

J.A. Clarke



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 37

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD(Premier): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I extend a word of warm welcome to some students, some sixty-seven students, and I would think perhaps they are on both sides of the House in the galleries, because there are so many of them. Sixty-seven Grade VIII and Grade IX students of Roncalli School in care of three of their teachers; Miss Dawe, Mr. Cole and Mr. Kelly. I do not think this is the first time that we have had students here in the House from that great school. I think they have been here in other years. Anyhow it may be the first time that these particular students have come to visit us. We are delighted that they have done that. We are very pleased that they are here, because if there is one thing we like more than anything else in this House, is to have visits from young Newfoundlanders, because you see, Mr. Speaker, what these young people may not always know or understand and it may be many, many years from now before they do understand that the main purpose of this House, the main job of this House and the members in it, is to make laws and do things that will make a better Province for these young people in which to grow up. That is our job. That is what we are here for.

Now sometimes, I will admit, sometimes it does not always look like that, and very often it is hard to see how this or that or the other action of the Government or of the House can possibly make Newfoundland a better place in which young people can grow up and take over the responsibility for running it five, six or eight or ten years from now. It is not always easy to see, but nevertheless that is what we are here for. We are here for that very, very reason. Here on this side of the House, over on the other side of the House, all of us are here in the House, we were elected to do that and that is what we are here for and that is what we are trying to do. We do not always agree on the best way to do it, but we all have the same desire. That is what we are here for. We understand that

clearly. We are trying to make a better Newfoundland, so that young Newfoundlanders who are now going to school and who will be coming out of school, out of college five or six or eight or ten years from now, will have a Province to live in, that they will be proud of, where they can live and grow and have a good living. I do not mean to live high, but have a good living, live well, and I do not mean just food and clothing and housing. I mean in the world of the mind, in the world of the spirit, have a good fine, decent and clean, energetic and progressive and honest Province to live in. That is what we are all here for, both sides of the House.

Now you might never think that. You might not always think that, but we know it. We understand it. We disagree and sometimes we agree to disagree. Here they are. We are happy they are here, sixty-seven of them, with three of their teachers and I am going to take them into a little secret now. There is one time every day just at the start of the House, when the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier are in perfect agreement. If we never agree anyother time of the day, we agree here at the beginning of every session. We are absolutely in perfect agreement, the Leader of the Opposition and I, and that is this: we agree on this that these students are wonderful. They are clean. They are clean-cut. They are decent. They are full of idealism. They are hard workers. They love their school. They love Newfoundland. They are trying to get ahead. They are ambitious. They are good looking, especially the girls, and they are intelligent. The Leader of the Opposition cannot get up and deny any of that. He has got to get up and agree with me, perfectly, and I now challenge him to do that very thing.

MR. THOMAS HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, while my colleague the Leader of the Opposition did not rise in his seat to concur with the remarks of the hon. the Premier, I am sure he does agree. It is with much pleasure that I associate myself with his remarks. As he says, we do not agree too often, but certainly we cannot disagree on this particular instance. I would hope that the students from Roncalli School will have an enjoyable afternoon.

One never knows, whether it is going to be exciting or otherwise in this hon. House, and if they are lucky, it might very well become a rather exciting afternoon. There is now way of knowing, whether it is a good day or not so good a day to visit this House. Certainly, Sir, it is a pleasure to see them here, accompanied by their teachers, Miss Dawe, Mr. Cole and Mr. Kelly.

As the Premier has indicated or guessed, Roncalli School is in the district, which I have the honour to represent. On behalf of my colleagues it is with much pleasure that I welcome these students and hope that they will have an enjoyable afternoon.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of welcome to those of the Premier and the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern), to welcome these students and their teachers. We occasionally have differences of opinion in this forum, Mr. Speaker, no doubt they do in their school. Our differences of opinion are settled in a different way perhaps, or they will be settled sometime in the near future. I do not doubt that. I hope that they will enjoy their stay here, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I might make a point that I made a few days ago and that is: I would like to see the Orders of the Day or the program given out, if it is not too expensive for the printer to print extra copies. I think it would be a good idea. It would give these visitors something to take back to the classroom and it is easier for them to follow the proceedings, if they have the Orders of the Day. So I will make that suggestion again and in the meantime I hope that they enjoy this afternoon's sitting.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. ANTHONY J. MURPHY: (Leader of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker, may I permit a question on a motion that has not been presented as yet. Mr. Speaker, I am out of order, would it wait for Orders of the Day?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member wishes to obtain some information?

MR. MURPHY: Yes. It is a motion that has been on the Order Paper for sometime - a select committee on the Auditor General's Report. I am just wondering, when the Speaker will be appointing that select committee on the Public Accounts. It is moved by the Minister of Finance, I believe some four weeks ago.

MR. SPEAKER: That matter will be gone into.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. JAMES R. CHALKER (Minister of Public Works) Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question no. 331 on the Order Paper of April 9th., asked by the hon. member for Burin. The answer to Question no. 345 on the Order Paper of April 9th., asked by the hon. member for St. John's West and the answer to Question no. 357 on the Order Paper of April 10th., asked by the hon. member for Gander and the answer to Question no. 362 on the same Order Paper of April 10th., asked by the hon. member for Gander.

HON. GEORGE A. FRECKER (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to two questions here. Question no. 448 asked by the hon. member for St. John's West appearing on the Order Paper of April 15th. We have one qualified officer looking after the matters referred to, but we avail of the services of qualified staff of other Government departments to carry out investigations and inspections.

~~The answer to Question 448~~ and in reply to Question no. 450, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West appearing on the Order Paper of

April 16, 1970,

Tape #500

Page 1

HON. G. A. FRECKER (Minister of Provincial Affairs): of April 15, we have Life Insurance as sub-head¹ of the question: None. Sub-head 2: Fire, General Accident and Automobile Insurance, four companies. Sub-head 3 ~~was~~ other types of companies; none. Sub-head 4, Local Incorporated 4, that is the four just referred to under Sub-head 2. The department has satisfied itself that policy holders of Newfoundland Fire and General Insurance Company Limited, and Newfoundland Marine Insurance Company Limited, and Canadian Universal Insurance Company Limited are fully protected by way of deposits pursuant to the Act and Company assets. The department has assured itself that the Insurance Corporation of Newfoundland has adequately covered the insurance agreement. The superintendent of insurance that is the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs has been assured by the Insurance Companies that the Insurance Corporation of Newfoundland is properly managed, and that the Reinsurance Companies are prepared to accept all the insurance agreements that are available from I.C.O.N. that is the Universal Insurance Company Limited. The superintendent is responsible for the administration of the Act and has one qualified official under his supervision, but he has four other officials in the department that might not be considered as specialists in the field.

HON. E.N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question (304) on the Order Paper of Wednesday April 8, asked by the hon. member for Fortune. I table the answer to this question, question (304). In answer to Question (419) on Tuesday's Order Paper April 14, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part of the question; a land acquisition and holding agreement between the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing, Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation was entered into. The agreement provides for the acquisition, holding for development and planning of 300 acres of land in the Elizabeth area of Corner Brook. A loan agreement between Central Mortgage and Housing and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has been executed, provides ninety percent of their estimated cost of initial development of service land

2191 A

in the Elizabeth Street area. In answer to the second part of the question: work has commenced in the Elizabeth Street area to provide ninety-seven residential lots and a further servicing of 145 multiple housing units. This work has been under construction now for some time. A contract was awarded to Messrs. Lundrigan's Construction Limited of Corner Brook, and the work there is progressing. Further to this proposal the consulting engineers have made submission to Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for a further development of the scheme. An application has been forwarded to Central Mortgage and Housing at Ottawa for their consideration, and we anticipate that further development will take place in the Elizabeth Street area this summer. In answer to Question (420) asked by the hon. member for St. John's West on Tuesday's Order Paper, April 14. In answer to the first part of the question. A land acquisition and holding agreement has been entered to the Government of Canada, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation. The agreement provides for their acquisition holding for development and planning for 850 acres of land. The answer to the second part of the question: no construction or development work has yet been commenced. It is expected this work will commence this present year. In answer to Question No. (421) on the Order Paper of April 14, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part of the question is no. And the answer to the second part of the question is no. But I might add that developments with regard to shell housing within the Province will be given in detail in the Budget Address.

HON. HAROLD STARKES (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question (434) asked by the hon. member for Burin. The answer is no. The answer to (436) asked by the hon. member for Burin. The answer is no.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Before we enter upon Orders of the Day, I intend to give my ruling on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for St. John's West a few days ago. I did not do it yesterday for the reason that it was private members' day, and the ruling and the remarks I intend to make about points of privilege are somewhat lengthy, and I thought it would be better done today than yesterday. Now as I say, not only will I give my

April 16, 1970

Tape \$500

Page 3

ruling on this matter of the point of privilege that was raised by the hon. member, but I want to say a few words concerning privilege generally in the hope that it will be a guide to all hon. members in the future when they rise on similar or other points of privilege in this House. I would say, first of all, that the Speaker of the House when he has to rule as to whether there is a prima facie case of privilege or not, he is placed in a rather anomalous position in that if he rules that there is a prima facie case, he appears to give his blessing to a complaint even if that complaint later on may be found to have very little foundation in fact. And the converse is also true. He is placed in a bit of an awkward position whichever way he rules. All the authorities and the various committees that have been set up in many parts of the Commonwealth have commented on this as sort of an unfair position in which the Speaker should find himself, and it is time that the rules in this connection were changed. Now before I proceed further I think that we should try and define what privilege is, and in doing that, I will first of all read what Erskine May says, and hon. members no doubt have read this before, but I will read it again for the benefit of the House. He says, "privilege is the sum of the fundamental rights of the House and of its individual members as against the prerogatives of the Crown, the authority of the ordinary Courts of law, and the special rights of the House of Lords." Of course, he is applying this particularly to the situation in England. He goes on to say, "It is more convenient to reserve the term "privilege" to certain fundamental rights of each House," and here again he is referring to England, "which are generally accepted as necessary for the exercise of his constitutional functions." Now this definition has been couched in very carefully chosen words. These words are designed to keep the definition as indefinite as is possible. And we can see the reason for that because if we were to have a very closely defined definition of "privilege" anything else outside that definition would therefore, be not a question of privilege at all. So the definition and the listing of what are privileges of the House and of its members are deliberately by all

2191C

April 16, 1970

Tape #500

Page 4

Parliaments kept very indefinite, and the Parliament itself decides if in each particular instance if there is a breach of privilege. In other words all the things that could be breaches of privilege are deliberately not catalogued and listed for fear that everything else outside these listings would be classed as not a breach of privilege, when quite easily it could be so.

Now last year, or last summer rather, in this Chamber we had a seminar on the Question of Privilege, and it was led off by one of the authorities I think, in the whole Commonwealth, Mr. Philip Laundy who conducted this seminar, and his comments, as I think I pointed out before, are to be found in the report of the proceedings of the Tenth Canadian Area Conference, which was held in Newfoundland on July 13, in this Chamber.

And his comments I think are very worthy of note. When he opened this seminar or this debate on the subject of privilege, he said this, and I think it is necessary to quote it. I think it should be of interest to every single hon. member. He said, "Parliament has traditionally been reluctant to define its privileges, and there are good historical reasons for this of course. Parliament has always been anxious to avoid defining its privileges for fear of encroachment to the limits." This of course has led to considerable confusion in the minds of members, let alone the public, as to what really constitutes privilege. Parliament long ago accepted that it would be improper to extend its privileges, and that was some time early in the 1800's. Parliament long ago accepted that it would be improper to extend its privileges, but at the same time it has always claimed the right to decide for itself whether or not a breach of privilege has taken place and the absence of a precedent has never been regarded as a reason for deciding that no breach of privilege or contempt of Parliament has taken place. He goes on further to say, "I think one must be aware as to what privilege is designed to do. Broadly speaking, it is designed to protect members in the carrying out of their duties, to protect them from obstruction, intimidation and hinderance. And at the same time to protect Parliament as an institution from being brought into contempt or disrepute. Now in

2191 D

political terms what he meant today, is that essentially privilege is related to the ancient privilege of freedom of speech. And I think that is worthy of repeating. Now in practical terms what this means today is that essentially, privileges related to the ancient privilege of freedom of speech..

There were three or four of the ancient privileges which are practically the only ones existing at the present time. Freedom of speech and freedom from arrest. It only means arrest in this present age within the confines of the House itself. As a matter of fact, in Ottawa, a member of the House of Commons was arrested in the grounds no later than I think it was last year. Parliament held that the police were perfectly within their right in arresting him within the precincts. If he had been in the House itself, he could not have been arrested. Outside it was another matter, he was under jurisdiction of the common law, and the laws of the land and not within the jurisdiction of the House. And this has been a bearing I think on what I will say a little bit later concerning the difference between words uttered outside the House, and words uttered in the House.

He says, "this is not fully understood. I think one only has to read the records of our Parliament and our Legislatures to appreciate this. Certainly the records of the Canadian Parliament are full of examples, where members have used the cloak of privilege to make personal explanations, to respond to political attacks, to question the accuracy of newspaper articles, to complain of an unsatisfactory reply to a question, and even for openly frivolous purposes. These abuses of the right to raise a question of privilege has always been very difficult to control, certainly in the Canadian House of Commons, mainly because of the right which has grown up for members to advise the Chair as to whether a prima facie case has been made out before the Speaker is called upon to give his ruling.

This has made it very difficult for the Chair to control the abuse of the right to raise the question of privilege." On the other hand," he says,

2131 E

April 16, 1970

Tape #500

Page 6

"many questions of privilege are raised with serious intent, but which upon examination prove to be nothing of the sort. There is for example, considerable confusion in the minds of members between Parliamentary privilege and political propriety." So much for that section of it.

Now if hon. members could turn to Beauchesne, to Page 98, at Citation 108.

2191 F

MR SPEAKER: they will find this, and this is a further definition as outlined by Canadian authority, as to what he considers to be privilege or a breach of privilege. Here is what it says: Citation 108, page 98: "Anything which may be considered a contempt of court by a tribunal is a breach of privilege, if perpetrated against Parliament, such as wilful disobedience to or open disrespect of the valid Rules, Orders or Process or the dignity and authority of the House, where by disorderly, contemptuous or insolent language or behaviour or other disturbing conduty or by a mere failure to obey its Orders." That is the definition as given by Beauchesne.

He also says, on page 100, down at the centre of Citation 110: "But to constitute a breach of privilege a libel upon a member must concern his character, his conduct, in his capacity as a member, and the conduct or language on which the libel is based must be actions performed or words uttered in the actual transaction of the business of the House. Bad faith must be imputed and the charge cannot be indefinite." Another thing that we have to remember when we read that from Beauchesne is that he was quoting from what was said in 1701, and there has been a lot of case law, there has been a lot of breaches of privilege and points of privilege raised in the various parliaments of the Commonwealth since 1701.

We have to bear that in mind when we read these sections in Beauchesne. They were valid in 1701 but there is an entirely different approach toward the matter of privilege, as is evidenced by the fact that nearly every country has set up, every parliament in the Commonwealth has set up committees to enquire into the question of privilege, because it is a vexatious question that comes before Parliament occasionally and the answer to it is very, very unsatisfactory under our present rules and conditions. There have to be some changes made, statutory changes, in order to change the Rules that have been established in the past and, as I will point out a little bit later, the reason why this change is so necessary.

The United Kingdom Government, a few years ago, set up a select committee on Parliamentary Privilege, to look into the whole question of privilege. I think it was about five or six years ago. They have made certain recommendations

and reported back to the House of Commons in England, and it is such a complicated question, there are so many differences of opinion, that it has taken them all these five or six years and their final report on this matter has still not been concluded or presented to the House of Commons for adoption. Some things have been presented.

One of items which this committee has brought before the Commons is this one: (And this I think shows the change between 1700, and in 1970.) And here is what this committee says on this particular matter, and I am quoting from the Parliamentarian which is the journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth. This is the January issue, it is published I think, four times a year. There is what they say about it, "The House should exercise its penal jurisdiction in any event as sparingly as possible and only when it is satisfied that to do so, is essentially in order to provide reasonable protection for the House, its members, or its Officers for such improper obstruction or attempt at, or threat of obstruction as is causing or is likely to cause substantial interference with the performance of their respective function." They go on further to say, "In general, where a member's complaint is of such a nature, that if justified it could give rise to an action in the court whether or not the defendant would be able to rely on any defense available in the court, it ought not to be the subject of the request of the House to invoke its penal powers." May I read that again. "In general where a member's complaint is of such a nature, that if justified it could give rise to an action in the court whether or not the defendant would be able to rely on any defense available in the court, it ought not to be the subject of the request of the House to invoke its penal powers." In particular those powers should not in general be invoked in respect of statements alleged to be defamatory whether or not a defense or justification, fair comment, etc. would lie." Now that is the trend, that is what is happening as far as the House of Commons in England is concerned. This is the trend and attitude of the House of Commons in OTTAWA.

2191 H

I said the other day that very rarely or seldom, I think were the words, should a case of a breach of privilege be brought before the House. Now that does not mean breaches of the rules in relation to things that are said within the walls of the House, within the Chamber itself. If we are to note the difficulty in which the various Houses, and Parliaments in the democratic system find themselves, we can understand the reason why the change is being made gradually with respect to rules governing privilege.

If a person is accused of uttering comment outside the House, and he is brought before the House, I think, as all hon. members will see, the unreasonableness of this. The House is the accuser. It is its own judge and it imposes the penalty. I think in 1970 (or in any age) this is almost an intolerable situation, where the House itself finds itself in the position of being the accuser, of accusing and at the same time giving judgment and also subjecting the person who is accused, if he is found guilty, to a penalty. This is the reason why all Houses within the Commonwealth, that I know of, who are dealing with this in a serious manner, wish to avoid, if at all possible, the question of privilege being brought before the House.

As for words uttered outside the House and brought before the House of Commons in England, there has been two cases in the last one hundred years; which shows the inclination on the part of every parliament to avoid privilege breaches, if at all possible. There are times when it is not avoidable, but in the main they should be avoided if possible.

With these remarks in mind, and having heard the statements made by both hon. members, the hon. Member for St John's West and the hon. the Premier in reply, I can only say this: Responding to political attacks outside the House and using words which are alleged to be libelous or defamatory has a remedy at law. That person is not denied

MR SPEAKER: his right under the law, but I do think these things should not be brought in and opened as a case of privilege within the House itself.

When there is a disagreement between two hon. members as to a question of fact and one says one thing and the other another, then that does not tend to establish a case of privilege that the House should be asked to rule on.

Utterances outside the House are not privileged, as are utterances of hon. members within the House. The member can make these things his privilege of freedom of speech within the House, outside he has no such privilege, as has been pointed out; and he has recourse to the courts of the land.

Therefore, I have to conclude that I cannot find a prime facie case is found in this particular instance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

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

May I draw to Your Honour's attention and to the attention of the House two matters on a question of accuracy in terms of today's "Evening Telegram". And, Sir, I may say I agree with the sentiments of the hon. the Premier the other day; the coverage of this session by the "Evening Telegram" has been quite outstanding. I can understand this, since yesterday we had a long and wide-ranging question, which it was not possible in the time available to table and which lead to some inaccuracies, which I now wish to draw to the attention of the House and in particular the Press.

2101 J

the first instance Sir, is, this is on page 15 and a reference to the aerial spraying programme last, this past season. The last paragraph but one, the report says 25 per cent of the cost was paid by the two companies, Price Newfoundland Limited, and Bowaters Paper Mill Limited, 25 per cent was paid by Ottawa and Newfoundland paid the remaining fifty per cent. I thought I had made it clear Mr. Speaker, that each of the four parties, of the Province the Government of Canada and each of the paper companies paid 25 per cent. So the Province actually paid 25 per cent.

The next section of the report has the subheading which states 3000 employed on roads. That is quite inaccurate Mr. Speaker. what I explained yesterday in reply to the question of the hon. member for Bonavista North was that the construction and reconstruction of thirty miles of access roads have enabled the employment of some three thousand men in large and small forest industries and I think I enumerated them as being commercial and domestic pulpwood cutting and saw -milling, it would appear quite ridiculous to suggest that three thousand men were employed at building the roads but they were employed working on woods operations made possible by building roads.

In the next section Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the second paragraph under Land Granted and Leased. The question of the hon. member for Bonavista North, The question No. 213 in section 3 referred, asked the trial acreage of pasturelands developed since April 1, The report says that bogland reclamation is no longer in the trial stages. There is some misunderstanding there it is so that bogland reclamation no longer is in the trial stages but in fact the question was whether trial acreage of pastureland had been undertaken and then in the next paragraph goes on to say some 16,516 acres of bogland were fenced and another 1505 improved. Where in each case it should refer to community pastures which are not restricted by any means to bogland. Mr. Speaker the same applies to a paragraph further down in that same section of the report the report is hesaid \$240.930 has been spent by the Government on bogland reclamation since April 1, 1969, and what I in fact reported to the House yesterday in reply to the question was that this amount was spent on community pasture development and that bogland reclamation in that sense no longer is

carried on in the sense ~~that~~ in which that term must be understood.

The second thing Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention is the fact that Hansard of Wednesday April 8, does not appear to me to be a complete report. It appears to end at a point where Your Honour advised the House that he would now leave the Chair. It occurs to me Sir, that certain important matters occurred subsequent to that and that in fact the proceeding did not in fact ~~not~~ end until Your Honour had passed outside the Bar of the House. I understand that the complete record with the additional matter is on tape, on the official tape recording and it would appear to me that for the sake of accuracy and completeness that additional matter should be included in the report. I would so move Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER: I shall ask the Editor of Debates to look into the matter.

MR.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question, officially when does the recording of the House cease, when the hon. Speaker leaves the Chair, is that then the completion of the business of the House. Or does the tape continue and take all conversations that happen after His Honour has left the Chair? Or does he get the

MR.SPEAKER: I could not give you, I know that the question is not addressed to the Chair and the hon. member does not ask, but I will for his benefit say that as far as I can understand the tape runs until the Mace has been carried out of the Chamber, now, I do not know if that happens in all instances or , but I know that the master tape continues on until the Mace is out of the Chamber but the Hansard tapes when they get to the stage where I say this House stands adjourned they cut it off there, but the master tape is kept on until the mace is out of the Chamber.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR.CALLAHAN: For the information of the House, Sir, is it Your Honour's ruling that the session indeed, the House is still in session until Your Honour has passed outside of the Bar of the House. I think that is the material point.

MR.SPEAKER: When I say that the House stands adjourned as I understand it, I say the House stands adjourned this Assembly is still, the House is adjourned officially , but while the Mace is still on the Table and until the Sergeant - at - Arms has taken the Mace outside the Bar of the House, this House is officially in session.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

The adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, as the House is aware I spend a few moments on Tuesday I think discussing a few matters that I figures were of some concern not only to us in the House here but to all the people of our Province. I do not wish to rehash all of these matters again, although some of them were very important and might need to be repeated. But there is, I did not arise on a point of privilege on this particular matter yesterday and that was^a reporting in the Evening Telegram where I had discussed in my opinion what a function the Newfoundland Constabulary could perform as a provincial Police Force and my feelings on the matter of having a well-trained very active group of young men who would not only perform perhaps the day to day work of a policeman but perhaps some aid in many other matters in our smaller settlements throughout the Province. At the same time I suggested that I felt in view of the great upsurge in delinquency and disrespect for law occurring and I referred to St. John's at that time, and I would also perhaps include Corner Brook and perhaps some of the larger areas in my statement. My feeling that it is time here in the City of St. John's that our Police Force should be split into precincts perhaps attached to our different Fire Stations in different areas of the town.

Now, in the report in the Telegram I think it is mentioned the C.I.D which is as we know it the Criminal Investigation Department of the Constabulary, but what I said was the Constabulary and perhaps suggest that it did not do much damage to what I had said but I would just like to explain now that I feel if the constabulary I am referring to, where we establish three, four, five precincts within the City of St. John's and we would break the actual force down into four or five sections, and at each precinct perhaps there would be in charge a head constable with ten or twelve constables serving that particular area permanently without doing other sections of the city and I believe quite frankly that it would be a means of our policemen becoming familiar with the different areas, with the people living in the areas and would be a great deterrent to the disrespect not only for law and order that is creeping into our society but disrespect for property and for other people. I would just like to correct that

item Mr. Speaker.

Another matter Mr. Speaker I am very much concerned with is the image that this Hon. House is projecting to the people of our Province. I for one Mr. Speaker, am serving my eighth year here in this Hon. Assembly. I felt when I was elected to this House in 1962, perhaps it was the greatest privilege that could be bestowed on any Newfoundlander to be elected by his fellow citizens to take a seat in this Hon. House. I have said on many occasions that I do not wish to become too political, although politics must enter into our conversations in this House. I have tried Sir, to the best of my ability to refrain from becoming personally involved with any member although there are times when I mention certain things in this House, perhaps mention them individuals who are personal friends of mine. But I only do it with the purpose of pointing out which in my opinion is not in the best interest of the Province. They may be questions of patronage to individuals, there have been some cases where certain individuals have been appointed to our civil service who I felt had the same right, but no more right than any other individual to be put into a job., without going through the proper channels.

But Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record now, and I have not been buttered up, or syruped up, or anything else, by the propaganda the statements that I hear on radio every day where we have two parties under the same name and perhaps a prefix before one of them, Two Liberal Parties in this Hon. House and I just want to make the position clear that I have heard statements that the Independent Liberals and the Tories are obstructing the business of this House. Now this is a matter of opinion to an awful lot of people as far as I am concerned, and I speak for the PC. Party and I am very proud of it at this moment. To say that we have never tried to obstruct wilfully and intentionally the business of this Hon. House. I think we all must be aware Mr. Speaker, of what has happened in the past year or perhaps eight, ten six months, where a great revolution occurred within one of the parties of this House and it was not the Conservative Party. Certain people felt that they could no longer remain on that side of the House, that is their own opinion, I do not question it, anyway

MR. A.J.MURPHY: Their opinions. We have had up to this present moment some very exciting moments in the House and I think I have said it before and I will say it again, that this House has been crowded pretty well every session. People come being humans, human beings to see what row is going to be taking place in the House of Assembly today. It is like the hockey games, unless there is a lot of boarding or a lot of slashing and so on and so forth the game was not too hot tonight.

Perhaps Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROWE (F.W.): That is not the only reason surely?

MR. MURPHY: We have forgotten the science or the reason that we are in this House, and I say we, because I am just as much a part of this House as anybody else. The only reason we are sent here is to work for the districts we represent. There has been a great change this year in the House

AN HON. MEMBER: The Province as a whole as well as the districts and the problems

MR. MURPHY: Well I could add that as well, but if we represent the people who sent us here, and we are all voted by forty-one districts, there are forty-two members, and forty-one districts send us here to represent each particular district, well I think basically we must be here as a whole to represent all the people of Newfoundland. I think quite seriously that is right because, I do not only vote on what concerns the district of St. John's Centre, but I vote and talk on things that concern other parts of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, and we have been saying this for many years, with reference to the Government side of the House which has been in power for so many years, that they almost think that it is a God given right that they should remain there. That they are above criticism.

This year on our Order Paper I can say have appeared, literally hundreds of questions to be asked, to be answered rather, perhaps more than the smaller Opposition we had for some years have managed to come up with but there are reasons Mr. Speaker, for more questions being asked. Perhaps more ill feelings between members because, as I said earlier we must remember

this great revolution that took place in 1969 and perhaps a few months before that, for certain members of the Government party, the Government side of the House, decided they could stand it no longer. They crossed to this side of the House. We were very honoured to have two of these outstanding gentlemen, former Cabinet Ministers, senior Cabinet Ministers, choose to sit with the Conservative Party which has been the official Opposition for twenty-one years, and I refer to the hon. member for Fortune Bay, the former Minister of Finance, Education and I believe Welfare in the department, in the Government. The Hon. member for Burin who was former Minister of Justice and combined both portfolios of Justice and Health.

I am very proud that they choose to sit with us. Now there were other members, I think numbering five, who decided that they could not sit, or would not sit, or did not want to sit with the Conservative Party, who sat as independent liberals, and my hon. friend from Labrador who decided to sit as a leader perhaps of the Independent Labrador Party or what ever it is being called, it is being called many names rather disrespectfully by people on the other side of the House, but I feel he choose it to be known as the Independent Labrador Party.

Now I have no quarrel with our friends next door, that is their wish that they sit as independent liberals. It has been suggested to me perhaps that the official Opposition is being perhaps a little upstaged or downstaged in this session. They do not hear too many rumbles from me who inherited the very important and honourable position as Leader of the Opposition. They say our members seem to be somewhat quiet, but I would like to explain Mr. Speaker, it is not for lack of interest. We are not being led by the nose as the hon. minister infers. Perhaps it is a natural condition on that side but it has not yet permeated this side, but I think in pretty well every case where there was a vote taken I think you found the combined Opposition voting for these things.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Surprise! surprise! what else is new?

MR. MURPHY: It was no surprise Mr. Speaker, but the actual facts are, how happy, how pleased we are to see hon. gentlemen who a few short years ago

were the knights on the white chariots on the other side of the House. Now as I say, it is not my wish to become personal, but I can remember quite distinctly and I do not know if it was August or Spetember of 1966, (we are in here four years, it seems like about fifty) but I remember the hon.member for St. John's West who a short few months before had been elected almost unanimously, and I say here again, and I have said it before that I supported the hon. gentleman to the St. John's Municipal Council, he came in and I think he was full of beans at the time as we would say, to do a tremendous job for the city of St. John's. He was at the time I would say the outstanding figure (with all due respects to the Mayor of St. John's) the outstanding figure on the St. John's Municipal Council. I think he was a sort of the member that was pushing. I think it was August or September where Mr. Jim Greene was Leader of the Opposition at the time who phoned me and asked me if I would attend a function at the trades school where the Premier was going to unveil another great step to benefit the Province of Newfoundland and this was the creation, and I may be just a little bit out on some of the details, but basically I think I am right on the facts, at that time I believe it was decided that we would set up a housing department within the Provincial Government.

I think it was split at the time, I think the hon. gentleman next to him now was the one that was responsible for, (was it Municipal Affairs and Housing at that time?) pardon me if I am just a little bit vague on the names, but it is like the Cabinet minister says I said from time to time, we should get different uniforms for different departments so we would know just who is who at this moment.

The point I was trying to make, here was the hon. member perhaps at that time, and still is I would say one of our outstanding citizens. I think we had something like 700 people at this do. It was one of the largest crowds I have seen for this announcement. The hon. Premier stood there on that stage, and the premier was eloquent, very eloquent everybody knows that. I certainly wish I had one per cent of his eloquence when I speak in here today.

And he introduced, unveiled if you like to all the people of Newfoundland the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: God child

MR. MURPHY: Who is God's child?

MR. NEARY: He brought him up

MR. MURPHY: Oh, the Premier's God child, I was not aware of that. I was wondering where this great fondness comes in.

The hon. member was introduced that day and I say to myself, "well here is one man, the Premier has gone over them all, he has named them all Richard Cashin, the hon. Minister of Education, I do not know how many more would be his successor," but all I said "this is it, this is the man for sure picked out, brought up there." I do not know if we had our dinner that evening, no, I think we just had a cup of coffee and a bun or something. I do not think it called for one of those great celebrations that we have had over the years, that I used to call "dinners for the liberal poll captains." they were called state dinners. I would ^{like} to get hold.....

I would like to get a hold of the list some day. But, Mr. Speaker, this was the usual pattern that has been followed over the years. The hon. member is introduced and he took over and this was it. Well as everybody in this House knows one of the things that I am always preaching about or arguing about is the lack of housing. I could see with the advent of this young wonder-boy or wonder-man at the time, this was it, that the plans that were unveiled

MR. SMALLWOOD: Conference number twelve.

MR. MURPHY: I beg your pardon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Conference number twelve.

MR. MURPHY: Conference number twelve. I think his white steed must have gotten the spavin or something. The hon. member never knows. But, Mr. Speaker, this was the story at that time. I think it was in just about two short years, the hon. member became somewhat disillusioned that what was happening - We cannot hear it all, because some of these gentleman were allowed to talk, you know, but we have this Cabinet secrecy, but this was a matter, I think, that broke, that came out quite openly. It was on the \$5 million bridge financing. The hon. gentleman broke, and he came to this side with, he was a Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Humber East. Both these young gentlemen came over here.

MR. NEARY: Last year was, "Rat on your party year."

MR. MURPHY: Last year was, "Rat on your party year." That is a very nice quotation, a very nice quotation. These are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that hit the headlines, these beautiful expressions, rats and this type of thing. But two hon. members came to this side and as it happened, the hon. member for St. John's went back again. He had his own reasons for that. But then came the great, the greatest, the biggest show that was ever put on in this Province. I do not know why it did not get mentioned in the Academy Awards last week, because it definitely did rate...

MR. CROSBIE: Calgary Stampede.

MR. MURPHY: The Calgary Stampede someone said. This came along and then we had a great number, not a great number possibly but some members of the Cabinet who had, I believe, taken the Premier at his word, who for many years said that he was going to step down. There was a great announcement made. I had the clipping only the other day. I believe it was 1956, during the election, when my hon. friend - did I say 1956? It was 1966, when my hon. friend the Minister of Education, I think there was a big meeting in Grand Falls, where the ^{Premier} introduced, I do not know it in so many words, but his successor, of course, this was during an election and I do not know if the same speech was made in the forty-one districts, but I know it was a good....

MR. FRED ROWE: Correction.

MR. MURPHY: I certainly would like to be corrected.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister has a chance to speak after, so he can correct it. I do not wish to say anything, Sir, willfully that is wrong. I would like to be corrected. The hon. minister speaks next. So, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the matters that perhaps have created some of the goings-on in this House during this past few months, and I will get back again to the - they are called defectors. They are called traitors. They are called rats, but I will call them hon. gentlemen who in their own wisdom decided that they could no longer sit...

MR. EARLE: : These are the rats who are not fighting.

MR. MURPHY: Who could not sit on that side...

AN HON. MEMBER: The advice the hon. gentleman has for the 29th?

MR. MURPHY: The 25th., I am a little disappointed. I thought I would be invited to be the guest speaker, but I am not even invited to attend.

But, Mr. Speaker, to get back to, and I am now talking about the image of this House. Many, many questions have been placed on the Order Paper. Many, many questions, and on Wednesday, they were answered in the fullest detail. I think they even put in the full points and the commas that

we hear so much about, because and I think the people of the Province are aware of this: that the people asking these questions now, were at one time playing with the other team. They were perhaps put in the bull pen temporarily to warm up to take over in another few months. I thought I would say the bull pen rather than the penalty box. These questions are aimed now at Government branches and, as I said much earlier, I am not repeating myself that this Opposition at the time were not in a position to get information even to ask questions on so consequently, there has been a little - perhaps this is not the word to use. There has been a considerable amount of friction created between the Premier and I do not know, if my hon. friend has yet been ordained as leader, but I think someone mentioned him as the chief of the Independent Liberals and it is almost at a stage now where it has just become a personal battle, rather than the official Opposition or the Opposition against the Government.

Now you speak to people on the street and you get phone calls of what we are endeavouring to do in this House of Assembly, with the people's House, with the very serious business that we have to perform, duties we have to perform here and we listen to statements made on radio, and I do not know, I have to refer to it. I guess I am perfectly free to comment on this matter of privilege; although, it is ruled on. I am not trying to reverse it but just to comment on it and the effect it has on the operation of the business of this House, and I am in possession of a report of the proceedings that the hon. Speaker read from, and he gave his decision, and his decision is what stands in this hon. House. There was just one particular paragraph, Mr. Speaker, that I noted here, and I would just like to comment on it. That is with regard to privilege. It was rather a significant one in my opinion and I think it went right to the point of what has been happening. He is referring to the provinces presumably have similar legislation providing for the privileges of the legislators. I think one must be aware as to what privilege is designed to do. Broadly speaking, it is designed to protect members in the

carrying out of their duties, to protect them, to protect them from obstruction, intimidation and hinderance and at the same time to protect parliament as an institution from being brought into contempt or disrepute. To me that is the most significant sentence in that and when we listen, when we listen to hon. members, one being the hon. the Premier, referring to an hon. member of this hon. House as being sick! sick! sick! Imputing, in my opinion, that is the impression that I got, that the hon. member was not mentally competent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Politically sick.

MR. MURPHY: There is no politically in this. Sick! in other words, he is not mentally competent. Well if that is designed to protect members in the carrying out of their duties, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see it. Quite honestly I fail to see it, because after all, if the impression is abroad that there is someone here that is not mentally well, that is mentally retarded or mentally something else.—the hon. Speaker laughs, I know it must be some sort of a little, I am not referring to the hon. Premier personally. But to listen to some of the stuff that we hear on radio, such dribble such rot, such stupid statements you hear, would turn your stomach, and I say that quite sincerely. It would turn your stomach to think that we, all of us here, supposed to have some measure of common sense and sit down in the mornings, or drive along in your car and hear some of the dribble that we hear over this program emanating from a radio station. God help us

MR. MURPHY:

I wonder what kind of an opinion people from outside the Province has, the outport people here. And then, Mr. Speaker, on the other side we have another hon. member come back and make almost the same accusations and invite a qualified psychiatrist or suggest that a qualified psychiatrist be invited to have a test on the hon. member for St. John's West and on the Hon. Premier to decide just which one is mental. I am speaking now, the hon. members opposite, this is typical of what has been happening here for twenty years. You get thirty-five or thirty-eight members over there leering at you because you try to bring some respect into this Hon. Chamber. This is the type of stuff, I wish we did have cameras to show the expressions on some of the faces of the members opposite.

MR. BARBOUR: Do not include me, Sir.

MR. MURPHY: I could not include my hon. friend. He is in my district and I am looking after him. This is some of the stuff, Mr. Speaker, that we have been putting up with, I have for the past eight years and a lot of people on this side for the last twenty years. There was men sat here as Leaders of the Opposition who had more brains than the whole lot on the other side put together and I say that unqualifiedly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Geniuses.

MR. MURPHY: Geninuses is right, geninuses. Absolute geninuses, Newfoundlanders, good qualified Newfoundlanders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Full many a flower is born to blush unseen and waste its fragrance in the Opposition.

MR. MURPHY: That is right, that is right. But we will find out why very shortly, Mr. Speaker, and the shorter the term the better, how long we will be in Opposition or someone else will be in Opposition. And I say this quite seriously because for the first time, for the first time in twenty years outside of the one or two and I read one here yesterday the hon. Dr. Pottle who had the guts to get on his feet and tell the Hon. Premier that he disagreed with squandering the peoples money, throwing it away on foolish, foolish industries

MR. MURPHY:

and you read back and you read some of the great names Senewald, Braun Wogan, and so on, all great men were going to make this Province Heaven itself and where is it all gone? Let us be perfectly frank, let us be perfectly honest and I do not think I am being politically unfair to mention these things. What has been happening in this Province? To give you some idea of this great democratic Province, Mr. Speaker, it was only the other day I had a man come in to visit me under this beautiful, under this beautiful looking democratic institution. Look at it, look at it, That is the Alcoholic's Liquors Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is democracy.

MR. MURPHY: If that is democracy I will just show you how democratic it is. I had a gentleman come in to me who has a lovely place, not in my district, not in St. John's, I addressed a letter to the Board of Liquor Control attention Mr. Vincent, I have the letter from him somewhere here, this gentleman told me he had applied on four occasions - a restaurant license, a hotel license, a tavern license and an agent's license, and could not get either one of them with no reason given. I wrote the Department and said, he was not in my district, I do not know if he is a liberal, a P.C., a new democrat or he might be with the hon. member for Labrador, he might be one of the vice-presidents of his party I do not know, and I wrote this Department and I received a letter back from him and he referred me that this man had already been told on many occasions and the reasons given why he did not get his license. He did not explain the reasons but he said under Section twenty-three of the Alcoholic Liquors Act, listen to it - not withstanding anything in this Act the Board shall not be compelled to issue any permit or license under this Act and may refuse, suspend or cancel any such permit or license in its discretion and shall not be obliged to give any reason or explanation for such refusal, suspension or cancellation. There is democracy for you. They can come in, they can close your tavern, they can put you out of business and not give a reason.

MR. MURPHY:

We have a Bill that is not yet proclaimed, it is called the Human Rights Code, not yet proclaimed I do not think. I read it through and everybody under the sun is guaranteed protection under this Human Rights Code, colour, creed, race, black, white, brown, yellow, blue but no one word in it of political implication, not one mentioned anywhere that I could find. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, when I say politics and liquor this is what I am referring to and we know the story on it, I have been preaching here for years of the terrible, terrible treatment of good honest-to-God Newfoundlanders who have preferred perhaps not to go out and campaign for this great liberal party. Perhaps they are not poll captains, perhaps they are not canvassers but under democratic rule and in this Province, Mr. Speaker, I say they have as much right to have a beer license, an agent's license or whatever you will as anybody else and let anybody on that side deny it. I ask anybody to deny that they are right to do it.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an ornament on the face of the earth that is costing money, it is the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. If I am ever elected to Government and I ever have the power to do it I would sweep it so far out the narrows you would never hear of it again. I said in this Hon. House and I will say it again, the Hon. Minister of Health referred to me as a beer peddler. I was a beer peddler for ten years, a salesman of a brewery and by heavens almighty they talk about things happening in this world some of the things that I saw happening with individuals on the spot would just turn your stomach completely for certain people were persecuted, we have had cases of them, because they did not conform, conform to what, reason, dignity, run their place right, no, no consideration, Mr. Speaker, you just had to be in.

There are people today and we have ask questions on this and never received the answers and we are going to demand that we get the answers, names of tavern owners, names of so and so, you will get a sweet name as I said here the other day and I am speaking on the same thing. The Happy Valley Motor Club or the some other club, who owns these licenses. It would be a

MR. MURPHY:

revelation to find out who owns some of these license and how many they own, it would be a revelation but you will find their names, Mr. Speaker, you will find their names high on the list of the hierarchy. There is your democracy, Section twenty-three, they explained to the man why he could not get his license. They said you cannot get your license because we do not have to tell you why you cannot get your license. Is that basically what he says, any lawyer read this? Right. This is democracy, this is it. We had more elections in this Province now than Kellogg got corn flakes.

But, Mr. Speaker, this to me over the years and I may sound like a broken record as our hon. and intellectual and magnificent Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources says, may sound like a broken record, but these are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, we talk about the right to live, the right to this, the Bill of Rights, everybody not withstanding in this Province providing he meets certain standards has as much right to a liquor license, a public health license, I do not think the Public Health bars a man from selling unless he does not conform the regulations or they give him the reason why. They tell him your barn is dirty, I am talking about selling milk or anything like this the premises must be kept clean. But this is it, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the reasons perhaps one of the reasons why this party has been kept in power for so many years, these are one of the reasons. You pick up the great Liberal Ball Program and this is repetition but it is still true. One year we counted something over 101 acts, it looked like a Who's Who, in liquor vending in Newfoundland. The Conservatives had one shortly after, how many acts do you think they got, guess, start at three and come down? None. Why? Is there no fear? Someone said there is no fear in this Province, no fear. You get your twenty-five dollars.

Look, just put in as a friend, -

MR. NEARY: The hon. leader has it in here, right down here.

MR. MURPHY: I was looking for a copy of it, I have to get one. We are getting our program ready now for our Leadership Convention. Has the hon. minister got

April 16th, 1970

Tape 505

JM - 5

MR. MURPHY:

a copy in his possession. I would like to have one. He will be watching, oh yes. The Premier you know -

MR. CHALKER (J.R.): By the way is that going to be on television, I wonder?

MR. MURPHY: What is that?

MR. CHALKER (J.R.): The Leadership Convention.

MR. MURPHY: Will it be on television? I certainly hope so. If we have to pay for it, it will not be.

2203

MR. MURPHY:gladly be free.

MR. ROBERTS: Will it be taken the place of Roland Martin?

MR. MURPHY: Roland Martin? No I do not think, that is Regatta Day, you hear Martin Roland's. But, Mr. Speaker, you know for twenty years this side of the House has been talking about this is one of the things, or many, many dozens of things, that have been happening in this Province. The other day I brought up the great Real Estate Deal. Here again, and I mentioned it the other day, and I am just repeating it, how owns this place in a certain place that we are paying \$9.00 a square foot for? Oh, the Royal Trust Company. We do not know who owns it, but the Royal Trust Company, who of course, cannot tell us. How owns it, we will find out someday, I hope. We will find out.

We have this great building in Corner Brook and must say it is a beautiful building and I think the people of Corner Brook deserve it. But we heard the great announcement on this building, we have a Cabinet Room, Mr. Speaker, in that building. I presume, Mr. Speaker, you were in the House the same as I was, the hon. Mr. Speaker was in the House the same as I was, where this great democracy Government where going to bring Government to the people. Bring it to the people, regularly we are going to have our Cabinet meetings in Corner Brook, how many did we have? How many meetings did we have in the building? I have some facts on this Corner Brook one? I would love to see a building in Corner Brook. I would love to see it, but of the millions of dollars that were wasted on it, I would like to see what sufficient and practical for Corner Brook to be there, and the rest of the money perhaps to help people to build homes of their own instead of a great big show piece. You know there is a name on the building in Corner Brook, but I would not say it here. The hon. members have heard it.

The building in Corner Brook, which is a public building, Mr. Speaker, was approximately \$2.5 million, these are answers we get from questions. It is presently being occupied by a total of eighty-five civil servants, in various departments of Government, eighty-five and the building cost \$2.5 million.

MR. NEARY : The hon. member for Humber East there is nothing outside of St. John's. The hon. member for Humber East tells us everything is in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Is there a Government Building in Corner Brook?

MR. MURPHY: I am going to describe it to the hon. Minister now in a minute.

MR. NEARY: Good.

MR. MURPHY: The Building in addition to the office space for the eighty-five, includes a library. The library takes up of course, which I will talk about later on. It is occupied by eighty-five people, divided into the cost of the building amounts to approximately \$24,000 per person. Here in this building and we say there are 1500 employees, and I think there are an awful lot more, than that in this building, cost \$7.5 million, and that is a cost \$5,000 for employees, and that is the very, very minimum number I would say. And in addition in this building, we have the House of Assembly here, which is the People's House, all this went into the \$7.5 million...

MR. EOWE (P&W): They were not built the same time though were they?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. MURPHY: I doubt if they were?

MR. ROWE: That makes a little difference.

MR. MURPHY: It makes a difference because it was not built in 68, that was only eighty-five people out there, and 1500 in here.

MR. ROWE: No, the cost, the huge cost.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, the cost?

I am just trying to get on the rental basis of space for each one worker in the Corner Brook Building. It cost approximately \$130,000 a year to operate it. Interest on our loan cost us about \$150,000 depreciation. So it adds up to a total of about \$330,000 in the annual cost of the Corner Brook Building. And this is about \$4,000 per year paid out in rent for each and every employee in the building. Space occupied, and this is where we must be practical. Here we are in this building here and the Minister of Public Works and the Premier has made statements, that there should be an extension put on it. But instead of that, we have gone into the big Real Estate Field, with Philip Place, with Gordonna in on the road, I just forget the gentleman's name who knows it, but I think he is rather close to the party opposite. I do not know how much we are paying in there. I mentioned I think, it was yesterday or the day before that we were paying a \$140,000

MR. MURPHY: a year rent for the Power Commission approximately, and the newspaper quoted me as \$110,000, that is \$140,000. We have the Workmen's Compensation over there, we have a Liquor Store there, and also a Federal Government Post Office.

MR. CHALKER: Is the hon. gentleman referring now to Corner Brook, or

MR. MURPHY: I am just referring now to the fact of the space in this building, for employees which is 730 square feet, per person in this public building in Corner Brook.

MR. CHALKER: Is that the total area you are taking?

MR. MURPHY: This is an area approximately 750 feet per person, the building 22,000 square feet.

MR. CHALKER: I wonder if the hon. gentleman saw the answer to the question put there today on regarding that building asked by the hon. member from Gander, I think there is 22,000 or 23,000 feet not allocated which is including a library, and I think a courthouse, and the area allocated through the R.C.M.P. which obtained that for nothing, I mean if you take that you have got a much less space to work with.

MR. MURPHY: Well, this is the day we got the samples. As the hon. member knows Mr. Speaker, this was prepared a couple of days ago, we find that in the building there are approximately 22,000 square feet of unoccupied space, and I think this is what the hon. member said, which is evidently not been rented by Government to outside people. We are looking for such space this does not seem to be an economic principle on which to operate.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker there is no space in that building as of this moment that I know of.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. Minister now may be perfectly right, these were notes that were taken from answers to questions that we had been proved with, and we tried to figure out the cost per rent basically, this is what you figure out, what the building is costing us. The density the number of people occupying the building so on and so forth. So from answers that we had, and this can be updated as of present, the answers we had; there were approximately 730 square feet for every person who works in the building.

MR. CHALKER: The hon. gentleman has taken any of the answers from the press has he?

MR. MURPHY: Well, as I say this is to... when I review I will be only too happy to correct it in the budget debate, when we are on the Public Works Estimates. But here we are with this great, and the point that I am trying to get across again, is this great surge of announcements, Corner Brook is going to get this great big building, and so on and so forth, and we build a building out there, and I do not for a moment deny Corner Brook a public building. But, why build a building, Mr. Speaker, that is three times too large for the needs, you got a Cabinet Room out there, I doubt if there was ever one, and I may be wrong, one Cabinet meeting held there as such.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member mind, when this building here was complete, I think it was 1960, I forget the exact date, we estimated that this building would look after the needs of the civil service and the Government for the next twenty years, I think it was a matter of five or six years, and we had to go outside for space. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, too, with permission of the hon. gentleman, I can see that happening in Corner Brook, with Stephenville and all those other places, at least we will have ample space available to put in more civil servants in this building instead of having to build another building.

MR. MURPHY: Oh absolutely, at that footage here, it is going to be good for the next 335 years.

MR. CHALKER:..... office space.

MR. MURPHY: I am referring to the office space, yes. But, you know, when we get on with the big announcements and the Cabinet is going to meet here regularly, we want to make Corner Brook, you know just the same as St. John's, this same old political propoganda, we raise monuments out there, and now in Grand Falls I think, we have much the same thing, I do not know, is the building open out there yet? May be it is just about opened, I think they had a little trouble with the building out there. But, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the criticisms that have been brought from this side of the House

MR. MURPHY: over the years, and everything was justified by the Government side. But we still think that there has been a lot of money that has been wasted, we are not one of the have provinces that have lots of money, that we could throw away, I think the hon. Minister of Welfare for example would like to have some of that \$2.5 million that was spent in Corner Brook for this building. Surely as a political gimmick, perhaps to provide homes for some of the very, very, urge cases that he has had brought to his attention.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all pleased to get back to what is happening in this hon. House. We do not wish to be coded as obstructing the business of this House, we will go along to the best of our ability with what is happening in this hon. House. I think someone mentioned yesterday that all we need is co-operation, and a measure of trust in each other, and what is happening, and I am going to refer, I can I presume refer to what had happened in this House yesterday. And explain my part in it

April 16, 1970

Tape #507

Page 1

MR. MURPHY: where a Motion was put on the Order Paper by the Government. There was one on for the member for Humber East with reference to opening on Wednesday night. I was approached as leader of the official Opposition. Would I be prepared to allow this motion to come in because as the hon. the Speaker knows, to bring in a measure like that, which is not a Government measure as said by the Government, but actually it is a Government measure brought in by government - they do not want to defeat it. That we would be prepared to back it because it had to have two-thirds of the House to put it through. The hon. leader of the House came to my office in here and asked me and I said, we are prepared if you, the hon. minister would guarantee that on Wednesdays, there would be no Motion made that the House rise at six o'clock. And with all the arguing we had yesterday Mr. Speaker, about this Motion providing, it was already built in that we meet on Wednesday night. We knew that, but there was nothing in the world to prevent the leader of the House from getting up next Wednesday and any Wednesday and saying the House would rise at six o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order! That debate was concluded. The hon. gentleman or any hon. gentleman will be permitted to refer to it next Session, next year, not in the remainder of this Session. The debate concluded yesterday. The vote was taken, it was disposed of. I hold that it is completely out of order to revive the matter now.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, in the Address in Reply a member is free to touch on any subject he wishes. That has been the practice in this House. I submit that the hon. member who is speaking should not be restricted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in a matter that has been dealt with and disposed of in a Session at no point thereafter in any kind of a speech, on any kind of a matter, may the matter be revived. It has been dealt with by the House - it is not a matter that is to be dealt with, but a matter that has been dealt with and disposed of and closed. It is wrong to revive it. There is no rule of Parliamentary procedure clearer than that Your Honour, no rule.

April 16, 1970

Tape #507

Page 2

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that point the matter in question has not been disposed of. The matter in question is going to come up every Wednesday during this Session. The matter is not disposed of.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I think the Chair ruled yesterday and drew attention to the members that debates cannot be revived. With regard to the Address in Reply - actually the rules relating to that debate are no different from the rules relating to any other debate, except that by the nature of the Motion before the House, the territory or the field which can be covered is different. Members are not permitted to say whatever they like in the Address in Reply. But the point of order taken is that the hon. member is not permitted to revive the debate, and that is a good point of order.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that makes this House such a lovely place to be you know. People rising on a point of order. You cannot talk about this, you cannot talk about that. This is something Mr. Speaker, that affects me as a member of this House with reference to an agreement made, and I think I have a perfect right to justify myself. If dealing with a matter, so all we have to do is get up and discuss it, then, no one else can discuss what is happening to this House, to the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member had his opportunity yesterday to speak on the debate before the House yesterday, and the rule is quite clear that it cannot be revived. On the other hand it is possible sometimes to have to touch on something that was said in some other way, but not to revive the debate.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I accept Your ruling. I know that the hon. Speaker of this House has had a very turbulent passage this trip. But I will just deal briefly with the rules of this House with Standing Orders. Our reasons for doing certain things and objecting to certain things, and I may be permitted to do these things I presume - presuming I do not get into a debate on a debate that has been closed. And that is the impression that

is left, but a great many people that this Opposition is too lazy to work. They will not work overtime. I heard the hon. the Premier this morning Mr. Speaker, tell the radio stations how he sits in his seat and has done it for the past twenty-one years unless he was out of the Province. He sits in his seat from three to six, and from eight to eleven when the House is open. And there is no one more aware of that fact than this hon. member here. But the Premier did not give the reason for that Mr. Speaker. He did not give the reason, the main reason why he does not leave his chair over there while this House is in Session. He did not state the reason why he closed the House, when the hon. the Premier and three of his ministers went away. Because the hon. Premier feels Sir, and this is my opinion, my own opinion, it might be shared by other people, that this House cannot operate without the hon. Premier being in the Chair. This is my opinion. When the hon. minister speaks, he can give us his opinion.

But the hon. Premier must sit in that Chair, just afraid that something else might happen in his absence. We talk about co-operation. We talk about smooth-running of everything. Now through the years and the most vivid, the most callous thing that I ever saw done, was the hon. Leader of the Opposition, my immediate predecessor, who made the terribly, tragic offense against this Province of Newfoundland by saying, I second the Motion. And was barred, not by the Premier, but by the rules of this House, which had to be brought to the attention, and then the great big magnanimous offer afterwards, oh, let him speak, let him speak. This is what gets me Mr. Speaker. When we talk about rules of this House, how important they are to the people of this Province, and at any time during the Session, the hon. the leader of the House can get up and move that these rules be suspended. How important the rules are. We had an unfortunate incident that I did not share in, because like the Premier, I am in my chair pretty well most of the time, only I am one of these unfortunate ones that like an odd draw on a cigarette, so I have to pop out for a few minutes. The Premier does not smoke, he gave it up twelve years ago. I have all the details on the Premier. He gave up smoking twelve years ago, and he is lucky that he does not have to get up and bow to this terrible urge to have a cigarette. Well

now look do not - please, I heard the Premier say only this morning say twelve years ago he gave up smoking, and the Premier can say whether I am wrong or right, but I think I am right because I heard him. Twelve were the years given.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twelve or fourteen.

MR. MURPHY: Well at least twelve years ago, so no one will get in trouble. But Mr. Speaker, this House is here for one purpose, whether we talk about Standing Orders or any other orders. Personally I know more about the baseball rules perhaps than I do about the Standing Orders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sure of that. I am sure of that.

MR. MURPHY: But Mr. Speaker, I have done more benefit to the youth of Newfoundland in baseball than I have done here in eight years arguing about silly, foolish matters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Give the hon. gentleman full credit.

MR. MURPHY: Stupid foolish arguments in this hon. House when there is so much to be done. Wednesday is private members' day. It has been argued that the rules say you can meet Wednesday night, every night but Friday, we rise at six o'clock. Two Wednesdays ago I think it was, the Motion was moved that we not sit on Wednesday night. By the time you get the orders through of the day, Mr. Speaker, as you know and go into private members' bills, you might have an hour and a half to discuss it. Now critically and legally - The House rose and when was that, last Wednesday was it? Two weeks ago, where the hon. members were refused to go ahead with their Motion. This is tremendous stuff, tremendous parliamentarism, tremendous - doing this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was no Motion.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen want to have a debate, will they kindly go out in the Common Room? But what I am trying to get across and I may not be very successful because I do not have great brains or the intellect of some of the crown princes on the other side, is we talk about Parliament, what Parliament is here for, and all we hear is rule so and so, rule so and so, rule so and so. Debate was stifled. The hon. minister there just says no Motion was made. In my few words here on Tuesday. If I sat down once, I sat down fifteen times to listen to different ministers

April 16, 1970

Tape #507

Page 5

explain a position. I try to be Mr. Speaker, to the best of my ability, a gentleman. If people want to ask me a question or give an explanation, look, I am only too happy to learn. But when you see an individual so arrogant, so contemptuously arrogant that will not yield the floor for two minutes to allow a member to perform a duty, I think it is darn poor sportsmanship. Darn poor sportsmanship. It might be parliamentary, but the hon. member will learn that our people today know what is going on in this Province. They very much learn, very much learn, and I warn the hon. minister and some others now to start and make plans for something to do after the next election Mr. Speaker.

This is not a threat. This is advice from a much older man. These are some of the things Mr. Speaker, that the people of this Province are looking at. Not whether it is Standing Order 14, or Standing Order 16, but our conduct in this House, and no matter we are protected by rules or anything else, I think in the first instance Mr. Speaker, we must be gentlemen and regard each other as such.

2218

April 16th., 1970 Tape no 508 Page 1

Do on to each other, Mr. Speaker, as you would wish them to do to you.
That is all I can say on that particular issue.

The hon. member from Burgeo-LaPolie spoke of matters affecting his district up there, with reference to C. N. R., a name that has become, in this Province, "despised" I would say for what they have done to the working people in our Province. There are ^{not many} ~~are~~ ^{very} things that turn me more when I look at a beautiful ad in a magazine, coast to coast with C. N. R., from Halifax to Vancouver and I am referring to passenger service. One of the great tragedies, Mr. Speaker, when this enquiry was being held here in St. John's, with reference to preserving this service, which meant so much to so many of our fellow citizens, in the way of jobs, wages that we can darn well ill-afford to lose even if it is five jobs or ten jobs. The Mayor of Port aux Basques was one that came in here to listen and give evidence on it, and he was not in the least concerned about taking off the passenger service. The question was asked, did he pay his own way in? He said, "no." It was paid by C. N. R.

But once it touches his own little area with freight handling, then everybody is up in arms. But when the passenger service, when we were so much abused by C. N. R. taking away jobs from our people and substitute a bus service, our Government was not too vehement in their protestations either, not very vehement at all. After the deal was consummated and everything was gone, our Government decided they were going to submit a brief, our Government decided to submit a brief. This is it.

MR. CALLAHAN: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: Sure go ahead my boy.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker on the point to which the hon. gentleman is now referring. I simply want to ask him whether the case, having been put at the public hearing to which he has now referred, the case having been put in respect of the railway passenger service by the then Minister of Justice on behalf of the Government, did not the hon. gentleman himself personally

on behalf of the Opposition support that case and restrict himself, not go further, but support the case that the Government at that time presented, was that not the fact?

MR. MURPHY: I supported a case, Mr. Speaker,.,.

MR. CALLAHAN: Exactly.

MR. MURPHY: Because in that, there was an extension, I think, and I may be wrong, from a certain day for about another year. That is what I supported. It was better than losing it six months or the year before. We saw everything was lost. You could not win. You cannot beat C. N. R., when our Government is not storming the fortress of the great House of Parliament in Ottawa.

MR. CALLAHAN: Will the hon. gentleman take another case or did he support the case that the Government made? That is the question.

MR. MURPHY: I supported and fought for the retention of the C. N. R. passenger service in this Province.

MR. CALLAHAN: Before the public hearing downstairs.

MR. MURPHY: I certainly did, and I have briefs to prove it. But we just sat by on the last moment and asked for this extension..

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman did not present a brief that day. He simply got up...

MR. MURPHY: The C. N. R. Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, and do not let any of us be too suprised..

MR. CALLAHAN: I am not supporting the C. N. R.

MR. MURPHY: Do not let any of us be too surprised in another few years that these steel ribbons may be gone to, and there goes another few hundred jobs. Do not at all be too surprised that these steel ribbons may be gone to, unless someone in this Province are standing up, fighting to retain the jobs. They can talk about service. They can talk about what they like, but let us get the jobs. That is what we need. Put our Manpower to work.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, all this and I say these great ads, these

great coloured ads from coast to coast. I wonder does Canada really cease at Halifax or Sydney. Are we indeed in fact as well as in any other way a member of this great Dominion of Canada, as we hear so much? Are we in fact, as well as - we get the baby bonus, yes. We get unemployment insurance. We get the other benefits. Is that all we want? We talk about Confederation. There are no anti-Confederates today, let us not face it. There are people who wish that Newfoundland had to get Confederation the proper way to a sovereignly elected assembly. But Confederation today, I think, the hon. the Premier terms it as the greatest blessing under life itself. We do not need, Mr. Speaker, to crawl to Ottawa on our hands and knees with our caps in our hands. This was not a one way street. Anybody that was in the commercial life of Newfoundland like I did, customs' work. How much revenue or how much monies were Canada receiving from the Province of Newfoundland before Confederation? What were their sales in this Province? Practically nothing. My hon. friend will tell you that. Practically nothing. Now we are a captive market. Does anybody figure out what central Canada: particularly Ontario and Quebec are receiving from this Province. Not only the dollar that we are spending there on what we are buying there. But when you think of the tax, the Federal sales tax that is paid on these goods that are shipped in here, that goes directly into the pockets of the Federal Government. We are not the great anchor around the neck of Canada that some people maintain we are.

We know we get substantial grants from Ottawa, but everybody else is getting them also, every other province are getting grants the same as we are and other things like....

MR. CALLAHAN: First class national parks and the facilities. The hon. minister is very pleased to, very glad to discuss national parks.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister is afraid to discuss them.

MR. CALLAHAN: Any time the hon. gentleman keeps within the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many too many people in this Province of ours who are not sharing in this great blessing of Confederation and a great many people would like to become first class Canadians. They say we are first class Canadians. As men, I would say yes, Mr. Speaker, but as far as sharing in the benefits of Confederation, we are fourth class citizens, because of the fact that this Government has been in power too long, that this Government has become arrogant, as the expression goes. They have disregarded entirely many good ideas that have been brought forward from this side of the House, not by me, but by many other learned men. They have rushed in, Mr. Speaker, where angels fear to tread in an awful lot of the things that have happened in this Province and now today twenty-one years later, we are on the verge of another great industrial breakthrough, and I say with all the sincerity in my body, I pray God we are. I say that, Sir, whether the Liberals get an industry, whether the Conservatives or the Independent Liberals or the Labrador Liberals, Labrador Independents, if it is for our people, and they are going to benefit, Mr. Speaker, we are for it one hundred per cent. But let us not, let us not talk about 6,000 jobs unless we are sure that we have 6,000 jobs. Back in 1952, we had a great machine plant to be erected - the plant was erected basically to provide some 6,000 jobs, and our worry at that time was the shortage of labour. We might have to get them in from other parts of Canada. If these 6,000 jobs are available in the next few months, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Government contact these 6,000 people who lined^{up} ~~up~~ eighteen years ago, give them the first chance on these jobs, because some of them are still waiting.

After twenty-one years, Mr. Speaker, we are in this Province, I believe in a very, very favourable position to really consolidate what gains we have made and I refer to, perhaps the most important thing that has happened in the Province and that is the growth, the growth of municipalities incorporated

over the years. I think today, we have something like ninety. I may be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: 200.

MR. MURPHY: Two hundred municipalites incorporated? Is that right? These are the people, Mr. Speaker, who will be the ones who should decide which Government, with the House of Assembly, what is best for our Province. We have another great factor that is entered into our - into the realm of movements in our Province and these are the development centres. You have the Northern Regional Development a group of men come together to decide what they can do on their own - these people are not looking for hand-outs, I think all they are looking for is a little bit of technical advice, a little bit of encouragement. It is a wonderful idea. You got the Burin Peninsula

MR. MURPHY: On matters pertaining to their own particular districts. The hon. Minister says very closely. According to what I read in the papers they are a long distance away from being close on this national park. I do not know how the hon. member feels on this down there, but as far as I know

Mr. Speaker, we have after twenty-one years or twenty years actually I suppose, this is our twenty-first anniversary, we have a lot to learn from the mistakes of the past. No longer are people going to be deceived, bluffed, taken in by promises whether intentional or unintentional being made. We look back Mr. Speaker, over the years and I can go back twenty years, when Confederation first came, and just prior to Confederation, and our Premier used to make the great appearances. He owned just about, he did not own it but he took up most of it, radio, and he would have some of his candidates on. I remember one evening the hon. member for St. Mary's, the former Minister of Health was on and Colonel O'Driscoll I think was running for Bell Island at the time, and I mentioned earlier the Academy Awards.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you if ever there was a show put off that could win first prize without any other nomination it would have been that. We are hearing the same, almost the same kind of stuff today that we were hearing then. Stupid nonsensical statements, "and you are a doctor?" "Yes I am a doctor." "You are a medical doctor?" "Yes, I am a medical doctor." "Now you are not a horse doctor?" You know, this is the kind of stuff went on.

"Oh Mr. O'Driscoll you are a colonel in the army." "Yes, yes." "Do they call you colonel or do they call you Joe?" This is some of the stuff Mr. Speaker, and we are just about, but it won elections. But today we hear stuff, God help us almighty, with the level of education we have reached in this Province I am sure that, Mr. Speaker, I believe quite sincerely it is time to get down to honest to God work, to face facts, to really work

MR. NEARY: I agree, do we start right now?

MR. MURPHY: Start right now, just listen to my words. It would be the best start the hon. minister ever made.

Mr. Speaker, we have today a very large public service, or civil service, whatever you would like to call it. We have some tremendous men in that service. Career civil servants I would call them, who have been in there for many years, have devoted themselves to the work of the civil service, who carry out their duties very efficiently. I would like at this time Sir, to say just a few words of appreciation to so many of these senior civil servants, and in between civil servants, and to ask this hon. House (and the Premier has already made the statement with reference to raises for civil servants) to ask this hon. House to consider very seriously, very objectively the set-up of our civil service at the present moment. For these people, these civil servants who have devoted perhaps most of their working years to the civil service, be treated justly in the matter of senior jobs.

There are certain jobs in the civil service, certain posts that the Premier has a right to appoint and that is his prerogative. Yesterday a question was placed on the Order Paper here, with reference to Mr. Herman Batten. A very good friend of mine, I have known him for many years who is now back in harness again as a consultant or an advisor on the Come by Chance plant

MR. NEARY: Good man

MR. WELLS: Apparently he was a

MR. MURPHY: Well if he were not, if he were not out of harness for nine months working on the Liberal Convention

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman as far as I know received leave of absence to work on being organizer or chairman of this great Liberal Convention, and now he is back again. What he is getting paid I do not know, but I am sure he is getting more than fifty dollars a week.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$20,000

MR. MURPHY: How much?

MR. CROSBIE: \$20,000.

MR. MURPHY: You are not serious. \$20,000. bucks a year. God help us Mr. Speaker. This is another example Mr. Speaker, of where, and I will be laughed

at, I will be scorned, I will be tut tutted, where friends of the Liberal Party are shoved into jobs and paid money that rightly belongs to other civil servants who are working for half nothing. I say this now, a friend of mine, a conservative wanted to attend the Liberal Convention as an observer. Who did he have to see Mr. Speaker? Who did he have to see? Will some one tell me who was in charge of observer tickets at the Liberal Convention. Observer seats? Well I will tell the hon. members if they are not aware of it. The hon. O.L.Vardy. A civil servant. Is this the Government of Newfoundland? Is this Confederation Building, or is it Liberal Headquarters and I ask it now. And I will continue to ask it, and continue to ask it.

MR. ROBERTS: No political discussions takes place in that room over there

MR. MURPHY: Politics are discussed in that room over there, but we do not pay anybody \$20,000. a year to come in and discuss them Mr. Speaker.

I may be all wet, I may be a babe in the woods, but I have grown up with certain things taught me between morality, politics, whatever you would like to call it, but to me it is immoral completely immoral to use monies of this Province to pay, I do not care how faithful it is, if the Liberal Party wants to pay this man or any other man let them pay him, but for God's sake do not let the people of Newfoundland have to pay him.

We brought up the same thing, I can go back, I can stay here until next Friday week talking about things we discussed in this House. As I said earlier I am not too hard to get along with, I can discuss with anybody or talk with anybody.

MR. ROWE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Would he be equally indignant and horrified if he discovered that some civil servants, 10,000, 15,000 or what ever it is was also working on behalf of an anti-Government, or an anti-Premier, or an anti-liberal party or candidate. Would he be equally horrified?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, and I say this now, that any civil servant that is being paid for working as a civil servant has no right to be working during his working hours with any other party or anything else. I will say that

MR. ROWE: What about after work?

MR. MURPHY: After work? It does not matter to me he can go out and do what he wishes, but if you get key civil servants, men that indispensable, and you hear the great statements on them, and you can say "here, look, take twelve months off, nine months off, to go down and arragne our great Liberal Convention." How indispensable are they? How indispensable are they?

HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Tory candidate in the last election in this Province got leave of absence from the Government of Canada to run as Tory candidate.

MR. MURPHY: Proper thing, proper thing, I do not object to anybody running as a candidate Mr. Speaker, I consider this the greatest service any man can do to offer himself as a candidate.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): The same thing

MR. MURPHY: The same as chalk and cheese my son, grown up, grow up.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the hon. gentleman

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman's mind in a few years has been turned from the channel of reason till he can only see straight ahead and with just one eye and that is in the middle of his forehead

AN HON. MEMBER: Single-mindedness

MR. MURPHY: No Mr. Speaker, as I say they can laugh, scorn, anything they like but what I feel I will say and these are things Mr. Speaker. We have asked questions, we have brought up matters, the waste of millions and millions of dollars that have taken place in this Province through no tenders being called for jobs. Big Jobs, and let anybody deny it. Look at the St. John's Municipal Council, calling tenders, I have seen price range from five to twenty per cent difference in prices on the same article, but not so with this great Government. We had millions of dollars to spend, this was Utopia, we are in Utopia now.....

with 25 per cent of your people almost crawling on their bellies.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is pretty good, with 70 per cent going on television.

MR. MURPHY: Wonderful, wonderful,

AN. HON. MEMBER: Last year the hon. member said 70 per cent.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman is NUTS, if I may use the expression, I never used 70 per cent. , I never used 70 per cent. Mr. Speaker, as I said let us think of the people, all the people, not one section of the people, all the people, We have work to do Mr. Speaker, we have work to do in this House, very serious work , we will get on with the business, we will get on with the business. Did the gentleman refer to the hon. the Premier and ask him to get on with the business after ten hours, of stuff that has been hashed, rehashed, hashed over hashed over again about how we were all starving to death in 1930. No one ^{has to} tell me that we were starving to death in 1930- 1931. No one has to tell me that. I know it, I went through it as did an awful lot of other people in this Province. Nineteen-thirty is gone, gone, we are in the 1970's now this is our responsibility,

MR. CALLAHAN: Thank God for that.

MR. HICKEY: There are only certain people you hear from over there.

MR. MURPHY: Thank God for that, is right,

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is the one who raised the Amulree Report.

MR. MURPHY: Thank God for that. I raised the Amulree Report for one reason to show that in these days when there was no money worthwhile and today with the millions of dollars that are being passed along, that we are still back where we started in 1932. And the hon. member did not agree, the hon. minister did not agree but Mr. Speaker, many thousands of Newfoundlanders agreed, and I think I am right on that.

MR. BURGESS: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. MURPHY: I would be delighted.

MR. BURGESS: Witnessing what is happening on the opposite side of the House does not this make the hon. gentleman wish that he could make birth control retroactive?

MR. MURPHY: My religious principles are against active, retroactive or in the future. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of a little story if I may break the trend for just a moment, talking about laws and all the rest of it. The story is told of a very successful business man in Toronto who decided to pack up and

leave and his friends were urging him to stay. He said: "No, I can not stay here," And he said why do you intend to leave? He said: "Look what is happening to this Great Dominion of Canada today, they are talking about their laws hey," He said; "two years you know, two years ago you could not mention the word homosexuality in Canada," He said, "last year it was made legal, and I am getting out of here before they make it compulsory."

MR.NEARY: That is a queer story for the hon. gentleman to tell us Mr. Speaker.

MR.MURPHY: Queer alright, you said the right word for it. Well I suppose there will always be an Amos and Andy show I do not know which one I am but the hon. member fills the other part of it. If the hon. minister would restrain his levity, he is usually in good humour and I know he must be one of the most popular ministers in the House and perhaps one of the ablest, there is the complement, beware of Greeks bearing - I do not know if the hon. the Premier is in the House - and I mention the great genius I have here on my right - this young man was going to the top -

MR.NEARY: But he took it serious.

MR.MURPHY: You mean this hon. minister did not take it serious. You do not know the hon. minister. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at the crossroads, - J.M.Browne's the crossroads - but it is J.R.S the crossroads now. This Mr. Speaker, will be the year that will decide where we go, if we start to climb back to where we should be, or if we continue going the way we are going and I do not say, that we have reached the point of no return. But I am just a little weary Mr. Speaker, unless very, very serious measures are taken that an awful lot of our people are going to suffer greater hardships than they are at this time.

We have had a Government Mr. Speaker, for twenty years of great announcements. There are so many industries that were brought, and again I do not want to go back and hash them over but in more recent years we had this great prefab. housing deal, the market is gone out of housing here, the number of housing starts, for any type of housing in Newfoundland was away below the national level last year. We here in Newfoundland have to pay considerably more, for pretty well all the commodities that we use. Our sales tax is not

the highest I believe it is the second highest in Canada. We are a little exception I think, we have the base of the tax lowered much lower than any other Province. The Premier announced today, not to the House, but on his own personal communications channel, that the budget will be brought in in ten days time. I would like to inform the hon. members now who have not heard the programme today that the budget will be brought in in ten days time which will be April 25, and we do not know if there will be an election. I will be listening tomorrow morning, the second part of the serial, to see if there will be an election tomorrow. But I heard that on V.O.C.M. this morning that the budget will come down the tenth, now this is definite, it was going to be brought down around the middle,

MR. NEARY: The hon. member cannot think about anything but the election.

MR. MURPHY: We hope the election is brought down tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Election is on his mind, he is eating it and sleeping it and -

MR. MURPHY: This is great fun, could I be blamed, this is great fun. If the Premier was only looking at what I am looking at now he would not have nightmares he would have little ponies. Oh well! Mr. Speaker, it is great to be humble Mr. Speaker, and the humility of the hon. Premier is really frightening. He stands on the floor of this House and I missed it unfortunately, I had to be somewhere else, very important business, - and he actually had to force himself force himself to speak. For the people, I think it was ten hours, some people think it was three weeks, but it was only ten hours - twelve hours altogether. And I did not get a chance I am keeping the copies of Hansard until I get my holidays so as I can read them. I do not have enough time now I am too busy. But I am sure Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is bored to tears now, listening to me saying a few things -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I like to listen to the hon. gentleman, I like it I always enjoy listening to the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have reached a stage now as I said we are at the crossroads. We have two or three large industries

that have been announced --and I have said this before and I will say it again - that we certainly hope they come through for the people concerned because there is nothing more despicable of building people's hopes up if there is no chance of supplying that hope, and I am not saying that this is happening at this time

MR. MURPHY: time has come to let these industries get into production, this is the times to set up hiring people, during the years we have heard so many promises of so many things for the people, that really is quite understandable how the people are just about given up on any hopes, there is a feeling of despondency generally among the people that it is just another promise. When we look back and see particularly around election time, there were many things that were promised, if we read some of the great manifestos that have been issued by the Liberal Party, we sometimes wonder when people would wise up. I think now they have wised up, I think their response to very many things that are happening in this Province today is quite evident. They are watching us, all of us here in this House, just what we are doing for them. I do not think they want this to be an arena, where people are fed to the lions any more. I think they feel that everybody in this House has something to attribute. I do not think they believe in obstruction of any kind. I do not believe that any more they want to hear two prominent public figurers, using radio or T.V. to throw accusations at one any other, of being bully-boys, of being sick, of being dictators. It is all right to get your name before the public I suppose. To get your name before the public makes headlines, you know. What I said today, there has said the hon. member for Bonavista South is a perfect gentleman, a lovely man. I do not think I would write a headline in the news or telegram tomorrow. If I said he was a bum, he was a bully, and he was a this and a that, I believe I would rate perhaps as being a, I would get a bit of a headline on it. Perhaps these are things that make the news, or salary increases which I hope, my explanation was taken as I explained it yesterday, that we are not in this House, and at this time we should look for more money. I would like Mr. Speaker, perhaps while I look at the hon. member for Harbour Grace, how sorry we are all with the great lost in his trawler the day before yesterday, it must have been a very great blow to his company just to get him ready to start operating. I am sure we all here feel very sorry for the hon. member, I think he is a very fine member, he has got a lot to contribute to the House, and this lost to his company does not affect to much, and not only the company

MR. MURPHY: I am referring to possibly, but the people concerned, the men or the mayor of Harbour Grace extend, deliver a message the other night how hard put Harbour Grace was. I do not know how the Hon. House can do to help these people of Harbour Grace, Mr. Speaker. These are the things here in this Province of ours, how one incident, and I will not say small things, but basically one little incident, that can put so many people out of work, and create a drain on the hon. minister of Welfare that people who are looking forward to earning a decent living, have to depend on public support to keep their families going.

Mr. Speaker, it is getting near 6:00 O'Clock and I have not too much longer to go, I presume in the rules of the House that we meet tonight, this is the understanding that the Speaker leave the Chair at 6:00 O'Clock.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot say.

MR. MURPHY: He cannot say. I am just wondering if a motion is in order, that the Chair not meet tonight, and the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon.

Now, I will finish my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, and trust that I have not bored the members to any great extent, or at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman has not bored me yet, I enjoy everything he says.

MR. MURPHY: And I appreciate the Premier's remarks, and I think he is quite sincere in what he says that, he does enjoy me. I have not yet been offered the vacant cabinet post, perhaps it is because I mentioned my hon. friend for that. But, Mr. Speaker, quite seriously all I say is this let us in Heaven's name act as grown ups, let us get down, let us get the business of the House done and farther more let us act like christian gentlemen were, nice to each other, courtesy to each other. Do not one member of this House try to out manoeuver the other. As I look there now at the Hon. Speaker, in heaven's name how does the hon. gentleman sit in that Chair and put up with all this stuff, when he could be out in his law office, quite happy, earning far more money than sat here having to settle a squabble on this, and a squabble on that, and quite frankly a learned gentleman like he is, he must sometimes wonder you know really got all their marbles? This is the way it strikes me. Mr. Speaker I would like to pay attribute to you at this time, and to the Deputy Speaker and my sympathy at the same time for

what you have to put up with. And I trust Sir that, I will try my best not to be too hard on you, and I think all our Opposition does here. And we respect your rulings, you make them in the best of your wisdom. You are only pessed with so much wisdom, and that is sufficient to do your job. But your job Mr. Speaker is one of the toughest in this House. You have got to make decisions, which if they are against me, I feel perhaps you might be favouring the other fellow so on and so forth. But I would like to congratulate you, and the Deputy Speaker for the very splendid manner in which you have carried out your duties in this session. As tough as they have been, But with appeal to the members to try to make your job, perhaps a little easier, I think we could all co-operate, and with each other. As I started off I think yesterday that we are aware this is our Province we are representing and all sections, no matter what district you come from you are representing all of Newfoundland, and to try and sit down and for heaven sake do not let one of try to out manoeuver the other fellow in some slick parliament way to try to prevent him from speaking. I have a lot of respect for the rules Sir, but I think rules are only a guideline, I do not think they are meant to be actually binding on anything that is to the betterment of the House. I think the rules should not deter any progress in the House. But I feel and I will reaffirm this again, Mr. Speaker, that working properly this House that we could meet in the afternoons from 2:30 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. and get through more work, and far easier on some of us on this side and perhaps on the other side, without having to have night sessions. I feel that quite honestly that we could

MR. MURPHY: that we could meet in the afternoons, get down to work, because another few days, I think the hon. minister of Education is going to clue up this debate, and I am sure that he will not be very long, because he is not very critical at any time - I think he is one of the finest members on that side to get along with. I very seldom have an argument with him, and I am sure he would only sum up, I do not know but he might take on right after me and finish at six o'clock. But he may want to continue tomorrow. But Mr. Speaker, I would like if I have the power to do it within my rights as I conclude to move that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon. Thank you very much. A seconder for the Motion? I did not think there was any need. And you cannot move adjournment if you have spoken in the debate? Well I move seconded by the hon. Minister of Education that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 P.M.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, before getting involved in some of the more serious and perhaps the more controversial aspects of this debate on the Address in Reply, there are several matters on which I want to comment. The Leader of the Opposition has said that I am the last speaker. It is customary I think for the Government of the House to close the debate on the Address in Reply, and this gives me a chance to summarize some of the thinking, and some of the talking that has been going on during the past several weeks while the House has been open.

First of all Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your role once more. Yours Mr. Speaker, it is not always a very easy task, especially in a Session of this kind where there is so much emotion involved. There have been so much heated argument. I think all of us are very delighted with the way in which our new Lieutenant-Governor performed his duties at the opening. He and his lady performed magnificently, and I think that this performance was matched by other aspects of that opening day. For example the mover and the seconder of the Motion were both veteran political figures. I think it was a very nice gesture that those men who served us so long and faithfully, should be asked to perform that function. We all expected

April 16, 1970

Tape #512

Page 2

they would give a good account of themselves. Well I think without exception we were genuinely surprised at both the eloquence and the contents of what they had to say. I do not want to denigrate the efforts of their predecessors down through the years, but I think I can say quite pre-conscientiously that these were the two best speeches of their kind that I have heard in this House in the twenty sessions or twenty-one, I am not sure which, that I have been privileged to attend. And it must have been heartwarming too Mr. Speaker, at a time when it has become fashionable in the name of political courage, not merely to attack the head of the Government, but also the record of the Government and the party which that Government represents.

I say it was heartwarming to see those two respected gentlemen step forward and reaffirm their loyalty to the Government which they have been a part to that party. And they did it without any mincing of words, and without any axe to grind. I know Mr. Speaker, that hon. members wish for me to refer to the fact that one of those gentlemen, the member for Trinity North since then has had a serious operation, but I am sure we are all happy to know that he is now discharged from hospital, and is apparently rapidly returning to health.

And since we last met Mr. Speaker, the official Opposition have a new leader in the person of the hon. member for St. John's Center, who just spoke to us so entertainingly, and so intelligently in so many ways. I am indulging in any smooth flattery when I say that that hon. gentleman always had the liking and the respect of this side of the House. And we all appreciate that in taking on at very short notice, a duty as leader of the Opposition. He has taken on a man-sized job, and that job has not been made any easier by the fact that the Opposition on paper at any rate, is larger than it was last year. The increase in the size of a party of an Opposition does not make it any easier for the leader of that Opposition for that party.

I want also to do something that has been on my mind for some time Mr. Speaker, and that is to express my regret that the man who led the Opposition here for the three previous Sessions is no longer in this House. I of course refer to Mr. Ottenheimer. I cannot help feeling that young and

April 16, 1970

Tape #512

Page 3

intelligent and dedicated Newfoundlander, and it was my privilege incidentally to offer him his first professional employment, when I was previously Minister of Education. I cannot help feeling that that young Newfoundlander should still be here. And I express the very sincere hope that some day he will again sit in this House in one capacity or another. While I am on that I would like also to refer to one of his predecessors as Leader of the Opposition, Mr. James Greene whose name we heard here today, who withdrew from public life after having served here I think for three terms, if I remember correctly. It was generally assumed, and this has a bearing on what the Leader of the Opposition had to say here yesterday. It was generally assumed that Mr. Greene felt that he could not in justice to his family, he could not continue on in politics. As a lawyer he could not afford to carry on for all practical purposes a full time job as a member and as a leader of the Opposition on the salary that was being paid him, when he could easily earn two or three times as much in the practice of his profession. And I think it is a matter of great regret that for that reason, he had to withdraw if I am correct. He did not tell me that, that is a general assumption, and I heard him speak of it publicly. His loss was a loss to this House, and a loss to the people of Newfoundland. If for no other reason than for a simple fact of arithmetic, that the experience that one gains after seven or eight years in this House. In spite of all that has been said about the announcements and the bizarreness and the circus atmosphere here, it is a tremendous experience to serve here. And of course it is an even more experience to serve the seven or eight years as a member of a district and as a leader of a party as he was. And so when a gentleman such as he or Mr. Ottenheimer, severs his connections with public life overnight, and suddenly at a comparatively young age as they both were, and that is a loss. It is a loss to the people, and it is a loss to the Province. And I am not being hypocritical at all Mr. Speaker. They are younger men than I am, and I will be gone out of this long before they would in the ordinary course of events. But I am not being hypocritical, when I express the hope that

April 16, 1970

Tape #512

Page 4

both of these young men, and this could apply to others who have served here as well, will some day be induced to offer their services again. Newfoundland cannot afford to lose the experience and the talent that young men such as they had and acquired.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to interject at this point that although the Department of Education is at present my responsibility, I do not intend to deal with educational matters as such in this Address. The opportunities for that will present themselves not only in the Budget debate, but in the fact that ~~there are~~ I think ten pieces of legislation of education legislation on the Order Paper, and it will be my responsibility to introduce them. And at that time I will

that time I will make some comments on education and certainly somewhere along the line, I intend in particular to speak on the matter of our University. I mention it now. I do not want anyone to think that because in this major debate, one of the two major debates of the session the fact that I omit any specific reference to education is an indication that all is well or that I am not concerned with it or that I do not intend to^{do} anything about it or to say anything about it. While I am on this matter of preliminary references, I am sorry my young hon. friend from Corner Brook, from Humber East is not here, because I planned to refer to some of the things that he had said, but I think I can say it and I will make sure that he does get a copy of the script which may not be a literal account of what I said, but certainly will convey the general tenor of it. I have listened to him entranced as he played on all our emotions here, especially at least in two of the speeches and especially those emotions which involved our sympathies and, of course, like everyone else, I cringed under his denunciations. I shivered as he accused us. I could pay him no greater compliment and I am being serious on this then to say that if I am ever charged with any criminal offense, serious criminal offense like killing someone or robbing a bank or something of that kind, I hope he will consent to be my defense lawyer; especially if I am guilty. We were almost moved to tears when he described the deprivation of the children of Newfoundland in respect of their chocolate bars and ice cream. Then we remind ourselves, does it really whether it is a tax on chocolate bars or on motor cars or on refrigerators or on ice-cream on on soft drinks or on shores. It is not the children who pay it. It is the parents that pay that. It is the wage earner who pays that. So the argument that he used there..

MR. MURPHY: Will the hon. minister permit one question?

MR. ROWE: Sure.

MR. MURPHY: Can the minister really serious to say that^{be} if is taking money out of the pockets of the parents? That is who foots the bill anyhow.

MR. FRED ROWE: Well that is exactly what I am saying. The children do not pay the taxes..

MR. MURPHY: No it was just a little bit different, it does not affect the children?

MR. FRED ROWE: It is exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker. When my hon. friend was telling us and describing the fight of the children of Newfoundland, we were almost moved to tears, when we realized how many children there were who were denied their chocolate bars and their ice-cream and so on, and I speak as a father, one time of small children and today a grandfather of five, and I do not want to see any child deprived of chocolate bars or ice cream or anything else which is in their interest to have and which does not harm them, although..

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be far worse to see them deprived of food.

MR. FRED ROWE: I was going to say there are other things, perhaps, more serious things that they could be deprived of, but let that go. The fact of the matter is, ^{it is} is that the parents who pay the taxes. It is the wage earner who pay the taxes. It is not the child and so the whole argument that the hon. gentleman used here was absolutely phony and fallacious. This idea that there is a connection between Come-by-Chance and chocolate bars and the innocent children of Newfoundland. Parents decide on their priority, they decide on how to allocate whatever money they have and so it is a good old-fashioned argument, a good old-fashioned word, a good old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon word for that type of argument and my hon. friend there tried to get us to weep over. I do not think it is parliamentary, so I will not use it.

Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the Chamber the other day, when the House congratulated my colleague the Minister of Justice on having completed fifty years as a member of the Bar of Newfoundland. I am sorry I was absent, because I would liked to associated myself with the others who paid a tribute to him at that time. My association with him has been more than political. When I first came here to Newfoundland to work as a

principal of a school under the United Church Board of St. John's, my hon. friend was the Chairman of the Staffing Committee of that board and was, for all practical purposes, my immediate boss. He befriended me then both personally (I want to go on record as this has been ~~the first~~ time that I have had a chance publicly to say it) and in the discharge of my professional duties and he has done so on many occasions since.

Further more, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think sometimes we fail to appreciate the tremendous job, the tremendous burden that he has carried here, that that minister was Attorney-General, Minister of Justice and as House Leader and particular as House Leader has carried here so faithfully and so efficiently during the past twenty-one years. I can say this, I think, without fear of contradiction that no member of this House in those twenty-one years has worked harder than he in endeavouring to make the legislative process, as we know it here in Newfoundland meaningful and successful. Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps your Honour would wish to call it 6:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 p.m. I do ~~leave the~~ Chair until 8:00 p.m.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 38

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, when I was finishing just before six o'clock, ~~the~~ something that I have not had a chance to do in twenty sessions in this House, that is, pay a tribute to my hon. colleague and venerable colleague the Leader of the House, the Attorney General of the Province, and the Minister of Justice. And he did me the honour to move, to stay out all the while I was talking about him. The first and only chance I have had to do it really I will not repeat again but I will hope that he, I do hope that he will look at Hansard and see how in spite of our frequent disagreement, how highly I regard him. And if he is here in the forty-second session I shall be glad to get up and pay another tribute to him.

Mr. Speaker, prior to adjourning for dinner at six o'clock, I had made a few and casual semi-personal references, there were one or two other references ~~that~~ at that time that I had intended to make but ~~the~~, since one of them involved my hon. friend from Burin I thought in fairness to him I should hold off, until he got in the House here. I have been amused after all the time I have been in politics to hear all the predictions and the prophecies and the challenges that are thrown out from time to time. The favourite challenge to the Premier, I have heard it at least a hundred times in this House, for some member, ring up his fist and say, "come down in my district and I will show you what we will do, and what the people think of you down there." Or, "come over to my district, or come up to my district" - in fact while I was home the House knows that this - and incidentally Mr. Speaker, the second time - in those twenty or twenty-one sessions that I have lost any time from this House because of illness - that I did have to ~~be~~ ^{stay} home and stay in hospital some weeks during the winter and I made use of one part of that period by looking through the earlier Hansards, the ones that were published for the sessions back in the early 1950's. And all through one sees here and there some member of the Opposition challenging the Premier or challenging some other hon. member, "Come over to my district and see what we will do." And already in this session there have been several challenges of that kind

hurled mostly at the Premier but some of them at other members. And this makes me recall that, and perhaps I should remind the hon. members ~~that~~ who are throwing out those challenges that on two occasions the hon. the Premier picked up those challenges, and he is still here. And for the sake of the record, perhaps I should say that I also picked up two of those challenges and that I am still here too. I have no idea what the Premier will do in another election, if he runs in another election, I do not know what district he will run in, perhaps he does not know himself. But it is a pretty safe exercise to hurl challenges at him anyway because he has already been invited to half a dozen and by the law of course, of mathematics and probability he cannot accept any more than one, so it is a pretty safe challenge. For the sake of the record and for my part and I state this categorically if I run in another election it will be in Grand Falls District and nowhere else.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, that is settled.

MR. ROY: Speaking of those predictions it reminds me of a prediction, I wish my hon. friend from St. John's West were here because I believe quite recently on a radio or television programme, I am not sure which he has been on most of the time, he is on the radio and television almost ad nauseam these days and most of the time he is predicting what is going to happen to us when another election comes around. And recently I understand he predicted that among the districts which the Liberals could write off was Grand Falls District, that reminded me that Grand Falls District was written off for the Liberals back in 1966, three or four years ago. I am also reminded, in fact I take comfort from the fact, that a few months ago my hon. friend from St. John's West, predicted and expected confidently that he in his leadership race, and his followers were equally confident, as I can personally testify, that they would receive a substantial number that he would have a substantial number of delegates from the District of Grand Falls, in fact he had workers out there and there is nothing derogatory about this I hope nobody will misunderstand what I am saying but he did have workers out there from St. John's, a number of them, very able and competent people, men and women and they worked extremely hard and he had some help out in Grand Falls District as well, and he was quite sure that he

was going to have some strength from that area. He was very optimistic I understand, about the outcome. Well, in case he has forgotten perhaps I should remind him what the outcome was, because I believe and I am subject to correction on this, I think the outcome was unique in Newfoundland last fall that not only did every single officer in the Liberal Association in Grand Falls and every single delegate pledge their support in the first instance when I was a candidate, to me, on the assumption that the Premier was not running and then when the Premier decided to run and I withdrew, to a man and to a woman, and even the four alternates Mr. Speaker, forty-four in all, out of that, anti-Liberal, anti-Smallwood, pro-Crosbie district of Grand Falls forty of them came in here and voted to a man and to a woman for the Premier and the other four remained at home ready to come in in the event they were needed.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, there was no corruption involved in this, no coercion, there was no bullying, no bulldozing, and there was a machine at work a political machine, a machine organized in part by the member for the district. There was nothing evil about that machine it was made of respected, and in some cases honoured members and citizens of Grand Falls district. And they worked, worked indefatigably for a cause they believed in and their coming in here, their repudiation of the member for St. John's West and their decision to support the Premier was deliberate derision of free and independent citizens of the District of Grand Falls. And anyone who knows the people of Grand Falls whatever else they are or are not knows you cannot push them around. Neither Rowe or Smallwood or anybody else can go and take those people by the scruff of the neck and say, "you do this or you do that." Try that and you will not be there very long.

Speaking of predictions reminds me, and looking at my hon. friend again from Burin that he made a prediction last year, while he was still my colleague in the Cabinet, as a matter of fact. It was at the time when I announced that I was going to run, I am not sure if I had announced or if there was a rumour around and his opinion was sought by some of the T.V. and radio people as to my possibilities regarding my leadership and he solemnly pontificated and

predicted that I did not have a ghost of a chance and he gave the reasons for it. The reasons was, and he did not even have ^{his} a tongue in cheek when he did it. It sounded to me quite serious, quite serious. The reason was that I was over fifty years of age. The fact that I had just reached the age of fifty-six. He went on the generalize again without his tongue in cheek to say that anyone, no leader in this day and age over fifty could hope - and I am paraphrasing now I do not remember the exact words although I can get them if I had to - any leader, any candidate for leadership over the age of fifty does not have a ghost of a chance in this day and age. Now one thing he forgot to do in that matter, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister tell, about whom is he now talking I did not hear who it was he was talking about? About whom, whom is he now quoting please?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to my former colleague the present member for Burin, who advises, I did not have a chance for that reason, I may not have had a chance I do not know but that was the reason he gave at any rate. But one thing he did, he forgot to do and that was to go up to the most powerful nation in the world, there are about 200 million people and advise them what they should do. because they repudiated his prediction a few weeks afterwards by electing a man who happened to be exactly my age, to the most powerful position in the world. And he forgot also, by the way, if they had not the fifty per cent or forty-nine per cent who did not vote for Nixon they even committed a worse crime because they voted for a man who happened to be three years older than Nixon, Hubert Humphrey. And of course it must have been a matter of little chagrin to my hon. friend to find that fifty million Frenchmen and French women again who as we know can never be wrong they went out and elected a man as President who was nearer to fifty than he was to sixty. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not very serious, but all this means is that these challenges and predictions and prophecies are usually a waste of time and usually they end up by making the one who does make them look silly.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question? I would take the awful chance of looking silly but do I gather from his remarks that

word did spread to the United States that I had said that because Nixon was over fifty he did not have a chance, and I can now claim responsibility for the election of the President?

MR. ROWE: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, that the ~~house committee~~

~~_____~~
hon. gentleman's comments and predictions were widely distributed and circulated in the United States. As a matter of fact having just recently visited that great country, I have a feeling that about 99.9-per-cent of them have not got the faintest idea that there is a place in the world known as Newfoundland.

MR. HICKMAN: I have two cousins there, so two people heard of it.

MR. ROWE: There are a few descendents of Newfoundlanders up there.

Mr. Speaker, I referred just recently and I may say at this point that I had intended to make some references to some comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in his fairly lengthy and certainly interesting speech yesterday, all yesterday afternoon or most of it and all this afternoon. But he through an ailment, most of us these days seem to be getting ailments of one kind or another, physical or mental, but my hon. friend's ailment, a very minor one, is a physical one as mine was and as most of us have had and he did me the courtesy of saying that he would not be here tonight because of that indisposition and so I will not at this time refer to some of the comments he made, some of the points he raised in his speech.

I did intend in particular to deal with the Trans-Canada Highway and the inferences, the implications and the inferences, the implications that he made and the inferences to be drawn from what he said but inasmuch as he is not here I will, and I am quite sure I will run out of time anyway before I finish the other matters I want to deal with, so I will leave that and perhaps I might have an opportunity in some other debate later on in this session to deal with it.

I do want to say this that if, and I will sum it up, I will generalize, anyone who conveys the idea that the Government of Newfoundland aided and abetted by the Government of Canada built any part of the Trans-Canada Highway at a standard which was below that which was supposed to be built is conveying something which is completely untrue. That was not done in Newfoundland and anyone who as he travels across Newfoundland, I do as much of it as most people do, as he motors across and sees five miles here or ten

miles there ripped up, scarified, torn up, bulldozed and so on and curses, as most people do, over the holes, ruts, rocks and the roughness from the rain and then assumes from that that this was a piece of defective Trans-Canada Highway, he does not know anything about it. That is not so at all.

The fact is that over half the Trans-Canada Highway was built to the general standard which was for the most part the minimum standard of the highway built across Canada, and then before the agreement expired we got the opportunity to get a ninety - ten deal from Ottawa instead of the fifty - fifty whereby we had built the first half of that highway. And having gotten this favourable ninety - ten deal we would have been off our rockers, Mr. Speaker, if we had not taken advantage of an amendment to the Trans-Canada Highway's Act in the Parliament of Canada which permitted us not only to complete the uncompleted parts of the Trans-Canada at the maximum standards not only to build those parts which were to be built new out of the wilderness, such as for example from Whitbourne to Clarendville or Whitbourne to Port Blandford which is maximum standards, but the agreement also permitted us to take the old Trans-Canada Highway which had been built to minimum standards and upgrade it and get ninety-per-cent of the cost back from Canada for upgrading that.

Any Province who did not take advantage of that when that agreement was due to expire in 1970 I think, I think it was due to expire in the present year, I think it has been extended to the present year, any Province who did not take advantage of that should of had its collective head examined and then to insist, assume, to imply that the reason that parts of the Trans-Canada Highway are being disturbed and torn up is because it was defected in the first place is, of course, to say something that was not true and is not true. I know it is a nuisance. I drove over it again this week, everytime I go to my district I have to drive over part of that which is being rebuilt and it is a nuisance but I also know that in a years time or six months time or whenever it is, I will be instead of driving over a piece of minimum standard highway twenty feet of pavement and five foot shoulders and fairly

MR. ROWE:

sharp curves and fairly heavy grades, I will be driving over a piece of maximum standard twenty-four feet pavement, a heavier pavement, ten foot shoulders which often mean literally the difference between life and death as I know personally. Well there are a few other points I want to make if I can -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. minister clarify my mind on one point? When we started to build the Trans-Canada Highway on the fifty - fifty arrangement, Ottawa paying half and we paying half, is it true that there were two standards that were legal, that were lawful? Canada said that if we pay half the cost of building this road you can build it to one of two standards, you take your pick. One is the minimum, you cannot go below that, the road must be a certain width, the shoulders a certain width, the curves and so on must not be greater than so much. You can build it to that minimum standard or you can build it to the maximum standard and whichever you choose is lawful and we pay half and that what we have done in fact since the ninety - ten was brought in is to rebuild parts that were built on the legal lower standard to the legal higher standard because Ottawa was paying most of the cost. Is that, do I understand that correctly?

MR. ROWE: Yes, with this qualification I do not think we could call it two, Mr. Speaker, two standards because you could build anywhere in between. You had a minimum standard or a maximum but you could go anywhere in between, for example if they decided the maximum grade permitted under an Act was two-per-cent and the minimum was four-per-cent there was no reason why you could not build a three-per-cent grade.

MR. NEARY: What about the width?

MR. ROWE: The same thing applies to the width and the same thing applies to shoulders. It could not be less than five feet the shoulders could not or the paving could not be less than twenty feet but it could also be twenty-four feet or twenty-two or twenty-three feet in between. And I should also add, and while the Premier was speaking I was reminded of this, that one of the

chief causes for complaint in recent months, criticism, and then a section of the Trans-Canada over between Port aux Basques and up through the Codroy Valley and another section in my hon. friend's district between Bishop's Falls and Notre Dame Junction. These are the first parts of the 560 miles of the Trans-Canada, these are the first parts built. That section from the Trans-Canada would involve Norris Arm for example, did involve the old section, that was built, I checked on it today, during the regime of the hon. Mr. Spencer whose last summer in the Department of Highways was in 1956 because in February of 1957 he became Minister of Finance and so these are the oldest parts as well as being built to the minimum standards.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty years or nineteen years old.

MR. ROWE: That is right. They go back almost from the time actually the actual grading started, they go back almost twenty years in fact I would think on the West Coast one part would go back as much as twenty years.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to - Yes, or another Trans-Canada, certainly, my hon. friend from Gander and I know very well that the section from Gander to Grand Falls today is almost as busy as the city street, on occasions it is as busy as that, the traffic is simply too dense there on a Sunday or on an evening and so on. But Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to talk, to make some reference to some of the Opposition arguments. I said just now that during my enforced incarceration at home and in hospital I read some of the Hansard's, the earlier Hansards, and I have been interested in the news, intrigued by the saneness of the arguments used by the Opposition right from 1949 right down to the present day. The same charges of reckless and irresponsible expenditures, charges that the Government were giving away our resources to outsiders and that we would get nothing in return.

As early as 1951 the House will be interested to learn, as early as 1951 the Opposition Leader stood up over there and announced that Newfoundland was bankrupt. That

~~Mr. Smallwood~~ was in 1951, that was twenty years ago. And I do believe there has been a year since that the same dismal announcement or prediction has been made on the other side of the House.

I was interested in looking at Hansard for 1956 which is now fourteen years ago, and that year our total expenditure in the budget brought down was for the tremendous amount of \$70 million. And the opposition held up their hands, I was here, and they not only held up their hands figuratively, they held them up literally in horror. One man said, this is the end. Newfoundland could not carry on with this staggering burden of expenditure or with the taxation burden that this expenditure entails. There is another fact categorically statement were made by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hollett, the present Senator Hollett. And he was supported by Mr. W.J. Browne, one of the ablest men ever to sit in this House, and I would suggest one of the ablest men ever to sit in any Newfoundland Legislature. Mr. Browne said, "that with expenditures going on to \$70 million a year," and these were his exact words, "the financial condition of the country, he rarely used the word "Province", the financial condition of the country has been jeopardized." Mr. Hollett was even stronger, the older members here will remember he had a stentorian voice, that used to send the shivers up and down your spine. And he said, talking about our debts, the amounts that we owe, he said, and these are his exact words, "back where we were, Sir, in the 1930's when we went broke."

MR. SMALLWOOD: We heard that here yesterday.

MR. ROWE, F. W.: That was in 1956.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No that was yesterday.

MR. ROWE, F.W.: I heard that every year since, in fact I heard it last night on radio. I heard a great, I presume an expert in the matter of finance, announce last night, the gentleman by the name of Mr. Frank Moores, announce that Newfoundland, last night on the radio, he said, Newfoundland is in dire financial strings, this morning by the way he modified it a bit, he said, that Newfoundland was not in dire financial strings, but it would be, if the Liberal Government continued in office, which I take it by translation means, that it will be in dire financial strings, if he does not become the Premier of Newfoundland.

~~Mr. Speaker:~~ Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new under the sun. Almost every argument that I have heard here in respect to the Shaheen Enterprises, I use the word "Shaheen", my hon. friend will know that there are several companies involved, which is perhaps a form of verbal shorthand would be acceptable. Last year we heard the same arguments about the Shaheen deal, as we heard about the so called, Doyle deal back in 1956, when we were trying to get the Wabush deals off the ground. Remember, that time, Mr. Speaker, this legislature was called on to guarantee a bond issue of \$16.5 million to enable a railway to be built from the Wabush area out to join the main railway of the Quebec and Labrador company. And the Tory Opposition, opposed it, in a most bitter way possible, indeed they undertook accrusade and they invited the people of Newfoundland to join them in that crusade, because we were ruining the Province. This adventurer down here from some unknown part, by the name of Doyle, and this irresponsible Government going to guarantee \$16.5 million, which of course would in evitably be lost, would be down the sink, and they drew up a monster petition, Mr. Speaker will recall, a monster petition was circulated around Newfoundland and the hope that they would get a majority of Newfoundlanders to sign it. The majority did not sign it. We had a special session of the House, and we put through that Bill. And as a result of that, the single biggest Iron Ore operation in Canada, one of the greatest in the world was started, and without that Labrador City and the City of Wabush could not be there at this minute.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the expenditure is over \$600 millions.

MR. ROWE: As the Premier reminds me, I think it is generally known the expenditures then, there all ready over \$600 million in that one area. And of course, it is an infinite industry. The Tory Opposition at that time, demanded that an election be held on it. The Government has no right to guarantee this \$16.5 million, the peoples money, which of course would be lost forever more. Incidentally, we were not called upon to meet one cent of that bond issue which was paid within two or three years, \$16 million.

Then of course, the other great argument we hear, we will hear it again, as I predict now, Mr. Speaker, we will hear it now, in the weeks to come,

~~Mr. Smallwood:~~ I was not here when the Premier and his party returned from Europe but I take it that this was a substance of some of the Opposition, some of the organized Opposition that greeted him and his party, when he returned, and what is that, it is very simple. You are giving away the Province, that is the argument.

I remember when the BRINCO agreement was brought in here, back in 1953 I believe it was, and the Opposition to a man charged, that what we were doing was to give a way most of Labrador and most of Newfoundland, the Island of Newfoundland, our birth right, to a bunch of English bankers over there. Whose only concern was to make a dollar off the people of Newfoundland. And when that Bill was brought in here, that famous BRINCO Bill was brought in here and debated at length for days, the Opposition called for a division on it, and stood up and voted against it to a man.

And then I remember a year or so later, I remember this well because I was the Minister of Mines, and Resources at the time, and some years before this House on the recommendation of the Government had given to a great American Mining Company, Falken Bridge, the exploitory rights,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Great Canadian Company.

MR. ROWE: F.W.: Yes, I am sorry, the Premier reminds me, it is a Great Canadian Company, but it also had an American branches and an American interest, and I referred to it as an American Company, because of what follows in a moment. We had given to Falken Bridge most of what is now the great Baie Verte Peninsula area coming right on down to where Gull Bridge Mine is on the Hall's Bay Road and including that part of Green Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 20,000 square miles.

MR. ROWE: F.W.: Yes, the Premier remembers that it was 20,000 square miles. It is a huge tract, anybody who has looked at the map never looked at, and they had other concessions as well. For a year or two they did some work there, and then the cold war started and Falken Bridge won the contract to supply the American Government with their stockpiles of nickle. And this called for an enormous expenditure on their part in order to development nickle resources in other parts of North America. And consequently, they came to us and said,

~~Mr. Speaker, I think~~ "look we have to be honest about this, we do not have the money and the resources and the men to go ahead and develop this area as we should, and we want to give up our rights there." And we understood it, and we accepted it, and they relinquished their rights there, because of their obligations to the United States Government, during the Korean and Cold War. This left us with this great area again, well what were we going to do with it? Now remember, Mr. Speaker, it had been there since the dawn of time. I happened to study a course in geology during one of my university periods, and one thing I remember that stood out about Newfoundland, and it is the one part of the earth I think, that was never, never completely submerged beneath the sea. And that Baie Verte Peninsula down there has been there since pre-Cambrian times. And it is one we knew, and our geologist told us, I remember Mr. Claude Howse, and Dr. Baird and Mr. Gover, these three men, coming in a conference with me one time, and I asked them what part of Newfoundland should be accompanied on most, they said, without any doubt in the world the Baie Verte Peninsula, that general area, we call it Baie Verte Peninsula, but it includes more than that, it takes in the South side of Green Bay, and indeed the whole area, it is right in the centre of Newfoundland through the Town of Buchans and beyond. And we had this particular area

April 16, 1970

Tape #517

Page 1

~~Mr. Speaker~~ do something about it. There had been the odd prospector going in there. He knew there was something around Tilt Cove. Copper had been mined there sixty, seventy years ago. Everybody knew there, every prospector who had ever seen it knew there was some copper and some traces of gold in another area which we now call the Rambler area, and we knew there was something in around Gull Pond. This had been common knowledge for a hundred years, and nothing had been done about it. It is true there had once been several small mines down there in Green Bay, but once the copper was discovered under the great American Shield in Ontario, these mines were no longer economic, and they had to close up. And here is what we have had to do. The Premier invited to Newfoundland, one of Canada's best known mining promoters in the person of Mr. M. J. Boylen, Jim Boylin as he was commonly known. And the Premier personally invited him to come down here and do exploration work. And he has done a tremendous amount of development work in New Brunswick and in other parts, he has a number of famous mines, he was very wealthy. He is the head of a number of companies, and finally he decided to do just that, and we decided to give him for exploration and eventually for development, if he required it, half of that Falkenbridge area, and the other half we decided to give to BRINCO. And again this was opposed. I remember it so well. I had to file those Bills through the House here. We were giving away the Province, and we could never see the charges because as I said a moment ago, there were minerals lying around there, but nobody had ever never proven up those minerals.

And all the minerals in the ground can never do any good unless some Corporation with the money, and some Corporation with the know-how, can prove up economic deposits and then develop it. And the only way that any Corporation has ever been willing to do that, is when it is given concessions. They just will not do it without the concession. Had we listened to the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, Boylen would never had gotten the concession we gave him. Tilt Cove would not have operated for ten years giving over 400 Newfoundlanders a good living. John Mansville would never, well it was Boylen himself by spending between \$2 million and \$3 million in the Baie Verte area.

He discovered a new deposit that no one in the world had ever suspected existed, and that was one of the richest deposits of asbestos on the face of the earth and almost at tide water. And because we had given Boylen those concessions, he spent that money in the Baie Verte area. Then he got John Mansville to come in and develop it. And so today we have in the Baie Verte area a \$30 million development there giving a livelihood now to men, women and children, 6000 of our Newfoundland people.

The Rambler Mines about ten miles from Baie Verte is another example of course which Boylen developed. Atlantic Copper Mines at Little Bay, which has given employment to several hundred people over the past ten years. Gullpond which is in my own district, and which is today employing I think, 230 Newfoundlanders, giving them a pretty good living. Newfoundlanders - even from Badger and even from Winsor and from Green Bay, and South Brook and other places in Green Bay. Between 200 and 300 people, Newfoundlanders working there.

And the same thing with BRINCO at Whalesback. Now, Mr. Speaker, again I stress the presence of those minerals have been known for generations. Individual prospectors would often go in there and fool around, come out with a lump of ore and say look this is wonderful, this little piece, of course it was. But you do not invest \$10 million in a mine for a piece of ore that size. If we had not given the concessions, if we had listened to the Opposition, all these mines would be non-existent at this very moment.

Then another I was interested in *reading* Hansard to see how many times, how many references were made to the Premier's failures in economic development. Frequently we hear someone say especially on some of the radio and T.V. programs - ninety-nine percent of which are I would think, critical of the Government, and much of which of course is organized, managed programs. But generally we hear this statement. Everything the Premier has ever undertaken has ended in failure. This is the funniest thing of all. It is not my business here to stand up and defend the Premier. He is able to do that himself better than I can. But I think perhaps in common fairness, in

April 16, 1970

Tape #517

Page 3

common decency, we ought to point out something which the critics of the Government rarely mention, and that is that the greatest single, industrial enterprise on the face of this earth, originated in the mind of Newfoundland's Premier. And it is not a failure. If anyone thinks that BRINCO and Churchill Falls is a failure, he does not know what he is talking about. He does not know anything about it. And it would not be in the process of development today if he had not engineered the agreement in the first place, and of course pursued it with a singleness of aim that very few others would have been able to emulate. And yet the same agreement, the same BRINCO agreement about which we were charged that we were giving Newfoundland away will turn into the ~~the~~ coffers of Newfoundland for our children and our grandchildren, tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars.

Here only today I think it was, we heard some reference to some of the industrial enterprises sponsored by the Premier which had been failures. The Rubber Plant at Holyrood and so on. Nobody will deny that we, the Government of Newfoundland lost in all millions of dollars on some of these enterprises. It was not all lost incidentally. A good deal of money was paid out in employment at times. And if it had not been paid out that way, good amount of it would have to paid out in dole, in relief. That fact is often overlooked too.

But nevertheless we admit. Nobody can in fact say that a number of these enterprises have failed. But what these critics of the Government somehow seem to overlook. I noticed this last year by the way. I noticed it when Placentia Bay became contaminated, in their righteous indignation, and their proper indignation, that 200 or 300 - the welfare and the livelihood of 200 or 300 fishermen in Placentia Bay was jeopardized. No one seemed to much of a thought for the 400 employees of the ERCO plant, whose livelihood was equally threatened by that misfortune. I wonder why? I wonder why all the concern. And we are all concerned, we have the right to be with the welfare of the 200 or 250 whatever they were, fishermen. Why was it nobody seemed to give any thought at all, certainly I did not hear it expressed to

April- 16, 1970

Tape #517

Page 4

the four hundred men and their families who were working in the ERCO plant, and whose livelihood depended on the continuation of that plant. Here again the member for Humber East, who is not here tonight, he is horrified at the thought that every kilowatt of electricity now being generated, or now capable of being generated in Bay d'Espoir may not be in actual demand at this moment. If the hon. gentleman, I am sorry he is not here, I do not like referring to two hon. gentlemen, but it is an argument anyway. I cannot help it, the fact that he is not here. If he had been with the Premier and me in Rome in 1956, when following months of preliminary discussions and negotiations. And then two weeks of active personal discussions and negotiations with the second largest consortium in all Europe, who are anxious to come over to North America and establish a great chemical enterprise

The name was snia Viscosa, an Italian base with ramifications all over Europe.

The Premier reminds me that R. A. Butler, the then chancellor and a man who a great many people expected would eventually be Prime Minister of England, was actually a director of this company. His wife, if I remember correctly, was one of the largest shareholders in it. At any rate, after all these weeks, and they were ready to come to Newfoundland, they were anxious to come to Newfoundland, they were anxious to come to the south coast, they were fascinated by Bay d'Espoir, they were fascinated by it. They had never seen Bay d'Espoir, but you look at a globe and see the strategic position of Newfoundland and in particular Bay d'Espoir, ice free, with one of the great harbours of the world, and in the very centre of the great Atlantic Basin. The great Basin, comprising I suppose, eighty per cent of the world's wealth, and Bay d'Espoir in the centre of it, and they were fascinated by it.

Then came the crucial question. What about power? And the Premier had to tell them, he said " yes we can give you power in Bay d'Espoir." " Oh? that is fine." They were very pleased about it. " Right away?" " No." " When?" " Three years time." " No deal." The whole thing fell flat on that one thing, and they moved into the southern United States. I think it was South Carolina that established this monstrous enterprise. Chemical enterprise which would have been without any doubt whatever gone into Newfoundland if we had had the power there for them, and could have given it to them within a reasonable time, say a year from that date. But we could not do it, and they were not prepared to wait three years.

So we went ahead, we have gone ahead with help, some help from the Government of Canada, we have gone ahead and developed Bay d'Espoir. This Government developed Bay d'Espoir, nobody else on the face of this earth, this Government took the deliberate decision after weeks and weeks of debate and discussion on it. We decided to develop Bay d'Espoir and we hear, and hear this, The hon. gentleman from Humber got up and almost breaks down in tears, because, he says that there is more electricity being generated there in Bay d'Espoir than we need at this moment. This is not true actually.

MR. MYRDEN: More water flowing over the dam

MR. ROWE: More water flowing over the dam yes, that is right.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a categorical announcement, I am not an engineer, I am not an expert on this thing, without Bay d'Espoir today, April 15th. is it? April 16th. 1970, without Bay d'Espoir half of Newfoundland would be shut down tonight, and the other half would probably be on reduced operation. The other half would be rationed tonight, without that Bay d'Espoir.

There is a thing called peak periods, and what kind of a fool would any Government, and corporation be if they developed, if they took a potential such as Bay d'Espoir with a half million or 600,000 potential there and developed precisely and exactly the exact amount of kilowatt energy that was needed at that particular moment? And then tomorrow, next week, a months, a years time, there is a power shortage. What do you do then? This is a mistake made all over the United States and was made in New York, right at this moment. Within the next twelve months there will be "brown-outs" in New York State. There was one there only the other day. There will be a "brown-out" in the city of New York this summer because of their short-sightedness. We do have Bay d'Espoir developed.

MR. WORNELL: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of information there, we do have Bay d'Espoir Electrical hydro-power developed, but we certainly do not have Bay d'Espoir developed industrially, and that is something that I was wondering if the hon. minister would comment on. Does he foresee any, well, I will not say immediate development, but any immediate, any development say within the near future?

MR. SMALLWOOD: (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, the minister would before answering my hon. friend's question answer a question that I would like to direct to him. Is he aware of the fact that this very day by helicopter two men accompanied by some Newfoundlanders, two men from California, from one of the greatest corporations in the United States, visited Bay d'Espoir by helicopter to examine it and make a decision as to whether they can recommend it to their corporation back in the United States as a place where they should go and establish a very, very large industry. Is the minister aware of that?

That is today, this day.

MR. ROWE: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that that is a rhetorical question. The answer to my hon. friends question is this - that it is unthinkable that in this day and age that a great harbour with any amount of water, ice free, with electric power, and even with road connections, that that will remain undeveloped industrially. This is unthinkable and the hon. the Premier of course has answered the question. We have only had Bay d'Espoir for what, for about two years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It came on fullstream a few days ago

MR. ROWE: Yes. We only had it partially there for two years, and fullstream just a few days ago. I was amused the other day when the hon. member from Humber East was criticizing our Bay d'Espoir development because, it is only a month ago that one of the units at Deer Lake which of course generates the power for Corner Brook, that whole area broke down, and Corner Brook was short by 30,000 horsepower, and would have had to close down the Bowater Mill, the Corner Brook would have had to close down at least in part but for the simple fact, what fact? Bay d'Espoir power, it is as simple as that.

My hon. friend from Humber East, he is a bright young lawyer, there is no doubt about that, and a very personable young man. But he has made some of the wildest allegations and charges here, he did it last year about education. I had to take an hour refuting allegations which he gave as statements of fact. He did the same thing in respect of agriculture in Newfoundland, and my colleague the Minister of Agriculture had to do the same thing. And he did the same thing in respect of health and hospitals on the west coast of Newfoundland, and the Minister of Health had to do the same thing.

MR. WELLS: And justice, and the answers did not convince me at all

MR. ROWE: No of course not. Well I will suggest to him

MR. SMALLWOOD: And justice, he had to be answered by the then Minister of Justice who is now a Tory.

MR. ROWE: Well I will suggest to him, and to anyone else for that matter before making allegations which could seriously impune the integrity, not of this Government, but of the Province of Newfoundland. He should be sure of

his facts on these things.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne refers to the setting up of a Salt Codfish Marketing Board. A move I think which has the unanimous approbation of every one here in Newfoundland. Certainly of this Government because we are I suppose, the originators of it. The need for this was so obvious I am not going to take any time expatiate and elaborate on the merits of the thing, but there is one side issue on which I want to comment.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to speak about the salt fish marketing corporation, I would point out that that was debated earlier in this session, and as the hon. Premier pointed out this afternoon to the Leader of the Opposition, you are not allowed to debate, refer to another debate in this House.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about a side issue. I did not say that I was going to talk about that. As a matter of fact every hon. member who spoke in this Address and Reply has talked about the merits of this Salt Fish Marketing Board. I am not going to do it, but whether my hon. friend's objection has no relevance at this point because, I am not going to talk about it.

MR. CROSBIE: It is quite relevant

MR. ROWE: I am going to talk about a side issue of it. It just happens that it immerged as a result of this discussion on the Salt Fish Marketing Board. And before I make those comments I want to say I have not discussed this with my colleague here. I have fooled him, I did him the courtesy of telling him that I was going to talk about this thing tonight, but I have not discussed it,. I have not asked his opinion whether I should or should not. I do not know what his plans or intentions are as of this moment.

There has been much speculation as to who will be selected to head the Board, and my hon. friend's name has been named as a potential candidate and personally while I would regret, as all of us on this side would, must regret to loose him, I cannot help as a Newfoundlander hope that there is some substance to it. ■.....

But this possibility that he might be given the presidency or what ever the term used is to head that board has raised some vociferous comments on the grounds that the hon. gentleman is a politician and should not, therefore, be appointed to a post of this kind. I think, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we should deal with this piece of stupidity once and for all. What is there about a politician which makes him unfit for any Government appointment.

The hon. gentleman in question has had a distinguished career, a record of dedicated service in Newfoundland, both in private business and in public life as we know. No one questioned his ability or integrity and I stress the word "integrity" no one questioned his integrity, when he was a bank manager. No one ever suggested that he was not a man of integrity in performing his duties to his bank and to the public. No one ever in any way questioned his integrity or ability, when he was a manager of one of the great fish plants in Newfoundland, on the south coast, and when he was assistant deputy minister of Fisheries that I personally know. He was one of our most competent and one of our most dedicated and most able public servants. Now what has happened since. The only thing that I know of is that he gave up the security, perhaps, I am sure to his regret at times, he gave up the security of a quite life in the Civil Service to offer his services to a constituency and to accept the Premier's invitation to serve in the Cabinet of Newfoundland at a very difficult time, I might say in our public history, because anyone who doubts that does not know anything about it. The last two or three years, the term my hon. friend has been here, has been by far the most difficult period in the history of Newfoundland since 1949, and therefore, the most onerous time to serve in a Cabinet. Now he served his district well, nobody disputes that. He has served his Province well, efficiently and without stint. He is held in the highest regard in Federal circles, I can publicly testify to that. He accompanied me on several occasions. I was senior to him and I headed up several delegations and my hon. friend, the member for St. John's West was on one of those same

delegations to Ottawa and he was. We all know that he was held in the highest regard in Ottawa. Now what is his reward for all of this. His reward is that "You are not fit to head up the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board because you have been a politician." I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how in Heaven's name can anybody rationalize that.

MR. CROSBIE: Will the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. FRED ROWE: Sure.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. minister will agree that nobody on this side of the House has raised the slightest objection. In fact it has the approbation of all sides of the House.

MR. FRED ROWE: In fairness I am very glad to say that I have to my recollection to the best of my knowledge, I have not heard a thing, a single thing. I wish I could say the same thing about some of our representatives in the House of Parliament in Ottawa. I wish I could say the same thing about some of the other opponents of this Government who came out and attacked the idea that this man might fill that post. Why? For one very simple reason, because he is a Liberal politician, a friend of the Premier of Newfoundland and a member of this Government. That is the only reason. There cannot be other reasons at all.

Mr. Speaker, I would bet on it that the majority of Supreme Court Justices in every province across Canada and in the Supreme Court of Canada have been in the practice of politics or have been identified with partisan politics. Would anyone in this House or outside tonight impugn, I do not like using names. There is no reason why I should not. Would anyone impugn the integrity of Mr. Justice Mifflin, because he once sat on this side of the House or Mr. Justice Higgins, because he once sat over there or for that matter of the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, because he was once identified with partisan politics outside this House? Is there anyone who would impugn the integrity of these gentlemen or for that matter of Mr. Justice Abbott in the Supreme Court of Canada, because he once served in Mr. St. Laurent's and Mackenzie King's Government? The list is endless in

every province.

If you extend this argument, we have heard the stupid argument, to its logical conclusion, then any man who has ever served as a partisan politician can never again serve his province or his country in any governmental function. What this means, to take an absurd example, a tragic example, if the late John F. Kennedy who would have finished, I think, his second term of office and, therefore, could not run anymore for President at the age of fifty-two and who was a partisan politician, a Liberal politician as it happens, called democratic up there, he would now this year be out of work at the age of fifty-two and could not for example be appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Can anybody imagine anything more stupid, more ridiculous than that.

Mr. Speaker, precisely because this House disagreed with that whole idea that fallacious attitude that we passed here legislation unanimously designed to attract public officials, designed to attract Civil Servants into political life, and protecting not only their pension rights but also their job rights, if for any reason they went out of political life, they were kicked out or they had to resign for any other reason, their rights would be protected. For example, we have, I suppose, altogether in this last twenty years dozens of examples. We still must have a dozen here. The hon. member for St. Mary's who is not here tonight; the hon. member for Trinity North who is not here tonight - two former members of the Cabinet. Both of them had their rights protected under that legislation. Right in this House at this moment, there are hon. gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, himself is one of those who rights are protected and what are those rights. Those rights are that any man who has been a Civil Servant and enters political life may, if for any reason he ceases being a politician, may ask to be reinstated in a job or in a similar job and if the Government is not in the position to accede to that request, then he has - they have no choice but to place him on pension, a pension based on the salary being received, being paid for that post at the moment that he applied for the pension.

That was passed unanimously by this House here and this is why I can say, Mr. Speaker, I would not be here tonight, if that had not been passed. I am sure our Minister of Finance would not have been here. I am quite sure my hon. friend's colleague on the other side, the member for Bonavista North would not be here, if this right had not been protected by that legislation. Yet we have to listen to this twaddle about "political" appointments. Mr. Speaker, since there is no logic to it we can only assume that it is motivated either by ignorance or more likely and we seem to forget this that always still at work at these old-fashioned, old-fashioned ideas of malice and envy and jealousy. They are still at work. I do not know what my hon. friends intentions are. I suspect I know. I can guess there has been enough rumors. He has not told me what he plans to do at this moment.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the hon. minister permit a question before he gets of this subject. Nobody is disagreeing with him at all. But what is the situation where say a Civil Servant enters political life and then for some reasons, either defeat or his own volition decides to retire from politics, when he has not reached pensionable age and cannot find a comparable job, is his pension based on, more solely on years service at that time?

MR. FRED ROWE: Take a specific case, Mr. Speaker. If his Honour, the Speaker, for example who was a former magistrate and who has not reached - I am quite sure has not reached the age of sixty-five, but some years from it yet. If he were for any reason to cease being in political life tonight, tomorrow he would have the right to come to the Government and ask to be reappointed as a magistrate or in some equivalent position, same rank, same status and same salary. The Government could accede to that request. I have no doubt it would. It would do precisely that, but if for any reason it could not do it or did not want to do it, then he can demand and would immediately get his pension based on his years of service that he had in that position and his age at that particular time and the salary now being paid for the post, not the salary paid

MR. ROWE: F.W.: I do not know of any executive assistant for civil servants or not, we have only had one. Perhaps my hon. friend must be an expert on that job. My hon. friend I think he is a bit young to be thinking about a pension any way.

Mr. Speaker every member I think almost without exception who has spoken has referred to the so-called Bonne Bay National Park or West Coast National Park. And in this very debate the hon. member for St. Barbe South devoted a good deal of his speech to the topic of the proposed National Park for the West Coast. Like myself, he has more than a passing interest in this matter. We both lived in Bonne Bay for several years, we are both married into the same family as it happened. Which means that automatically, we are connected with some of the oldest and well-known families on the West Coast. The Payne's and the Crocker's, and the Wilson's and the Butt's and the Taylor's all old westcoast families, we are connected with them by marriage. These are people who pioneered in the development of the West Coast, some of them went there when they had to be literally prepared to fight for their very lives on what was then an uninhabited coast.

Now in this matter of the national park for Bonne Bay, I can make a claim, which again is not a vote. It is a simple matter of fact. I think I was the first member in this House ever to stand up and put forward the merits of Bonne Bay for consideration in this matter. I did it the first month I was in this House. Then I had a second interest because the Minister of Mines and Resources at that time, it was my duty to try to formulate a program of parks for the Province to place before my colleagues, and that program was accepted and subsequently was implemented by my hon. friend the present Minister of Labour. And as a result we have a system of provincial parks which are a model in some regards for all of Canada, which elicit the admiration of visitors from all over the world are our system of Provincial Parks here. So I mention them now, not to boost, but simply to indicate Mr. Speaker how absurd it would be for anyone on that side of the House or anywhere else to insinuate that we are not interested about parks. We have developed the best system of provincial parks in all Canada.

But we have other responsibilities too, it took seven or eight years to develop the Terra Nova National Park. And the main reason for that, as the Premier has pointed out here on other occasions, was that we stood in the way of that development. WE stood in the way of that development, not because we did not appreciate had that park would mean to the Province, I remember very well again, and I will make this personal reference, I was the Minister at that time. I remember the new negotiations I had to carry on with Ottawa on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland. My opposite number in Ottawa was the hon. John Lasage, later became Premier of Quebec. And for several years we negotiated and rowed and argued and fought back and forth. And much of that fighting was with Mr. Pickersgill who after became the member for Bonavista North, used to verse drug vessels, because of our failure to go ahead with that park, and why did we hold it up? I will tell you why we held it up. Because we did not know, we did not know number one what that area held, the surveys had not been made, we did not know how much wood was there, we did not know how much mineral was there, if any? And the park also, the park as originally delineated included the whole Terra Nova River. And we knew that on the Terra Nova River, there was a potential of 100,000 horsepower. And once it would become a National Park, everything would be frozen forever more. No development of the river, no development of any minerals, no development of any forestry products, and we took the attitude that we could not afford that. And we insisted on having investigations made, and the investigations made by the geologists showed that there was no, as far as it was humanly possible to ascertain, there were no minerals in that Terra Nova area, no economic minerals.

And then we got the famous Jenkins, the forestry expert to come here and he spent two years making a forestry survey, and he came up to us and he said, "there is a potential in that park area of 700,000 cords of pulp wood. And we knew what the river had. And we refused to give to freeze all that forever more. And as a result of these delays we eventually got them to leave the river out. The river is not in the park.

MR. ROWE: R.W.: We did not have to worry about minerals, but we did not feel like tying up 700,000 cords of wood, when that could mean the difference perhaps between a small paper mill or not getting a small paper mill. And finally Ottawa agreed and amended their legislation, so that we are permitted if we ever put a third paper mill, we are permitted to extract from that park, the incremental growth which is something in the order of 25,000 or 30,000 cords a year forever.

Now as a result of that the Terra Nova National Park was delayed. And I do not make any apologies for it. I do not think the Premier or anybody in the Government does. We felt we were doing our duties in Newfoundland. We had to take the long term view. We had to take all the factors, just not one. Of course it is nice to have a park.

Mr. Speaker, I do not need to say this, I am a Newfoundlander, who is as interested as anyone in this world in getting a national park over where my wife and their people belong. The most beautiful park, not just of Newfoundland, I have been through every part of Canada, I know how majestic the Rockies are, and I know how beautiful Northern Ontario is, and I say now, that for variety and uniqueness of beauty, Bonne Bay cannot be matched anywhere in Canada. And I do not need to tell my friends in this House how interested I am in the outdoors. I probably spend more time of my spare time in the outdoors perhaps than anyone else here does.

So for anyone to suggest that we are not interested in getting a National Park in Bonne Bay must be crazy. On the other hand, for anyone to come to me, and tell me, a Newfoundlander, whose people laboured to struggle here for over 300 years, that we can afford to tie up forever more 15,000 square miles on the West Coast of Newfoundland, minerals and waterpower, and wood, and oil and whatever else is over there, land and anything else, that we can afford to tie up 15,000 square miles he must be off of his rocker. We cannot do it. Newfoundland is not that big. It is not that rich, or anyone to say, that we can afford not to develop a mine, no matter how small it is when we have so many thousands of our Newfoundlanders as a reminder that every hour in the day over here. And many thousands of our Newfoundlanders looking

for work, that we can afford to disregard the possibility of a mine, I do not care what it is called, silica, gold, copper, lead, manganese, it does not matter, if it provides jobs, and for anyone again, to suggest that we cannot in this day of age develop a mine, without desecrating the whole countryside, again he is off of his rocker, he do not know what he is talking about, he should go down and see what is being done in some of the mines in Newfoundland today.

We did not pollute the waters of Baie Verte, with that great asbestos mine down there. We are not polluting the whole countryside down there, and we would not need to pollute the Eastern Arm of Bonne Bay by developing a silica mine, big or small. And we would not need to pollute Parson's Pond or Western Arm or any other part of that area by developing the oil there. Oil has been developed in other parts of the world without polluting the countryside. And if there is oil over there, and a lot of people think there is, the idea that we can afford, we the poorest Province in Canada, with more unemployed. My hon. friend who comes from Bonne Bay, or at least his wife comes from Bonne Bay, and who chastises so much about this Bonne Bay Park, he knows, as well as I know, that the vast majority of the young men and young women in Bonne Bay area, as they come up they leave and go to Toronto and Boston, and other place. His wife, my wife have more relatives in Boston and Massachusetts, then they have over in Bonne Bay. And why is it? Anyone to suggest that we can afford to disregard the possibility of oil development, or any other development. I think the idea is crazy.

Mr. Speaker, we will get a park, a National Park in the Bonne Bay area, and we will have the whole west coast developed, in accordance with that blueprint that my hon. friend has drawn up. I suggest and I went through it flying down on the plane the other day from Montreal, I suggest that

April 16, 1970

Tape #521

Page 1

MR. ROWE: that this is one of the finest documents ever drawn up in Newfoundland, that blueprint of the development of the West Coast. And nothing I have said here, nothing can be construed indicating that we are not going to have a National Park in Bonne Bay, and that National Park can be a big National Park. It could be three or four hundred square miles, and it does not have to be a square. As a result of the Premier's insistence we managed to get the National Park in Terra Nova elongated so that instead of having ten or twelve miles of the Trans-Canada built by the Government of Canada we got I think it was twenty-seven miles of it. And the National Park in Bonne Bay when it is put there, can be so designed and delineated to take in things like Trout River, a unique community in Newfoundland. And the great Trout River Gulch, there which there is no equal in Eastern Canada. The Table land unsurpassed in any part of Canada. And the Gros Morne and the Eastern Arm of Bonne Bay and the Western Arm and all the other areas. The Park can include that. And we will get a Park over there. And we will have developments there, and the two are not irreconcilable. One does not rule out the other.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about resettlement. I want to refer first of all to a distinguished Canadian writer who in my opinion, is one of the leading fictioneers in Canada, and perhaps in the English-speaking world. He is fairly well-known to some of us in Newfoundland. His name is Mr. Farley Mowatt. I have read his fiction about his dog. I have read his fiction about his experience with wolves, when he lived among the wolves. I have read that fiction. I read his fiction about the Vikings in Newfoundland and North America. I read his fiction about his nautical experiences of his boat here in Newfoundland, and I have enjoyed it all.

But in none of these has he shown so much imagination or has he reached such heights of fictional creativity, as in his writings about his life in the Newfoundland outports. That is where he has excelled himself. I think I should add Mr. Speaker, parenthetically that it is sometimes confusing to read Mr. Mowatt, because he is not always careful to label his

April 16, 1970

Tape #521

Page 2

writings fiction. And there have been I suppose some people who have been naive enough to accept some of these fictions for truth, even his fictions about Newfoundland outport life. Mr. Mowatt has not confined his efforts to his writings about the idyllic life of our Newfoundland people in isolated fishing hamlets. He has gone on to even greater fictional achievement by his account. I have read his account. I had to answer it in a Canadian magazine in part. His account of what an arbitrary, and these are some of the words he used, and savage and despotic government, or governments. One here in Newfoundland, the other in Ottawa, have done to our innocent and independent and stalwart fishermen by mercilessly booting them out of their lovely, their enriching, the placid environments, and planking them down in some urban ghetto. Some semi-urban ghetto, where they are, according to Mr. Mowatt as any alien Jew ever was in Babylon, where these poor angishores cannot carry on their traditional work, where their only choice is to go on dole. I have heard all this only recently. What I am saying now I heard it all repeated by a well-known member of the Tory Party, where the men cannot carry on their traditional work, where they grieve out their hearts in longing for their previous arcadian environment for that state of rustic and rural solicity and simplicity, from which they were so brutally dispossessed, as a result of the brutal schemes of Smallwood and his hencemen here, aided and abetted, of course, by the insensitive, unfeeling bureaucrats up there in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should add at this point, that Mr. Mowatt's efforts in this matter have been ably supported, and I want to pay tribute where tribute is due, by one or two other commentators at the local level. And that several of the political opponents of this Government and of the Government in Ottawa have attempted to seize on this issue greedily, almost ferociously, in the hope that perhaps this might become a great cause celebre, an issue which might even help to over-throw this Government. Mr. Speaker, let me interject here. This government may be over-thrown, I have no doubt in the course of time this government will be over-thrown, whether it is in two years time or in twenty-one years time. I have no doubt. But I will

say now Mr. Speaker, whatever else is responsible for the over-throw of the Government, it will not be this Government's resettlement and centralization program.

MR. HICKMAN: It could be that dinner though that the Government gave Farley Mowatt.

MR. ROWE: Yes, that might go against us I agree with you. Mr. Speaker, why would any Newfoundlanders side with Farley Mowatt's ravings about life in the Newfoundland outports? Why would he do it? Well there could one or two reasons. It could have been a person was born in St. John's and knew nothing about our Newfoundland outport life, especially outport life in the isolated hamlets, coves and islands. He might know nothing. I have heard hon. gentlemen in this House here not recently, get up here and speculate on conditions in our Newfoundland outports. And he was talking about something which was non-existent. Now there is the other type of person. You could have somebody who was born in an outport, like myself, in a relatively prosperous outport, in a medium size outport. For example the place where I was born, the village then of Lewisporte, had 500 or 600 people there, and most of those people were gainfully employed. Most of them worked on the coastal dock, on the branch railway, or they were government officials, or they were contractors with the AND Company and they went up to Bishop's Falls and so on.

There was never in my time growing up in the community of Lewisporte, any able-bodied relief. There were four persons, as I very well know, on sick relief, no able-bodied relief. And if you grew up in that community, and your father was a small-time businessman as mine was, in my growing up, prior to that I hasten to add, that for many years, (I am very proud of this) he had been a fisherman, and he had been a Labrador skipper. But the year that I was born was the year that he gave up going to sea and stayed ashore, and entered a small business there. Well I grew up enjoying that kind of a life. Or if you were the son of some government official, a magistrate, or a custom's officer, or your father was an engineer or a conductor on the Railway. You grew up in a pretty select world in Newfoundland in the year

April 16, 1970

Tape #521

Page 4

1920 or '22 or '24. Select in a lot of ways. For example you enjoyed something Mr. Speaker, that ninety percent of the Newfoundland children never saw from one week to another. You enjoyed the possession of a ten cent piece, or a twenty cent piece at times, and that was something that ninety-percent of the children of Newfoundland did not enjoy. And so if you grew up in that community, you did not know what it was to be cold from lack of clothing. I never knew what it was. None of my compatriots in Lewisporte knew what it was. Your house was not palatial, but at least it was reasonably comfortable. And if your parents, as mine were, and most of them were there, as they were in some other places of Newfoundland, were provident, if they kept a cow as we did, and you grew some vegetables, and your mother either grew or gathered fruit and made preserves and all the rest of it. You enjoyed a pretty good life. And you were in a sense, your father probably or your mother took part in social activities, church activities and so on. You enjoyed luxuries of some kind or another. Maybe a football, or skates. You might even have enjoyed a bicycle. In 1920 I would say that probably one percent of the boys, say the fourteen year old boys of Newfoundland, had a bicycle. One percent of the other ninety-nine percent did not have one. And ninety percent never saw one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What year?

MR. ROWE: 1924? 1934.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not one percent.

MR. ROWE: No I may be wrong on that. I am talking about 1924 - '22 - '25 when I was a small boy. What I am saying of course, applied equally in 1934 - 1935 as well. Mr. Speaker, when you

Mr. Speaker, when you left home, now if you enjoy that kind of life the chances are your father could find enough money to send you to St. John's to take your Grade XI, if you could not get it in that community or even to go away to Mount Alison, especially, if you were living in or you were a merchant's son on the south coast or on the west coast of Newfoundland or go to some other school or college. I remember for example our customs' officer in Newfoundland. I remember him very well. He was an old friend of mine. He was an uncle of Senator Bradley, Mr. W. W. Bradley. He was a very intelligent and very able man. He was a customs' officer. His salary was something like \$55 or \$60 a month and he was a provident man. His wife was a very competent woman. He not only left money, believe it or not but he was able to send his daughter away to get an education first here in St. John's and then on to the United States to a girls' college. That young woman born in a relatively humble home in Lewisporte became the principal of one of the great ladies colleges of the United States.

Now looking back on that life, you had a pretty good time. You had no regrets about that. The memory went on, the years went on. Your memories would become more and more idealized. It was a good life and anyone who criticized it and anyone who opposed it by carrying out such hairbrained schemes as centralization was a fool or a criminal. That person who grew up there he knew how good and rewarding and how idyllic that life in a small Newfoundland outport could be, and of course, Mr. Speaker, if by chance he became a journalist or a reporter, then it was seventh heaven, because then he could practise his trade by doing something which was near and dear to his heart..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Every body with fruit trees in the garden, and a couple of pigs a cow, hens, grew their own vegetables, they lived a life of riley.

MR. FRED ROWE: That is right. So no wonder you feel like assailing and castigating those political nit-wits, the scoundrels responsible for trying

to destroy that lovely Newfoundland way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make some personal comments on this matter, but first of all, I will offer my credentials. I want to offer, Mr. Mowat in his writings in various Canadian periodicals, he has given his credentials. He has told how he lived down in Burgeo and he has written a description of his boat and all the rest of it. My credentials are: that I, in addition to growing up in a middle-sized, relatively prosperous Newfoundland outport, I also spent the early depression years teaching in different parts of Newfoundland: the West coast, Central Newfoundland Bonavista Bay and later on on the South coast of Newfoundland and in the summer of 1935, I had a most unusual experience. I would not have lost it for anything, when I look back on it. I got a job taking up the census, anyhow, I think, I visited some dozen or so communities, every home in those communities, not the prosperous homes relatively, the homes of affluence I knew in Lewisporte, but the homes in the little coves and hamlets and islands around Notre Dame Bay. That was a revelation.

I was for a period a supervisor and inspector of schools and at that time on the East coast of Newfoundland, I visited over 100 communities and I visited many of the homes and I visited every home and saw how every child looked, looked, Mr. Speaker, how every child dressed, and I knew something of the way of life of those children. Then when I became the member for Labrador, I visited personally - Mr. Speaker, I think my time has about run out. I have several other matters. I wonder if the House would be prepared to grant me some time to go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He came well within an hour and a quarter the other night.

MR. SPEAKER: Can the hon. member have at least another fifteen minutes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Agreed.

MR. FRED ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: How much longer?

MR. FRED ROWE: Well I do not know, but I will not be too much longer,

Mr. Speaker. As the member for Labrador, Mr. Speaker, I visited every home

in every community, in every settlement in Labrador from the Quebec border, Lanse au Clair, right up that Strait of Belle Isle coast, right down the vast coast, as far down as the most northerly settlement which is Nain at the present time. I should say that I did not do that - another settlement that existed then, two others, but since has disappeared. So I know something of life on the coast of Labrador as well.

Then when I became the member for White Bay South, and the Baie Verte Peninsula again, I visited most of the homes, not every home, but most of the homes, certainly ninety-five per cent of the homes in that great bay and in that great peninsula as well.

During my other activities in Government, I had visited most parts of Newfoundland. When I was Minister of Highways, I travelled over every inch of roads, every inch of roads that existed in Newfoundland. So, I offer these as my credentials, Mr. Speaker against the credentials of Mr. Farley Mowat.

When people talk to me about the idyllic life in these hamlets and villages, I know how idyllic that life was. I have been out on the Horse Islands in the month of July. My wife and I went out there once or twice. I have been out there many times, but once or twice on a beautiful day in July and August, a beautiful summer day, and I have seen how these people, how well they lived there and I mean this. They had bottled meat, bottled birds and bottled seal meat and they had - I must defend my former constituents from the Horse Islands, they did not have any other bottle commodities there. I took good care not to expose any bottle commodities there either. I remember how idyllic that life was. I had some on the boat yes. You would always wish you could stay there. No noise, no frustrations, away from all the sweat and the grime and everything else. What a lovely life it was?

Mr. Speaker, I also remember the month of February when for six days, we tried to get a helicopter to go to Horse Islands to take off a ten year

old boy who had fallen from a stage and had broken his arm, a compound fracture with the bones exposed through the flesh and for six days that little boy there suffered and agonized while his arm turned gangrenous and we had to risk the life of a pilot and a nurse over twenty miles of the most savage ocean there is anywhere in the North Atlantic to get that little boy out to save him. We did not save his arm, but we saved his life. I remember that to.

I remember down in the little cove, ten miles north of Jackson's Arm . I remember the old man in the middle of the winter who got pneumonia, in this little hamlet, six families there.

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the name of it?

MR. FRED ROWE: My hon friend would like to know the name of it. It was Little Coney Arm which no longer exists. He must know where it is. Yes I know I called it a cove. I figured it to be. By the way I know as much about coves as he does. Actually it is a cove in an arm. It is a little cove in an arm. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I remember the old man, seventy years of age. who got pneumonia. They had a radio telephone there. They were in touch with the outside world. I remember for three weeks Dr. Thomas from St. Anthony tried and tried to get in there in a single engine plane and finally did get in there with a nurse and risked his life. He told me himself that he risked their lives to get in there and land on a nearby pond and got the old gentleman out and got him down to St. Anthony and he died two days later, and I happened^{to} know as anybody knows that we not only risked the life of one of Newfoundland's and Canada's most valuable doctors to do that, but anybody who knows anything about penicillin knows that that poor old man could have been prevented his suffering and the risks that were incurred there by the doctor and the nurse, which could have been prevented, by one shot of penicillin, if he had been somewhere where there was a nursing station or a hospital or a doctor, but you cannot have a nursing station in Little Coney Arm. You could not have a doctor station there and you could not even put

a road down there, as I told them, ten miles of the worst terrain in Newfoundland, for six families, you could not do it. I encouraged these six families to leave and to go other places, but they did move up to Jackson's Arm, they had a chance.

Now let me tell this House something else, Mr. Speaker. From that

from that little community. Let me say this, during my term in White Bay eleven little communities in coves and islands, ranging from five or six families up to as many as twenty families. They moved, the communities disappeared, disappeared with my blessing, I did not boot any one out, I did not take them by the neck and drag them out, as you would a cat, They moved, they moved with my blessing, and they got some help to move. They did not go to St. John's, they did not even go to Corner Brook, they moved to places like Hampden and Jackson's Arm and so on. At least where they had the chance, they had road connections, at least where they had a chance for medical services. But let me tell this House something else, in those eleven communities, most of which were one hundred years old not one child, not one child, except one, had ever gone to grade nine. And in that same little Arm that I talked about just now there was not one child who ever reached as far as grade seven, which is another way of saying that for generations those youngsters came up illiterate. Sentenced by accident of birth, sentenced to illiteracy, sentenced to the dole when they could not catch a few codfish, or jig a few codfish. That is that idyllic life.

I have repeated it here before I do not think the significance has ever sunk in Mr. Speaker, that a child born in a one, in a community where you had a one-room school in Newfoundland, and I know all about the exception, the child born in the community with a one-room school had one chance out of 700 of ever getting a grade eleven matriculation. It is not something from my imagination, These are the statistics from the Department of Education. Then there are people who would oppose our encouraging those people to move out of there, out of these little places, and some of them will say, yes, but what about their livelihood? I heard somebody say this, on the other side the other day, the implication, I think it was the leader of the Opposition, I am sure it was, who referred to our taking people out of places where they could earn their livelihood and put them down in some place where all they could do was go on the dole. Now that Mr. Speaker is the greatest myth that is extant in Newfoundland tonight. It is a myth, a complete myth. That is the myth, that the people living in these communities such as the

ten that I have just referred to, the eleven that I have just referred to in White Bay South. That those people as long as they ~~were~~^{were} there were able to earn a half decent livelihood, but once they were taken out you condemn them to a ghetto, to an economic ghetto, in some other community where they have to go on dole and grieve their hearts out. That is a myth of the first order. Here are the facts:

The great proportion of able-bodied relief of dole in Newfoundland has always been in the smaller communities in Newfoundland, not in the bigger ones. I mentioned just now, Lewisporte, five hundred people when I was there. Tonight Lewisporte had 3300 people. I will tell you now that proportionately there is less relief in Lewisporte tonight just as there is less relief in Glovertown and less relief in Springdale, and less relief in Clarenville, and less relief in Baie Verte, than there are in the ten and twenty families, hamlets of Newfoundland tonight. And by the way, where did all that population in Lewisporte come from, almost overnight, and Clarenville, and Springdale, and Baie Verte, and Glovertown, and Gambo and so on. These are the people who came from those very little hamlets and islands I am talking about. Where at least, and even suppose they could not find anything to do, Mr. Speaker, at least they were near the medical and social services. At least they could get a shot of penicillin if they got pneumonia. At least their youngsters could get their arms set if they broke their arms, and at least the youngsters could go to school. From that same Coney Arm that I mentioned just now where not one child had ever received grade seven up to 1949, a youngster graduated from this University last year.

The traditional pattern Mr. Speaker, in these little communities was to fish for a few months in the summer, if there was any fish around, and then go on dole that was the pattern. Fish for three or four weeks or a couple of months and go on dole that was the pattern, I repeat, and the other concomitant was ignorance and illiteracy. Ignorance, not the ignorance of bad manners but the ignorance of not knowing.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things in Lewisporte, in, there are a lot

of things that this Government has done, things of commission and omission. But the one that I am prepared at any time to face the people of Newfoundland on, to face the people of my district on, and defend, and take a chance going down on is this policy of centralization. It had, naturally you could pick holes in it, naturally things have happened that are undesirable. Naturally in the early days when people moved in en masse, forty, fifty families moved into one place where there was no water and sewerage and so on, naturally problems developed. But these problems were not insoluble. They are nothing to the problems Mr. Speaker, of having thousands of boys and girls grow up in permanent eternal ignorance and illiteracy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about Tourism in Newfoundland. I do this very deliberately because I never cease to be amazed at some of the arguments, some of the accusations that are hurled against us. Only the other day the hon. member for Humber East, again, I wish you were here, he said, he referred to the Government Economic Programme and then he said - and I am paraphrasing - instead of squandering money on reckless and ill-thought out and grandiose enterprises we should be doing something in Newfoundland to develop a natural enterprise like the Tourist Industry. Mr. Speaker, I did not know whether to laugh or cry when I heard that. The implication of course is that we have done nothing, or virtually nothing to develop the tourist industry in Newfoundland. That is the implication. I heard another hon. gentleman make the same charge on a radio or television programme.

In 1949 I was giving a series of talks on the radio, and I devoted one to the tourist industry. And I made some enquiries into it and I found out and I got the figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and they showed that Newfoundland that year, previous year, had derived \$2½ million from the tourist industry. Now Nova Scotia in that same year had derived \$25 million from it, \$25 million for Newfoundland, \$25 million for Nova Scotia. I remember saying in that radio address that we should try to build up a tourist industry in Newfoundland and if we went at it long enough and hard enough we could

perhaps build up a tourist industry worth \$20 million in Newfoundland. Well, we applied ourselves. In 1964 -I mention this year for a special reason - in 1964 D.B.S estimated that our - not estimate it was not an estimate actually - it was almost figures that are indisputable. That our income from tourism was \$27 million. I remember \$2.5 million in 1949, \$27 million in 1964, we had helped to build that up in a lot of ways by advertising all over the world, by making films and publicizing them and by financing tourist enterprises in Newfoundland itself, the government did and so on and so on.

And of course the Premier reminds me, by spending millions, four hundred million dollars on road or road system, because without roads you could not have any substantial number of tourists anyway, just as without hotels and other establishments you could not have tourists they would not come. Well not, that was 1964 Mr. Speaker, That year we decided; and I remember the time it was decided in the Chateau Laurier in Ottawa. The Premier and I were talking it over and we decided that we would declare 1966 Come Home Year, partly for sentimental reasons, partly because we expected to have the trans-Canada Highway completed and partly and mostly because we wanted to build up the tourist industry. We thought it would be a great build up for the industry. We spent a lot of money and effort on that Come Home Year undertaking I remember it very well. I was ~~MEMBER~~ chairman of the general committee. My hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition I am sorry he is not here, to hear me say this, he served on one of our committees and worked very hard on it. But our time

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Our money were well invested. Incidentally, and this is not generally known, I think it is the first time it has ever been stated in public. On one of the committees, the chairman, the accomodation committee was the late respected Darroch MacGillivray, he was the chiarmna, and he asked to meet with us with the Premier and some of us at lunch, at least he asked to meet with us and we had lunch together here in the dining room downstairs. Mr. MacGillivray recommend two things. He was a hard headed man, a very cautious and conservative man in certain respects, and he recommended two things. He recommended that we would take, make efforts to increase hotel accomodations by encouraging expansion of existing hotels number one, and by encouraging some international chian of hotels to move into Newfoundland. Now we had tried, the Government had tried to get a hotel chain in Newfoundland before that, but we had not been successful. We tried again, we did the two things that Mr. MacGillivray had suggested.

We encouraged hotel owners in certain strategic places particularly and tourist operators to expand their enterprises, Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and elsewhere, and we invited Holiday Inns to move into Newfoundland. I have to go on record tonight

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): We tried Sheraton, we tried all the great hotels chains

MR. ROWE: That is right, as I said a moment ago, we had failed up to then to get any great chain to come into Newfoundland. We tried Hilton, Sheraton we tried any number of them. This time we got Holiday Inns to come in here. Holiday incidentally was, and still is the largest single chain of hotels in the world. Greater than the Hilton, greater than the Sheraton. At that time they had 1,000 hotels and now I suppose they must have 1,100 or 1,200. To do that required the use of public money and public credit. Newfoundland money and Newfoundland credit, but I want to go on record tonight that I make no apologies for being a party to that.

Surley Mr. Speaker, the House knows that almost every country in the world has done precisely that. It has hypothecated public credit, public money in order to get hotel chains to come in. Surely this House knows that the great Hilton, the great chain under the name of Hilton are not all owned

by the Hilton interests.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very few

MR. ROWE: Very few if any are completely owned by them, the Hilton Hotels in Turkey which have been instrumental by the way in attracting tens of thousands of visitors to Turkey who would never think of going there if they were not assured and reassured that there was a recognized hotel system there that they could utilize.

I want to say now, and this is in no way derogatory of the hotels of Newfoundland, they are good hotels, I have some of them in my own district but no local hotel can have the same advertising appeal as the great hotel chain like Hilton or Holiday Inn.

Now Mr. Speaker, I said that in 1964 when we decided on Come Home Year, the income was then \$27, million. In 1966, that is two years afterwards it had gone up, the income from tourism had gone up to \$46 million, and in the year just ended the official figures are, I obtained them the other day, in the year just ended our income in Newfoundland from the tourist industry was \$62 million which probably makes it the single biggest in Newfoundland tonight.

I have examined the figures for other Provinces over that twenty year period - When I say a single industry I am thinking of Corner Brook as being a single industry, and Grand Falls as being a single one, and individual mines and so on. There is probably no single enterprise in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador tonight that has turned in to the coffers, that has turned in to the pockets of the people of Newfoundland this past year \$62 million. We started twenty years ago with \$2.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have checked with other Provinces, British Columbia in that twenty year period tourist industry has increased approximately six times. Ours has gone up twenty-five times. Now I want to make a special reference here, and that is to the development of the Tuna Fishing Industry, sport fishing industry in Newfoundland and I want to pay a tribute to the man who is almost entirely responsible, and that is the former director of tourism Mr. Vardy, who suffered more catcalls, and more abuse, and more ridicule at the hands of the Government's political opponents, that is why he suffered it.

that is why he had to suffer it, I would not have done it, I would have told them what to do with the tuna industry, and walked out. I would not have told them here in the House because the words would not have been Parliamentary.

MR. MURPHY: I wonder if he would elaborate a little bit

MR. ROWE: Not on that but, I can elaborate in this way over and over, anonymous letters to the papers, jibes and catcalls, and Mr. Speaker, there was no tuna fishery for years in Newfoundland when Nova Scotia had one attracting hundreds of thousands and probably millions of dollars. We had none, today we have it, a great tuna fishery in Conception Bay and Notre Dame Bay even bigger, and I predict now that in ten years time every large bay in Newfoundland will have a sports tuna fishery, and this is what is attracting the people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about some of our economic problems. I think the greatest single economic problem that we have in Newfoundland is one that we do not hear very much about. We do not hear it stressed very much and I am going to raise it tonight. I do not think it has ever been raised to any degree here in this House. I want to say this without presumption, that I feel that what I am going to say now might very well be the most important for what it is worth, the most important comments I have ever made right here. Our economy is still on a narrow basis. It is still a weak economy. The Province as a whole has a weak economy. At one time it was much weaker with almost entirely fishing. Now it has expanded but it is still weak, it is still the weakest of the nine major Provinces of Canada. We have more communities in Newfoundland relatively, depending on one industry than any other Province in Canada. Just think of the number of towns in Newfoundland, major towns that are depending one one industry.

Think of Corner Brook virtually one industry. Think of Grand Falls, think of Windsor, if for any reason Grand Falls mill had to close down permanently, the third and fourth largest towns in Newfoundland would disappear over night. Be dissipated over night. Think of Buchans, one mine, think of Labrador City, one mine. The City of Wabush, one mine. St. Lawrence down there, one mine. Baie Verte, Virtually one mine. I mean depending virtually on

one mine, and you can go on, Grand Bank, Fortune and so on all round. We have the majority of the larger communities in Newfoundland one industry communities.

Now you have Goose Airport, and Happy Valley depending entirely, or virtually entirely on a military base, just as we had most of Argentia depending on the military base, and most of Stephenville too. We had Bell Island. Bell Island received a death blow, to all practical purposes a death blow when the mine closed down..

MR. NEARY: We were the third largest community

MR. ROWE: That is right, Bell Island, I can remember very well, I went over there as Minister of Mines and the population was 12,000 people. 12,000 people most of them prosperous.

My own district Mr. Speaker, is certainly apart from Labrador West is the most highly industrialized district in Newfoundland. Every community in it with the possible exception of Badger is a one industry community. Buchans, Grand Falls, Windsor, and even the adjoining communities. Bishops Falls in the other district, Bishops Falls and Botwood are dependent on that one mill. The Premier and I had this problem brought home to us very vividly only a few weeks ago when as a result of a trade dispute between Canada and Mexico the Mexican Government decided that it would cancel its order of paper that it was getting from Canada. From what part of Canada? From Grand Falls mill. Twenty per cent of the production of Grand Falls mill this year is being sold to Mexico and this would have meant with the cancellation of that order the Grand Falls mill would have had to close down for two months.

Two months, people were almost panicky and I went out there and met with the entire Trade unions, the joint trade unions out there, the Premier was in touch with the very highest circles in Ottawa on the matter, and well you know the result. It is indicative of the precarious situation which we find ourselves in here. Then there was Grand Falls a few weeks ago, tomorrow it will be some other town or community and Mr. Speaker I want to say this categorically, I think it is morally wrong for our people, for large numbers of our people to have to live in such a state of jeopardy and uncertainty for most their lives. I do not.....

MR. ROWE: R.W.: I do not think that the people of Happy Valley should live in the state of uncertainty, that they live in. And I do not think the people of Buchans should have to do it, that mine when it was established was suppose to go on for ten years, it is there for forty years. Life is still only ten years, and I have no doubt that it will be going on long after I am gone from this scene. But nevertheless, the people there are always living in a state of uncertainty, and this applies to other places outside of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest to you, this is a problem too great for any community itself to tackle, too great for any province, certainly a Province like Newfoundland to tackle. It is a problem that has to be tackled and for which responsibility must be assumed by all the parties concerned. What do I mean by all the parties? By the community itself. By the industry itself, the mining industry, the mining company, the paper company or and by the Provincial Government and by the National Government. And in the case of military bases, there is a responsibility on the Government of what ever nation is involved, in our case under the United States Government.

I tell you that the live, the very livelihood tonight of 10,000 people in Happy Valley and Goose Airport should not depend on the caprice or the whim of some official in the Pentagon in Washington. And this is what it depends on. I have no doubt at all that some senior officer in the military services of the United States Government could recommend tomorrow to the Secretary of Defense to be closed down and in one month be closed. And no community of people should be forced to live under those circumstances. Now what is the solution? I do not know, but I know that something should be done, and here is just one suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada would initiate a plan, probably put it under in the first instance, come into a department of Government like DREE, a plan which would make a study of all the one industry towns across Canada, which would analyze, compute their future. It ought to be able to do that.

MR. ROWE: F.W.: It should not be whip of man to determine the potential life of most communities. And assuming that that life was planned, as it is with all mines, the life of any mine has to be planned. Assuming that that is so,

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would mind, I have been puzzling my brain since he made that conjecture that more than any other province of Canada we have more towns, or more towns than any other province of Canada, that are one long town, or one horse towns, in the American phase, that is to say towns depending on one industry, we have more of them than any other Canadian province. I have been trying to rack my brain to test that, and it does not seem to measure up to me somehow. I know how many we have, but is that more than other provinces, the wheat, the farming villages and towns of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the little mining town, are they not one industry towns?

MR. ROWE: F.W.: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not have a catalogue of them all, I am familiar with a good number of the areas. I made the point that all provinces of Canada have the same problem. I think that relatively we have a great problem there, but the average town in Ontario say, Southern Ontario, it may be in the tobacco belt, or it may be in the fruit belt, but that average town of 4,000 or 5,000, the Brantons, and the Branfords, and so on, I do not know what their population is now, when I lived there, some of them would range from 8,000 to 10,000. They usually add a number of little secondary industries, mainly manufacturing articles for Eatons, to sell in Toronto. They usually have a fruit industry. Agriculturally, they were not confined merely to corn, or to tobacco, or to the dairying industry. They are usually headed by versified industries. And of course agriculture is capable of being diversified, agriculture could be hardly called a one industry, when you can diversify it to the point of having cattle or poultry or tobacco or what have you. That is the point I want to make. I do know Mr. Speaker, it is a problem as serious, only it is incidentally, a recent issue of one of the most influential periodicals in the United States not too well-known, I regret to say right here in Newfoundland, that is the New York Times Magazine which is issued every Saturday or Sunday, and it is one

the fines periodicals, I think it was three weeks ago, they had a feature article on this very problem, on this very problem in the United States of what happened not only the problem, but what happened to the town, but the problem of what happens to the human beings? What happened, happened in Grand Falls two years ago, when that new paper machine was put in, four other machines had to move out, and a relatively large number of men, I do not know how many, it was estimated to be 200, thanks to the humane activities of the country, the effects were mitigated, but nevertheless a number of men in their forties and fifties found themselves suddenly on early retirement, on early pension. Tell of a man fifty working in the paper machine all his life, suddenly he finds himself without a job in Grand Falls, and he has got a family, he has got four teenagers in school, what is he going to do at that age? Where is he going to get fresh training, how is he going to train himself in a new skill? How wants to take on a man of fifty-two years of age? I experienced this in Grand Falls in a limited way. He has experienced it in hundreds of ways on Bell Island, and this is a very serious problem. No man should find himself not wanted by society. No man should be put in a position, undeservingly put in the position where at the age of forty-nine or fifty-two, or forty-five or fifty-five where in effect society says to him, we do not need your services any more. That is morally wrong, it is morally indefensible. And this is an increasing problem in our society. And it cannot be tackled I repeat at the local level, at the provincial level, it is a problem that will require the combined efforts and a long range planning of all the parties concerned. And it would have to be initiated I suggest, Mr. Speaker, by the Federal Government or whatever is the strongest of the entities making up the group involved.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak longer on that, but it would not be right for me to do that. I want to say a word here now about the new politics, what they call the new politics. There are somethings that do not

MR. ROWE: F.W.: but there are other things that do change. In recent years, we see the last two or three years a new concept has developed and one of them is that if you are a member of the Government you are a fair target for abuse of any kine, from any quarter, but it is not called abuse it is called criticism or is called fair comment. But if the Government member retaliates at all, then it of course becomes a assassination of character or vilification, personal vilification or abuse.

Let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker, let me give you an illustration, my hon. friend, I realize he feels very strongly on this, he had his change to speak, and no doubt he will be speaking again in the debate, and will not hear him in this debate, but in other debates, and we will hear a few of his expressions. Let me illustrate what I mean. I might say, no time have I ever discussed this with the Premier or with anyone else for that matter. Mr. Frank Moores for example, could get up as he has done, and I hear him do, and castigate the Premier of Newfoundland by every possible name to think of, a petty dictator, he could get up and accused the Premier as a dishonest man, I have heard him do that. I heard Mr. Moores myself and he spoke in Central Newfoundland, I am the source, accused the Premier as being a dishonest man, it was on the radio and it was public, the Premier is a dishonest man. Now all right, Mr. Moores is entitled to his opinion, no matter how serious it might be. When the Premier

MR. ROWE:

When the Premier last year pointed out the perfectly obvious fact and true fact that Mr. Moores and other members of his family acquired substantial sums of money as a result of their fishing operations in Newfoundland this became, in some strange way, a vicious attack on Mr. Moores and his family.

MR. CROSBIE: Which is what it was during a Political Campaign.

MR. ROWE: A vicious attack. Mr. Moore, Mr. Moore, Mr. Moores who called someone else, his Political opponent, a dictator or a dishonest man or all kinds of names. For once the Premier or for that matter anyone else here points out what is an obvious fact it becomes a vicious personal attack. One of the things I was hoping, I did not intend to say this but I have always had ambitions of getting out of public life before or by the time I was sixty years of age.

A statement that I heard Mr. Moores make last night, perhaps more than anything else, induced me to change my mind on that. Anyway I am not going into that right now. Here is another aspect of the new politics we have been accused over here of being puppets of the Premier, of being political cowards, of being a bunch of yes men, walking about in abject fear of the Premier's wrath, I am not making this up, these have been accusations heralded at us on this side of the House, both Ministers and Members, of being a crowd of sycophants toadying to the Premier's whims, or grovelling at his feet every now and again. All of these things have been imputed to us. Well of course this is not abuse, this is not defamation of character, this is fair political comment. When I pointed out last year, that two hon. gentlemen, of who is here tonight, while still professing to be Liberals, had deserted the Government three weeks before an Election, before a Federal General Election, and pointed out that this certainly helped to contribute to the defeat of some of the Liberal Party candidates, I am referring to the Federal Election, I am referring to the member for St. John's West, and I said this before, and I am referring to the member for Humber East, and when I pointed out that fact, that their defection three weeks before,

MR. ROWE: F.W.: A Federal General Election injured the party to which they protest to be loyal. This became in some strange way a personal attack on these two gentlemen and their charger. I am a puppet, I am a sycophant,

MR. CROSBIE: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. ROWE: I am walking at the feet of the Premier.

YES.

MR. CROSBIE: Does not the hon. minister realize what was the damage in that election, was a scandalous attack made on one of the hon. members when he resigned from the Cabinet? Not your resignation from the Cabinet. Surely the hon. minister would not expect them to stay in the Cabinet, if they could not agree with Government policies?

MR. ROWE: It becomes perfectly all right for two hon. gentlemen who left our party two of them are here tonight, to join the Tory Party. It is perfectly all right for them to accuse us over here of being yes men, and being cowards, and a lot of other unsavory things. But this in some way or other, some mysterious way, I do not understand, when they do that, they are not imputing any, they are not defaming our character. If we were to do it, if I were to hint at anything like that, I would be immediately be guilty of character assassination. Under this new policy

MR. EARLE: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? It is not defaming a character on one side, but in another case by a minister who leave the Cabinet, is then accused of not telling the truth. And has to defend himself, is that not fair play also, is he not permitted the truth?

MR. ROWE: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to now,

MR. EARLE: He knows very well.

MR. ROWE: I do not know, if my hon. friend wants me to make a statement on another matter, I am able to make it any time at all. However I did not intend to do it tonight. Under this new political philosophy a man who happens to be more loyal to his party, or more loyal to his Leader, deserves nothing but contempt and castigation, and who in the interest of ambition, or may be for other reasons, deserts his Party or stabs his Leader in the back, he becomes a political hero. This is part of the new philosophy Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we have consented to the hon. minister to continue with his speech. Now if he is going to continue with the political langrel kind of thing, he is going on with now. How can he expect us to continue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman is allowed to speak, let him speak. Let him say what he wants to say.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will speak in this House, and everybody knows over here, whether the House is open or not, the Government must go now. The Government must go on, the Department of Health must be operated, the department of Education and all the rest of them, has to go on. Which places of course a man is burden on, a number of the members over here, because they are torned between the two obligations. One to be here in their seat, and the other to look after their departments and the public interest. And in this occasions absents. And this year as everybody knows we have been plagued also by illness. Last week we had four hon. gentleman, one of whom is back here tonight, either in hospital or seriously ill at home on this side of the House. And there are several others again tonight.

I ask this question, Mr. Speaker

MR. CROSBIE: For seven days adjournment.

MR. ROWE: Is it commonly accepted principle that the Government has a duty to maintain a quorum? Surely that duty is not restricted for the Government. Surely it is the duty of any hon. members to maintain a quorum in a House. I can well understand, their disagreeing I was not in the House that day, on that Wednesday afternoon. I can well understand their following day, there perhaps taken it out by 5:30 P.M. in the afternoon, possibly discovering we lacked a quorum, and then moving out en masse, and they did that, I was here I saw it. I can well understand that, that was a natural reaction perhaps, 5:30 in the afternoon, an half an hour does not matter very much. And I thought that would be the end of it, I must confess Mr. Speaker, I was surprised two days ago, I was surprised to find 4:30 in the afternoon, an hon. gentleman came into that doorway their, and he discovered we were below a quorum here, and immediately the word was passed around, and immediately everyone but one over there moved out, and tried again to catch the Government, tried again to create at 4:30.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister permit a question?

Does the hon. minister know that the hon. member for St. John's West was not in the Chamber, and had left a long time before that was drawn to the attention of the House, and that he was in the Press Gallery at the time and knew nothing about it? So his statement is not critically correct.

MR. ROWE: No, I am not saying that all the hon. gentlemen were involved in this, they were not. One hon. gentleman was in Ottawa, or was out of the Province at the time. But other hon. gentlemen were I saw them,

MR. EARLE: Would the hon. gentleman permit an explanation? In a form of a question. Does he not realize that the other day when several members of this side of the House left their chairs, they did go into and discuss the sort of rabble that was going on?

MR. ROWE: Not at that particular time, that is not true, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, by the way that is not a question. Mr. Speaker, the time it happened first, the hon. member for Burgeo was speaking, he is one of the most dedicated and faithful and quietest members of this House, and he deserves better treatment. The second time it happened, the hon. member for Bonavista South again, I am sorry he is not here tonight, he was making a fine speech, as it was mentioned today, and he has been a faithful member of this House, no more faithful man, in this House tonight or any night. He has been a faithful representative of his district, and he deserves better treatment.

MR. EARLE: When we left the neither of these were speaking.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

MR. EARLE: It was a different occasion altogether.

MR. ROWE: I was here, oh! another time, oh! I can well understand that. I am talking about the two occasions, within this past week, within the past seven or eight days, when hon. members over there have deliberately precipitated the lack of a quorum on this side and therefore brought an end to public business, whether the public business is good or bad. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you now, if yesterday or any Wednesday afternoon on private members day, if we deliberately created a lack of a quorum by walking out, every radio, every T.V. that night would be monopolized by hon. members on the other side

Mr. Rowe:-F.W.: castigating the Government here for derelicting its duty, and for irresponsibility.

MR. EARLE: He walked out for twenty-seven days.

MR. CROSBIE: Twenty-seven days of adjournment.

MR. ROWE: I want to say just a word or two about under this new political concept the party organization as becoming an evil thing, by definition a corrupt thing, this is the thinking, this is the indoctrination that goes on. I suppose ninety percent of the students at the University, at our Universtiy believe that any party machine is by definition corrupt and ficious.

MR. CROSBIE: No not all of them.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I belong to what is perhaps, I represent perhaps the most highly organized district in Newfoundland. Every community in my district has political organization, it is not merely Liberal Political Organization, most of them have other organizations too, there is one being formed there tonight, I believe, of the third party.

I want to say now that that machine is a political machine in Grand Falls district. I had a hand in forming it there, and there is nothing corrupt about it. And the people out there who are taking part in it, Mr. Speaker, are not bribed or bull-dozed, and that is true of my hon. friend's machine in Gander. Such as it is. And I want to say too, that I see nothing wrong, my hon. friend the member for St. John's West this past year built up, I want to pay a tribute to him, I am not saying this in a derogatory sense, he built up in my views a most efficient, the biggest and most efficient political machine ever created in Newfoundland. Obviously any political machine, big or small, cost money. And the bigger it is the more money it costs.

April 16, 1970

Tape #527

Page 1

MR. ROWE: there is nothing wrong with that. I saw my hon. friend's machine in action in fifty different places, as he very well knows, he must still have it in action, I am sure it is. There is nothing wrong about that thing. I do not think we are doing justice to our political system, when we allow these ideas to be perpetuated and to be disseminated. I would not pretend that all politics is lily-white, and I am not trying to defend the wrong-doing that goes on in politics. It goes on in law. There are crooked lawyers. There are crooked doctors, there are doctors who have operated unnecessarily on people in order to get the money. There are lawyers who have gypped poor and ignorant people. And there are businessmen who are crooks, and there are politicians who are crooked. In my own estimate, for what it is worth there is as much corruption and dishonesty in politics as there is in any other occupation or avocation or profession. No more and no less, and I want to say Mr. Speaker, even though we make these charges and allegations of corruption, sometimes we do it "tongue in cheek" perhaps, expecting not to be taken too seriously. When we do that, we are doing a disservice to our society. Our society is based on a party system. There it is. The Premier said here the other day and someone pointed out, Churchill I think, pointed out, that our system of government is very impertinent. It is probably a bad system. The only thing about that is that the other systems are worse, or at least we think they are worse.

The system of Government that we have with all its imperfections is in my view Mr. Speaker, and in view of most of the people in our society, it is a better form of Government than any that has yet devised by the mind of man.

Now I want to finish up Mr. Speaker. Since we had the last Session here, we in the Liberal Party have had a policy and a leadership convention, and I announced my candidacy for the leadership there based upon the assumption that the Premier would not be running. I made it clear at that time that if the Premier changed his mind, I would withdraw from the contest. I did so. I have no regrets for having taken that step. It would have given me no

April 16, 1970

Tape #527

Page 2

pleasure to run against, apart from any other consideration, to run against a man with whom I have worked intimately for over twenty years, starting with the Confederation campaign. A man who befriended me personally on more than one occasion. And as there was a second consideration, and I made it clear to my supporters at that time, that if I were to compete with the Premier, common sense, common sense and the world recognized principle of Cabinet solidarity would make it imperative for me to withdraw from the Cabinet. I did not think of that last November. I put that on paper. I wrote to my supporters when I was carrying on the campaign. And if I had withdrawn from the Cabinet, that in turn would have been a repudiation of the understanding that I had given to the people of the Grand Falls district, many of whom supported me on the argument, based on the argument that after eight years without Cabinet representation the district, one of the largest, one of the two largest in Newfoundland, probably the wealthiest in Newfoundland, and certainly one of the most important, deserve Cabinet representation. That would have been a repudiation.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who goes in public life it seems to me, ought to be prepared to take on responsibilities including leadership responsibilities when called on. He must be equally prepared to offer his services in the interest of his party. However, I have never stayed awake night time chewing my fingernails on this matter, and I have no intention of doing so. I have not always agreed with the Premier's views. I have frequently disagreed with him, and he has disagreed with me and with mine. And I have made this disagreement known to him in the proper place and in the proper manner. I am quite aware that the Premier is not infallible. And I have said that I am equally convinced that no one else in this Province could have done in the last twenty years, often against irrational and pathological opposition, no one could have done what he has done to bring Newfoundland out of the eighteenth century. Not the nineteenth century, the eighteenth century. I realize that some of the Opposition has been justified, and some of it, even when not justified, has been sincere. And I know equally well that some of the vicious attacks that have been made on him, and I am not referring at this time to any one individual or any one group, that some of these attacks

April 16, 1970

Tape #527

Page 3

have been motivated by personal ambition, and by an uncontrollable lust for power, and as I said earlier tonight, in some cases by simple and old fashioned malice, envy and jealousy.

I have been a part of this Government in Newfoundland since 1947, when I came out and announced without being solicited. I announced my support for the Confederation cause and for its leader, and no one is more aware of the blunders, the mistakes of commission and omission that have been made since then. If we had our time back again, certainly if I had my time back again, and I know it is shared by others, a lot of things we did would not have been done. Some of the things that were not done, would have been done, or would have been done differently. But I am not ashamed of the record Mr. Speaker. I am not, I stand here tonight, after twenty Sessions in this House, and I am able to say with a clear conscience, I am not ashamed of the record. Not my record, but the record of this Government and this Party in those twenty years. I know here that tonight whatever it is, the 16th day of April, there are more Newfoundlanders working today, than in any previous time in our history.

Our Newfoundland people are earning more today than any previous time in our history. Our standards of living are higher today than any previous time. More of our children are getting a good education in school, and in college and in our University than at any previous time. I know that our people today are enjoying better medical services, better social services, and better health than in any previous time. In short Mr. Speaker, I know that our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has continued to grow without interruption since April of 1949, and that growth and that progress will continue. And if I did not think so Mr. Speaker, if I did not think so, I would leave Newfoundland tomorrow, and go somewhere I am quite confident I could make a living more easily. If I did not believe that Newfoundland is growing and will continue to grow. If I had not believed it twenty years ago, I would not have come back here, when I had severed my connections with Newfoundland, and if I did not believe that tonight, I would urge my sons and their families to get out of Newfoundland and to stay out. And that

is not the note I am going to end on. I want rather to reaffirm my confidence in Newfoundland. My confidence that Newfoundland with all its disadvantages and God knows, there are many of them, and with all our weaknesses, and we have many of them, and with the setbacks that we are going to encounter, I believe that we will continue, that Newfoundland will continue to become a better place for our people, and I believe that our people in turn will be able to play an ever more important role in the growth and in the development of our great Canadian nation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Motion is that the Address prepared by the Committee appointed be adopted. Those in favour please say "aye" contrary "nay". The Motion is carried.

Committee of the Whole:

On motion, that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish, 1970." Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. HODDER CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

Clauses 1, 2, 3, 4 Carried.

MR. H. COLLINS: Clause 5. I wonder if we could have some reassurance from the Minister that it will be representation of the fishermen of this particular Board, I am thinking about directors?

MR. MALONEY: Yes, the Federal Act Mr. Chairman advised the Advisory Committee there will be fishermen representation.

MR. HICKMAN: Clause 6. I asked the hon. minister for an explanation of Clause 6. Is it possible in the view of the hon. minister under Clause 6, for Corporations or persons other than the Salt Fish Corporation to purchase salt fish?

MR. MALONEY: Only from the Corporation. The Corporation as I understand the legislation. The Corporation is the sole buyer and the sole seller. So another Corporation may buy but only through the Salt CodFish Corporation.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, does this particular clause mean that Super-markets for instance in various towns across the Province may have arrangements made with the fishermen in adjacent or near communities will not be permitted

April 16, 1970

Tape #527

Page 5

to buy fresh fish from the producer? Because I can envisage here that the consumer might end up paying more for fish products which is now the case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Consumers all over the world will pay more so that our fishermen can get more.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, that is not the argument.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may answer the hon. gentleman. Referring to Section(18) which we will come to eventually, you will notice that the Governor-in-Council has power to make regulations exempting certain classes. And the purpose of this legislation Mr. Chairman as we establish the second reading, is to control the export. We are not concerned at this stage with Roger Bidgood buying salt fish for sale. That is not the primary purpose of it at all. There is power in Section(18)that the Government can exempt any transaction, person or class of transaction from the application of the Act.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, under section(6)of this Bill, the Corporation can be given the power to control all the fish curing and the selling of fish intra-provincially, which would mean that it would be able to control, you mentioned Roger Bidgood, buying the fish and selling it within the Province. Or it should be exempt. And under Sub-section(2) without limitation of generalities Sub-section(1)and so on: all cured fish produced by fishermen or a producer that are of a standard quality to be specified in an agreement etc., and that are offered by the fisherman or the producer for sale by the Corporation for disposal in intraprovincial trade shall be bought by the Corporation. You mean the Corporation must buy?

MR. MALONEY: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: It must buy this fish if it is offered?

MR. MALONEY: If it is of the quality, and at the price.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The state of monopoly of the purchase of all salt dried codfish in Newfoundland and other Canadian fishermen is a complete state of monopoly of buying it from the producers, and the marketing of it in the market, intraprovincial and interprovincial and foreign. Inter, Intra, and

foreign. Inter - Intra - and foreign. The big state monopoly.

MR. HICKMAN: All this can be is intra and foreign is under this sole and excluded jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: These clauses are exactly comparable with the addition of intra instead of inter with the relevant sections in the legislation passed by the Canadian Parliament.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is complimentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes they are comparable. Yes this is what it is. We can only deal with intraprovincial, but we must deal with that or the Federal Act is ineffective and has loop-holes in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two Acts. The Federal Act and our Act together give the Board a complete monopoly of the purchase of all salt cod from all fishermen, and the marketing of it inter, intraprovincial and foreign.

MR. ROBERTS: And of course Mr. Chairman, Nova Scotia, their Province are passing exactly similar legislation.

MR. CROSBIE: Is this legislation approved by the Federal -

MR. ROBERTS: It has been checked by our draftsmen Mr. Chairman with the Federal draftsmen, and by the Federal Minister and Provincial Minister of Fisheries. Yes, it has been checked in every respect Mr. Chairman.

MR. EARLE: Clause (8) It seems to me that it is a very necessary precaution for this particular section. I think it applies in other Powers and Inspections Acts having to do with other products. And that is the compensation for the article which is taken to be inspected. I know that in the case of canned goods and so on, the Federal authorities pay for samples which they take, or at least pay for the repacking and so on. Now in the case of salt fish, it might not be a very valuable item and the size taken for inspection, the sample taken for inspection, but at the same time

April 16th., 1970 Tape no 528 PAGE 1

but at the same time future packs may well be of significant value and there should be reimbursement for any damage done or any packages taken in the course of inspection that should be in there.

MR. MALONEY: This is right. This whole section, Mr. Chairman, having to do with inspectors as the hon. member said, of course, is taken from the Old Fish Inspection Act and has been the one that has been on the books for years and years. It does not provide compensation, because the old Acts have never provided for it, not in the same way as the actual mechanics.

MR. HICKMAN: Again Mr. Minister, if the hon. member will permit me, I do not see really a very strong case here for compensation, because if fish, cured fish is taken out for examination, what really can happen to it? If canned products are taken out and opened up, then, of course, they are lost, but if fish are withdrawn for examination, then they either go back as an inferior quality or something of that nature..

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, further to that, then I will yield to the hon. member. The inspector has only ninety days at maximum in which he must either return the fish or subject it to the further proceedings provided for by the legislation. The most the inspector could hold the fish would be ninety days, Sir.

MR. EARLE: I am thinking of specialized packs. The precaution should be taken now, at this time. It is done in most other industries. There is also involved the expense of unpacking and repacking and so on. There is quite a lot of involvement.

MR. ROBERTS: They will have a look at it and if it calls for compensation they will give it.

MR. HICKMAN: This, Mr. Minister seems to be the reverse approach from what is taken in, in the Food and Drug Act and as the minister is aware some packers of certain species of fish from time to time have difficulty with food and drugs. If there is a seizure made by an inspector that the inspector in due course, if he wishes that product or pack to be disposed

of must apply to a county or a district court in this Province for an order to dispose of it and the onus is on the Crown rather than on the producer. This is the reverse situation; apparently, the Government of Canada does not follow it. In fact there^{have} been litigations as the minister is aware in this Province and generally speaking the towns had a difficult time in these cases. But this is, I think, you will admit a new departure.

MR. MALONEY: The hon. member, of course, is referring to the frozen fish..

MR. HICKMAN: The canned fish.

MR. MALONEY: The canned fish.[?]

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. MALONEY: Canned fish, as well, of course.

MR. ROBERTS: Salt fish is different than either frozen or canned fish.

MR. HICKMAN: What I am getting at^{is} that the inspectors under the Food and Drug Act will go in, if they wish, and they will take a whole pack and say we have examined five cans, we condemn the works..

MR. MALONEY: They will pretty well destroy the product right there and then.

MR. HICKMAN: But you cannot do it without getting right into court and proving their case. The onus is on the Crown. Here you simply have to be convicted of a violation and the whole thing is forfeited.

MR. EARLE: To make it perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman, if we get into specialized packs such as the Premier mentioned and specialized salt fish, I have seen in packing industries, where an inspector will come in and take as many as twenty-five and fifty samples, because there may be fifty batches compared and the fifty samples just disappeared, but under the Federal Act, he is compelled to pay for these. This I think should be taken care of in this legislation.

MR. MALONEY: Yes this is certainly a valid point, Mr. Chairman, and the Act permits regulations...

MR. HICKMAN: Does the minister feel that this is one of the things which

will be considered.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, we are on Section (8) are we not?

MR. ROBERTS: No, no Section (9).

MR. CROSBIE: No, Section (8), we have not left Section (8).

AN HON. MEMBER: Section (8).

MR. ROBERTS: Section (8) still, okay.

MR. CROSBIE: Under Section (8), an inspector is given certain powers - the regulations do not come into it. Section (8) empowers an inspector under (b) to open any container found therein or examine anything found therein that he reasonably believes contains any cured fish and so on. So he can open containers and go of and leave them and he does not have to replace a container or restore the container or repack the container. All that has to be done at the expense of the person whose containers are being banged open. This is an arbitrary power that has been given an inspector under the Act. That is the point, and I do not see how you can cure that by regulations. He says in the Act that he can do it.

MR. MALONEY: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that these are extracted from the Fish Inspection Act which has been in force for about fifty years and there is very little complaint on this point, but the hon. member's point is a good one. Fishing casks and casks could always been open by an inspector and left open at the order of an inspector. The hon. member for Fortune Bay will be very familiar with that. Inspectors could come in and order casks open at any time and it was the obligation of the shipper to open the casks, if the inspector had reasonable grounds to suppose that the product in the cask was cured. This has not been an issue from my certain knowledge or from my experience, but I cannot argue with your point, your point is a good one.

MR. FARLE: In the old days in the packing of fish in casks, I have seen abuse of this privilege by inspectors; whereby they would come into

a store and open ten casks and take every confounded fish out of them and leave them in a heap on the floor, and then that stuff would all have to be put back in the casks, the head of the casks had been ruined, the hoops had been ruined and in some cases it meant new packages and in this instance, I think the precaution should be taken. It is done in all other instances. I cannot see why it is not written in this Act.

MR. HICKMAN: Will the minister admit, you know, that Fish Inspection Regulations may have been adequate for the former method of curing and packing fish: where the emphasis from here on in obviously is not going to be on packing the large casks of fish to Brazilian markets but rather package fish in cellophane designed hopefully for sale in supermarkets and that type of industry. It is completely a different quintal of fish.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I think the points are well taken, if we could let the clause stand and perhaps one or both of my learned friends opposite in consultation with the law clerk would draft an amendment; although the effect of which would be any unreasonable search or seizure would be subject to action. I do not know what the legal words would be, Mr. Chairman, but this was done by the draftsman. It was not done by anybody in the Government, anymore than it was done, when my hon. friend was Minister of Justice. If there is a flaw, we will gladly correct it. Sure. I think it is a wise precaution to take.

MR. WORNELL: The word "reasonable" here. It is objectionable to me. Reasonable to whom? To the inspector or to the businessman? Why would be put during normal business hours?

MR. ROBERTS: It is a standard legal phrase, and it has been in 50 million Acts since the year 1 and Mr. Chairman the hon. member has a perfect right to suggest but I do submit that it really - I agree completely with the hon. gentleman's feelings, unless he is prepared to move and amendment, which of course, is in order. I have not heard..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have an amendment before the Committee and that is that Clause (8) stand aside. Those in favour please say "aye." Contrary "nay." Clause (8) will be stood aside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (9) carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause (9) applies to where an inspector if he has reasonable grounds might seize cured fish and so on, and detain it. He shall not detain it after the provision of the Act has been complied with or after ninety days unless proceedings are instituted. What I am wondering here, Mr. Chairman, is that: what about if the fish, while it is under seizure is destroyed or damaged or deteriorates? What is to happen then? Particularly if the person whose product is being seized happens to be innocent, you know, is he compensated? What happens, if he suffers any damage through all of this?

MR. MALONEY: He would be liable in the normal way that anyone would be liable for the....

MR. ROBERTS: An action for damage would lie.

MR. CROSBIE: NO, no not unless the Act provides for it.

MR. ROBERTS : Why not? The Act does not prohibit it.

MR. HICKMAN: The Act gives the right of seizure.

MR. ROBERTS Right of seizure but not.....

MR. HICKMAN: And the right of disposition in the event of a conviction.

MR. ROBERTS: It does not give any power to destroy. Brove it, Mr Chairman, really to do that would be to prove that it deteriorates because of the seizure and that would be an impossible thing, if there was negligence on the part of the corporation or any of the corporations' agents then surely they would be libel in law.

MR. HICKMAN: What was the question, what was the other question?

There is a seizure, subsequent acquittal which indicates the procedure should not have been made, and there is a loss of sale and profit as a result thereof. Surely there should be an action in damages, and that would not arise just because it is not prohibited, that kind of an action, you may very well have an action arising out of negligence during the time that this was in custody, but here is where it has been properly held in custody but was in property seized. No negligence

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the situation surely is analogist, if a policeman arrests me on reasonable grounds, and I am later found innocent by a court, or not guilty by a court I have no right for suit for false against that officer. Surely it is analogist Sir.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not think it is, no I do not think it is no, no, no,

MR. ROBERTS: A lot louder

MR. HICKMAN: I do not think it is analogist Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman if I may say so, because, there under the criminal law obviously you cannot place a police officer

MR. ROBERTS: It is the civil law

MR. HICKMAN: I know that, that is why I say it is not analogist.

MR. ROBERTS: I say civil law is involved in false arrest, it is civil action

MR. HICKMAN: No, I know but it is arising out of an apprehension or an apprehending rather than that took place under the criminal law

MR. ROBERTS: Or a citizens arrest for that matter, perfectly valid

MR. CROSBIE: But all the cured fish is really the property of the market board anyway

MR. ROBERTS: Of course

MR. CHARIMAN: Does clause 10, carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Would you not go so fast Mr. Chairman, we would like to scan the section.

Clause 12:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, now there has been an agreement entered into with the Government of Canada for the whole thing to function. Where are you now

with respect to the agreement? Are the terms of an agreement agreed upon? Are you ready to enter into an agreement when the Act is proclaimed or what stage are you at?

MR. MALONEY: I believe the officials of the Government of Canada will be coming to the Province next week to meet with the Government of Newfoundland on the agreement, and then going to Nova Scotia and Quebec.

Clause 15:

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, just a question. What kind of boards, committees or councils does the Government have in mind. What are these supposed to be.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, my colleague who gave the instructions says the clause was put in by the draftsman to make sure the power was there. I would suggest that the only committee we have in mind at this stage would be an advisory committee, but the Ottawa Legislation provides for the advisory committee in which everybody is represented. It is a general power.

Clause 16:

MR. HICKMAN: What sort of payments are envisaged there?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, again that is a general power, I am told it is needed if ever payments were made. The payments of course would have to be authorized in the annual appropriation Bills. We have no payments in mind I hasten to add.

MR. HICKMAN: This is what I had thought

MR. ROBERTS: No we have none in mind, Ottawa has to pay the shot.

MR. HICKMAN: Well do not give them a chance to get out, you know what they did on the health branch

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes

Clause 17: Mr. Chairman, clause 17, acquisition of property. In connection with the issue or question I raised the other day on second reading as to what is to happen if certain facilities, or plant facilities or other facilities in connection with the salt fish trade, if it turns out in six months time or a years time that these premises are no longer needed by the marketing board. and they do not want to use or rent those facilities. Are the people in question who own those facilities to be compensated, and if so who is to

compensate them is it the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland? It has been suggested to me that in that situation the Government of Newfoundland is the party that has to compensate them, that is to be done for the loss of use of their salt fish plants or salt fish facilities. Would the minister elaborate on that point.

MR. MALONEY: The Hon. member has raised as he knows a hypothetical question.

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is not hypothetical

MR. MALONEY: In dealing with it earlier I remarked that a survey that had been made recently by the Federal Department of Fisheries indicated that the facilities in Newfoundland for curing, drying, processing fish were adequate to meet the present estimated productions. So the question that the hon. member has raised is indeed hypothetical.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, any question that we can raise about any Bill before the Bill goes into operation is hypothetical, because the situation has not actually arisen until the Bill goes into effect. There are certain people engaged in the salt fish business in the Province who have plants and facilities who are extremely worried first, whether their plants and facilities are going to be used by the Salt Fish Marketing Board, and if they are not going to be used, are they going to be compensated for them, number two; it is not hypothetical then, and number three; who is going to compensate them? Is it going to be the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland. Now this is not hypothetical. It is only hypothetical in the sense that this legislation is not yet in effect. Surely there must have been discussions between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland on this point because certainly there are premises in Newfoundland used in the salt cod fish business that are inadequate or unsanitary, that the board is not going to want to use, or inefficient, that the board is going to want to cease using after is gets going for a year or two, and there must be some policy. This must have been discussed with the Government of Canada. It is just not that hypothetical, and it is not hypothetical to the people who are in the salt cod business now and who have plants and premises that they hope that this board is going to rent

or use. I mean it must have been discussed by our Government with the Government of Canada.

Who is to pay for this property, or is it to be paid for at all?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer it in detail. The hon. member is right when he says that every question is hypothetical in a sense. There just has been no decision. Certainly there has been no decision on the part of my colleagues and myself that we are going to pay anything because the present view we have is that there will be no property surplus on day one, after this Bill, if it becomes law comes into effect, there will be no property surplus on day one, that was not surplus the day before this Bill become law.

I certainly cannot speak for the Government of Canada, they made made any announcement on it?

MR. MALONEY: No

MR. ROBERTS: They have to our knowledge made no announcement on it, nor authorized us to say anything Sir. I cannot answer it.

MR. MALONEY: I would like to say this, I will agree that the hon. member has raised a valid point. One thing I know the Government of Canada has not yet determined, and I suspect that it will be some time before they can determine it, and that is what exactly is meant by redundancy. Fish plants in Newfoundland all five plants have been becoming redundant as some hon. members will know since 1920, when the salt fish industry started to decline. One this year, two next year. When we came into Confederation I think we had as many as ninety salt fish producing plants in Newfoundland, and they have been going down and closing out for one reason or another. One of the large ones in Newfoundland is in the district of my hon. friend from Burin. The Buffetts the big salt fish producers.

They in their wisdom decided that they would devote their efforts to other kinds of business, and so today they have a premises on their hands.

MR. ROBERTS: Their premises do not become redundant just because of this Bill they are redundant now.

MR. MALONEY: There are other premises around Newfoundland, there are hundreds of them. In Nova Scotia, in Quebec, where people have given up. They have

either devoted their efforts to some other more profitable kind of business

My hon. friend from the district of Fortune,

MR. ROBERTS: His family were in the salt fish business for many years

MR. MALONEY: They have had a redundant premises for well after the closing time tonight and well into tomorrow I would say

MR. HICKMAN: It is a lovely old house and boat though

MR. MALONEY: And I would suggest to the hon. member for St. John's West that I would like to sit in on the discussion where redundancy could be determined and defined

MR. CROSBIE: You have a list now of all active premises and salt fish business

MR. MALONEY: Every premises licensed in Newfoundland 1969 which was the last effective year. We know the plant, we know the capacity for storage, for cool storage, we know the drying capacity and pretty well everything about it. That was done in a recent survey. It tailors in I might say to the approximate production at the moment which is 500,000 quintals of fish.

There may in a year or so be a rearrangement necessary, and some of these people may for their own good reason decide that this business is no longer worth the time and effort we will devote our business to something else. I do not know how you could draw up a criterior for redundancy on which you could make any agreement. The only thing I could say is, that if a man finds himself, a man who owns a premises and finds himself aggrieved under this legislation or any other Government legislation then he has the normal recourse whatever that is. If a supermarket opens up on the Kenmount Road and by so doing knocks out the corner grocery that has been there for years what happens? What recourse does he have? He may have some recourse in some court of law, I do not know. But I suggest that it is not unlike the situation that exists here. It is a very difficult thing in my opinion Mr. Chairman to

MR. CROSBIE: It is going to be controversial is it not?

MR. MALONEY: It is gling to be controversial, it is going to be one of the

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! It now being 11:00 p.m., I shall have to rise the committee, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, committee rises, reports progress and asks leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow at