



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 29

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

## VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Met At 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by Mr. George Hobbs, chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission that the sixth generating unit has just gone into operation at Bay D'Espoir, completing the Bay D'Espoir Hydro-electric Development for the time being. That development now has total generating capacity of 600,000 horse-power which gives it an adequate and entirely satisfactory reserve to take care of peak periods. An additional 100,000 horse-power is avail through Bay D'Espoir by development of the upper salmon river if the need should arise in future.

Bay D'Espoir has more than doubled the total generating capability on the island of Newfoundland. This capacity was only 400,000 horse-power before the first stage of Bay D'Espoir was completed in 1967, 400,000 horse-power. Now it is 1 million horse power, an increase of 150 per cent. The development at Bay D'Espoir has cost approximately \$170 million dollars including the construction of over 1,100 miles of transmission lines which provided a trans island grid, integrating all existing transmission and distribution facilities on the island. Part of the financing of th \$170 million, part of this came form a \$24 million grant from the Atlantic Development Board of Canada, and by the end of 1969, as a result of this investment by the Government of Canada, the Government of Canada had already received back \$20 million through taxes and other factors.

Part of that A.D.B. grant, namely \$4 million of it, was used for frequency standardization work in the Province. That is conversion from fifty cycles to sixty cycles. As a result the whole island now is on sixty cycle power with the exception of certain portions of the two paper mills, North Star Cement in Corner Brook, and the industry and town of Buchans with these sole exceptions.

The first construction on the Bay D'Espoir project such as, access roads, and other preliminary work began in 1964 and got into full swing the following year. Over the years since, the development provided a total of 2,000 jobs and paid out an estimated \$40 million in wages. Many of those who were engaged in building Bay D'Espoir moved on to Churchill Falls. Bay D'Espoir was thus the training ground that qualified them for similar work

on the great Labrador Hydro-electric project.

The statistics on jobs and wages for the construction phase of Bay D'Espoir are entirely apart from the figures for permanent staff of the Power Commission and staff of others engaged in power generation and distribution on this island. It is estimated that these, that is the Power Commission and others are providing employment permanent steady employment for 1,800 persons today with a combined wage bill of \$10 million a year which is approximately the equivalent of the paper mill employment in Corner Brook.

Bay D'Espoir supplied forty per cent of the islands requirements of electricity in 1969, forty per cent. The proportion is expected to go to fifty per cent next year and in view of this the sixth unit is absolutely essential in periods of peak load. Mr. Hobbs informs me that the total of 6,000 horse-power from Bay D'Espoir will ensure adequate service for all customers of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission until early in 1971, then the first unit of the 400,000 horse-power thermal generating station at Holyrood will be in service. This first unit at Holyrood providing 200,000 horse-power is to be in operation by next December of this year. A second unit of the same capacity will be ready by April 1st. 1971.

I am sure Mr. Speaker, that all hon. members will take enormous pleasure from this news that I bring the House today.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

HON. G.I. HILL (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition on behalf of the people in the southern part of southern Labrador. The prayer of the petition is that the present ferry service be extended during the winter months by means of a plane service. This House will recall Mr. Speaker, that some six years ago when this ferry service was first inaugurated I did suggest at the time that maybe it would be carried on during the other months of the year by helicopter service. Now this may not be feasible, but since that time I have been working with the idea that a plane service would take place in this part of my district.

Now Sir, this petition is signed by 660 people involving the communities of L'Anse-au-Clair, Forteau, L'Anse-au-Loop, English Point, Buckle Point, L'Anse-Amour, Cape Charles, Pinware, West St. Modiste and Red Bay covering a distance of some sixty miles. In view of the reports that we have

been hearing the past day or so, I do believe that we do have a good chance of this petition coming to fruition. I support the petition Sir, whole heartedly and ask that it be received by this House and referred to the department to which it relates.

On motion petition received:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it is with very great personal pleasure indeed that I support the prayer of this petition, and in doing so I would say first of all that all hon. members of this House or nearly all are well aware of the fact that it was the agitation of the hon. gentleman who just sat down that caused the Government to put the ferry service there in the first place, the one that is there, by boat. The hon. gentleman received the plaudits of this House when the service was announced by the Government as a tribute to his efforts to get it put into effect.

At that same time that the hon. gentleman agitated for that particular service he agitated also, for an air-borne service between the northern part of Newfoundland and the southern part of Labrador. I believe that he in bringing this petition from 600 of his constituents to us here today in this House, I believe that he is doing no more than merely anticipating, or these 600 constituents of his are doing no more than anticipating something that is about to happen. Because it is the program of Her Majesty's Government in this Province to have that service brought in. It is true that we want the Government of our nation to pay for it, but it is this Government that wants it brought in and we have been agitated into that by the hon. minister who represents that part of our great Province.

With a heart and a half I support the prayer of this petition.

MR. BURGESS: I would also like to support the prayer of that petition for a good, for possibly the past year in any speech that I have had in this House I have emphasized the fact that the need of the people on the south and the north coast of Labrador are great indeed, and the provision of an air service for this section of the Province would be greatly welcomed by the populace, by the people who live there, and nowhere was it more evident, the need for this service than a short while ago when a conference was held in Goose Bay called "Labrador in the Seventies." Upon my return to my own district, ten days after this conference had concluded I met some people in Goose Bay who had come in from the coast and who were still in Goose Bay

because of the fact that they had been unable to get back to their homes on the south coast. This was ten or thirteen days later.

MR. HILL: I think that was weather conditions was it not?

MR. BURGESS: Weather conditions and the fact that the facilities were not there. It was on account of weather conditions, but there is no question in my mind that the prayer of this petition, that no where in this Province is it more needed than on the south and south coast of Labrador, and I support the prayer of the petition because it is so vitally necessary, and because these people are living in a sort of political limbo, where they are mid-north, they are not far enough north to benefit from the programs that apply to northern areas of this vast country of Canada, and they are not far enough south to avail of the benefits that come from living in the south. They are in a limbo, a political limbo, and this would be a small measure to alleviate some of their difficulties.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the prayer of the petitioners. The hon. member who just presented the petition and I worked closely on the original ferry. He did I must say most of the work, but I was fortunate enough to make the first trip on her, and at that time I think it was at Blanc Sablon we landed, the original trip. The first request that we received was for the continuation of this service by air during the winter time. It is only right Sir, that those people who are completely isolated in the winter time should be given this service as quickly as possible. I might also say Mr. Speaker, that the ferry service between St. Barbe and Blanc Sablon and Forteau have proved one hundred per cent successful. I add my support.

April 8, 1970

Tepe #383

Page 1

MR. WINSOR: I have at first to disagree with the hon. member for Labrador West. His statement of the fact that people could not get to Labrador South after the Labrador convention is not correct. The Labrador Affairs made a plane available to the clergymen and other people of Labrador South. But the weather was down and it was down for more than ten days. Now Sir, if this hon. gentleman in his wisdom can do anything to correct the weather in Labrador South or any part of it, then I will say he will perform the task in which he is trying to do. Not only separate Labrador from Newfoundland, but he will control the elements as well.

MR. BURGESS: Point of order. I do not think that this allegation is called for. This is completely uncalled for and I would ask the Speaker to request the hon. gentleman to retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the hon. gentleman's point of order?

MR. BURGESS: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I would respectfully ask the Speaker to make the hon. gentleman retract that statement that I am trying to separate Labrador from Newfoundland. It is uncalled for.

MR. SPEAKER: This is a difference of opinion between two individuals again. I do not think it was an allegation that the hon. member was trying to make. The hon. Minister for Labrador Affairs can explain that I think, to the satisfaction of both the members of the House.

MR. WINSOR: Yes Mr. Speaker, he is certainly going about trying to separate politically, let us put it that way. Now Sir, I have the greatest of pleasure in supporting this petition, because here we have a small stretch of water, not more than eleven or twelve miles separating the coast of southern Labrador, from that of the Island of Newfoundland. And from November until the next June, those people are literally disconnected from the Province of Newfoundland.

This should not be in this day and age Sir. I would strongly recommend to the hon. Minister without Portfolio who presented the petition, that in addition to advocating this air service. He should also advocate the extension of the ferry service, and for a more modern ferry, to operate that service. I am convinced that the ferry could operate if properly constructed later in the Fall and early in the Spring. This Sir, if we are to combine that part of our Province with Newfoundland, then it is through transportation.



MR. SMALLWOOD: Our government cannot do it.

MR. CROSBIE: It is the government's policy to ask Ottawa to do it Mr. Speaker, not the Government's policy to do it. But with that exception I certainly support this prayer of the petition, and hope that this service will become a fact.

MR. A. J. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise and support this petition, perhaps there is a double-barrel meaning in it - if it came out that everybody supported it but the Leader of the Opposition, the first thing they would say, we were agin 'em. But as far as transportation in Labrador South - I mean if we can get the mail up to Port Hope Simpson from St. John's in fourteen or fifteen days, I think it will be something of a miracle. The correspondence I have in the area has taken some eighteen or twenty days to get a letter from Port Hope Simpson. You write one in the meanwhile and then you get one back another two weeks after, and say "look you did not answer my letter two weeks ago, and there is five letters on the way now, and I have not had a satisfactory answer to either one of them. So in these days of rapid communication when we can put a man on the moon in a couple of days, and we cannot get a letter to Port Hope Simpson in eighteen days, I think it is time for something down there. I do not know if we can give the hon. member some wings to get back and forth for us, but definitely transportation is badly needed, and I am sure that Mr. Peddle and all his efforts will get the support of the hon. member sitting in the House and the rest of the members for Labrador to further the great work he is trying to do for this great district of Labrador South, West and North.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. Those in favour "aye" contrary "nay", carried.

Notice of Motion:

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Organization Operation Functions Powers Duties Rights And Privileges Of The Constabulary Force In Newfoundland."

HON. AIDEN MALONEY (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that

and it has to be done. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in supporting the petition.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this petition. It had not been my good luck until last through the district of Labrador South. And if any area in this Province that I have travelled in that is the most backward so far as public services are concerned of any. It is not necessarily because of any government policy, but because of geographical location.

But Mr. Speaker, I have never come across conditions as I witnessed them in that district that reminded me so much of the feudal ages. I had not realized before there was anywhere in the Island where men did not know until the end of the season what their fishery supplies were going to cost them. And did not know until the end of the season what price they were going to get for their fish. I thought that was something that was gone out forty or fifty years ago, but it still remains true in the district that the hon. Minister without Portfolio represents. It should end with the new salt fish corporation. I do not think it is true all over the Island, that the fishermen do not know what they are paying for fishery supplies.

So Mr. Speaker, this is a district that because of its geographical location needs a great deal of attention. I have never flown over another district that was so scenic either Mr. Speaker. And if the means of transportation back and forth to Labrador South could be improved, I do not think there is any question but there will be a great increase in tourist business of people travelling there from Newfoundland. And certainly in the wintertime they need this air transportation that the hon. member's petition recommends.

But Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier when speaking to this Motion, said that it was government policy to provide this air service, then went on to say that it is the government's policy to provide it with some other government's money. How can a government have a policy that it is going to carry out certain matters when all the money is to come from some other government? That is not government policy. It was stated that the hon. Minister without Portfolio has agitated for this air service to be started. But I do not doubt that he has, but he should also agitate with our government that our government provide the money itself to provide the service, if necessary. If it is government policy, then our government must be prepared to find the money for it, if Ottawa will not.



I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to answer Question No. (109) on the Order Paper of February 27, in the name of the hon. member for Burin. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to circulate the correspondence in question in connection with the Resolution adopted by this House on April 24, 1968, two years ago, relative to the recognition of rights of the Pentecostal Church, and requesting an amendment to the British North America Act. I attached a copy of the Resolution, a copy of the letter from you Your Honour, as Speaker of our House to the Governor of Newfoundland dated October 11, 1968. The reply of the Governor, October 23, through his secretary, Captain Shea. No excuse me, the letter of the Governor <sup>through</sup> Captain Shea to the Secretary of the Governor General of Canada, dated October 23. A letter to Captain Shea, secretary to the Lieutenant Governor from the Under-Secretary of State for the Government of Canada, dated November 5. A letter from the Superintendent of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, Pastor Bursey to me on the date of November 29, 1969. My reply on the date of November 24, 1969 to Pastor Bursey. A letter to the Speaker from the Deputy Minister, Mr. Channing in my office, January 6, 1970. A letter of the Speaker, Your Honour to Mr. Channing on the date of January 12, 1970. A letter of Mr. Channing to Your Honour, January 29. A letter of Mr. Andrew Chatwood, Executive Assistant to Mr. Jamieson in Ottawa dated March 4, a letter again of Mr. Chatwood to the Executive Assistant to the Hon. Mitchell Sharp, Canada's Minister of External Affairs dated March 4. And a letter of Mr. Chatwood to the Department of Justice in Ottawa on the date of March 4. And a letter of Mr. Chatwood to Mr. Channing on the date of March 24. Full correspondence Mr. Speaker is hereby tabled showing exactly what has happened.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, does he propose answering part (2) of 109 namely; Please table the reply if any, that is of the correspondence received from the Government of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what I have just tabled. I just tabled all correspondence that we have, there is no correspondence that we have,

MR. HICKMAN: Is there any from the Government of Canada?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no correspondence, " NO " correspondence whatsoever in our possession from anyone that is not now tabled. I have tabled all correspondence from the Government of Canada or anyone else.

MR. HICKMAN: That means there is none.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is, there are several letters from the Government of Canada there.

MR. HICKMAN: Letters from Andrew Chatwood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Andrew Chatwood is a part of the Government of Canada, and so is the Executive Assistant of the Minister for External Affairs, so is the Executive Assistant of the Minister of Justice; so is the Executive Assistant of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. These are all parts of the Government of Canada, they are not ministers, but they are part of Canada's Government, and these letters have been send by directions of the ministers. And the letter from the Executive Assistant to the Governor General is send by direction of His Excellency the Governor General of Canada. So they are from the Government of Canada.

#### FURTHER ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No: 244 on the Order Paper of April 6th. in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West asking for the name of the members of the staff of the Department of Economic Development. I table herewith. Their names and their salaries.

Question No. 254 on the Order Paper of April 6th. in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West, giving the names of people who are on my staff, as Premier of the Province, with their titles and their salaries.

HON. WILLIAM J. KEOUGH: (MINISTER OF LABOUR): I beg leave to table the answer to question No. 150 on the Order Paper of March 5th- in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, during the period which the House has been recessed, there appeared in the press, stories attributing questions to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. And may I say how pleased we are to see him back, and of course how sorry we were that due to the fact that he was not with

us, due to a personal cause. The hon. gentleman has not tabled the question Mr. Speaker, but if the House wishes the information is in order, I have the information on that matter which he did raise publicly, at least up until today's Order Paper, Sir, he has not raised it by means of a question. But, if it is in order Your Honour, I could give it very briefly.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it would be better left, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would put the question on the Order Paper and have it done in the ordinary way.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Labour could advise us of that last question, he was referring to Question No. 150 on the Order Paper of March 5th, Question No. 150 is not on that Order Paper, and Question No. 150 is another question directed to the Minister of Finance, so I am not quite sure what the minister just tabled.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the question should have directed to the Minister of Labour, and I answered it in place of the Minister of Finance.

MR. WELLS: The question was in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Board, on the Order Paper of March 4th.

MR. KEOUGH: March 4th. is it?

MR. WELLS: Yes.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker have I your permission to draw your attention to an error in the Order Paper of today, on question No. 304, which is directed to the Minister of Provincial Affairs, that is obviously the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention also to Question 275 on the Order Paper of yesterday. The one there is asking about certain ships, 365,000 ton carries it should be, and it is printed two 650,000 ton carriers. And even the Newfoundland Government has not originated 650,000 ton carriers yet.

#### FURTHER ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before we get into Order of the Day, I have a question which I meant to direct to the Minister of Supply and Services, in his absence, I would direct it to the hon. the Premier. Arising from a statement made by the Minister of Supply and Services last week, I believe, outside this House anyway, outlining the Government's intention to setup their own maintenance services for Government aircraft at Torbay. I wonder would the minister be prepared to take the House into its confidence, and table

all correspondence, all tenders, all bids, for the various airlines concerns, and whether he would be willing to indicate to the House, what effect this will have on Eastern Provincial Airways maintenance crew, how many people might be laid off etc.

MR. SPEAKER: A question of that nature should be put on the Order Paper.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, this is very important, I have no doubt the Premier could answer this question.

MR. SPEAKER: This question could be conveniently to be placed on the Order Paper, and at this time it is not in order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman could put it on the Order Paper yesterday, and get the answer today, if he puts it on today, it might be answered tomorrow. Put it on accordingly to the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is not much point to put down questions, if we are not getting many answers. I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Justice. Could the hon. Minister of Justice tell us, whether the Government has directed Mr. Justice Mufflin to proceed with his inquiry into the laying off the thirty-two police constables in St. John's in February. Whether or not he has been directed to proceed with that, and would the minister tell us, whether or not he is going to attend the meeting, which is going to be held by members of the constabulary tonight, to which apparently he has been invited, to discuss various matters with them?

HON. L. R. CURTIS: (MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, I might say that I had intended to make a statement on this matter. Presently, it is not yet ready, I may be in a position to make it during the afternoon. If not perhaps, tomorrow.

MR. JOHN CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, one part of my question there is not much point to it, unless it is answered today. Is the hon. the minister going to attend the constabulary meeting tonight, which he has been invited to attend?

MR. CURTIS: That is my business.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is not just the minister's business, it is public business.

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has answered the question.

MR. CROSBIE: The minister has said, it is not the public's business, what he does in his official secret position.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! order, please. The minister has answered the question, and it is not subject to comment.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CURTIS: Motion number three.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion number three on the Order Paper of today in the name of the member for St. Barbe South.

MR. GERALD MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I guess it is so long since this Motion has been on the paper, I may as well read it. It must be a month or more at least. It is to move;

Whereas since at least the year 1966 there have been discussions and negotiations between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada concerning a proposal to create a National Park in the area of Bonne Bay;

And Whereas there appears to be little progress made to an agreement being reached between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland with reference to the Bonne Bay National Park proposal, and there have been many contradictory statements issued in connection therewith;

And Whereas in 1969 the Government of Newfoundland suggested that the presence of Silica within the proposed boundaries of the Bonne Bay National Park required a delay in reaching agreement with the Government of Canada on the said Park;

And Whereas recently it has been revealed that concessions have been granted for exploration for oil within the boundaries of the proposed National Park;

And Whereas it appears that the Government of Newfoundland will have to expend some Three Million Dollars to acquire title to all the land within the boundaries of the proposed National Park;

And Whereas it is desirable that Members of this Honourable House of Assembly and the public of Newfoundland be fully informed of the position with reference to the establishment of the Bonne Bay National Park;

Be It Resolved that this House regrets the failure of the Government of Newfoundland to proceed expeditiously with the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay National Park and the failure of the Government to report fully and completely to this Honourable House of Assembly and to the public of Newfoundland the facts with respect to the proposal to establish a Bonne Bay National Park and directs the Government to table in this Honourable House of Assembly all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada relative to the proposal to establish a National Park in the Bonne Bay area.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the Motion.

Sir, this resolution today, has I imagine, stirred more people's interest around Newfoundland than almost any other issue over the past few years. I believe Sir, that the idea of some form of relaxation to everybody, including fishermen, farmers, mill workers, civil servants and even politicians is uppermost in everybody's mind, almost eleven months out of a year, because Sir for the few brief weeks of summer that we live to expect in Newfoundland it is something of a real treat to be able to take our families and relax in the great outdoors.

Almost continuously over the last few years, it has been my greatest desire to see the proposed Bonne Bay National Park become a reality. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must again give this hon. House a short explanation of some of the details of the beginning and of the controversy that has ensued since.

I do not think I can explain it any better than one of our native Newfoundlanders did in the Western Star in March of 1969 and I quote from the article. " A park in the Bonne Bay region has been proposed by various Newfoundlanders since the 1920's. And various civil servants took up the cause in the 1950's and the 1960's, mostly amongst them actually Dr. Stuart Peters, who was a former deputy minister of Resources.



and it was largely Dr. Peter's campaign on its behalf that roused the interest first of the Provincial and later of the Federal Government.

After the Federal Government had taken its first look at Bonne Bay and agreed that it seemed like a place where a park could be developed, they employed Dr. W. O. Pruitt, Jr. to do an ecological survey and make recommendations on the area required and the type of management need. Dr. Pruitt being the most highly qualified man in North America to undertake this work as he is one of the greatest authorities in the world on the ecology of the northern wilderness.

Dr. Pruitt, at that time, recommended an area of about 1,500 square miles stretching from Goose Arm, Bay of Islands to Daniel's Harbour, and his reasons, Sir, for this recommendation was that the area offered protection to three rare species of animals: the Arctic hare, woodland caribou and the pine marten, included in a region with rare plants that are found nowhere else in Canada and offered exceptional tourist opportunities to motorists, campers, hikers and canoeists. The area that Dr. Pruitt recommended and that the Federal Government requested was refused by the Provincial Government, and they offered instead a small area just north of Bonne Bay. The Federal Government rejected the Provincial Government's first offer outright. The two Governments never did come to an agreement on where the park boundaries should lie. The Provincial Government subsequently agreed to part of the area south of Bonne Bay, requested by the Federal Government, the land between Trout River Pond and South Arm, which is still being considered and lately, of course, it is now in the main park, if it every happens, of course. This "secondary area" at the time is about one-third of the requested area south of Bonne Bay, and includes the rare plants mentioned earlier, but does not include the range of the Gregory Plateau caribou herd, which Dr. Pruitt regarded as important.

Even though no agreement on boundaries have been reached, the Federal Government continued its surveys. Then in September of 1968, the Provincial Government discovered a deposit of quartzite on the north shore of Bonne Bay stretching up into the mountains, a distance of about five miles. They took continuous samples from the out-croppings and had them assayed at St. John's. They proved to be, on the average, about 96-per-cent pure, and in

some cases better than this and they decided to drill for further tests." That was the end of that article.

Mr. Speaker, this same article goes on to explain about the characteristics of quartzite and its importance to the industrial plant at Long Harbour. But we have yet to learn the results of this final test and although the people of Newfoundland were promised this report by September 30, 1969, we are still waiting to hear what this Government intends to do with this area.

Mr. Speaker, at this stage of development, the Federal Government decided to retire from the area without consultation with any of our authorities. This was the first of many frustrations and statements which befuddled the entire population of Newfoundland. The present administration felt duty bound to investigate the possibilities of any mineral wealth within the park area and this action I agree with, but how long must we wait for that information?

Mr. Speaker, the great controversy began then between the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources and Dr. Pruitt over the value in dollars it would bring into this Province. I do not think to this day that anybody is convinced that a mine will produce anything like the benefits of a national park. But it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, to relate some of the statements about what was holding up the park such as this one from the hon. minister as early as January 17, 1969: "word of the discovery at that time, which was silica came at the very moment that a conference of Federal and Provincial officials, being organized at my request for the purpose of finalizing certain aspects of the Gros Morne National Park proposal." We heard nothing then about oil concessions. Of course, this statement by the hon. minister: "the exploration to determine the size and value of the silica deposit should be finished by early September and by that time, we will know whether the silica is worth going after or not." Another statement in March, 1969, by the present minister: "acquiring the land for the Federal Government to take over and develop would cost the Provincial Government \$2 million."

As we already know from tabled answers in this House, the minister has now given us the figure of \$3 million. In one year, it has gone up by \$1 million. In the same breath the minister wondered, if it would be best to

to use this money to develop a Provincial park. As late as December, 1969, the present minister was stating that. He was still trying to clear up all the details that would lead to the development of the park. He said that the Federal Government was still busy doing survey and other preparatory work.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, the mining surveys, as any sensible Newfoundlander realizes, had to be done, and we appreciate the great interest that the Government had in looking into the possibilities of any mineral deposits within the land that they would be giving over to the Federal Government. The truth of it was, Mr. Speaker, and I have said this before that the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources should have had this work completed long before this. This was five years that they had been negotiating on this land. Therefore, the proposals for this national park had started, as I said, five years before 1969. There was little reason to believe that this could not have been done at any stage within these years.

Mr. Speaker, we are not the only group looking for information on the national park. The Federal member for the district, Mr. Jack Marshall has been repeatedly asking the Federal Government questions concerning the development of this park, and he has been continually getting the same information and that is that the Provincial Government is still debating on what the boundaries should be. Therefore, it has been the continued answer from the Federal Government that nothing can be done until this land is turned over for development by the Federal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come up to the present matter over the last month or so. Mr. Marshall in Ottawa has stated that the Federal Government's National Parks Branch has budgeted \$1,971,000 to be spent in the area during 1970-71, and it is interesting to see that this item was only listed as a new highway for Gros Morne, so that it seems that even the Federal Government were not too anxious to make known that they were going to have this money available for the next two years. After further digging into the Federal Minister's budget, Mr. Marshall now finds that the monies earmarked, totals something like \$5.2 million over the next

five years and that \$1,971,000 was listed only as road construction to upgrade highway seventy-three to national park standards, as well as, twenty miles of internal park roads. This, of course, would be a total of almost fifty miles of national parks standard highway from Wiltondale to about four miles north of Cow Head.

Mr. Speaker, I would like you to listen to some of the other monies to be spent or listed to be spent. Almost immediately, there is \$384,000 of which \$250,000 is allotted for land acquisition and the rest for fencing, landscaping and survey work that is involved. Mr. Speaker, as late as February 20th of this year, Ottawa was still saying that an agreement in principal has been reached to build a national park in Bonne Bay, but nothing further can be accomplished until the Provincial Government hands over the land to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, surely this shows that the Federal Government, who have budgeted this money for 1970 have every intention of proceeding toward the development of this park in good faith. Therefore, we feel there is absolutely no reason to keep this information from the people.

Sir, it has been the practice of authorities both Federal and Provincial to undertake projects in the outports of Newfoundland without prior consultation. I am not fully convinced that this has been entirely the case with the national park, because we have been most fortunate in having in having an organization in the district of St. Barbe South, which has grown in strength over the last few years and has been instrumental in pursuing all aspects of the district's needs. I am speaking of the Northern Regional Development Association and especially its executive.

The people and members of this association have continually discussed the present situation, but they have not sat back and waited for things to happen. They have been trying for quite some time to develop within the area, the type of assistance which will produce good results when this national park is developed.

The following, I would like to read, Sir. It was sent to me by the Zone One Chairman who is in Bonne Bay and who has been responsible for much of this information. It is titled, "Tourist Information Scheme for Bonne Bay", and I would like to read to this hon. House some excerpts

from it. It is called, "The Tourist Development Committee of the Steering Committee of Zone one of N. R. D. A." They have drawn up an overall scheme for the beginning of a gradual build-up of tourists into a major factor in this area. They area at present being considered

extends from Wiltondale to Wood Point and Curzon Village and over to Trout River. This area has been famous for its magnificent scenery since the last century and is acknowledged to be outstanding in Eastern North America. The natural environment and the picturesque settlements offer a wide variety of attractions as they stand, among them the following: hiking, hill-walking and rock climbing; special interest for botanists and geologists; ideal sailing and boating on the two big inlets and on three exceptionally lovely ponds; good fishing on the ponds and rivers, also on the open sea and in the inlets where both mackerel and tuna abound in the tourist season; game of all kinds is to be seen on the hills; in the winter the scenery resembles alpine country and offers fine touring on snow-shoes, skidoos or skis and all these pursuits are already available to the enterprising and experienced but so far there are no facilities to enable the average tourist to enjoy them.

From experts in the field, from numerous published reports and from first hand experience of other places, there is no doubt that the development to the maximum of the tourist potentials of an area acts as a stimulant to all aspects of life, industry and trade. The scheme to develop tourism will tie in with any other industries that are developed in the district, with reciprocal benefit. An exception would be an industry that destroys or polutes the natural environment and makes it unattractive to visitors.

The cost of helping to develop the tourist industry is negligible compared to that of any other industry. It brings income to the people both directly and indirectly and this is widely distributed throughout the area and stays in it. Later developments by commercial concerns will add valuable jobs but the majority of their income will go to the owners who many not even be in the Province. If local communities and individuals are encouraged to provide all the facilities they can first, the development of commercial enterprises will not completely by-pass them.

Mr. Speaker, I am still continuing from that article from the N.R.D.A. group. The scheme is designed to involve the communities as much as possible and to increase the number of visitors gradually so that the skills required for catering for them will be gained by experience, without the need of much outside help. If the "Community School" suggested for this winter comes into



being and this was written last fall, groups would be encouraged to study some of the important aspects of catering for tourists. Sir, I would like to outline the four headings:

1. Public Relations and Information, which is so badly needed all over this country:
  - (a) A simple brochure will be prepared and distributed.
  - (b) Road signs will be set up at key points.
  - (c) A central information centre will be set up, associated with gift and craft shop also sponsored by N.R.D.A.
  - (d) A large scale map outside this centre will show details of trails and other facilities.
2. Increased tourist accommodation:
  - (a) At least one trailer site will be set up. (nearest is at Deer Lake).
  - (b) More homes will be encouraged to get a licence to take visitors.
  - (c) At least two picnic sites will be set up, one at Trout River Pond and the other in Bonne Bay.
3. Increased facilities for tourists to enjoy the natural amenities:
  - (a) Trails for hiking and skidooning will be improved and marked.
  - (b) At least two boat launch ramps are needed, one on Bonne Bay and one on Trout River Pond.
  - (c) More boats will be made available for hire.
  - (d) Highway view points will be opened up and the Highway Department will be asked to try and make stopping places for cars.
4. Special events to attract tourists:
  - (a) Skidoo and ski clubs which already operate in the area, will be approached and if possible weekend meets arranged.
  - (b) The discontinued regatta will be re-established and held early in the season and held in conjunction with a fair of local crafts and produce. Interesting events and good publicity will be arranged.
  - (c) Following an earlier regatta on Bonne Bay, one would be planned later on Trout River Pond.

That is the end of their statement, of that part of it. If these simple plans prove successful in the coming year, that is this year, more ambitious

ones can be developed in the future. Individuals will see ways to add to their income by providing needed services and thus the area will gradually achieve its own independent tourist industry.

If and when the Bonne Bay National Park becomes a reality, the communities will be in a position to gain enormously from being on the fringe and being able to offer already a wide range of accommodation and holiday activities for the visitors." Mr. Speaker, this was signed by R. W. Smith, Director of Zone one. Mr. Speaker, this will confirm what I have said many times that people of this area are very interested in their development in the tourist industry. They have held high hopes that this national park will be developed, and they are getting prepared to give the type of service that all tourists expect. This is the type of people who are planning to give much more than they will be getting out of it and this leads me to discuss some of the statements that were made in the local Daily News of Monday, March 23, 1970. I must say here, before I begin, that I am not in complete agreement with everything in that editorial but as usual I value every man's opinion with relation to the park at Bonne Bay and if I may quote, Sir, from the paper: "anyone who has travelled along the west coast from Bonne Bay north or who has flown over the area will agree at once, if he has an atom of appreciation for natural beauty, that this could be the most enchanting national park in the whole of Canada.

Moreover, in a world desperately threatened by the pollution of water, land and air. It is highly desirable to preserve as much clean open space as we can for healthful as well as aesthetic reasons. This is also a materialistic world in which man's desire for new sources of employment and affluence is in conflict with his interest in the beauties of nature and the cleanliness of his atmosphere.

One of the troubles with the Bonne Bay park proposal is that many of its advocates see in it something of both. They want the park but they consider it as the most immediate source of economic gain for the people in the area. The preservation of an area of magnificent scenery is associated with and argued for in behalf of economic gain. If this were the only consideration it may be asked whether the possibility of an oil strike is not far more intriguing than what good may be made out of a summer tourist trade."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think for a minute that this statement was well thought out, because I do not care whether you have great dreams of striking oil or striking gold, there should be a little more consideration given to the thought that a national park will produce more than a summer tourist trade. I am sure Mr. Editor - I am sure that the editor did not feel that this is the only thought behind the building of a great national park. He must realize that in Western Newfoundland as the people in Bonne Bay have stated, we have a greater potential of winter activities than any other part of this Island. We enjoy outings with our families in the winter, skiing, or motor tobogganing, much more often from November until May than we get out of the two summer months of July and August. I do not know who amongst the hon. members in this House have enjoyed the wonderful pastime of taking skidoo trips many miles through the woods, fishing on ice covered lakes, boiling up as the old Newfoundland saying goes in an area of great beauty and enjoying it more than any other summer pastime. This is not a rich man's pastime. It is the daily experience of hundreds of fishermen and ordinary working men who have learned that we have a greater winter paradise to enjoy ourselves in than any other part of North America except probably in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, to carry on with the editorial: "there are three main bodies of opinion. There are first those to whom the preservation of the purity and loveliness of nature must come first; particularly, where the area involved is in many ways unique in terms of its essential attractions and its flora and wildlife. Next are those, and perhaps this is the motivating factor of some of the people of the regional development association, who see in a part a combination of this with a good deal of local employment. And finally, there is a government in a province of very high unemployment which feels obligated, before it transfers ownership of land to Ottawa for a national park, to determine if the property contains anything of transcendent material value."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with this whole statement. I am fortunately or unfortunately within the group who see the combination of the preservation of this lovely part of the country and also a great deal of employment for the communities within close proximity of the park. This is not an extremist point of view. I feel that there is a place for a wilderness

section in this park. I also feel that there will be an area that can be developed to take care of a great deal of the tourist trade which has very little interest in climbing mountains and in nature study hunts.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote the end of this editorial because as they go on and say: "there is, of course, also a basis for initial compromise. That is to create a park within an adequate area in terms of content and size with the clear understanding that provision for its enlargement will be satisfactorily made. In this analysis of the controversy, the only purpose is to set out some of the main elements that are involved in the hope that it may be a contribution to the present dialogue. Each interested group has a case. Where does the most immediate, as well as the most enduring value lie? Now, Mr. Speaker, the thought behind this statement seems to appeal to every fair minded person. The proposed park

MR. WINDEN:

proposed park of 600 square miles may look very large right now within our lifetime but because of the speed of industrialization I think we are heading beyond that because it is not beyond my belief that in our lifetime we will be looking for an area where we can take our family and spend it beside a lake or a beach. Because these untouched areas are fast becoming scarce even in our part of the country. We feel that the provision for an enlargement of this area would be quite realistic because of the potential for a great tourist development and will be in the whole area of what is now being considered as the new national park. As the editor states, each group has a case and I believe, Sir, that there has been enough information gathered from all interested parties within this island of Newfoundland to give the Government of this island an idea what the people want.

Mr. Speaker, the great tragedy of this whole befuddled controversy has arisen over this oil concession business in the areas of the northern section of the proposed national park. From the map supplied in the "Evening Telegram", which came as a surprise to many people, when it showed that there were at least three concessions given to NALCO back in 1950-51-52, the whole idea which has been confirmed by the Federal Government that no oil rights would be considered within a boundary of a national park, seems to have brought this whole idea back before the public as just another reason to postpone the development of this area.

Well, Sir, we all know the history of oil within the Parsons Pond area but we were greatly surprised that any thought would be entertained by these people to start development south of this concession. We also know that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by speculators who have been trying to find the source of any commercial amount of oil, maybe it exists and maybe as the Government suggests it would be wise to spend more money to find out if there is any great amount there. I have already stated that according to the map this is a small area in the northern section it would be quite reasonable to expect, if this area is taken out of the park, that the area south of Bonne Bay including the Gregory Plateau and running up towards Wiltondale could be an addition to this park and possibly be of greater interest to visitors than the northern section.

MR. MYRDEN:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard more about the national park for the past three weeks outside of the House of Assembly than we have for the last three years because it seems so strange that the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources can give this information when we are asking for it since this hon. House has started to sit. The minister has stated in the fifth, in the fifth annual Provincial Park's Workshop that by 1973 the Government will be able to say the national park in Bonne Bay exists. Now, Sir, this seems to be exactly what we have been asking for.

The statement " This mineral survey undertaken last summer has been completed and we know that there is a valuable mineral there and so did everybody else. This does not mean that we will exploit it but we had to access in value all the resources of the area before they disappeared forever into a national park". Sir, this is exactly what the minister had promised the people of Bonne Bay. Unfortunately, he told the people that they could expect the answer last September and I do not know about the big dark secret, what the big dark secret is, but I think the people of this area deserve at least an answer whether there will be a mine or a park or maybe even both.

Again we were greatly surprised, Sir, especially in Corner Brook when Mr. E. P. Henley, the Tourist Development Director of the Province, told a meeting in the Corner Brook Chamber of Commerce on March 31 that he agreed with a statement last month of the Resources Minister, W.R. Callahan, that the Provincial Government would not settle for a wilderness park at Bonne Bay. He said, "At Terra Nova we have some 157 square miles of wilderness, you can see it all in two days. The 500 miles at Bonne Bay is the same, more with nothing to do, this is ridiculous."

But Mr. Speaker, as the paper stated, he hinted at possible development of the entire northern peninsula, not just 600 miles and, of course, this came as a surprise, came as a great surprise to everyone in fact but then we felt that as a Tourist Director this gentleman was only dreaming of what could possibly happen. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier was also dreaming when on April 2 over Radio Station CFCS, on an open line, he described the new national park as being 1200 square miles, maybe, of course, this will all come out in the White Paper, but I have not seen it yet, which will be presented I understand and has now been presented by the Premier for



MR. MYRDEN:

the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. We certainly hope, as the Premier stated, that we will be very pleased with this information. We are actually, there is quite a bit of information on it.

We have, Sir, been very patiently trying to get information and I believe from the amount of correspondence I have received from the people in Newfoundland we are now getting at last the information which we have been asking for.

Mr. Speaker, before I finish this part of it I would like to say that if by bringing this before this hon. House and which I know every hon. member over here will support, if not in principle then within his own private thoughts, I feel that I have done justice to the people I represent and also to the great numbers of Newfoundlanders who feel that we must try and protect some of our basic natural resources so that we can live to enjoy it, and I hope that I have not spoken in vain.

Mr. Speaker, to say that I was surprised at this glorious document, if you would like to call it that, that was presented here yesterday would be putting it mildly. I have never, Sir, I do not think, gotten mad in my life but I was overcome actually when I saw it last night. If they called the Pushie Report ninety-per-cent trash, if there is such a thing as 110-per-cent trash that is it because every bit of that stuff, Sir, has been in the papers and on the air for years, every bit of it. There is nothing there, not a thing, nothing new, not a darn thing but when they put it all together it starts to look nice until you start to go through it, Sir, and I spent most the night, I must say.

Yesterday when the Premier said he was going to reject this contemptuously; "we are not going to get something bigger but it is going to be better." Well that is twice he made a mistake because he has already said it is going to be 1200 square miles. I hope it will be better, I have always said that I would love to see a golf course, love to see swimming pools, parks or little parks within the big parks. I have every thought, Sir, that it will probably be done because there is nothing wrong with that, I will go right along with it. But to continue along on these lines, that you are not going to get a Gros Morne National Park, you are going to get something better. We are going to spend \$50 million to \$60 million, they are not sure, \$30 million do not make much difference anyway when you are talking about millions, and they are going to

MR. MYRDEN:

spread it right from Bonne Bay down to St. Anthony and over to the Labrador shore. Yes, the essential elements of the historic coast proposals thus emerge as follows: development of the Gros Morne National Park, but also, read on, conclusion of negotiations for establishment of the National and Historical Park at L'Anse Meadows, fine and dandy, very good, Sir, I would love to see it, and, of course, the Dorset Indian Sites along the northern coast, development of the fisheries, forest, mining resources.

The greatest development we can do and the greatest help we can give the fisheries is close that gulf to the dragger situation we have had for the last ten years down there. Sir, we cannot fish in the gulf, we cannot keep nets out because the draggers are tearing everything, they are going to tear up the shrimp beds, they are going to tear up the scallop beds and they are going to destroy the lobsters for one reason only and we, yesterday, heard a great speech here about going out to the Grand Banks and taking them over and that is 200 miles off and we cannot look after our own inland waters. That is the only help we can give with the fisheries, put those draggers out, our own included, Sir, absolutely, because there is no hope to expand any shrimp, scallop, lobster, herring are all going to be destroyed. It is only a matter of a few years, if we have seen it, we have seen it in our lifetime.

Then it goes on to develop and maintain transportation facilities including an all weather road. Yes, Sir, I would love to see it, I would love to see an all weather road down the coast, I would be the first one to jump up and cheer if I could get that down there and I am sure the hon. member for St. Barbe North and the member for White Bay North would be happier still and even the Labrador South man would help us, I am sure they would, absolutely. But it is only daydreaming, we have not got enough money to buy that bit of land for the park. You just got your answer today, this Government has not enough money to give you a helicopter service, Sir, across the Straits. That was not feasible, you are asking for it. No, Sir, that is the answer that was given here. This Government does not have the money to give a helicopter service across the Straits and yet we are

MR. MRYDENT: And yet we are talking about fifty or sixty million dollars. We have not enough money to buy this land. \$2 million. Yes DREN, if we get the DREE money, there will not be any left for Newfoundland according to this. It will all be spent on the Northern peninsula, and I would love to see that too. I would love to see, every bit. You will get your chance Sir, just wait a minute. You will get your chance to stand up and fight for your end of it. And it goes on, "the proposed National Park should not be viewed in isolation from the region around it". Well that is a great statement. Wonderful. We are now developing the region down there Sir, if that is what they are thinking about. We are developing the region, not from government money or government help, in the Hawke's Bay, Port Saunders and Port -au-Choix, and the fisheries and everything else. That is being developed. But this is brand new statement.

"To proceed with the National Park proposal as it stands would be overlooked as an exciting opportunity to initiate an intrigued development strategy, whose impact socially and economically will be felt by a much larger number of citizens over a much larger geographical area." Well that is a wonderful statement. It is true, absolutely true. I would love to see it. That is really good. But it is not going to help those people down in Bonne Bay, who are looking for something to do.

But Sir we come to another substance, the real substance of this. "Very substantial costs are involved in the repatriation of properties and rights," and get that Mr. Speaker, "rights" in the proposed National Park area, for the purpose of providing to the Government of Canada clear title to the area. Among these costs are those associated with the relocation of communities. And compensation - get that Sir. Compensation to owners of property and rights granted for resource development purposes." There is the crux of it. These oil concessions now have to be brought back. They were given twenty years ago. Nobody did anything with them, but they are going to be brought back now.

This is why we need the \$3 million. Not \$2 million but \$3 million. We need that extra million for our friend. And it is submitted that since the acquisition of properties and the extension of rights is for national purposes. The nation should bear the burden of the cost. The only thing

the Federal Government ever asked of this Province or any other Province to give them the land, they will develop it. There is no question about that. That is all they ask of them. Pass over the land.

It is that representative areas of our Province and thus of the nation must be preserved, for they are aesthetic ecological and recreational value, for present and future generations. Their inadequate balance must be struck between the future, for the present and future life needs, and the need for conservation for conservation sake. And that when conflicts arise, value judgements must be made regardless of the consequences in the light of what appears as any given moment to be the entire public interest. That is a real good statement. Big words and everything else. But it is not true. You are talking about mines and everything else. We are talking about preserving the land, you agree with that. Good. This is a kind to a natural law. That is another one. That is a real good statement. It is kind to natural law.

Number six on historic documents. It is that where resources required for life, for life use, are barred from such use, there must be compensation. There cannot be a vacuum. There must be a benefit conferred in return. A benefit at least as great as that which is lost. I agree with it, but in other words, what you are trying to do now is sell all the concessions. And that Silica Mine and the oil concession and every other timber rights down there. Do Bowaters want to be paid for their timber rights? No, that is what they do not. Do not kid yourself. They are interested in the Park, interested enough to pass his land over. They will pass it over if you will give them the extra. Excuse me Mr. Speaker, I should not be speaking to the minister, it is you.

And again in the case of the proposed Gros Morne National Park, the value judgement simply must answer these questions. Which is preferable? The use of known resources for life, or their preservation in a National Park. Oh my! That is all there is to that one. And if the latter, how may the loss of resources required for life use be compensated for, if at all, to be brought back of course, to be paid for. The value of the judgement, let us look at this. The objective must be to obtain for the people of the region and the Province generally, economic and social benefits at least as great as those accruing or likely to accrue from the use of resources to

be locked up. No. Including extra, minerals merchantable fisher force, fish and game both as good resources. And as a basis for income from guiding and catering. And also compensation for properties. And again rights necessary to be acquired or extinguished to make way for park development. Now in other words it seems that they have now received a piece of land down there, and instead of passing it over to the Federal Government, you are going to try and sell it. The Minister is going to try and sell it.

I wonder if every other Province did the same thing. And the minister stated also right here that he has operated in good faith. He also said that he was the one or if not him, this Government started back in 1964, they made the first approach I believe to the Federal Government. They asked them if they would be interested in developing a Federal Park. And in good faith over the past six years, when they said yes, the Government has been negotiating year after year, pining a little more, we want a little more. You are not going to get this now, because there may be minerals there, there may be something there, so therefore we want a park - we want what we want. And it continues for six years after they said yes we want it. Oh you are not those senior interests and now we are going to see what we can get for it. And the latest of course is they want the \$50 million or \$60 million for the whole coast. I agree, I would love to get it. I hope he has it. I hope since he has been in Ottawa, he brought it back with him, because as far as I am concerned, if he has not, and I doubt if any government is going to listen to that foolishness. I do not <sup>know</sup> whether you are going to sit back - a government in Ottawa and say well look, yes you have such a wonderful piece of land there, that we really want it Mr. Speaker. And at any cost, \$50 million or \$60 million is only a few dollars and we need that land.

Yes I am afraid it would be a long period of years Sir. A good many years, a good many years. Now we come back to something else on Page 9 if you would like to continue on following: Therefore, the following are put forward as facilities necessary to equip fully Gros Morne National Park, in order to enable it to complete, compete satisfactorily with other National Parks in the Atlantic Provinces. And to realize its full potential in terms of its economic impact on the northwest coast of the Province. And the first one is Recreation Village, including golf, tennis, heated swimming pools.



April 8, 1970

Tape #388

Page 4

children's playgrounds, and probably most of them in the Lomond area - there is nothing wrong with that Mr. Minister, and Mr. Speaker. Not a thing wrong with that. That was mentioned three years ago in this House, so there is nothing new in it either, but there is nothing wrong in it.

Winter Sports Range to provide for the winter tourist demand to which there is now no satisfactory provision in the Atlantic Provinces. That is a great one, considering there is a great Ski Club there in Corner Brook. There is nothing there, winter sports do not mean anything in here. Do not worry Mr. Speaker, it is in use now and it will be in use this weekend, for everyone who wants to enjoy it. And a few more weekends yet. One in Labrador City, that is another one.

This would include skiing, slopes and cross country, tobogganing and snowmobiles. Snowmobiling, that is a new word, I have heard tobogganine, motor tobogganing, and skidoing, but snowmobiling. There is nothing wrong with that Mr. Speaker. There is really nothing wrong with that. That is a good thing. There is no doubt about it. Unfortunately it has been mentioned many times by the Northern Region Development Association, but clear of that, there is nothing wrong with it. It is like I say, a lot of this stuff we have all heard before, and I am glad to see it put down in print, because it means the minister is listening to some of the people at last. And he is putting it down here, there is nothing wrong with that.

Underwater park component, probably north of Rocky Harbour. I would not like to go north of Rocky Harbour, because you are right out into the Gulf. There is nothing there north of Rocky Harbour that you can get into. You want to see that stuff in there, if that is what you call <sup>a</sup> coloured picture. That was never taken up there though.

But regardless of that Mr. Speaker, there is only one real area there, and that is within the arm, eastern and western. I do not know, and I stand to be corrected. The hon. Minister of Public Works will probably know it a lot more than me because he sailed there by boat, and I am sure that he was caught out there a good many nights trying to get into Bonne Bay. I am positive of that, because most of the time I was with him. And there was an awful long coast right from Port Saunders down to Bonne Bay, and that is a hundred miles of it. So I do not know where you would put an underwater park there, but it is good, there is nothing wrong with that.



April 8, 1970

Tape #388

Page 5

To be the first in Canada and capture the rapidly emerging underwater sports interest. I agree, there is nothing with that. I heard that mentioned first by Doctor Laird, and I felt quite proud that he was going to use it, and I am proud to see it there because this is what we want. But you will not be able to Mr. Speaker, you will not be able to use it if there is a silica mine within miles of it. Rest assured about that because when any mining goes there, any open-pit mining and you start to get the run-off. It does not matter whether it is north of Rocky Harbour or south of Bonne Bay, that is going to pollute the waters in the whole area there, you need not worry about that. So therefore, we must say here that there is going to be no silica mine. It has not been stated anywhere, but I do not believe there is. I do not think the minister is going to mention silica for a good many years Sir.

I think he is fed up on that word. The Adult Education and Fine Art Center probably at Woody Point, as I have stated before, the Woody Point people are always talking about this, this is good. That is good. There is nothing wrong with this. I said I have heard it all before in the ARDA study.

That is all right Sir, there are active people down in my district, and they go ahead regardless of government help. Marina and small boat basin at Nettie's Harbour, nothing wrong with that, I fully agree with it. Retention of certain communities such as Sally's Cove and Trout River. Now that comes to a very interesting point. In some of the statements the ministers made here on that is this: Back in 1969 of January, just before we were at Bonne Bay, and I believe it all came out there in Bonne Bay about Sally's Cove and Trout River. There was a statement came back from the minister

MR. MYRDEN: the Minister of Indian Affairs a letter to the Minister of Mines and Resources concerning that thing on March 7th. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development in a telegram to the hon. the Premier, advise that he understood that, if the mine site on the east arm is proceeded with you are prepared to include the Trout River area south of Bonne Bay in the park proposal, including the eventual move of the Trout River community.

Now on one hand you say here, you hope to retain this certain community, but you have already stated, by this telegram, being received by you, you stated that this would be, or Mr. Speaker, the minister stated that further on the Premier advised this is very welcome news indeed, and I have advised my colleague the hon. William R. Callahan, the Minister of Mines, Agricultural, and Resources of your decision and I expect that he will be in touch with you very shortly to resume discussions on this very worthwhile project.

Now the minister has stated that he has done this in good faith, and I believe him, and I honestly believe that he has done everything possible to retain those fishing villages along the South River and Sally's Cove. Because I feel that, and he does too I am sure, that it would be a terrific waste of money to move people, people such as people in Sally's Cove, Mr. Speaker, who have never, I suppose never in their life had to go very, very often, very seldom you will see a man on welfare in Sally's Cove. They will go everywhere and anywhere, anything to do, this winter, I believe, according to one chap he told me, we have had one month, a man ran out of his unemployment, and he said he had one month on ablebodied relief, that is all in a population I suppose there must be twenty-three or twenty-four men working there, they are all over this country, but they never stop home. And they are great fishermen, and they are great workers. And I believe like the minister, that I believe him, when he says he wants to retain those certain communities, there is nothing wrong with that. Because they are beautiful picturesque, beautiful villages down around South River, these areas the Premier has been there, he has seen it all. You can always get a good welcome in these places because these people are good god-fearing people, and they love to see people coming to talk to them. They love it, but I will state right here again, that is another good idea, there is nothing wrong with it. It is a perfect idea. The preservation of historical and colourful structure such as lighthouses, that idea came from article. Because I have seen the article in

the paper. But it is a good idea, there is nothing wrong with it. The continuation of fishing rights and landing rights along the coast within the National Park, as tourist attractions and provisions of wharves and landing and marketing facilities, including a sea foods restaurant concession, that is a good idea. There is nothing wrong with that. The wild zoo park, where typical animals from within the National Park might be viewed by visitors. I have lived in Bonne Bay, and I suppose I travelled the coast for twenty years, and unfortunately I have never seen an arctic hare or a pine martin, and I do not know of any other people who have, it is one of these rare animals that you are very lucky if you can find. That would be a good thing because these animals will never be seen again. These are animals that are almost extinct, and as I understand in another item there the minister has done everything possible to retain these timber rights, that these animals live in, that is a good idea. There is nothing wrong with that.

Provision of the fish hatchery is planned in the new Kent County National Park in New Brunswick, that is good too, absolutely. Nothing too wrong with that.

Now we want to get to the back part of that on page thirteen, the St. Barbe Coast has seen an important surge forward in industrial development based on the resources of the region. That is a fair statement, that is right. There is no doubt about that. They are doing it, and they are working hard at it. It has not come to its full capacity yet, but it is coming. And I think it will be, I think it is going to be a good industry there, but the development started in Hawkes Bay, Port au Choix, Port Saunders area are sufficiently promised to justify their designation of the area, as a special area under the DREE Program. There is nothing wrong with that. Because that area there alone needs help in the form of wharves, in the form of water supply and everything else. It is not just yet a major integrated forest products plan, I am afraid. Not as yet, but it will be.

The long liner fishery has seen spectacular growth and plans have been made from a significant shrimp harvest. Scallops are also important, and lobsters are traditional. I have already stated my feelings on that on that Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to go through it again. I believe the minister has the same trouble down in his area, with dragnets. I am sure he has. There can be, and there will not be any danger of a shrimp harvest in the Gulf, whether it is north of Port au Choix, or in St. George's Bay, until, and until that Gulf is closed to the dragger situation we have over there now. It has

cost this Government here hundreds of thousands of dollars, and I thank them for it, and the people do. Because as far as I am concerned we could not do anything else, these people had, it was beaten right into the ground by dragger situation, the Federal Government would not help them. Maybe they could not, I do not know, They have never done anything actually over there to help this boat situation. They have worked hard, and they have send boats down there, but as the boats go out in the night time, you will see them in on the shore, you can count them in the straits down there just like another city. And that is only eight to nine miles apart. And we are talking now about going out to the Grand Banks, and take over some of the Grand-Banks, we do not even own our inland waters. There cannot be any shrimp industry. There cannot any scallop industry of any great length. There never will be a great lobster industry because they are dragging right to the bottom, and they are coming right in on the shore, these draggers. And, Sir, what worries me, that there is a school of herring out there, that is called the gulf herring that comes down around Port au Port, from Port au Port right up through, it is only a small school, and unless we get the draggers out of there and keep them convinced, that until further studies are made there should not be any fishing other than for food consumption, not dehydrating plants because I think they are going to clear it up. I think the minister over there has agreed with it, until further studies are done. I think something should be done. And I think that Gulf of St. Lawrence should be turned into the inland waters which it was meant to be. We cannot do it, the hon. the Minister of Public Works has had many of these complains up in his area, right through the straits. There are draggers from all over the world, and the biggest kind. Well, I have seen them grounded up in the minister's district. Grounded, come right in on shore, and I have seen three more coming to drag it off before the patrol boat comes. They have gone so close in. So there cannot be, and I am sorry to say, there never will be a very important scallop or lobster or shrimp until this is done.

There have been encouraging results from mineral exploration and large sums are being expended. Well, I do not think he means within the park, I think the hon. minister means outside, there has been quite a bit of mining. However, whether at Port au Choix, Hawkes Bay, Port Saunders, or elsewhere along the coast successful development largely will depend upon transportation particularly adequate highway transportation, and I am not against that. I still say, I would love to see that highway.

The main thing, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, there is some little thing back here, I do not want to go on too long. This is on page eighteen, what we now seek is a great national park, that will excel not only by virtue of its wilderness act, but also by virtue of the facilities associated with it, and the additional attraction of a historic nature, linked to it by a good highway, and there is nothing wrong with that. But, right below that he says again, Mr. Speaker, the Gros Morne National Park must not be considered or developed in isolation. It must be the chorin nucleus of a development of the whole section of Newfoundland, which surrounds it. And I agree, it should not be. It would be in isolation if it started. There is \$5 million in Ottawa that we know about for the next few years. There is almost \$2 million within this next fiscal year. This is all we are complaining about. We would like to see it started now, the people down there would. There has been more phone calls and agitation over this thing, than anything else. There is no reason for it. But, I agree, I would love to see this year \$50 million. Maybe that would help the whole economy of the north coast, I would love to see it, I would love to see the road. But, I do not want to wait for the next six or eight years. Because it is impossible, these people cannot wait, Mr. Speaker. They are too badly in need of some employment. And this is what the whole crux of the matter is.

I cannot see how the Government can come up with a paper like this, within twenty-four hours before we are going to discuss this park, and say this is the answer. All you have got to wait for is two or three more years, when the money is sitting there in Ottawa. I do not know what the score is. But I hope the minister has brought back some answers, I will be glad to listen to him, Sir, because there is a lot of people not only in St. Barbe South who are interested in this park, there is a lot of people all over Newfoundland are mostly interested. And I think, as far as I am concerned, that maybe he has the answers. I hope he has.

Thank you.

HON. WILLIAM R. CALLAHAN: (MINISTER OF MINES, AGRICULTURE AND RESOURCES)

Mr. Speaker, the Government of course do not accept, Sir, the resolution. And I hope as I go along to indicate very, very clearly to the House why we do not accept the resolution. The motion, and why we, we will ask the House in fact to reject it. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we shall ask the hon. gentleman opposite who just sat down, to vote against the resolution.

The hon. gentleman who just sat down ranged over a very wide area, and many of the things he discussed are discussed in a small pamphlet which was circulated in the west coast of the Province sometime ago, some months ago, I would say. There is no date on it, that I can find. And the first panel, Mr. Speaker, has (and this is perhaps a little plagiarism, because it is not certainly an original type with the hon. gentleman) It says, "the forgotten peninsula what now." At the bottom in the first panel indicates that it is a report by the hon. the member for St. Barbe south, presumably to his constituents.

Now Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind the title "the forgotten peninsula", it is interesting to glance over the four panels on the inside, the immediate four, which are headed by a headline, "Our needs are great", and then it says/since September 8th. 1966 with your help, much as been accomplished".<sup>but</sup> And the entire four panel, and a fifth panel on the back and to a large extent a sixth panel on the back, are a catalogue of all the things the Government have done since September 8th. 1966 in that district! And Mr. Speaker, it is a very revealing list, and indeed, it makes one wonder what the purpose of the pamphlet was in the first place, because what one perceives from the cover is diametrically imposed to the burden on the inside. And I suggest Sir, that exactly and precisely the same situation exists with respect to the resolution the hon. gentleman has on the Order Paper today. Indeed, he has just spoken for in excess of one hour on a resolution which sets out to condemn the Government, and then he has spoken as I have said, in excess of an hour indicating to the House where he is in agreement with what the Government had done and proposed and in virtually every instance he has stated quite clearly, and indeed I asked him on a number of occasions Sir, across the House, whether this is agreed, is that okay, is that good, and in each case he said, yes. And I noted it as he went along.

So Mr. Speaker, really the resolution appears to be a rather foolish one. But, nonetheless it is on the Order Paper



HON. W.J. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): It is on the Order Paper, and it is to be debated, and the hon. gentleman has begun the debate and I suppose there is no turning back now.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution regrets the failure of the Government of Newfoundland to proceed expeditiously with the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay National Park. Mr. Speaker, the Government have not proceeded expeditiously which I take to mean as quickly as possible, and I underline the possible. The Government have not proceeded as expeditiously as it might have proceeded. We admit this for the very simple reason Sir, that we reject the proposed Bonne Bay National Park as it is proposed, and we have been rejecting it for many months. We shall continue to reject it as a concept. But, Mr. Speaker, we have not as I heard on the radio this morning, I do not know what was on last night I was not here, but I heard broadcast this morning that we had in fact as a Government, rejected the Bonne Bay National Park. We have not rejected the Bonne Bay National Park. We ask for the National Bonne Bay Park to be established. Mr. Speaker, we have continued in that desire, and I might say in that determination and what has happened very simply is that we have been negotiating for the best possible concept, and the best possible reality in terms of a national park that we can obtain at Bonne Bay, now, before an agreement is signed because, Mr. Speaker, when the agreement is signed it is going to be too late as we have found with Terra Nova to be going back looking for facilities comparable to those existing in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to sign an agreement until we know that we are being treated as other Provinces have been treated, and we know how they have been treated. If the hon. gentleman thinks that is tripe Mr. Speaker, he should learn to read and get into the paper and see what the information is.

MR. CROSBIE: I have been into it, it is nothing but a sheet of lies.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well that might be Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman must have found many things that were not to his liking.

Now Mr. Speaker, this Government has been accused in effect and in fact, the hon. gentleman began with the implied accusation that we were not concerned about the provision of parks or playgrounds, places where people

could go I think he said, we have an all too short summer anyway, places where we can go on the weekend and relax.

Mr. Speaker, that accusation is laid on a Government that have in ten years created thirty-nine and we are now into the fortieth wilderness parks which rank, (and I defy anyone to show any better) which rank with the finest wilderness parks in North America. They are truly wilderness parks Mr. Speaker, and the determination is that they will continue to be wilderness parks, that they will not be cluttered up by artificial attractions. Now if that

AN HON. MEMBER: How many wilderness parks?

MR. CALLAHAN: Thirty-nine Mr. Speaker, and one being built at this moment in the Codroy estuary.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is not a single park north of there

MR. CALLAHAN: There is one at River of Ponds Mr. Speaker on that coast

MR. MYNEN: No there is not

MR. CALLAHAN: And there would have perhaps been one at Western Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: White does not have any parks

MR. CALLAHAN: At the time that consideration was given originally to park development at all on the St. Barbe Coast, the consideration was in respect of Provincial park development and Western Brook might well have been a Provincial park. But the Government took it a step further, and took it indeed several steps further and we come to the point where in 1964, and again in 1965 there was consideration of a national park and in 1965 this Government, asked the Government of Canada to consider putting a national park there.

Mr. Speaker, in case there may seem to be some conflict between the policy that we have proposed in respect of Gros Morne, and the policy of preserving Provincial parks as wilderness, let me say this. That hon. members who will read the "White Paper" will find that consistently through the paper we have not in fact asked that facilities be put in the national park, we have proposed that they be provided in association with the national park. The reason Mr. Speaker, and we appreciate the policy, the reason is that the policy of the Government of Canada in respect of national parks is not to put facilities directly within them. We agree with that policy. We think there should be areas alongside or hard-by national parks where facilities might be

provided in association with it. This is a policy I think which will be followed more and more.

Now Mr. Speaker, to get to my point, the point is that this Government have in fact created in ten years a system of wilderness parks that ranks with wilderness parks anywhere in North America better than most. We know that from the quite voluntary letters that come in from people telling us how much they appreciate these parks as wilderness parks. Mr. Speaker, I also have to say that that is all we have at Terra Nova, so with the new Provincial park being built, and including the Terra Nova National Park, within a period of perhaps eighteen months we will have forty-one wilderness parks in this Province and not one of them will have within it and most of them will not have nearby facilities of course in terms of first class trailer parks or any other artificial facility.

The reason Mr. Speaker, is that private enterprise is not sufficiently convinced, and I must say that I cannot blame them, that a two months or at the most a three month tourist season does not justify the expenditures required to provide these facilities in isolation from normal communities. In other words, you are not going to get very many hotels built out on the Trans Canada Highway hard-by a Provincial park, or even hard-by the National park. The same goes for other facilities. Mr. Speaker, these parks for the most part are on the Trans Canada Highway which means that they are in line of east - west travel across the Province. Now if private enterprise, and I know because I have dealt with many a prospective operator on this, <sup>all</sup> they want to do is put in a portable chip van, or a portable soft drink wagon or something so they can go in when there are people there on a Sunday and get out again. That is not really a facility, it is a very small convenience.

They are not prepared to do it Mr. Speaker, and how much more in respect of the north coast, in respect of L'Anse Meadows, in respect of Gros Morne. It is all fine what the hon. gentleman says, and I agree with him. There are many things that local people can do, but show me Mr. Speaker, the man that is prepared to go up to L'Anse au Meadows and put up visitor accommodation, build a motel within reasonable distance so that visitors who travel 300 miles will have a place to stay. I know there is a hotel up there, 1727

there is a motel up there, I am aware of that, but it is not close to the site, it is not convenient, and not adequate for visitors. The result Mr. Speaker is that if Government funds, public funds are not used to provide facilities of this kind the facilities will not be provided. As I have said we have the experience, we have had the experience trying to persuade oil companies who have year round business on the Trans Canada Highway, gas stations and restaurants very well setup, and Mr. Speaker, the House will be amazed at the difficulty of trying to get them to put a few more dollars in to put in decent trailer sites, trailer parks to accommodate the hundreds and I suppose by now the thousands of people who travel with trailers and who have no place really to go with them to get proper services and facilities hook ups and all the other things that are necessary to enjoy them. If they will not do it on the Trans Canada Highway Mr. Speaker, where I suppose ninety per cent of the traffic moves, how much less chance that they will go 200 or 300 miles up the north coast and do it. If we are talking about large numbers of people it is going to have to be done.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that we have provided parks all over this Province, and we will provide more. As money becomes available, and as common sense dictates there will be more Provincial wilderness parks. But forty-one of them, if you include Terra Nova would seem to me to be pretty ample at this stage, and there is nothing that another wilderness park far off the beaten track, no matter how good its attractions for a limited number of people who are interested in ecology, or spectacular photography, or what have you, the average bread and butter tourist, the man and his wife and three, or four, or five, or six kids, not only want to go and enjoy the outdoors, but also to have a little comfort, and some place perhaps to scow the kids away for a few hours so that for the first time in twelve months the parents can have a rest. They are not going to be attracted to another wilderness park Mr. Speaker.

Then let us carry it a little further afield. Let us look at what has been provided. The hon. gentleman from St. John's West said "tripe"

MR. CROSBIE: Trash

MR. CALLAHAN: All right, trash, tripe, there is not much difference. The fact is Mr. Speaker, that all across this country in National parks, there have

been provided facilities which make it impossible for Terra Nova or the Provincial parks, or Gros Morne to compete for the share, for a share, a real share, a significant share of the tourist trade on the east coast of North America. Now the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe south spoke a little kindly, and has been indeed a relative bed-fellow in recent times the hon. the member of Parliament for Humber, St. Georges - St. Barbe, and he has been talking about the great boom to the tourist industry that would accrue were this park to be established immediately. We have five or six hundred jobs. Mr. Speaker, we have \$25 million a year going to pour in to the west coast. The hon. gentleman's bed-fellow has said it. His strange, political bed-fellow.

MR. MYRDEN: Meaning Mr. Marshall

MR. CALLAHAN: And Mr. Speaker, it is useful to look at the basis for those statements, and the basis for them, although there has been no attribution I think, but it is pretty clear, another little bit of pledgorism, the basis is an observation of the Royal Commission which indicated that while there were 62 million living within a 1,200 mile radius of Port aux Basques, our share necessarily of that traffic would be very, very modest. Now that was

MR. CALLAHAN:

that was switched around, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that there were 62 million people in the area and if only we could get two-per-cent of them we would take in, rake in, 25 million. The point of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the Royal Commission did not say that in the first instance and then in the second instance the reference to 25 million is taken completely out of context and bears absolutely no relationship to the tourist industry or national parks in this country or in this Province. So we have, the hon. gentleman has been talking about illusions, we have the great delusion. People on the North coast of this Province have been led to believe that if only the stupid Government, Mr. Speaker, would allow the Government of Canada to take 600 square miles of our land, put a fence around it, that that in itself would return to the Province between 500 and 600 jobs and to the West Coast \$25. million a year. How foolish, Mr. Speaker. Talk about tripe, Mr. Speaker, tripe and trash.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But cruelly, cruelly deceptive, an utter cruelty.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman does not agree with that.

MR. MYRDEN: No, I do not agree with that.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. member does not agree with that. He thinks the people should be delayed.

MR. WINSOR: If there were fast boat service, Mr. Speaker, we would do far better. The same as they do in P.E.I..

MR. WINSOR: How fast is fast?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have indicated in this paper, Mr. Speaker, we would need to move twelve times as many people, and we would need to move them in a period of about two and a-half months. instead of twelve months. P.E.I. does it, Mr. Speaker, because you can do it in forty minutes or less. The question is, what do we do with the people when you close off the resources to them and twenty or thirty years time when you are getting two million people a year, that is the question? All you have to do is look at the development in the tourist industry in the other Atlantic Provinces to see how long it has taken to develop, despite how close they are, despite the fact they could come up from the States on a-day basis. It is nonsense, Mr. Speaker. The people have been deluded, they have been led to believe that the solution of all their problems is to lock up an area of wilderness and say; "this is a national park", put in a few roads, put in a few picnic sites and we have the



MR. CALLAHAN:

solution to all the problems of the north coast.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cruel deception.

MR. CALLAHAN: We are told, Mr. Speaker, that for every 10,000 people who visit a park, and this is in support of Gros Morne, for every 10,000 people the return is the equivalent of one hundred jobs. If that were true, if it were true, we would have a very very comfortable situation in this Province.

MR. CROSBIE: Who made that statement?

MR. CALLAHAN: The statement has been made, it has been published.

MR. CROSBIE: By whom?

MR. CALLAHAN: It has been published, Mr. Speaker, and the reference is in the White Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the source?

MR. CALLAHAN: The reference is in the White Paper the hon. gentleman says he read, he apparently did not read it very well, so I leave him to go and find it.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the source?

MR. CALLAHAN: The source is in the White Paper. It is in the paper.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that for every 10,000 persons who visit a park the thrust into the economy is one hundred jobs, or its equivalent. If that is so, Mr. Speaker, if the contention were correct, if the contention that national parks in the Maritimes are responsible for an input into the economy equivalent to 326,000 jobs in the Maritimes, this is the kind of nonsense the hon. gentleman and his friends and his associates have been pouring out. They talk today, Mr. Speaker, about blackmail. The blackmail has been coming from over there and the attempt has been to blackmail this Government, not the Federal Government.

MR. CROSBIE: Shame.

MR. CALLAHAN: Into making a deal, Mr. Speaker, that would be highly disadvantageous to this Province. And it is continuing today. The hon. gentlemen say they have not been given any information. The information was tabled yesterday, and they cannot complain that they have not got it. And today again, Mr. Speaker, we have the cries that we have not got the information. Well, it is there, Sir. It has taken some time and some effort to compile it and hon. gentlemen, apparently, have not even read it, and they persist in the attempt to blackmail this Government, by this

Resolution and otherwise.

MR. MYRDEN: Ah! Come on!

MR. CALLAHAN: Into a deal with the Government of Canada that would leave this Province, as I said, at a grave disadvantage in respect or vis-a-vis or in comparison with other Provinces and in the terms of the resources that would be removed from the use of the people of the coast.

It is interesting, Sir, that one of the concerns that I have been waiting, and I waited for some time this afternoon for the hon. gentleman to voice it and he finally did, he made a brief reference, he talked about jobs on the coast - I should think, Mr. Speaker, that as the member for that district his primary concern, if not his sole concern, would be for the people, how much compensation they will get for their homes, how much help they will get to relocate, what they will do between the time that logging is suspended or the landing of fish upon the coast is suspended or they are not allowed to hunt any more in that area or plant their gardens or guide or cater to tourists? What are the people going to do, Mr. Speaker, from the time that those activities are suspended to the time that this great tourist industry arises and starts to re-employ them? And how many of them?

MR. MYRDEN: Go to work at Come-By-Chance.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman might be surprised. It is a very good thing we have a Come by Chance where hon. gentlemen are concerned.

MR. GROSBE: Big oil wells.

MR. CALLAHAN: The point is, Mr. Speaker, what do the people do in the meantime? Do they go on welfare that the hon. gentleman says does not exist in Sally's Cove. All right, but how long, how long will it not exist? If they lose a livelihood tomorrow, if the place is closed up and they are told they have to move, what happens then?

MR. MYRDEN: You have had the last three years to plan for this.

MR. CALLAHAN: So, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have been doing and that is why hon. gentleman opposite have been on my back and trying to blackmail this Government to stop the planning. Now they say, "why have you not been planning?" We have been planning, Mr. Speaker, and that is why this document is here today.

MR. MYRDEN: But you were ready to sign it half a dozen times.

MR. CALLAHAN: We will sign it and tell the hon. gentleman this; if the telephone should ring now and the minister should say we accept this program

MR. CALLAHAN:

in principle and substantial detail, I think I can fairly say on behalf of the Government this minute we would sign it tomorrow morning or tonight or as soon as they want it signed.

MR. MYRDEN: I thought you had it signed already.

MR. CALLAHAN: But that, that is because we have taken the time to look at it, we have taken the time to work it out, we have taken the time to do the economics of it and see what the real benefits are and now we know, and we know that the real benefit is about one hundred jobs.

MR. MYRDEN: You did not inform the public every step of the way?

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the hon. gentleman's opinion.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have done the research and the planning. We know what we are talking about and we are not prepared to accept a proposal or the force of this Resolution which would require us to proceed to sign an agreement to establish another wilderness park, to put around 600 square miles of our territory a fence, and say; "There is salvation". Because, Mr. Speaker, there is not salvation.

Hon. gentlemen may bleat and bawl about it but it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that the best estimate we have been able to come to is that the employment associated with that park, translated into full-time jobs, would amount to about 100 jobs, which might be 300 jobs, part-time, or might be 600 jobs, part-time, but that would be very, very part-time. We have the figures, Mr. Speaker. They are here. They are not my figures. They are not this Government's figures. They are the information supplied to us by the National Parks Branch. -

If hon. gentlemen will refer to page 11 of the twenty questions concerning Gros Morne Park, they will see what the employment is across the country. And the best you can get is Banff, which is the biggest and most famous, I suppose. At least it vies with Gasper. Mr. Speaker, what it comes down to is, across the country a total of 2,100 full-time job equivalents. As I say, that might be 4,000 or 5,000 part-time jobs. That is throughout the whole system, Mr. Speaker, in every Province, in the Federal Service, in Ottawa and in the Regions, engineers, men picking up papers, clerks, stenographers, right up to the Director of National Parks, 2,100 full-time jobs. Now does anyone seriously suggest, and it has been seriously suggested that all we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is sign the agreement, turn

MR. CALLAHAN:

over the land and there will be 500 or 600 jobs immediately in that area or alternately that we will get one hundred jobs for every 10,000 visitors which in the case of Terra Nova would be about 3,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, in Bonavista Bay today. The equivalent of 3,000 jobs as a result of Terra Nova Park and the hon. gentleman who wrote that, hon. or otherwise, indicated that the people of Bonavista Bay would certainly agree that Terra Nova had been a great thing, it had solved the problems of Bonavista Bay.

Mr. Speaker, the figures made up on the basis of one hundred men, or a hundred jobs equivalent for every 9,615 visitors, so we call it 10,000. One hundred to 10,000 . 307,000 visitors, 3,000 jobs

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pretty good, that is the way to get Newfoundland going, get lots of parks. We should make the whole Province a park and there will be no unemployment.

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CALLAHAN: That is the answer, Mr. Speaker.

It goes further than that, of course, if one wishes to dissect the figures and really consider what they mean. If it is true, as has been claimed, that every visitor to a national park spends between twenty-five dollars and forty dollars, which means that every family of four, on every visit, spend \$160, you will find that every one of those full-time jobs is responsible for a unit output of value, if you carry the equation along, of \$400,000, per man, per season. It would mean to say that every full-time job in that park was turning out \$400,000 worth of value into the economy in two and a-half months. Mr. Speaker, if we can achieve that rate of economy there is no problem with Canada -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this as it is in all the other parks across Canada?

MR. CALLAHAN: This is the equivalent. This is the equation that we are told will apply if we develop a park at Bonne Bay, a wilderness park.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the theory or not the theory actually but on the basis of the strong indication that the hon. gentleman had not really read nor absorbed some of the information, much of the information in the document, may I remind the House.

I remind the House, Sir, that the Gros Morne Park in size will be the biggest national park east of Manitoba. It will also be by far the biggest national park created in more than forty years in Canada, and only the great parks in the West; particularly Wood Buffalo, the great wilderness park and Jasper and Banff, Prince Albert, Riding Mountain, all of which are huge mountain wildernesses. Only those parks, Mr. Speaker, will be bigger than Gros Morne and no other will be as big. I may be asked why there have been no major national parks created in forty years? Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we can go further and ask why there are no national parks in the province of Quebec and why the total national park area in the province of Ontario is about twelve square miles?

MR. SMALLWOOD: National.

MR. CALLAHAN: National Park, altogether twelve square miles in the province of Ontario.

MR. SMALLWOOD: National Parks.

MR. CALLAHAN: By the way, Mr. Speaker, there are Provincial Parks. They have some small ones and some major ones and in some majors; particularly Algonquin, which is a very famous park, there is incidentally resource processing and resource use. There is certainly timber use.

Mr. Speaker, here perhaps is a revealing piece of information from the Globe and Mail on the 8 January, this year. The story indicates that Mr. Rene Brunelle, Minister of Lands and Forests for Ontario is negotiating with Mr. Chretien, the hon. John Chretien, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development of the Government of Canada, to establish a major national park in Ontario.

The story says in the second paragraph: "unlike other provinces, Ontario has no national park of appreciable size and previous attempts to reach Federal-Provincial agreement bogged down because of two major differences. Ottawa has traditionally insisted that Ontario pay the full cost of acquiring the park land. Ontario in turn has balked, over the thought of turning over to the Federal Government potentially valuable mineral and timber resources in a park site."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is rich Ontario.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, we are so well of down here that we can afford to talk about, give it up, hand it over; do not ask questions, do not try

to bargain, it is none of your business - the Government of Canada will decide what the park is going to be like and what is going to go in it and what is going to be provided. That is what we have been advised, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. gentleman on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, either we have been so advised or the newspapers are obviously are liars, newspaper reporters are liars.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that it is none of our business, that we have no right to bargain, that we should not argue, that we should crawl into our own little quiet corner and be quiet and let the Federal Government take what it wants for park purposes. The Government of Ontario does not say that, Mr. Speaker. There is another reference in the Globe and Mail on the 31 January: "Ontario by this time appears to have agreed in principle to a new national park and an extension to a present one." The announcement has not been made yet at this point. Again the story says that Ontario ranks behind all other provinces except Prince Edward Island in space devoted to national parks. This is because unlike most other provinces, Ontario has been unwilling to turn over land with mineral or timber resources to the Federal Government. Another problem for the province has been Ottawa's traditional insistence that provinces pay the full cost of land acquisition. Mr. Speaker, I say again that we are so well off and so rich - we are so much better off than Ontario that we can afford to play fast and loose with the resource areas that we have in this Province.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, and it is a very valid one. It has been raised here today. It has been raised on the radio. It has been raised in the newspaper and that is our argument, this Government's argument that if a national park area and the resources it contains is going to be turned over for a national purpose, then the nation should bear the cost and this has been ridiculed and "pooh-poohed", Mr. Speaker, as a silly argument - we are going to ask Ottawa for the money, and they are not going to give it and we wish they would, but they will not. We have heard it again today. The Government of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, does not mind telling the Government of Canada that it should pay for lands and rights it desires for national purposes nor indeed does the Government of British



Columbia and it may interest the House to know that during the so called delay on the Bonne Bay Park, we have reached an agreement in principle with the Federal Government, that we should not lose the benefit in this Province of what may be provided as an advantage to other provinces, and since they are in fact paying that poor province of British Columbia large amounts of money towards the acquisition of lands for a national park, that perhaps they might just consider paying over some to us as well.

Mr. Speaker, I say that if the Government of Canada are prepared to compensate the Government of British Columbia, then how much more should we go and seek compensation? British Columbia, as the other provinces, has gotten the various benefits, the various programs for the provision at Federal expense of facilities in and in connection with national parks all down through the years. Our misfortune is that we lost the eighty-five years during which all these things were done and now we are being asked not to try to recover them. A deal can be made and you can bargain, and should. There has been alot of talk, Mr. Speaker, about how the Government of Canada set the rules and if they say, this is the way it is, that is the last word. We have been told that we have to hand over the land. It has to be vested in the Government of Canada in their ownership and for that purpose we have to obtain the land, pay the cost of it and hand it over to them unencumbered forever.

Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting for the House again to know that in the Province of Quebec, the Federal Government are going to get into park development on the Gaspé Peninsula, and they are going to foot the bill. They are going to build the roads and put in facilities. But, Mr. Speaker, they will not own the land. Now we have heard a lot of that from the hon. gentleman from St. Barbe South particularly, and again his side-kick, the hon. gentleman who sits in another place.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a provincial park in the Province of Quebec, on the Gaspé Peninsula, the Forillon Provincial Park is being leased to the Government of Canada who will put in the money, who will put in the facilities and then later on hand it back to Quebec and why? Because, Mr. Speaker, Quebec like Ontario refuses to give its territories over to the Government of Canada and lock up the resources in them. We are asked to do it. It is demanded that we do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him this question? Is he aware that we would not and we flatly refuse point blank to give the Government of Canada the land where Terra Nova National Park is now? We refuse point blank to give them that land except on two conditions that we laid down and they accepted. One that the annual growth of timber, growing on that park would be cut at the Newfoundland Government's direction for a third pulp and paper mill, if it should and two that they build the Trans Canada Highway right through it and pave it. We made those two conditions and they accepted them and carried them out. But we are not allowed to make conditions for this one on the West coast?

MR. CALLAHAN: What has been suggested, Sir, if the hon. member for Humber East will open his ears and listen? What has been suggested is that we have no right to bargain, that the Government of Canada are going to make the decisions and we have nothing to say and this has been suggested time and time and time again and these are some of the clippings to prove it.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite so that the sustained yield growth of timber in the Terra Nova National Park may be harvested at the discretion of this Government and the highway was a consideration.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only at the discretion of this Government provided this Government says it is for the third pulp and paper mill. We have no other discretion. It must be for the third - this is in writing.

MR. CALLAHAN: I believe, too, that there are, as I remember the agreement, there are areas, additional areas which may be added and there is also reference to waterpower. Conditions can be made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These were letters from the Prime Minister of Canada to me and from me to the Prime Minister of Canada, the law of Canada today. The first national park in Canada where the Government of the Province laid down terms and conditions and the Government of Canada accepted. Mr. Pickersgill and I had the one and only row of our lives over that. I stood firm and I won. John LaSage was the Minister of Northern Lands at that time. That was as much as we could get and that was pretty good what we got.

MR. SPEAKER: There are no less than four speakers taking part in the debate right now.

MR. CALLAHAN: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think the case is clear. I think the case is proof that you can negotiate, that you can make a deal, that you

can get a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, there have been no ultimatums. I resent that. There have been no ultimatums. The Government of Canada were delivered and I will say it again, perhaps later, the document which the hon. gentleman read through so avidly and commented on was prepared primarily for the eyes of the Government of Canada. Most of us know what the story is with Bonne Bay and Gros Morne, Mr. Speaker. It is no secret. We know what

MR. CALLAHAN: what we want. We know what we want to do. The hon. gentleman who spoke prior to me said there is now here that has been suggested over the years. Some of the things that he referred to were indeed suggested by him, and some by the University, some by our own people, long before the hon. gentleman ever suggested it. But Mr. Speaker, let me say this too, that when the hon. gentleman sits over there and points out that these things are not new, that they have been suggested time and time again, he sounds a little sick when he follows that up a few minutes later and says that we will not listen to the people.

As he said, as he said on the radio last night, he said on the radio this morning, our ears are closed Mr. Speaker, to the desires of the people, but he gets up here this afternoon and tells us that all we have done is stolen the ideas of ARDA, the ideas that he has put before the House, the ideas that other people have had. So I hope he will recognize Mr. Speaker, that we have not had our ears closed, that we have been listening.

MR. MYRDEN: Will the hon. minister permit a question Mr. Speaker, just one short question? And this has been confirmed by the way. This was in 1958 I believe that they started Terra Nova Park. At that time they did give the rights to the Federal Park at Terra Nova with those timber concessions. And with the waterpower, and with other things in 1958. And yet when they started to negotiate in 1964, and that is when it started for this new Gros Morn - yes I am talking about two parks. Six years later and right up to now there has been no mention of why we have negotiated back and forth, and I would like to know why 1964 right up to now, nobody has known that all this stuff was being negotiated on. It is a big secret.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is how negotiations are done. That is how negotiations are done.

MR. CALLAHAN: The answer is very simple.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer will be seen shortly. The hon. gentleman will not like it. He will not like it. He will not like it. No one from that corner that way will like it. We are hard to beat. We are hard to beat.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen surely will have their chance. If I may reply to that curious question Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked. It is a very curious question. Again obviously, he has not read the paper. The paper was put before the House Mr. Speaker, so the House would know what the answers to many questions are. And that question is answered. And the

April 8, 1970

Tapa #393

Page 2

simple simple answer is this, that originally, and I referred to this earlier this afternoon. Originally we were talking in terms of about twenty square miles, and then it escalated to about 140 square miles. And we were still talking about a provincial park, and when we made the proposal to the Government of Canada in 1965 Mr. Speaker, because it was officially made in 1965 and not 1964, the area was still 140 square miles, and there were very few problems with the area in terms of rights of any kind, very few.

But Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada looked at it and came back and said, 140 square miles we are not interested in, we want 800 square miles or 840 square miles. So in one fell swoop the thing had escalated between letters, between correspondence six or seven times, and this made the thing vastly more complex, brought in a great wide area, brought in more people who had to be relocated, more rights. And some of these rights that we hear about Mr. Speaker, go back to the 1890's when a certain company was paid with lands for building the railway. These are some of the rights we are talking about, and now we are asked to just take them away.

But the point is Mr. Speaker, that the negotiations became extremely complex in 1966, and particularly more complex a year and a half later, when Dr. Pruitt was a great man in his field, but let him stick in his own field. Let him be an ecologist. Let me him try not to play politics. Let him not try to be a highways engineer. Let him stay out of the particular field of wildlife management, then he probably is very good, and very highly regarded in his field.

He is the same gentleman Mr. Speaker, who recently wrote a diatribe for the Canadian Society of Zoologists, and virtually every statement in it is wrong, when he is outside his own field. Well Mr. Speaker, when Dr. Pruitt made his recommendation, he talked in terms Mr. Speaker, about an area, double the area which the Federal Government latterly sought, which itself was six or seven times the area originally offered. So these are where the problems came, in these escalations of territory, because it brought in so many more people and so many more considerations. And in the first instance, we probably we not have had terribly much to worry about. But when you start talking about uprooting Mr. Speaker, 1500 people and their homes and their properties, and the schools and churches and everything else that these communities have, and the compensation that is required to be paid

April 8, 1970

Tape #393

Page 3

In one form or another, you are talking about rather a large consideration. And every time that area jumped the size of the consideration increased.

MR. CROSBIE: May I interrupt the hon. minister for a few moments? I have a Motion I want to make as Your Honour knows,

MR. CALLAHAN: That is out of order Mr. Speaker surely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. minister has the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West has given notice that he has a Motion regarding the adjournment of the debate to move at 6 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He can only move that when he gets the floor, and he cannot get the floor when someone already has it.

MR. CROSBIE: I refer to Your Honour and the hon. gentleman opposite to the fact that Mr. Curtis as hon. President of the Council had been allowed to make these Motions during the debates twice earlier in this Session, and as the hon. Speaker knows, the Government is attempting to choke off debate here on this private members day today. So we do not accept the hon. Premier's interjection.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. If I may continue Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have said that if the hon. member has given notice that he intends to move at the hour of adjournment 6 o'clock that this House do not adjourn.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No one with the exception of the hon. member who has the floor, no one may speak except with his permission. No one can get up in the middle of another member's speech and give notice of a Motion. There is a Motion before the Chair Mr. Speaker. The only other one that is allowable is a motion to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member yields and gives him the opportunity.

MR. CALLAHAN: I have not yielded Mr. Speaker. I told the hon. gentleman I would yield if he had a question. And if he has not a question, I do not yield.

Now Mr. Speaker, to get back.

MR. WELLS: Sir, would you inform the House as to whether or not the hon. gentleman's Motion is concerning adjournment, and is a proper Motion at any time according to our rules, is the Motion concerning the time of adjournment of the House, and that may be made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order, a Motion to adjourn

MR. WELLS: I am making a point of order and if the Premier would have the



courtesy to keep still until I have it made, then he can express his opinion on it. As your Honour knows, and I would ask your Honour to give the House a ruling on this, the motion the hon. gentleman intends to make is a motion concerning the time of adjournment on this particular day of the House and that motion is in order. I submit to your Honour at any time and now is the proper time to make it, when there is only a few minutes left. As the hon. member said that the President of the Council has made it on several occasions.

Now this is an established precedent that the Premier so often quoted yesterday - 138 years of it. "What is sauce for the goose has got to be sauce for the gander."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on this Point of Order, if I may be permitted? It is a well known fact that a motion to adjourn is always in order and is not debatable. This is a well known fact. I did not make this rule. This is a well known rule. A motion to adjourn may be made at any time and is not debatable, but must be put. But what I understand is that the hon. gentleman proposes to make a motion not to adjourn, which is another matter altogether. It is a motion not to adjourn. A motion to adjourn is in order, but even it must be put without debate.

MR. WELLS: A motion to adjourn at a later hour.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the Government are trying contemptibly to cut off debate on private members' day at 6:00 p.m. As your Honour well knows, we wish to move that this House not adjourn at 6:00 p.m. today, but resume at 3:00 p.m., as has been the course and the custom since this House opened at the insistence of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is to the Point of Order the hon. gentleman is speaking?

MR. CROSBIE: This is to the Point of Order. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What Point of Order is he speaking?

MR. CROSBIE: This is to the Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. President of the Council has been allowed twice before in this session to move that. But today the hon. Premier wants to stop this debate on the Bonne Bay Park. He wants to stop the private members from continuing until 11:00 p.m. tonight on private members' day - a contemptible, bullying act of a vast majority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this in order?

MR. CROSSER:    That is what this Point of Order is about.

MR. SPEAKER:    At 6:00 p.m. we can put the motion to adjourn at a later date  
and it is as simple as that, when I leave the Chair.

MR. CALLAHAN:    Mr. Speaker, may I continue.

MR. SPEAKER:    Yes.

MR. CALLAHAN:    I do not know where I was. I will try to pick it up again.  
May be that was the intent, Mr. Speaker, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, we did not, on this side, ask for this debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:    Order please. Will the hon. member continue uninterrupted?

The resolution came

MR. SPEAKER: Uninterrupted

MR. CALLAHAN: The resolution came from the other side, are they now objecting to our debating it?

MR. CROSBIE: You will not let us debate it tonight

MR. CALLAHAN: I will debate it Mr. Speaker as long as I have something to say, and that could be a week.

MR. CROSBIE: Well let us and I come back tonight

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, will this interruption cease

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, Doctor Pruitt made a report to the Canadian Wildlife Service, the Canadian Wildlife Service being an arm of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which also is responsible for National parks. Doctor Pruitt's report dealing with animal species and habitats recommended that the total park area now be increased from what the Federal Government had asked previously, and may I say by the way Mr. Speaker, we have never rejected as such, as the hon. gentleman opposite said earlier, I think he said that we offered, here is what he said Mr. Speaker, I remember it clearly because I have heard it before, that we offered a certain territory that the Federal Government came back and said "no this is what we want" and that we rejected it. We have rejected nothing Mr. Speaker. What happened was that the Federal Government came back and asked for a minimum 480, and a maximum 800 square miles. Anything in that range, and that was where the negotiations took place. It got down to 480 square miles. That was the minimum they would accept, and that was exactly what they got. What they wanted in addition to that was extraneous, it was not necessary to the complete concept as they at that time had formulated.

Subsequently we added on the Trout River Gulch area which brought it up to 600 square miles but it is not so that we ever rejected a Federal proposal as the hon. gentleman stated. What happened was, the Federal said "this is the minimum, this is the maximum." We agreed to the minimum. Well Mr. Speaker, having agreed to the minimum, and the Government of Canada having indicated what they wanted

MR. WELLS: That is not what the gentleman talking said here yesterday

MR. CALLAHAN: Having indicated what they wanted Doctor Pruitt came in with the report which increased the area by double the maximum that the Federal Government had been interested in. That meant something in the order of 1,500 square miles. Then in addition to that, and this is something the hon.

gentleman referred to, to protect Pine Martin which have never been known there has been no evidence in recent times that they are there, arctic hare which exist in at least three other places in the Province. I will agree that perhaps they do not exist in any other national park, but they are not close to extinction as the hon. gentleman indicated. To protect three herds of caribou two of them introduced, Doctor Pruitt not only wanted to expand the park area four times the Federal minimum, or double the Federal maximum, he also wanted to have reserved an eight mile strip of forest down the whole length of the park area, and two great swaths Mr. Speaker, one going down into the head waters of the Humber River, and one going down into the most productive forest in White Bay. Practically down to the coast in Sop's Arm. That would have tied up more timber than I suppose fifty national parks of the kind proposed or worth to us economically.

This is why we talk about value judgements. Can we afford Mr. Speaker, to lock up the timber and close the pulp mills so we can have a national park. I do not think we can unless somebody suggested it in jest I hope. If we close down everything and turn the whole island into a national park, maybe that is what we should do if there was any way of feeding the people in the meantime, maybe it would be a good idea. The reality of it Sir is that we cannot do that.

This is where the trouble came, this is why negotiation. Negotiation with the Federal Government, negotiation with the rightful owners of properties and the rightful owners of rights in the expanded area, which if it had not

MR. CROSBIE: It should be called, you are afraid to debate this issue today

MR. CALLAHAN: Expanded to a lesser degree. Now there has been a lot of talk Mr. Speaker about (I think it was mentioned here today) about Bowaters and the timber, and about the oil lands at Parson's Pond. Indeed I should refer to a reference in today's Evening Telegram

MR. CROSBIE: Point of Order Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour well knows if the clock goes to six Your Honour automatically leaves the Chair and the House will automatically be adjourned until tomorrow morning.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): According to the rules

MR. CROSBIE: According to the rules. We have been informed Mr. Speaker, by the Government that they will not consent to our request that we sit tonight. I therefore on private members day suggest that we continue this debate tonight. Now has the Government offered that this debate go on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the Point of Order Mr. Speaker, where is the Point of Order?

MR. SPEAKER: I will have a remark to make on this same subject before we have reached the hour of six o'clock.

MR. CROSSIE: Well we will have time to make a motion before Your Honour leaves the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I will make remarks on this in sufficient time to settle this matter I think to everybody's satisfaction.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, In today's Evening Telegram on page one, in the last column, about paragraph six and seven I would think. Paragraph six says "What is important the White paper adds is that resources such as minerals and timber rights should not be locked up forever in a national park unless there is commensurate benefit in return." It goes on to say that " However there is no mention in the White Paper of the four oil concessions adjacent to the boundaries of the park, which were granted to Bison Mineral and Petroleum Limited a subsidiary of Canadian Javelin."

Mr. Speaker, there are two things I want to say about that. One is that these areas were not granted to Bison. These areas in fact were established as fee simple areas to Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation by this House stautorily in the year 1951.

MR. WELLS: That is one of the Crown Corporations

MR. CALLAHAN: That is not the point Mr. Speaker, the point is that these lands were granted to NALCO by this House by statute as fee simple lands. They have not been granted in the sense of a mineral concession to Bison Mineral and Petroleum.

MR. SPEAKER: We find ourselves now in a most peculiar and if I might say certain delicate situation regarding adjournment of the House. If we follow the rules correctly and technically and to the very point, when it becomes six o'clock on Wednesday the Speaker leaves the Chair and he resumes the Chair at three on the following Thursday. Now as has been pointed out, in the past I am bound by the rules, and at six o'clock I leave the Chair until three the following day, that is the rule. On the other hand, we have had during a Wednesday sitting on a couple of occasions we have had an hon. minister moving that we do not adjourn at six o'clock, but continue on at eight.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but not while a member was speaking

MR. SPEAKER: Only when an hon. member yielded and gave him the floor, or he watched his opportunity during the time to the put the motion after some hon. member had resumed his seat. If the hon. member has not yielded the floor to anybody to make a motion he has to resume his speech, and it is now close to six o'clock and I now find myself in this position. But, I would for the equity of it, for the reasonableness of it as I see it, I would be prepared, but I can only put a motion before the House that we resume at eight o'clock if I have the consent, and the person speaking would yield and I have the consent of the members of the House to put this particular motion. This is the situation in which I find myself. It is six o'clock and I have to leave the Chair until, unless I get the agreement of the House to put a motion regarding the resuming of sittings at eight o'clock. I cannot put the motion unless I have the consent of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is six o'clock now Mr. Speaker

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister has not yielded

MR. CROSBIE: I submit Mr. Speaker

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of Order, I will not

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of Order Mr. Speaker, I was out meeting with the hon. the Minister of Health about this question when the last opportunity came up to make a motion here before the hon. minister stood up to speak. When the hon. the President of the Council made his motions earlier, he was dealing with gentlemen who were prepared to be decent on this side of the House, and who gave him the right to do it

MR. SPEAKER: Yes

MR. CROSBIE: Now the same thing applies tonight. Here it is private members day Mr. Speaker, the Government has forced us to meet every night

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the Point of Order?

MR. CROSBIE: On this Point of Order, on the Point of Privilege, on the Point decency, on a point of common decency that is what this point is. On the point of a bullying majority of a Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is out of order

MR. SPEAKER: I have made my remarks on this, I am forced to leave the Chair until eight unless I have the consent of the hon. members

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until three



MR. SPEAKER: Until three tomorrow afternoon

MR. CROSBIE: I move that the House do not adjourn at six o'clock today

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept the motion because I do not have the consent and this is the rule, I hope all hon. members understand the position in which I find myself. It being now six o'clock I do now leave the Chair and this House stand adjourned until tomorrow at three o'clock.