Attorney General to say who decided whether or not?

Mr. Curtis: The Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. Forsey: Surely we can rely on the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. Hollett: Some people I know are not relying on the present administration in Ottawa — As the hon. member for Corner Brook West pointed out, just four can make up the quorum and four men can sit down and change or recommend the change of the name of a place or recommend the change of the name of a place to the government.

Mr. Murray: After due notice having been given.

Mr. Nightingale: I might say, Mr. Chairman, we have a Nomenclature Committee, and we found out the people were not going to stand for the name of a new street, Dunfield Street. They did not think it classy enough. The people will come back when we advertise, we don't need to worry about that.

Mr. Hollett: It is too late after the Lieutenant-Governor in Council decides.

Mr. Curtis: They can rename it again.
On motion clause carried:
Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment carried:

RENT RESTRICTIONS ACT:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Suspension of the Rent Restrictions Act".

Mr. John Forsey: Mr. Chairman, I understand that was deferred for debate.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, you were not here.

Mr. Forsey: I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I think it is absolutely ridiculous to amend a Bill, apply an

amendment that will suit the minority group of St. John's and effect and endanger a majority group in the outports. If this government is not prepared to carry out a slum clearance outside St. John's — people are forced into these homes not because they want to.

Mr. Hollett: I want to point out it is entirely out of order to discuss this Bill here. I want to point out the debate was adjourned. I do not see why we discuss it here.

Mr. Curtis: Did the Bill pass second reading?

Mr. Forsey: I was here. The Attorney-General held it back and suggested some additions or amendments to it at that time.

Mr. Hollett: It did not pass second reading.

Mr. Forsey: Mr. Chairman, if I was away, I now make a public statement. I will have to condemn the house for having legislated the Rent Restrictions Act. I think it was a stupid move.

Mr. Chairman: The clerk will produce the copies of the record to find out definitely if this Bill has passed second reading.

Mr. Curtis: The records of the house, Mr. Chairman, show the Rent Restrictions Act passed second reading Monday the 27th day of April.

Mr. Forsey: I consider it my duty to object to this, Mr. Chairman. Don't get me wrong — I just understood the Bill would be revised and certain expansions and restrictions limited, and I know people within my district who are not in favour of it. We adopted it in wartime in Newfoundland, but it is a tremendous measure to protect the tenant from unscrupulous landlords. We have lots of fine landlords but also lots of the other kind.

Mr. Curtis: I wish the hon. member would read the Bill. I know we cannot discuss the principle now, but if he read the Bill — We do not repeal the rent restrictions, the Governor-in-Council takes authority to suspend it and takes authority to revive it again. Well, surely what objection is there to

that. In other words the Governor-in-Council can suspend it and in two weeks time, if it is found we have not acted wisely, reinstate it. Surely my hon. friend, if he feels that in his district they need the Bill, he will make the proper representations and we will be happy. We will be happy not to suspend it in the first place, and if we have suspended it we will be happy to reinstate it. It is an experiment really. I understand from the Minister that the Act has not been used.

Mr. Hollett: Is this in second reading now?

Mr. Curtis: No, I am asking leave of the committee to make these comments. I would be glad to say nothing further. I don't like speaking.

Mr. Hollett: What clause are we on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Clause (2).

Mr. Hollett: I would like to say a word on Clause (2). I must say although I appreciate that this section is probably the cause of lots of hardship to landlords, because they cannot get sufficient rent to make the necessary repairs, and so on, but I do think, in this time of stress and strain under which our economy is labouring, and when we have so many living in rented homes, right here in St. John's, and Corner Brook is another place with many people not working and having a job to keep body and soul together with the food handed out by welfare offices, what is going to happen if suddenly the rents are raised? What is going to happen if the restrictions are raised and we allow a landlord to oust John Jones or Bill Smith who today are having very great difficulty in paying the rents, even though they may be small? I think it is highly unwise for the government, at this particular time, when certainly we have no good prosperity, certainly conditions are very bad although they are not as bad, I understand, as they were last year according to reports I read yesterday from the Bank of Montreal, with 3000 less on the unemployment list than there were last year. Still there are some 33,000 people in Newfoundland who are unemployed, and I think it would be a very great pity to raise the rent restrictions at this pres-

ent time. In a time of prosperity, with everybody earning good money, we could take off the restrictions and let the landlords raise rents if they want to, particularly in view of the fact that certain housing has been held up; by whose mistake it does not matter. Lots of people are in houses today not living happily in their surroundings, but if they raise their rents they have to get out and go into hovels, and instead of cleaning up the slum conditions we are creating slums. I agree with my hon. friend from Corner Brook West that this is a very unfortunate time to take off these rent restrictions.

Mr. Forsey: Mr. Chairman, is it permissible to speak on this Clause (2)?

Mr. Curtis: Yes, sure.

Mr. Forsey: I do not want to sound contrary, but I want to speak on it now. Even now, the only thing wrong with the Act is that it has no teeth in it, you must wait for a Board to intervene. The Board comes out with a yardstick and follows that yardstick. The landlord has a great opportunity to revise his costs and the city tax, school tax and water tax he is allowed to make over and above his return on that investment, and the measure of valuation they take for his property is on the books of the city of Corner Brook, not at the original cost of \$1600. It is valued at \$6000 and he is allowed to base his rent on \$6000 which is pretty fair to him. But those who know, in any area, and certainly in the Humber and Humber West, where seasonal workers who can't build must live for the convenience of their families, know that the taxes are high because the people who work in the mill on a permanent basis have very high wage levels, and it means that the rents of these people, once this Bill is enforced, can go up to \$50 from \$20. Where can these people go? Where can they go unless the government provides slum clearance in Corner Brook and do what they are doing in St. John's? Yes, it is a good way to get rid of them; raise the rents and have the people walk out, but they have to walk out on the streets. Only the other day a chap, under the rent restrictions, was told to get out on a certain day. The light and telephone wires would be cut and the water cut off, not by

the public utility but by the landlord, and even now the magistrate can't do anything very much. The reason was that he asked for paint to paint the place after three years. I am not saying it is like that with everybody. There are decent people too, and there are troubles with rents too when the fellow at any price does not pay and feels he can't pay. But there are people who, for reasons of absolute economy, lack of finances, can't pay — show me the bank which will lend money to a fellow with a seasonal job and I will show you applications tomorrow for 50 homes in Corner Brook. In ten days I can bring a petition from everybody who rents in Corner Brook — I am willing to say 90% of the people, without question, will protest this, but 100% of the landlords will agree with it. Why would they not? They are selling a necessary product. It is a product for which there is a need. They will raise the price. The cost of living will go to an all-time high. We pay more for a pound of fish today than for a pound of chicken, yet turn around and someone says — "this was a wartime measure adopted from Britain and applies no where else in Canada" — Get rid of it. At some other times we boastfully say this government leads in this Province in this move, and now we are ashamed we have something others have not. It is nothing to be ashamed of. If they had to live hard and work hard for a dollar, and were not born with a silver spoon in their mouth, they would find out it is a blessing. Not all of us can live in rich palaces.

Mr. Hollett: Then again, people are forgetting — Take the condition of Bell Island at the present time, with 550 men to be laid off. Some of them live in Conception Bay but a good many of them live on Bell Island, most in rented homes. Are we going to join hands with Dosco and starve these people to death and allow the landlords over there (I know some of these landlords) allow them to throw these people on the street? Is the government party to that kind of thing? I hope not. And it is not only Bell Island, but other places in the country whenever there is a cut back in production and people are laid off here and there, a good many of these people laid off are the ones who are the least independant and have to live in rented homes. Is this government going to pass a piece of legislation here that is going

to make it worse for these people? I say, Mr. Chairman, I am certainly going to vote against that Bill. I must say, Mr. Chairman, I must have been out of the house a few days ago when it went through. Anyway I go along with my colleague. I didn't see this before, and I would ask the Acting Premier to hold it because I certainly agree with the hon. member for Humber East. We have a situation in one district and he has the same in his, and probably more so in Corner Brook West. I am certain that this legislation would do a great injury to a lot of people. If it is necessary to enforce this thing or something similar in certain areas, there may be some reason we do not know of, why it cannot be done? But it is an unusual thing for a member of the Government to object in a speech on the floor here to a Bill brought in by the Government — But I must say I must have been out of the house or otherwise I would have said something on this particular thing when it came up for second reading. I would suggest the very things mentioned here now in second reading, if I had been here, because it will create a problem and it will definitely cause very serious trouble to a lot of people in both our districts, and I would suggest probably others as well.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no objection — I am not interested at all personally. I never had any trouble with my tenants and never had to raise their rents. I have not done it. But I just think it is about time this kind of legislation came off the books, but if there is need for this type of legislation, then, under no circumstances, would the government act to undo it. This is purely enabling legislation, but if the house feels the time is not ripe, I would be glad to take it back and see what the government says about it.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): A lot of those adversely affected would very likely be in the labouring bracket and I think a lot of trouble might arise, when somebody would get the idea that this is yet another move that might fall rather heavily on that particular section of our community. For that reason, I would not be in favour of this Bill at just this time. We may quickly reach the point where ample housing, we hope,

may be provided in the crowded areas, and when that comes about, of course, as hoped for, the Bill might come up for consideration again at any time.

Mr. A. Mifflin (Trinity North): Could the Minister let us know how often the provisions of the Rent Restrictions Act were used nowadays? At one time during the war they were used quite a lot, but in the last couple of years how often have people applied for a decrease in rent or anything like that under the Rent Restrictions Act? If you are in arrears of rent you can be kicked out anyhow — The Act cannot apply in such a case.

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, during the past two years, the Board has found it necessary to meet about 10 times, in two years, half a dozen times each year. For the past three months we have not had an application for an increase in rent, or decrease in rent, or one for greater hardship — So we were just wondering why the Board should still function or why the legislation should be there. It would appear as though it is really unnecessary due to the fact we have received no applications.

Mr. Renouf: It is a situation though, is it not, relating to the territory of St. John's mostly. I know perhaps the Rent Control Board does the job from place to place, but is less likely to have applications come from other areas of the country due to the difficulties and necessity of getting about. The St. John's situation, as the Minister indicated, may be less active now in appeals to the Board, but that is St. John's only. Maybe the area which the hon. member spoke about may still be under difficulty, but due to the distance from the centre of the Board it might not be as active in appealing to the Board.

Mr. Abbott: Last year, Mr. Chairman, the Board visited Corner Brook and Grand Falls, because we received applications from people in those areas. That Board spent, I think, two or three weeks in Corner Brook and Grand Falls and after they came back we found more criticisms of the Board than before they visited; that they even granted increases to landlords, and so on. The tenants were in an uproar, writing me and the

member would send the complaints to me. We did have a request last fall from Happy Valley. Now, to send the Board to Happy Valley would cost as much as to send a Royal Commission to Ottawa, so that this roll would have to be greatly increased —

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, I think the matter might stand. I might say that some time ago I received a request from the Law Society to the effect certain amendments to the Bill would be desirable. I would like to have these referred to, so that I might just see what the thoughts of the legal profession were on this matter. I think perhaps we might well have the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Forsey: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has made a statement about Corner Brook. It was well justified. If ever you saw a bunch of intelligent gentlemen who acted with either complete dishonesty or complete disregard for their ability to appraise the property, it was the Board when it met in Corner Brook. They took one house and raised the rent from \$60 to \$80 and, on the scale that they used to grant a certain landlord increased rent, the rent for that home should have been decreased to \$22 a month. That is not a wild statement. I showed the evidence to the Minister. I can show it to this house. Take that scale again, and take the appraisal of this particular house on the books of the city of Corner Brook, add their cost, repairs, fire insurance, and the return should be around \$22 a month. They increased it from \$60 to \$80. They had a clever lawyer representing them. The meeting itself was held in camera. Mr. Hickman, at that time, asked about the school tax and said it was a tax peculiar to Corner Brook and because of that should be included in the cost by the landlord. In other words, attach the school tax to the property and apply it to the tenant to pay, when in reality the tenant is paying the property tax for the landlord. Now, I can assure this house that I feel and know what is taking place, and know what I am talking about. Lots of times I talk and don't know too much, but I can tell you this — That is what is wrong with the Rent Restriction Act, there are no teeth in it. It is administered very uneconomically. I am not a professor and cannot tell you how, but I would say this — You have a Department of

Welfare. Why have a Board sent up to stay at the Glynmill Inn so many days at so much a day when you can have it done locally, delegate certain authorities to do it. It is something I don't understand. I was quite willing to pass the buck, write the city of Corner Brook, and ask the council do they want to restrict life in the area they control

Mr. Mifflin: All your complaint is the composition of the Board?

Mr. Forsey: I am complaining of the fact we are trying to repeal an Act when we should be trying to improve it. It is weak in its present state, when a tenant is not protected and the magistrate and police can do nothing for him — hire a lawyer to take action because the Act is being violated by the landlord, that is what you have to do.

Mr. Hollett: The motion is before the house and we must either vote on that or have it withdrawn, one or the other. I am not in favour of having it stand over. The motion has been made. I suggest the motion be put to withdraw it, if it is to be withdrawn, and I would be perfectly happy. Otherwise, I think we must vote on it.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, the motion to rise the Committee always comes first. Motion, that the Committee rise and report progress on this Bill, carried:

Mr. Curtis: The other three Bills referred to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, refer to Mines and Resources. As the Minister is not here I move now that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried: Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered the matter to them referred and directed me to report having passed Bills, Nos. 14, 16, 17, 20 and 21 and 18 without amendment. On motion report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to it referred and directed me to report having

passed Bill No. 12 with some amendment. On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the other matters to it referred and has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again. On motion report received, Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow:

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the house at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.

Thursday, April 30, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

RESIGNATION OF HON. GREGORY POWER:

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest regret that I have to make an announcement which I have been dreading for many months past I would have to make at some time or other. For a good many months past, the health of my colleague and friend, the Minister of Highways, has been giving all of us the greatest concern. He has occupied a position in the Government that called for great physical and intellectual effort, the position of Minister of Highways; and ever since last Fall the state of his health has been such as to make him and us both wonder whether he would be able to carry on the extremely arduous work of the coming road building and road paving season. Throughout the past winter, Mr. Power has not had the physical comeback that we had hoped for, and he has come to the conclusion, greatly to my own regret, that the persistent ill-health from which he has suffered makes it necessary for him to drop out of politics altogether. He has therefore offered, and we have been obliged to accept, his resignation from the Government. I understand

that His Honour the Speaker has at the same time received Mr. Power's resignation as a member of the House of Assembly. His retirement from politics takes place from today's date.

Greg Power has been my closest personal friend for the past 12 years. I first met him when he came to see me to offer his services to the cause of Confederation. That was when Confederation's cause had pitifully few advocates and friends. I welcomed his support with a satisfaction that it would be impossible to describe today. From that moment until very recently, indeed until the state of his health intervened, we have been very close together. Together we fought for Confederation, and together we have fought for the upbuilding of the new Province. He has always been a tower of strength to me personally, and to the Liberal Party and the Government of the Province. I will miss him acutely.

Greg Power is one of the brainiest men that Newfoundland has produced. Those of us who know him well have endless admiration and respect for his wit, his good humour, and his shrewd, reliable judgment. He could deflate bombast and humbug and hypocrisy quicker than any man I ever knew. His feet were always planted firmly on the ground. He was a rock of common sense. He loved his native Newfoundland, and above all he loved his native town and neighbourhood of Placentia.

My own task for years was made the lighter by his inimitable and incomparable good company. It is going to be more difficult now than before, for me personally. I am sure I express the sentiments of this side of the house, and indeed of the other side as well, when I say that we hope that he will find peace and contentment in his retirement. Now that he is removed from the intensity and burden of public office and membership in this house, his health may greatly improve. At least we all here hope it will be so.

I propose to submit the name of Dr. Fred Rowe as the new Minister of Highways, and to become Minister of Education myself, at least for a while. I am confident that Dr. Rowe will carry out Mr. Power's highways policy faithfully and with enthusiasm and efficiency. And so, Mr. Speaker, there disappears from Newfoundland politics one of the most brilliant of Newfoundland's native

sons. Poet, student, omnivorous reader, humourist and wit, rock of common sense, lover of his native land, one of the real fathers of Confederation, and in all ways a true-born Newfoundlander, Greg Power will never be forgotten by his countless friends of the old Confederate movement and the present Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker: I have to announce to the house — As the Premier has said; I have today received a letter from the hon. Mr. Power tendering his resignation as the member in this House for the district of Placentia East as from today, for reasons of ill health.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is also with a feeling of regret that I rise on behalf of myself and my colleague, a feeling of sorrow and loss which we feel on this announcement just made by the Premier. I have known for sometime, of course, that Mr. Power has been ill, but I did not dream that the illness was such that it necessitated his retiring from this house, and from politics.

We were of different persuasions as far as politics are concerned, but I had a great admiration for Greg Power and my admiration for him was greatly enhanced during a recent visit, last fall, to Labrador, with a party of which he was a member. I discovered then, with great pleasure, that Greg Power had much more to him than I had allowed myself to think previously that he had. I discovered then in Greg Power a man for whom I could have the greatest respect as a man. I want to say right here and now that I am very, very sorry that Mr. Power has had to make the decision which he has made. I am quite sure the Government will miss him and I am quite sure that everyone on that side of the house will miss him, and I know we will miss him. He not only was a politician, with whom I did not agree that is to say, in the past, but he was a man of many parts, and as the Premier pointed out, a poet. I have here in my hand now, which I could read, although it is probably not wise, a little piece of poetry — "Answer to a Child" which I think is a master piece. I would commend it to all members of the house to read. He was not only a man of politics and a man of the world but Greg Power was a man of god, as far as that

poetry was concerned, and I am quite sure that expresses his soul. I am, Sir, very sorry, as I say, to know that this house will have to sit without him in the future.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for White Bay North, who is away from the house for a few days on business of considerable importance, as the house will realize, I have the honour to present a petition from a large number of voters in the town of St. Anthony, praying for the development of hydro-electricity under the rural electrification program of the government. This petition is not only signed by a great many of the citizens of St. Anthony but is accompanied by letters, individual letters, from the St. Anthony Town Council, from the Mayor of St. Anthony as well and from the Superintendent of the International Grenfell Association Mission at St. Anthony and Dr. Charles S. Curtis and other prominent citizens of that town.

Now Sir, I happen to know that St. Anthony, for several years past, has been most anxious to get hydro-electric development. I was instrumental in getting a survey made by Commander Desbarats of the potential power that is there, and the practical problems involved and the cost of developing and providing the electricity. The government itself, directly, as the house knows, is not now concerning itself, as such, with hydro-development. The duty to do that now falls on the shoulders of the Power Commission. The Power Commission is not yet fully functioning. It has, it is true, its chairman and its hydro-engineer from England and chief engineer, chief hydro-engineer, a staff of two, but the other two members have not yet in fact been appointed, although on a public occasion recently, (I think last fall) I did suggest it was the intention of the government to appoint two well known citizens, well known businessmen in the persons of Mr. Thomas Ashbourne, a former member of the National Convention and former member of the House of Commons and also Captain L. Stick of Bay Roberts, who is also a former member of the House of Commons. The Government has not, to this moment, made

the formal appointment, but I imagine that will be done soon, and then the power commission would be complete, with a chairman and two members and its engineer, and they will be much closer to being able to do something. The next consideration is that of finances; as to whether or not the government are able, pending settlement of a certain question in Ottawa, to finance the rural electrification program to the extent that we had hoped and still hope to be able to do. I say these words of explanation in presenting this petition on behalf of the hon. member for White Bay North and in so doing give it my warmest support. On motion, petition received.

GIVING NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Hollett:

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I don't know if this is the proper order for questions, but I am wondering whether we are going to have a little paint on the outside of the house before Spring, which is just around the corner. I am sure the department concerned could find enough grey paint to make things a little more shiplike. I am sure it would not cost much but would certainly improve the look around the fountain. These grey houses look like they came from the Western Front, and it would not hurt to give them a coat of paint.

Mr. J. Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. I notice in today's "Evening Telegram", in black headlines — "Two Kinds of People — Jack Forsey, Liberal Member for Humber East brought laughter from his colleagues in the House of Assembly when he said there were times when a man must not speak as a politician but as a responsible person." Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of newspapers too, apparently. There are those bright enough to rise above criticism, and those so small that they take it out on ignoring remarks that might be to their benefit. Now the "Western Star" has no representative here. They are represented by the reporters of their parent newspaper, the "Evening Telegram." Here in this house I can only assume then, Mr. Speaker, this is

the kind of trash and nonsense they report back to the people of my district as having been the text and content of some ninety minutes of speaking in this house, in this session. I can assure the owners of the "Telegram" and "Western Star" that I will conduct a campaign to give the truth and show them up for the cheapness and the smallness for their inability to act as responsible newspapers and give the news whether they like the person who says it or not.

Mr. Speaker: I have called the Orders of the Day.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. U. Strickland (Bonavista South — continuation): Mr. Speaker, for a few moments yesterday afternoon, before adjourning this debate, I tried to put before this house my convictions concerning the coal trade between Newfoundland and Sydney. After going home last night I had some 'phone calls, both from vessel owners and coal dealers here in St. John's, and I learned some real facts to support the argument that I was trying to present to this house yesterday afternoon. For arguments sake — One of the vessel operators here in St. John's who does not as yet own his own vessel but is trying to pay it out, last year brought six loads of coal from Sydney, and for the six loads he lost 61 days in Sydney waiting for coal, an average of 10 days lost time at Sydney per load. I claim, Sir, that the six loads that he did bring were absolutely useless to him, and he made not a cent on his five months of operation. I said that our vessel operators were going to lose their shirts. They are already doing so because that man has his practically gone.

One of the directors of one of our coal companies here in St. John's told me last night that on one cargo of coal, 2800 tons, his company received a bill for \$1500 for demurrage, for lost time in Sydney. The first question that came to my mind, Sir, is this: Who paid the demurrage? There is only one answer — the consumer. And is it any wonder coal sold in Sydney for \$13 a ton and less is sold in Newfoundland for \$26 — there is no wonder at all. I have been told, Sir, by those who should know that at the

moment American coal is far more attractive than Canadian coal as it can be landed, as one man told me only this morning, in St. John's from American ports today as two dollars a ton less than Canadian coal can be landed. And that is in support of the argument I raised yesterday that the subventions now going to mid-Ontario or some of it, at any rate should be directed towards Newfoundland. At least two dollars per ton should be given to Newfoundland to offset expenses.

One man told me that bottoms are more available in American ports than they are in Canadian ports to bring American coal to Newfoundland. That may be the case, but there is a danger there, and I shall never cease to do all that I possibly can for our men who go down to the sea in ships. I can never get away from the fact that, for many years, I got my living that way, and I know what our men have to go through and anything I can do in this world to assist them that way I will do it, even to lifting my voice in this house.

The 13,000 tons of coal brought in to the city of St. John's last year from America meant what? It meant \$50,000 worth of trade not going to Captain John Blackmore or someone else, or 35 loads lost for the "splinter fleet". That is what it amounts to, Sir, and not only the fact that the dollars are going out of Canada, but the dollars that could be in the pockets of our Newfoundland seamen are not there because they are bringing in coal from America which ought to come to us from Sydney. What is the answer? It is no good to criticize if we haven't got an answer, an alternative. I think I gave the answer yesterday when I suggested that now is the time to set up a committee to look into this matter. No less than three men representing the three coal companies of St. John's, said "amen" to that today and said it was the only possible solution. Their suggestion is that they hold a meeting of the Coal Board right here in St. John's as quickly as possible. Let us bring in our coal dealers from Bonavista, Conception Bay and Trinity Bay and the South-West Coast and let us sit down with the members of the Coal Board and hear their problems and try to find some solutions.

Mr. Hollett: Who is on the Coal Board?

Mr. Strickland: Mr. Huran is the Chairman, Mr. O'Brien the secretary, and I forget the names of the other members. I do not know if my colleague the senior member for Harbour Main, knows or not.

Hon. P.J. Lewis: No.

Mr. Strickland: I found Mr. Huran, the chairman, to be reasonable when we met at Sydney, and when I suggested that he meet our coal dealers in Newfoundland at St. John's, he thought it was a good idea and he would be delighted to do it any time. Now is the time to bring him in; otherwise, I repeat what I said yesterday. This year we are going to have more trouble in Sydney due to the fact the Federal Government are prepared to pay as much as \$4.50 a ton subventions to send coal into Ontario, but not a cent for Newfoundland. Again, I ask — Why the discrimination? It is time for us to get an answer.

Mr. Hollett: May I ask the hon. gentleman — has any request been made to the federal government for such aid by this government or by any part of this government?

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): If the hon. member will allow me — The answer is yes, not once but many times in the last 10 years. Their answer always was the same — that subsidy had been paid to enable Cape Breton to go up the St. Lawrence River into Quebec and Ontario to compete with American coal that came across the border. It was a short haul and very much cheaper and it was necessary to subsidize that coal, not the coal coming to Newfoundland. Indeed they did subsidize it for a great many years before Newfoundland became a Province at all.

Mr. Hollett: May I ask the hon. the Premier — Has any request been made to the present administration at Ottawa?

Premier Smallwood: I don't recall that one has, and rather doubt that it has.

Mr. Strickland: Mr. Speaker, if we can land American coal in the city of St. John's two dollars cheaper than Canadian coal, is not that argument enough for subventions of at least two dollars a ton on coal coming into

Newfoundland? We did have a subvention paid Newfoundland at one time, and paid to St. John's only. It did not reach to the outports. I don't know why. I suggest again, Sir, if we are going to avoid trouble this year, now is the time to do something about it. We had an 11% increase in the cost of coal the moment the ton was reduced from 2040 to 2000 pounds per ton.

Again, I would like to go the whole hog. Loading facilities in Sydney are not as modern as they should be. I recall loading in Newport Mines a few years ago. No matter where you tied up, the shoot overhead travelled and came over — In North Sydney, to load coal you have to move the boat one foot, one yard or a hundred feet, going to the line and hauling the boat back and forth. That is how modern it is — No modern improvements whatever. We were told in the Coal Board meeting by Mr. Gordon, three years ago, that they would definitely have a new washing plant at Sydney that year, or the following year. That was three years ago. There is not yet a peg driven into the ground for a plant yet. I am going to argue now, Sir, that if we had a washing plant in Sydney to wash No. 12 and No. 16 coal from the Waterford Mines, it is just as good for domestic purposes in Newfoundland as coal we are taking from Sydney Mines. If we could have it washed, that would be an apparent solution to this problem we are experiencing with coal. I hope what I have said has not fallen on deaf ears, and something will be done in the near future to take care of our troubles, if possible. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I would like to make a brief comment on — employment insurance for fishermen. It is a wonderful thing, a wonderful thing, but still there is something wrong with it. The fisherman goes fishing, catches 100 quintals of fish, hauls up his boat in the Fall of the year and sits down quietly at home and draws unemployment insurance. It is right he should. But the poor beggar who goes fishing morning, noon and far into the night and catches 50 quintals goes home to live on the dole for the rest of the winter, because he cannot draw any unemployment insurance. I think there is something wrong with that set up.

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Any suggestions?

Mr. Strickland: Yes, I think any sensible-minded man, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague is, has an answer for that. There should be some form of insurance against a failure of catch. This a form of insurance for the successful fishermen, the failures get no insurance at all — catch the fish or live on the dole. There is no other answer to it. I think something should be done about that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with my own district: just a few comments: Roads first: First of all, I am going to state now that last year, because of the mechanized units that operated in my district of Bonavista South, there was a tremendous improvement made in the roads in the district that I have the honour to represent — a tremendous improvement. I received letters from all over the district expressing immense appreciation of what was done. But I am anxious to get the best possible benefit from every single dollar we spend in the district of Bonavista South in particular, and Newfoundland in general. I have another suggestion to make, Sir, and it is this: I noticed last year that when any new piece of road had to be built, machinery was taken from the maintenance job that it was supposed to do. Every unit has about 50 miles of road to maintain, and that is quite enough work for any unit. That unit was taken from its maintenance work and for two or three, four, five or six weeks — (my colleague from Trinity North understands) — most of his units work this way, working away, building a new piece of road — Well, then your regular maintenance is going to pieces I think the solution to that problem is this. Every centre, like Clarenville, Grand Falls or what have you, should have a special unit for nothing else but building new pieces of road. I think that is the only answer to it. The men who worked on these units last year, as far as my district is concerned, did a marvelous job, and I went out of my way last Fall to tell the boys what I thought about the job they did.

Mr. Hollett: Out over your way?

Mr. Strickland: Yes.

Mr. Hollett: It should have been a pleasure.

Mr. Strickland: Yes, but half the time you have to go out of your way to do things, and

that is when you enjoy it most, when you go out of your way. Mr. Speaker, I would like you to go out to that little place in my district, called Sandy Cove where they have the best community spirit I have ever seen in the Island of Newfoundland, or the Province of Newfoundland. This was demonstrated in the little community of Sandy Cove in the past two years, and I only hope and pray that spirit may spread to the rest of Newfoundland. I am going to say right now, Sir, we have far too many people in Newfoundland prepared to take the attitude — "Let the Government do it". But we have out there in Sandy Cove a crowd of people, men, who did a marvelous job. Here is the story.

For a long time, many years, during the winter season they had to go two and three miles for drinking water. But nature, Divine Providence, (call it what you like) favoured them with a pond elevated above the settlement for quite a distance. And these men, with the assistance of the Department of Municipal Affairs, (and the Hon. Minister (Mr. Abbott) knows the story) set to work. They collected what money they could among themselves and then appealed to the government for assistance to put a plastic line from the pond down through the community. First of all, they went up on the heights and built a reservoir, and then they laid their main line. And you should have seen the berry patches they had to go through, and the flower beds that had to be torn up. Nothing stopped them nor stood in their way. They forgot all their differences and they just drove the line through front yards or back yards, it did not make any difference, from one end of Sandy Cove to the other. And then they set to work, with a great deal of free labour, and laid their lines into their kitchens. I don't know how many men were involved, Sir, but quite a number, from one end of Sandy Cove to the other. I went out last summer, I wanted to see what flow of water they had from one end of the settlement to the other. I went to the house nearest the reservoir, and they had a force equal to anything we have in St. John's. Then I went to the last house in the community, the farthest away, and found they had the same force of water there that they had in the house nearest to the reservoir. It was a tremendous undertaking and something really worthwhile, something which

shows a wonderful spirit, a spirit which I only hope spreads to many other places in Newfoundland. Eastport is catching the same spirit. I understand they are going to form a community council, if possible, with the same idea in mind. I say again, Sir, what I said a moment or two ago — We have far too many Newfoundlanders prepared to sit idly by and let the government do everything. Thank God we have a few Newfoundlanders left who are prepared to do what they can to assist themselves. And, Sir, this is the type of people I like to see the government assist all they possibly can, the men really trying to live, trying to help themselves.

Mr. Hollett: And spoil them then?

Mr. Strickland: Spoil them? It is time they are spoiled in that case. Mr. Speaker, with assistance from the government, the people of Southern Bay this year are to have a plant built there by the Arctic Fisheries, a pothead whale plant especially — I don't think I will go into the history of the whole operation, but I have suggested to the manager it would be a good thing if freezing facilities were put in for squid, mackerel and herring. Last year, very few pothead whales came into Southern Bay. Herring were numerous, and the men could have made a lot of money last year if they had had the freezing facilities there then. But, Sir, thanks to this government, I believe that this year that plant will be built and possibly in operation during the late summer. That will mean a great thing for the economy of the nearby settlements.

My good friend from Harbour Grace (Mr. Sheppard) tells about the farming settlements over there in Shearstown. Well, Goose Bay is fast becoming one of the greatest areas in Newfoundland. The history is this — and I have a paper here written in the Department of Mines and Resources, which I am going to give to the press and ask them to print it. I will not go into it in detail; but during the last 10 years, in that area, 800 acres of land have been cultivated, and it has added a lot to the economy of Goose Bay, Bonavista, I am safe in saying, is the biggest fishing settlement in Newfoundland.

Hon. J.R. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): No.

Mr. Strickland: In that case, it must take second place.

Mr. Cheeseman: The biggest inshore.

Mr. Strickland: I believe the time has come when some form of municipal government will be set up in Bonavista, and goodness knows it is badly needed. There is a great need for improvement in the roads in the settlement, and street lighting is required. The water supply is anything but what it should be, they need recreational facilities, slipways are needed for our fishermen, and a dozen and one things I could mention. I believe, Sir, we are on the right road now, and I believe that in the very near future you will see a marked improvement in the town of Bonavista, something that I will be proud of. Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made some worthwhile contribution to this debate. I am proud to have the opportunity to represent the district of Bonavista South, and I can assure the hon. Premier that, while I sit in this House as a member for that district, I will do my very best for the people I have the honour to represent, and I have no fear that when the time comes to go back to the people and look for their support I will receive it again.

On motion of Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): debate on the Address in Reply is adjourned.

LEGISLATION: (3rd READING)

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Trustee Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Local Government Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act To Amend the Pharmaceutical Association Act, 1954." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland Medical Board"

Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Public Libraries Act." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment and Powers of the Nomenclature Board." On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE ACT:

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to make it mandatory for insurance companies to submit their balance sheets to the Department of Provincial Affairs with a view to have these balance sheets submitted to a statistical company to formulate the rates. As everyone knows, automobile insurance rates are supposed to follow the incidence of accidents during the year. The purpose of this Bill is to allow the Government to have supervision to see that the rates are not set arbitrarily, but are submitted to a statistical company. Canadian underwriters do follow this practise for practical purposes, but the purpose of the Bill is to make it compulsory. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have not had an opportunity to see this Bill. It has not arrived in the house as yet.

Mr. Speaker: This Bill has not been distributed yet? Then I take it the hon. Leader of the Opposition would move the adjournment of the debate.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, may I say that if the Solicitor General had known it was not distributed he would not even have moved it. We have no desire to have legislation passed unseen. We know the Opposition have great confidence and faith in us, but not so much as to want to pass legislation without even reading it.

Mr. Hollett: At least we must observe the formalities.

On motion, debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Notaries Public Act, 1957."

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill. In time past, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council (the Executive) have appointed notaries public, and there are certain functions which a notary public can perform, but there has never been any attempt made to fix the fees to be charged by notaries. The effect of this Bill is to empower the Supreme Court, the only proper body we can think of, to fix the fees to be charged in certain cases by the notaries. I don't think there can be any objection to this Bill, and I move second reading.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Provide For Use of Sound Recording Machines For the Taking and Recording of Evidence."

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this Bill just has the effect of trying to bring the courts up to date. We have had a very difficult time, Mr. Speaker, in my department in trying to get suitable stenographers, and there are times when the court work is very much behind on that account. Under the present practise it is necessary to have a stenographer take down the evidence and transcribes it. The effect of this legislation will be to allow evidence to be taken by tape recorders or wire recorders and the use of these recorders in transcribing evidence and as evidence of what went

on in the court will, from now on, be acceptable, if the Legislation passes this Bill. I don't think there will be any objections to it, and I move second reading.

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General would inform me if this is in effect in other provinces or is it something novel?

Mr. Curtis: No. It is in effect in other provinces.

Mr. Murray: It certainly makes sense.

Mr. Hollett: I don't think I am inclined to disagree very much, Mr. Speaker. There is just one thing in Section (4) there — "sound recordings made under this section, certified by the judge or some person in charge of the sound recording machine." Now there is a vast difference in being signed by the judge and signed by a mechanical operator of a machine.

Premier Smallwood: He is an officer of the court.

Mr. Hollett: It does not say that. At any rate that is something which can be dealt with in Committee of The Whole.

Mr. Curtis: I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend; the person in charge not being an officer of the court should be sworn also. On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Life and Accident Insurance Agents (Licensing) Act."

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, this is purely a formal amendment to the Insurance Act. It is a new definition of the word "Agent" substituted for the old one, that is all.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

Mr. Murray: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that item deferred.

On motion second reading deferred.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Validate Assessments Made In The Towns of Harbour Grace, Placentia and Freshwater."

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the date on which the Assessment Act, 1958 was given Royal Assent the property valuation of Harbour Grace, Freshwater and Placentia had been completed; while the Courts of Revision had not been held. So that, rather than repeat the assessment procedure under the new Act, the revisions were carried out under the provisions of the old Act. Strictly speaking that was incorrect, and the attached Bill is for the purpose of validating the procedure.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Payment of Bounties on Construction of Coasting Vessels."

Hon. J. R. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to encourage the building of new vessels for the Newfoundland coastal trade. As is well known to all hon. members, the coastal fleet, which is so essential to this country, is rapidly disappearing. The cost of constructing vessels was greatly increased during the past ten or fifteen years and the result is that neither individuals nor corporations find it sufficiently attractive to invest in the construction of new boats.

The rates of bounties proposed in the new Bill are in line with the total bounties that are payable on fishing vessels. There is this difference; in the cost of fishing vessels the Federal Government pays \$160 and the Provincial Government \$165 making a total of \$325 a ton. In this Bill, we propose to make the maximum payment \$300 a ton. There is a scale and Section (9), sub-section (2) sets out the scale of those bounties. On vessels not less than 15 tons and up to 25 tons \$125 a ton; for vessels more than 60 and up to 100 tons, \$250 a ton, and vessels more than 100 tons and not exceeding 400 tons, \$300 a ton. Anyone who knows anything about shipping realizes the relative cost of constructing vessels in the different categories varies, and for that reason we are

suggesting, as we did last year in the rebuilding bounties Bill, a scale of payments according to cost.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, the Bill brought in last year for the payment of bounties for repairing and rebuilding vessels is showing good results. I think that, as of this moment, some 20 vessels have been either repaired or rebuilt, thereby adding at least 20 vessels to the fleet which will be good for another 20 years. We sincerely hope that this Bill, when it becomes law, will offer encouragement which will be sufficiently enticing to enable local people to build coasting vessels. The present Act, which was passed in 1938, is still on the books but, of course, will be repealed by this Act. Mr. Speaker, we believe this Bill is good for the general economy of the province. And I move second reading.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we only just received this Bill this afternoon and have had no time to read it but I am in accord with the general principle etc. one hundred per cent. I am glad the Government has seen fit to bring in this Bill. Our coasting fleet at the present time is fast dwindling. I do not know how many vessels we have, probably 40. I think somebody said 40 a day or two ago, of a size of 100 tons.

Mr. Cheeseman: That would probably be the outside figures.

Mr. Hollett: Both the hon. Minister of Fisheries and I remember when there were many more than 40 coastal boats; in fact we had to use our fishing vessels as well do deal with the trade necessary to look after the sea-freighting needs of our people in this country. We also remember, of course, when our fathers built their own boats without any bounties; went into the woods, cut the logs and timber, sawed the planks and built the boats and sailed them.

Mr. Cheeseman: It was largely a community effort.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, there was no question about that, Times change of course, and there are other avenues of employment. The cost of living has gone up and it is not possible for any man now to go into the

woods and cut the frame of his boat and build it and sail it and so on. So governments all down the line have adopted the practise of granting bounties for building not only coastal boats but fishing vessels and all sorts of vessels. And this, I think, ought to be a great incentive to our people, we have a few left who want to go to sea, who want to sail their own boats. This ought to be a great incentive. On a vessel of 100 tons there will be a bounty of \$300 a ton, I think it is; certainly a great incentive. Things in general today cost a lot, and I think there is some other bounty which takes care of engines, up to a degree, at any rate. But I do want to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Fisheries for bringing in this Bill. I do hope it is put on the Statute Books without undue trouble. I do hope it will be properly publicized by all our news media, as we proceed with this Bill, and I do hope that many honest to goodness seafaring men and merchants will read this Bill and decide to build more coastal boats, which are badly needed. As we all know, our coastline has 1000 or more small settlements, some large but most of them small, and coastal boats, wooden vessels, are needed to carry the where-with-all to live, to these various places. And, Sir, unless the people who can build these boats are assisted to build them, then they cannot get the boats and it is going to cost a great deal to take the goods to these people living in these places, a lot more than it should. I am very happy to say we agree with this Bill and to say we have been advocating it for sometime. I am very happy the Hon. Minister has brought it in and certainly we are in accord with the principle of the Bill.

Hon. M. P. Murray (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he would be good enough to let us know if these little "Jackboats" used out of Renewes and Fermeuse —

Mr. Cheeseman: This is "Coastal" — These would be under fisheries.

Mr. Hollett: They get \$360 a ton, I think it is.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion, the house recessed for 10 mi-

minutes, after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend and Consolidate the Law With Respect To Boiler Pressure Vessels and Pressure Plants."

Hon. C. R. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the Act, as it is, is long and cumbersome and with 38 sections. We have now revised this into 12 sections (that is the draft Bill) for the purpose of correlating related provisions in the same sections. The four major changes are:

(1) Establishment of an advisory committee. It has been charged our safety requirements are insufficient — Our Act was originally drafted by the chief boiler inspector for Ontario, who came to Newfoundland on loan for that purpose. It has been held our Act is designed for a highly industrialized area and is not suited to this province. Under the circumstances, I think it would be helpful to provide a media outside the technical staff of my department, which can examine representations from industry and operating engineers and advise me accordingly. The Bill proposes the appointment of a body to be known as an "Advisory Committee" to be made up of representatives of industry and operating engineers.

(2) At the present time examinations of engineers, classes (I) to (IV), and firemen is the responsibility of the chief inspector. A one man examination Board set-up has obvious disadvantages. The Bill proposes the establishment of a Board of examiners consisting of three persons, two persons holding first class certificates of competency, with the chief inspector as chairman.

(3) Appeals: At the present time there is no provision for appealing decisions to withhold or revoke certificates or to shut down plants. Many matters dealt with under the Act are technical in nature and give rise to differences of opinion even amongst the technical people. I believe appeals should be permitted. That is provided for in Section 14.

(4) Codes: At the present time we are guided by the "CSA", i.e. the Canadian Standard Association; "ASME", the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the "ASA" code, the American Standard Association. If these codes should be amended, the amendment would also guide

us. In other words, our inspection services are governed by these codes in their entirety even though they may contain certain provisions which are not practical here. The Bill proposes that we change our practice and adopt these codes only by reference thereto. In other words, we will adopt as our regulations only the parts of these codes which we deem useful to us. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to detail other changes here. I will be glad to discuss any points that may arise as we go through the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of Corner Brook Act, 1958."

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the amendments to this Act are not very contentious. It sets forth the qualifications for mayor and councillors, men who offer themselves to the council. No person who holds any office, place or employment of emolument, profit or advantage from, under, or in connection with the council or the city or while he holds any salary or other remuneration payable out of the funds of the city is eligible, and furthermore, any person directly or indirectly undertaking a contract for the council is not eligible. Councillors who are in office and who are parties to a company shall resign if that company should enter into a contract with the council. It also provides for the submission of a council budget through the council, not later than the first day of December, every year. This budget must, of course, be submitted to the minister before the 31st day of December. Any increase in the spending for the year must receive the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It also provides for identification plates to be attached to certain things on which the council collects taxes. These are the main amendments. Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Assessment Act, 1958."

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, in some towns where assessments had been made, it was discovered that certain deeds conveyed the property to other persons. This amendment provides for the change of the owner or tenant change of name to be made in the assessment roll. I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Chairman, in moving the amendments, there are three: The first amendment is one which merely corrects something omitted here, but which is embodied in the departmental Bill. The second one merely gives a clarification of the duties of a welfare officer and his powers and immunity in taking certain actions as a welfare officer and as an officer working under the School Attendance Act. Section No. (4) merely makes provisions that when cases are held before the juvenile court or any other court, transcripts of evidence shall be forwarded to the proper authority so that proper assessment may be made in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Memorial University Act." On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Food and Drug Act."

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, that Bill was really disposed of yesterday but, by mistake, the Chairman of Committees reported having made progress and asked leave to sit again. I move now we pass the Bill as amended.

On motion Bill on order paper reported passed as amended.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend the M. James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955."

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

INDUSTRIAL TAXATION:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Approve and Give Statutory Effect To An Agreement Between the Government and Advocate Mines Limited."

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Chairman, I notice reading through most of these new Bills brought in, none of them have to pay the SSA tax on anything, as far as I can see.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Not on the original installations.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Does that apply here to, because this section advocates they are not at any time liable to pay any?

Mr. Curtis: The SSA tax is one of general application.

Premier Smallwood: It could be worded another way — Advocate shall be liable to pay all taxes of general application, and mean what it says here now.

Mr. Hollett: I think it is alright here.

Premier Smallwood: Actually I think the point is well-taken. Recently, within the past year or so the thinking in government circles has rather changed from what it was in respect to the SSA. The SSA is imposed on virtually everything in Newfoundland, every bit of consumer goods, clothing, pretty well everything. Our thinking in the past year or so has been along this line. Somehow, the more I think of it the more it seems wrong for the government of a Province that is endeavouring to develop and to get industry going, so as to enable more and more of our people to have an opportunity

to earn a living; to proceed on the one hand to get industry started and on the other promptly to tax it, to tax the effort of those who are invited in here to start the industries going. Now obviously, of course, everyone must pay taxes. You cannot have anyone exempt altogether from the payment of taxes. But, Sir, it does seem inconsistent to go out and bring a man like Boylen, for example, into Newfoundland — (I am quite proud personally of the effort I made to bring Boylen in here), he has already produced one substantial mine at Tilt Cove and shortly will have a very very large mine operating at Baie Verte, one of the largest of its kind in the world, this asbestos mine, a \$20 million dollar investment, and possibly before the end of the present year, another mine at Little Bay in Green Bay.

Now, Sir, on the one hand to bring into this Province a man such as James Boylen, or John Doyle if you like, or the Steel Company of Canada or Pickands Mather etc, and tax them, (apart now altogether from such taxes as everybody pays in the world, of course) to tax them on the very capital goods they bring in to enable production to take place, to enable production to start in the first instance and to be continued thereafter, to open a mine seems to warrant discussion. They have to bring in machinery of all kinds and if you operate a mill associated with that mine to process the ore, the more processing the better, obviously. It is always better to process ore up to a point, than not to process it at all, but merely to ship it away as raw ore. Yet, desirable as that is for the general economy of the Province, we would, on the one hand invite them and talk them into doing it, and on the other hand, tax the very machinery they must use to get the production started and continued. So that, Sir, our thinking has been along this line. We ought to exempt, as far as it is lawful, and this house may pass these laws; we ought to exempt them from payment of any taxes at all on their original investment of machinery and equipment to get the industry established but thereafter, thereafter, we should impose all taxes of general application, the regular taxation applicable generally throughout the Province and indeed even to impose certain special taxes on them, if they are making use of the natural resources of our province, which God gave

us for our benefit, the benefit of all of us as a people. If they deplete these resources, we should make them pay something for the privilege of making a profit out of such depletion.

Now, that has been the thinking of the Government, and I feel that it is pretty sound. Again and again and again we impose the SSA tax on new machinery being installed. Take as an example this new plant coming here now, International Paper Company, is the biggest of its kind in the whole world. Crown Zellerbach is the second largest and Bowaters is third. Well, the Canadian branch of that company has recently decided to establish a small plant in St. John's making bags, cartons and containers. They have decided to spend almost \$500,000. A young St. John's businessman is their representative here (I believe Mr. Hutton) is going to be manager of this plant. Now the first thing that we do ordinarily, after expressing our pleasure with their decision to come in, is to slap a tax on the very machinery they are going to bring in. That seems to be wrong.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): What has been the custom?

Premier Smallwood: The custom has been this. The law required us to impose that tax, but again and again the old Associated Newfoundland Industries, now I think absorbed into the Newfoundland branch of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, has made representations to us, time after time, along these lines, and we had the uneasy feeling that they were right. Now, how does our thinking go along that same line in regard to replacement equipment and machinery as it gets worn out and they buy new equipment, or if they extend and additional equipment is necessary for expansion, it should be similarly exempt from the taxation; but ordinary replacements and, of course, ordinary material to be used, should be subject to taxation. This is all rather irrelevant, Mr. Chairman, and you are generous to allow me to say this, because I am talking only to Clause (20) which does not deal with any of that, but only that that company shall not at any time be liable to pay any taxes other than taxation of general application.

Mr. Hollett: I don't think it is irrelevant, Mr. Chairman. What are taxes of general application? The SSA is not one of general application, not after these other agreements.

Premier Smallwood: It is of general application but they may be exempted here or there, and except, insofar as they are exempted, they are of general application.

Mr. Hollett: In other words you are making Advocate pay the SSA and not making others?

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): May I suggest here that special equipment should not be used for anything else but only for this particular production. There should not be any tax on that. — If they cannot be used for anything else, I say, yes.

Mr. Hollett: That is exactly what the Premier says. I am not quite sure yet — I think you are making Advocate pay —

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Yes, they have not asked for any exemption.

Premier Smallwood: We have, in a number of instances, provided specifically in some agreements or contracts for exemption of this or that concern from payment of that tax, but what we have been doing over and above that is considering whether we ought not to make a general proviso. Now there is a difficulty involved here. If you have, for example, a paper mill today that has paid the tax, and then a new paper mill is established tomorrow, if you have a general exemption commencing from a certain date then the new paper mill, having come after that date, is exempt and it immediately goes into competition with the older paper mill already in operation, and you thereby establish an unfair advantage for the one over the other; the new company over the old friend. Similarly you have factories around St. John's that have been here a good many years and have been paying the SSA since the tax was introduced ten years ago, and the Treasury of Newfoundland just cannot afford to make it retroactive and begin paying back to the many companies the taxes they had paid under the Act. So, it is extremely difficult thing to decide where to

draw the line so as to be fair. That is why we have never yet come to a final decision, because of the complications.

We have asked the Finance Department to compile for us a list of firms that have paid the S.S.A. — I am talking of manufacturing and producing firms and not talking about consumption goods but production goods — a list of the firms who have paid and how much and what we would have to pay back. It is staggering. In 10 years you collect a lot of revenue. We might not mind paying back a couple or \$3 million or more — So that is a difficulty that stands in the way. But, Sir, in general we are tormented in mind by the inconsistency of coaxing people into Newfoundland and being very glad indeed when they do come to start new industries, and then immediately beginning to tax — not their ordinary operation on which all businesses ought to pay taxation, corporation taxes and the like, but to tax the very machinery they are bringing in to start an industry going — We are being tormented by that, but there are practical difficulties in the way of exempting them, which have been rather staggering, so that up to the moment we have not adopted a general policy. We have only given the exemption to this, that and the other concern, here and there, in the last year or so, and not too many. As far as I can remember, I do not think it is here in the case of Advocate, that is this big enterprise of Johns-Mansville and that Belgium and Swiss Company and that one in Argentina, four altogether, establishing at Baie Verte — I think even there we are requiring them to pay.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Chairman, whilst I appreciate the attitude of the government on this idea of relieving the new companies of the S.S.A., if I may ask the Premier, if that were unique here? I think I can quite agree with him because the exemption of this tax, in my opinion, does not affect the moving of a new secondary industry here, this carton manufacturing concern — They are not coming out of a spirit of benevolence and I question whether we can afford to be charitable above being just. It always appears to me that the old, tried and true secondary industries of St. John's do not receive the sympathy we are prepared to show those who have not proven themselves. They might be

here today and gone tomorrow. To me it is ordinary justice not to exempt a new company, not out of any sense of benevolence, coming in to make money, if so you have an obligation to refund the taxes collected from the old companies doing business many, many years.

Premier Smallwood: That is one of the problems.

Mr. Duffy: I think for that reason if it were a question of not moving in if this tax were not exempt (which I don't think it is at all) I don't think we can afford to be too charitable over that.

Motion, that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried.

On motion that the committee rise and report having passed Bills No. 24 and 25 without amendment and No. 15 with some amendment and made progress on Bill No. 11, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Clarke (Chairman of Committees): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Bills No. 24 and 25 without amendment.

On motion, report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed Bill No. 15 with some amendment.

On motion, report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report progress on Bill No. 11 and ask leave to sit again.

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

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at three o'clock.

Friday May 1, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS: NALCO:

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to Question No. 33 asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Now I could take the position this question is wrongly addressed, being addressed to anyone in the government. NALCO is now purely a private corporation, the government having sold its shares a year or so ago. Therefore the question might more properly be addressed to the corporation itself. However, I want to be as helpful as possible and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the chairman of the Board of NALCO now is Mr. H. C. Hilton, who is the head of the Steel Company of Canada. The Steel Company of Canada is Canada's biggest steel company. The president of NALCO now is Walter J. Williams, formerly vice-president of "A.E.C." (Atomic Energy Commission) of the United States. The other directors of NALCO now are H. C. Jackson, managing partner of Pickands-Mather & Company of Cleveland; A. S. Glossbrenner, president of Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, America's fourth largest steel company; George M. McIntosh, vice-president of Harriman Ripley & Company of New York and, representing Canadian Javelin, John C. Doyle and Harold E. Brock. These are the present directors of NALCO. And I must admit they are a more distinguished list of names than formerly was the case. These are very distinguished industrialists of Canada and the United States.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): You must not deprecate us!

Premier Smallwood: No, I would not say the former directors were altogether undistinguished, but these are very distinguished men. Some of them are present here today. We have sold all our shares. We sold them a year or so ago, as the house knows.

(4) and (5). There has been no change since the last time that information was tabled, at least I have not heard of any changes. It is quite possible however, that in recent months NALCO could have given sub-concessions to other corporations. That is what it ought to do, try to get various mining concerns in North America to come in upon their areas, take sub-concessions to conduct explorations with the hope of finding something to develop. That is their main purpose in acquiring the Government's shares in NALCO.

ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT ON UNEMPLOYMENT:

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): It is the intention of the Government to lay on the Table of the House copies of the Report of the Royal Commission relative to employment in Newfoundland?

Hon. C. H. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not have this report. It was a Royal Commission, not a committee set up in my department, and the report was presented to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Mr. Hollett: In that case, I ask the hon. the Premier.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): I may say to my hon. friend that in the government we have been just a little disappointed with the report. Frankly, we hoped that somehow or other the report would suggest practical ways and means to cope with the problem of unemployment. Perhaps that was too extravagant a hope; perhaps it was not reasonable to expect a purely local Royal Commission that would have to recommend only things that the government could do — I suppose it was unreasonable to expect much from such a Royal Commission. If it were a Federal Royal Commission making recommendations to the government of Canada, they then could have recommended things that were within the power of a much bigger and more powerful and wealthier Government to perform but whatever the reason and whatever the justification, we are a little disappointed in the report.

We studied it in Cabinet and I would table it gladly. This was a Royal Commission requested by the Newfoundland Federation of Labour asking the government to set up that Royal Commission, and we did so in direct response to the Federation of Labour's request, and were a little disappointed. But we do not blame our Royal Commission, not in the least. I want that to be thoroughly clear. We do not blame the personnel of that commission, that was made up of representatives of the Federation of Labour and representatives of the Board of Trade and representatives of the public. They did their best, but perhaps it was an impossible task that we imposed upon them. After all, unemployment is not a simple thing; its causes are not simple and its solution is not simple.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I might ask, in reference to the answer to question No. 33 — this atomic force behind this, does that mean we can go on with atomic research and electrification in this country? Why could we not smelt our own iron ore when coal is not needed. We could have a mill here of our own, or would it be cheaper to freight the finished product. That raw ore is shipped out with the rock at the present time. Now these are some of the questions that committee might investigate, with this magnificently headed committee of NALCO.

Mr. Hollett: I understand from the hon. the Premier that this report will be tabled in a few days.

Premier Smallwood: Well, I said "soon".

Mr. Hollett: I have heard the hon. the Premier mention the word "soon" very often.

Premier Smallwood: This session, of course.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like to ask the hon. the Premier, in view of the connection of the Newfoundland government with Canadian Javelin, if he would care to comment on an item appearing in the "Daily News" relative to a fine of \$1,000 being placed on Javelin.

Premier Smallwood: I suggest that question would much more usefully be directed to Mr. Doyle who is coming here in a day or so, along with the representatives of the different iron companies. All this whole group involved now in the iron ore development are coming here in a day or so; Monday, I think. Mr. Doyle will be here then and my hon. friend might more usefully direct the question to him. My first knowledge of it was when I read about it this morning — On the telephone yesterday John Doyle told me he was glad to report that the difficulties he had been having with the Securities Commission in Montreal are now all settled and Javelin is being quoted again in Montreal. It has not been quoted for months past. Evidently he did not say this, but from what he told me, and from what I read in the paper, I assume some kind of technical breach has occurred, which he will settle by paying a small fine. There was a much more serious one with the "SEC" of the United States, but it was resolved. He is a very able man.

Mr. Hollett: He has conquered the government anyway.

Premier Smallwood: Government? — all the governments all over the North America.

Mr. Hollett: Could the Premier give us the price of Javelin at the present time, seeing he is in so deeply? They are not quoted any more in Canadian papers, perhaps now they are trading again they will be quoted.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): It is not the first time they were not quoted.

Premier Smallwood: No, they were off once before.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

PRIVILEGE:

Mr. John Forsey (Humber East): Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to belabour the point, but am rising to a point of privilege. We might say in haste what we repent at leisure. That is not my policy in getting up, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say here now that I want to publicly acknowledge the coverage

that I have received and my district received from the "Gerald Doyle" News Bulletin and "CBC" reporters. We also received good coverage from "CJON" and "VOCM" and I publicly thank the reporter of the "Evening Telegram" who related part of the second portion of my speech to the "Western Star". I say the second portion because there was no comment on the first portion, and I would like to inform the "Evening Telegram" that I will have the first and second parts in pamphlet form sent to my district so that they may know what I said and judge it accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear the point of privilege. I have called Orders of the Day:

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

LABRADOR IRON ORE DEVELOPMENT:

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one of six or seven Bills presently before the house dealing with this great iron ore development that is about to take place in the Wabush Lake section of Labrador. The seven Bills are: The one to which I am now speaking and the six that follow on the Order Paper of today: These are: "A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

"A Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council To Enter Into An Agreement with Canadian Javelin Limited."

"A Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council To Enter Into An Agreement with The Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, and Canadian Javelin Limited and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions for the same purpose."

"A Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor In Council To Enter Into An Agreement With Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, Canadian Javelin Limited, and Wabush Iron Co.

Limited, and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For The Same Purpose And To Make Certain Amendments To The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957," "A Bill, "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor in Council To Enter Into An Agreement With Wabush Lake Railway Company, Limited, Northern Land Company Limited and Carol Lake Company Limited And To Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For The Same Purpose."

"A Bill, An Act To Amend The Wabush Lake Railway Act, 1955."

"A Bill, "An Act Respecting a Private Mining Carrier Railway In Labrador."

These are the seven bills, and, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the motion given to the first of these seven, but if it is the desire of the house and the house is willing, I am prepared now in this one speech to cover all seven, cover the matter included in all seven Bills. It is all one picture. So that I will be in order, I now ask the permission of the house to deal with all of the seven of them in the one speech, instead of making seven speeches.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable if we do not have to reply in the same manner, that is, if we are allowed to reply to each one of the other Bills.

Mr. Speaker: Each Bill can be debated separately.

Premier Smallwood: I am not in any way suggesting any limitation at all upon the rights of the house. I am asking only for the special right for myself in this one regard, to allow me to speak to the seven Bills, but not to limit the Opposition to the same procedure.

Mr. Speaker: It is agreed that each Bill will be put separately.

Premier Smallwood: Of course they must be put separately, but all seven deals with the one broad picture. I think the house will understand the matter more clearly if they are covered in this one speech, which should take an hour — I don't know. The position is this: In the Wabush Lake Area of Labrador the Labrador Mining and Explor-

ation Company had a great concession from the Commission of Government, granted to them, I believe, in 1937 or 1938, and forming part of 20,000 square miles in Labrador which had been granted by the Commission of Government to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company. The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company is a company whose two chief owners were, and are, the Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, the Timmins interests; and the M.A. Hanna Company, that is the George Humphries interests, George Humphries being a former Secretary of the Treasury of the United States — 20,000 square miles.

Their concession had to be lessened by so many miles at intervals until it was reduced to 1,000 square miles, which has not been reached yet. The first lessening they did was shortly after Confederation, and what they shed was passed back to the Newfoundland Government as being useless, because they would not have passed it back if they were not quite sure it was useless. That was this great Wabush Lake Section. Now, as it turned out, they were very lucky because they were not too familiar with the geography of the Lake Wabush Area and not being familiar and wanting to pass back to the Newfoundland Government a great slice of the territory, they did not know quite how to define it geographically. They did not quite know how to lay down a boundary and say: "outside that boundary is what we pass back to you." So they used, I think — I speak from memory — they used the shore of Wabush Lake and all, say, to the east of that shoreline came back to the Government of Newfoundland. But this meant, of course that all that was not on that side of the boundary remained on their concession, and today they are thanking God that they did not pass back to the Newfoundland Government all of Wabush Lake.

Now, this territory was assigned to NALCO. The exploration rights on Wabush Lake were assigned to NALCO in the NALCO Agreement. And NALCO ceded to Canadian Javelin, (John C. Doyle), the right to explore that area of, I think, a couple or 3,000 square miles, the Wabush Lake section. And they discovered this iron ore, and proved by diamond drilling the existence of over one million tons of iron ore, low grade iron ore, low grade but valuable iron ore.

This ore averages about 38% iron. It is low grade, but valuable because it is very easy and cheap to beneficiate, that is to concentrate from 38% to 60% or 65% iron by a cheap and efficient process of separation, of concentration.

Canadian Javelin spent \$4 million or \$5 million on a great project running over several years, drilling and exploring and proving up, and they retained some of the largest firms in all of North America to do the work for them. The drilling was done by Canadian Longyear, which is the Canadian branch of that great American drilling company. The analysis was done by Battelle Memorial Institute, which is the biggest institution of its kind perhaps in the world, certainly in the new world; Ford, Bacon and Davis, the greatest engineering firm in the United States and many other concerns. And having spent several millions of dollars, Canadian Javelin proved beyond all doubt the existence of the ore, the value of it. This, of course, attracted world wide attention, attracted the attention of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, who knew that the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, i.e. Jules Timmons and George Humphries Company, the original Labrador Company had not passed back to the Newfoundland government all of Wabush Lake, but only 80% of it and still retained some of the holding.

About four years ago, the Iron Ore Company launched a great program on what they had left to Wabush Lake, on their side of the boundary, the area they had not passed back. They spent close to \$5 million in these four years in drilling their own section and proving that they too have a vast field of iron ore in their part of Wabush Lake, the part known as Carol Lake, so much so that they have decided to go in and develop iron ore in their section. In the meanwhile, Canadian Javelin succeeded in signing a hard and fast agreement with Pickands-Mather of Cleveland. Pickands-Mather and Company are one of the world's two great companies, mining and dealing in iron ore. The other, of course, is M.A. Hanna, i.e. the one in the Iron Ore Company of Canada. These two firms are the world's greatest leaders of mining and selling of iron ore. Now there are two others, Cleveland Cliffs and the Ogilvie Norton Company. These are the four greatest concerns of the world,

but the two, M.A. Hanna and Pickands-Mather, are away ahead of the other two. Pickands Mather have put together a company known as the Wabush Iron Company, the owners of which are themselves, Pickands-Mathers; the Steel Company of Canada; which is Canada's biggest steel company, usually known as 'Stelco'; Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, American's fourth largest steel company; Interlake Company, an American concern and the Mather Iron Ore Company and Canadian Javelin. These are the owners and shareholders of the Wabush Iron Company, with which Canadian Javelin has made a firm contract under which the Wabush Iron Company, lead by Pickands-Mather, goes into one part of Wabush Lake, only one part — And I ask the house to take careful note of that fact — just one part of Javelin's concession at Wabush Lake, and undertakes a great program of mining iron ore. This is a contract with Canadian Javelin, under which Wabush Iron Company agreed to build a great processing plant at Wabush Lake, a place to take iron ore and process it from 38% iron content up to a concentrate 65% iron content, handling 12 million tons a year of concentrates, not of iron ore but of concentrates, which means many more millions of tons of iron ore, of course, to get the 12 million tons of concentrates; and to build a town to house between 4,000 and 5,000 people. The whole project is to cost something over \$250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars.

I announced these facts some weeks ago. Now the latest development of course, is that the Iron Ore Company of Canada, by agreement with Labrador Mining and Development Company, who are the owners on the other side of the boundary (and when I say the other side of the boundary I am not referring to the boundary separating Labrador from Quebec but only to the boundary separating the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company's land near Wabush Lake from Canadian Javelin Land at Wabush Lake) have decided to build a processing plant of their own, with a capacity of 6,000,000 tons of iron concentrates, that is half the size of the Wabush Iron project. I am sure, Sir, the house will realize why it is that the Iron Ore Company combine are building a plant with a capacity only

half as great as that of the Wabush Iron combine; the reason being, of course, that the Iron Ore Company already have great facilities further north at Knob Creek, Burnit Creek and Ruth Lake, in the Schefferville Area, 150 miles further north.

The Iron Ore Company deal calls for the constitution of a town. They undertake to build housing for between 3,000 and 4,000 people. So that, Sir, the whole of their project will cost something over \$150 million. The two projects, therefore, in the Wabush Lake Area, two separate towns; two separate processing plants; two separate mines are removed from each other by some miles, not a great many miles but some miles. These two projects together involve two towns accommodating between 8,000 to 10,000 people, 3,000 to 4,000 for the Iron Ore Company and 4,000 to 5,000 in Wabush, with the two projects together involving a total capital outlay, a total capital investment of over \$400 million, which is almost twice as much as the whole of the existing iron ore development of Labrador. That is to say, the great docks at Seven Islands; the great steamship loading facilities; the great stockpile facilities; the railway; 365 miles long from Seven Islands to Knob Lake; the great mining project at Knob Lake; the new town of Schefferville; a \$250,000 worth of electric shovels at Knob Lake, because there the ore is on the surface of the ground and great electrically operated shovels gouge out and fill the great trucks. These shovels, the whole of that vast project, cost only a little more than half as much as this new great twin project is to cost in Wabush Lake. May I remind the house that the Wabush Iron Development is only one part of the Wabush Lake area of Canada Javelin. In addition to that there is the Julian Lake and Knoll Hill section. These are still there and negotiations on them are progressing between John Doyle, in behalf of Canadian Javelin and certain Europeans, I think primarily the German Steel Industry of the Ruhr Valley. So that, Sir, it is entirely possible, and indeed when the world recovers from the present depressed state economically in which it is, it is entirely probable, that another great iron development will take place also in the Julian Lake and Knoll Hill area in the Wabush Lake area of Labrador.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible and entirely probable that this Wabush Lake Area is destined in the next six, seven, eight or 10 years, more or less, to become perhaps the world's greatest iron producing centre, especially as the Mosabi Range iron development in Minnesota is declining in size and importance as it must inevitably do, as it is doing and has been doing for a good many years past. These two projects which are now in hand are to have a total of 18 million tons a year of iron concentrates.

Now, just in passing, may I invite the attention of the house to a most dramatic contrast — Here are two companies, the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Wabush Iron Company, each of them made up of a number of very large and important companies, Canadian and American—and in that connection I omitted to list the names of those who constitute the Iron Ore Company of Canada. I did give the names of those constituting the Wabush Iron Company. The names of the I.O.C. companies are "Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines, that is the Timmons Interests; M.A. Hanna Company (the house will notice that this company is in both groups) National Steel Company, ARMCO Steel and finally the quite recently added to the group, Bethlehem Steel. Now I hope the house will note the significance of that fact. Now Newfoundland has Bethlehem Steel, I think the second largest steel company of the world. The largest, of course, is U.S. Steel. That is the group constituting the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

Now, as I say, this is a dramatic contract — The Iron Ore Company will mine ore and concentrate it and ship it and sell it and they will pay to the Newfoundland Government as taxes what the legislation requires them to pay, legislation which was enacted not by this House of Assembly but enacted rather by the Commission of Government, but binding on this house, binding in honour on this house and binding on Newfoundland. Under that legislation, the tax that they will pay on this six million tons is at the same rate as they now pay on the ore they produce at Knob Lake, and in that section of Labrador, 5% of their profits as these profits are defined in the law, in the statute, in the statutory agreement. These, however, are not the profits as they are defined by the Income

Tax Laws of Canada. They are far less, they are far smaller. In any given year, the Iron Ore Company of Canada at Knob Lake has two profits, one on which they pay income tax to the Government of Canada and another, on which they pay 5%, if only a portion of what they pay the income tax on, because there is a difference.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): The difference I suppose is to be on the net profit.

Premier Smallwood: In each case it is the net profit, but the difference is in what is called profit. What is called profit, for the purpose of paying income tax to the Government of Canada is the normal profit, the same as for any company, and is the same universally across Canada. But when it comes to computing the 5% tax they must pay the Newfoundland government, the profit is computed on a different basis altogether, the profit is computed in the way we find it in the Statutes of 1938, passed by the Commission of Government. It says the profit shall be the difference between the money they take in for the sale of their ore, and the costs, which are deducted. Then they list the costs. And, Sir, there is a long list, as long as your arm. And when the total of these is added up, that total is subtracted from the total income they have had, and the difference is profit. But there is included in that long list a substantial list of many items that would not be included as costs in computing their regular income tax. Have I made that thoroughly clear? Originally, before that was done, the Commission of Government had another tax agreement with them, which was repealed and this present one substituted. The original one was that they paid the Newfoundland Government not a percentage of their profit but rather a flat rate or royalty per ton, and the royalty was 10 cents.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): The rights of the Iron Ore Company are only the rights of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company.

Premier Smallwood: The agreement made between the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and the Government of Newfoundland governs precisely the rights

of the Iron Ore Company of Canada. They could not receive from the Labrador Mining and Exploration anything the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company did not have. They could only sell what they had, and what they had to sell was taxation at that rate.

Mr. Hollett: If the hon. the Premier would allow me. Was not an agreement made between the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and the Iron Ore Company after we went into Confederation and while the present government was in power?

Premier Smallwood: The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company have made agreements with a number of companies, a considerable number of companies, but that is their own private affair. The point that we must bear in mind is that, no matter what companies they make arrangements with or made arrangements with in the past, they are limited in any agreement they make with any companies to the terms of their own agreement with the Newfoundland Government. They cannot sell what they do not possess. If my hon. friend were not himself a member of this house but a businessman, and he came and made a contract of some kind with the Newfoundland government, and if he then went out himself, having that contract with the Newfoundland government, which sets forth certain terms and conditions, and he went out and made a contract on his own with a dozen other outfits, those other contracts must be subject to the contract he has with the Newfoundland government, but it is none of the Newfoundland government's business what other contracts he may make or with what other concerns he may make them.

Mr. Duffy: I wonder if I may ask this question? On the next profit which the government taxes are levied and the next on which income tax is levied which is the greater? I am trying to get at the net.

Premier Smallwood: The greater is the net profit on which the income tax is paid, because in the lists of costs there is a catalogue — Let us get it and I will read out the list. It is a long list in the contract of the items allowable as items of expenses or of cost.

Now there are many items in that list not in the list of items when it comes to computing the profit on which to pay income tax. Do you see what I mean? Therefore the profit is larger that you pay income tax on, than is the profit on which you pay the tax to the Newfoundland government. When we get it, I will read the list to the house.

Now, a mile or two away (which reminds me of the poem) "A mile or two away, upon a little mound, Napoleon stood, upon our storming day" — a mile or two away, but still in Labrador, still in this Province, still in the Wabush Lake section of Labrador, is another company, Wabush Iron. They too have a town. They have a mine. They have a mill. They are just a few miles apart. The one pays 5% of the profit, which is artificially computed but lawfully and legally according to the contract, but here Wabush Iron Company pays not a percentage on the profit, which may rise or fall, but a flat amount of 22 cents a ton for every ton mined and shipped. They pay that to the Newfoundland government. Now my hon. friends may take my word — they will have a chance to check — but they may take my word in the meanwhile — 22 cents a ton must be paid to the Newfoundland government. Now, it is a minimum of 22 cents. It is fixed only insofar as it is a minimum, but it is not fixed at 22 cents as far as a minimum is concerned. There is now, in this legislation before the house today, an escalator clause, which we have succeeded in getting them to accept, under which they pay more than 22 cents a ton if the value goes up, but not less than 22 cents if the value goes down. In other words, we can never receive less than 22 cents a ton but we may very well receive more if the ton ore market goes up, as so many people think is inevitable in the next 10 or 20 years — It must!

Now, I have portrayed the actual nature of the development that is about to take place, and when I say "about to take place" I mean that quite literally. The Iron Ore Company are rushing their development. "Rushing" perhaps is not the proper word to use. At any rate, Sir, they are going forward with it under great pressure, and I think I may say that — if our friends in the press box would not report the next few sentences — I think I will say why — It would not do Newfoundland any good to have this blazoned around the world.

Mr. Hollett: Don't say it! Don't say it!

Premier Smallwood: Let us put it this way — perhaps it is better not to say it — There is Knob Lake and Wabush Lake. Knob Lake ore is direct shipping ore that is not beneficiated, but scooped up with great \$250,000 shovels and put aboard the trailers and shipped down, 365 miles south to Seven Islands and dumped aboard the ships and the ships carry it off. It is a direct shipping ore requiring no beneficiation.

Now, for an ore to be a direct shipping ore it has got to have at least 51% iron. That is the minimum, and it must contain a small maximum of other things, silica, phosphorus and what have you. A very small proportion only is allowed. More than that and there is a penalty. Less than that and there is a premium. So that what is important in a shipping ore is to have a high percentage of iron, the minimum being 51%, 49% rock and silica and phosphorus and magnesia, or whatever you call it. You do not want to haul things uselessly on the railway, and load them aboard ship uselessly, and to the steel mills uselessly, things that cost the steel mills much more money to extract from the ore. So the more of it there is, the greater penalty the steel mill will charge the mine; the less there is the more the mine will charge the steel mill. Now I practically told the house the story of Knob Lake — If the house can put two and two together that is why the Iron Ore Company are so very, very eager to get working quickly at Wabush Lake, so that they may upgrade the Knob Lake ore — Now, without saying it, have I made myself clear? The Wabush Lake ore, which is a 38% ore that can quickly and cheaply be beneficiated to 65% ore, can, by mixing with the Knob Lake ore raise the general average — That is the driving force behind the Iron Ore Company's effort to get their project started quickly.

Mr. Hollett: You mean the beneficiation?

Premier Smallwood: The 65% ore.

Mr. Hollett: You mean mixed with the other.

Premier Smallwood: Mixing with the 65% brought up from 38% to the 51% direct shipping ore, and depending on how many

tons. If you use ton for ton, it is 65% plus 51% divided by two; or 58% shipping ore. On the other hand, if you put two tons of Wabush Lake 65% iron to one ton of Knob Lake 51% iron, it will be higher than 50%. That explains the urgency for the Iron Ore Company to get this Wabush Lake ore quickly into production.

Mr. Duffy: You have no indication what time is "quickly"?

Premier Smallwood: Yes, they are building the railway this year, and in the middle of next year they begin the construction of the mill and mine and town, and the year after they will be in production — what year is that?

Mr. Hollett: Election year, is it not?

Premier Smallwood: Yes, election year, 1961, we hope.

Mr. Duffy: You say in 1960 and 1961. You said in Montreal, 1962 elections.

Premier Smallwood: 1961 is still 1961 and still election year, we hope and we believe.

Mr. Hollett: I thought it was 1962 one time.

Premier Smallwood: If my hon. friend is so scared of the elections he wants to hold it a year after the term expires, I am afraid we will stand by the law and hold it within the legal limits, which is five years from the date on which this General Assembly, on which the 31st. General Assembly was called together by the Government — five years, and I think that it is 1961 in which we must have an election.

Mr. Speaker: March 1962.

Premier Smallwood: All right! Now we don't know when the election will be. Now we have the Opposition completely mystified. I feel very happy about that. I said 1962 in Montreal.

Mr. Duffy: You said in two years, and that would be 1961.

Mr. Smallwood: Well, I will leave it to my hon. friends to figure out. Well now, the

Wabush Lake Area lies 40 miles or more to the west of the present railway. The present railway runs south from Seven Islands to Knob Lake, 365 miles. And if you go down that railway, 224 miles, from Seven Islands and then turn and face due west you are looking right across at Wabush Lake, 40 odd miles away. So that what is necessary is that a railway be built from Mile 224, west, to get to Wabush Lake. Now here is what is going to be done. I would like the house to follow me very closely on this point.

The two groups, i.e. the Iron Ore Company group and the Wabush Iron Company group, have now agreed — and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I take not 99% but 100% credit for having arranged this agreement — I went to Montreal and met with one group and then the other came to St. John's and I met them, and I went to Montreal again and met the other and then back to St. John's and met the second group again, and then arranged for the two to meet again in Cleveland and they agreed, fell out and disagreed. I got them back on the rails again, and for months I worked strenuously to get agreement between these two groups who, taken together, are the world's greatest combination of iron ore producers and steel users. Remember that! these two groups together — And I got them to agree to this; that they would build one railway between them, a joint railway from mile 224 westward for 30 miles, not 40 miles but 30 miles. Now I will not swear whether it is 30, 31, 32, 33 miles, but 30 miles west. That railway is to be owned by these two great groups jointly, and they are doing it in this way: They formed a new company known as the Northern Land Company Limited. The Bill is here on the Order Paper today — "An Act To Authorize The Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement With Wabush Lake Railway Company, Limited, Northern Land Company Limited and Carol Lake Company Limited and To Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For the Same Purpose". The two groups are forming the Northern Land Company, and the Northern Land Company is owned 50-50 now by these two great groups. Remember this! Remember this! It is owned 50-50 by two groups. The Northern Land Company received from the Wabush Railway Company the right-of-way for 30 miles for a

railway, and they own it — This is owned by the Northern Land Company. The Northern Land Company then builds a railway, just a railway, no rolling stock, just a railway — The Northern Land Company builds a railway from Mile 224, 30 miles west, and they own it but do not operate it. They own it. That is provided here in the legislation.

Mr. Hollett: Quite a job for a bunch of lawyers.

Mr. Smallwood: No, they are not lawyers. I will tell you who they are. They are Hollinger, Consolidated; Hanna; Republic Steel; Youngstown Sheet and Tube; National Steel; ARMCO Steel, Bethlehem Steel own half and the other half is owned by Pickands-Mather, Steel Company of Canada, Youngstown Sheet and Tube, Interlake Iron and Mathers Iron and Canadian Javelin. Between them they own this 30 mile railway. They built it at their expense and they own it but do not operate it, nor do they provide rolling stock. It is a railway that has no rolling stock, 30 miles of road bed with rails and sleepers, owned 50-50 between them, by these two great groups.

Now, at the end of this 30 mile railway will be two or three other railways; (when my hon. friends have enjoyed their private joke) — When this railway is built it is a jointly owned railway, there will be built beyond it, beyond Mile 30, several railways — we know of two — and there will be almost certainly a third one. One is to be built by the Iron Ore Company of Canada, about eight miles long — I think it is eight miles or something of that order. That will be their own private railway, privately owned to serve their own mine and their own town, in other words, the Iron Ore Company of Canada at Carol Lake, which is part of Wabush Lake will have a town, a mill, a mine. To get to Seven Islands, they will go aboard their own private railway, ship the ore over their private railway for eight miles to the Mile 30. Now at Mile 30, with their own rolling stock, coming from their own railway, they go on to the commonly owned railway of which they are half owner — They are whole owners of their own railway and of their own rolling stock — and their own rolling stock goes on the 30 mile railway, of which they are half-owners, and then go on to the 365 mile railway of which they are very largely the whole own-

ers. Their own railway company is called the Carol Lake Company.

Now then, the Wabush Iron Company will build its own railway from Mile 20 and it will be the Wabush Lake Railway Company and the Wabush Lake Railway and will be owned by the Wabush Lake Iron Company. Then subsequently, when the deal is consummated for the development of ore in Julian Lake, another railway will be built down from Mile 8 to Julian Lake or perhaps from the end of Wabush and will go to Julian Lake. Then when the development comes into Knoll Hill there will be another railway — So that, Sir, you will have a little network of railways going off from Mile 20, but the one owned in common is from Mile 20 back to Mile 1, and Mile 1 connects to the main railway at Mile 224 — Now, have I made that clear?

Now, another thing. This 30 miles of railway, which is to be jointly built and jointly owned, is to be a common carrier only insofar as one of the two owners is concerned. There are two owners remember! There are two groups, the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Iron own the 30 miles of railway, half of it owned by the Wabush Iron Company. This is to be a common carrier, the half owned by the Wabush Iron Company, but the half of it owned by the Iron Ore Company of Canada is to be a private railway. I will explain the significance of that: Arising from the fact, the use of this commonly owned, jointly owned railway for 30 miles, the use of it is to be 50-50 each company owns half the shares of the railway; each company is entitled to use half the railway and the time and facilities of that railway, and the half that Wabush uses makes it a common carrier but the other half is a purely private railway, and they are not allowed to carry anything for anyone but themselves.

Mr. Hollett: Who owns that?

Premier Smallwood: The Iron Ore Company or the Carol Company, a new company they are creating for the purpose of their own railway — The Iron Ore Company of Canada — The Carol Company, Limited. Now, there is another feature, and it is this: Each of these two companies, Wabush Iron and the Iron Ore Company of Canada has the right, in this legislation, to

build its own railway besides, side by side with the 30 miles of commonly owned railway. But in that case, if either company elects ever to do that (and the reason here is: suppose that 10 years from now, the Iron Ore Company of Canada is not satisfied with six million tons of concentrated ore each year and wants to make it 12 or 15, and 12 years from now Wabush Iron are not satisfied with their 12 millions but want to make it 15 or 18 instead, then suddenly you have come to the point where one railway for those 30 miles is just not enough), in case either of these companies ever elect to do that, they meet and the Iron Ore Company says, "Well boys, we have to have another railway!" Under the legislation they can toss a coin, or decide between them by some means or other which of them will build the second railway. Now, which ever one builds the second railway must sell to the other one its rights in the present railway, — or must give, not "sell" — must give over the rights to the company that continues to operate, which will then assume sole ownership. At that point, then, each company will have its own individually owned railway, but the one that will be the common carrier will be the first one built.

Now, of course it takes a great many millions to build an extra railway and neither company wishes to build unless they must, unless the gross tonnage makes it absolutely necessary. Mr. Speaker, it is 4:20, and I have completed the first aspect of my speech, and I have one other, the changes in NALCO. Perhaps we might have a recess for 10 minutes and then I will try to conclude in as short a time as I can. On motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

NALCO:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I have to add a word to what I said about the railway. I said that, beyond the 30 mile point, at which it is jointly owned, private railways will be built. I want to make clear, in connection with these private railways, that they are private only in the sense they are not common carriers. The companies that are building them primarily, and almost entirely, for their own use so far as freight is concerned, so far as concerns the hauling of

iron ore — They, of course, are opening these railways to the public to travel on as passengers and ordinary freight, because the people who must go into each town will have to travel over these railways. But they don't want to build railways for other companies to ship iron ore on, only their own ore. In that sense only, these railways are to be private railways.

Now there is another thing I have to add in connection with the main railway before I leave it — The legislation before the house now provides for payment of the same minimum of 22 cents a ton on any iron ore produced anywhere in the NALCO areas of Labrador. As of this moment while I am speaking, under the law as it exists, the 22 cents payable is only on the Wabush Lake mine or mines owned by Wabush. But the new legislation now before the house, if it becomes law, requires the minimum of 22 cents a ton to be paid on other iron ore produced anywhere in the NALCO area of Labrador. In other words, Julian Lake, Knoll Hill or anywhere else within the present NALCO area. There has been no change in the NALCO area, only a change in ownership in the shares in NALCO, but geographically all the area of NALCO is the same now as it was when most of the shares were owned by the Newfoundland government.

Mr. Hollett: That only applies to what? Wabush Iron?

Premier Smallwood: No, it applies to any iron anywhere in the NALCO area, whoever mines it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to NALCO itself. The house is perfectly well aware that, a year or so ago, the Government sold for cash the shares it held in that company. These shares gave the government control over NALCO because they constituted a majority of the shares of the company. We sold our shares for \$1,200,000 cash to these two groups, Wabush Iron and Canadian Javelin. So that today the control of NALCO lies in the hands of those two companies, and of these two companies, Wabush Iron, which is primarily Pickands-Mather and the Steel Company of Canada and Youngstown Sheet and Tube, — of course these two companies Wabush Iron, I say, has the control. The Wabush Iron Company alone has

51% of the shares and all of the remaining 49% is divided between them. Canadian Javelin is the next biggest and then the other original shareholders, Ripley and so on.

Mr. Hollett: In other words the \$1,200,000 came from Pickands-Mathers?

Premier Smallwood: From all of them in the same proportion in which they bought the shares. But the bulk of the shares we sold went to Wabush Iron and the minority sold at the same time went to Canadian Javelin, etc. They were all sold at the same price per share. Each of the two groups paid the government. In other words there were two cheques. One cheque came to the government from Wabush Iron for the majority of the shares, and the other cheque from Canadian Javelin was for the minority of the shares. Between the two of them they bought all our shares, but in reality Wabush Iron was left holding over half of all the shares that were, and are, in existence at the present time.

Now, in selling our shares in NALCO we wanted to turn NALCO, as far as it was practical to do so, into a sort of other BRINCO; not entirely so, not completely so, but considerably so, into another BRINCO. I will give the house an example of what I mean — When the Newfoundland government owned a majority of the shares of NALCO, naturally NALCO could be and was looked upon in a different light altogether from the light in which it would be regarded now when it is owned entirely by private interests and not at all, to any extent, by the Newfoundland government. When it was a Crown Corporation owned by the Crown, 70% or 80% and at one time 90% of all the shares being owned by the Crown, this Legislature naturally enough was disposed to treat NALCO far more generously than it would be inclined to treat NALCO, when NALCO once became a private company. For example: This house, this Legislature, gave to NALCO, when it was a Crown Company, very large tracts of timber lands in Labrador and gave to NALCO these tracts of timber land on pretty generous terms. Because naturally, you see, we were only giving it to ourselves. This timber, (already the Crown timber) belonged to Her Majesty the Queen in right of the gov-

ernment of Newfoundland, and if this house transferred it to NALCO it was still transferring it to Her Majesty the Queen in right of NALCO. There was only 10% difference.

Before NALCO existed, the timber was 100% the Queen's, and when NALCO was formed and the timber rights ceded to NALCO, as to 90% it was still the Queen's, but 10% belonged to private interest. But when the government sold all its shares in NALCO then NALCO became a private company. (Deputy Speaker, Mr. Clarke replaces Mr. Speaker in the Chair). When NALCO then became 100% a private company we felt, and said quite frankly that, in dealing with them, in the sale of our shares, we did not think that we could go into the House of Assembly and ask the House of Assembly to be as generous to NALCO in respect to this timber, now that NALCO was a private company, as the House of Assembly had been to NALCO when NALCO was just a Crown Company. They agreed to that, not I would say tumbling over with joy but they ultimately agreed. So that we have included in this legislation now before the house quite important changes in the timber concessions.

What we in fact did is to make it resemble, as much as possible, the Crown Zellerbach terms, the terms that we applied to Crown Zellerbach in connection with the Crown timber which they were to have in Labrador. Now it is summarized here in this statement, which I will read, and after I sit down a copy of this statement, which is printed, not typewritten but printed, will be distributed to every member of the House.

"The Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited (Amendment) Act, 1959, as proposed (hereinafter called the "NALCO ACT"), constitutes a modification of the existing timber and mineral provisions.

"Effect of "New Timber Provisions
(1) To reduce from December 31, 1977 to April 30, 1970, the terminal date of the period in which the Corporation may exercise its rights to take a timber lease."

(In other words reduce by seven years and terminal date).

"(2) To permit a renewal of a timber lease for ninety-nine (99) years sub-

ject to the establishment of a wood-working industry in the Province."

In other words, we take this position: — If we give a license to a company on timber, etc., for a period of, say, 99 years, we will renew that license for many, many 99 years periods. We will put no limit on it if it is serving a paper mill or large establishment using wood. In other words, we are taking the position as the government and asking the house to agree, to concur in our view; our view being that once a mill has started to use pulp wood as its main raw material it is foolish, just plain foolish, to put a time limit on the operation of that mill. What limit can you put? Suppose we had our time back now and were negotiating with Lord Northcliffe for the establishment of a paper mill in Grand Falls or had our time back and were negotiating with Sir W. G. Armstrong, (Armstrong-Witworth) in England, for the establishment of a paper mill in Corner Brook, would the government of Newfoundland now, any more than 25 or 26 or 50 years ago, in the case of Grand Falls, and 25 in the case of Corner Brook, now, any more than then, feel disposed to put a time limit on the operation of the mill and say that, in the year 2000 A.D. this mill shall stop?

On the contrary, our feeling is that it is just plain silly to put any time limit on production, any time limit on the prosperity, to say there shall be production, there shall be employment and there shall be industrial activity but only up to a certain year? So we say, we adopted the principle, as long as water runs and grass grows green, production shall continue. Now, in the case of a mine we cannot say that, but can only say production will continue as long as ore is there. But finally the day arrives when the mine is only a hole in the ground, and all the mineral has been removed. But for a paper mill, unless the timber is destroyed by fire, or if it is cut at a faster rate than the growth, the time will never come when you have to stop, when there is any sense or any point in stopping production.

"(3) To require the Corporation to pay an annual minimum royalty, at the rate of One hundred and fifty thousand (\$150,000.00) dollars per year, commencing in the year that the Timber Lease is obtained. This obligation, which insures a prompt de-

velopment of the Timber Lease area, supplements the original Act, which had no such requirements. The annual minimum royalty will be paid by the Corporation to the Government until the earlier of:"

"(4) the surrender by the Corporation of its Timber Lease;

or

(5) construction by the Corporation or its assigns of a mill or plant having a minimum capacity of five hundred tons of pulp a day. Such mill or plant must be constructed by 1984."

(That is to insure a prompt development once the lease is given. The original Act had no such requirement. There was no need of any such requirement in the Act when it dealt with a Crown Corporation.)

I want the house to notice there is a new principle introduced here, the principle of escalation. These rates of a dollar or two dollars go up as the price of newsprint goes up in the world. The ground rental of two dollars per square mile per annum remains intact. Then, to the end that Nalco may be competitive in its exercise of timber rights, it has been provided that Nalco may be subject to more favourable royalty rates if the government should, subsequent to May 1, 1958, grant more favourable rates to others — This right does not apply to royalty adjustment commitments of the Government undertaken with others prior to May 1, 1958 and it will not apply where the government grants more favourable rates to persons holding concessions of 1,000 square miles or less.

"(6) The inclusion in the timber provisions of matters and rights patterned after the existing Crown Zellerbach timber legislation as the same relates to good timber practices and ancillary rights.

"(7) The inclusion of a right in the Government to subject timber lands to a higher economic use.

"(8) The inclusion of a limitation on the Corporation's right the use of timber during the exploratory and investigative period without the payment of any royalty to the end that the Corporation can only cut and use such amounts thereof as are reasonable in quantity and the use is non-commercial."

Now, the meaning of this is — the right to NALCO to make use of the timber land even after NALCO is granted a lease, their rights to use these timber lands is subject to one overriding right, the right of superior economic use — If the government of Newfoundland at any time, under this legislation, can see a better use to be made, a more economic use to be made of that timber the use to which NALCO is putting or proposing to put it, and NALCO is not satisfied to put it to that better economic use, then the government can step in and decide the use it shall and must, be put to; the greater economic, the higher economic use. In other words: Suppose, for instance NALCO just built a great saw mill. Suppose they met the conditions of the lease by building a saw mill but not a paper mill, and somebody else comes along and says — "If we had that timber we would build a paper mill" — That would be of greater economic value, and the government, in that case, goes to NALCO and says — "You cannot hold that timber because there is a higher economic use to which some one else is prepared to put it, unless you are prepared to put it to that higher use, your rights shall die. That is written into the agreement."

Mr. Hollett: Wabush, Iron Ore of Canada and Pickands-Mather are NALCO. They own 51 per cent.

Premier Smallwood: It is still a corporation, still NALCO. They own the shares. NALCO is still there entirely, unchanged except in two respects: (1) It has a different set of shareholders and (2) we are making changes in the legislation. Except in these two respects NALCO is exactly as it was. NALCO is still NALCO. There are different shareholders. The shares are held by different people than those that held them previously, still NALCO is a corporation. They may sell to someone else next year or the year after next, but NALCO is still there with its rights, as it is, as we now propose to amend them.

Mr. Hollett: Who owns the controlling shares?

Premier Smallwood: The Wabush Company, but they may sell them. But if they do sell them they are still subject to the law, the

original charter this house passed and is now proposing to amend. According to this present legislation, this legislation as amended, we hope, in the present session to lay down precisely what their rights are no matter who may own the shares in NALCO. These are the rights of NALCO as they are, as they are written in the law.

Now (8): "Inclusion of limitation on the Corporation's right to the use of timber during the exploratory and investigative period without the payment of any royalty to the end that the Corporation can: only cut and use such amounts thereof as are reasonable in quantity and the use is non-commercial."

I think that pretty well covers it except that, again in connection with NALCO, there are a few other points that are described here. I think I had better read them to get them into the record.

"(1) The exploration leases are stated to expire on March 31, 1978, in order that the terms of those leases may coincide with the periods in which expenditures must be made.

"(2) To require the Corporation (its assignees, lessees and transferees) to expand in connection with investigation and exploration under exploration and mineral leases, the sum of \$1,600,000 — this sum being an NALCO Concession." Which sum has been spent, and in fact much more than that has been spent. NALCO has furnished to the government evidence of the fact that as of January 1, 1958 more than \$4,000,000 has already been spent on such investigation and exploration. NALCO, since it was formed by this house and given its rights by this house has spent, up to January 1, 1958, over \$4 million.

Well, it has a million from this Government or nine hundred thousand and it had a hundred thousand from other shareholders. Then they sold some additional shares for five dollars, for which it got another half million dollars, was it? Which was one and a half million of its own capital. Incidentally at the point we sold it, its capital had all been spent. But in addition to its own capital, it spent or it procured the spending of millions of dollars by other concerns that were brought in to spend the money exploring

small sections of NALCO's areas, including Canadian Javelin. And the inclusion in the NALCO ACT of methods by which NALCO will report to the government on exploration expenditure and for provisions for renewing mining leases for 99 years, giving the government the right to insure to others surface rights, and the 22% royalty on iron ore shipped from NALCO concessions areas, subject to an escalation pursuant to an established formula.

This escalation provision contained in the NALCO Act does not apply to payments of 22¢ per ton to the Government on the so-called five square mile Wabush Ore Body, the Knoll Lake Area, the Julienne Lake Area, or those areas in Labrador on which Pickands and Stelco hold option rights. These specific areas are subject, however, to escalation by virtue of the pursuant to The Julienne Lake (Mineral Lands) Act, 1959, and The Government-Javelin Taxation (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1959.

(7) To permit an exemption from the Social Security Assessment Act of monies expended for capital improvements. This exclusion or exemption is premised on economic necessity.

(8) Provision is made to limit municipal taxes to forty per centum (40%) of the total assessment on all industrial establishments, whether owned by the Corporation or not. This provision has been brought into the NALCO Act by reason of its existence in the Crown Zellerbach Legislation.

Now, the house in that connection will remember that in the Crown Zellerbach deal, we did something entirely different from that which had been done in the Bowater, or original Corner Brook deal. In the original Corner Brook deal, Corner Brook was completely exempted from payment of municipal taxation in any shape or form. The result was, as the house knows, that when the City of Corner Brook was organized two or three years ago, Bowaters who are the successors to the original Corner Brook, were not liable and are not now liable to municipal taxation. It is true that Bowaters, by voluntary action, have been paying certain fixed sums each year to

the City government of Corner Brook, but that is an act of grace. Under the law they are specifically exempted from municipal taxes. They are not legally bound to pay them, but they voluntarily paid, not as much as they would ordinarily pay, as they would pay, for example, if here in St. John's. They would pay much more to the City Council of St. John's than they now pay to the City Council of Corner Brook. But in the Crown Zellerbach legislation we said that, in any town, paper mill town, or pulp mill town or logging town, any town that may come about through the efforts of Crown Zellerbach, whatever the municipal taxation there is in that town, imposed by the municipality, they shall not impose on Crown Zellerbach in that town of a total of more than 40% of the total collection of taxes in that town. Now, we have copied that into the NALCO Legislation presently before the house. Have I made that thoroughly clear? They are not exempted from municipal taxes but they are not required to pay anything more than 40% of all that the municipality can collect, and they are supposed to pay it.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Is there any basis for that 40%?

Premier Smallwood: Let us say, for instance, they collect a million dollars a year or a hundred thousand dollars a year, however they compute it they are not allowed — however they may assess it — the total tax they collect must not be more than 40%.

Mr. Duffy: I know! I was wondering on what basis the 40% was arrived at?

Premier Smallwood: And why not 50%? Why not 30%? The reason is that all across Canada, and in the United States in late years, this 40% has been adopted as a sort of universal figure. It is not a figure invented here for the purpose of this Act nor previously for the purpose of the Crown Zellerbach Act, but rather an adaptation in Newfoundland of a figure which has become rather commonplace across the continent.

(9) To preserve the "traditional rights" of Newfoundlanders to use our lakes and ponds, to fish and hunt, and to acquire wood for fuel and other purposes. Now, that is a clause we are quite proud of. This has not been customary when intro-

ducing this type of legislation. We introduced that in the Crown Zellerbach Legislation and have now copied it into the NALCO Act as an amendment, that although NALCO have the right, the sole right, to acquire a Crown lease for timber, once they acquire that Crown lease they can't bar Newfoundlanders from the exercise of their traditional rights as Newfoundlanders to tramp through the woods and to trout and to shoot and hunt and even to go and cut some fire wood and ordinary wood for ordinary domestic purposes.

Mr. John Forsey (Humber East): That means any roads they build will be available to Newfoundlanders?

Premier Smallwood: No. Roads would be their private property, which they might or might not permit the public to use, just as today the private roads through the A.N.D. Company areas and Bowaters areas are sometimes closed, in fact gates are built across the roads and travel over them is allowed only by special permission. In late years there has been a strong tendency on the part of these companies to refuse that permission in certain seasons of the year, when fire hazards are high because of the hot weather.

The Statutory Agreement appended to the NALCO Act has for its purpose preserving to the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited the rights given it under the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act of 1951, as amended. This is in keeping with the manner in which Brinco, Crown Zellerbach and Labrador Mining and Exploration Company Limited hold rights in the Province. It also preserves the default provision of the 1957 Nalco-Havelin (Mineral Lands) Act.

The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1959 and Statutory Agreement.

The purpose of this statute, as opposed, and the companion Statutory Agreement is to place the Knoll Lake iron ore deposit on the same legislative basis as the mineral deposits covered by the Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957. Specifically, this Act, and Statutory Agreement provide for:

(1). The mechanics of protecting against defaults.

(2). A 22 cents a ton royalty to the Government for each ton of iron ore shipped from the area. The escalation on this 22 cents is payable by Javelin pursuant to the Act and Statutory Agreement appended to the Act.

(3). The elimination of the requirement that the operating lessee must proceed "with due diligence" with mineral development.

NOTE: Financing of a project such as is here contemplated cannot be completed if the rights to the property may be lost through the application of a standard as vague as "due diligence". The same result is obtained by reason of the fact that the lease for this area provides substantial minimum royalties which will have the effect of forcing development.

(4). To include interpretive language as to when iron ore is shipped, thus serving as a guide for royalty payment.

(5). To make applicable the above noted exclusion from the Social Security Assessment Act for capital improvements and the provision on limiting a municipality's right of taxation.

I may say that a government, in giving a mineral concession, is influenced very powerfully by the desire to force the hand of the lessee, of the company, the party to whom the lease is given. I have an area that John Jones or John Doyle or anyone you like is asking for, a mineral concession, which he is asking for just for the purpose of sitting on it. There has been so much of that down through history, and so much of it especially on the part of large corporations, building up their reserves of minerals, piling up their reserves of timber with no intentions of putting them to immediate use but just piling them up for some dim future — there has been so much of that that when a company or individual comes to a government asking for a mineral concession, a government naturally and instinctively tries to pin down the concessionaire to some time limit within which the development must take place. Just as inevitably, just as instinctively, the concessionaire resists being tied down. Now, in the Act as it is, unless we amend it, it says that it must be brought under development with "due diligence". The amendment proposes to strike out the words "due diligence". The government

have agreed to ask the house to strike out the words, and we have agreed to ask the house to do so in response to the arguments out to us, i.e. "if we have to go and get \$25, \$50 - \$70 million financing to get this mine going—an iron mine cost a tremendous sum of money — what bankers, what financial houses are going to put up the necessary millions of dollars when the very rights, the very concessions from the Newfoundland House of Assembly are subject to development with all "due diligence"? The lawyers for those banks, for those insurance companies, for those trust companies, for those financial houses who are asked to put up the money, when the whole deal is submitted to them, the first thing these lawyers point out to the people supposed to do the financing is that, if the concessionaire has to hold these rights, he has to develop with "due diligence." What does that mean? What does "due diligence" mean? Does it mean a day? A month? A year? How safe are those rights?

(Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair)

Are they sufficiently clear and beyond doubt to justify putting in \$125 million? Now then, they have pointed that out to us, and we have agreed that it is sensible, we have to agree it makes sense. Then they say — "You really don't need the words. The reason you don't need the words we can show you under two headings: (1) are we the kind of people to get rights to sit on? (We have to say, in common justice, that John Doyle is not the kind of man who acquires rights for the purpose of sitting on them. You cannot make John Doyle sit on anything).

Mr. Hollett: What is he doing?

Premier Smallwood: He is the greatest promoter in this country, in North America. What Newfoundland needs is exactly that kind of promotion.

Mr. Hollett: He made a fortune.

Premier Smallwood: Let us hope he makes 10 provided also he gives us fast development. And let me remind my hon. friend, any Government, any small Government that is going to sit by and wait until some philanthropist comes in to develop, without any intention of making a fortune for him-

self, will wait a long time, a long time. Now, I say if we had half a dozen John Doyles and each one made half a dozen fortunes it would be a good deal for Newfoundland, providing each of them produced working mines.

Let me give the house an example. I brought M.J. Boylen into Newfoundland. M.J. Boylen is a great promoter, probably Canada's greatest today. John Doyle is perhaps North America's greatest, including Canada, but in Canada alone M.J. Boylen is probably the greatest promoter. He has promoted mine after mine in New Brunswick. He has brought about the greatest mineral rush in Canadian history. In Newfoundland he already has one mine operating in Tilt Cove, and another great mine about to start in Baie Verte, with \$20 million to go into it. It is not an iron mine. Iron mines run into enormous sums of money for capital, but an asbestos mine, in a civilized part of the world, such as Baie Verte, with a town, roads, hospitals, telegraphs, the ordinary amenities easily accessible, accessibility in and out, transportation and all the rest, a mine can be started for just a fraction of what it would cost down in the isolated part of Wabush Lake, in Labrador. And there is now another mine about to start at Little Bay. Three mines, one man. If he is going to make a fortune in Newfoundland, remember, it is the price we must pay for industrialization whether in Newfoundland or Quebec. He is going to make that anyhow and he will make far more in New Brunswick when he gets the mines rolling than he can ever make in Newfoundland. We are not going to stop these promoters from making great fortunes for themselves. If Newfoundland is going to say — we will be different from all other provinces where promoters make great fortunes for themselves — those who start their development in Newfoundland are going to be different — then we are not going to have any development, if promoters are not going to make fortunes.

We can take that position, but if we do take that position we can reconcile ourselves to no development, because that is the way development is brought about — The great Lord Beaverbrook, 50 years ago, at the age of 30, exactly half a century ago, went to live in England, retired, with \$30 million, the greatest promoter Canada had seen up to

that time, Canada Cement; Stelco of Canada; Nova Scotia Steel; company after company after company in Canada, — the greatest promoter in Canada's history. Well, these men produce results. That is capitalism. That is our system of finance and capital, private capital, that is the system, that is the incentive to get industry rolling, to get production started, to get men employed, get jobs for people, and some one man always ends up making many fortunes, building one on top of the other — Lord Northcliffe, Lord Rothmere, Sir Eric Bowater, name them all, all of them, all the same, and if John Doyle makes a fortune out of promoting and getting development in Labrador he will only be doing what Jules Timmons has done. Do you think Jules Timmons has not made a great fortune?

Mr. Hollett: Surely the Premier is not putting Doyle on the same level with Timmons and Rothmere?

Premier Smallwood: They are all promoters.

Mr. Hollett: They had money when they started.

Premier Smallwood: Who had? Beaverbrook? He did not have two cents to rub against each other — He told me, and I read the story. He was a Presbyterian Minister's son, one of a big family, with hardly enough to eat, Albert Arnsworth, what did he have when he started, the great Lord Northcliffe.

Mr. Hollett: When he came to Newfoundland he had it.

Premier Smallwood: Oh, he had become respectable then. The promoter became respectable after he had made his fortune, is that it? There is no difference — a promoter is a promoter, and they have a great part to play in development of industry.

Mr. Hollett: He was never fined \$1,000 for refusing to disclose —

Premier Smallwood: Lord Beaverbrook was brought often before court when building up his \$30 million fortune, 40 or 50 years ago. He had one of the most notorious names in all Canada. Did you ever read the

story of the formation of Canada Cement, formed by him together with 25 cement producing companies into one great corporation and combined the capital came to a certain total. Who becomes a multi-millionaire in this world today by teaching Sunday School? That is not how it is done. My hon. friend is not a great multi-millionaire because he has not —

Mr. Hollett: Not like my hon. friend the Premier, who is not a millionaire yet.

Premier Smallwood: Well, that is that — Then the Julianne Lake (Mineral Lands) Act, 1959. The purpose of this Act is identical in purpose with the Knoll Lake Legislation, and then the Government — Javelin Taxation (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1959, about the same.

Mr. A. M. Duffy: (St. John's Centre): Do you mind my asking a question? What are the value of NALCO shares as of today I wonder?

Premier Smallwood: I don't think there is any market value.

Mr. Duffy: There must be a value.

Premier Smallwood: There is no par value. They had no par value. They have a right to issue more shares.

Mr. Duffy: There must be a value.

Premier Smallwood: There have not been any shares issued since last shares NALCO sold under Government control at five dollars — There were only a few sold at that price.

Mr. Duffy: Is the value considered higher today?

Premier Smallwood: Considerably lower. There is no trading done in the shares to establish a price. After all, prices of shares are established, surely, by market buying and selling, what some one is willing to offer and so on, somewhere between the two is the market value.

Mr. Duffy: Are there any of these shares in the hands of individuals?

Premier Smallwood: There were a few in the hands of Sir William Stephenson. Littleton B. Gold, who died, had a few shares. I suppose his widow has them now, and two or three others like that, but no individual in Newfoundland, a few individuals who were part of the original formation of NALCO had some individual shares, but no one else ever had any. We had some — I had one share and the Attorney General had one share and the late Minister of Highways had one share. These were not our shares. They belonged to the government of Newfoundland, issued to us while we were directors, to give us qualifying shares. When we ceased to be directors, the shares went back to the corporation, so we now have none and never did have them except in our official capacity and we ceased to have them when we ceased to be directors.

Mr. Hollett: In that connection, Mr. Speaker, are there any shares on the market of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company?

Premier Smallwood: I think so, yes. I think they are traded back and forth. In fact, I think they are listed on the Toronto-Montreal exchange and are traded like any other shares. So the Iron Ore Company of Canada shares are traded and listed but NALCO shares have never been listed, nor have they been traded. My hon. friends may be aware that BRINCO shares have never been listed nor traded.

Well, Sir, I think that I have given the house sufficient explanation at second reading, especially as we remember that this legislation will, after it receives second reading, (if it receives second reading) go into Committee of the Whole where it can be debated very thoroughly, line by line, and clause by clause. Also, in view of the fact that lawyers and directors of these different concerns are due to arrive here next week and are willing to meet with the members of the house in private sessions to answer questions and give information. I have never asked them if they were willing to meet in public sessions. Businessmen are usually shy about meeting publicly, and prefer to sit down quietly and answer questions. I hope that members of the house, on both sides, will avail themselves of the opportunity of sitting in private sessions with these indus-

trialists and question them closely and get all the information possible. So I say, in view of the fact that an opportunity is being provided, and the further fact that thorough discussion will take place in detail in Committee of the Whole, I may perhaps have given sufficient explanation to date. I do not expect the Opposition to be ready to proceed with the debate today, and perhaps not even on Monday. They have had the legislation now for some days. It is pretty hefty stuff and I do not for a moment suppose that they have been able to master it in that short period. I hope, however that my explanation today has thrown some light on the matter and that when we come to debate again at Second Reading, the Opposition will be thoroughly ready. I certainly don't want them to begin the debate one moment before they are ready. Now, we have copies of this printed explanations, which will be circulated, and I am sure they will be of some assistance to the house.

Mr. Hollett: Before the hon. the Premier sits down, Mr. Speaker, might I say here this exposition of the various Bills have enlightened us in the Opposition and I hope has enlightened some of the members on the Government side too. But I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if any provision has been made (I don't remember seeing it as I read through — but I have not finished reading it all) to protect the interest of the Newfoundland labour in any development, that may take place? I wonder if the hon. Premier could tell us that. I understand at the present time, the Iron Ore Company of Canada requires a person to have a Master's Degree or a Doctor's Degree or something before getting a job with them. Therefore I am wondering if there is something there to cover it.

Mr. Speaker: That could probably be answered later.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate, but may I make it clear I have finished speaking, and just as the Leader of the house, not to continue the debate, I move the adjournment of the debate, without claiming any privilege to speak again except possibly in reply at the close of the debate.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday at three o'clock.

Monday, May 4, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Clarke (Deputy Speaker) in the Chair.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

Question Nos. 29, 30, and 31 tabled (see index)

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, arising out of a news item today, relative to the proposed housing development likely to take place in the East End of St. John's, I wonder if the Hon. Premier, or whichever Minister is responsible for this project, would care to make any comment? It appears from the news item, and I was sorry to hear this, that the housing program, which runs into millions of dollars, would likely be held up by some little trouble between the government here and the Federal government at Ottawa. If that is so, it is deplorable. I am wondering if the Minister or the Premier would like to make some comment?

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): I am not aware of any trouble between this government and Ottawa that would hold up anything.

Mr. Hollett: I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, it was stated in the news item —

Mr. Smallwood: We are not responsible here for news items.

Mr. Hollett: No! I asked a question! Is there any comment the hon. Minister or the hon. Premier would like to make? Has the pro-

ject been held up by any differences of opinion between the two governments? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. Smallwood: No, it has not.

Mr. Hollett: That answer then is "No"?

LEGISLATION:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into an Agreement with Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited and American Smelting and Refining Company".

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of this Bill — The house will remember that in 1949 the officials of government authorized exclusive mineral exploration concessions to be granted to two companies, the A.N.D. Company and Buchans Mining Company in respect of 6,250 square miles of Newfoundland territory. The original exploration period was to end December 3rd., 1958. The intention of this Bill is to provide for extension of the exploration period for an additional five years in respect of the 6,250 square miles on which these companies had concessions for mineral exploration. The American Smelting and Refining Company is now substituted for Buchans Mining Company.

Since 1929, when the Buchans Mining Company started operating at Buchans, the company has produced more than \$220 million worth of zinc, lead, copper, gold and silver, and about one-third of that amount was produced in the years before 1949 and about two-thirds of it produced since Newfoundland became a Province of Canada. The ore deposits were first discovered in 1905 by a Micmac Indian by the name of N. Benoit. In 1925, a means of separation was found to recover the various minerals from the ores, by the flotation process. The original ore deposits were estimated to contain about 60.5 million tons of mineral ore. Since 1928, the mine found more than that amount, and were it not for the continued program of exploration and development, exploration that could carry right on through the years, all of the original ore

would now have been exhausted. I believe that, quite recently, the company announced an additional reserve of some five or five and a half million tons of ore. So that, based upon the extension and the production being just about the same, the mine should be good for a number of years from now on.

The Buchans Mining Company was a subsidiary of the American Smelting and Refining Company, and at the end of 1958 the American Smelting and Refining Company took over the assets and liabilities of the subsidiary company and the mine is now operated by the American Smelting and Refining Company. As I said, in 1949 the government of that day entered into an agreement giving the Buchans Mining Company and Anglo-Newfoundland and Development Company exploration expansion rights over 6,250 square miles of Central Newfoundland. The agreement expired at the end of 1958, and the company reapplied for a portion of that area, which had not up to that time been fully explored. They wanted that reapplication for a new concession to be the subject of further mineral exploration concessions for a period of five years.

Now, under the original exploration agreement the company was required to spend \$250,000 on exploration and mapping, over a 10 year period. They actually spent somewhat over \$1 million, and they have, of course, supplied the government with a large number of geographical and topographical maps of the area which they explored. This Bill is a proposed exclusive mineral exploration concession to be granted to the A.N.D. Company and American Smelting and Refining Company. The concession is to be for 1000 square miles of the original area, which is 1000 miles that they had not explored — of this total mileage — 145 square miles are in the vicinity of Buchans Junction, 448 in the vicinity of Virginia Lake, and 162 in the area of Tally Pond and 28 square miles in the vicinity of South Pond and 153 in the vicinity of Grey Lake and 18 in the vicinity of West Grey River, and 100 square miles in the vicinity of East Grey River.

The period of new concession is proposed to be for five years, from January 1959 to December 3rd., 1963. The companies are to be required to spend a total of \$125,000

during the exploration period at the rate of not less than \$25,000 per year. The companies will be required to submit to the government annual reports of work done and audited accounts of the monies spent. The companies are to have the right to select five square miles for mining leases for each \$25,000 spent on exploration, but not to exceed, in the aggregate, 25 square miles. The company will be required to surrender 200 square miles of the new concession area each year of the concession period, with the first surrender made at the end of December 1959. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very great impact the Buchans mining complex has upon the economy of Newfoundland, I anticipate it would be the wish of this Legislature to grant the new concession, and I move second reading.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise, to support the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources. I am very familiar with the area in Central Newfoundland, and I do know a great impact for good the Buchans Mining Company has had upon the people in that area, and not only the people in that area but also in the whole of Newfoundland. Let me say, since they had the concession to prospect and explore they have spent, I believe, over \$1 million in prospecting. I see no reason whatsoever why we should not give them more time to make further explorations, with the hope that they will eventually bring in a mine or mines which would be beneficial, not only to the people in that area, but to the whole country.

I am glad to see that the government is making the arrangements with these people. It is a much better arrangement, I think, than some other arrangements about which I shall probably have to talk today or tomorrow. I think the granting of any concession whatsoever to any mining corporation, or any woods working people, should be granted directly by the government and not indirectly as has been done in certain other instances. I am very happy to support this, Mr. Speaker.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Labrador Lands (Reservations) Act":

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in 1936 the Commission of Government reserved from the operation of the Crown Lands Act a certain and extensive area of Labrador. The effect of the reservation was to reserve it from staking. Subsequent to that, the same area was made the subject of a concession to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company. In the meantime, under the shedding principle that was evolved from the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company Act, that company had, from time to time, to return certain parts of its concession, shedding them, and they reverted to the Crown. But the areas that have been returned to the Crown have remained in the category of Crown Reservations, and because of the nature of the reservations made by the Commission of Government in the first place, the government today can deal only with the returned portions, the shedded portions; that territory gained, in connection with the development and operation of mines or minerals. In other words, if today it is thought desirable to give agricultural rights or concession rights or timber rights or water power concessions or surface rights or concessions, with regard to this shedded portion, the government does not have authority to deal with it, but can only make the returned and shedded portions available in cases where mines and minerals are concerned. The purpose of this Bill is to give the government the right to dispose of this land as it sees fit, for any purpose, whether in connection with the development of mines or minerals or not. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, we are completely in accord with the principle of this bill. I might ask the Minister, when replying, to refer to the schedule — The land schedule hereto — There is no schedule here and therefore no "hereto". I suppose it is in the Act. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us the areas of land referred to in the Act?

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, the reference is to all the land reserved in the first place and which became the subject of a concession to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company. I believe, speaking subject to correction, it was 27,000 square miles of

territory in Labrador, but in order to be certain of that I undertake to produce a map at the Committee of the Whole stage. On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:
Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act":

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments to this particular act. The first one is merely the re-enactment of one which is already in the Corrections Act. There is one change made in the last line, where provision is made for two other persons. It is merely done for balancing purposes. The second amendment allows for the commitment of delinquents to training school for indefinite periods, provided that the indefinite period is not the regular time for which he might have been committed. Thirdly, there is a re-enactment of a section taken out of the Welfare of Children Act, which should be in this Act as well.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading:
On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE:

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

Mr. Jones took the Chair as Chairman of Committee of the Whole:
Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Amendment Act, 1959"

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us who makes up the advisory board?

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): You mean the names of the members of it? I propose to ask the Committee not to adopt this Bill but only to read and consider it — not adopt — let it stand for another meeting of the Committee.

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): We can get it then? I am sorry! No minister seems to know the names of the

Board members. That is why I asked. Mr. Chairman, I don't suppose there happens to be many appeals to the Advisory Board?

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Quite a few from Corner Brook.

Mr. Hollett: I see. We will get the names later?

Premier Smallwood: The hon. Leader of the Opposition appreciates there are dozens of boards, a long list of them. I am sure no member could reel off all the names of all the boards.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I would like to ask if this is the same as in St. John's, The Metropolitan Areas Board?

Mr. Abbott: No.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, could you let the whole Bill stand for another consideration, and report progress on this Bill? Motion, that the Committee report progress on this Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Amendment Act, 1959".

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Wild Life Act":

Mr. Hollett: In reference to Clause (2), I drew attention to that on second reading. I don't like the section very well. I don't suppose it is too important but I will read it again — "A wild life officer may, without a warrant, enter and search any logging camp, mining camp or construction camp in which he has reasonable cause to suspect that any gun or other firearm is kept contrary to this Act or the regulations and may, on view, seize the same, and upon conviction of any person in respect thereof, the gun or other firearm is, in addition to any other punishment imposed, forfeited to Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland and may be disposed of as the Minister may direct". The unfortunate part of it is he can seize any gun in a man's camp and take it away with him as evidence. In other words, it is really convicting the man, taking the gun, before the person is brought before the court, in a sense.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): It is the only way we can do it.

Premier Smallwood: The Leader of the Opposition knows this is the Committee of the Whole House and that was adopted in second reading.

Mr. Hollett: In principle! What have we committees for if we cannot talk about amending it? The principle in the first instance, I admit, was carried. Why I have brought it up again is just to repeat the fact that I don't like the idea.

Premier Smallwood: The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows he is out of order in getting up again. He stated his objections to the principle, and the principle none-the-less has been adopted in second reading. The hon. gentleman knows, without my telling him, or anyone else, he is out of order. He knows he is out of order, and knows it better than any man in this house.

Mr. Hollett: I was about, Mr. Chairman, to make an amendment to the section, but I had not the opportunity to get to my feet. I would like to have the rules observed to the extent that a person can make an amendment without being rudely interrupted by anybody on the other side of the house. I was about to make the amendment that the words "without a warrant" be deleted from the section. In other words, a wild life officer may enter and search any logging camp, and leave it to the courts to decide whether or not he entered legally or not. If we leave out the words "without a warrant" it does not seem too bad. Mr. Chairman, I move that the words "without a warrant" be deleted from the section. I am quite sure the hon. Minister will understand why. We know that it is absolutely essential for all woods camps in the country to have a gun in camp.

Premier Smallwood: Now, Mr. Chairman — to a point of order — the hon. gentleman is now completely defying the rules. We cannot argue this. The time was there to argue it when the Bill came up before the house for second reading. That was the time —

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Premier Smallwood: Only one point of order at a time. I must have time to state my point of order and that must be disposed of before another can be raised or discussed. Now, the matter of whether or not guns should be allowed in camps at certain times of the year is a matter that came before the house for discussion at second reading. That provides the only opportunity there is for discussing the principle of the Bill — second reading — and taking a vote when debate ends, and the principle is either adopted or rejected. If rejected, there is no Committee Stage; the clause is rejected, but if adopted then at the Committee of the Whole, which is what we are in now, we are not permitted to discuss the principle. It is against our laws. We made the laws ourselves and in doing so copied parliaments under the British flag for a thousand years. We don't permit ourselves to discuss that in Committee of the Whole. The Leader of the Opposition knows that just as well as I do, and ought not to try and break the rules for discussing the principle. He has made an amendment that the words "without a warrant" be stricken out, but he cannot and I cannot and no one can discuss the principle in this clause — It is against the law. We cannot do it.

Mr. Hollett: The only people can discuss this, Mr. Chairman, are the people on the opposite side. The Opposition dare not.

Premier Smallwood: Dare not what?

Mr. Hollett: Discuss the principle of a Bill in Committee of the Whole. I have seen everything done in Committee of the Whole, principle attacked, torn up, thrown out, principle reserved, everything else happening when the government wants to do it.

Premier Smallwood: That is not fair and it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. Hollett: That is true, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Smallwood: It is not true.

Mr. Hollett: What I am trying to stress is that it is important, very important, that woods camp owners who have camps where woods operations are carried on should be allowed to have in their possession in camp

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order —

Mr. Hollett: I beg your pardon!

Premier Smallwood: The hon. gentleman is not now allowed, by the law of the house, to discuss here today whether or not it is right or is not right for camps to have guns in their possession. That is contrary to the law. He is allowed to discuss and only to discuss, whether they should or should not have a warrant in making the search. That is the only thing lawful for him, me, or anyone to discuss at this stage.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I still think it is absolutely essential that the wild life officer going in to search a camp should have a warrant. But the clause says he may go in without a warrant and search the camp, seize the guns, go to the magistrate, get a summons, serve it on John Jones, even if he never shot a partridge and had the gun only for protection. He has to leave his camp, go out of the woods and go before a magistrate and be punished simply because the wild life officer went in and, without a warrant, seized the gun as evidence, on the strength of the fact that he had heard that the man might have killed something or did kill something. I think the words — "without a warrant" — should be deleted, and I hope the government will consider it.

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not acceptable for this reason — In a closed season you can't expect to keep a gun in any of these camps. There were individual complaints during the past year where there was every reason to believe a gun was kept in certain camps in contradiction of the law. Now this law is made by regulations and you cannot get a warrant to search under regulations — so it is necessary to make the provision that is made in this Bill.

Mr. Hollett: Is the hon. Minister trying to tell us he can't go before a magistrate and swear out a complaint against John Jones for killing a moose out of season?

Mr. Keough: Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said. I did not say anything about killing

moose out of season. The point in question is the keeping of guns in these camps out of season and you cannot go, under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, and get a search warrant to search a camp.

Mr. Hollett: What does the Minister want to know? Whether the guns are there or not? Is it unlawful at the present time to have a gun in the camp?

Mr. Keough: In closed season, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Mr. Hollett: Ridiculous — That should be amended.

Premier Smallwood: I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should say that — flabbergasted! The hon. gentleman is well known in many parts of Newfoundland as a citizen who loves sport, to go out in the country shooting and fishing. He also knows that our population is growing faster than the population of any other province of Canada. We have the highest birth rate in Canada and the lowest death rate, and our population is growing very fast. Indeed the pressure of the population in Newfoundland today is creating many problems for us. One of the greatest of these problems is that of preserving our wild life. There are many, many hundreds of streams and ponds that used to be well stocked with fish which today have none at all, and there were many, many barrens and ridges and open spaces and wooded spaces on this island which used to be fully stocked with wild game that today are not. As our population grows, the risk of a complete disappearance of fish and trout, salmon, birds and game becomes very great. The danger becomes very great indeed.

One step was taken by the law, by this house, many years ago, not now, not in this session but many years ago, to prevent unlawful slaughter of game — For example one way to prevent the slaughter of game out of season was to forbid camps to have guns in their possession out of season. Now why is that? There is no great principle violated. The fact is that if you have camps 20 or 30 miles up in the bush where enforcement of the law is difficult, where you have no police and where there is little machinery indeed for the enforcement of the law. Therefore,

the practical thing — and you have to be eminently practical in this — the practical thing is not to allow a gun in camp. The law is that you shall not have a gun in camps of any kind, woods camps, fishing camps, geological camps, prospectors camps — You cannot have a gun in your possession out of season because if you do then the chances are that someone will kill game out of season. And we know, as a practical fact, a great deal of game is killed out of season. Now, that constitutes a grave danger to the conservation of wild life in Newfoundland and so the law says — “You shall not have a gun in your possession out of season, but only in the time of year when it is lawful to kill and only then, of course, under certain conditions”. As far as the calendar is concerned, you are allowed to kill at certain times only, and you are allowed to kill at other times, and at such other times you are not allowed to have a gun in your possession in camp.

This amendment says merely that the practical difficulty that has arisen under which the Minister has to carry out the law is that he is not permitted (either he or his agent) to go into a camp and seize a gun. This provides the opportunity to do it. Why should we not allow a wild life officer to go into a camp without a warrant, if there is any good reason to suspect that, if a warden hears a gun go off and has definite evidence a caribou or moose has been killed and more than one, and knows where it is? But when he goes down to the magistrate — the magistrate will not give him a warrant to go up and search — and if he did give it to him it would be useless. By the time he got down 50 or 60 miles, perhaps on foot, to the nearest magistrate to get his warrant and went back, he would probably find no gun there. So we might as well say — “go ahead and kill all you like”. Now I wish we could as easily stop the slaughter of our game in that way I have already mentioned in this house, by aircraft, men gunning game from the air. I wish we could stop the ‘plane loads of caribou and other game, not only caribou but ‘plane loads of fish that have been brought out of Labrador. I wish we had a way of stopping that. I wish there were something practical we could do about that, such as what has been done here. Now, I call upon the Leader of the Opposition, who is, to my knowledge a very ardent game

hunter, I call upon him now as a good Newfoundland to vote to give us the authority to send men in and search for guns without a warrant.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, what the government is really doing is declaring an open season for bears in Newfoundland. If bears could only read now and could read this piece of legislation they could say, "very well, we are all safe during the closed season for game, we can go into that camp now and take what they have and, if we want to, frighten the devil out of them" — In other words, it is declaring open season for bears on men's camps — be reasonable.

Premier Smallwood: Better 50 guilty bears go free than one innocent caribou be killed out of season.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask also if there is any search at all for motor cars on the highroads, even a fellow with a nice wife in front — Why not search cars for rifles, because I know lots of partridge are brought down from Cappahayden and up the Shore. We have to protect wild life. I love sport too and I agree with the Premier, word for word, about protection, but I would like to see him go a bit further. I think every automobile during the closed season should be checked once in a while to see if they carry a rifle, especially when going into that district where we know there are partridge. I really think that is so.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister guarantee the house the owner of a camp will be allowed, under a permit, to keep a gun or guns in the camp?

Mr. Keough: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had already covered that in second reading. I believe, as I said at that time, the Minister has authority, on application from the camp owner, to authorize the keeping of a rifle or gun in the camp during the closed season. Incidentally, in regard to the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's North, the law has already anticipated him in that respect. That law is there whereby wild life officers can set up a road block and search cars for rifles and for big game out of season when we suspect big game shooting out of

season, and confiscate the game and rifle and car until such time as the law hears the case, and, in cases of conviction the court then usually orders permanent confiscation in the case of weapons.

On motion Bill passed without amendment. Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Notaries Public Act, 1957". On motion, Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Use of Sound Recording Machines for Taking and Recording Evidence."

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I think I drew attention to one item there where it stated that sound recordings made under Section "B" are to be certified by the judge, or a person in charge of a sound recording machine. I did make a distinction between a judge and a person who might be in charge of such a machine. We might as well leave that out and let the judge certify it.

Mr. Nightingale: Mr. Chairman, I think in this particular case we have a recording clerk in the court. These machines are not always reliable.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): We can let that clause stand and go on to Clause (5).

Motion, that Clause (4) stand, carried:

Mr. Curtis: You see, shorthand reporters are sworn in and the operators would be sworn too.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): It might be a commercial firm, machine and all, sworn in to take the evidence.

Mr. Curtis: They will be sworn.

Premier Smallwood: If required by the rules of the court.

Mr. Curtis: Yes.

Clauses (1) through (3) carried, clause (4) stand, clauses (5), (6), (7), carried:

On motion, Committee ordered to report progress on this Bill and ask leave to sit again.

Committee of the Whole, on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Welfare of

Children's Act." Clauses (1) and (2) carried: Clause 3 read:

3. Section 7 and 8 of the said Act are repealed and the following substituted therefore:

"7. (1) Every welfare officer has in the discharge of his duties as a welfare officer all of the powers of a constable and is protected from civil actions for anything done in bona fide exercise of the powers conferred by this Act.

(2) Every welfare officer has all of the powers of a constable under The School Attendance Act".

Mr. Hollett: I don't know how this can happen but I don't like the idea of conferring on the welfare officer powers of a constable.

Premier Smallwood: The constable has this power under the Provisions of the School Attendance Act.

Mr. Hollett: There is nothing in this country but constables and police officers and welfare officers. I think we ought to preserve the dignity of the constabulary by not allowing their duties to be performed by any Jack, Tom or Harry in this country. I think it is rather a shame for us to go too far with this — It is just my opinion. I am not too much concerned only that we are in a sense, I think, stepping a bit on individual liberty when we allow this to happen. We are going to turn welfare officers into constables and tomorrow or next day someone else, until eventually you won't be able to turn around at all without a constable staring you right in the face. It is rather unfortunate.

Premier Smallwood: It would be serious if we were to give the police constables the powers that the welfare officers have, but it is not at all serious to give the welfare officers a limited part of the powers police constables have. Now it is only giving to welfare officers those powers that a policeman now has under the Welfare of Children's Act. Now surely if you have to make a decision between giving the powers to the welfare officer — We have done so, in fact, under the main act. This is only an amendment to the main act, we have given to policemen, regular constabulary and I suppose the mounted police right around the Province certain powers aimed at the

protection of children. We have given the police force certain powers. Now we say, in this amendment, that is alright. That is necessary to protect children. That is necessary, but we will also give to the welfare officers the same powers under the same act to deal with the same children. In other words, if there is a policeman around — and in a great many places in Newfoundland there is no policeman within miles and miles — but if there is no policeman around there may very well be a welfare officer, because welfare officers continually travel, indeed in most cases costing the people of Newfoundland hundreds and thousands of dollars a year and maybe more — They are continually travelling within their respective districts and when they come across a case that needs police action, I mean a case of children, protection of children, welfare of children, under the Welfare of Children Act, if they come across a case requiring police action they should have authority to do that police work, and not have to wait for a policeman to come along.

Now if anything is wrong in the whole picture, it is the giving to regular police powers over the Welfare of Children's Act. There is nothing wrong with giving the powers to welfare officers. That is all the present bill does; gives the power to welfare officers, trained and employed by the government and trained and having been employed as a trained person, who are from time to time given additional training, sent to a university (and classes are held within Newfoundland) and bringing trained persons down here from other universities to train them — they are trained people, trained to protect children, and we have 80 to 90 of them. What is wrong with giving them the rights we have already given to policemen, under this Act, the Welfare of Children Act? What is wrong with giving the welfare officers the same powers to deal with children as we already have given to policemen, who may be well trained as police officers but not trained at all as welfare officers?

Mr. Hollett: Are you giving them police uniforms too?

Premier Smallwood: No. They don't do any arresting.

Mr. Hollett: They could?

Premier Smallwood: I don't know. I cannot answer that. Perhaps he has the same powers but they would be very rarely used, and on the few occasions he might use it, it could be done without a uniform. A Welfare officer, particularly in connection with children, must not look like a police officer.

Mr. Hollett: In dealing with little children, and welfare officers are to help little children.

Premier Smallwood: They may be dealing with negligent parents or delinquent children. They may be dealing with delinquent or negligent parents, you see, and not directly with children.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, of course, that is right! But I hate to think of welfare officers — Now I have every respect for police officers, constables, but I don't want to have little children look at a welfare officer and say — here is a constable coming — You see we all had our fears of constables as children, and rightly so because we were frightened by our parents who threatened to call the policeman if we were not good boys.

Premier Smallwood: And often with the boogie man.

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Under this amendment — In the original act, 1952, there is provision for the appointment of welfare officers. That is redundant because there is a provision made in the Departmental Act for the appointment of such welfare officers as are necessary. Now the amendment, section 7 (1) and (2) that is exactly the same as in the original Act, section 8 (1) and (2).

Mr. Hollett: Do read it.

Mr. Hefferton: Every welfare officer duly appointed under the provisions of this Act has, in the discharge of his or her duties as such welfare officers, all the powers of a constable and is protected from a civil action for anything done in bona fide exercise of the powers conferred by this Act. And subsection (2) — Every welfare officer has all of the powers of a constable under the provisions of the School Attendance Act — So that, Sir, the only reason why this is brought

in is because of repetition and redundancy because it is already provided for.

Mr. Hollett: I am against repetition. Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

COASTING VESSELS BOUNTIES:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Payment of Bounties on the Construction of Coasting Vessels".

Clauses (1) and (2) read and carried: Clause (3) read:

3. (1) Any person who intends to apply for the payment of bounty shall, subject to subsection (3), before he lays the keel, apply to the Minister for a permit to build the vessel in respect of which he intends to apply for bounty, and shall, in respect of the vessel, at the time he makes his application supply the Minister with:

- (a) plans and specifications of the vessel or a model on a scale approved by the director of sufficient data from which plans may be prepared;
- (b) information on the make and type of engine to be installed;
- (c) such information as the Minister may require to show the applicant's ability to complete the building of the vessel; and
- (d) any other information which the Minister requires.

3. (2) To qualify for a permit an applicant:

- (a) who is an individual must be and shall satisfy the Minister that he is:
 - (i) a British subject and a bona fide resident of Newfoundland;
 - (ii) applying on his own behalf and not on behalf of some other person;
- (b) which is a partnership, company, co-operative society or any other body, whether or not it is incorporated, shall satisfy the Minister;
 - (i) that at least fifty per cent of its membership is made up of British subjects who are bona fide residents of Newfoundland or that the controlling interest in it is and will continue to be held by British subjects who are bona fide residents of Newfoundland;
 - (ii) that it is applying on its own behalf and not on behalf of some other person;

(c) shall satisfy the Minister that he has had experience in the coasting trade; and

(d) shall give an undertaking to the Minister that during the period of ten years from the date of final payment of bounty he will in all respects comply with the Canada Shipping Act insofar as it applies to the vessel.

3. (3) An applicant may, with the approval of the Minister, assign his permit to another person if that other person is eligible for a permit, notwithstanding that construction of the vessel in respect of which the permit was granted has begun and this Act applies to that other person and to the vessel as if that other person had been the first applicant.

Mr. Hollett: If I may and if it is not too late, I would like a moment before going on to refer back to the last paragraph in clause (2) — If I have your permission, Sir. Clause (2) — "Vessel" includes every description of vessel suitable in the opinion of the Minister for use in the coasting trade and propelled by means other than sail. Surely a man who wants to sail without an engine is entitled to the bounty?

Premier Smallwood: Under this he is not.

Mr. Hollett: I am wondering why.

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): It is not practical, not today.

Mr. Hollett: We sailed in vessels all our lives.

Premier Smallwood: But this is an age of hydrogen and atomic bombs, and big space ships and jet propulsion.

Mr. Hollett: This does not refer to any engine in any shape or form.

Premier Smallwood: Then think about a definition of a boat. A boat must be a boat, not a sailboat nor a rowboat — We might go back to the galley, I suppose.

Mr. Hollett: In other words you have to have an engine before collecting the bounty.

Hon. J.R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): A schooner can have sails with an engine.

Mr. Hollett: You get a bounty on the engine too. I thought this was just a bounty on the building of ships. I am sorry the Minister of Fisheries is not here. I would like to have his opinion on this.

Premier Smallwood: This Bill is his opinion.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder if the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Strickland), might comment on that — he is an old sailor, or seaman.

Premier Smallwood: We have another, the member for Labrador North.

Mr. Earl Windsor (Labrador North): Mr. Chairman, I don't think it would be very practical today for a man to build a sailing ship. It is very much outdated. And if a man is going to collect a bounty on a sailing ship, I am afraid he is going to use her as a yacht rather than as a way of making a living or contributing to the economy of the country. As far as I am concerned, I agree with that section of the Bill very much. I don't think there is any practical purpose in providing a bounty for sailing ships in 1959. That could have served a purpose 20 years ago, but I am afraid it is a little late in coming now for sailing ships, but not for diesel power and engines.

Mr. Uriah Strickland (Bonavista South): Mr. Chairman, I already talked to the Minister on this and other aspects of this Bill. And if a man today would build a sailing vessel and put it in the trade, his earning power would be reduced to nil. Before he begins he must have power and more power, if he is going to do anything in the coasting trade in Newfoundland this year, next year or in the years to come. I would suggest that he should be compelled to have sails with the engine, in case of an engine break down. That would be alright. There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Hollett: Why is it not in the Act?

Mr. Strickland: I think it is in Section 7.

Mr. Hollett: I think it is a pity a man can't build a nice sailing vessel. I want to say this for the coast-wise trade — if it referred just to fishermen, I don't believe it is possible to build a fishing vessel today with an engine and prosecute the fishery successfully.

Premier Smallwood: Because of the cost?

Mr. Hollett: Yes.

Mr. Smallwood: I admire the spirit of the Leader of the Opposition in raising that point. I believe he raised it entirely from warm sympathy for the people who sail ships, and he had not given it as much thought as he has in the last few minutes, but it came from a good spirit. Clauses (2) through (7) carried:

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Chairman, it might be a good moment in which to draw the attention of the Committee and the people generally to the fact that in all Canada (and I think I am correct. I know I was correct two or three years ago) there is still no manufacturer of small diesel engines, marine engines, from end to end of Canada. There is no manufacturer of small diesel engines for the use of lighting plants and engines for fishing boats and for small schooners, small vessels, and compressors and many other engines of many types. The diesel power has to be imported. It is imported from England, from Germany and possibly from Japan — I don't know, but there are none made in Canada — I do know that. About three years ago, I collected the figures of all of Canada, showing the consumption of diesel power up to 50 horsepower and 100 horsepower. Taking 100 horsepower as being the maximum size of a small diesel, I procured the figures for the consumption in all of Canada and went to the busiest man in Europe, in Germany, in the manufacture of air-cooled diesels, and did my best to get his firm to come into Canada. I had to go as far as to get the government of Canada to agree to consider (for the amount of the tariff) to consider an engine as made in Canada if no more than, I think, 60% of it was actually made in Canada, allowing as much as 40% of it to be imported and assembled in Canada. Of course, what I was trying to do at this time was to get a small industry here

in Newfoundland for the manufacture of diesels. Strictly speaking, this has nothing to do with Clause (7), but it shows that, even in Newfoundland, which is one of the smallest of the Provinces, and not the most up to date of all 10 of them, diesel power has become essential in coasting vessels, and is to be regarded now as a legal requirement, insofar as a bounty to be paid is concerned.

Mr. Hollett: Before carrying that, what provision, if any, is made if a man goes to work and builds a coasting vessel and conforms to the act but has not sufficient funds to get the necessary engine? He can't get a bounty until he gets the engine. Has that been taken care of by any legislation here or in any other way? A man who is going to build has to assured — :

Premier Smallwood: I don't know what the answer is to that. As far as boats — fishing boats are concerned — I know the answer. I am afraid, I don't know the answer for coasting vessels. The government of Canada, if the boat is not more than 60 feet long, pays a very substantial bounty and the government of Newfoundland pays also another very substantial bounty. The two governments together already pay out very large amounts of money to help a man build a fishing boat, including the cost of the engine. Then, in addition to that there are loans, in addition to the bounties, from the two governments. There are also substantial loans from the Loan Board operated by the Newfoundland government. What the position is for a coasting boat I frankly don't know.

Mr. Hollett: Could we have it tomorrow?

Premier Smallwood: I don't know if the Minister will be here tomorrow but as soon as he is here I will see that the information is forthcoming.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): May I draw the attention of the house to the time?

Premier Smallwood: I did not know it would be so long. We were hoping to get through this Bill and then have a recess. Perhaps, having passed Section (6) we may have a recess now.
House recessed for 10 minutes:

After recess, on motion, Clauses (6) through (10) carried:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, the bounty is payable on ships used mainly in the coasting trade. I was just going to make a remark. If the owner of such a vessel can use her in the seal fishery, is there any objection to using her at the codfishery?

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): I am quite sure that any particular ship built under this bounty for part of the season, the shipping season, that would be considered for qualification. The seal fishery, I understand, is specifically mentioned. It seems to be desirable that the seal fishery would be specifically mentioned in the Act. There has been some difference of opinion sometimes as to whether a seal is a fish or a mammal. Whatever it might be, a coasting vessel could be used at the seal fishery. It is specifically mentioned. On motion clauses (11) through (16) carried:

Mr. P. J. Canning (Placentia West): Before that last clause is carried, if I may I would like to ask a question under Clause (9). I know I should have asked it then. The Bill seems a good thing but I am wondering if the Minister of Fisheries approached the Federal government with regard to the re-pair bounty. The Federal government gives a considerable bounty for fishing vessels, and I cannot see why they should object, if they are approached. I would like to know if they have been approached and if not why not. If not, I think it would be advisable to approach them before passing this Bill.

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Chairman, officials of my department have discussed the matter of bounties with the Federal department concerned on several occasions. So far, we have not been successful in being able to persuade them to pay any bounty on ships built for coastwise trade, as distinguished from fishing. I may say that is the reason why, in this Bill, we are proposing to pay rates of \$300 a ton on vessels built for coasting trade, which brings the total bounty to be paid in line with the combined amounts obtainable on fishing vessels, which come in part from the Federal government and in

part from the Provincial government. The two payments together total \$325 and we are preparing to pay rates of \$300, because there is so far nothing being considered by the Federal government.

Mr. Canning: They have refused?

Mr. Cheeseman: Well we have not been able to induce them to agree. We are still pursuing it.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment; carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Validate Assessments Made in the Towns of Harbour Grace, Placentia and Freshwater": Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment; carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the City of Corner Brook Act, 1958":

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment; carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Assessment Amendment Act, 1958":

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment; carried:

Motion, that the Committee rise and report progress, carried:

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

(Mr. Clarke (deputy speaker) in the Chair):

Mr. Eric Jones (Burin): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed the following Bills without amendment. Bills No. 27, 33, 36, 38, 40, 44, and 46.

On motion, report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow:

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered certain other matters referred to them and report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again on Bills Nos. 11 and 34.

On motion, report received, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow:

BILLS PASSED:

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Food and Drug Act" —

On motion, Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the M. James Boylen (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955" — On motion, Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and Advocate Mines Limited" — On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title to be as on the order paper.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day to stand deferred and that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock. My reason for proposing Wednesday rather than tomorrow is that the Maritimes are supposed to be closed in today and St. John's will be shortly, tonight certainly, so that those people who are coming from the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Pickands — Mather & Company, who are supposed to get here tonight, will not now get here tonight but are expected to get here tomorrow.

I said here on Friday, when I introduced these seven bills, I did not propose to ask the house to go ahead with the debate until first of all the members of the house had an opportunity to meet with those companies and question them and satisfy themselves on the different points of the seven bills before the House. The proposal was that we should meet tomorrow morning for that purpose and then perhaps tomorrow afternoon be ready to go forward with the debate. Now the meeting with these companies cannot take place, practically speaking, before tomorrow night, probably. I hope that would be convenient for the Opposition — tomorrow night. If they get here in the forenoon tomorrow, perhaps it would be feasible to have the meeting tomorrow morning. At all events, I thought we would not meet here tomorrow. That would leave us free for a meeting with these companies, for the meeting of members of the house with officials or representatives of these companies. I would certainly hope we

could meet with them and put to them any questions that hon. members may desire, to enable us to go forward with the debate on Wednesday afternoon, because we will be quite busy if we are to get this heavy legislation (57 Bills) out of the way. This involves several railways in Labrador, I think, one or two branches and these two towns. If we can get this out of the way really there won't be an awful lot left for presentation to the house apart from the budget and the estimates — and if we could get all our legislation cleared up, leaving just the budget and the estimates, the house could concentrate on that, and consider the whole financial position, as we are bound to do, when we discuss the budget and estimates.

Therefore, Sir, I move that the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock. If hon. members will give me permission to do that, I will notify them sometime tomorrow as to when we can have that meeting with these representatives. The hon. member for St. John's East has been in court the last two or three days. He was not here on Friday and therefore may not have heard that representatives of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, Pickands — Mather and that whole group, Pickands — Mather, the Steel Company of Canada, Youngstown, Canadian Javelin, all these groups represented in these bills are coming here, at my request, so that they can sit in, and the members of the house can put any question they like — so that the legislation will be thoroughly understood.

Mr. James Higgins (St. John's East): Where would that meeting be? We had one in the other chamber before — This might be better?

Premier Smallwood: This might be a more cosy room. There won't be as many people present, perhaps, at this meeting as there were at others, and there will be less jet-propulsion at this one.

However, this is my motion.

On motion, all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock.

Wednesday, May 6, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. W. Smallwood (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Brighton Island. The prayer of the petitioners is for the establishment of a bait depot on the island. Now, Sir, this is a Federal matter, and it is my understanding that it is, and I do support the prayer of the petition. I realize that this house can do nothing about it, and therefore I ask that the prayer of the petition be referred to the Provincial Department of Fisheries to be forwarded by them to the House of Commons. On motion, petition received for referral to the Provincial Department of Fisheries for forwarding to the Federal Department of Fisheries.

Hon. S.J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of the shopkeepers and storekeepers of Sunnyside and Come-by-Chance. The prayer of the petition is that this be declared an area under the Shop Closing Act. I might add that this particular matter has been under discussion for a considerable time by the Department of Provincial Affairs, and I hope enactment may be brought about as soon as possible. I support the prayer of the petitioners, Mr. Speaker, and ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. J.R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Parson's Pond in St. Barbe district. The petitioners pray that assistance be given by this government and the Federal government towards the erection of a cold storage plant in that vicinity. They would like to have that plant, Sir, available for bait as well as fresh frozen fish. They have there, right at their doorstep, Mr. Speaker, an ample supply of halibut, lobster and salmon. Sir, I support this petition with all my strength

and do hope that this year the department concerned will see fit to start the erection of this cold storage.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that is another petition which should more properly have been addressed to the House of Commons. We will accept it, and ask that it be referred to the Provincial Department of Fisheries to be forwarded to the Federal Government department. It is a joint venture, really. On motion, petition received for referral to the Provincial Department of Fisheries for forwarding to the Federal Department concerned.

Hon. C.H. Ballam (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Meadows and other people living on the south side of the centre of the north side of Bay of Islands. Their petition is that the Department of Highways change its policy in regard to building in this particular area to give prominent consideration to that section between Summerside and Gillams Brook. This area every year gives so much trouble that it means that the road has to be closed, thereby cutting off all of the people who live for 20 miles outside this particular area. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am familiar with the area and that I agree with these people this should be done. They are trying to do a roads program with a maintenance crew, and in the 35 miles from the Humber River to Cox's Cove this area happens to be right in the centre, and if this particular job is to be left to the maintenance crew it will not be done for many years, thereby isolating another 20 miles of this particular road.

I certainly agree with the petitioners, and I would ask that the department concerned would give every consideration to this petition. I can assure you that, only last week, the Church of England school burnt down in Meadows and right at this particular time, a time when some 50 or 60 students could not take their exams, except through the co-operation of other denominations — This school could probably have been saved if the fire equipment which was called from Corner Brook could have proceeded over this section of road in response to the call; but because of this bad section of road they could not reach the area in which the school

was burning and therefore the school was completely destroyed. I agree with the petitioner, Mr. Speaker, and would request that this petition be referred to the department concerned, and I seriously hope and strongly suggest that something should be done in the matter. On motion, petition received, for referral to the department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

LEGISLATION:

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries): Tabled answers to Nos. 24, 32. (see Appendix)

Hon. F.W. Rowe (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer here to questions No. 7 and No. 14. I don't know the date of the Order Paper. I have lost track of it. At any rate, the question was asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition in connection with the construction of roads and pavements of roads and places paved and also in connection with the purchase of machinery by the Department of Highways and the type of machinery, cost and suppliers of the machinery. I may say in connection with the number of miles of road actually constructed by the Department of Highways, the number of miles paved by contractors is 70 and five by the Department of Highways, 75 miles of road paved last year. I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have endeavoured to answer these questions as fully as possible and in the spirit in which they were asked, and I am very happy to do so because the Government is quite proud of its achievement in the matter of road construction and paving, and also of the new program towards maintenance instituted last year under the direction of my immediate predecessor in the Department, (Mr. Power) whose resignation was so much regretted by this house only a few days ago.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposi-

tion): Mr. Speaker, I ask your permission to speak to a point of privilege: It is in connection with a newspaper item which came out today, and over the Doyle News Bulletin, purporting that the hon. member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) — (In order to make my statement as quickly as possible I ask your permission, Sir, to read that statement). This is the statement which came over the "Gerald Doyle News Bulletin" purported to be made by the hon. member for Placentia West.

"In the House of Assembly some weeks ago I made a statement to the effect that during the past 10 years, there has been lacking the spirit of close co-operation between the Provincial government and the Federal government of Canada. It is now evident that this condition has deteriorated even further in recent months to the point of a practical blackout with Ottawa"...

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): What is the hon. gentleman quoting now?

Mr. Hollett: The hon. member for Placentia West — I repeat: "It is now evident this condition has deteriorated even further in recent months to the point of a practical blackout with Ottawa. This predicament combined with the fact that differences exist between the local P.C. Party and the party at Ottawa can only result in at least temporary, if not permanent, loss to our Province." And here, Sir, is the point at which the point of privilege arises, "Possibly to further aggravate the uncomfortable position, the "PC's" at the provincial level have melted to the point where legislation is passed with little comment, with not usually more than two Opposition members present."

The point, Mr. Speaker, to which I want to take exception is — I want to ask: Who speaks for the government, on the opposite side? Is it the hon. member for Placentia West or is it the Premier? The Premier told me a few days ago there was no difference of opinion, as far as certain things were concerned, with regard to here and Ottawa. But has the hon. member also the right to say this: that a difference exists between the local "PC" party and their counterpart at Ottawa. If he has, he knows more about it than I do. And, Sir, I take exception to the audacity, the brazenness of any man on the

opposite side to do that publicly over any radio station here in Newfoundland. It is a most ridiculous thing. A year old child would not make a statement like that, "than further to aggravate the uncomfortable situation, the P.C. Opposition at the provincial level has melted to the point where legislation is passed with little comment from not usually more than two Opposition members present in the Chamber." Now, Sir, that is an indecent attack on a small Opposition.

Premier Smallwood: I am sorry, I missed the first few sentences. This statement was made where and when?

Mr. Hollett: The "Doyle's News Bulletin" and by the hon. member for Placentia West.

Mr. Smallwood: It was not made here in this house?

Mr. Hollett: On the Doyle News Bulletin today.

Premier Smallwood: I am sorry — I did not hear the news today.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand this was a statement that was made by the news commentator and which is supposed to have been made to the news commentator by the hon. member for Placentia West? Is that the situation?

Mr. Hollett: It was brought to the station, I understand, in the form of a written or typewritten statement, as the case might be, by the hon. member for Placentia West. Now, Sir, on this point of privilege — I think if any member of the opposite side, or this side, wants to express an opinion like that, he should do so in the house, and not go to the news stations and ask them to publish it — And this criticism of the Opposition — that we usually only have two here — Everyone knows one of our colleagues was confined to bed for two or three days because of the flu, and another member had not returned from the South and another member, for two or three days, was busy in the courts — and for any member on the opposite side to take advantage of a situation like that to make a statement publicly over the air to the people of Newfoundland is disgusting and uncalled for, and I am very

much surprised to know it would be tolerated on the other side of the house. If any person on this side made a statement like that about the government, I would not sit with them — I would not sit with them — I think it is most ridiculous — I have three honourable men, as honourable as any man in this country, and then to have a member on the opposite side to circulate a statement like that — I think it is disgusting. They are members of the house, representing the people of Newfoundland and no member, cabinet member or private member, has the right to say a thing like that and take upon himself the right to say that relationship between the "PC" Party in Newfoundland and in Ottawa is strained — It is disgusting. How could he know anything about it? For any private member to take upon himself the right to say a thing like that publicly, over the air, to all the people of this country, to me shows a lack of discipline in the Liberal Party here in Newfoundland. I am surprised, and will state my opinion here. I am disgusted with it, and do hope nothing like that will happen again. Surely any man opposite who wants to criticize us can get up in the house and do so.

That, Sir, is my point of privilege: — I do hope it won't happen again — My colleagues work, we all work — and I say that legislation is passed with little comment — in other words, we don't even ask a question and don't try to amend anything. Why the other day when there was a most important piece of legislation for the building of coastwise vessels the hon. member for Placentia West was not even in the house, and took good care he was not — He was afraid he might say something if he was. He was late. He did not say anything — I object very strongly to this, Sir — That is my point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Before any one else speaks I would like to say this concerns a statement made outside of the house, or supposed to be made outside of the house, by a private member of the house. I think, in view of the connection, the hon. Leader of the Opposition had a point of privilege that was well taken, and I shall give the hon. member, who is supposed to have made this statement, a chance to reply, but naturally we cannot have a general debate, a free-for-all on this matter at this time. Does the hon.

gentleman wish to reply, to explain the statement?

Mr. P.J. Canning (Placentia West): The item to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred was given to one of the news reporters as my personal opinion. I feel, Sir, this is a democracy, and I have every right to state anything I have stated there, and as long as I am in public life I will go on making such statements — The hon. gentleman referred to a Bill — I was in the house before the Bill was passed, and I would say I asked the only constructive question or made the only constructive comment made on the Bill when I asked if Ottawa had been approached to give a subsidy towards this repair bounty of building bounty.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I don't know if that closes the matter or if anybody else —

Mr. Speaker: Well the hon. member made the point that he was giving a personal opinion, he was in no way speaking as a spokesman for anybody else, for the government nor any one else. Of course, what he said is a matter of opinion and I cannot decide between matters of opinion. I don't think that the matter referred to deals with any privilege. It was not made in the house, and I don't think it can be construed as going against a privilege of the house.

Mr. Hollett: Putting slurs on members of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: I do think the hon. Leader of the Opposition dealt with the matter very well, as he had every right to do from his place in the house, to contradict it. I think the point was well taken.

Mr. Higgins: Sir, with your permission I would merely wish to suggest to the hon. member, when he expresses his right to express his opinion he should remember there are people on the other side also who are absent from the house on many occasions, for obvious and proper reasons. I may say we might quite reasonably ask where was the hon. Speaker last week. Everyone knows the hon. Speaker was engaged in matters of considerable importance. And I may say, when I am absent

from this house, my whereabouts are always ascertainable.

Mr. John Forsey (Humber East): As this was stated as an opinion, I do wish to disassociate myself with these remarks as having had no part in them, and I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition entirely.

Mr. Speaker: Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

Since no other honourable member wishes to speak the motion is that this report be received and adopted. Motion carried.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): Will Your Honour arrange with Government House for the presentation of the reply?

Mr. Speaker: Very well, I shall notify the hon. members when His Honour is ready to receive the Address in Reply in person, as has been the custom.

LEGISLATION: NALCO:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951."

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 28 is, I believe, a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951," and was introduced by the hon. the Premier a few days ago in conjunction with some other bills having to do with the mineral and timber rights on the Labrador and also the construction of a railway. I speak only to the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act."

Now, Sir, let me say here at the beginning that I feel almost like a person speaking at the demise of somebody we have known for quite a while and perhaps somebody that we did not like very well at times, when I refer to that NALCO Act. There is so much that can be said on the NALCO Act, Sir, that I hesitate to say all that I ought to say, perhaps because of its association with various new corporations which have been introduced into the development of Newfoundland. The NALCO Act, as we all know, was passed on the 22nd of June,

1951. It had then as directors, the Premier, the Attorney General and Dr. Valdmánis, Chesley Pippy, Eric Bowring, H.M. Lewin, Claude Richardson, Lyttleton B. Gould, George McIntosh and Col. Harold Griffin. This corporation at that particular time stated as its reason for being introduced — "Whereas it is expedient for promotion of industry and economic development of the Province of Newfoundland and for the development of its natural resources and improvement of the standard of living of the people of the Province that a corporation be formed with the powers and be granted the concessions and rights hereinafter respectively described and set forth."

This Act, Sir, gave to the corporation certain rights. I believe it gave them the mining rights and wood rights if you like, timber rights to various areas in Newfoundland and Labrador, to the tune of some 24,000 or over 24,000 square miles. It was an Act of 39 sections, and it stated, at the outset practically, that it was a Crown Corporation — and the members of the house, and I refer particularly to the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Attorney General, on many occasions stated during the introduction of that Bill, that it was a Crown Corporation owning 90% of the shares and it would always remain a Crown Corporation. And I quote here from page 987 of Hansard that year in the words of the Premier — as follows:

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order? I am a little embarrassed in rising to this particular point of order because I would not want the Leader of the Opposition for one moment to think that I have any desire to restrict in the least his freedom and the freedom of his colleagues and the freedom of this house to debate the Bill now before us. But I do suggest that the hon. gentleman is out of order if he attempts to debate the NALCO Act or to review the history of NALCO. I suggest that it would be in order, and he must debate this Bill — this Bill — I am prepared to concede that in debating this Bill he should have considerable leeway in debating the six other Bills also before the house, but that he is strictly out of order, completely out of order and so would I be and so would any hon. member be if he attempted in this debate to discuss the NALCO Act or the history of NALCO.

That was done last session when the debate took place on a Bill authorizing the Government to sell its shares in NALCO. That Bill was brought in and was debated and adopted and became law. Now we are not debating that today nor in this session. We are debating certain amendments and it is these amendments only, I hold, that are debatable, with this exception — In debating these proposed amendments hon. members should be allowed considerable latitude in debating the six other Bills not yet become law but now before the house, having received first reading. Now the hon. gentleman will not find himself limited in debating this Bill by not being able to debate the history of NALCO. This is a Bill to provide for certain specific, spelled-out, amendments, and there is ample room for debate.

Mr. Speaker: I think I might at this time ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition if he intends to follow the pattern set by the Premier when he spoke on this Bill in giving a review of all of the other Bills that followed, or whether he was going to speak to this Bill alone?

Mr. Hollett: This Bill alone, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: In that case I would suggest to the hon. member he would give only just as much of the history of NALCO as is necessary to lead up to this Bill, just bearing in mind he is debating the second reading of this particular Bill.

Mr. Hollett: I appreciate the point of order raised by the hon. the Premier. I appreciate the fact that the history of NALCO is so distasteful to him and to the whole Government.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order — Is that a fair and honourable comment on my point of order — I rose to make this point of order, not that the history of NALCO is distasteful to me — On the contrary I am very proud of the part I have played in the formation and upbuilding of NALCO. My point of order is that he is out of order in debating the history of NALCO and the NALCO Act. Whether it is distasteful or tasteful to me, it is out of order

and it is not proper to debate it, under the rules of the house, that is all.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition probably that last remark was uncalled for; There was nothing in what the Premier said to indicate such was his position. I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would continue from where he left off, without labouring the point of the history of NALCO, but maybe from now jumping into the middle of the Bill itself.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I was only giving some of the history of NALCO for the benefit of some of the members on the opposite side who have probably never even read the 1951 Act and all the amendments thereto. One realizes today, Sir, as far as NALCO is concerned we are sitting at its demise, its burial, as far as Newfoundland is concerned. It was, as I said, 90% owned by the government, a government corporation owned 90% by the government, and it was always to remain so, at 90%. Today, NALCO is no longer a Newfoundland owned Corporation. Newfoundland owns not one share and, if I may go back into its history far enough to relate the fact that the last shares were sold last year or the year before, I forget which now, for \$1,200,000 and that \$1,200,000 was forgotten for a while; I will come to that in some other debate, I hope. I want to point out that NALCO today is not the NALCO we all talked about in 1951 and 1952, etc. I was not here in 1951. It is a different Act altogether. It is owned as to 51% by — I don't know who owns it, whether it is Pickands-Mather or whether it is the Wabush Iron. I suspect it is Wabush Iron owns 51% today, and I believe Javelin, which is John C. Doyle, owns some 40% of the shares and the rest is owned by Harriman Ripley, Gould and some others who bought them in the first instance. \$100,000 was first brought by them. But when we look at the NALCO Act in relationship to Newfoundland we have to remember it is no longer what it was. The government of Newfoundland has no control whatsoever over NALCO today. Today, NALCO has been given the concessions owned by the government in the past and then the government has now sold out all the concessions granted to NALCO at that

particular time. I am very sorry that the hon. the Premier would prefer that we don't go into the life history of this child.

Premier Smallwood: It is not that I would not, but the laws of the house would not permit.

Mr. Hollett: The laws of the house certainly permit the history of any Bill up here for amendment.

Mr. Smallwood: Yes, the history of the Bill, not NALCO.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition is going along very well.

Mr. Hollett: Until rudely interrupted. I would like a ruling as to whether or not, in discussing an amendment to any Act, the members speaking cannot go into the history of the Act — Is he disallowed?

Premier Smallwood: The NALCO Act, no, of course not.

Mr. Speaker: I think I explained my position there a moment ago — The Leader of the Opposition, in my opinion, has given the history of the Bill. He had brought us up to a point in the present-day life of the company and he was continuing the debate. I thought I explained that, and that he was continuing the debate, having brought the house up to the present position of the company as named in this Bill. I would suggest that he continue from where he left off a moment ago.

Mr. Hollett: At the moment, Sir, I find great difficulty in continuing. The hon. Speaker has not given a ruling as to how far back in history I can go.

Mr. Speaker: It is very difficult for the Speaker to do that. I think the Leader of the Opposition can go far enough back in the history of the Bill to acquaint the house with the situation as it exists today. I think he has done that. That was my impression.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, but the hon. the Premier took exception to what I was going to read from Hansard relative to the fact that

NALCO was always to be a Crown Corporation.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, to that Point of Order. Maybe I can help Your Honour. There was a NALCO Act a number of years ago, passed by this house after long debate, and it became law. Then there were amendments made from time to time. Last year, a year ago, there was another amendment authorizing the government to sell its shares in NALCO. That became law after a debate. Now we have another Bill to provide for some other amendments. From time to time as amendments are brought in, is it proper and in order to have the whole story all over again? Is that proper in parliamentary law? Under the rules I hold that it is not. Here is a Bill which, for 15 or 16 pages, allows for changes of principle. Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not touched on them yet. He has not come to them yet. He is permitted, I believe, to speak for as long as he likes; the next three days, five days, three weeks if he wishes. Is it possible or proper for him to speak at any length he likes on the history of NALCO and the NALCO Act, not the Bill but the Act, the one that is law, passed sessions and sessions ago? Is he not confined to debate the principle of the Bill and not an Act which became law when it was passed and received Royal Assent? Is he not limited in debate to a discussion of these principles and not the NALCO Act generally, and what it embodies; without going into the right or wrong of the government having sold the shares; the right or wrong of their having ceased to be a Crown Corporation? Is not that all over and done with? Was it not debated, passed and adopted by this house as a law? And is it debatable now today? It seems to me there ought to be no difficulty in having a ruling on that.

Mr. Speaker: The position is not quite as simple as that. If this Bill to which the Premier refers has been brought in at this present session, than it would definitely infringe a rule of previous debate, but "the Rule of Previous Debate" refers to Bills brought in at the present session. If this Bill, the NALCO Bill, had been brought in at the present session then no debate on it would be permitted whatsoever, it would be finished, it would be done with as far as this

session is concerned. But that does not preclude bringing up a Bill passed in the last session or the session before.

Premier Smallwood: It does not preclude what?

Mr. Speaker: Mentioning a Bill.

Premier Smallwood: How about debating it?

Mr. Speaker: I was about to proceed to that point. Now just exactly how much leeway any member should have in debating a particular Bill, and in so doing refer to the Bill passed in a previous session, is more or less one of how far it is necessary for him to bring the house up to date on the Bill that is being discussed. I think that he should be given enough leeway to describe the situation, without going fully into details of that particular Bill — That is what I tried to say just now.

Premier Smallwood: Your Honour, on that point, there is nothing in this Bill at all about selling the government shares in NALCO. It is not referred to at all, not touched on, not dealt with.

Mr. Hollett: Who said anything about it?

Premier Smallwood: The hon. gentleman was proceeding to debate that, and had already begun to debate the question of NALCO having ceased to be a Crown Corporation.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Premier Smallwood: He had begun to debate the question, which is not in the Bill, the question as to whether or not NALCO should have continued to be a Crown Corporation, and whether the government should or should not have sold the shares. These matters had been disposed of in the last session and are not mentioned in this session, in this Bill. It is not an issue now before the house. It is not in this Bill anywhere now. Now the hon. gentleman may or may not wish to debate the principle in this Bill. Up to now he has not touched upon it, but has dwelt solely upon the question as

to whether or not the government should have sold the shares they had in NALCO.

Mr. Speaker: That brings me to the point of relevance — As I said — in discussing any Bill, whether in Committee or at Second Reading, the rule of relevancy applies. It can be more easily seen in Second Reading because there the house confines itself to discussing the principle of the Bill. Therefore, I gave it as my ruling that I thought any member discussing a Bill should only give enough of the history to bring the house up to date, and he should not infringe upon the rule of relevancy. If this Bill does not speak about the selling of shares or the reason for selling of shares, in that case, I would suggest that there is no point in discussing it, because it is not relevant. In these things, hon. members are governed by common sense as to what is relevant and what is not relevant. I suggest that the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who has the floor, continue, and that he would confine his remarks to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I abide by your ruling, but I objected in the first place to the Bill we have before us today and the one I am supposed to speak on, which states specifically in Section 8 (a) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Act, 1951, that — surely goodness, I can go into the history of this and all the other sections of the 1951 Act, if I am to discuss the principle involved in this amendment. And I go on further to the Schedule under the Statutory Agreement in this particular Bill we have before us, the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act.

“And Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, a corporation constituted by Section (2) of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951, the Act No. 88 of 1951, as amended by the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited (Amendment) Act, 1952, the Act No. 3 of 1952, and as further amended by the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited (Amendment) Act, 1957, the Act No. 83 of 1957” — all these Acts are mentioned in the Bill before us, and according to the ruling I cannot refer —

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member will for-

give me — I think he has done that very thing. It is my recollection that, up to this point, he has told the house when the Bill was passed; he has given some of the history which lead up to the passing of the Bill, he has made the point that the government no longer owns shares in it, that the government has sold its shares to certain companies. I think in doing that he has brought us up to the present session. I don't think it is very important what the Premier or anybody else said in 1951, at this stage.

Mr. Hollett: That is the object — I wanted to quote the hon. the Premier. If you, Sir, think that these amendments are not important to this Bill and not relevant let me point out Section (14) of the Bill as amended in 1957, where it says, a total of 26 sections of the said Act are hereby repealed.

Mr. Speaker: But I think that was debated at the time that particular Bill was passed.

Mr. Hollett: But it is still the history of NALCO.

Premier Smallwood: All of this would be very appropriate when debating whether or not we should sell the shares, but is not appropriate to this particular Bill.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest the Hon. Leader of the Opposition continue from this point.

Mr. Hollett: I do not know what point to continue from.

Premier Smallwood: Speak to the Bill.

Mr. Hollett: I am trying to speak to the Bill but no one will allow me — I am speaking to it and am not allowed because the hon. the Premier objects to some quotations I referred to, which he made in 1951.

Mr. Speaker: That is not exactly the position.

Mr. Hollett: It is, practically.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition sees my point of view — That is not exactly the position, and I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to speak to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Hollett: Will I be allowed?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Hollett: Thank you! Well, the principle of this particular Bill, Sir, I presume is the same as the previous Bill — I must not mention dates — That was for the development of the natural resources of Newfoundland

Premier Smallwood: That is not the principle of this Bill, no!

Mr. Hollett: Well, this Bill proposed to make amendments to a Bill which has for its purpose the development of the natural resources of Newfoundland — May I put it that way?

Premier Smallwood: That is right.

Mr. Hollett: And it makes certain amendments, Sir, which I presume will make it much easier for the various companies concerned — which have been brought in through the instrumentality of Mr. John C. Doyle — to go into Labrador, or into Newfoundland, if you like, and establish wood-working industries or paper industries; to open up iron ore mines; to build railways in order to satisfactorily operate or take care of these mines. That is the purpose of this Bill. Also the purpose, I understand it, as it has been outlined in a memorandum given to us by the government, was to incorporate therein limitations on timber exportation and cutting and production, and make provisions more favourable to the government on timber royalties; and there will be an obligation on NALCO, or the operators, to pay to the government 22 cents per ton royalty.

Now, Sir, nobody can object to that. No one can object to a principle which has as its aim and object the development of Labrador. We can object to the royalty, if we so desire. We may say that 22 cents is insufficient, particularly in view of the fact that Canadian Javelin will get 50 cents. Canadian Javelin will get 50 cents on every ton that comes out of Labrador — When I say Canadian Javelin, Sir, actually I mean Mr. John C. Doyle and his associates. They will get 50 cents for every ton of ore which comes out of Labrador whereas we here in Newfoundland, the people, will get 22 cents.

Premier Smallwood: Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him — On Bell Island there were two companies, as the honourable gentleman knows, DOSCO and Nova Scotia Steel. The hon. gentleman may be startled to learn that one of these two companies always paid and continues to pay to the other 50 cents a ton royalty for all the ore that the second company mined. DOSCO pays, I think to Nova Scotia Steel, 50 cents a ton on every ton of iron ore that DOSCO takes out of those parts of the mine that belonged in the days gone by to Nova Scotia Steel and may still belong; 50 cents a ton royalty, apart from what they pay to the government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Hollett: Well, I thank the hon. the Premier for that information. But, Sir, I do remember that hon. the Premier, in times past, criticizing the A.N.D. Company, or at least the government that brought in the A.N.D. Company and Bowaters and others; criticizing them on account of the fact that the natural resources of Newfoundland were given away to these great corporations; they were contributing nothing to the welfare of the country but royalties and so on, and never would it be allowed to happen under his government, never!

Mr. Smallwood: And 22 cents a ton is not nothing!

Mr. Hollett: I say any man, or company of men, getting 50 cents a ton for every ton they got out of Labrador will do very well out of Newfoundland. I would not say Newfoundland is doing too well with 22 cents. Why should a company such as Javelin demand and receive 50 cents a ton on every ton of ore which comes out of Labrador whereas the people of this country, who own the property, get only 22 cents? If I were to oppose the principle of this Bill, I would have to oppose that. Now, I do know that Mr. Doyle and Javelin have been promoting the assets which we have in Labrador, and I know also that they are being very well paid for it. I have no objections to their being very well paid. But there are certain things in the history of this NALCO Act which are so startling that the members of the opposite side do not want to hear of them. That is tragic in a way. I believe the government were acting in good faith in the

past, in 1951 and thereafter, when they negotiated this NALCO Act. But I do believe they were taken advantage of — I repeat, I do believe they were taken advantage of — and once having been taken advantage of, all the amendments in the world cannot completely remedy the scars which will have been made on the production of the wealth of the territory which this Act is concerned with.

I find very little wrong with the amendments, which have been brought in here in this Bill, under the circumstances, i.e. under the circumstances of their having made this agreement with NALCO some several years ago, in 1951. The other day I went down to the Registrar of Deeds, and I went through all the legislation down there, and God knows! There must be 500 folios of leases, licenses and Bills and everything else, which referred to the Labrador. And when I see this small, little strip of land which people like Pickands-Mather and Wabush Iron and others have for development under the leases which have been made, and then think of the huge amount of territory controlled at the present time by people who are not a part of Newfoundland, not Newfoundlanders, never were and never will be Newfoundlanders — They are promoters, gamblers, capitalists, in Canada and the United States — and there are no Newfoundlanders in NALCO. The hon. the Premier gave the names of those directors the other day, which showed all the shares were held outside the country — And these people have the right to negotiate for the sale or lease, or to operate themselves, over an area of some 24,000 or 25,000 square miles in Labrador, without leave or license as far as this country is concerned. They can grant 99 year timber leases, and they can, over a period of 12 to 20 years, explore and plot out the various pieces of land available. They can go and sell it, sell the right to develop it, and Newfoundland has no more say about it. That is the hard part, that is the part I find very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to swallow — To think that 25,000 square miles of — what is the area of Newfoundland itself —? 42,000 square miles I used to learn when a youngster. They have over half as much as the whole of Newfoundland, this group of men who are not Newfoundlanders, I begin to wonder, are we part of Canada? Are we a province of

Canada? — I have to say here today that 25,000 square miles of our territory today, its fate, its destiny, its development, depends on a group of men from the United States mostly. It is quite a thought, Sir, for all of us.

Premier Smallwood: That is so, subject to the conditions laid down in the Bill the hon. gentleman is now debating, the conditions laid down there, what they are to pay for that.

Mr. Hollett: Some 22 cents a ton and a dollar a cord.

Premier Smallwood: Or two dollars, and 8% of the profits in other cases — It is all laid down there.

Mr. Hollett: I know! I don't need to speak of that — That has been talked about so often.

Premier Smallwood: Except today when debating it in the house.

Mr. Hollett: According to the 1951 legislation, and agreements made thereafter with Canadian Javelin, we should have been exporting today about 18 million tons of ore a year from these concessions. The railway is not built yet. But, Sir, as I see it, there is hope, there is hope for the future, and I will say this here — It is my own opinion, and I may be proven wrong, but from what I did hear, and I want to thank the hon. the Premier for arranging for us all to have an interview with the representatives of the various companies, this morning — I was impressed particularly by one or two of the men there who were quite familiar with all the details and who, I believe, are definitely honest and above board. Naturally they want to make a dollar — but I was impressed with the answers which they gave to some of our questions, and I do hope, and I do think that the future is promising. But what I am worried about — these companies to whom we spoke this morning have little small concessions, which I think come to about 20 square miles altogether.

Premier Smallwood: But there is lots of ore in that 20 square miles.

Mr. Hollett: It does not say anything about iron ore.

Premier Smallwood: What do they want the land for? For the sake of the land?

Mr. Hollett: What has NALCO got?

Premier Smallwood: To look for areas. There are areas of a mile or a half a mile that might be valuable.

Mr. Hollett: And development?

Premier Smallwood: Yes development.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am still here although nobody knows it.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, that was not the reason God Almighty planted us here in this country, to divide the country up into strips of 24,000 square miles and hand it out to a bunch in the United States to make millions out of it. I don't think that was the reason. As NALCO was originally intended to be, 99% was government owned, and the government then could always keep control over the issuances of licenses. In this new arrangement the government has no say whatsoever, none whatsoever. If NALCO — and when I say NALCO I mean a group of men in the United States of America — if they find a strip of land of 15 or 50 square miles in the Labrador, on which there is some timber or some iron ore, they then can try to arrange for the development of that, and if they get more than we get, 22 cents a ton, and a dollar a cord if they cut wood, and these amendments here today are simply to aid and abet and to assist — As I said, I find nothing particularly wrong with that. My only complaint is the way NALCO has passed out, passed away.

Premier Smallwood: Passed away ha! ha! ha! The hon. gentleman is humourous.

Mr. Hollett: To Newfoundland there is no humour whatever about it. In the first instance, in 1951 and for a number of years, the hon. the Premier was a director and the hon. the Attorney General was a director and another man, not honourable, was a director, and there were some fine men there, some very fine men there as direc-

tors. Later they had Sir William Stephenson — I am now encroaching on the history of the Bill and had better be careful. Then we had an Act to authorize them to make a loan, and they could not raise the loan or did not raise the loan. Then, Sir, William resigned and so on, and so on. Then Mr. John Doyle met them in Montreal and made arrangements to buy them out, and ever since that time has been buying out and buying out — Now even Mr. Doyle has no control over it. He has done very well out of it, I must say.

On motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes, after which Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I have not very much more to say, because it would be more or less pointless, of course, to say anything, to extract any reaction from the government. But I want to say this — since the amendment was made to the NALCO Act in 1957, the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation has come under the control of a number of companies in the United States of America and in Canada and —

Premier Smallwood: Yes, and Canada.

Mr. Hollett: And Newfoundland has no further say. There are 25,000 square miles of territory to be explored, and I must, in consequence of the fact that the Newfoundland government shares were sold since the amendment in 1957, I must, Sir, with your leave refer to the amendment made in 1957 relative to the objects for which the corporation was incorporated.

Now the objects for which the corporation was incorporated in 1951 were, as I pointed out, to explore, and develop the natural resources of Newfoundland and Labrador. It was just a small paragraph (about so big) — But in 1957, and I am only referring to this because of the fact that since that time the control of NALCO has gone to these various companies in the United States and in Canada — Newfoundland has no further say in that 25,000 square miles. It need not be there at all as far as this government is concerned. These men who control NALCO now are H.G. Hilton, chairman of the Board; Walter Williams; H.C. Jackson; A.S. Glossbrenner; George M. Mackintosh; John C. Doyle; H. LeBrock. They now have

absolute control over the exploration and development of that huge area of the province, whereas in the 1951 Act it merely stated the Corporation was formed to develop the natural resources of the country. Now in 1957, under that Act, it was made possible for the government to sell the shares in NALCO, and since the Act was passed they have been sold and complete control has gone to these people.

I want, Sir, to refer to some of the objects for which the corporation was incorporated. They were to explore and investigate the natural resources of the province of Newfoundland — (by they I mean these people I referred to a moment ago). They were to explore, develop, work, improve, manage, maintain — these people here now and not Newfoundland — to prospect for ore, explore, develop, work, maintain and manage, gold, silver, copper, nickel, etc, and so on and so on. They were, under Section (3), to acquire legal title, and so on. I point out these things because I want everybody in the house to read them. Here we have a number of men in the United States and in Canada who can do all these things with 25,000 square miles of the country. Remember, it is this Government which permits this. They can construct, lay down, erect —

Premier Smallwood: Mr Speaker, is this in order?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would explain how he is tying this in with the principle of this particular Bill?

Mr. Hollett: Sir, there is no principle in the Bill; let us put it that way. There is no longer any principle in the NALCO Act.

Premier Smallwood: The hon. gentleman cannot speak if there is not. That is the only reason for speaking at this stage.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The hon. Leader of the Opposition is discussing the principle of the Bill. On second reading that is all the house can discuss.

Mr. Hollett: The principle is developing the natural resources of Newfoundland.

Premier Smallwood: No.

Mr. Hollett: This amends the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Act, and the principle of that Bill is developing the natural resources of Newfoundland, and Goodness knows why the hon. Speaker is trying to restrict statements with regard to a written law passed in this house. If I cannot refer to it, then, Sir, you had better order me out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition must not take it personally. I am just bound by the rules.

Mr. Hollett: What have the rules to do with this?

Mr. Speaker: The rules of the house have to do with everything done. I do not make the rules. I am merely pointing out the rules to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I am not trying to restrict. The Chair has no reason to restrict him. Sometimes the rules restrict him. I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to just bear that in mind.

Mr. Hollett: I am trying to bear it in mind, Mr. Speaker — Surely I can refer to what NALCO can do. Can I refer to what NALCO can do?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition or any other member ties it up with the principle of this Bill, certainly.

Mr. Hollett: Of course, it belongs. Anything in relation to the Bill has to do with the principle; has to do with development of the natural resources of Newfoundland. I want to point out just what the NALCO people can do. Now it is no longer NALCO as far as Newfoundland is concerned, but a corporation which is operated or owned completely outside of Newfoundland, with control wholly outside Newfoundland to the extent of 24,000 square miles. I am trying to find out what that foreign company or group of companies can do under the NALCO Act — If I am wrong —

Premier Smallwood: It is not the NALCO Act which is being debated, but this Bill.

Mr. Hollett: I don't know why the government is so touchy on that point.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker is not touchy. I merely point out to the hon. Leader of the Opposition he has made that statement at least four times, that NALCO is owned by people outside of Newfoundland. At least four times the hon. Leader of the Opposition has made that statement in this same debate, at least four times, in different ways, this statement has been made.

Mr. Hollett: I do hope, Mr. Speaker, when other people in this house repeat themselves four times and 20 times that the hon. Speaker will draw attention to the fact. We have to drive these things home, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Hollett: I have heard the hon. the Premier — he knows himself.

Premier Smallwood: I am in order when I do.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Hollett: The hon. the Premier has not been in order since being here. He speaks exactly as he wants, how he wants and when he wants, and I pat him on the back. What is he here for?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. the Premier is out of order in interrupting at the present time.

Mr. Hollett: There is no question about it. I want to point out, Sir, I have nothing against this foreign group of companies. I hope they develop the country. I am trying to point out what they can do, over 25,000 square miles of Newfoundland, and am trying to point out what the government did. This government which prated so much about giving away the A.N.D. Company and Bowaters territory and what have you, have done this. These men can lease or license, exchange, hire or otherwise acquire any timber land.

Premier Smallwood: What page is that on?

Mr. Hollett: It is in the 1957 Act.

Premier Smallwood: And that is the one we are debating?

Mr. Hollett: I am referring to the 1957 Amendment to the NALCO Act. They can, under (6) prospect, explore for oil and gas and petroleum.

Premier Smallwood: Is this in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Hollett: I am trying to point out what the NALCO people can do.

Premier Smallwood: And the hon. gentleman is not entitled to do so when that Act was debated. We are now debating a new Bill — and that is what he ought to be debating.

Mr. Hollett: I maintain that the 1957 Act is referred to here under this amendment. If the weather were referred to, we could spend the afternoon talking about the weather.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. gentleman would continue and confine himself to discussing this Bill now, and what this Bill does.

Mr. Hollett: That is exactly what I am trying to do.

Premier Smallwood: You cannot get mad with the hon. Leader of the Opposition. It is impossible to get mad at him.

Mr. Hollett: There is no point in getting mad with anyone in this world. I suppose I am on the right Bill, am I?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Hollett: I wonder — This is an Act further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, Limited, Act, 1951. Here I am referring to the amendments, and every time, I am stopped before I can proceed. What I want to say — this is the NALCO Act, and under this Act any amendments thereto, including the one we have before us — under that they can prospect, explore, drill for and produce and accumulate — they can construct, etc.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, to a Point of Order — Can any member defy the rules like this? I have broken the rules my-

self in the last 10 years, but I have tried in those 10 years to broadly and generally see that the rules are carried out. I don't get too much help. It is not my duty. It is Mr. Speaker's duty.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker is doing his duty — He has pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition on several occasions the need for discussing this Bill and asked him to debate this Bill. I think the Leader of the Opposition is at the moment debating another Bill.

Mr. Hollett: Excuse me! I am not debating any other Bill. I am debating the Act.

Mr. Speaker: This Bill is An Act To Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, Limited Act, Bill No. 28 — I wonder would the hon. Leader of the Opposition turn to it and discuss the principle.

Mr. Hollett: Yes! I take it I am ordered not to refer -

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should read from another Bill.

Mr. Hollett: I am reading from another Act, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, another Act. Take this one! This is the one which is being debated.

Mr. Hollett: To enter into any arrangement with any government or authority municipal or otherwise — I would refer this particularly to members on the opposite side, as a matter of fact I would refer it to all the people of Newfoundland, (page 372 of the Newfoundland Statutes 1957) and there are the reasons for the NALCO Act, when it was in existence. There are 31 sections there, and if you read them you will find out just exactly what can be done by any persons who acquire any interest under this Act or amendments thereto. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is very serious — Mind you, as I said before, I am not objecting to the principle of the Bill before us today, but I want to connect it with the Bills which had gone before and the Acts which were passed previously, because I believe that this amending Bill here has, and will, tend to improve

the situation considerably. That is the point I am trying to get around to, but people seem to object to it. I do say there is in Labrador, Sir, (and this Bill has to do with it) piles of wealth. Nobody knows the extent, not even NALCO, not even John C. Doyle or Javelin; not even Pickands-Mather; not even the Wabush Iron Company — They have no idea what wealth lies down there. They know of some wealth. We know of some wealth. We know there is more there. But, Sir, as I said, I believe that this amendment will help improve the situation as we knew it before. That is my opinion, and for that reason I have no objections to the Bill although some little points may arise in Committee of the Whole.

I am sorry, Sir, if I have in any way infringed upon the authority of the Chair, because I try to respect the Chair. I believe, Sir, you and every member of this side, as well as the other side, have the interest and welfare of Newfoundland and the people at heart. I do believe anything brought in here really is meant for the betterment of our people, but I think it is important that our people do know just what is being done. I do not like to be hindered from saying those things I want to say, which I know are true, or being kept from being a little repetitious. I know there are those who rely on repetition. I never had that bad habit until I learned it after I came into this house.

Premier Smallwood: You are blaming me now?

Mr. Hollett: It is so easy to be repetitious. Anyway, Sir, I won't say anything more on this particular Bill except to say I, and I think my colleagues — I am pretty well sure my colleagues — agree. We are not against the principle. We rather agree with it and hope it will improve the situation considerably.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, at last reached the principle of the Bill, and when he reached that principle he told us all that he supported it. He might have saved a lot of time if he had stated that at the beginning.

Mr. Hollett: I would not have gotten what I wanted.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, in this debate, before any member speaks he ought to say whether he is speaking to the Bill in question or the seven Bills, The Premier, when speaking, spoke to the seven, and I presume any member following has the right to speak to one or to the seven, as he wishes. It is going to be complicated to do the book-keeping.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): If we speak to all seven is there any time limit?

Mr. Curtis: My hon. friend said we were sitting in at the demise of NALCO — "At the demise of NALCO."

Mr. Hollett: As far as Newfoundland is concerned.

Mr. Curtis: We did that at the last session. Well, as far as the government is concerned, it bowed out and private interest took its place. We did that, I say, at the last session. This, today, is rather the resurrection of NALCO — And if my hon. friend will read the 13th chapter, First Corinthians he would know what the resurrection means. This is the resurrection of NALCO.

Now, my hon. friend said that the government had been taken advantage of in NALCO. The object, Sir, of the government in introducing the NALCO Bill has been very effectively worked out. The object that the government has in mind is every day being brought to fruition. Indeed, I would say that the amendment before us now is the consummating act. When NALCO was incorporated, it was true that the government was the majority shareholder. The government was the majority shareholder because the government wanted to see that that area was developed — explored and developed. That has been done, not in its entirety but considerable money has been spent and considerable exploration has taken place on the Labrador as a result of NALCO's inception. Far from being ashamed, Mr. Speaker, of anything that NALCO has done, I honestly think that the Newfoundland of the future will some day realize that NALCO has been a tremendous success; in fact, that NALCO may well be the brightest star in the history of Newfoundland.

Mr. Hollett: We have heard that before.

Mr. Curtis: I am not one of those who think that, because BRINCO has done things or someone else, that NALCO has not done its job and done it well. NALCO had an original capital of \$1,000,000 and took in some more monies. NALCO spent over \$1,500,000 exploring in Newfoundland and Labrador. NALCO has amongst its concessions an area in Labrador which had been turned back by the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company. They were given that concession in 1938. They had it for eight or 10 years and then threw it back to the government, saying, this property is valueless. The stone that the builder refused had become the chief cornerstone.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I think I was interrupted on many occasions during the few words I had to say because I was not speaking to the principle of the Bill. I now raise the point of order that the hon. the Attorney General is not speaking to the principle.

Mr. Speaker: I think he is speaking to the principle. He is bringing the position up to date, I think.

Mr. Curtis: I am answering the points of the hon. member, point by point, and I am answering the point he raised. Now then, this area had been refused, turned down as valueless, and was passed over to NALCO. And look, gentlemen, at the result. If it had not been for NALCO, that property would be in its previous state. It would have been as it was 10 years ago.

Mr. Hollett: It is still in its previous state.

Mr. Curtis: It is not, Mr. Speaker. This property is not in the state today it was in 10 years ago, as my hon. friend well knows. When we had the meeting this morning — Over \$7 million has been poured into the exploration and development of this area of Labrador, and \$7,800,000 is not hay. Other areas, tremendous areas, have been in the hands of people for many, many years without bringing in anything like the handsome results that the government expect, and I think my hon. friend expects from these operations in Labrador. The Lab-

rador Mining and Exploration Company, as I said before, was given these concessions away back in 1937 or 1938 and in 1959, because of NALCO, and because of the companies that NALCO brought into the picture, the same company is looking anew and is about to develop other areas in the Wabush Area. That, Mr. Speaker, is entirely due to NALCO. As I say, far from being ashamed of NALCO I am proud of NALCO. As far as being ashamed for what they have done, I am proud of what they have done. And I think, as I said before, (and I won't repeat myself twice) I said before that future populations of Newfoundland will take pride in the achievements of NALCO. I am not a bit disappointed that the government is no longer a shareholder in NALCO. We became a shareholder just to get the thing going. We got out of it. We got our money back, and as a result we are responsible for a development in connection with these Labrador properties better than any deal that any government ever arranged before for Newfoundland territory. How can you compare what we get under this Bill with what we derived under any other Bill on the Statute Books?

Mr. Hollett: Wait until you get it, and then talk.

Mr. Curtis: We will get it. When people will back up their enthusiasm with hard cash, when they back up their enthusiasm with that kind of money you can bet your bottom dollar, Mr. Speaker, it is something worthwhile, and it is something that we will get and be proud of — 22 cents we will get, Mr. Speaker, 22 cents a ton on all the iron that comes out of Labrador. What do we get from other companies? What do we get from the Labrador Mining Company? Less than six, and I doubt if we get six. Here we get 22 cents simply because the government went into the project in the initial stages, and because we pushed it.

What do we get besides that? We get 8% of the net profits from the company on all other minerals, all minerals other than iron, and that is before taxes and not after. Is not that away ahead of 5% from the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company? Eight percent on the profit on all other minerals other than iron. Let us hope they find lots of them. We can do with 8%, and if we can get

8% before taxation, Mr. Speaker, they are welcome to what they can make after that. Then, what do we get as a result of this Bill? We get the escalation on the 22 cents, which is a very, very important concession. (In fact they made a mistake in drafting the Bill. They provided that, if the price went up, if the price of ore went up 5% they would pay us five times the 22 cents. Fortunately they discovered the mistake).

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Surely the government would not have taken advantage of that?

Mr. Curtis: Anyway, we have the benefit of the escalation clause, which means if the price of ore goes up 100%, instead of being worth \$11.50 to us, it is worth \$23.00. Instead of 22 cents we get 44 cents, and in proportion. And let us hope the price will go up. But, Sir, under no circumstances do we get less than 22 cents a ton. That escalation feature alone, Mr. Speaker, should be sufficient to have this house on its feet congratulating the government on the success of the negotiations. We are happy to get 22 cents plus the escalation. This 8%, Mr. Speaker, was in the last Bill. I cannot refer to that except in passing.

Now then, what do we get on timber? The timber concessions originally granted to NALCO were very generous, and they were made generous because of the government ownership of 90% of the shares. But, Sir, in this Bill, now that this company is a private company, we have tightened up those provisions, with the result now (and my hon. friends will see the difference if they look at the two Acts. They will see that, originally, they paid practically nothing for the wood. They had the right, I think of 20 years in which to apply for a license, and after 20 years, they could get a 99 year lease and I believe the maximum that would be paid us would have been a dollar a cord), under the present amendment the company has to pay two dollars a cord for the wood exported and it has to pay one dollar a cord for the wood it uses. It must take its lease within 12 years and it must pay a minimum of \$150,000 a year in royalties. Is that not a tremendous improvement?

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): That is when they start operations.

Mr. Curtis: No, when they get the lease they have to start paying right away, \$150,000 a year royalty until they get into operation, and even after they get into operation. That is the floor, the minimum.

Mr. Higgins: That was not in the original?

Mr. Curtis: That was not in the original Act. Now, in this Bill we have what is better still; we have an escalation clause so that if the price of newsprint goes up, up goes the royalty. And that, as I say, is of great benefit to the Province. So, Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend opposite spoke on this Bill, and found himself prone to wonder, I can appreciate his position because there is not very much that an Opposition can say in opposing this Bill. I say that, because I appreciate the position of the Opposition, and if I had been in their position I would have liked to be able to go back to the history because there is not much else they can say. However the rules of the house forbid that. I would be happy to throw the whole debate open.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would not.

Mr. Curtis: I would love it. I do not think it is out of order to say that. I am not doing it but I would like to, honestly, to look into the past of NALCO and look into the whole course of events. Do you realize. Mr. Speaker, before we had that mill at Corner Brook, which the Liberal government put through in 1923, do you realize that the original legislation for Corner Brook was passed away back in 1915? I was in the house as a reporter in 1915 when the original Bill came in. It was originally the Newfoundland Production Company, if I remember rightly — It takes time, and I personally am very happy that in the year 1959, although it has taken us 10 years those 10 years have been well spent and now, at the end of those 10 years, we see strong companies, powerful companies with tremendous assets prepared to pour huge sums into the development of Labrador. So we have the new provisions in this Act, the timber provisions and a few tidying up provisions. I do not think I need detain the house much more in connection therewith. I was just looking again to see if my hon. friend said anything else I ought to answer. Yes. He

looked at the map and he went down to the Registry of Deeds and saw this big map, this big area NALCO had.

Mr. Hollett: I said nothing about maps.

Mr. Curtis: Then he saw the smaller area Javelin has and the area that Pickands-Mather have. Surely the man who deserved the credit is the man who faced that huge expense and pinpointed the valuable parts of it. Surely that is worthy of some reward.

Mr. Higgins: And surely he has gotten it.

Premier Smallwood: Surely he deserved it.

Mr. Curtis: Look at the big concession from which they had to get that. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago when the Buchans Company wanted to find a new area, they went off miles and miles in every direction, and came back and found the second location almost immediately adjoining the first. You must have a large area in which to prospect; you must have a large area, and when you have finished your prospecting you are left with a small area; I don't think that is any argument at all. I do not see just why my hon. friend brought it up except to show what a tremendous job these people had done in finding this small area, this needle in the haystack.

Mr. Hollett: They kept everybody else out, you know!

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, if anybody wanted an area in Labrador and promised us to spend money on it — and this Bill provides that they have to spend another \$1,600,000 in the next 14 or 15 years — They do not get this property, they do not continue to hold this area for nothing. They have to spend at least \$100,000 a year for the next 16 years in exploration and development. And if my hon. friend or any of his friends come across with that kind of money I dare say the Premier could find an area in Labrador for them to spend it in. There is a tremendous amount of rock down there, and before you find anything you have to examine and explore a great area. BRINCO has spent millions of dollars in the last three or four years, and I don't think they have had the luck yet to strike anything worthwhile. They may

strike it tomorrow. Let us hope they will; but these are the fortunes of war where mining companies are concerned.

I don't think I need say anything more, Mr. Speaker. I think that the members of the government and every member on this side of the house have every reason to be proud of this legislation. There is nothing in it that we are not proud of. We would love to get double the royalties but that just would not be feasible. We would love to get, instead of a dollar and two dollars for the trees, two dollars and four, but that would not be reasonable and instead of 8% of the profit before taxation, we would like to get 10, but that would not be feasible. We have to be satisfied. You will find that under this legislation the government of Newfoundland is doing handsomely, and we are proud of it.

Mr. Hollett: Don't forget that pride goes before a fall. You were quoting scripture a moment ago.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): That sounds like Shakespeare.

Mr. J. D. Higgins (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree with the reasoning of the Attorney General. I am not greatly concerned with whether the government has reason to be proud, but certainly on balance it would appear to have reason to be satisfied that this legislation, and I am discussing now all the Bills, represents a decided improvement on legislation of this type brought into the house in the past.

Now, insofar as the changed status of NALCO is concerned, I am not too much concerned. We all know at one time, it had been anticipated that NALCO would forever remain a Crown Corporation. Well, over-riding circumstances changed its complexion; but irrespective of that, we do have the position today that to a great extent at least, because of the bringing into existence of NALCO, we now have, as an end result, a group of corporations all of which appear to be financially responsible, and who are prepared to spend sizeable sums of money to develop areas of the Labrador. It is unfortunate that we ourselves had not the resources for this development. Not for a moment, Mr. Speaker, am I suggesting that the government should go into business. I

don't think any of us would be prepared to say that is the soundest policy — But if it means we have to get people from the United States, there is no great disgrace in that. This is not the only part of Canada developed by United States capital. As a matter of fact, I suppose that today about 60% of Canadian industry is dominated by American investment, at least. So that there is nothing about which we need to be too much alarmed in the threat of American domination. These are responsible people. The aspects of the whole thing which appeal to me, Mr. Speaker, is that you have a tightening up on the agreements for timber cutting. We did have rather vague legislation. We now have an improvement on the royalties payable, and have tied them down at least to do something within a certain specific period. The royalty on iron ore is 22 cents a ton, including the escalation clause. I must say, in all fairness, that is a very good stroke of business on the government's part. It certainly represents a tremendous improvement over the agreement negotiated in 1938 by the Commission of Government, and whilst it is true the value of the dollar has declined, yet 22 cents against eight or seven cents certainly represents a much more favourable picture from the standpoint of Newfoundland. What it is going to mean in the future in the final result, from the standpoint of employment for our people is concerned, is difficult to say. Certainly we are told, on what appears to be reliable authority, they have already spent or committed themselves to spend something like \$7,800,000, and that, as the Attorney General said, "is not hay". When people are talking about money like that, it is not merely a speculative proposition. This group of people are going into this thing, frankly, to make money. More power to them. The fact that they are making money out of it is no reason why we should not adopt the agreement, because it is going to provide for Newfoundland something we could not provide for ourselves from our own resources. There is going to be, it is hoped at least, permanent employment for a considerable labour force in this Province when these things are set up, and whilst the construction period is on, there again, we hope and we have reason to hope there will be considerable employment provided. The important aspect of this thing, Mr.

Speaker, seems to me will be the work in the Committee of the Whole stage to make sure there are no loopholes left. With the principles of the legislation, I think, that we on this side of the house feel that our Leader was very correct when he said that we have no quarrel with the principle of the Bill.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we adopted the rule to speak on all seven Bills in this matter we would save some repetition, but I do not propose to do so unless it becomes the rule of the house. It appears to me there is little basis for reasonable objection to the principle of this Bill, except this. The government had stated in very definite and dogmatic manner sometime ago that NALCO would always be a Crown Corporation, and it would retain at least 90% of the shares, and now, with the same dogmatic tone, tells us that it is completely devoid of shares. As you know, these shares were sold year. We had objected to it, and I am not convinced that it was the wisest thing to do. However, that is water under the bridge. It has been done. In Committee Stage, as my colleague suggested, there are some matters on which we can comment, we hope, to some advantage; but to this point, as I said, there seems to be no reasonable objection to supporting the principle of this Bill. One thing emerges in my mind from all this — I have listened very carefully to the Premier's very clear and simple explanation on the entire seven pieces of legislation, and I listened this morning to the gentlemen whom I considered experts, representing the various companies concerned, and as I see it, it appears to me that the government is always at a disadvantage in these matters; it does not have the same expert counsel that these companies have. Now while I do not question the reputable qualities of these companies — that is beyond question — at the same time they are business people and astute business people, and it is a cold business deal.

Premier Smallwood: And they can afford the highest priced legal counsel in the world.

Mr. Duffy: But can we afford not to have good advice? I sometimes think — and this is not a criticism but a comment which I

think is valid. When any specialized legislation comes up for consideration (of any specialized nature) the government should not expect that any member of this house would be highly qualified on any specialized matter, and it seems to me we cannot afford to not have that type of counsel and advise. Sir, I support the principle of this Bill.

Mr. G. R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Speaker, insrecent days I have been out of circulation, while this very interesting topic has been on the agenda of the house. Having asked permission of the hon. member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning) I rested in my bed at ease. My comments on this Bill in general, Mr. Speaker, are that in this age of space, in this age of the atom, in this age when the world is getting very, very small, in this day and age when the focus on the Northland had become more and more intense, I do not get particularly excited at the immediate prospect of what may come in Labrador. Rather would I wish that the territory of Labrador were untangled, and unfettered and unmeshed from the long, long series of agreements and instruments and covenants and contracts which are almost like a jig-saw puzzle. With the fullest of confidence in the future and what the future is going to bring, I would feel far happier if the generations, this generation and the generations to come, could plot and plan and avail of the great things that are going to happen in this territory of Labrador. I think the people concerned with the deals under consideration are perhaps very, very fortunate and perhaps very, very farseeing. However, now that we have the Bills under consideration, whether we wish it or not, we have to consider whether we support or otherwise the Bills before us. With the other speakers, and with my colleagues too, I hope to see this development of the Labrador territories come about to the benefit of all concerned, to the enlargement and to the development of new communities and new activities and almost a new land up there. I have read in part through these Bills, and I do see some omissions. They can hardly be termed topics of principle, but I note in the first one, the principle of reforestation relating to timberland seems to have been omitted. I do note that there is a clause relating to forest husbandry and due care for the cutting and forest operations,

but there is no specific principle or obligation there for actual reforestation. It is conceivable that operations might be undertaken to such a degree that the forest lands might be considerably denuded, and that would be a very great tragedy I would like to see something definite included in this Bill to make it obligatory that actual reforestation takes place where necessitated. I am not going to delay the house unduly. I have only a few brief remarks more to make. It does provide for royalties on minerals other than iron ore. We trust that the higher premium on uranium will accrue to this province, and I sincerely hope, in general, that the expectations of the government will be fulfilled. Personally, I take the attitude that I will wait and see. The bigger these deals are sometimes the less meat they have. But I will reserve my judgment, and in general support the principle.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole house on tomorrow.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Thursday at three o'clock.

Thursday, May 7, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

Hon. J. T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries):

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to make this statement:

Hon. members will recall that on Wednesday, March 18 last, the hon. member for Placentia West (Mr. Canning), speaking on the motion for an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, commented on the loss of the dragger "Blue Wave" with all its crew. The hon. member for Burin, (Mr. Jones), when addressing the house on April 1, also made reference to this tragedy. I did not comment at the time, but I felt that I should bring this case to the attention of

the hon. the Minister of Transport at Ottawa and ask that responsible officers of his department look into it and make a report on the suitability of trawlers with design and specifications similar to those of the "Blue Wave" for operating under winter conditions in north-west Atlantic waters. I have now received a reply, dated April 24, 1959, from the hon. Minister, which reads"

"Further to my letter of April 10, in reply to yours of March 23, 1959, with respect to the loss of the motor trawler "Blue Wave", my officers have now investigated this matter and I have to advise you as follows:

"The "Blue Wave" was built in 1949, to the highest approved standards of the Steamship Inspection Service, and was certificated for Home Trade II voyages. She was of sound construction, adequately powered and was in good condition, and fully equipped in accordance with the regulations.

"This vessel's stability characteristics were quite satisfactory and, in the design, cognizance had been taken of the fact that she would be called upon at times to operate in icing conditions, which would result in additional top hamper (weight).

"As there were no survivors of this tragedy, it was felt that no good purpose would be served by the holding of an official enquiry. It appears, however, from such information as we have been able to obtain, that the immediate cause of the capsizing was an excessible build-up of ice on deck, which resulted in a fatal loss in stability before the master and crew were fully aware of the situation. It is possible that the vessel ran into icing and weather conditions that were beyond her capacity to out-ride; that the cargo shifted; that the master failed to use the best judgment in the handling of his ship, or that a combination of these and other factors lead to disaster.

"We are satisfied that trawlers with design and specifications similar to those of the "Blue Wave" are quite suitable for operation under winter conditions in Northwest Atlantic waters, provided they are loaded with due regard to the weather conditions they may be called upon to face, and are competently handled.

"It is noted that Mr. P. J. Canning referred to the loss of another vessel of this type in Newfoundland waters, and it is presumed that he had in mind the "St. Richard" or the "Blue Comet". The former vessel capsized and foundered in January, 1951, there being some reason to believe that a shift of cargo had led to a dangerously unstable condition. The latter vessel capsized and foundered in February, 1954, during heavy weather and in this case we are informed that an overloaded condition probably led to the disaster.

"The loss of these two vessels therefore can hardly be taken as an indication that the "Blue Wave" and other vessels of this type are unsuitable for winter operations off Newfoundland.

"I was pleased to note that you have the greatest confidence in thoroughness of the inspection carried out by the Steamship Inspection Branch of this Department. As you know, they confine themselves, in the certification of vessels for safe operation, to the strength of hulls, ample margin of stability, a sufficient amount of power, and the carriage of safety equipment as required by the regulations. Matters of design beyond these requirements are, we think, properly left to the shipowner, who should be free as possible to develop the most efficient type of fishing craft in order to enable him to compete successfully in the tough international competition that faces this particular industry.

"I should add that officers of the Steamship Inspection Service are under instructions to advise shipowners at all times on matters of the safe and proper operation of their vessels, on the basis of the experience they gain in their work of inspection of Canadian ships, and there is a close cooperation between fishing boat owners and this Service in these matters.

I thank you very much for bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) George. Hees."

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before going on, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries, was the statement expressedly

made there that the ship was unsuitable for winter operations? Was that statement there?

Mr. Cheeseman: It was not!

Mr. Hollett: Well, one thing was said which I take was unfortunate and which I feel I have to mention — Some reference was made to the good judgment of the master. The man is dead and gone, and I have this to say for the master. He was the most careful and the most competent master in the fishing business in Newfoundland, and I fail to see where any evidence was shown whatsoever to indicate any cause for the statement.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): It does not say that. It said that it might have been caused by — and made mention of four or five things, or a combination.

Mr. Hollett: But included that.

Premier Smallwood: Only as a theoretical possibility.

Mr. Hollett: I should like to have that cleared up. I don't want that to go out.

Mr. Cheeseman: In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I read the letter that I received from the hon. Minister of Transport. None of the words are mine. And I sent the hon. Minister a verbatim statement by the hon. member for Placentia West. If you will read the letter — I have included sufficient copies for every one who is interested — if you will read the letter I do not think you can read into it that he has charged that there was any mismanagement, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested. I don't think there was anything like that. I suggest before passing judgment on it, it might be well to read it properly. Probably I did not read it as well as it might be read. You had better read it yourself before coming to any conclusions.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. W. Smallwood (Green Bay): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the people of Rattling Brook. The prayer of

the petition is for the construction of a road between Rattling Brook and King's Point. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is a road of some sort between Rattling Brook and King's Point. I understand the Department of Highways has made a survey along this trail or road, with the purpose, I imagine, of constructing this road. Now, Sir, I would advise the people of Rattling Brook and all the people who live between Rattling Brook and King's Point to make available to the Department of Highways the right-of-way on which to construct the road. I heartily support the prayer of the petition and ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates. On motion, petition received for referral to the Department to which it relates:

Hon. J. R. Chalker (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of the settlement of River of Ponds, Squid Cove, Hawkes Bay, Port Saunders, Port au Choix and Eddies Cove. The petitioners pray that the Department of Public Health be asked to erect a hospital in that area. I may say, Sir, that at present at Port Saunders there is a nursing station, which is rather old and not suitable for the present needs of the area which it serves. I have already taken up with the Department of Health the seriousness of this position, and they are looking into it at the present time. But, Sir, I agree wholeheartedly with this petition and ask it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion, petition received for referral to the Department to which it relates:

NOTICE OF MOTIONS: LEGISLATION:

Hon. B. J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local School Tax Act".

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask the hon. the Premier to table the follow-

ing information:- It is the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of the New University this year and if so how many buildings will be started?

ORDERS OF THE DAY LEGISLATION:

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the City of St. John's Act" — On motion Bill read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter Into an Agreement with Canadian Javelin Limited":

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I read this through very carefully, and I have discussed it with my colleagues, and we find ourselves in a position to agree with the principle of this Bill. There may be one or two things in Committee stage which we may have to raise, but perhaps not even that. We are perfectly satisfied that this Bill is in the best interest of the development on the Labrador, and we agree with what the hon. the Premier said — although it is not safe those days to agree with the hon. the Premier.

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Why not?

Mr. Hollett: Charges right and left! We should not agree with anything the Premier says. I don't know what kind of a person he is, but we on this side are not supposed to agree with anything whatsoever. I believe somebody said that the other day.

Premier Smallwood: They must have been joking.

Mr. Hollett: As a matter of fact I believe it is the opinion of one or more members on the opposite side.

Premier Smallwood: He was only joking.

Mr. Hollett: I submit jokes of that order are not appreciated by some of us. However, I agree with the principle of this Bill. On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

NALCO:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited and Canadian Javelin Limited and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions for the same Purpose".

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, here again we have studied this Bill and find it to be absolutely essential to correct some of the difficulties which arose by reason of the fact that NALCO changed hands since 1957, and also owing to certain agreements which have been entered into. When the minister is replying, I would like him to give an explanation of Section (5) relative to the payments to the government in lieu of certain taxes, which I do not quite understand. I would like to have an expression of opinion from the minister. That is about the only comment I would make. No, there is one other — Section (7); I fail to see why there is need for that section there, which states that certain provisions for the NALCO Act will apply for a period of 15 years. Probably the minister, in replying, could tell us why 15 years has been selected. Otherwise I agree with the principle of the Bill. I have also gone through the Statutory Agreement, and with regard to the NALCO-Julliane Mining Lease, I forget the area, but think it is something less than five miles. Perhaps the minister would give us information with regard to that. Apart from that, everything else is agreeable.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest this refers to clauses and might be more properly dealt with in Committee.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I suggest the principle of the remaining Bills be dealt with by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, expressing his agreement with us that they all be dealt with in principle, as the Premier did in introducing them, because nobody on this side of the house is going to object to the principle, and they all have to be dealt with in Committee. Motion, that this Bill be read a second time, carried:

Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, Canadian Javelin Limited and Wabush Iron Company Limited and to Provide Certain Statutory Provisions for the Same Purpose and to Make Certain Amendments to the Nalco-Javelin Minerals Act."

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Wabush Lake Railway Company Limited, Northernland Company Limited and Carol Lake Company Limited, and Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For the Same Purpose".

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, I might say, in regard to all these Bills to which my hon. colleague referred, we have gone very, very carefully through them, and more than that, we have had the benefit through discussion with the legal advisors of all the firms here, and most of these conversations turned out very satisfactorily. We have made certain suggestions to them, as well as the members on the other side have made suggestions, and we have concluded that each and every one of these Bills is absolutely essential for the development of the Province, particularly Labrador. We have gone into the matter of unemployment in this country, and employment with regard to the building of the railway and development of the iron mines. We have gone into that with the legal lights of these various companies, and they have satisfied us that they will in future, at any rate, do everything within their power to see to it that insofar as possible, Newfoundland labour will be employed and not only Newfoundland labour but Newfoundland technical services and any other services necessary in regard to the building. We are very pleased, I might say, with the explanations given to us, and there is nothing in this with which we disagree that we cannot take up in Committee of the Whole. There we can ex-

press our opinions on any particular section.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wabush Lake Railway Act, 1955":

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Respecting a Private Mining Carrier Railway in Labrador".

Hon. J. R. Smallwood (Premier): Mr. Speaker, this is the final one of the seven Bills that were introduced by me on Friday past. The whole picture of the development about to begin in Labrador is contained in these seven Bills. Yesterday and again today all the members of this house sat for hours in conference with the lawyers and the directors and highly placed officers of the various concerns, divided into three great groups. The Iron Ore Company of Canada, represented here today by five or six of their officers, directors and lawyers (including, I may say, a young lawyer from Cleveland, Ohio, whose name is Taft, and who is the nephew of the late Senator Taft and grandson of the great President Taft of the United States of America); the Iron Ore Company delegation is lead by a man whose name is extremely well known and highly respected in Newfoundland, Mr. W. H. Darrel. The second great group is the Wabush Iron Company, which is a combination of the great American firm of Pickands-Mather and the Steel Company of Canada, which is Canada's biggest steel company, Youngstown Sheet and Tube mill company in the United States, and several others. Then, thirdly, Mr. John C. Doyle, the Chairman (I think he is) of the Board of Directors of Canadian Javelin Limited; together with some of his legal representatives, some of his lawyers.

These men sat for several hours yesterday and again today with all of the members of the House of Assembly, from both sides. I think the Leader of the Opposition will not object if I say that he and I presided jointly over the meeting. I was accompanied at the table by the Attorney-General and he was accompanied by his close legal adviser in his department. We, all of us I think, felt absolutely free, yesterday and today, to put

questions to these companies, and we did so, and we did so with great frankness. We were all, I think, impressed by the fact that these companies, or the representatives of these companies, 12 or 15 of them altogether, spoke with frankness. So, Sir, the two meetings turned out to be quite useful, and I am sure every member of this house, as a result of these two meetings, is far more impressed than he ever was before, with the great possibilities for Newfoundland's future that lie in the development of Labrador.

Now, it would be useful, I think, in closing this present debate, (which though short is one of the most important that ever took place inside these walls) to give the house and through the house the people of Newfoundland via the press and radio, some approximate outlines of what is about to happen, what has been happening. What has been happening, first and foremost, is that this year, beginning now, today or beginning yesterday, a railway is being built and will be completed by this time next year, entirely within Labrador, i.e. entirely within the Province of Newfoundland, running westward 30 odd miles from mile 224, or some point in that general area, into the area of Wabush Lake. This railway is being built and owned jointly by the two groups, the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Iron. This railway will be extended at the western end by two or three, or maybe more, branch lines, each of them a private line, a privately owned railway, each of them running from the western end of the joint railway to some mine or mill. For instance, the Iron Ore Company will have its own railway about six miles long, going still further west from the end of the joint railway, to go to their mine and mill. The Wabush Railway will have another branch line from the end of the joint railway still further west to their mine, and then the mine at Julianne Lake, which is a Canadian Javelin property will also run beyond the end, the western end of this joint railway. In the present year, the joint railway will be built, but very little else will be done. It is true the Iron Ore Company will build a few glorified bunk houses this year and they will install a relatively small pilot plant — relatively small. That is about the size of it for this present year — a 30 odd mile railway, jointly owned by two groups, the erection of three or four rather large bunk houses by

the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the building and installation of a pilot plant, a relatively small pilot plant on the site by that same company.

Next year, however, things will begin to move in real earnest. Next year the Iron Ore Company will commence to construct their new town to house between 3,000 and 4,000 people, and they will open the mine next year, and they will also begin, next year, the construction of their large mill, capable of producing 6,000,000 tons; 5 or 6 million tons of iron concentrates a year. In the year after, that is to say in 1961, they will be shipping. Next year, also, the other company, the Wabush Iron Company, will install a large pilot plant capable of producing 100,000 tons of iron concentrates a year and in the same year in which the Iron Ore Company of Canada will be shipping ore, in that year (1961), the Wabush Iron Company will commence to build their town, to build their mill, which will be somewhat larger than the Iron Ore Company's Mill, and opening of their mine.

Now there is a great probability, or it appeared to us from what we were told, that instead of there being two separate towns, one for the Iron Ore Company of Canada and one for Wabush Iron Company, there will be one town, because, although it does not really matter whether there are two or there is one, from the standpoint of the number of homes — the number of homes will be the same eitherway — there would be a great difference, of course, in the services, the social and other services that are needed by the people who will work for the two companies. If there are two towns, there will have to be two Roman Catholic Churches, two Anglican Churches, two United Churches and two Salvation Army Citadels and so on, whereas if there were only the one town, there would only be one church for each denomination, one movie picture theatre would be enough, one of this and one of that, one sewer and water line system, one electricity system. Because of these economies, Sir, it seems to be entirely probably that the two companies will unite in the building of the town, one town to serve both companies and the employees of both mines and both mills.

We are reminded at this moment that at Timmins, in Ontario, there is only one town but that employees of some 12 or 13 differ-

ent, entirely different, mining companies are all accommodated in that one town, although they are employed by some 12 or 13 different employers, having little if anything to do with each other. And the employees are not segregated according to the companies for whom they work. They are all mixed up and intermingled in the town, together in one united town, one united community, although they work for different companies precisely as in any other town, such as the town of St. John's. We questioned the companies representatives this morning with a view to getting some idea of how many men might find work when the whole thing is in operation. I think, if it is one town we are likely to have a town of something between 8,000 and 10,000 souls, men, women, and children, and I think the total of the men working in offices and the like, mostly men, the grand total number would perhaps be 3,000. I think one of the companies suggested it would be of the order of 1,500 they would have employed, and the other company would be approximately the same size, if not somewhat larger. Therefore, 3,000 or more men would be employed there, making a total population for the town of something between 8,000 and 10,000 persons. Sir, we were given emphatic and generous assurances this morning that it was the desire of the companies, all three of them, all three groups, to have these operations in the area of Wabush Lake be 100% Newfoundland, and if not 100% then as near to it as they could make it, so that all the people living and working in this new town in Labrador would be Newfoundlanders.

Now, we are reminded that at Seven Islands, for example, there was a time a few years ago, when a great many American citizens were employed, and they were employed because of the fact that it had proved difficult up to then to find Canadian citizens who were experienced in that kind of work. So, therefore, Americans were employed and they were used to train Canadians, with the result that they trained themselves out of their jobs and Canadians took their place, so that today, the number of American citizens employed in that operation is exactly three men, one the General Manager and two others. Similarly, as it was suggested to us today, at the outset, insofar as these companies were not able to find Newfoundland-

ders with the necessary training and experience, they would find employees where they could, but always only where and when they could not find experienced Newfoundlanders, and always for as long as a time only as it would take to train Newfoundlanders to take their places.

So, Sir, we have the positive assurance made in the hearing of the whole membership of this house, under the joint Chairmanship of the hon. Leader of the Opposition and myself, this emphatic statement by the representatives of all these companies, three very important mining groups on this continent — that is why I am saying it now, so that it will go into the records of this house and go on the public records through the newspapers and the radio — I may say that, following the meeting that we held this forenoon, that the members of this house held with these company representatives, I convened another meeting which was held until nearly 1:30 p.m., consisting of some 14 prominent Newfoundland businessmen, industrialists, who sat down with the 14 or 15 representatives of this iron ore development and discussed the further important question of having Newfoundland materials used in the construction of the railway and town, mines and mills. And I can report to the house here now that this meeting was just as frank, just as friendly and just as successful as the earlier ones held with the members of this house. We were particularly anxious that in the building of that railway, for example, the railway ties should be cut and made in Newfoundland, creosoted and otherwise treated and processed in Newfoundland, and shipped to Labrador in Newfoundland bottoms, if the shipping in Newfoundland bottoms proved to be economical and otherwise practical.

And we are anxious that Newfoundland plasterboard and Newfoundland plaster-laths be used in the construction of homes and offices and hotels and ships and theatres and other structures that will be erected in the new town. We are anxious that Newfoundland flooring, birch and oak hardwood flooring and Newfoundland doors, birch and mahogany doors made in Newfoundland, be used in the new town. We are anxious that Newfoundland lumber, of which this year a good many millions of feet have been sawn, especially

on the Great Northern Peninsula, especially in White Bay, that a large part of this lumber should be sold to the new operations, perhaps late this year and certainly to a much greater extent next year. We are anxious that Newfoundland aircraft be used in the aircraft work that will be needed, and particularly in flying Newfoundlanders back and forth between points in Newfoundland and the Wabush area and points in Labrador and the Wabush Area. We are anxious that Newfoundland ships, and Newfoundland everything that can be used will be used. And, Sir, it was made clear at this meeting that we did not expect to sell cement and plasterboard and flooring and doors and lumber and other things except upon the basis of these products being competitive with other products as to price, as to quality and as to delivery. But that if they were competitive in price, quality and time of delivery we should not have an equal chance with the products of other parts of Canada but a preference, a distinct preference, because they are Newfoundland products and because it is a Newfoundland enterprise that is going forward in Wabush Lake.

To this proposition, the companies' representatives agreed generously, agreed willingly and in the most friendly fashion. Indeed we have no doubt at all, no doubts at all, as to the desire of these companies to deal fairly with Newfoundland in these two matters of providing work for Newfoundlanders and seeing that Newfoundland materials went into this great project.

Now, I objected strenuously here yesterday, on a Point of Order, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggested, or attempted to review the whole history of NALCO, but only on the grounds that it was outside the rules of the house. I would warmly welcome the opportunity, and if I did not strongly suspect that His Honour the Speaker is just watching every word I say at this point to see I keep within the rules as he was yesterday, with a little prompting, that the Leader of the Opposition kept within the rules.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I suppose the Premier knows he is out of order now.

Premier Smallwood: I am too well aware of it. That is my trouble. The Leader of the Opposition apparently can go along in

complete and blissful ignorance that he is out of order and completely happy, but I have a guilty conscience, because I know the rules of the house and know when I am out of order, and have a guilty feeling when breaking them, but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has the happy faculty of being right, left and centre and not even giving the matter a second thought or even the first one.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, if I thought he meant that I would rise to a Point of Order.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Premier knows — He who sins and knows he is sinning is entitled to more stripes.

Premier Smallwood: Exactly. That is a disability from which I suffer in this house. But, Sir, let me say this — let me say this only. We must not confuse the end which you have in mind, and the end which you try to attain, when you adopt means to attain that end, the means may appear to you to be a good means and subsequently they appear to be not so good as they did formerly, and ultimately they appear to be useless. So that, unless you are a doctrinaire, unless you are stupid, you change these means, you amend them, you drop them or you scrap them and take up new means. Now the end we had in mind, and we still have in mind, and I am sure that in this there is no difference at all between the Opposition and ourselves, I am sure there can be no difference of opinion amongst us Newfoundlanders, all over this Province, no matter who we are or what we are, the end we all have in mind is to develop Newfoundland. The development of Newfoundland, the development of our natural resources, thereby, of course, providing work and employment and wages, and thereby raising the standard of living of our people, thereby creating ever more new opportunities for young men and young women, pouring out of our schools in thousands and tens of thousands as we pour millions into the building of schools and we raise the standard of education and our population increases at an enormous rate is our aim and ambition. We have the highest birth rate in Canada and the lowest death rate in Canada. As our population increases at an enormous rate, and the educational standards of our people rise rather spec-

tacularly, and tens of thousands of smart men and women pour each year out of our schools the need for opportunities, a chance in life, a "break", the need becomes more urgent and more pressing every year.

All of us agree on that. There is no party difference in that matter. We all want Newfoundland developed. Where we sometimes disagree is as to the means of accomplishing that purpose, of reaching that end — The road we should take — This appears to be a good road, and we take it! We get half-way down and we say — "Well, really it does not seem to be getting any near the end. Perhaps we had better go back and take another road". Now you can turn right around and go straight back from where you began and take a completely new road, or you can cut across diagonally and get over there — come completely back to where you began and get off on the right road — or take a diagonal road, and in doing so you may get stuck in the bog.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): Or get a ticket.

Premier Smallwood: Yes, the Opposition will get you a ticket, speaking figuratively. Now NALCO, we thought, was and we certainly hoped the right road to development. The Opposition did not think so. The Opposition disagreed heartily with NALCO at the time it was formed. They opposed the formation of it and now they oppose the dissolution of it. They were against it when we formed it, and for it when we dissolved it. The Opposition are always eight or 10 years behind in their thinking. Alright, I take it back, I don't want to say a word to anger my hon. friends. I don't want to say a word. I know that yesterday they were strongly against its dissolution. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition was practically crying when he said, and spoke in a solemn voice, rather hushed and solemn, as when speaking of the dead — "In fact we are in here at the demise". Now I take it that "Demise" means death. "We are here", he said, "at the death of NALCO".

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to correct the Premier. He is correct up to a certain point. We were not here at the birth of NALCO, not one of us was here at its birth.

Premier Smallwood: You cannot take refuge in the fact that the personnel of the Opposition has changed somewhat, somehow so that they are now not there. It is the same Opposition, the same political party, the good and the bad.

Mr. Hollett: However you look at NALCO, anyway, you gave it away.

Premier Smallwood: Sold it.

Mr. Hollett: Sold it, yes, for scrap.

Premier Smallwood: For \$1,200,000. That is a profit of 33%, which is not a bad rate of profit. It might even be considered profiteering in some circles. Is not 33% profit on money a good dividend? Newfoundland received capital gains, non-taxable profits. Then, in addition to that, we get this new development, this new deal in these seven bills that have been put through the house here in second reading in the last few days, under which we get 22 cents a ton on all iron ore to be produced in Newfoundland on all the NALCO areas, 22 cents a ton, and more than that, because we have an escalation clause giving us more, if the price of iron ore goes up. And in addition to that again, we get 8%. And I read the newspaper today and I listened to the radios last night, and I was a little regretful they did not get this point the Attorney General made yesterday in his speech. Perhaps he did not dwell on it quite long enough. So there was not a clear understanding of the fact that the government gets, apart from the 22 cents and more on iron ore, (more if the price goes up), apart from that and in addition to that the government gets 8% of NALCO's profits. And remember, NALCO's profits may not be made by NALCO. It may be made by subsidiaries or concessionaries but we still get them on any base metals, copper, lead, zinc or any other base metals that may be developed, ever, in the NALCO areas, no matter who develops them.

The Newfoundland government gets 8% of any of these profits before taxes, which is the equivalent, I understand, to about 11% or more. Yes, that is right! The taxes are about 50%. That is about 16% after taxes, the equivalent, from any property of NALCO, of the 23,000 square miles, on any minerals that are found and developed

anywhere on the NALCO territory, no matter who finds them, who develops them. If they make any profit, 8% of it comes to the government of Newfoundland, net profit, before taxes, before they pay taxes. That is a straight royalty, a share of the profits coming to the Newfoundland Government. That is why we tried to copy BRINCO. You see, when we sold NALCO to these parties, we tried to make NALCO into a kind of BRINCO. So we adopted the principle of shedding of land; we adopted the principle of the 8% as our share, the government's share, the Treasury's share of the profits that would be made, apart from iron ore. In iron ore, as the house knows, it is 22 cents a ton at rock bottom and it increases if the price of the ore goes up. Then, in addition, we sold NALCO for this, for doubling the royalties we get on the mineral, on the timber rather.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. the Premier quite in order now?

Premier Smallwood: Well I am answering the hon. gentleman in the remarks he made when out of order. It is a mute question as to whether I am in order to answer questions posed by the hon. gentleman who was out of order when he posed them. However, I won't dwell on that.

Let me say this — having tried one means to get development and we did have a lot of success — We did get Wabush — There would be no Wabush development today but for NALCO, but for Canadian Javelin, because when the Iron Ore Company of Canada threw it back to us, as they were required by law to pass back some thousands of square miles of their concession — they were required by law to do that — so they had to pass some back and naturally they passed back what they thought was useless. They certainly were not going to pass back to the Crown what they thought was valuable, but rather what they thought had no value. They passed it back to the Crown. The government gave it to NALCO, and in giving it to NALCO the government did not feel that they were giving NALCO much.

It was a lot of mileage but there was no hint in this world that it was anything but mileage, in the wilderness of Labrador, passed back by the one company in the world

that was in there and had taken a look and had mapped it all. The 20,000 square miles they were given, they had mapped. They told us about that this morning, about all the trouble they had gone through and expense to map their concession of 20,000 square miles — and the one company in the world knowing anything about it, passed it back to the government, and the government gave it to NALCO, and NALCO gave 3,000 square miles of it to Canadian Javelin. Canadian Javelin went in there and spent a total of \$8 million, or \$7.8 million — call it \$7 million. It is closer to \$8 million, they spent their own money, their shareholder's money. As a result of that we see today the direct result of NALCO, the direct result of Javelin, we see today what promises, what promises, to be one of the great iron ore developments of the world, of the world, as the direct result of NALCO.

Well, a man reaches his maturity and goes over the hump and begins to go down hill. NALCO reached its maturity, reached its hump. It has lived its best days in the form in which it was born, as a Crown Corporation. We said, "Alright, sell it to energetic industrialists such as the Steel Company of Canada, such as Pickands-Mather, such as Youngstown Sheet and Tube. Sell it to them and let them see what they can do with these 23,000 square miles of territory. Besides spending their own money, they may get 20 other great concerns, each of them taking 1,000 or 1,500 miles to see what they can do. Now that is what we are all hoping, and I am sure the Opposition are just as strong in their hopes, that they will make a success of it as we are, because by the time they get these developments down there they will find a half dozen more and get a lot of other people in, and get these things going, and we will have revenue pouring in. Just about that time the Opposition may begin to pick up, and who knows, they may be over on this side. And, Sir, look at what we are doing! We are building up Newfoundland and her prospective revenue for my hon. friends to spend some 15 or 20 years from now or maybe 12 or 15 years from now.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier a question? This is not a criticism, I am just looking for information. What would be the position — this might be a little out of order — What

would be the position now had we retained these NALCO shares, in this present situation?

Premier Smallwood: The position would be this: (1) NALCO had no capital at all, and spent, in fact, far more than its original capital. Its original capital was \$1,000,000, of which the Newfoundland government put in \$900,000 and private shareholders put in \$100,000. Then we sold a few more shares to John C. Doyle, or Javelin and realized about \$300,000; altogether we had about \$1,500,000. That is what NALCO had, and they spent every dollar. When we sold out our shares in NALCO, NALCO had \$60,000 left out of \$1,500,000. Therefore, obviously, unless someone was prepared to pour huge sums of additional monies into NALCO for additional capital, NALCO could no longer do anything; only sit on its oars and do nothing. That is an unfortunate phrase that was used here in this house once. And much worse than the fact that NALCO would have no capital, much worse than that was the fact NALCO had petered out and had no personnel, no one but the Attorney-General, the Minister of Highways (who has just resigned, Mr. Power); and myself, three pretty busy men; a corporation on whose board there were to be Cabinet Ministers because the government was the principal party in it. It had ceased to have the drive and the energy and experience of great industrialists. For a while, as the house knows, we had Sir William Stephenson. He was said to be a man of great success, but he did not prove to be so. For a while we had Mr. Eric Bowring as a director and Mr. Lewin and Mr. Ches Pippy, but one by one all went out so that NALCO consisted solely of John C. Doyle.

Mr. Hollett: You did not name them all.

Premier Smallwood: The hon. gentleman is thinking of Dr. Valdmanis, Victor J. Fine. We brought Victor J. Fine in from Cleveland because he had been vice-president of Cleveland Cliffs, and at that time we hoped Cleveland Cliffs might turn out to be Wabush. As a matter of fact, Wabush was born, but we never did succeed in getting Cleveland Cliffs to the point where they would be the great pioneers. Cleveland Cliffs is a very large concern, however. The

fact of the matter is that NALCO had become an empty shell with no money, no drive, with no skill, with no experience, and if it were to accomplish anything new blood had to come in to it, and new blood would not come in unless they owned it.

Now we had some of the most energetic and successful mining people in North America, and I suppose that means most of the best in the world as the owners of NALCO, and we really do think they can accomplish something. If they don't, they are sitting on more than 20,000 square miles of territory and they can all congratulate themselves they were given 20,000 square miles, as big as one of the States of the United States. But that won't put any money in their pockets nor pay them any dividends. For that to be worth anything, they have to pile a lot of money in and do a lot of surveying and do a lot of drilling and put up a lot of capital and put a lot of drive into it. Well, they are bound by the agreement here, to which we have just given second reading, to spend \$100,000 a year. But that is like the amount we bound BRINCO to spend. BRINCO has spent 25 times as much as we have bound them to spend, and so have most of them, and so will they.

Mr. Hollett: Don't forget the 22 cents a ton from some of these companies.

Premier Smallwood: That is so! When the development goes on and the profit is made. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot sell NALCO and still have it. You cannot eat your cake and still have it. We cannot get these developments and still have it. And if NALCO makes money from the development that has already taken place or is about to; if NALCO has a substantial income, so much of that goes right back into Newfoundland earth to develop more, because money is no good to those people as such. They use a certain amount to live generously but most of their money goes back into development of some kind or another. And you see, if NALCO has any income it will spend it.

However, Mr. Speaker, that is the story up to now, and I think that we can be a little optimistic about this. There are things to make us pessimistic in Newfoundland but there is this at least to make us feel hopeful. I am glad that the house has seen fit to give

Second Reading, and as the Leader of the Opposition has already said, in Committee of the Whole we can take this legislation line by line and word by word, and we will probably see the need to make some changes here and there, and in that, of course, give the Opposition the usual courtesy, all the opportunity and time they can possibly want to consider every aspect of the Bill and to have any postponement or adjournment they may feel necessary.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow:

On motion, the house recessed for 10 minutes after which Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

On motion that the house go into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman of Committee of the Whole:

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Use of Sound Recording Machines for Taking and Recording Evidence".

Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill, carried:

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act To Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels and Pressure Plants".

Hon. M. M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this Act has been copied from any Act on the Mainland, from one of the Provinces?

Hon. C. M. Ballam (Minister of Labour): No! It is a consolidation of our present Act, but it is cut down and modified and is not so cumbersome. I mentioned before, on introducing the Bill, that the Act had 38 sections, and it is being revised, in this present Bill, into 12 sections. It is all over the place, but this sort of puts it into order, as you see.

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister where the distinction is drawn between boilers certified for plant operations or simply residential boilers. Where is the line drawn for the necessary certification for boiler operation?

Mr. Ballam: Well, the issuance of a certificate for engineers and for firemen is contained in the regulations and is not particularly specified in the Act, but a plant of a certain horse-power would require a certificate.

Mr. Duffy: What I mean is this: I happen to know of a property where they have to pay a boiler inspection fee or something, not a commercial premises, a semi-residential with boilers that are smaller in capacity than many residential ones. I know of a private property. I know of it myself.

Mr. Ballam: You could have a small boiler, you know, with high pressure. It is not the size, it is the capacity. You might have a small unit here and it might have a capacity of two hundred horse-power of pressure. Do you follow me?

Mr. Duffy: Yes.

Mr. Ballam: Or you might have a huge thing, as big as this window but with low pressure. It is the pressure used that counts. The certification depends upon the pressure.

Mr. Duffy: I see.

Mr. Hollett: Could I ask the hon. Minister if the members of the Advisory Board come under the Civil Service Commission? Are they members of the civil service, the members of the Advisory Board?

Mr. Ballam: We have no Advisory Board as yet. This Bill proposes we would set it up.

Mr. Curtis: Will they be paid?

Mr. Ballam: They could be paid a per diem rate while they are sitting, but the Advisory Board must be engineers, not necessarily civil servants.

Mr. Hollett: Not necessarily?

Mr. Ballam: But they must be engineers because the Committee is set up to examine people for their engineer certificates.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, whether the

vocational examiners can't do this at the present time. A man who passes his vocational tests is an engineer is he not, licensed afterwards?

Mr. Ballam: I don't just follow. We have an engineering class in the Vocational Training School, and when students finish their course they will be examined by our chief inspector, or by the Board now being set up.

Mr. Nightingale: Then the man passing through that grade would be entitled to operate one of these boilers?

Mr. Ballam: It depends on which particular exam — either fireman, fourth engineer, third engineer, second engineer, chief engineer. There is no first engineer.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Anglo Newfoundland Development Company Limited and American Smelting and Refining Company".

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, where is that 50 square miles?

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, under the agreement, which expired December 31, 1958, they had the right to select 50 square miles. Now they have given the boundaries of that to the department of Mines and Resources and are registered at the department at the moment. It can be shown on the map if necessary. It is at the Registry of the Mining Documents in the Department of Mines.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed this bill without amendment, carried:

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act":

Hon. S. J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in this amendment there is a change in the wording; the word "two" to be changed to "three".

"The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint a Youth Guidance Authority for the province consisting of the Di-

rector, the Director of Child Welfare, the superintendent of the Boys' Home and Training School, the superintendent of the Girls' Home and Training School, a psychiatrist under the Newfoundland Medical Board Act, and three other persons".

On motion, clause as amended carried:

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, under Clause 3; "A juvenile who has been committed to the care and custody of the Director of Child Welfare for a fixed period shall not be detained in a school after the expiration of such period".

Mr. Hefferton: Mr. Chairman, this section must be read in conjunction with the Welfare of Children Act, where the definite period is made 12 months — The two tie in together.

Mr. Eric Jones (Burin): Mr. Chairman, does (14) — 1 — "Subject to an Act of the Parliament of Canada and to subsection (2), every juvenile committed to a school shall be committed for an indefinite period and he shall thereupon be detained in a school until he is released on probation". Does this take away from the magistrate the right to commit a child for any period of 12 months set down in the Welfare of Children Act?

Mr. Hefferton: You mean he cannot commit them for a month or three months? That is right, according to the Welfare of Children Act.

On motion Clause (3) carried:

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I don't like these words in the third line of 26A-1 "Hether voluntarily or under a commitment. It is alright to have the guardian under a commitment, but I do not think that under a case of voluntary commitment it should apply. I move these words be stricken out. "Whether voluntarily or"

On motion, Clause (4) as amended carried: Motion that the Committee report having passed the Bill with some amendment, carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Labrador Lands (Reservation) act".

Hon. W. J. Keough (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, at Second Reading stage I undertook to produce a map for the hon. Leader of the Opposition, which would show the area of Labrador to which this Bill referred. I will send it across to him. It was the area that was subsequently made available to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company under the requirements of the Act. The area in blue here are areas subsequently made available to NALCO and other areas is green now under the Statute of Crown Reservations.

On Motion, the Committee reported having passed this Bill without amendment. Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951".

Mr. Curtis: (7) (a), Mr. Chairman it has been redrafted — It is an improvement in the drafting but no change in the principle. The new section is:

(a) "the adjustments to be made as of the 1st. day of May in any given year shall be computed by increasing or decreasing the respective royalty rates prescribed by subsection (5) in the same proportion as the percentage of increase or decrease, as the case may be, in such wholesale price per ton of standard newsprint for the month of January in such year above or below the wholesale price per ton of standard newsprint for the month of January, 1958, bears to such wholesale price for the month of January, 1958".

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, there are so many subsections — I would like to comment on that — As I read it, the most we can get, although it is the minimum royalty I don't think we can get more than that, because if 100,000 cords are cut, that \$100,000 will be deducted from the \$150,000 royalty.

Mr. Curtis: Yes, except during that year. They still have to pay \$150,000, but the excess may be used up on what they prepaid. In other words, the \$150,000 will be prepaid royalty, but every year they have to pay \$150,000. Before they can take advantage of the prepaid royalty they have to be in excess of that. For instance, if they pay \$150,000 this year and that pays for 150,000 cords and they only cut in that year

100,000 cords, then they have 50,000 cords credit. To take advantage of that, they have to cut 200,000 cords next year, the 150,000 they have to pay and the 50 they can charge.

Mr. Hollett: Why a period of 12 years?

Mr. Curtis: That is the first period we could agree on. We first tried to get out altogether, and then tried to get it down to six and then 20 and 12 was a sort of compromise we reached. I tried to get that clause down to six but just could not.

Mr. Hollett: Does this mean all the wood in that area may remain there for the next 12 years and nobody else can go in there?

Mr. Curtis: As long as they pay the \$150,000 a year. They have to pay that whether or not they cut.

Mr. Hollett: Irrespective? They must be insane!

Mr. Curtis: That is the reason we found it hard to tie them down. We had to have some return for the wood, or some payment in lieu of cutting.

Mr. Hollett: I see they only pay it for 14 years. After that, what happens? I take it after they pay that they pay a dollar a cord.

Mr. Curtis: No, I think that is the year some other arrangement will be entered into.

Mr. Hollett: They have 12 years in which to make up their minds whether they take a lease and must pay \$150,000 in the meantime?

Mr. Curtis: No, from then on, at the end of the 12 years, because it is appreciated it takes some time. The minute they take the lease, the minute they apply for the lease, they start paying the \$150,000 a year. That is so they would not take out the lease prematurely. In other words, we don't want a lease outstanding if they don't want to use it. When they do, once they apply, they have to pay.

Mr. Hollett: If they don't apply for the lease they get nothing?

Mr. Curtis: It reverts to us after 12 years.

Mr. Hollett: In other words, it is tied up for 12 years?

Mr. Curtis: Under the present Act, it is tied up for 20 years, so it is quite an improvement. In any event, it does take time, as we know. Crown Zellerbach, before committing themselves, took nine years to get started.

Mr. Hollett: Could Crown Zellerbach take advantage of wood in that area, under Crown Zellerbach Act?

Mr. Curtis: No! No! There is a change on page 10, line two, instead of ... "to increase the minimum capacity of the mill". The words "of the mill" will be stricken out.

Mr. Hollett: Why is that?

Mr. Curtis: Because the mill would normally consume the equivalent of 150,000 cords. If they invested millions of dollars in the mill it is pretty safe to be sure they are going to operate it.

Mr. Hollett: If not, there is no revenue coming into the Crown.

Mr. Curtis: That is a chance we have to take. If they start a mill and operate it they will consume more than 150,000 cords a year.

Mr. Hollett: But they don't pay us anything then?

Mr. Curtis: Yes, they still pay us the royalty but not the minimum. They pay us a dollar a cord but there is no minimum.

Mr. Hollett: In the matter of water supply, will BRINCO be protected?

Mr. Curtis: (17) For the purpose of supplying adequate quantities of pure, clean water for the mill or plant or other facilities of the Corporation, the Government shall take such action as may be necessary... They can't take action contrary to the BRINCO Act.

Mr. G.R. Renouf (St. John's South): Mr. Chairman, on the matter of conservation,

does that paragraph mean reforestation, I wonder? It says — "carry out, at all times, cutting operations and forest management in such manner as will best conserve its forest areas to the end that such areas may provide a permanent supply of timber for its operations".

Mr. Curtis: I think that would just mean they will do what is necessary. I think it is held that in Newfoundland it is not necessary to reforest, that natural reforestation is sufficient.

Mr. Renouf: I wonder if it is too late to put in the word "reforestation"? Some areas, I believe are automatically renewed by nature, but there are others that are not.

Mr. Curtis: Well, it is rather awkward to amend this now, if the parties have gone. I would rather not commit myself but would be glad to take note of it. We might pass it in the meantime. You see, this Bill has been already agreed by the various parties. I would do anything essential, but if it is not urgent, I would hesitate to make any changes.

Mr. Hollett: I think you could read "reforestation" into that if you wanted to.

Mr. Curtis: I think forest management would include it.

Mr. Renouf: The general tenor seems to read that way already.

On motion, Clause (2) carried):

Clause (3) read:

3. Section 8B of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefore:

"8B (1) The Government hereby grants to the Corporation exploration leases on the terms hereinafter set out in the unalienated portions of the areas described in the Schedule.

(2) The exploration leases referred to in subsection (1) shall be in full force and effect until the 31st. day of March, 1978, but shall forthwith be terminated and the Government shall be entitled to re-enter upon that part of the demised premises in respect whereof no notices by the Corporation pursuant to Section 8E have been given,

(a) if during the periods,

(i) commencing on the 28th. day of

June, 1957, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1963;

(ii) commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1963, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1968;

(iii) commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1968, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1973; and

(iv) commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1973, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1978.

the Corporation shall not in each said period expend either directly or indirectly through assignees, lessees or transferees on the areas leased to it by subsection (1) and on any other areas leased or conveyed to the Corporation, its assignees or transferees, the sum of not less than Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) (Canadian) on exploration and investigation, such expenditures to include, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, expenditures made to determine the existence, size, extent and analysis of any one or more mineral deposits, but not to include expenditures made for the actual physical development of any mineral deposit necessary to mining on a commercial scale, deep drilling for oil and salt, and drilling lower than two thousand (2,000) feet below sea level for any purposes whatsoever; or

(b) if the Corporation or its assignees or transferees default in the payment of any sums payable by the Corporation or its assignees or transferees to the Government hereunder and such default continues for a period of six (6) months after the sums have become due and payable.

(3) If in any period referred to in paragraph (a) of subsection (2), the Corporation, either directly or indirectly through assignees, lessees or transferees, spends in accordance with that paragraph an amount in excess of the expenditures required in such period then the amount in excess so spent may be applied on the amount of Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) (Canadian) required to be spent in any succeeding five-year period and the obligation to spend at least Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$400,000) (Canadian) in any succeeding five-year period against which that excess

has been applied shall be reduced by the amount of that excess.

(4) The Corporation shall, at the times hereinafter specified, submit to the Government an account of the expenditures of the Corporation, its assignees, lessees and transferees, made pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (2), namely,

(a) on or before the 1st. day of June, 1963, for the period commencing on the 28th. day of June, 1957, and ending on the 31st. day of March 1963.

(b) on or before the 1st. day of June, 1968, for the period commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1963, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1968;

(c) on or before the 1st. day of June, 1973, for the period commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1968, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1973; and

(d) on or before the 1st. day of June, 1978, for the period commencing on the 1st. day of April, 1973, and ending on the 31st. day of March, 1978.

(5) For the purpose of complying with paragraph (a) of subsection (2) the Corporation shall subject to the exception contained in that paragraph receive full credit for all exploration and investigation expenditures incurred in connection with those lands described in subsection (1) even though at the time such exploration and investigation expenditures were incurred the said lands were held by the Corporation under any one or more mineral leases which have superseded prior exploration leases."

Mr. Hollett: 3(4) — Accounts to be submitted — May I ask, Mr. Chairman, will that be tabled if required.

Mr. Curtis: I don't see why it should not. It is a statement to the government and anything the government gets you are entitled to see.

On motion, Clause (3) carried.

On motion, Clause (4) carried.

On motion, the Committee rose to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Mr. G.R. Clarke (Chairman of the Committee of the Whole): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed

me to report having passed Bills Nos. 34, 42 and 41 without amendment.

On motion, report received, Bills ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have directed me to report having passed Bill No. 39 with some amendment.

On motion, report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Clarke: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again. On motion, report received, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and the house at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday, at three o'clock.

Friday, May 8, 1959

(Afternoon Session)

The house met at three o'clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I have to announce to the house that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor will be pleased to receive members of the House of Assembly for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply to the Speech From the Throne on Wednesday next, at 3:15 P.M.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

Mr. I. Mercer (Fogo): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Change Islands, for the erection of a bridge across Change Islands Tickle, a distance of approximately 200 feet. Much inconvenience and hardship is caused in winter to the people and property by crossing in a boat in stormy weather and moreover, slob ice often makes the crossing impossible. Much inconvenience is caused businessmen, churches and schools.

Whereas large sums of money are spent every year on highroads on neighbouring islands in Notre Dame Bay South it is humbly asked that the house take note of this request and that the prayer of the petition be granted.

This petition Mr. Speaker, is signed by some 360 eligible voters. In supporting this petition, Your Honour, may I say that in Change Islands, the Tickle, which is about 200 feet wide has the churches and schools on one side and the business premises and lodges are on the other side. Of course, the people are living on both sides. If the house can imagine that Tickle, with the children going over to school and home in the evening, and on Sundays going to church in the same manner and coming home and going back to Sunday School in the afternoon, and the every day traffic of the people themselves which is all done by boats, then the need for a bridge becomes obvious. It does not seem to be a terrific engineering feat. There is not very much money you can spend in Change Islands except on a project of this nature. This is very, very important to the people. Since I have been in the house representing Fogo District I think this is the first petition the people of Change Islands have ever asked me to present. Perhaps it is because they have asked so little that they have received less. I certainly endorse and support wholeheartedly this petition and ask Your Honour's permission to lay it on the table of the house to have it referred to the department to which it relates. On motion, petition received for referral to the department to which it relates.

Mr. M. Lane (White Bay North): Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to support the petition presented by the hon. and learned member for Fogo district. There is an area, as the hon. member stated in which very little can be done. The men are engaged in the fishery and it will help them considerably, more so than perhaps we know. I have great pleasure in supporting the petition.

Mr. Mercer (Fogo): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present to the house a petition from the people of Seldom. The prayer of the petition is for the provision of community wells at Seldom. There is very little source of drinking water, according to the Depart-

ment of Health, and Doctor Wells of Fogo Cottage Hospital says even this limited supply is unfit for human consumption. Community wells would help eliminate the possibility of disease and would at the same time give an ample supply of fresh water to the fish plant there. I may say, Mr. Speaker, in support of this petition, while there are only 29 families in the area, it is where the fish plant happens to be — in Seldom itself. There is Little Seldom, Seldom and Wild Cove. I inspected that well myself on my last visit down there, and I can truthfully say I am quite surprised to see such a small supply of water for the community, also for the fish plant. As a matter of fact, the last person who signed this petition is the manager of the fish plant. It is a great danger to the health of the people, particularly during the months of July and August. I am quite sure if the Department of Health will investigate the matter there is no doubt that corrective action will be taken. I certainly support the prayer of the petition, and I sincerely hope some move will be made to provide suitable wells from a sanitary point of view, not only from an ample water supply point of view. I ask leave to lay the petition on the table of the house and have it referred to the department to which it relates. On motion, petition received.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to lay on the table of the house the Protected Road Regulations, 1959.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

LEGISLATION:

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Provide For the Development of Housing Accommodations."

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend the Unimproved Lands Redistribution Act, 1957."

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Notice of Questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Renouf and Mr. Nightingale.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:**TERM 29:**

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there was some announcement made by the hon. Minister of Finance a day or so back when he stated that he would not be able to bring down the budget until such time as something definite is learned about the monies we are to receive under Term 29. That seems to me to be rather strange, and I was wondering if any member of the government, as the minister is not here himself, would like to make a statement on that because God knows when we will hear about Term 29, and we have to bring down a budget sometime. I was wondering if I had heard aright or was he misquoted?

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): I did not hear the statement to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers. I can say in connection with the budget that the draft estimates, upon which, of course, the budget is based, are still in the hands of the printers but are expected today or tomorrow, I think. These are only draft estimates and they will have to come before the government and be very carefully considered by the government and adopted finally and probably considerable changes will be made. At least, that has always been the case every year, without exception. Considerable study has to be given to the draft estimates after they are received and changes made and the amended estimates adopted and sent back to the printers.

Mr. A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Boiled down?

Premier Smallwood: Wittled down, of course. Finally the approved estimates are sent back to the printers for the necessary corrections to be made in the printed edition. Now that having been done, the Minister of Finance is in a position, for the first time, each year, to draw up his budget,

which of course must be in conformity with the estimates of revenue and expenditure already approved by the government.

So far as Term 29 is concerned, not having heard the statement of my colleague, to which the Leader of the Opposition refers, I am, of course, unable to offer any comment. I do say, however, that until 1962 we know what the government of Canada proposes to pay to the government of Newfoundland. We know that the amounts are exactly as recommended by the McNair Royal Commission. The dispute, as my hon. friend knows, between Newfoundland and Ottawa is not on that point. We had hoped to get more than the Royal Commission recommended but we have no legal nor moral nor constitutional claim for more than was recommended. That is not the basis of any difference of opinion between St. John's and Ottawa. The basis of any difference of opinion hinges on the length of time the payments recommended by the Royal Commission will continue to be paid to Newfoundland. The Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker), on one occasion in the House of Commons, before the Easter recess, said: "The final and irrevocable settlement would take place in 1962". Since then, as we all know with great pleasure, the Prime Minister has given some indication that they are perhaps reconsidering the matter. Now, we will not know until the Bill is brought before the house. The Bill has not yet been brought before the House of Commons, before Parliament. When it is brought there we will see what it says, and after the debate has taken place in Parliament, and the matter adopted, we will know where we stand in the matter of the length of time during which the payments will be made to us — but that does not prevent us from bringing down a budget now in the current financial year, because we know precisely how much we are going to get from Ottawa under Term 29 and we know it for this year and for two years after this year until 1962. We know also what we are getting for last year and the year before, together as a lump sum, to be attributed to last year and not attributed to the year upon which we have entered — I think that is clear.

Mr. Hollett: Thank you.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further

To Amend The Accident Insurance Licensing Act."

Hon. M. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the principle of the Bill is to give the Superintendent of Insurance more control and more powers of regulation over the premium rate payable by the public to underwriters of automobile insurance. As we all know, these premium rights are supposed to be set on the incidence of accidents and the number of claims paid out by these insurance companies during the preceding year. Now, under this Bill, it is made mandatory each year for these companies to file with the Superintendent of Insurance a balance sheet showing the number of premiums received and the amount of claims paid out in the year. In turn, the Superintendent of Insurance has to submit this balance sheet to a statistical agency in Montreal or elsewhere, to pay for the production of a scientific scale. The fees paid to the statistical agency, under this Bill, are spread out among all the underwriters in this Province. That Mr. Speaker, is briefly the principle of the Bill, and I move second reading.

On motion, Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Supply) asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local School Tax Act, 1957" — On motion, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow. On motion, the House goes into Committee of the Whole on various Bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. G.R. Clarke (Committee Chairman).

NALCO AMENDMENT!

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Act, 1951." Clause (5) read: Section 81 of the said Act is amended by inserting as subsection (4) and (5) the following:

"(4) In connection with any exercise of such power of expropriation, the Corpora-

tion may enter upon any lands which it may propose to expropriate in order to ascertain and measure such lands and obtain the description thereof.

- (5) The Corporation shall serve a written notice on the owner of any lands to be expropriated pursuant to this section that the said lands (describing the same) are required and will be taken for the purposes of the Corporation, or if the owner is not known or cannot be found, or if for any other reason personal service cannot be conveniently effected, the Corporation shall post a written notice of such expropriation in a conspicuous place upon such lands, and thirty days after the service or posting of such notice, as the case may be the lands shall be vested in the Corporation."

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): Is it anticipated that NALCO, if it requires any more land, (they have 25,000 square miles now), this given them the right to go in and stake out any land which they so desire on any other person's property or on government property? I take it, if they cannot find the owner then in 30 days they can go in and take possession. I suppose this clause is absolutely essential?

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): Yes. They have to compensate anyway. I think it is probably for the railway — No, it would not be for the railway.

Mr. Hollett: It seems rather strange to me.

Mr. Curtis: Let it stand and we will find out what it is for.

On motion, clause (5) stands:

Clause (6) read:

Section 8K of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

- "8K. — (1) For the purposes of this section;
- (a) "concession area" means all of the premises described in the Schedule to this Act;
- (b) "gross ton" means two thousand two hundred and forty (2240 pounds avoirdupois);
- (c) "iron ore products" includes iron ore, crude iron bearing material and any material or composition produced from iron ore or crude iron-bearing material;

- (d) subject as hereinafter in this subsection provided, iron ore products shall be deemed to have been shipped when delivered to a carrier in the concession area or from stockpile grounds or from the treating plant or plants, as the case may be, for shipment to the purchaser or consumer thereof, but when iron ore products shall at the request of the purchaser or consumer thereof be placed in stockpile or held elsewhere, such iron ore product shall be deemed to be shipped on the date that the property therein shall have passed to such purchaser or consumer;
- (e) the amount of iron ore products shipped shall be determined by railroad weights in gross tons calculated and certified by the carrier transporting the same which shall be accepted as prima facie correct, or by weightometers or by such other weights as may be generally in use for such purposes, subject in any case to the right of inspection by the Government and by the Lessee and any errors discovered shall be corrected and settled for promptly; and
- (f) when iron ore products shall be sold by the Lessee and placed in stockpile or held elsewhere at the request of the purchaser and the property therein shall pass to the purchaser before the iron ore products shall have been delivered to a carrier in the concession area or from stockpile grounds or from the treating plant or plants, as the case may be, for shipment to the purchaser or consumer thereof, such iron ore products shall be deemed to be shipped on the date that the property therein shall have so passed, and in any such case the weight of the iron ore products shall be estimated on the basis of weightometer weights taken by the seller at the time of stockpiling or in such other manner as shall be agreed upon between the Government and the seller, and the weights so estimated shall be subject to final correction and adjustment as in this subsection provided.
- (2) Subject to subsection (4), the Corporation or such person, firm or company (in this section sometimes called the Lessee) actually carrying out mining operations for iron ore under any mining leases granted in the concession area shall pay to the Government a sum to be determined at the rate of twenty-two cents (22) (Canadian Funds) per ton for every gross ton of iron ore products mined and shipped from the premises demised by any such lease, provided, however, that if the published Lake Erie price at Cleveland, Ohio, of Old Range non-Bessemer Ore analyzing fifty-one and one-half per centum (51.50%) iron, natural analysis, at the time of any shipment exceeds eleven dollars and seventy cents (\$11.70) (United States Funds) per gross ton, then the rate of twenty-two cents (22c.) (Canadian Funds) per gross ton for each such shipment, shall be increased in the same proportion as the amount of any such excess bears to eleven dollars and seventy cents (\$11.70) (United States Funds), said payments to be made on the 25th days of January, April, July and October in each year, or, if any such day falls on a Sunday or a holiday, then on the next ensuing day, and shall be in respect of all iron ore products shipped during the calendar quarter immediately preceding the first day of the month in which payment is to be made as aforesaid, and such payment shall be in lieu of any and all taxes that would otherwise be payable by the Corporation of any lessee, sub-lessee, assignee or transferee of such premises under The Mining Tax Act, chapter 43 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as amended from time to time or under any Act standing in the place of The Mining Tax Act as so amended, and any taxes for which the taxes now imposed by The Mining Tax Act are declared by that Act to be substituted, and any taxes imposed either generally or specifically upon mines or minerals or specifically upon persons carrying on the business of mining, in respect of operations under the said mining leases or in respect of iron ore mines or iron ore products made, produced, won, gotten, raised or removed under the provisions of the said mining leases.
- (3) The Corporation or its assignees or transferees shall pay to the Government in respect of any other mining lease granted under this Act
- (a) in respect of minerals, other than iron ore, a tax as computed under The Min-

- ing Tax Act, at the maximum rate of five per centum or any lower rate for the time being in force; and
- (b) in respect of petroleum, natural gas, and related hydrocarbons, royalty not exceeding twelve and one-half per centum of the wholesale value at the well-head;
- (4) In respect of iron ore products mined and shipped from any premises demised by
- (a) An Indenture of Lease executed, in the form set forth in Appendix A to the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule to The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957, the Act No. 84 of 1957, by and between Canadian Javelin Limited as Lessor and Pickands Mather & Co., and the Steel Company of Canada, Limited, as Lessee which has become fully effective according to law, and as amended from time to time;
- (b) an Indenture of Lease executed, in the form set forth in Appendix B to the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule to The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957, by and between Canadian Javelin Limited as Lessor and Wabush Iron Co. Limited as Lessee which has become fully effective according to law, and as amended from time to time;
- (c) an Indenture of Lease executed, in the form set forth in the Schedule to the Option Agreement appearing in Appendix C to the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule to The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957, by and between Canadian Javelin Limited as Lessor and Pickands Mather & Co., and The Steel Company of Canada, Limited, as Lessee which has become fully effective according to law, and as amended from time to time;
- (d) an Indenture of Lease executed, in the form set forth in Schedule B to the Agreement made between Wabush Iron Co., Limited and Canadian Javelin Limited on June 28th, 1957, and registered in the Registry of Deeds for Newfoundland in Volume 389 at Folios 435 to 464 (both inclusive); by and between Canadian Javelin Limited as Lessor and Wabush Iron Co., Limited as Lessee and which has become fully effective according to law, and as amended from time to time;
- (e) an Indenture of Lease executed, in the form set forth in the Appendix to the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule to The Julienne Lake (Mineral Lands) Act, 1959, by and between Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited as Lessor and Canadian Javelin Limited as Lessee which has become fully effective according to law and as amended from time to time; or
- (f) any indenture or agreement lawfully substituted for any Indenture of Lease referred to in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e);
- the Corporation shall not be required to make the payments referred to in subsection (2) as long as such premises are held under such lease and the payments are made by the person, firm or company actually required to make such payments under the Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957, and the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule thereto, The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1959, and the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule thereto, or The Julienne Lake (Mining Lands) Act, 1959, and the Statutory Agreement forming the Schedule thereto.
- (5) Subject to the subsections (2) (6) and (7) of this section, the Corporation shall be subject to taxes of general application levied by or under the authority of the Province or any municipality or other governmental subdivision, but shall not be subject to any tax of special application or any discriminatory tax.
- (6) Notwithstanding subsection (2) of Section 6 or any other provisions of The Nalco-Javelin (Mineral Lands) Act, 1957, or subclause (6) of Clause 7 or any other provision of the Statutory Agreement appended thereto, the Corporation, its successors, assignees, sublessees, licensees and agents, shall be exempt from the provisions of The Social Security Assessment Act, chapter 41 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as amended from time to time, or any Act standing in place of The Social Security Assessment Act as so amended and any similar taxes heretofore assessed or hereafter imposed either generally or specifically upon the purchase, consumption or use of machinery, equipment, structures, plant, materials goods, articles and things used in the original installation or expansion, in all or any part of the areas described in the

Schedule to this Act of works, buildings and facilities required for

- (a) mines, mine works and buildings, mineral exploration and prospecting and mining operations;
- (b) the treatment of processing ores and metals;
- (c) the development and equipping of pulp, paper or logging facilities;
- (d) the extraction and treatment of petroleum, natural gas and related hydrocarbons;
- (e) house building and town construction;
- (f) steam, hydro-electrical or other plants for developing power;
- (g) installation of water, sewerage and lighting systems; and
- (h) the construction and equipping of transportation, shipping and storage facilities:

Provided that such exemption shall not apply in respect of

- (i) any capital replacement made otherwise than in connection with expansion of any of such works, buildings and facilities;
- (j) spare parts, articles and materials required for renewals, replacements and repairs; or
- (k) any tax imposed by or under The Gasoline Tax Act, chapter 38 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as amended.

(7) Wherever the Corporation is subject to taxation by any municipality or other local taxing authority within the Province, the taxes levied by such municipality or other taxing authority against the Corporation, for any years together with the taxes levied by such municipality or other taxing authority against all other industrial establishments and activities for such year shall not exceed in the aggregate forty per centum (40%) of the total taxes levied by such municipality or other taxing authority for such year.

Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition): This is a long section and there are one or two things I would like to ask something on. Is there any particular reason for establishing the weight at 2240 lbs.?

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): It was in the original Act. It is a strange thing though — In Canada a ton is 2000 pounds, but in every bit of legislation we have, they

asked to make it 2240. It was a thing we were trying to avoid, but in this case it is in the original Act. Every time I saw 2240 I resented it and said so, but have not been able to get it changed.

Mr. Hollett: It means a lot in the long run.

Mr. Curtis: About 10%, yes.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder if the minister thinks it is possible to get that changed?

Mr. Curtis: I don't think so, but will bear it in mind between now and third reading.

Mr. Hollett: One other thing. Could the minister tell me what the price of iron ore is at Cleveland, approximately?

Mr. Curtis: I think it is \$11.70.

Mr. Hollett: Is that the average price?

Mr. Curtis: I have not heard of any change.

Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier): It is almost bound to go up. It would have gone up now but for the recession.

Mr. Hollett: Then I notice the corporation, or its assignees or transferees, will pay to the government in respect of any other mining lease granted under this Act 5% on all minerals other than iron ore and 12½% on natural gas, etc.

Premier Smallwood: The 5% is the regular tax of general application. The tax in Newfoundland on minerals is 5%. That is the regular taxation, the normal rate of general application. Now that is made applicable here as well. That is the rate the Labrador Mining and Exploration and the Iron Ore Company of Canada both pay, 5%. Over and above that they are to pay 8% of their profits.

Mr. Hollett: Yes. But I was looking a little ahead into the future. By the time they make other leases to other companies that price could very well be increased. Here they say they shall pay to the government — who knows if, in 10 years time they get another lease it might be possible to put on 10% instead of 5% and more than 12½%.

Say in 10 years time a grant were leased to some other company.

Premier Smallwood: Who leases?

Mr. Hollett: NALCO. In 20 years time, if you like. They only pay you 5% but if that section were not there at all and you could stipulate, at least there could be a clause that could stipulate that it is possible for them to pay more.

Premier Smallwood: In a number of cases, (in the case of Buchans, for example) they pay the 5% not only because 5% happens to be the rate of general application but they pay it because that is the rate agreed to in the statutory contract made between Buchans and the Newfoundland Government. A like arrangement exists with the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, and arising out of that the Iron Ore Company of Canada pay 5%. It is not merely because it happens to be the rate of general application but because that is the figure set down in their statutory agreement with the Newfoundland government, and so in this case as well.

Mr. Hollett: Yes, but the point I am trying to get across —

Premier Smallwood: The same point might be made equally of the Labrador Mining and Exploring Company and the Iron Ore Company of Canada, Buchans Mining and the St. Lawrence Corporation and others who have the 5% in their statutory agreements.

Mr. Hollett: I am not finding fault with that anyway but with the fact that even if 20 years go by before NALCO gives another mining lease on any mineral other than iron ore, they are only bound to pay the government 5%.

Premier Smallwood: Apart from the 8%.

Mr. Hollett: I am not talking about that. But 20 years or 50 years time — why bind a government for 20 or 50 years?

Mr. Smallwood: Every government does that.

Mr. Hollett: No.

Premier Smallwood: The hon. Mr. Walter Monroe bound the present government and bound the Commission of Government before us and bound our successors to the payment of 5%. The Buchans Mining Company are bound by statute by the government of that day, in 1926 or 1927 to 5%. The Commission of Government, in its turn, bound all its successors to 5% taxation in the case of the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, and the Iron Ore Company of Canada. That is the statutory agreement to which we are now bound, since 1938.

Mr. Hollett: That was on a lease already issued.

Premier Smallwood: This is on a lease already issued.

Mr. Hollett: No it is not.

Premier Smallwood: Yes it is exactly that, or it is on a lease provided for in the concession they have. Any mining company that comes in wants, naturally, to know in advance and to have it set down in black and white in a contract and to have that contract be made statutory by this house, to have the sanction of this house all set down in black and white as to what they are bound to pay. They do not want to be open to eccentric and unpredictable rates of taxation which may arise from time to time. They want to know in advance what rate of taxes they will be liable to pay. That is all this is — before they go and spend money and commit themselves.

Mr. Hollett: I am quite sure the hon. Premier does not quite get my point. NALCO has, let us say, 20,000 square miles of territory.

Premier Smallwood: No they have not — They have the sole right to search in that area.

Mr. Hollett: Well, surely the hon. Premier understood what I meant. Alright, they have the sole right to search for minerals over an area of 24,000 square miles. They find 10 years hence that they can give a lease to the Steel Company of Canada, if you like

— In 10 years time they are prepared to issue a lease, not the government — the government has no more right — they are prepared to issue a lease in 10 years time, and we are bound to accept from them 5% only as a royalty on any mineral, gold or silver, if you like; bound by this to accept. They might get God knows how much, 50%, 20%, but the government binds itself by this and not only this government, but the government 20 years hence, to receive only 5% from NALCO, who are only, as you know, trading on Newfoundland territory.

Premier Smallwood: Promoting.

Mr. Hollett: I don't see why they need that there. Why should the government, 10 years hence —

Hon. M.P. Murray (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Would it suit the objection if we put in a minimum of 5%?

Mr. Hollett: That would take care of it.

Premier Smallwood: I don't think either could be done. Take the Buchans Mining Company today —

Mr. Hollett: Why go back into the past.

Premier Smallwood: Not back in the past but into the future — the Buchans Mining Company 10 years hence decide to lease part of their concession to some company mentioned by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Steel Company of Canada or any other rate of taxation that the new owner will pay is set now, and was set in 1925, I think it was, at 5%. Or take it another way. The Labrador Mining and Exploration Company, to whom the original 20,000 square mile concession was given by the Commission of Government in 1938, may 10 years hence do what they did three years ago or four years ago; they may give to a company a big slice of that territory. They gave a big slice to the Iron Ore Company three or four years ago. They may do the same thing 10 years hence. And the rate at which taxes will be paid to the Newfoundland Government will be 5% because that was set back in 1938 when they got the lease. It is the same thing exactly in this legislation.

Mr. Hollett: Not at all.

Premier Smallwood: Precisely. In 1938, the government of Newfoundland and the legislation of Newfoundland (and they are one and the same thing) gave 20,000 square miles of a concession to the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and gave them the right to assign parts of it to others, and whoever developed any minerals on any minerals developed would pay 5% to the Newfoundland Government. That is exactly what was done.

Mr. Hollett: No, the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company was to pay the given percent on any development in that area.

Premier Smallwood: No.

Mr. Hollett: Yes! Don't they pay you 5%?

Premier Smallwood: They pay 5% on minerals they produce, but the Iron Ore Company of Canada, a lessee of the Labrador Mining and Exploration, and remember the Iron Ore Company of Canada owns no minerals in Labrador, these minerals are owned by the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company and the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company were given the Labrador Mining and Exploration concession by the Commission of Government in 1938, and the original company, the parent company, the Labrador Mining and Development Company, (which is the equivalent in this case of NALCO), that company passed on anything it develops, they pay 5% and the company to whom they have sublet, i.e. the Iron Ore Company of Canada which also pay 5%. That was fixed in the legislation of 1938. If that company 10 years hence subleases another part of the area, the company who subleases also pays 5%. Now that is exactly what is provided in this legislation.

Mr. Hollett: Well, would the Government consent to changing the word "lower" to sub-clause 3 of Section (c) to the word "higher"? "Taxes as computed under the Mining Tax Act or the maximum rate of 5% or any higher rate" why say "any lower" rate? Why not cut out the word "maximum" and substitute "higher" for "lower"?

Premier Smallwood: I don't think we could. It is 5% unless that tax should become lower in the meanwhile, in which case we should accept it at a lower rate, which I think is perfectly reasonable.

Mr. Hollett: Why not "if it becomes higher?"

Premier Smallwood: No, 5% is the maximum. They always want to know the maximum tax they have to pay. After receiving this information, they say — "in the meanwhile, suppose you yourselves lower the rate, will we get the advantage of the lower rate?"

Mr. Hollett: I am thinking of the petroleum. I think most of the countries in the East get 50% of the net profits — We get 12½%.

Premier Smallwood: They get that after the wells have been operating half a century. These are wells which do not exist.

Mr. Hollett: I hope they exist.

Premier Smallwood: We hope when these operate for 20 or 50 years — I have no doubt the Legislature of that day, either bi-laterally or uni-laterally will want to change it. In the meanwhile we get the people to come in and drill but we don't think we can get more than 12½%.

Mr. Hollett: Where is that taken from, Alberta?

Premier Smallwood: I think it is the same all across Canada.

Mr. Hollett: Of course, if the government wants to let it go at 12½% there is nothing we can do.

Hon. L. R. Curtis (Attorney General): The government is just as anxious as the hon. gentleman to get more, in fact we are more anxious because we have to balance the budget. But the fact of the matter is that practically every mining company in Newfoundland has that 5% ceiling, and you cannot expect other companies to come in and compete with a lower ceiling. The entire area of Buchans, as the hon. Premier

said, has a ceiling of 5% and has had for 20 years. Although it would be very pleasant if we could raise it and we would like to if we could but if we do raise it we just put these people — ?

Mr. Hollett: What people?

Mr. Curtis: Any people who come to Newfoundland for a concession and spend money. And goodness knows we want to get all we can get. If we charge more than 5% or do not give some assurance of terms under which they get the lease — At present, NALCO has the property leased and is going to lease other properties immediately and they therefore want to know before the lease what the maximum royalty will be. Does my hon. friend realize that, under the Reid Legislation, away back in 1902 and 1892, we were limited to 5% on all their areas in Newfoundland and have been for the past 50 years. It is just a situation which developed and we can't do anything about it, although we would like to.

Mr. Hollett: The people are complaining they are getting only 5% from Buchans, the government said that.

Mr. Curtis: I know — We are getting 8%, an extra 8% on the net profits, or practically 13%, so I think we are doing very well in this case. Mr. Chairman, there are several small changes there which are more or less formal. The first is on page 19. On the last line — Insert a colon after "thereof" and delete everything that comes after that. That means the first six lines on page 20 come out altogether. Then on page 23, at the end of paragraph 4, two lines from the bottom of the page, it should read "Mineral" lands instead of "Mining" lands. Subject to those amendments I move the adoption: On motion, clause (6), as amended, carried. On motion, clauses (7) through (9) carried:

Mr. Curtis: Now, Mr. Chairman, instead of asking the Committee to report the Bill I would like to report progress so that over the weekend if we find any errors that need to be corrected, we can go back into Committee of the Whole.

Motion, that the Committee report progress on this Bill and ask leave to sit again, carried.

On motion, the Committee recessed for ten minutes after which Mr. Chairman resumed the Chair.

CANADIAN JAVELIN:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council To Enter Into An Agreement With Canadian Javelin Limited."

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, could somebody tell me where is the office of Javelin in the City of St. John's?

Mr. Curtis: It was in the Woolworth Building — I don't know where it is now.

Mr. Hollett: Is it still in St. John's?

Mr. Curtis: I am not sure of that.

Premier Smallwood: I think they occupy a floor of Canada House on Fifth Avenue, in New York.

Mr. Hollett: And no office in St. John's?

Premier Smallwood: I think they moved from St. John's to Ottawa, as a temporary measure pending moving into new offices in Canada House, Fifth Avenue, New York. Their office in Montreal now is occupied by Pickands-Mather.

Mr. Hollett: Another point — I want to ask the minister if he could explain to the house the reason for this original action against Javelin in Montreal a few days ago? What was it all about?

Premier Smallwood: It was not a criminal action.

Mr. Hollett: It was tried in the criminal courts.

Premier Smallwood: No. There was a point blank refusal on the part of Canadian Javelin to file certain information requested by the Quebec Securities Commission and they preferred to accept a conviction on a technical offence and pay the fine to filing the information requested. They just would not file and did not file and paid the fine

instead. And they have been restored to their trading rights; that is "over the counter" of course. They are not listed. They have been trading again for some months; not trading over the counter in Montreal because of this quarrel, this point blank refusal to file information requested. As I said, they paid the fine instead. But they have been restored again, and I think we will find very shortly they will be listed on the American Exchange.

Mr. Hollett: Could the Premier tell the house what was the nature of the information?

Premier Smallwood: No, I am afraid I can't, I don't know.

Mr. Hollett: I wonder if the minister could let us have on tomorrow an exact description of these leases.

Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney General): I will try to get a map with them all shown, yes. The next clause is the clause I referred to the other day when speaking in the house, where, through some error they were multiplying the 22 cents, the percentage increase, which would have been very satisfactory to us. Unfortunately they discovered it. A new clause was circulated yesterday, and I ask that the clerk read that clause, as amended.

On motion clause (schedule) as amended carried:
Motion, that the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill, carried:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting a Private Mining Carrier Railway in Labrador."

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier could tell us who comprises Carol Lake Company?

Hon. J.R. Smallwood: It is the name under which the Iron Ore Company of Canada have organized their railway company to operate from the western end of the joint railway to the site of their new mine and mill at Carol Lake. It is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a few nominal corrections: On the eighth line — At the end of the line, instead of the word 'company' I would like to insert the words 'persons'any other persons, firm or corporation. Then three lines further on the word 'company' appears again. On motion, clause (3) as amended carried.

Mr. Curtis: In the second line of clause (4) the same word 'persons' instead of 'company'. On motion, clause (4) as amended carried.

On motion, clause (6) carried.

Mr. Curtis: In clause (6) there is an amendment we would like to make, Mr. Chairman. We would like it to read now. "Subject to the Act No. 41, 1938, and entitled An Act For the Confirmation of a Agreement Between The Government and Labrador Mining and Exploration Company Limited." We have to do that because there is no short title to that Act. The last three lines should be deleted after a full stop after the word 'company' in the third line from the bottom. Deleted: "Provided that Section 18 of the said The Wabush Lake Railway Act, 1955, shall not apply to the undertaking of the Company."

On motion, clause (6) as amended carried.

Mr. Curtis: In clause (7), Mr. Chairman, on the fourth line, after the word 'may' insert the words: "with the prior consent in writing of the government, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld": then "enter upon and assume possession of and appropriate lands belonging to any person or corporation that may be required for the purpose, and the compensation to be paid by the Company to the owner for or in respect of such lands or the damage or injury sustained by the owner through the exercise by the Company of its rights under this section shall, unless settled by private agreement, be determined by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided."

On motion, clause (7), as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, in clause (8) there is only one correction: On the fifth line from the bottom the word lands should have a capital L.

On motion, clause (8) carried.

On motion, clauses (9) and (10) carried:

Mr. Hollett: On clause (10), Mr. Chairman, it appears the company can take all the necessary wood for the construction of the railway. We were talking about ties here and were supposed to get them creosoted, and now the company has the right —

Premier Smallwood: Can but won't. When they built the present railway from Seven Islands to Knob Lake they passed through 1500 miles of timber, which timber, as the house knows, was ceded subsequently to NALCO. That was not used for the railway ties. That was soft wood, spruce and fir, and was not considered to be suitable to make railway ties. And we heard they even brought ties made of oak from the Southern United States rather than use the wood through which the railway passed. I think it is highly unlikely they would use any of this wood for that purpose. There might be other purposes. On motion, clauses (11) through (14) carried.

Mr. Claude Sheppard (Hr. Grace): Mr. Chairman, does this remove the town or proposed town which might be built from the jurisdiction of our Department of Municipal Affairs?

Premier Smallwood: In one way I hope so. I wish they would also build the churches and schools while they are at it. As to taking over municipal control, the Attorney General could better answer the question than I.

Mr. G. Nightingale (St. John's North): I think they would be just community townships for a time. They would not go to the length of the city of St. John's, with taxable populations, but it would be quite easy for the company to collect taxes. They could just deduct it. I don't think it is meant like that, I am pretty sure.

Premier Smallwood: Well it is pretty clear here. They have pretty sweeping powers, to make regulations concerning drains, streets, buildings, lighting, water supply, fire protection, keeping of animals, public health, closing hours of shops, and other subjects which may from time to time at the request of the company be assigned to the company by the government. But it is pro-

vided in the next paragraph that the government may at any time require the company to revoke any regulations made. They are given the power but the government have a sort of overriding right to veto.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite follow clause (15) either. I do not see why we give the company the right to streets, roads, lighting, water supply, keeping of animals and public health.

Mr. Nightingale: It is company controlled. They are paying for it, you see.

Premier Smallwood: It is the same as Scheferville now, I think.

Mr. Nightingale: They will dam the water supply and pipe it.

Mr. Hollett: They will probably make a better job of it, of course, than any council would.
On motion, clauses (15) through (18) carried.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, there is a small amendment to clause (19). In the eighth line, before the word 'provided' the words 'providing service to the public generally' we deleted, and there will be a colon after railway.
On motion, clause (19) as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: In clause (20), in the fifth line, the word 'respectively' is deleted and is put in again after the word 'railway' in the next line. That is an improvement in the wording. It will now read 'interchange of traffic over the railway respectively'. On motion clause (20) as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: In clause (21), the word 'material', fourth line from the bottom should be plural and in (d) 'telegraphic' should be 'telegraph'; installation of telegraph and telephone systems". On motion, clause (21) as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

Premier Smallwood: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was asking earlier

the price of iron ore. The price is approximately \$11.70 a ton — That is on pretty good authority.

Mr. Hollett: I thank you very much. Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor In Council To Enter Into An Agreement With Wabush Lake Railway Company, Limited, Northern Land Company Limited and Carol Lake Company Limited and To Provide Certain Statutory Provisions For the Same Purpose."

On motion clauses (1) through (5) carried.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell the Committee just how we stand now with Wabush Lake Railway Company. Have they all the rights granted to them under the original Railway Act?

Premier Smallwood: The Act is still there.

Mr. Hollett: They are giving the rights over to this company.

Mr. Curtis: Right. There are some amendments, particularly on page 4. The construction of the Joint Facilities by Northern Land Company Limited as described in clause (2) of the Statutory Agreement — all the rest is deleted. Then in the next line — we want to take out the comma after Northern Land Company Limited — the grant of the rights, benefits and privileges by Northern Land Company Limited to Wabush Lake etc.

On motion, clause (4) as amended, carried.
On motion, clause (5) carried.
Schedule:

Mr. Curtis: On the second page, after the word "area" in the first paragraph I would like to have these words inserted. "which area is understood to include, without limiting the generality of the" —

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, before we go on, could we have that whole section read? This alters it a little bit.

On motion, clause as amended carried.
On page (8) clause 2. (amendment).
Page 10, three lines from the bottom of the page. The words should be "under this agreement". On motion, schedule as amended, carried. Motion, that the commit-

tee report progress on this Bill and ask leave to sit again, carried:

Mr. A. M. Duffy (St. John's Centre): Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to the attendance over there.

Mr. J.D. Higgins (St. John's East): It is 100% over here. Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act To Amend The Wabush Lake Railway Act, 1955." On motion, clauses (1) and (2) carried.

Mr. Curtis: I have an amendment here, Mr. Chairman. "The Government hereby undertakes to assure to the company from time to time, from unoccupied Crown Land in Labrador land for a railway right-of-way to the Julienne Lake Area." Now we may have to amend that when the Committee comes back, but at the moment I would like to add, after the word "Labrador land for a railway-right-of-way to Julienne Lake Area — "and such land as may reasonably be necessary for construction and operation of company railway or railways or for other purposes incidental thereto, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing." I would like to have that section stand over, as the wording is not very accurate. Let clause (4) stand and have it done properly, as I cannot make sense out of it.

Mr. Hollett: Why is it not given to the new company?

Mr. Curtis: Because all rights-of-way are given in the first instance to the Wabush Railway and are assigned by them, I would like to have clause (4) stand. On motion clause (4) stands.

Mr. Curtis: In clause (5) "If the Company or Northern Land Company Limited, as the case may be" Take away the comma there, and the words "as the case may be" should come out. On motion, clause (5), as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: Clause (6) — On the first line — "Section 19 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor: "Then instead of this proviso there is a proviso which has been circulated." On motion, clause (6), as amended, carried.

Mr. Curtis: There are one or two amendments there. Section 28 is renumbered and there is a correction in Section 29 — second line — "any other company or owners of railways" after the word "railways" add "whether public or private" Then there are two new sections (30) and (31), and then section 32: Sect. 30 — "The Company shall afford reasonable facilities for the junction of private sidings or private branch railways with any railway belonging to or worked by the Company."

Sect. 31 — "The Company shall not: —

"(a) Make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to, or in favour of any particular person or company, or any particular description of traffic in any respect whatsoever;

"(b) by any unreasonable delay or otherwise howsoever, make any difference in treatment in the receiving, loading, forwarding, unloading, or delivery of the goods of a similar character in favour of or against any particular person or company;

"(c) subject any particular person, or company or any particular description of traffic, to any undue, or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever; or

"(d) so distribute or allot its cars as to discriminate unjustly against any locality or industry, or against any traffic that may originate on its railway destined to a point on another railway in the Province with which it connects: Provided that this section shall be without prejudice to

"(e) any agreement now or hereafter made or entered into by the Company pursuant to the powers vested in it by law; or

"(f) any agreement in force as of the date of the enactment of this section by and between Canadian Javelin Limited and Wabush Iron Company Limited which affects or prescribes rights, duties and obligations of either of said companies or of the company."

I will try, if possible, Mr. Chairman, when this Bill comes back to have it reprinted so that we will all have copies before the Committee rises. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to refer back to clause (6) in this Bill, to this mimeographed sheet here. In the middle of that it refers to Carol Land Company, which should be Carol Lake Company, on the tenth line.

Mr. Hollett: Amending the amendment.

Mr. Curtis: Amending the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill.

I might say we dealt with this railway Bill this afternoon because there are some gentlemen in the house today who represent the Iron Ore Company in a legal capacity.

Mr. Hollett: Mr. Chairman, while in Committee I would like to say that I have had the pleasure of meeting these two gentlemen, and I am quite sure the company which they represent has a tremendous future in this Province of Newfoundland, and I am quite sure from what we have already done that they can take back with them the good wishes of this whole house.

Mr. Curtis: We concur in that, Mr. Chairman.

Motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, carried:

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. G. R. Clarke (Committee Chairman): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

Mr. Curtis: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the house at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow Monday at three o'clock.

On motion all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred:

On motion the house at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at three o'clock.

INDEX

- Page 9 Address in Reply, A. Mifflin (Trinity North)
- Page 11 G. Clarke (Carbonear — Bay de Verde)
- Page 12 I.W.A.
- Page 13 Term 29
- Page 13 Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of Opposition)
- Page 14 Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier)
- Page 16-19 (Inclusive) I.W.A. (Premier — Resolution)
- Page 19 Hon. M.M. Hollett on resolution
- Page 21 A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre on Resolution)
- Page 21 G.R. Renouf (St. John's South on Resolution)
- Page 23 Petition (J.R. Chalker — St. Barbe)
- Page 24 Petition (Hon. F.W. Rowe)
- Page 25 Petition (M. Whalen, Harbour Main — Bell Island)
- Page 25 Annual report, Department of Mines & Resources tabled
- Page 26-28 Ministerial Statement — Premier — Royal Visit
- Page 28-29 (Inclusive) Legislation — Woods labour — I.W.A. Hon. L.R. Curtis — Hon. The Premier
- Page 39-41 Hon. M.M. Hollett
- Page 41-44 (Inclusive) Hon. C.H. Ballam (Minister of Labour)
- Page 44 Annual report Department of Health 1957
- Page 44 Speaker rules that 3 copies of Answers to Questions must be provided.
- Page 44-61 (Inclusive) Legislation — 2nd Reading — Amendment to Labour Relations Act; I.W.A.; Union decertification; (Hon. L.R. Curtis) (Hon. the Premier supports Bill).
- Page 53 (Mr. Speaker chides Public Gallery)
- Page 57 Hon. M.M. Hollett
- Page 59 J.D. Higgins (St. John's East)
- Page 60 A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre)
- Page 61 G.R. Renouf (St. John's South)
- Page 62 Report of Standing & Select Committees — (Education — Hon. F.W. Rowe) tabled
- Page 63 Ministerial Statement — Hon. the Premier Bell Island — effect of C.L.C. broadcast.
- Page 64 Crown Zellerbach deal off.
- Page 65-71 Committee of the Whole — "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act" (I.W.A.)
- Page 71 Royal Assent to Bills relating to woods — labour dispute (I.W.A.)
- Page 72 Petitions (Hon. S.J. Hefferton — Trinity South)
- Petitions (Hon. P.J. Lewis — Harbour Main— Bell Island)
- Report of Select Committee on Address in Reply — presented by Arthur Mifflin — Trinity North for self and G.W. Clarke, Carbonear— Bay de Verde, G. Rex Renouf, St. John's South
- Page 73 Lt. Governor's Warrants
- Page 73 Hardwood's Plant — Insurance
- Page 75-81 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate — Address in Reply; A.M. Duffy (St. John's Centre)
- Page 84 Cost of Royal Commission on Term 29
- Page 85 Petition: Hon. J.T. Cheeseman.
- Page 86 Annual Report of Dept. of Public Welfare (1958)
- Page 86-95 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (Hon. F.W. Rowe — Education).
- Page 96-97 J.P. O'Driscoll (Bell Island)
- Page 97 Ministerial Statement (Premier) Bell Island mines to close down.
- Page 99 Hon. M.M. Hollett on Wabana problem.
- Page 100-104 Ministerial Statement (Premier) on I.W.A. (labour violence).
- Page 104 Hon. M.M. Hollett — I.W.A.
- Page 105 Hon. L.R. Curtis — I.W.A.
- Page 107-114 (Inclusive) Address in Reply — adjourned debate — G.R. Renouf.
- Page 114 Personal Privilege (Hon. C.H. Ballam)
- Page 115-118 (Inclusive) Ministerial Statement — Hon. J.R. Smallwood — I.W.A. violence — Member of constabulary killed in melee.
- Page 118 Hon. L.R. Curtis on I.W.A. problem.
- Page 120 Hon. M.P. Murray (Ferryland)
- Page 120 Ministerial Statement (Premier) Telegram from Church representatives backs Government stand in woods labour dispute — praises police restraint.
- Page 121-125 Address in Reply (Hon. Dr. J.A. McGrath)
- Page 125-127 Throne Speech Debate (Mr. M. Whalen — Harbour Main).
- Page 127 Legislation — 2nd Reading.
- Page 129 I.W.A. Ministerial Statement — Hon. J.R. Smallwood.
- Page 130 R.C. Nuns removed from Badger because of woods labour problems (Hon. F.W. Rowe).
- Page 130-137 (Inclusive) Petitions: G. Nightingale (St. John's North)
- Adjourned debate — Address in Reply (J.D. Higgins — St. John's East).

- Page 137-141 (Inclusive) Hon. P.J. Lewis (Minister w/o Portfolio).
- Page 141 Legislation — Committee of the Whole.
- Page 142 Petitions: (W. Smallwood — Green Bay) (C.W. Sheppard — Harbour Grace).
- Page 142-148 Adjourned debate — Address in Reply (C.M. Lane — White Bay North).
- Page 148-151 Earl Winsor (Labrador North).
- Page 151 Legislation (3rd Reading)
- Page 151 Ministerial Statement (Hon. the Premier) Provincial Government to sue Federal Government.
- Page 152-156 (Inclusive) Ministerial Statement (Hon. the Premier) Iron Ore Development — Labrador.
- Page 152-163 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate — Address in Reply (P.J. Canning — Placentia West).
- Page 163-167 (Inclusive) Hon. J.T. Cheeseman (Minister of Fisheries).
- Page 167 Ministerial Statement (Premier) scholarship in memory of late Constable William Moss.
- Page 168 Petition (W. Smallwood — Green Bay)
- Page 170-188 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate Address in Reply (Hon. M.M. Hollett).
- Page 189 Petitions: Hon. J.R. Chalker — St. Barbe.
- Page 190-194 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate Address in Reply (Hon. M.M. Hollett).
- Page 194-206 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate Address in Reply (Hon. J.R. Smallwood).
- Page 206 Interim Supply — letter of recommendation of estimates acceptance from Lt. Governor MacPherson.
- Page 207 Ministerial Statement (Term 29) Premier.
- Page 208 Ministerial Statement (woods — labour dispute) — Attorney General L.R. Curtis.
- Page 209-213 Petitions (3) Hon. L.R. Curtis.
- Page 213 Report Workman's Compensation Board tabled (Hon. C.H. Ballam — Minister of Labour).
- Page 213 Civil Service Pension Report — available when?
- Page 214-219 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (Hon. M.P. Murray).
- Page 219-220 (Inclusive) Legislation (new); Trustee Act; Rent Restriction Act; Urban & Rural Planning Act; Pharmaceutical Act, 1954; Food & Drug Act; Newfoundland Medical Board Act; Health & Public Welfare Act; Nomenclature Board Act; Automobile Insurance Act; Memorial University (Pensions) Act; Public Libraries Act; Education (Teacher's Pensions) Act; Frobisher Ltd. (Confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955; M.J. Boylen (confirmation of Agreement) Act, 1955; Advocate Mines; Crown Lands (Mines & Quarries) Act; Wildlife Act.
- Page 221 Petitions (P.J. Canning — Placentia West)
- Page 223 Adjourned debate — Address in Reply (E. Jones — Burin).
- Page 224 Royal assent.
- Page 224 Continuation (E. Jones) — Address in Reply.
- Page 226-233 (Inclusive) Hon. S.J. Hefferton (Minister of Welfare).
- Page 234-237 2nd Reading — Legislation.
- Page 238 Visitors welcomed (Music Festival contestants).
- Page 239 Petitions (Hon. E.S. Spencer) Hydro; (Hon. J.R. Smallwood).
- Page 241 Petitions (G. Nightingale — St. John's North)
- Page 241 Legislation — Bills varied.
- Page 242 Report of Crown Corporations not made public??
- Page 243-251 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate on Address in Reply (W. Smallwood — Green Bay).
- Page 251 Legislation — varied — 2nd Reading.
- Page 252-257 (Inclusive) Ministerial Statement (Premier Smallwood) (Federal Government violates contract re- make-up of St. John's Housing Authority).
- Page 257-259 (Inclusive) Hon. B.J. Abbott (Minister of Municipal Affairs) comments on above.
- Page 259-260 Hon. L.R. Curtis (Attorney-General) comments on above.
- Page 260-264 (Inclusive) Hon. M.M. Hollett (Leader of the Opposition) comments, with permission on Ministerial Statement.
- Page 264 Reports of Labour Relations Board & Minimum Wage Board tabled (1958).
- Page 264 Legislation — NALCO — Canadian Javelin — Wabush Mines.
- Page 264 2nd Reading — Labour Relations Act.
- Page 265-267 (Inclusive) as above — Hon. J.R. Smallwood & others.
- Page 267 Bill withdrawn.
- Page 267-275 (Inclusive) Address in Reply continuing (J. Forsey — Humber East).
- Page 275 Petitions (Dr. J. McGrath — St. Mary's).
- Page 276-277 Motions — new legislation — varied.
- Page 277-282 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (L. Strange — Port de Grave).
- Page 282-287 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (G. Nightingale — St. John's North).
- Page 287-291 (Inclusive) Legislation — 2nd Reading.
- Page 291-293 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole.
- Page 293 Petitions (L. Strange — Port de Grave).
- Page 293 Orders of the Day — Premier welcomed back from London.

- Page 294-301 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (C. Sheppard — Harbour Grace).
- Page 301-309 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (G. Sellers — Labrador, South).
- Page 309-310 Notice of new legislation.
- Page 310-315 (Inclusive) Address in Reply — continued (J. Forsey — Humber East).
- Page 315-319 (Inclusive) Address in Reply (U. Strickland — Bonavista South).
- Page 319-328 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole (Various Bills).
- Page 328-330 (Inclusive) Resignation of G.J. Power.
- Page 330 Petitions (Premier Smallwood)
- Page 330 Point of Privilege (J. Forsey — Humber East)
- Page 331-334 (Inclusive) Address in Reply — continuation (U. Strickland).
- Page 334 Legislation — 3rd Reading (7 bills enacted)
- Page 339-343 (Inclusive) Industrial Taxation (S.S.A.)
- Page 342 N.A.L.C.O.
- Page 343 Royal Commission Report on Unemployment.
- Page 343 Canadian Javelin fined \$1,000.
- Page 344-360 (Inclusive) Labrador Iron Ore Development enabling bills:— 7 (N.A.L.C.O.) (John C. Doyle) (Mr. J. Boylen) (Jules Timmins) (Lord Northcliff) (Lord Rothermere) all mentioned, among others. Details by Premier Smallwood —questioned by other house members.
- Page 361 Housing — St. John's
- Page 361-362 Legislation — 2nd Reading of a Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited and American Smelting and Refining Company" (Hon. W.J. Keough) (Minister of Mines & Resources).
- Page 363-369 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole:— various bills.
- Page 369-372 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole (Coasting Vessels Bounties).
- Page 372-373 Bills passed into Law
- Page 374 Petitions (W. Smallwood - Green Bay) (Hon. S.J. Hefferton) (Hon. J.R. Chalker) (Hon. C.H. Ballam)
- Page 375 Notice of Motion — new legislation.
- Page 375-377 (Inclusive) Point of Privilege (Hon. M.M. Hollett).
- Page 377-393 (Inclusive) Legislation — 2nd Reading NALCO Legislation.
- Page 393 Ministerial Statement — loss of "Blue Wave".
- Page 394 Petitions: (W. Smallwood - Green Bay), (Hon. J.R. Chalker - St. Barbe).
- Page 395-403 (Inclusive) Legislation — 2nd Reading — City of St. John's Act (amendment); 2nd Reading — "NALCO"; 2nd Reading — "NALCO — Javelin Minerals Act" (amendment); 2nd Reading — Wabush Lake Railway (Et al.) legislation.
- Page 405-407 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole; Labrador forests.
- Page 408 Petitions: (I. Mercer - Fogo)
- Page 410 Term 29
- Page 411-417 (Inclusive) NALCO Amendment — Committee of the Whole.
- Page 418-422 (Inclusive) Canadian Javelin — Committee of the Whole.
- Page 422 Petitions: (Hon. W.J. Keough)
- Page 423-424 (Inclusive) Legislation: 2nd Reading — Amend. "Crown Lands (Mines & Quarries) Act".
- Page 425-429 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole — NALCO (continued) (Brinex - Brinco).
- Page 429 Committee of the Whole — Canadian Javelin.
- Page 432 Committee of the Whole — Wabush Lake Railway.
- Page 433-436 (Inclusive) Ministerial Statement:— Memorial University.
- Page 436 Motions
- Page 437 Legislation passed.
- Page 440 Bills passed in Committee
- Page 442 2nd Reading — The Frobisher Act.
- Page 443-452 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading: Memorial University Act.
- Page 452 Housing Bill
- Page 454 Petitions: (G.R. Renouf — St. John's South)
- Page 456-458 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading — Forest Protection Bill; House adjourns to call of the Chair.
- Page 458 Petitions (I. Mercer - Fogo)
- Page 459 3rd Reading — Teacher's Pension Legislation.
- Page 461 Legislation re- St. John's Act.
- Page 463-471 (Inclusive) Cement Plant Legislation.
- Page 471 Health & Welfare Bill — 2nd Reading.
- Page 472 Apprenticeship Act — amend; — 2nd Reading.
- Page 475 City of St. John's Amendment Act:— 2nd Reading.
- Page 476 Ministerial Statement (Premier) re- St. John's Housing Authority appointments.
- Page 476 Petitions (Hon. S.J. Hefferton).
- Page 477 Orders of the Day — new legislation.
- Page 478 Interim Supply 1959-1960 — \$13,520,000
- Page 478 Interim Supply Bill (Hon. E.S. Spencer).
- Page 479-482 (Inclusive) Term 29 (Hon. J.R. Smallwood).
- Page 482-489 (Inclusive) Loan & Guarantee Act; (Committee of the Whole)
- Page 489 2nd Reading — City of St. John's Act.

- Page 494 Royal Assent — Interim Supply; Eight (8) Bills relating to Labrador development.
- Page 496 Committee of the Whole — Memorial University Bill.
- Page 497-507 (Inclusive) Ministerial Statement: Memorial University (Hon. J.R. Smallwood).
- Page 507-513 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading — North Star Cement.
- Page 514 2nd Reading — Automobile Insurance Act.
- Page 515 2nd Reading — M.J. Boylen legislation.
- Page 516 Committee of the Whole:— Amend Health & Welfare Act.
- Page 517-519 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole:— An Act Further to Provide for the Development of Housing Accommodation.
- Page 519-525 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to enter into an Agreement with Newfoundland Cement Company Limited and North Star Cement Limited".
- Page 527-529 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading — Amend to Education Act.
- Page 530-536 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole: Supply: Municipalities: Statutory Salaries: City of St. John's Act: M.U.N.: Car Insurance.
- Page 536 Members' Pension Plan
- Page 537 School Attendance Act
- Page 537-542 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading of a Bill "An Act to Authorize the Government of Newfoundland to Enter into an Agreement with McNamara Construction of Newfoundland Limited and Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Act" (C.M.I.C.)
- Page 542-545 (Inclusive) Amend. Summary Jurisdiction Act.
- Page 545 2nd Reading "An Act to Amend The Conditional Sales Act".
- Page 547 2nd Reading "Crown Lands Act Amendment"
- Page 548-551 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading "Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment".
- Page 554-558 (Inclusive) 2nd Reading "Revenue & Audit Act Amendment".
- Page 560-563 (Inclusive) Resolution re- Contributory Pension Plan for House of Assembly members.
- Page 563 Supplementary Supply Resolution.
- Page 564 Royal Visit — Gift to Her Majesty.
- Page 565 Bay d'Espoir power.
- Page 569 2nd Reading Members' Pensions legislation.
- Page 572 Committee of the Whole; Supplementary Supply.
- Page 581-593 (Inclusive) Budget Speech (Hon. E.S. Spencer)
- Page 593 Petitions (I. Mercer - Fogo); Petitions (Hon. M.P. Murray).
- Page 595-597 (Inclusive) Logger Blacklisted; I.W.A. — N.B.W.W.
- Page 600-605 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole; Highway Traffic Act Amendment.
- Page 605-614 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole on Supply; Sinking Fund; Statutory Salaries; Legislative; Executive Council; Dept. of Finance.
- Page 615 Ministerial Statement; Statutory Holidays (Hon. J.R. Smallwood).
- Page 616-630 (Inclusive) Budget Debate (Hon. M.M. Hollett)
- Page 630-633 Committee on Supply; Estimates.
- Page 633 House condolences on death of Thomas LeFeuvre.
- Page 634-642 (Inclusive) Adjourned Budget Debate (A.M. Duffy).
- Page 642-655 (Inclusive) Estimates:— Departments of Attorney General; Mines & Resources.
- Page 655 Petitions:— (J. Forsey — Humber East).
- Page 656-661 (Inclusive) Adjourned Budget Debate (G.R. Renouf).
- Page 661-675 (Inclusive) Hon. J.R. Smallwood (Premier) chides A.M. Duffy for his "insolvency" charges made in Budget Debate.
- Page 675-677 (Inclusive) Committee of the Whole House on Estimates; Depts. of Public Works; Health.
- Page 678 Ministerial Statement (Premier Smallwood) Shop closing hours.
- Page 678 Petitions: (Premier Smallwood) (J. Forsey - Humber East) (W. Smallwood - Green Bay) (Hon. P.J. Lewis).
- Page 682 Committee of the Whole: Estimates: Depts. of Public Welfare: Board of Liquor Control; Municipal Affairs & Supply; Labour; Fisheries; Highways.
- Page 698 Institutional Purchases.
- Page 699 Polio outbreak
- Page 701 2nd Reading — St. John's Shops Act.
- Page 703 1st Reading of a Bill "An Act to Amend The Shops Act" (Shop closing hours).
- Page 705-707 (Inclusive) Royal Assent; Supply; Plus 66 pieces of varied legislation.
- Page 707 House adjourns to call of the Chair (Term 29).
- Page 708 Resolution — Term 29
- Page 709 J.D. Higgins leaves P.C. Party.
- Page 712 A.M. Duffy leaves P.C. Party.
- Page 713 Placentia Gut Bridge.
- Page 716-735 (Inclusive) Term 29
- Page 735-749 (Inclusive) Personal Privilege (J.D. Higgins) Adjourned debate (Term 29 — G.R. Renouf).

- Page 749-757 (Inclusive) (Hon. M.P. Murray — Term 29)
- Page 757 Petitions (Hon. M.M. Hollett)
- Page 758-781 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. M.M. Hollett).
- Page 781-782 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. J.T. Cheeseman).
- Page 783 Personal Privilege (Hon. M.M. Hollett).
- Page 783-794 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate (Term 29 — Hon. P.J. Lewis).
- Page 794-795 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate (Term 29 — Hon. C.H. Ballam).
- Page 795-798 (Inclusive) Adjourned debate (Term 29 — Hon. E.S. Spencer).
- Page 798-801 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. A.S. Mifflin).
- Page 801-804 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. F.W. Rowe).
- Page 804-805 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. W.J. Keough).
- Page 805 Election Call??
- Page 806-811 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. L.R. Curtis).
- Page 811-813 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. A.M. Duffy).
- Page 813-815 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. B.J. Abbott)
- Page 815-820 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Hon. J.D. Higgins).
- Page 820-821 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — C. Sheppard).
- Page 821-824 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — I. Mercer).
- Page 824-827 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — Dr. J.M. McGrath).
- Page 827-829 (Inclusive) Adjourned Debate (Term 29 — C.M. Lane).
- Page 829 Resolution (Term 29 — Hon. J.R. Smallwood) Dissolution of the House.
- Page 844 House divided on Motion — Yeas (31) Nays (2).
- Page 845 Prorogation — Speech from the Throne.

NOTE: This was the last time the Provincial Legislature met in the Colonial Building.



NEWFOUNDLAND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

List of Members

Joseph P. O'Driscoll, Esq.,
The Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood
Eric S. Jones, Esq.,
The Hon. John T. Cheeseman
Uriah F. Strickland, Esq.,
George W. Clarke, Esq.,
The Hon. Myles P. Murray Q.C.,
Isaac Mercer, Q.C.,
John R. Courage, Esq.,
The Hon. Beaton J. Abbott
The Hon. Edward S. Spencer
William R. Smallwood, Esq.,
Claude A. Sheppard, Esq.,
The Hon. Phillip J. Lewis, Q.C.,
and Matthew P. Whelan, Esq.
John A. Forsey, Esq.,
The Hon. Charles H. Ballam,
Earl W. Winsor, Esq.,
George Sellars, Esq.,
The Hon. Gregory J. Power
Patrick J. Canning, Esq.,
Stephen K. Smith, Esq.,
Llewellyn Strange, Esq.,
The Hon. James R. Chalker
The Hon. William J. Keough
Augustine M. Duffy, Esq.,
James D. Higgins, Esq., Q.C.,
George M. Nightingale, Esq.,
G. R. Renouf, Esq.
Malcolm Hollett, Esq.,
The Hon. James M. McGrath
Arthur S. Mifflin, Esq.,
The Hon. Samuel J. Hefferton
The Hon. Leslie R. Curtis, Q.C.
C. Maxwell Lane, Esq.,
The Hon. Frederick W. Rowe,
District of Bell Island
District of Bonavista North
District of Burin
District of Burgeo and LaPoile
District of Bonavista South
District of Carbonear-Bay de Verde
District of Ferryland
District of Fogo
District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage
District of Gander
District of Grand Falls
District of Green Bay
District of Harbour Grace
District of Harbour Main
District of Humber East
District of Humber West
District of Labrador North
District of Labrador South
District of Placentia East
District of Placentia West
District of Port-au-Port
District of Port de Grave
District of St. Barbe
District of St. George's
District of St. John's Centre
District of St. John's East
District of St. John's North
District of St. John's South
District of St. John's West
District of St. Mary's
District of Trinity North
District of Trinity South
District of Twillingate
District of White Bay North
District of White Bay South

1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions and activities. It emphasizes that this is crucial for ensuring transparency and accountability in the organization's operations.

2. The second part of the document outlines the various methods and techniques used to collect and analyze data. It highlights the need for a systematic approach to data collection and the importance of using reliable sources of information.

3. The third part of the document focuses on the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. It discusses the various statistical and analytical tools that can be used to identify trends and patterns in the data.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the implications of the findings and the need for further research. It emphasizes that the results of the study should be used to inform decision-making and to guide the development of policies and procedures.

5. The fifth part of the document provides a summary of the key findings and conclusions of the study. It highlights the main points of the research and the implications for the organization's future operations.

6. The sixth part of the document discusses the limitations of the study and the need for further research. It acknowledges that there are certain limitations to the data and methods used in the study and that further research is needed to address these limitations.

7. The seventh part of the document provides a list of references and sources used in the study. It includes a list of books, articles, and other sources that have been consulted in the course of the research.

8. The eighth part of the document provides a list of appendices and supplementary materials. It includes a list of tables, figures, and other materials that are included in the study.

9. The ninth part of the document provides a list of acknowledgments and thanks. It expresses appreciation to the individuals and organizations that have provided support and assistance during the course of the study.

10. The tenth part of the document provides a list of contact information and a list of authors. It includes the names and contact information of the individuals who conducted the study and the names of the authors of the document.