



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 57**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1970**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, it is with more than usual pleasure, personal pleasure, that I extend a word of welcome today to the students that are in the gallery. Everyday we have students visit us here in the Chamber, everyday I have the pleasure on behalf of the House to extend a word of welcome to them and everyday the Leader of the Opposition joins with me in a word of welcome to these students.

Today I have an exceptionally great pleasure because these are thirty students of grade nine from Bishop Field and they are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Kevin Clarke. Now what gives me the special pleasure is the fact that Bishop Field is my own old school. I attended there for five years as a boarder, I boarded in for five years and I think I can say truthfully that they were the happiest years of my life as a boy. I attended a lot of schools but Bishop Field for five years as a boarder and all around the world today there are men who were my school chums of that time. Some of them are gone, some of them are dead and some were killed in the First War. Two of the greatest men that ever lived at Bishop Field College, Rex Rowsell and Jack. Rex was a teacher, his brother Jack was a senior student, a pupil teacher as they used to call them then, both of them sons of Magistrate Rowsell of Bonavista and both of them killed in sight of each other together in the First of July Drive. They were my very warm friends indeed and that is a long time ago.

Yes, I think the happiest days of my life as a boy were those that were spent at Bishop Field College and I am sure they cannot have as much fun today as we used to have then, I am sure of it. The Minister of Public Works does not believe that they can possibly have as much fun today as we used to have. I am sure they do not do the outrageous things we used to do.

MR. CROSBIE: Jam spoon and everything.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Jam spoon, that was Ralph Wood, the head master, he had a great big wooden jam spoon and you would hold out your hand and jam spoon the big wooden one would fit right into your hand. There was no way to escape it but the late I.J. Samson had something better. He had a big stave of hardwood, stave

MR. SMALLWOOD:

about three inches wide and about two and a half feet long and he would not use the jam spoon. What he would do is get you to bend down over the desk and he would make a little speech, he would say first on the one cheek and bang would come the stave, then he would say then on the next cheek and bang would come the stave again. and he had a regular little liturgy, a little ritual he used to go through. Yes, a very cheeky teacher.

Well, I led two strikes down there at Bishop Field. Once about the food and we wanted more molasses than they were giving us, more molasses and less bread. They were not giving us enough molasses to spread on the bread so I led a strike and we had a fierce and bitter strike. Oliver Twist wanted more too but he was not at Bishop Field. The other strike that I led was because we were gated. We were supposed to go down to St. Thomas's which we did every Sunday morning but Sunday nights we were supposed to go and usually there were no teachers on duty so you would sneak away somewhere else. This Sunday night a teacher did turn up and took down the name of every student that was in the Bishop Field section of St. Thomas's Church and then compared it with the list of those who had passes for the day and discovered that a bunch of us should have been there and were not and we were up and gated for two weeks and I led a strike over that. But those were marvelous times and I am sure they cannot have that kind of fun down there today.

Today at Field they are all serious minded young men. They do not think of anything except their lessons and scholarship and learning and they are serious minded and never give a thought to anything else. We used to think at least half of our lives about sport and athletics and trying to beat St. Bon's in hockey and football. We did not always succeed in fact we did not succeed very often in the years when I was there but we could always try and we had great fun trying to beat St. Bon's. I do not think they give any thought to sport now in Field. It is a pity to see the students now just wrapped up in their studies all the time and never giving a thought to athletics or sport or anything else.

I hope the Leader of the Opposition will welcome them because I believe that Bishop Field is in, is it, well he has one Feildian over there, maybe he

MR. SMALLWOOD:

will be answering, but Bishop Field I believe is in St. John's East, is it or is it in St. John's Centre?

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's East.

MR. SMALLWOOD: St. John's East and there is no member here at the moment for St. John's East so I suppose they will find an old Feildian over there somewhere. I know that the whole House will join in welcoming the fine young Newfoundland lads here today.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and my colleagues on this side of the House it gives me great pleasure to welcome these students from Bishop Field School as it is now known, it used to be Bishop Field College. I think I can claim this right far more than any other member in the House for the simple reason that my grandfather in 1844 was the original old Feildian under Bishop Field. In those days the school was located where Queens College used to be located on Forest Road and he went there under Bishop Field. All of my uncles and cousins went to Bishop Field College throughout the years. One was a Rhode's Scholar in Oxford and a cousin was also a Rhode's Scholar from Bishop Field College. I went there myself for eleven years and while never shining very greatly in scholastic affairs, I see a smile on the face of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, we did shine fairly well in athletics particularly in rugby which I am sorry to say is a game that is now left this Province. It was a rough and ready game in which I was captain of the team and some of my colleagues who are now in the House I think took part in that rough and ready game. It was certainly something that made men out of mice and our political stamina and our ability to take some of the things that we get in this House I attribute to the fact that we played rugby when we were very much younger.

While I was at Bishop Field College the one thing which was engrained in us and I hope that it is still being engrained in these students from Bishop Field is the fact that win or lose you always play the game fairly. This was preached to us day in and day out and it is something that I do not think anybody could ever disassociate from their training at Bishop Field College. It is something which I hope these boys have learned and inwardly digested and that

MR. EARLE:

they will carry all through their lives.

I have great pleasure on behalf of my colleagues in welcoming these boys and I hope that if they stay here this afternoon they may learn something but I hope that they will not learn anything to the detriment of the ideals to which they have been brought up.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the students from Bishop Field College also on behalf of the Liberal Reform group in the House. When I was first a student at Bishop Field myself, Mr. Speaker, our head master was named appropriately Mr. Tanner and he was quite proficient in following the trade his name indicated of tanning but they did not use jam spoons in those days they used large heavy rulers. Well, we dealt with rulers in the old days at Bishop Field and we can deal with rulers today and that is what we are attempting to do on this side of the House. We have a lot of experience in dealing with rulers.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier neglected to mention, his memory is not as good as it used be, that in addition to the Leader of the Opposition the chief of the Liberal Reform group also rises on these occasions to greet the students. I do not like to be forgotten but I am glad to notice that outside the House I am never forgotten. I have not been forgotten today because the CBC dared to have me on the air last night on their regular program on CBC interview with a member of the House of Assembly so I am not altogether forgotten.

I hope that the students who have come here today will see some action in the House, Mr. Speaker. It is private members day and we are going to debate the Bonne Bay Park resolution that we have been attempting to debate for the last few weeks. We hope we will be debating it. However the majority, Mr. Speaker, the students will notice that the majority controls the activities of the House and if the House does what the majority dicates that it must do and as has been pointed out here in recent days minorities are a matter of little concern. It is majorities only that govern these matters so we assume we will have the Bonne Bay Park resolution to debate and I trust they will enjoy the proceedings of the afternoon.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass by being an old feeling along with the Premier, the hon. member from Fortune and the hon. member



MR. CHALKER:

for St. John's West. I thought I was the longest in term of years attending Bishop Field College but my friend from Fortune to had eleven years under his belt. I think both of us started kindergarten with Miss Wells.

MR. EARLE: We were both students.

MR. CHALKER: We were both students, good students. We finished the course, Mr. Speaker. I understand now that the Premier has told the hon. House this afternoon that he led us several strikes down there. Unfortunately all the strikes that I was concerned with were against me with a jam spoon on my hand.

However, my years at Bishop Field College, like the Premier, were probably the most enjoyable of my entire life. I enjoyed every moment of them and I am glad to see in this House this afternoon four old Feildians and I believe there are others, I am not quite sure. There is one I know the hon. member I think from Trinity, Mr. Lane, was an old Feildian and I think at one time in the Cabinet we had if not three possibly four old Feildians at the one time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We were following the principle of the old school time.

MR. CHALKER: That is right. I wish to welcome those students here and say that, probably within another year or so, I attended school myself there, my sons attended it and I hope within another year or so my grandson but that does not mean to say that I am too old. Welcome to this wonderful House.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, before we pass on to another order I would like to rise to what I feel is a matter of privilege of this House and that is with reference to a statement I heard on CBC today with reference to the Premier going on a Province wide network tonight on CJON with some news or a statement on a matter that this House has been trying to discuss for some days and further, and if I got this right, one television station is being denied this report and the members of this House, according to this report he gave in an arrangement made with CJON, are not permitted within in some hours to speak on this very vital subject to give the general public a chance to absorb this statement, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a definite, absolutely definite, offense if you like against democracy, against the members of this House who I think have a perfect right to comment on anything. I feel it is a matter of the privilege

MR. MURPHY:

of the House denying us our right to discuss anything and I feel that it should be within the House and actually I feel it is a form of contempt for the members and the democratic principle in this House of Assembly and I cannot too forcibly, Sir, say my feelings with regard to this absolute, outright contempt for the members of this House that we are not the first to hear a statement on a very, very vital issue that we have been trying to debate for some days. I would like to go on record, Sir, and I am sure many members of this House will agree with me that we feel it is absolute contempt for the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I will say this that the hon. members raises a question of privilege. Even if it were a question of privilege which would come before the House I do not think that we could take notice of it until after it had happened and not call it a breach of privilege before the event.

MR. MURPHY: I will do that tomorrow again.

MR. CROSBIE: On that point of privilege or whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on it also. I was invited last night by the CBC to appear on their program and twice a week on Tuesdays and Thursdays as a member of the House of Assembly. There has been seven members of this hon. House interviewed on that program which is for eight or ten minutes on Here and Now on CBC on Tuesdays and Thursdays. I watched the hon. the Premier there some two weeks ago on that program addressing himself to me with his usual vigor and vim. Last night I was invited to appear on that program and give my view. I was astounded today to hear the Premier protesting that because CBC had had the audacity, the nerve to allow me to appear on their program and express my views on matters which we have not been permitted to discuss in this House that he was going to boycott the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and appear tonight to make a statement on a major issue of Government policy affecting this Province on CJON television alone of the television networks and that he had laid down a condition, I am told had laid down a condition, that no-one else, no opposing point of view was to be allowed to be expressed on CJON television until at least two or three hours after he had spoken. This, Mr. Speaker, is the antipodes of democracy, it is an insult to the rights of members of this House that the Premier is attempting to bully CBC to prevent CBC so CBC will fear to invite on their program other

MR. CROSBIE:

members of this House other than those that agree with the hon. the Premier.

It is a contempt of the rights of individual members of this House and I support what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition have said to the hilt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to what has been said?

MR. SPEAKER: There is no motion before the Chair. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition raised it I believe as a point of privilege and I said then that the time to raise the point of privilege is not on something that is expected to happen in the future but after it has happened then the question will be decided whether it is a breach of privilege or not. Will the hon. the Premier go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman who just spoke said that I had laid down conditions to CJON and then he named the conditions that I am supposed to have laid down namely that no comment on my statement was to be made for several hours after I had made the statement. There is not one syllable of truth in that allegation, not one syllable. It is untrue.

MR. ROBERTS: I may make a statement on behalf of the Government with respect to the matter which the gentlemen opposite apparently feel it will be dealt only with by the Premier in his statement tonight on behalf of the Government. Late last night, Sir, I was approached by Mr. Larry Dobbin representing the union locals who negotiate for some of the employees, some not all, some of the employees at hospitals in Twillingate, Grand Falls and Corner Brook. Mr. Dobbin knowing of our very deep concern with the treat of strikes of these hospitals asked if he and some of his associates could meet the Government to discuss the situation. I told him, Sir, that I



MR. ROBERTS: I told him Sir, that I would be glad to explore any avenues that might prevent the disruption of hospital services in this Province. I added, that any such meetings would have to involve representatives from all the employees and of all the employers concerned. I took this position Sir because it is obvious the threat of disruption of hospital services in Newfoundland and Labrador is not confined to possible action by employees at Twillingate, the Notre Dame Memorial Hospital, Grand Falls, the Central Newfoundland Hospital, and at Corner Brook, the Western Memorial Hospital. But that threat has been broadened because <sup>of</sup> the wage demands that have been made in recent days by representatives of various pari-medical personnel, and in particular the X-ray technologists and the laboratory technologists.

Accordingly, Sir, the Government have authorized me to call a meeting of all concerned, this will include representatives of all the employers concerned, some of whom are boards of individual hospitals, in addition of course to the Government themselves, as we are the largest single employer of hospital employees in this Province, and the Newfoundland Hospital Association again on the employers side, as some boards might ask that association to represent them. From the employees side invitations will be extended to the three Canadian Union of Public Employees Locals concerned, to the Newfoundland Government Employees Association, who represent most of the employees in Government operated hospitals, to the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland and Labrador, to the organizations representing laboratory and x-ray technologists, and the representatives of any other organized groups of employees in hospitals who might wish to attend.

The purpose of the meeting, Mr. Speaker, will be to review the situations that now exist, and to explore means <sup>of</sup> resolving of a dispute. The meeting will be held as quickly as possible, but I will expect it will be a day or so before all concerned can be gathered together.

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. R. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, if I may Sir I beg to present a petition from the residents in the town of Bonavista, the oldest town in North America, regardless of what anybody else might say. This petition, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not much older than St. John's.

MR. BARBOUR: A little older. Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 942 residents. And Sir the pray<sup>of</sup> of this petition, if I might quote, we the

MR. BARBOUR: Residents of Bonavista, Newfoundland do strongly protest the action of the Bonavista Trinity Placentia Integrated School Board in proposing that this area be made a school tax area. We feel, Sir, that is the imposition of further taxes on the people of this area which at best can only boost a short seasonal employment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is not only unthinkable, but unbearable in our opinion the above mentioned proposals were made to the Government without, and I repeat, without any consideration to prevailing economic conditions, burdens already borne by the majority of our people who are in extremely low income tax brackets.

Mr. Speaker, the people who live in the town of Bonavista are ninety-nine percent fishermen. There are thirteen long liners, 105 small fishing boats. And the livelihood, the families depend on the fishery. There are few who get some seasonal work in construction, but both construction, and the fishery are just seasonal.

Therefore, Sir, we think because of the low income this school tax that is now to be imposed upon the people is unjust, and unfair. And the people are not satisfied. In addition to this petition, really a thousand names there are other petitions being presented to the Council of Bonavista. But what the people are so mad about is this, why should they come to the Government first until they first went to the people of Bonavista and reason the matter out with them? They did not do this. And I am going to tell you right here now, Sir, so far as the people are concerned they are not going to pay this taxes I can assure you that. There are 1200 children going to the schools in Bonavista, there are two high schools, there are several elementary schools, there is a large number of teachers, the people do not mind paying the fee of \$3 per month but, Sir, they just cannot be taxed improperly to pay this school tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this petition with all my energy, with my whole heart, my soul and body, and I ask the department concerned that they give serious consideration to this petition. I also ask, Sir, that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. DR. J. M. MCGRATH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the settlement of Mall's Bay in St. Mary's Bay, which reads as follows, it is signed by practically every householder in that settlement. "Due to circumstances existing in our community in which no communication by telephone is possible, we the undersigned residents of Mall Bay, St. Mary's Bay request that action be taken immediately to remedy this situation by having a telephone system extended to include our settlement."

Now, I am aware Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter outside the administrative jurisdiction of the Provincial Government. But it is a very, very important situation, this is a fishing community and outside communication is very often a matter of great economic importance, plus the fact of course, to get in touch with medical aids in cases of emergencies is also a matter of grave concern to the community.

And I am hoping perhaps while this does not, as I say this is not a direct responsibility or come under the authority of the Province, that it might perhaps be referred to the Minister of Community and Social Development, who might perhaps get in touch with his confrere in the Federal Government and perhaps get something done about this situation. It is certainly the anomaly today that a small but important fishing community has no outside communication by telephone at all.

And therefore I ask permission to lay this paper on the table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a word or two of support to the hon. member for St. Mary's, it is not that I am intimate with the area, but just because the fact that the hon. member mentioned, these things are sort of beyond our control in this House. But we have heard this on many occasions Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that many members particularly representing smaller outport areas, all the time come with certain requests that are not

MR. MURPHY: within our compass to do, But I feel that when a petition is presented that the whole House should back these things and endorse the hon. member with whatever authorities, and I think they should have the same force and effect as if it pertained to this House in itself. And I would just like to support it for that reason.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I were in the House of Commons and that came there I would support it very ardently. I have to say that if I received a petition from my district and it was on a matter for which I had no responsibility and no minister of the Crown in this Province had any responsibility, I would nonetheless present it to the House and I would support it.

But let us face the reality, the only petition that may properly be presented to this House, the only question that may be asked of any minister is one that has to do with matters for which the minister in question or the Government in generally have administrative responsibilities. We have no responsibility administratively or constitutionally for public wharfs and certain matters for which the Parliament of Canada under the constitution of Canada, the division of powers has responsibility.

I had a visited today from Farther McCarthy and a group from St. Brides, in Placentia Bay, and they told me of a brief that they and other citizens had prepared in favour of a wharf in St. Brides. There is no wharf from Placentia to Branch, that great stretch of shore. One of the most fascinating stretches of scenery that I have ever seen in my life, utterly magnificent, but not a harbour. And so they got up a brief asking for a harbour, they have sent it properly to the Government of Canada through the task force that is now examining the problem of the phase down of Argentina. But they came to me, not thinking for a moment that I had any responsibility or that the member for the district had any responsibility, but you look for help where you can get it. And if you are represented at Ottawa by a member, of whatever party, he is a long distance off, he is along way off, Ottawa is is 1100 miles or 1200 miles away from here, and you go to the man nearest to you, and as the Leader of the Opposition says, it may not be properly brought in here, may be properly speaking, if we are going to be strick about it, it should not be brought in here, but we are all Newfoundlanders and these things

MR. SMALLWOOD: whether the Government of Newfoundland or the Government of Canada do the paying, we want them anyway because they are so badly needed. Now if this is forwarded to Ottawa, it will go forward with my ardent support.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. W. R. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition from the District of Port Au Port. The petition, Mr. Speaker, it appears from the covering letter which was circulated from the Junior Chamber of Commerce Stephenville. And essentially what it asks is that a particular individual contractor, and a food service contractor be granted a new lease, I suppose, on a building at Stephenville on the former Air Force Base for the purpose of operating a nightclub or catering to parties and weddings, and as we might say, "times". I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most essential requirement in the District of Port au Port. But there are quite a number of names on the petition, the covering letter says about 3000, I have not counted them, but I do, as I think I must ask leave Sir to table this petition and ask also that it be referred to the department to which it relates. I am not sure what department that is, but I think in part, it would be the Department of Public Works, which is responsible for the Harmon Corporation, and I suppose also to the Department of Finance, which is responsible for the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. In any event, Sir, I ask that the petition be tabled, and referred to the proper department.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. JOHN C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and support this petition. Like the hon. minister says, it might not be the most important one to come from his district, but I would think that any petition that comes from a member's district would be an important petition to the people who have got the petition up. And in this particular case, I think it is, although a name has only now been mentioned, Mr. Butler, is a gentleman who had I believe a lease from the Harmon Corporation on a nightclub facilities



MR. CROSBIE: out in the Harmon Airforce Base. I think it is Mr. Michael Butler, and he was operating it as a place for catering to private parties, weddings and the like, and I think that since certain events since last fall he has had that concession removed from him, that the lease got cancelled.

MR. CALLAHAN: There is absolutely no connection that there was.

MR. CROSBIE: There is no connection is there?

MR. CALLAHAN: If the hon. gentleman contends,;

MR. CROSBIE: When I am finished speaking, if the hon. minister wants to get up and speak, the hon. gentleman in connection was a supporter of mine in the district of Port au Port in the recent Liberal Leadership Convention.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There will be no interruptions.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And whether there is any connection or not,

MR. CALLAHAN: There is no connection.

MR. CROSBIE: that people in that district certainly feels there is a connection,

MR. CALLAHAN: Because the hon. gentleman .....

MR. CROSBIE: If there is some good reason why he should not continue to carry on his catering activities in that place, then we will be interesting in hearing it.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition, apparently it is a petition signed by some 3000 persons in the Port au Port area, the gentleman in question is a very capable businessman, a very capable cater, and conducts his business well in the Port au Port area, the catering business, a Newfoundlander, and I hope the department to whom it is referred will treat it with a great deal of sympathetic consideration. And that no extraneous consideration of who he might support politically will interfere with the petition made.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, may be I should rise on a point of privilege.

MR. CROSBIE: You can rise on whatever you like.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to sit here and listen to the hon. gentleman impute motives to me, I think it is not only unparliamentary, it is offensive, the hon. gentleman has just imputed, Mr. Speaker, motive

Mr. Callahan: on two occasions, he has referred to extraneous pressures which might be brought as a result of matters that happened last fall. Now Mr. Speaker, if the House wishes to know what the situation is of Mr. Butler's activities to its references made in this petition, I can tell the House, and I can tell the House in detail because I was the one who recommended that Mr. Butler be allowed to carry on those activities in the first place. But that is another story, I am not going to sit here Mr. Speaker and have motives imputed or suggested to me, or to anyone on this side, by the hon. gentleman who is carrying on, I might say, a political vendetta that started last summer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The situation is now that we are at the stage of presenting petitions, we do not want to have a debate on each petition as it arises. I think hon. members have made their points, which have very little to do with the prayer of the petition.

Moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

FURTHER PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to some questions. Question No. 218

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. 218, on the Order Paper of March 10, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West, having to do with the Sea Mining Corporation at Aguathuna. Mr. Speaker, I should say that the Sea Mining Corporation are not required to file production returns to the department. I am advised by the company that they have been producing lime, and magnesium hydroxide, 218, March 10. They have been producing lime and magnesium hydroxide and are currently testing production of refractory magnesium, meaning magnesium to be used in the manufacture of refractory or high heat resistant brick.

(2) I am informed by the company Mr. Speaker, that the plant has not indeed been closed at any time but that part of this operation was suspended for a time last year due to internal damage or the need to conduct internal repairs and also because at the time storage facilities could not contain additional production while they were waiting for their marketing to catch up with their production at that time.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, would he indicate to the House, or does he know how many men and women are employed by Sea Mining at this time; in Newfoundland?

MR. CALLAHAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have that precise information my recollection is that it was to be in the area of about thirty-five, whether that is so I am not entirely certain.

Question No. 311 on the Order Paper of April 8.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on that last one. Have the Government been called upon to honour any guarantees given by reason of Sea Mining being unable economically to handle its own payment?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have no idea Mr. Speaker, this does not relate to my particular responsibilities. I think the question should be directed to the Minister of Finance, by the Order Paper.

Question No. 311 on the Order Paper of April 8, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer Mr. Speaker is no. The account is not required to be submitted before June 1 1970.

Question No. 312: on the Order Paper of April 8 in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. (1) Yes. The Shawinigan Engineering Company Limited of Montreal. James F. MacClaren Limited of Toronto. The Atlantic Development Board. 2. (1) October 1969. (2) Nil. (3) the report is being studied by appropriate departments and officials of the Government and some evidence of implementation will be provided I think in legislation that come before the House in the present session and in the estimates to be considered by the House shortly. 3. This report is in I am not sure now if it is ten or eleven volumes, we have a limited number of copies I will be happy and I had hoped to have a copy of the report today but I do not have it I could not obtain it sufficiently quickly. I will be happy Mr. Speaker to table a copy of the complete report in ten or eleven volumes in the House and to provide another copy in the Legislative Library.

Question No 315: on the Order Paper of April 8, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. I thought I had Mr. Speaker, the complete list of the employees of the Abattoir and I do not seem to have it but I will obtain it and table it.

Question NO. 339: on the Order Paper of April 9, in the name of hon. member for St. John's West. I think Mr. Spaaaker this has to do with pollution, control provisions or the provision for the prevention of pollution at t Come by Chance. I think this information has largely been provided to the House recently by the Shaheen Group and I draw to the attention of the House also the safeguards bhat are provided and are being provided in legislation of the Parliament of Canada, particularly with reference to the delivery and the carriage of petroleum products by sea. There is legislation presently for the Parliament of Canada both new legislation and legislation that is being updated and strengthened and I think that these, this legislation in addition to the safeguards to be built into the plant will provide the protection that is perhaps required.

MR.HICKMAN: What is the answer to the second part?

MR.CALLAHAN: I think the same applies to the second part, the hon. gentleman

refers to the second part of the same question? I think the same applies Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question is very similar to the first part and I might say too that in addition to the fact that there is legislation I think this applies to a further question further on, that there is legislation to come before this House and certain steps have been taken by way of establishing some formal co-operation with the Government of Canada by the appointment of our officials on joint committees add that kind of thing which will provide further protection. I think the second part deals with consultants and we are not at this point at least employing consultants Mr. Speaker, because essentially consultants are not required in terms of the oceanic involvement in this project because the new legislation automatically as was illustrated here the other day will put requirements on the companies and in the second place the process itself and the design of the process will take care of the landwork elements of the operation. I think also there was extensive information given the other day about oil storage tanks. I think the question is essentially answered in these various areas.

MR. CROSBIE: The answer is no, as far as consultants are concerned.

MR. CALLAHAN: If the hon. gentleman takes no to be the answer, the hon. gentleman will be conveying a completely wrong impression of what is being done.

MR. CROSBIE: You have not retained any consultants that is what it asked.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. minister permit a supplementary question? Has the designer or the designers of the Oil Refinery at Come by Chance been given an indication of the type of anti-pollution control that the provincial department, the appropriate department of Government will require and has the minister seen the plans and is he satisfied that the plans contained within them, the anti-pollution control that he is now demanding.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows as I do that the detailed plans we were told here the other day have not yet been drawn. (2) the House in reply to questions from hon. gentleman on the other side was told what some of the plans are in general terms. (3) the Jacobs Engineering people



who were here are advising this Government at the process they are not specifically engaged as consultants in relation to pollution problems and as I have just said Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen take that to mean and purvey the impression that this means that the Government are not concerning themselves with the control, prevention or abatement of pollution in this project, hon. gentlemen will be conveying a completely wrong impression.

The Government of Canada I repeat again will be required to carry out legislation which has been passed and is now before the Parliament of Canada which will very very materially affect this project, both in respect of oceanic areas and terrestrial areas and in respect of waters on the land. In addition to that Mr. Speaker, I have just said that our own legislation is going to be amended or changed or new legislation brought or both and in each case the company will be required or will not do so at its peril will be required to follow the law whether the provincial or the federal law that exists. This assurance obviously was given here the other day, the assurance must be given and the company must in fact perform or it will fail to perform as I said at its peril: In addition to that the Government are being advised by a competent engineering firm in respect of the process and in that regard Mr. Speaker, I think I can tell the House and assure the House that this means the entire process including the discharge of effluent. We have not, and I say this, in the hope that it will not be taken and slaughtered Mr. Speaker, and used to convey a wrong impression we have not engaged specifically a firm of consultants in respect of the possible pollution problems at Come by Chance. The answer to a problem of that nature is not to deal with the pollution Mr. Speaker as the House knows it is to deal with the process and prevent the pollution and this is being done in more areas than one.

MR. COLLINS: A supplementary question Mr. Speaker -

MR. CALLAHAN: I have answered the question Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to point out once again, that there can be supplementary's

obviously, but we cannot start a debate on the answer to a question or on the question itself under the guise of a list of supplementary questions. If any hon. member wishes to ask a supplementary question but we cannot leave the matter open and have another debate on this particular issue.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there is legislation presently before the House of Commons which would require an industry such as the industry which is to be established which would require the oil refinery people to submit detailed plans specifications before they are committed to even start construction. The federal legislation is mainly concerned with pollution of the sea and to what body will the oil refinery people be required to submit plans and specifications to ensure we are being protected in terms of pollution on the land.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, as I have already said I appreciate the hon. gentleman's concern and I am concerned and the Government is concerned. In the first instance we do have excellent reputable engineering advice in respect to the project and all its processings and in the second place we do have legislation now in existence in the Province which will be strengthened and which will be broadened and which will indicate where such plans must be brought. This is being done Mr. Speaker every day at various levels of government. Let me give the House an example: If somebody tomorrow wishes to construct a particular building in the City of St. John's or anywhere else for that matter.. If someone wishes to go out in the country today, and I have signed maybe sixty-five to seventy-five, at least approved sixty-five or seventy-five applications this morning for summer cabins Mr. Speaker which laid down the location how far from a body of water where the sewage disposal must be and all the other details . So it starts even with a summer cabin. Mr. Speaker, various departments of the Government have responsibilities in this regard and it is our intention to bring legislation which will co-ordinate all these activities and all these responsibilities and all these interests and it will be to that place and I do not wish to name it at this time, the

hon. gentleman will appreciate the fact the legislation has not been brought here yet. But Mr. Speaker, there will be, as there is now, but the scope will be broadened, a central authority to which plans of this nature or any nature that require this kind of approval and protection in terms of the public interest will need to be bought and this will be done and I hope that when we get to it from the point of view of legislation action that the House will support what we have in mind.

Mr. Speaker this is not a simple question, the elements of potential danger if you like, fall into several categories the elements of authority fall into several categories of governmental operation and the need is to co-ordinate these authorities in order to satisfactorily deal with the problems and this will be done and it will be done on a broad scope not only in relation to this project but in relation to any project or undertaking that appears to threaten in any way the environments so that we can have the absolute maximum of control.

QUESTION No. 399, on the Order Paper of April 13, standing in the name of the hon. the member for St John's West: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that the make enquiries as to the names of the principal officer of applicant companies or corporations. The names of shareholders generally are not sought, for reason that there could be thousands. The names of principal officers of applicant companies or corporations are sought. The names of shareholders generally are not. The reputations of applicant companies or corporations usually are determined, where it is necessary, Mr. Speaker. Where the reputation or standing is not know, then it is determined.

Question No.400, on the Order Paper of April 13, also in the name of the hon. member for St John's West: Mr. Speaker, this question and the question which follows are two extremely comprehensive questions which I suggest, Your Honour, are not possible to be dealt with in the scope of the question period. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the obligations of

the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation are contained in eleven separate Acts of this Legislature and some fifty agreements made pursuant to those Acts. I think it is just impossible, Sir, to answer the question, considering its scope and its generality, within the scope of the question period.

MR CROSBIE: In respect of Question No.400, the question merely asks; has the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited complied with the requirements of legislation in submitting accounts of its expenditures, and ,if so, are such accounts and expenditures available for inspection?

I mean, what is so complicated about answering that? Either they have submitted their reports and accounts, as required, or have not.

MR SPEAKER: Only a few moments ago I said that we have to have in answers to questions; if the hon. members gives an answer to a question it is not subject to debate nor comment. We can have a supplementary question, if the person who is giving the answer is satisfied to accept it as such and not ask for it as notice, but we cannot have a list of supplementary questions which develop into a debate and we cannot have comment and we should not have comment. The rules say we should not have comment on answers that an hon. member or minister gives. That has been clear and has been repeated a dozen times and it still remains the same.

MR WELLS: M r. Speaker, would you advise members, so that we will know in the future; is it not always in order to correct a misrepresentation? Is not that always correct and in order, to correct a misrepresentation? The hon. minister understood the question one way and the hon. member for St John's West said' no, that is not correct. This is the question. Is not that always in order?

MR SPEAKER: A person may ask a question to have a point which he does not understand clarified, most certainly.

MR CALLAHAN: I am not misrepresenting, Mr. Speaker. I am simply saying that a question which involves, because it necessarily must, every detail of eleven bills and fifty agreements is not a proper matter to try to reply to in a question period. Now that involves everything from whether

the company's vehicles are properly licenced to the current year. I do not know if they are and I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to try to deal with it. The question, I think, is mischievous, and was put there for the very reason that we now see.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there is a complete misrepresentation as to this question. This question, Mr. Speaker. .

MR CALLAHAN: M r. Speaker, I have the floor.

MR SPEAKER Order! Order!

M R CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am speaking here on a point of order.

MR SPEAKER: If the hon. member is on a point of order, let me hear the point of order.

MR CROSBIE: The point of order is that the hon. minister has misrepresented what this question on the Order Paper is. It asks; has a certain corporation complied with legislation submitted before it.

MR SPEAKER: As far as this particular question is concerned the matter is now closed, both the question and the answer.

MR CALLAHAN: The big sook and his side-kick!

Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No.401, on the Order Paper of April 13, standing in the name of the hon. member for St John's West. As I have said; I think the answer must be the same as for the previous question.

Question No.402, again in the name of the hon.member for St John's West: The first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, the answer is that the Department of Fisheries and Forestry of Canada, through the Fisheries Service, have been engaged in monitoring and surveying, for several years, in connection with the Iron Ore Company of Canada operations in Labrador. And I specify the Iron Ore Company of Canada.

In this present year we expect the Department of Fisheries and Forestry of Canada will carry out a further survey to review any changes that have occurred in the sedimentology, the chemistry and the biology of Wabush Lake, in respect of and as a consequence of the disposal of tailings. They want to know whether there has been any change



in the chemical and sedimental and biological conditions and the like. The last survey, as I think I have said, was conducted in 1966. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries and Forestry of Canada do this. Mr. Speaker I am trying to answer the question and if the hon. gentleman will contain himself we will get to the answer, get to the end of it.

HON. W. R. CALLAHAN (Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I refer particularly to the Iron Ore Company of Canada, because in the case of Wabush Mines Limited, by agreement with the Federal Department, they undertook and completed very shortly within three months after operations began in 1955 completed a dyking system which has served to contain their disposed tailings. While the question refers to both companies in the same vein and in the same way, the problem really relates to only one of them. The latest inspection reports of the Federal department concerning the Wabush Mines disposal operation, the latest reports indicate that the disposal is being conducted according to the agreement made in 1955.

Now Mr. Speaker, I could add to that, that very recently there has been a meeting with the Iron Ore Company of Canada dealing with other matters at which this matter again was discussed. Federal Fisheries Department were there as were the University and other agencies and various departments of the Government. The latest report we have is that there have been no, to this time at least, there has been no effect upon fish resources in Wabush Lake. I repeat in order to indicate the significance of that statement. The judgement of the Federal Department and the federal minister, that in fact the fish resources are the first line of defense and the first evidence of any severe effect upon waters - a serious effect upon waters, is noticed in fish life. I think the fact that the monitoring has been going on since 1966 without any major survey, indicates that there perhaps has been no major change in the condition of the lake. But we will find out in detail what the situation is after the new survey is done, which will begin, and perhaps may be even concluded this year.

Now Mr. Speaker, having said that, because that deals really with the responsibility of the Federal Department. Everything that I said a few minutes ago to do with water resources, to do with the Canada Water Act particularly. And with our appointment of officials to a Federal Provincial Committee, has to do again with this particular situation. We have appointed the Deputy Minister of Resources, Mr. G. B. Malone,

Mr. David Mercer of the Economic Branch of the Department of Finance, and Mr. Doane, the acting manager of the Water Authority to be our representatives on a Federal-Provincial Consultative Committee which will have similar representation from the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada will have one Committee, or at least they will have one set of representatives, and these representatives will meet with similar persons from each of the Provinces. And the intent of that is to carry out jointly the provisions of the Canada Water Act, whether it be in respect of purely provincial water, or hopefully pure provincial waters, or making pure provincial waters. Or waters of national significance such as are defined in the Act, or inter-jurisdictional waters defined in the Act. So in all respects Mr. Speaker, the Canada Water Act is very important to this consideration. And as I have just said a few minutes ago, there will be in addition to all that, there will be legislation brought to this House in this Session to deal further with this important matter.

The Government Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second part, are aware of the monitoring and inspection work of the Federal department and are kept advised. And I may say on behalf of the Government that the Government will act on any recommendations deriving from such monitoring inspection and surveys. And we have not had any recommendations to this point, but again, I am referring again to a previous question. The report of MacClaren and Shawinningan to which I referred earlier makes recommendations, and we certainly intend to act on those again to the method that will later be proposed to in the House.

The Government of Canada Mr. Speaker, and this Government are co-operating fully on the implementation of the Water Act, and as I have said, we have appointed officials, and this of course will not apply - the operation of this legislation and anything else we do will not apply only to Labrador - it will apply everywhere in the Province.

Question (405) on the Order Paper of April 13, in the name of the hon.

the member for St. John's West. With respect to the first part Mr. Speaker, the timber royalty clerks in the departmental offices in this building, maintain a ledger in which are recorded details of all cutting permits issued by the department ranging from very small domestic permits to the largest commercial permits, everything, every permit. So that we may maintain only records but also an inventory, and the details of all these permits are contained in the ledger, but I think it would not be accurate Mr. Speaker, to classify this ledger as a public registry. The second part which asks, is it mandatory for any person, firm or corporation having any such rights, licences or grants to advise Government if they are assigned to any other person, firm or corporation. I draw the attention of the House to Section (78) of the Crown Lands Act, the Revised Statutes 1952, Chapter 174 Section(78), which makes it mandatory for assignments of timber licences to be registered in the Registry of Deeds, where a certified copy furnished to the department for the purposes of record.

Question No. (406) on the Order Paper of April 13, in the name of the member for St. John's West -

MR. CROSBIE: Is this ledger open to the public?

MR. CALLAHAN: I am answering (406) now Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am answering (406)

MR. CROSBIE: Is the said ledger open to the public?

MR. CALLAHAN: The answer to question No. (406) Mr. Speaker, is "no."

MR. CROSBIE: Part of the question the minister has not answered.

MR. CALLAHAN: Question No. (466) on the Order Paper of April 17.

MR. HICKMAN: What was the answer you gave to (404)?

MR. CALLAHAN: I really do not know Mr. Speaker, that was a long time ago.

MR. CROSBIE: What is the answer to (406)?

MR. CALLAHAN: (406) is "no," Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: That is a good answer. Short and precise.

MR. CALLAHAN: Question (466) on the Order Paper of April 17.

MR. CROSBIE: You took time to look it up did you?

MR. CALLAHAN: All the time in the world Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: We know that. We know that you are taking lots of time.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is helping. Every time he opens his mouth. No. (466) Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper of April 17, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. This has to do with the Forest Inventory Land Capability project, and the cost in the first instance last year; \$707,142.69. of which \$636,428.43 is to the account of the Government of Canada. And \$70,000 I believe that is correct, I subtracted quickly - \$70,428.43 is to the account of the Province. And the second part, Mr. Speaker, the project is programmed for completion by March 31, 1974. The status of the project in terms of aerial photography the Island of Newfoundland has completed. Labrador is about one-third completed, and the last contracts are being left for plan termination in 1971, depending only on weather. This is very low flying Mr. Speaker, and the weather conditions must be very good, if the photography is to be at all satisfactory. In terms of forest inventory, the Island of Newfoundland, the data is collected. The processing is partly completely for delivery this year. All the data Mr. Speaker, in this eight year program - it concerns it is<sup>a</sup> project to map the forests, all the land, all the wildlife for their various uses, to determine to grade them, to grade the land for various uses, whether for recreation or forestry or whatever. It is a basic management resource planning tool which will be fed completely into computers Mr. Speaker, and ready for instant read out, so the data collected - the data has been collected for the Island in terms of island inventory, and the process is practically completed, and we hope for delivery this year. Map production on the Island for forest inventory is one third completed in draft form, another one-third complete in manuscript and available out of production orders on request. The design has been outlined for Labrador for forest inventory and details are being completed.



We will be into Labrador in a big way this year. Forest Capability on the Island the field work is completed for all but the northern peninsula. The mapping is half completed and is in draft for manuscript form. The Labrador Reconnaissance for Forest Capability is to begin this year. And Wildlife Capability Mr. Speaker, the Island of Newfoundland, the field work is mostly completed, the mapping is one third completed, and is in draft for manuscript, and in Labrador we have begun reconnaissance and that of course will be continued. In terms of Recreation Capability, the Island has been completed in terms of field work, and the mapping is three-quarters done, and in Labrador the reconnaissance has begun and will be carried on in the present year. As I have said Mr. Speaker, this is a very general, but at the same time, a very basic project which is about half way done. It is a eight year, \$6 million project to give us for the first time, and this incidentally was a recommendation of the Kennedy Royal Commission on Forestry. There is an inventory of forest resources being done. It was fortunate I think that by the time we were ready

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order Mr. Speaker. The question is on the Order Paper. Just answer the question. The minister has answered this question, he is now going on to the past history of this and the rest which is not relevant. He has answered the question and I now submit Your Honour that he should pass on the next question.

MR. CALLAHAN: Now Mr. Speaker, I was just concluding that answer by saying for completeness sake that eventually other matters than just forestry came into it and it has turned out to be a very excellent program, and I think it will show its benefits for many many years to come. The question no. (471) on the Order Paper of April 17 - I will have more to say about the ones that are skipped later on maybe next Wednesday. This question Mr. Speaker is in five parts, (471) April 17, in the name of hon. member for St. John's West. How many applications have been received to date for caribou licences for hunting season during the calander year

1970 showing separately a,b and c. How many applications from out of the Province, and how many from residents? The total applications Mr. Speaker, 1313 - from residents 702, from non-residents 611. The second part of the question; how many licences available for hunting in the Province during 1970, showing separately the number available for out of province applicants, as compared with the number available for residents, and of those available how many already issued? Now Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the total that will be available for the entire Province, because the seasons and quotas for Labrador usually are established quite later than for the Island. For the Island the total number of licences, and this quota is fixed by the Wildlife biologists on the basis of census, figures and actual counts, aerial counts. The total number available is 1,175. The number available for out of province applicants is 561. The number available for residents is 614. And I draw the attention of the House Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the resident licences, or at least the number of licences being reserved for residents is slightly in excess of fifty percent, and we try to ensure and indeed we do ensure that the number of caribou licences available to residents never drops below fifty percent. On the other hand we have a very active tourist and catering industry which if we were not to provide sufficient licences, would collapse, along with all the guides and everybody else employed in it.

And virtually all of the non-resident licences are disposed of through the caterers on a quota basis depending on experience and other matters, and we deal very closely with them on this. The last part of the question Mr. Speaker, how many licences already have been issued? Technically speaking, strictly speaking, none. The licences are not issued, actually issued until later in the year, but they have all been reserved. And I make the distinction Mr. Speaker, so that the impression will not in any way be gained by anyone that there still are licences available, they are not. It is simply that the mechanics are distributing the licences themselves - do not provide for them to be sent out until somewhat later in the year. How is it decided which applicants would receive licences, and

if licences were issued on the basis of the date when applications were received, who was in charge of receiving and noting the date? Licences were sold Mr. Speaker, as is normal on a first-come first-serve basis. The usual practice has been that when about half the licences are gone, or a little further on, special pains are taken in the cashier's office, at least this has been the practice in the past. We now do it for every licence application that a date and time-stamp is put on at the cashier's office in the Department of Finance, not in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, so that when the application comes to the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the order of receipt is already established mechanically or electronically, and there can be no undue preference shown. The applications are received in the mail room of this building, go to the cashier, and from there go to the officials of the department who then take over, and actually deal with the application from that point. The fourth part; has any applicant for a caribou licence received more than one licence and, if so, what are the names of those applicants, and how many licences did each receive and what was the reason for their being granted more than one licence? The answer Mr. Speaker, as to whether any applicant received more than one is "no," and therefore the other parts did not arise.

MR. BURGESS: Has the department or the hon. minister received a request from the residents of Cartwright relative to being allowed to hunt caribou in the Mealey Mountain range, and if so, what was the answer?

MR. CALLAHAN: We have had numbers of requests Mr. Speaker, not only from Cartwright but from other areas of Labrador. Not to my knowledge in petition form, but there have been telegrams and letters and my colleague the Minister of Labrador Affairs brought this matter to my attention on a number of occasions. We have some difficulties in Labrador which hopefully this year we will begin to solve. For one thing we have a very good wildlife biologist in Labrador now, and he has already begun work. We will have a special caribou survey I hope undertaken and completed this year. And co-operatively I think with Canadian Wildlife Service in possibly the

Province of Quebec we will get a very first class job done in that respect. The problem until now Mr. Speaker, has been the unreliability of information, which has indicated that the herds are quite small, and to allow an open season would destroy any possibility of the growth of the herds. So we have had to be I am afraid, tough unwillingly. We have had to be tough. It is not that there has not been open seasons in Labrador, there have, but some areas have been restricted

and we have had to turn down requests for an extension of dates. The reason is that over-hunting would have destroyed the already small herds. Our hope is..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you have reason to believe that there has been poaching?

MR. CALLAHAN: I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, there is very good reason to believe that there has been poaching, but on the other hand, and we have had to suggest - we have had to make some suggestions to the magistrates, although being unwilling to intervene that they consider all the factors in many of these cases.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would any poaching that did exist be done by starving people or by sportsmen; comfortable, well-off sportsmen?

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to that is that in one case, the people had very expensive snow machines, very expensive guns and were a long, long way from home and my impression was not that the people were destitute. But, however, the fact of the matter, the basic fact, to answer the hon. gentleman's question is that until we have reliable information that will indicate what the sustained yield or sustained kill from the caribou herd of Labrador can be, then we are very reluctant to have a wide open situation that would result in the herds being lost completely and then we would have to start from scratch and try to reintroduce them and build them up. That would be a long ..

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question? The question is one that has been posed on a number of occasions and that is, with the number of private planes that we presently have in use, do we now have instances where the pilots of such planes actually have licences to guide and if so are they then depriving citizens who are normally and have traditionally been considered guiders for hunting, fishing and so on, are they being deprived in anyway of a living, as a result, to your knowledge?

MR. CALLAHAN: I have no knowledge of that precise situation, Mr. Speaker, but



there are, obviously, companies - I can think of one or two companies, at least, two outfitters, companies of outfitters who do have aircrafts, and I would be surprised if the officials of these companies also are not licenced guides as well as licenced caterers; so it is possible that this kind of thing could happen, but I do not see too much detriment in it. I think the people who fly the aircraft have also corporate responsibilities in many cases, and I think they do not spend all their time, actually, guiding people through the woods, but we do have, and we have had recently a couple of meetings with the caterers and outfitters association, and we will be having more. One of the primary objectors at the moment is to try to nail down some particular rules and regulations that would protect against the kind of situation that might arise, such as my colleague has referred to.

The last part of the question, Mr. Speaker, the fifth part: table the names of all those persons or firms or corporations who have received licences to date, this year.' Well to be technical again, nobody has, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know, if this would serve any useful purpose. We are talking about several hundreds of people. If we do this with caribou licences, I think we should do it with all big game licences and that is about 20,000 people. If we do it with big game, perhaps, we should do it with small game and that is another 20,000 or 25,000 people, and I really do not see..

AN. HON. MEMBER:    It is another quintal of fish altogether.

MR. CALLAHAN:    No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a different quintal of fish altogether. I think the principle is that we table the names of persons who have received licences and if caribou, why not moose and why not partridge and why not anything else?

Now, I think, the implication in the question, Mr. Speaker, is that

certain persons are being favoured and that the licences are not being distributed on an equitable basis, on an even chance basis and if that is the implication, Mr. Speaker, and that is carried through and the names of persons who have licences are published, then, I think, it can only result in these persons being ridiculed or held up to some kind of opprobrium in their communities, and I do not believe that that is a wise thing to do. But I say again, the principle should be, if we are going to embark on this kind of thing, which I am not prepared to recommend to the House, the principle should be that the name of every game licence holder be tabled and that is, as I have said, runs into 40,000 or 50,000 people, at least, names.

MR. CROSBIE: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister is now arguing over whether his refusal to answer the question is a proper refusal or not? I submit that ..

MR. CALLAHAN: Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I have not refused to answer the question. I have answered the question and am giving a reason for the answer.

MR. CROSBIE: If you do not mind, Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet. I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking to a Point of Order.

My Point of Order, the hon. minister is abusing the question period. He is not now answering the question. He is attempting to make an argument as to why his refusal to answer, is correct. That is out of order at this stage in our proceedings.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, I still have answered the question. I have answered the question, Mr Speaker, and given a reason for the answer. The hon. gentleman cannot make more than that of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. minister finished his answer?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to one question here, but so much time has gone by that I am quite happy to wait until another day to give it.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. COLLINS: Before proceeding with Orders of the Day, I have received a fair amount of mail from my own district and other districts from people who are interested in obtaining work at the proposed refinery in Come-by-Chance ..

MR. SPEAKER: Is this to be a question?

MR. COLLINS: A question for the hon. Minister of Labour. If he would be able to indicate to me where I might or what person I might contact to try and find work for those people.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know, if that is very urgent at the moment. I would suggest that I have notice of that question.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion denied. The resolution on the Order Paper, in the name of the hon. member for St. Barbe South.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this resolution - I think I should refresh the minds of the members of the House as to what this resolution says - not a chance in this world is this resolution going to be withdrawn. We have listened to the hon. minister now for three or four hours and now we are going to get down to the real guts of this issue. The resolution, Mr. Speaker is:

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 (the hon. minister has certainly confirmed that. He has confirmed that with his

three or four hours of chit-chat. He has confirmed that there is no progress being made to an agreement being reached) there have been many contradictory statements issued in connection therewith; (The hon. minister has living proof of that statement, because he has contradicted himself about a dozen times on it).

AND WHEREAS --

MR. CALLAHAN : Stick to the resolution.

MR. CROSBIE: I am coming to the resolution. The hon. minister has spoken three or four hours, he might let us speak for a few minutes on the resolution.

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; (Silica, we are all familiar with "Silica" in this House. Silica).

AN HON. MEMBER: Say that again.

MR. CROSBIE Silica, Silica, the hon. Silica, Silica. The delay was not caused by Silica, Mr. Speaker, it was caused by the hon. minister, the hon. minister using Silica as an excuse.

MR WELLS: -- That is his first name.

MR. CROSBIE: AND WHEREAS recently it has been revealed that concessions have been granted ( I am going to outshout the hon. minister. He can interject. He can try and say what he likes. I will outshout him. I got the microphone. Now he can either listen or not).

AND WHEREAS recently it has been revealed that concessions have been granted for exploration for oil within the boundaries of the proposed National Park: (The minister jumped from Silica to oil, when Silica vanished as a reasonable excuse, he jumped on the oil shute. Oil concessions in 1951. That was a bit too slippery for him. He jumped from oil to a White Paper. The minister has been jumping from Silica to oil

to White Papers.

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; (The hon. minister gave us that information in answer to a question. Three million dollars. There is the nub of this issue, Mr. Speaker - three million dollars that the hon. minister does not have).

AND WHEREAS it is desirable (In an answer to a question in this House, the hon. minister stated that it would take three million dollars to acquire title of the land).

AND WHEREAS it is desirable that Members of this hon. 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; (That certainly is desirable, because we have not been fully informed of the position at all. We have been fully misinformed. Fully misrepresented, not fully informed).

BE IT RESOLVED that this House regret the failure of the Government of Newfoundland to proceed expeditiously with the establishment of the proposed Bonne Bay National Park & Who could oppose that? Who could argue that this Government has proceeded expeditiously with the establishment of this Park? Never has the Government taken such a tardy, unexpeditious approach to anything. The hon. minister has no intention to proceed with the park. That is correct. That is a frank admission) and the failure of the Government to report fully and completely to this hon. House of Assembly and to the public of Newfoundland the facts with respect to the proposal to establish at Bonne Bay National Park (that is the truth, Mr. Speaker. Never have the facts been so hidden and such an attempt been made to confuse facts as this Government has done with the Bonne Bay National Park) and directs



the Government to table in this hon. 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."

The Government does not wish to do that, Mr. Speaker. There is little selected portions of the correspondence contained in this mighty White Paper. This White Paper to beat all White Papers. Tattletale grey, tattletale grey this paper is. It is not in the white class at all. That is the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that was introduced in this House on March 6th., by the hon. member for St. Barbe South - March 6th. introduced in this House. Hoping to have it debated Wednesday, March 11th, but on Wednesday, March 11th. the Government fled. They fled over to Paris and London and took off for twenty-seven days and adjourned this House, so there was a twenty-seven day hiatus. The House opened April 6th. and the member for St. Barbe South finally got a chance to start this debate on Wednesday, April 8th. He spoke some forty or forty-five minutes. He made good sense. He made good sense. He did not want to take unlimited time like the hon. minister. He did not want to waste the time of the House. He wanted to get to the meat of the issue. but the hon. minister has done his best to put off this debate week after week after week, with his unbearable tripe on this National Park.

The House opened April 6th - note this, Mr. Speaker, the House opened again on April 6th and the minister who was good enough to table a letter in this House to the hon. John Chretien P.C. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The hon. minister tabled a letter dated April 6th. What is this White Paper, Mr. Speaker, nothing but a hastily concocted subterfuge, to get up to the Government of Ottawa before this resolution came on to be debated - April 6th, this wonderful White Paper went up to the Government of Ottawa and the Government of Ottawa sitting there

quietly, paying no attention to it, waiting for Newfoundland to come up with some sensible proposal to get on with this National Park.- April 6th. This White Paper, Mr. Speaker, was concocted between March 6th and April 6th. a hurried scramble, get down the old FRED plan, the \$350 million FRED plan that the Premier announced in Trout River which was going to revolutionize the Northern Peninsula in the Fall of 1968. Get the old, white FRED paper down from the shelf, grab up another old ARDA paper, take out one here, a bit there, and a bit there, scramble it up together into a White Paper and then say to the Government of Canada; "gentlemen you are foaming at the mouth to have a park at Bonne Bay. You are foaming at the mouth up there in Ottawa, but gentlemen in Ottawa, we are not going to let you have that park in Bonne Bay. We are not going to let you unless you give us \$60 million. Now we are not going to follow. We pay no attention to the national policy of the last hundred years that a province must acquire title to the land and pass it over to the Government of Canada. No our Government is greater than every other province. Our Government is greater than all. Our Government says, no park. No park, without \$60 million. Have you ever heard such tripe? Who does this Government think it is going to fool with that approach?

AN HON. MEMBER:    Which government? Our Government?

MR. CROSBIE:        The Government sitting opposite.

Does the hon. Premier want to make a little interjection?

MR. SMALLWOOD:    Speak, speak.

MR. CROSBIE:        Interject, Sir. Go ahead and interject.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    An attack on the Government. Look at at his cringe.

MR. CROSBIE:        The hon. gentleman is on radio every morning. He is on television winding and howling about the hon. person who is now speaking in this House, but he is not bothered at all. No, he is on VOXM at 10:15 every morning. Bully boy he is calling out, Bully boy, and what is his latest one?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sook! Sook!

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Premier is an elderly father.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And hairdo.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. members on this side of the House are not bothered by the hon. Premier at all. He just can think of nothing else. He has myopia. He can only see one thing. The members over here are all he is worried about now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a devastating attack!

MR. CROSBIE: I would sooner have a hairdo than no hair like the hon. minister opposite.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah! the wit. The scintillating wit.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Premier does not like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The scintillating wit.

MR. CROSBIE: He does not like it. That great Parliamentarian does not like the House of Assembly this session.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am the member who put this on the paper over two months ago. Now I have listened day after day, after day. I would like the member, actually, to go ahead without any interruption.

My Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, is that we have listened for over three hours to the hon. member across the floor there, and we have not been able to discuss this Bonne Bay Park for almost two months. Would you mind, Sir, asking those members over there to please keep a little bit of dignity back in the House so that we can get on with it.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the resolution that was debated on April 8th by the hon. member for St. Barbe South, following by the minister who kept following and following. The minister spoke on Wednesday, April 15th. We got off on the rules debate. On Friday, April 24th.,

the minister took up what time was left that day. On Wednesday, April 29th., the minister took up all the time that day. So now it is Wednesday, May 6th., when we are finally able to proceed with this debate - from March 6th. to May 6th - two months, for the private members of this House to have a chance to debate this resolution, which they think is of great importance to Newfoundland and particularly the West coast.

It is a disgrace, prevented by the Government from meeting any Wednesday night, since the House adjourned in March, so we could proceed with this resolution. Wednesday afternoon, after Wednesday afternoon, the hon. minister - the only afternoon, the hon. minister has answered any questions has been Wednesday afternoon, then he took an hour, if he could to answer them - to dribble out his answers, deliberate attempt to stifle debate on this resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty poor show, but it does not matter; the public understands what is happening. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this White Paper? What is wrong with it is this:

MR. CROSBIE:

this, it is an attempt to fool the people of Newfoundland, an attempt to fool this House that this Government seriously pretends that it can force the Government of Canada into spending \$60. million in Newfoundland to establish a park at Bonne Bay. What the people of Newfoundland and the people of the Bonne Bay area want and the Northern Peninsula want is a start on the Bonne Bay Park this year. They want the highway paved also from Deer Lake up to St. Anthony, they want L'Anse-au-Meadows developed, they want Port au Choix developed. Does the hon. Minister mind if I speak in the House or do you want to shout a bit more? I will stop while you shout for a few minutes.

MR. ROWE: Let him rave on for a few minutes then we can resume.

MR. CROSBIE: The people of that coast want the road paved, they want Port au Choix developed, yes, they want L'Anse-au-Meadows developed, they want -

MR. SMALLWOOD: They want the White Paper -

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, we will come to the White Paper, we will come to the tattle tale gray paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what they want, that is what they will get.

MR. CROSBIE: They want, Mr. Speaker, economic development in Port au Choix and Hawkes Bay, not from this Government they will not get it. This Government cannot afford \$3. million to acquire the land of the Bonne Bay Park and attempts this confidence trick on the people of Newfoundland to fool them. They want those things, yes, and they want an air service across the Straits. They want all those things and all those things should come, Mr. Speaker, but they are not going to come through this attempt to bluff the Government of Canada. They are going to come over a period of years and the right way for them to come is in a development plan for Newfoundland, an overall development plan for Newfoundland which will contain these things. There is no such plan because this Government has hung back for the last two or three years and has not presented to Ottawa any sensible development plan for Newfoundland. That is the place for them to get these developments. The Bonne Bay Park is a separate issue. The Government of Canada has money available, Mr. Speaker, in their estimates this year to spend on the Bonne Bay National Park but this Government, the Government sitting opposite us in this House are preventing them from spending



MR. CROSBIE:

it because the Government sitting opposite is not prepared to comply with the national law and policy of Canada, will not turn over the land at Bonne Bay to them and the Government cannot do that because the Government has not got \$3. million to acquire title to the land.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right. The Bonne Bay Park should start this year and the rest of development come when the Government of Canada agrees to it, that is when it should come.

MR. NEARY: Ontario will not help out because they have not got any money.

MR. CROSBIE: Ontario happens to be a quite prosperous substantial Province. It does not have to look to the Government of Canada for their good things. Newfoundland happens to be in a different category.

Mr. Speaker, I will prophesy now that this ridiculous White Paper, this attempted blackmail put up to the Government of Canada will result in no action because the Government of Canada will not proceed with the Bonne Bay National Park on this basis. They will wait until the Government of Newfoundland puts up to them a sensible proposal for the development of the Bonne Bay National Park and the first thing we must do is acquire the land, title to the land, that is the basic thing we must do before the Government of Canada can proceed any further. \$1.9 million. I think it has been stated in their estimates that is going to be lost for this Province this year because this Government has not got its share of the funds to acquire the land, to turn title over to the Government of Canada. That is the real issue and to cover that up this Government comes up with this so called White Paper, this pretense.

In this White Paper, Mr. Speaker, the Government admits that it requested the Government of Canada originally to establish this park. We requested Ottawa to establish the park not the other way around. Ottawa did not come to Newfoundland and say, gentlemen we will do almost anything to get this Bonne Bay National Park established, not at all. Our Government asked Ottawa to establish the National Park. We cannot lay down the conditions, Ottawa lays down the conditions. We are asking Ottawa to establish a second National Park in Newfoundland. Ottawa is not asking Newfoundland to let Ottawa establish this

MR. CROSBIE:

park and we lay down conditions, give us \$60. million and we will allow you to do it but yet this White Paper tries to twist the situation around so that it will appear that Ottawa is pleading with us to establish the park and we are saying no, not unless you give us \$60. million to develop the rest of the Peninsula.

The rest of that Peninsula should be developed but the hon. Minister for Community and Social development knows how it should be developed under a development plan through the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and that can go ahead, the planning can go ahead, getting the agreement of the Government of Canada can go ahead while the Bonne Bay Park itself is under way. The answer lies in the estimates. There is no money or none visible in the estimates of this Government presented to this House for the Bonne Bay National Park to acquire title to the land, none.

We are going to lose the money that is in the Federal estimates this year for Bonne Bay Park. It is going to be spent in other Provinces on other national parks because of the attitude this Government is taking. This Government has not been told by Ottawa or by the department concerned that they buy this White Paper. They have stuffed that White Paper away where White Papers should be stuffed, in a cupboard. They are laughing up their sleeves up there. They are not going to be pushed around by the Government of Newfoundland. They have their conditions and when they get a sensible proposal from this Government they will act on it.

In the meantime this Government wants to use this White Paper as a subterfuge, it hopes to fool the poor people up in the Northern Peninsula into believing that this is so, that this is real, that the Government of Canada is going to give us \$60. million because it is dying with desire to have this Bonne Bay National Park.

There is one thing I agree with in this White Paper, Mr. Speaker, the pictures, lovely. There is nothing more beautiful than that Bonne Bay area, it could not be a more beautiful place. There is a picture here of the hon. Minister, no it is a dense algae bed, sorry, mistaken identity.

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order please! Visitors to the gallery are reminded that

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL):

applause and laughter and all that sort of thing is forbidden.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has them in the palm of his hand, they are breathless, they are waiting on him on his devastating wit.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Premier on his supreme moments like that. I agree with the pictures, Mr. Speaker, Trout River Road, Western Brook Sands, the dense algae bed, the hon. minister will be familiar with the algae bed, L'Anse au Meadows, rocky out crops - rocky out crops reminds one of the Cabinet, the rocky out crops - scenery of the purposed park, a sculpin, short horned sculpin. I will not say, Mr. Speaker, who the short horned sculpin reminds me of, the common jellyfish, ah! ha! the common jellyfish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now the wit is flowing.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear from Western Brook gorge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ah! the wit of him, the brilliant wit of him.

MR. CROSBIE: The pictures we agree with but nothing else. Mr. Speaker, from Bonne Bay -

MR. CALLAHAN: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not giving away to the hon. Minister on these points at all.

MR. CALLAHAN: On privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has no choice.

MR. CALLAHAN: On privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I am serious. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is on pictures and I am on privilege because a couple of weeks ago at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite -

MR. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order please! Will the hon. Minister please state his point of privilege?

MR. CALLAHAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On request I circulated the only coloured photographs I have of the under water portion of the park at Bonne Bay, the purposed park, they went to the other side, Mr. Speaker, and they have not been returned and I need them desperately and I do not know who has them and I wonder if hon. gentlemen would consider that and return them to me. I know they would like to keep them, they are beautiful.

MR. MURPHY: There is not that many of us over here, you could ask us individually.

MR. WELLS: What is the point of privilege?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege. Because we understand that the hon. Minister is not a master of the Parliamentary rules we will not object and if we find his hon. pictures we will give them to the hon. gentleman. I have not got them I can assure you of that, Mr. Speaker.

The area from Bonne Bay up the coast of St. Barbe past Daniels Harbour through St. Barbe North and on to St. Anthony is one of the most beautiful in this Province if not the most beautiful and has to be developed and will be developed. And any Government that gets in power that has the good sense and good management to do it will develop it in corporation with the Government of Canada and not with cheap ultimatums, not with tawdry electoral dodges and devices, no. By sensible negotiation and entering into sensible development agreements with them.

This is an election dodge. The Government knows, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be no Bonne Bay Park started this year but it may have an election and it wants to fool the inhabitants of that area. Well it will not work. The Bonne Bay Park should start now and the rest of this development come as soon as the Federal Government will agree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we see the Canadian Government policy is in parks? It is quoted an historic coast as part of this White Paper, the hon. Minister quotes their policy on parks, the Government of Canada's. The basic purpose of a national park system is to preserve for all times areas which contain significant geographical, geological, biological or historic features as a national heritage for the benefit, education and enjoyment of the people of Canada. This is the basic purpose of the national park system not to supply golf courses, not to supply swimming pools but to preserve areas which have geographical, geological, biological or historic features for the benefit, enjoyment and education of the people of Canada. That is the national parks concept in Canada yet our Government thinks and the minister thinks that they can bully and ballyrag and threaten the Government of Canada into constructing a park with golf courses, swimming pools, tobogganing and everything else that is listed in this White Paper despite this announcement of what the national policy is.

Mr. Speaker, there has been every dodge in the world attempted not to

MR. CROSBIE:

proceed with this national park. The silica was discovered in the fall of 1968, it was discovered, Mr. Speaker, after the Newfoundland Fred plan for Western Newfoundland was turned down by the Government of Canada so that this great development that was promised at Trout River would not be able to go ahead. Then silica was discovered and that was used to delay the Bonne Bay Park and then this year we have had oil discovered and that is supposed to delay the Bonne Bay Park. What is the oil situation, Mr. Speaker?

In 1951 this House of Assembly gave the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited certain rights up in that area, the Parsons Pond area. They gave them to the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation which was a Crown Corporation and the Act is Act 89 of 1951 vesting that the Parsons Pond Oil Lands Vesting Act, vesting rights there in Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, under the Act that incorporated Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited, Act 88 of 1951, the Act that set up the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited Section 8 (b) which applies to the Parsons Pond oil lands that were granted to NALCO, the Act said, "For a period of ten years from the date upon which this Act comes into force the exclusive right to explore, develop, produce, extract and remove all minerals both metallic and non-metallic in the areas described, that is giving them that right, and on the expiration of such period of ten years or within six months thereafter the exclusive right for a period of fifty years and subject to such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may prescribe to explore, develop, produce, extract and remove all minerals both metallic and non-metallic on, in or under every tract of land which is a square forty acres or less contained within such areas upon which the Corporation has done work which if the tract was staked out as a mining claim under the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951 would be counted as sufficient work to enable the Corporation to obtain a development license under that Act."

Part (2) of the same section says, "All parts of the areas, described in paragraph (b) of sub-section (1) to which I have just referred, on which sufficient work has not been done by the corporation on the expiration of the period of ten years referred to in that paragraph to entitle it to an exclusive



MR. CROSBIE:

right for fifty years as set out in that paragraph shall revert to the Crown and be thenceforth dealt with as crown lands upon which there is no encumbrance."

Now the hon. Minister has not told this House as yet whether the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited has met the conditions that were set down in this 1951 Act. Did they do such work which if the tract was staked out as a mining claim would be counted as sufficient work to enable the corporation to obtain a development license? Have they got a development license and therefore have they now they now got an exclusive right for fifty years with respect to those lands? That has not been explained to the House.

Mr. Speaker, two questions that we dealt with here this afternoon are on the point. Question 401 which the Minister said he could not answer in the House as it was too complicate to answer, which he did not want to answer. Question 401 - (1) With reference to the rights granted to Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited by Act No. 89 of the Statutes of Newfoundland, 1951, cited as The Parsons Pond Oil Lands Vesting Act, 1951, to explore, develop, produce and so on these minerals at Parsons Pond, since the rights were granted to NALCO has that Corporation complied with all requirements of legislation or as contained in agreements entered into with the Government respecting its exploration in that area? What could be simpler to answer?

The question asked, the question refers to this Parsons Pond Act in the legislation and just ask a simple question, since those rights were granted to NALCO has NALCO complied with all requirements of the legislation or as contained in agreements entered into with the Government respecting its exploration in that area? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is either yes they have or no they have not. How is it to complicated to answer? The hon. Minister pretends to complicated to answer. NALCO has either met its obligations under the legislation or it has not, yes or no. If the answer is no they have no rights up in this area under the legislation. If the answer is yes they have rights. Certainly this is a question that this House should have answered. The hon. Minister can answer it, yes they have complied with the requirements or no they have not. Why does he refuse to answer it? Let him explain that to the people of the Bonne Bay area.

MR. CROSBIE:

Part (2) of that question - Since the said rights described in Part (1) were granted to NALCO what has been the total expenditure of NALCO with reference to exploration and any other of its activities directly relating to the reputed oil-bearing lands situate at Parsons Pond covered in the said Act No. 89 of 1951? Mr. Speaker, these corporations who are granted rights to explore for minerals are required to inform the Government how much exploration they have done and what they have spent on it each year. Surely that record is in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. What money has NALCO spent on these oil lands at Parsons Pond since 1951 in exploration? That is a simple matter for the Minister to report on but he refused to answer.

Part (3) - On what date was active exploration undertaken by NALCO with reference to the oil-bearing lands at Parsons Pond and what was the nature and extent of such exploration activity? Is that too complicated to answer. NALCO has either done exploration up at Parsons Pond and if they have they started it some date and stopped it some date or they have not and they must report to the Government under the law what was the nature and extent of their exploration activity but the Minister will not answer that. Why not, Mr. Speaker, why cannot these simple questions be answered? Is NALCO entitled to any rights there or not?

Part (4) - During the years 1968 and 1969 what exploration activity was undertaken by NALCO with respect to these lands describing, if there were any such activity, the number of men involved, the nature of the activity and the moneys expended in each of those said years? And the Minister says he cannot answer, too complicated. Has ever -

MR. CROSBIE: has ever such a reprehensible answer been given in a House of Assembly as that? Refuses to answer, the minister knows whether there was anything done in 1968. They must report to the minister if they have done anything, submit a return. He knows if there is anything done in 1969. He knows there was nothing done in either 1968 or 1969, but he is not man enough to stand up in this House and tell us the truth. That question should be answered. And if they do not answer the question, then we must publish the fact that the Government will not answer the question. That question answered will show there is no worry about these lands up in Parson's Pond, and there is no rights to them. It is just part of the whole deception, the minister should have never said today that he could not answer that question, he forgot that this debate was coming on. Contemptible, reprehensible, and it is not fooling us, it is not fooling anyone!

Question 400 another question that was too difficulty for the hon. minister to answer. The hon. minister who spends ten or fifteen minutes answering the simplest question. How many caribou licences were handed out? It took him fifteen or twenty minutes to answer that, and then he says these other questions are too complicated to answer. Question 400, it is too bad the hon. minister is not here, I miss seeing his smiling countenance across the House, listening. Has NALCO complied with all the requirements of legislation granting it concessions or rights within Newfoundland with respect to submitting to the Government accounts of its expenditures on exploration and otherwise, with respect to any rights granted to NALCO, or any leases granted, or any grants made to that corporation, relating to timber or minerals within the Province? The answer to that is either yes, or the answer is no. It could not be simpler. And if so, are such returns or accounts available for inspection to the members of the House of Assembly? Answer, "yes they are available for inspection," "No they are not available." Is that too complicated for the hon. minister to get up and say in this House? No, the hon. minister does not want to answer the question. He does not want to say, whether they comply with the legislation, and the agreement, why not?

MR. CROSBIE: Section 2 of the question, If any such returns or reports have not been submitted by NALCO as required under the terms of presently existing legislation or under agreements entered into, which of them have not been so submitted, and what action has the Government taken to ensure compliance with the requirements of legislation and/or agreements entered into with Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited?

The minister cannot answer. The minister does not want to answer. Mr. Speaker this House gave NALCO certain rights and whether or not those rights are properly administered, whether or not they are concessions, are properly worked on, whether they live up to their obligations we must depend on the Government to enforce. And when a member of this House asks if legislation of this House has been complied with, the House is told it is too complicated for the Government to answer. That is subterfuge. That means the Government will not answer because it does not want to answer, because there is some reason the Government does not want to answer. The minister is not fooling anyone.

There are questions on the Order Paper which had a great bearing on the Bonne Bay Park issue. And the Government refuses to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, look, look at this, the minister will say you know there is oil up there, they are going to explore for oil, and that it makes no difference to the Government of Canada, they do not mind these old oil drills going up there in one of their national parts. Then you look at the paper March 26th. 1970, the Evening Telegram, Mr. Chretien now I am quoting, "If Newfoundland wishes to have a second national park that Government should adhere to the Federal Law concerning national parks, as other provinces do." Northern Development Minister, John Chrétien told Jack Marshall, P.C. member for Humber St. George's, St. Barbe, Tuesday, that is what the minister at Ottawa is saying. He is not dancing a jig, and saying glash over the \$60 million that the Government of Newfoundland, that we want that Bonne Bay Park on any terms at all. No. What is the minister saying, "If Newfoundland wishes to have a second national park that Government should adhere to the Federal Law concerning national parks, as other provinces do." That is what the minister is saying. The Evening Telegram March 26th. 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Marshall had asked if the minister would agree to hold a public hearing in the Province concerning complications? Mr. Chretien's reply was not a question of holding a public hearing to find out yes or no, if there can be any type of oil research in the park. Quoting Mr. Chretien again, "Policies are well known in Canada, there can be no exploration of any kind in a park". Mr. Chretien said, that is a Federal policy, "Policies are well known in Canada, there can be no exploration of any kind in a park, how could there be? How could you have a national park with mineral exploration and oil drilling and the rest of it going on. If Newfoundland wishes to have a second national park, that Government should adhere to the Federal Law concerning national parks, as other provinces do". Northern Development Minister John Chretien told Jack Marshall. That is the position, that is the position, not the hon. minister's White Paper. And one other condition to this, no exploration in any national park and even more so the Provincial Government must acquire title to the land, and the land must be turned over to the Government of Canada, and then they will proceed with the national park. Not White Papers, they do not get a White Paper so called from a Provincial Government and just chuck in their policy that they have had for a hundred years, and jumped the given \$60 million to do things that should be done, but under other programs, Do not use the Bonne Bay National Park, there are many good arguments as to why the rest of the things in that White Bay should be done, the road paved to St. Anthony, L'Anse au Meadows developed, it is going to be probably the greatest tourist attraction in Newfoundland, refindings at Port au Choix, the economic development of Port au Choix, Hawkes Bay area that can stand on its own feet. That has been done now, it stands on its own two feet, the air service across the Straits can stand on its own feet, the paving of the road they should not be tied to the national park. If our Government says to the Government of Canada as it has done, we are not going to let you have your national park there unless you agree to ~~some~~ <sup>spending</sup> \$60 million to do the rest of these things, then neither the park will be done nor will these other things be done.



MR. CROSBIE: Now the Minister of Community and Social Development is working on an overall plan with the Government of Canada which he hopes to conclude this year, if he is not including in that Provincial Development Plan the paving of the road up to St. Anthony, the Hawkes Bay Port au Choix area, and these other matters he is out of his mind. This is a plan for the Economic Development of Newfoundland, so obviously the hon. minister is including that. This White Paper is an obstruction thrown his way, it is like throwing a birch billet in front of him when he is running to meet Jean Merchand, Jean Merchand with a cheque in his hand, and our minister running to get it, somebody throws a birch billet in his way and he falls. That is what that white paper is, a stab in the back to the Minister of Community and Social Development. A stab right in the back.

Now you will hear, Mr. Speaker, other arguments—the hon. minister is saying that the Government of Newfoundland cannot give away land without first knowing what is underneath it. They cannot do that, it has no intention of handing over several hundred square miles of Newfoundland without knowing what is underneath it, right down to the middle of the earth. As the Evening Telegram pointed out, or the editor on April 24th. why so much concern about one particular area? And then he goes on to point out, the large areas that the Government has allowed to be covered by water for the Bay d'Espoir Development on the South Coast the Gray and the White Bear rivers, the Churchill reservoir in Labrador, 2500 square miles. We are allowing large areas of Newfoundland to be covered with water under those developments, not knowing for sure what resources are underneath those lands. And the situation is no different in Bonne Bay Park except the area is a lot smaller. The National Park Act laid down that the two levels of Government must first reach an agreement on the choice of land to be made a park. Then it is up to the Province to reserve this land, and assign it to the Federal Government, which then takes the responsibility for developing costs.

There are two things holding us up, Mr. Speaker, one our Government cannot agree with Ottawa on the boundaries, or does not want to agree, and two, our Government has not got the money to acquire title to the land. That

MR. CROSBIE: is what is holding up this Bonne Bay Park, not this White Paper, I mean the supposed demands made on the Government of Canada. The people who own land in that area Bowaters and the rest of them, I have no doubt will be very reasonable as<sup>to</sup> what they require to render their rights from those lands. I do not know what NALCO's position is, because I do not know whether NALCO has any valid rights up there. But supposing NALCO does, I am sure that NALCO which is now controlled by Canadian Javelin would not be unreasonable as to what they would want us to render their rights up there in the interest of this Province. That is if they have valid rights left up there. I do not think the Reid Newfoundland Company or the others would be any problem either. There are problems with individual property owners who would have to be properly compensated for having to leave the area, and there is the problem of Sally's Cove and Trout River, as far as I am concerned Trout River should remain there forever, because I cannot see that as being damaging to the park at all, and Sally's Cove is in the same class. But those matters can be worked out.

But instead of them being worked out our Government is trying to pretend that it is doing all it can for the park, and at the same time it is doing all it can to block it. Because the Bonne Bay Park should be underway this year, if this Government had \$3 million to acquire the land and get it underway.

Look at the White Paper: Let us look at it a bit more closely. "The Historic Coast", as the minister calls it. He mentions in the first page the now defunct FRED Program for Western Newfoundland and Southern Labrador. Mr. Speaker, this is where this came from, the defunct FRED Program for Western Newfoundland, which the Government of Canada would not accept. It says in here that in August 1968 the FRED Program for Western Newfoundland was presented to the Government of Canada and turned down. If the proposal made in this White Paper was slashed out of that FRED Program, which was not accepted by the Government of Canada, that is where that White Paper came from. This White Paper went in to Ottawa August 1968. September 1968 the Premier goes to Trout River and announces a \$350 million FRED Program for Western Newfoundland. The hon.

MR. CROSBIE: the Premier had not heard from Ottawa then, he heard later that it was turned down. That has been the technique Mr. Speaker that has worked to date, but it will not work any longer in Newfoundland. Will not work any longer this great announcement of \$350 million and then it is forgotten about later, because Ottawa never agreed. The White Paper of \$60 million which is never going to be agreed too, not under this proposal here. That is page 1.

Now here is something sensible on page 3

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Very smart Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was speaking over there. Now if the hon. gentleman wants to have a sub-committee meeting he can have it out in the corridor, Mr. Speaker. Not to be interrupting someone who is trying to speak in the House here.

MR. CALLAHAN: The hon. gentleman is right, he interrupts nobody.

MR. CROSBIE: There he is the hon. jelly fish.

Now Mr. Speaker page 3, here is a sensible sentence that the minister said, a sensible sentence slipped in somehow, page 3. "The National Park should be viewed as the core or nucleus of a development of a region". That Mr. Speaker is a good sentence. "The National Park should be viewed as the core or nucleus of a development of a region". Exactly and the core or nucleus of the development of the Northern Peninsula should start this year with the Bonne Bay National Park. And the Government should put aside this White Paper and announce that is what it is going to do, not try and fool the people of the Northern Peninsula, the Bonne Bay Park can start this year. The rest of this program hopefully will be proceeded with this year or next year or whenever the agreement of the Government of Canada has gotten under the proper ~~agis~~ an economic development plan for Newfoundland, that is the only time the rest of it is going to start or going to happen. But the park should start now, and be the core or nucleus or a development of a region. When the park starts the Government of Canada is going to become responsible for the road within that park boundary, and they will pave it at their own expense, that is some <sup>thing</sup> immediate that could come now, not waiting for the road to be paved from Deer Lake right to St. Anthony this year or

MR. CROSBIE: try to give the impression that it is going to be paved this year. It is like the momentous highway program the hon. Minister of Highways announced the other day, \$100 million I would say the estimate is, that he is going to spend this year on these highway programs. And in his Highway Program and in his estimates in the Department of Highways, is \$10 million less this year, than last year. And this is suppose to be spend outside the DREE areas, no DREE money. Who is the Government trying to fool? The National Park should be viewed as the core or nucleus of a development of a region. Now it should start now.

The Hawkes Bay, Port au Choix, Port Saunders special area is designated under DREE now. That is going to go ahead, the National Government is interested in this National Historic Park at L'anse au Meadows, and they are interested in Port au Choix and these are going to be tremendous tourist attractions. But they are not going to be bludgeoned by this Government, they are not going to be held up to blackmail by this Government. They are not going to have the gun pointed at their heads and say you will not do anything, we are not allowing you to do anything until you give us \$60 million. That is a policy for a Government. Our Government announces its policy, our Government policy is to pave the road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony, and its policy is to provide air plane service across the Straits, and its policy is to develop L'anse au Meadows and Port au Choix and the park. Then you ask, with whose money? Ah ha! not with our money, we do not have the money that is not our policy, we are going to do it with the Government of Canada's money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can the Government say they have a policy to pave the road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony, and then say it all has to be paid for by the Government of Canada. That is not a policy, that is bluff. Pure bluff, a hundred percent bluff, not a policy at all. Clearly a first class all-weather highway is the concomitant of the full development of this region of the Province, true. And it will only come under a full DREE program, not as an adjunct to the park. Can you imagine Mr. Speaker, here is a national park at Bonne Bay which goes up the highway, I do not know how many miles, forty or fifty miles? Seventy-five miles, and the Government of Newfoundland says to the Government of Canada, you

MR. CROSBIE: must when you take over this park, when you start this park, you must pave not only the seventy-five miles of road with in the park, you mut go on another 200.miles and pave it all the way to St. Anthony, or else we are not going to let you have your park. When it is our Government that asked them in the first place to do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Our Government should ask them. That is the duty of our Government.

MR. CROSBIE: Imagine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is our duty.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the hon. the Premier is really elucidating. He is having elucidations. Mr. Speaker



MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier, sometimes, thinks that I mispronounce words and sometimes I do, but I think the meaning is clear enough. The hon. Government opposite requested this park.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Our Government.

MR. CROSBIE: The wit has me pierced to the chest bone. I do not know if I can continue on, faced with this heckling.

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

MR. CROSBIE: I will certainly permit a question.

MR. BURGESS: The Premier is wearing a blue tie today, no doubt to match his eyes. I wonder where he got the soft hat to match his hair.

MR. CROSBIE: I have never seen the hon. gentleman check his hat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to continue faced with this sharp heckling from the other side. The first class all weather highway. We want the park. We, the people of Newfoundland, particularly, the people of Western Newfoundland want the park in Bonne Bay and the Federal Government is willing to help us have it and put it there, if we turn the land over to them. They are not coming down - Ottawa is not coming to St. John's and getting down on their needs and saying, "gentlemen please let us have the land at Bonne Bay. We will do anything, if you do. We will spend \$60 million on the Northern Peninsula, if we do." That is not what is happening. They are just chuckling up in Ottawa and they see this foolish White Paper come up on April 6th, Ah, they are up to their old political tricks down in Newfoundland, ha! ha! ha! We will just sit quietly by until the next election is over. That is their attitude up there. They will do something, if they get some sensible proposal from the Newfoundland Government. If they get the land, then they will proceed with the park. They have money in their estimates for that purpose and we,

the Government of Newfoundland has not a cent for that purpose.

Page (4), yes, page (4) is golf courses, heated swimming pools and the like. Well that is grand. We would like to have those in the park, if we can get them, but the Bonne Bay Park fits in with the policy of the Government of Canada, which is: it is an area which has geographical geological, biological, historic features as a national heritage for the benefit of education and enjoyment of the people of Canada.

The place for golf parks might be in the park or outside the park. The place for swimming pools might be in the park or outside the park. This park can stand on its own without swimming pools and without golf courses. It is a magnificent, scenic, wilderness park. That is the important thing. Do not worry about swimming. You have the whole of Bonne Bay to swim in. Can you swim in Bonne Bay?

MR. MYRDEN:    Yes, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE:    You have numberless ponds going up the Peninsula and you have sand beaches going up the Peninsula. I have not swum in Bonne Bay. That is why I asked the hon. minister.

MR. ROWE (F.W.):    I think if he swum in Bonne Bay, he would not be trying to give us the wrong impression on that.

MR. MYRDEN:    My children learned how to swim in Bonne Bay.

MR. ROWE (F.W.):    Yes, I know. I know. I swum in Bonne Bay many times. I know how many weeks of the year you can swim in Bonne Bay.

MR. CROSBIE:    The hon. minister opposite was over his head when he swam in Bonne Bay, and he is over his head now.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    The wit of the man. The wit of the man.    Mark Twain.

MR. CROSBIE:    Rapier like. Rapier like.    Now proceed with the White Paper. White Paper, where was I? Oh, yes, here it is here. Here is an interesting paragraph. Now we get to the nub of the matter, page (4). Very substantial costs are involved in the repatriation of properties and 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 to owners of properties and rights granted for resource development purposes. It is submitted that since the acquisition of properties and the extinction of rights for national purposes, the nation should bear the burden of cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is contrary to the policy of the Government of Canada in connection with national parks for the last hundred years. Now we would have a special - acquiring title to the property is one thing. That is definitely our responsibility. Relocating, if Sally's Cove, had to be relocated or Trout River. Relocating communities like that, yes. I have no doubt that the Government of Canada would share in that. It would come under the resettlement program anyway, if it went ahead, but the nub of it is: very substantial costs are involved in the repatriation of properties and rights in the proposed national park area. That is what is holding this up, Mr. Speaker. Those high costs which this Government cannot find the money to meet. That and other things that may be behind the surface but that principally.

There is an interesting sentence on page (6): which is preferable the use of known resources for life use or their preservation in a national park? Well what a sentence. That is a dilly. The use of known resources for life use. Yes, the silica. Dig up the silica for life use or their preservation in the national park. I will tell you what is most valuable in my opinion. My valued judgment - their preservation in a national park at Bonne Bay. That is what is more important than that silica that was talked about for a year or so, much more important. The resources of Bonne Bay preserved as a national, historic, scenic park. This is much more important. How could the Government of Canada continue their policy of establishing national parks? I got all choked up there, Mr. Speaker,

their policy of establishing national parks, if they had to buy the land in every province of Canada where the province wished to see a national park established? To ask a question is to answer it. They would not do it. They could not do it. I do not doubt that they are prepared to help Newfoundland in special ways, but they are not going to implement a national policy which will require them to buy the land for national parks in every province.

Here is a questionable statement, Mr. Speaker, page (8): the addition of another wilderness park will not have an attraction for large numbers of visitors such as to draw them off the beaten path of the Trans Canada Highway. What nonsense? What utter nonsense? If a park is ever established at Bonne Bay, you will not have trouble getting them off the beaten path of the Trans Canada Highway. What is there on the Trans Canada Highway that would want anybody to stay on? You go on the Trans Canada Highway to get somewhere and when you get to Deer Lake and that park is there, you are going to head right up to the Bonne Bay National Park. It will outdo the Terra Nova Park in no time after it is established, as far as, visitors are concerned. The beaten path of the Trans Canada Highway - there is hardly a scenic view along the whole highway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Utter nonsense. Utter trash.

MR. CROSBIE: Very few. Difference of opinion. There are very few stretches of the Trans Canada Highway that there is any scenic beauty you can see in driving along. I said there are very <sup>few</sup> sections, that happens to be one of them and there are a few others. I will tell you one section, not so pretty. That is that big thing out by Roche's Line. That was page (8).

Page (9), tobogganing. The hon. Premier better look out. He will soon be tobogganing in an electoral slide. Tender toes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: His speech today is almost as good as the one he made Saturday night in Gander.

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, the hon. Premier got his tapes. There is a spy behind every potted man.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a speech that was.

MR. CROSBIE: The C.I.A. has nothing on him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a speech that was.

MR. CROSBIE: The people of Gander were not afraid of the hon. Premier's spies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What a speech that was.

MR. CROSBIE: We only hope that he got all the names correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ha! ha! what a speech!

MR. CROSBIE: I am prepared to play the tape for the hon. the Premier anytime, if he needs it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would he like to hear it in this House? Would he like it, if I can get permission to have it played in this House?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, special session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would love to do it.

MR. CROSBIE: Good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would love to do play it in full. I would love it.

MR. CROSBIE: Wonderful. Can we send out invitations?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to have it played all over Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: Well why not use it in your next election.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CROSBIE: I am glad that you have drawn our attention to that fact, Mr. Speaker. Page (11), let us see. Discussion of L'Anse au Meadows, which is good. Port au Choix, all things we can agree with. The developments in Hawkes Bay, Port au Choix, Port Saunders and the number of visitors we are going to get, when we get a sensible government that will approach Ottawa



in the right way.

MR. CALLAHAN:    On its knees.

MR. CROSBIE:    Not on its knees. That is what this Government has been doing, on its knees, crawling all the way, crawling all the way on its knees and its belly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are blackmailing. Which is it? Crawling or are we blackmailing? Which is it? Are we crawling or blackmailing?

MR. CROSBIE:    In some cases crawling but in this case, blackmailing. You are trying the other approach.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. WELLS    Pure fraud.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman will get a surprise one of these days.

MR. CROSBIE: Page (17) the Government says: we are prepared and are in fact negotiating with the major property and rights' holders to buy back their properties and rights for national park purposes. Who? Who is the Government negotiating with? This has been going on for the last three or four years. Surely all the negotiations should be concluded now with Bowaters and the Reid Newfoundland Company and NALCO. How long are the negotiations going to go on? Who are they? How much have they been asking for? Why has not the minister given us any valuable information in this debate. For three and four hours, he went on and on and on saying nothing. He did not answer questions 404 or 401 then and he did not tell us who he was negotiating or what it was going to cost. He gave us no information. He continued his policy of bluff. Who are they?

Page (17) an interesting admission in view of this White Paper. Last line: it should be borne in mind that this Government took the initiative and respect of Gros Morne National Park. The request went from St. John's to Ottawa, not the reverse, but this Paper would like to pretend that it is the reverse, that Ottawa begged Newfoundland to let them do it, when it is the other way around and since this Government initiated the original request

about four or five years ago, the Government has been dragging its feet. It has been putting every obstacle it could think of in the way of this national park and this White Paper is the latest - from silica to oil to White Paper. What will be next? I hesitate to name it. The White Paper goes on with twenty questions concerning the proposed Gros Morne National Park. It is going to be an area of some 600 square miles. Then it tries to pretend that Newfoundland is giving far more of its territory <sup>to</sup> national parks than any other province. It takes out Labrador and shows Newfoundland giving 1.8 per cent and then puts Labrador in and says 0.5 per cent. This is on page (2). It has been put over on the side, hoping that no body is going to glance on the left side. He would only be looking at the right side.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    It is there. It is there.

MR. CROSBIE:    Going down you would not see over here brackets: Newfoundland with Labrador 0.5 per cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD:    What a mind! What a mind!

MR. CROSBIE:    The Terra Nova National Park, 47.9 <sup>down</sup> man years at Terra Nova National Park. It would be interesting to tell the people at Charlottetown and Bunyons Cove and the rest, the hundreds that have employment there, part-time employment in the last few years that is 47.9 man years, and we should laugh - we should laugh at the Bonne Bay National Park, because it is only going to have 47.9 man years. Well that is better than no man years even if it is only fifty people. Fifty men a year, it would be better than none. Read Newfoundland Bowaters, NALCO, these are the people who have concessions there. Rocky Harbour and Cow Head - no, Sally's Cove and Trout River are under negotiation.

The end of page (4): There are no plans to open a mine. That was a dynamic revelation in this White Paper. Whoever thought there was going to be a mine opened up there anyway? The silica business. There is no chance

of there ever being a mine there and the conditions that were laid down, prevented it anyway. The Government considers that another wilderness park will not confer sufficient benefits on the region of the Province to justify locking up the known resources of minerals, timber and wildlife in the area. There have been plenty of resources locked up, as I pointed out before, in connection with Bay d'Espoir, Churchill Falls and all these developments. We never heard all this yap then about locking up these resources, not at all.

Then page (5) the cost is given. The cost of this White Paper. It is estimated that including the highway, the national park, the DREE program, the national historic park at L'Anse au Meadows, the cost will be, at least \$ 50 million, perhaps as much as \$60 million and the proposal has been put to the Government of Canada. In other words, we are saying to the Government of Canada: gentlemen, if you want this Bonne Bay Park, we want \$60 million, if that is an accurate estimate, because surely the cost of reconstructing and paving the road from Deer Lake up to St. Anthony itself would be almost \$60 million in excess of it. Every bit of \$60 million - well it is the Government's policy to do all these good things with some other government's money. That is some policy.

The economic benefits is the next thing on the White Paper of national parks in Canada and Newfoundland. It does not say who it is prepared by? What people prepared it? Who are they? What are their qualifications? It criticizes Mr. Pruitt, Dr. Pruitt who has argued for a larger park, wildlife park and being on the air and the rest of it. We all know his credentials and who he is, but here is this - economic benefits of national parks in Canada and Newfoundland. There is no author signed to it, no group of people, so we can see what their qualifications are. I do not know who prepared it and then it goes on and attempts to refute what Dr. Pruitt and others have said. There is no authorship to it. We

cannot check their credentials to see if they are recognized people and what their experience is. So I say it has no value.

Dr. Pruitt puts his name on the line. He says this is what I think. Here are my qualifications. Others do the same - this White Paper

MR. CROSBIE: this White Paper nameless, nameless it would be interesting to know who did it. Terra Nova's last annual report, it employs forty-eight people a year. By the way this Government does not think too much about Terra Nova Park. But there is an article in the Evening Telegram on April 15th. which outlines some of the facilities that were there, it is a 152 square mile recreation haven, there are 417 camping and trailer sites in addition to twenty-four privately operated bungalows, which can accommodate ninety-six people, there are picnic areas, park roads, nature trails and a public dock, it is classified as a public recreation park. Sixteen other parks in Canada which fall under the same classification. When the park was built, that is Terra Nova, the Federal Government had changed its policy towards national parks and decided that the public would do without golf courses and the like. Instead future national parks were to be developed as wilderness areas with traces of modern civilization kept to a minimum. There is nothing wrong with that, it makes good sense. Now if there is a national park at Bonne Bay and there can be golfing facilities and the rest of it along side somewhere, fine. The superintendent - Part of these parks should be nature oriented and kept as wilderness areas. A six hundred open air theatre will be opened near the park headquarters this year. Terra Nova Park is a lovely park, and it performs a very valuable function and I do not think it should be stopped and laughed at because it does not have a golf course or a swimming pool. Most of the people who are visiting national parks -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it not The Evening Telegram, that newspaper, criticized them up and down because they did not have these things?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I remember the Evening -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, you are right.

MR. CROSBIE: I remember the Evening -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are a hundred percent right.

MR. CROSBIE: I remember the Evening Telegram has been agitating for a golf course or a swimming pool at Terra Nova Park. But I do not happen to agree these are essential things to a National Park. It would be grand to have them down in that area. But I do not see any necessity why they must be part of



MR. CROSBIE: the Terra Nova National Park. How many people visiting the Terra Nova National Park are golfers?

MR. COLLINS: Put the course in Gander where we want it.

MR. CROSBIE: Put the golf course in Gander, yes. And the swimming pools, who has trouble swimming down there, I visited Terra Nova National Park, the Terra Nova Lake is a wonderful place to swim in, sand beaches all around it, Eastport, there are sand beaches at Eastport,

MR. SMALLWOOD: It depends on how thick his hide is?

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman knows all about the thickness of hides. Because the hon. gentleman's is as thick as twenty-one years in politics to makes one's hide and that is pretty thick. I have only got two or three years at it, and mine is getting pretty thick also. I do not even mind being call, what is it a sook? A sook. A big sook. A sook actually is an Arab shopping centre, Mr. Chairman, so I do not know how the expression pertains to me.

MR. McALLAHAN: You never heard of sook baby?

MR. CROSBIE: No I never heard of that either. There are some of you gentleman experiencing this, there is a minister in the Cabinet who can only understand things in baby talk. Is that who you heard it from?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is displaying great wit, great wit.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier is beginning to appreciate me more and more, and I find that most refreshing, most refreshing, most refreshing. Then the last document of this White Paper, this monumental White Paper, this White Paper out whited all other white paper, the tattle tail gray paper, or some having been calling it the brown paper, "The Gros Morne National Park history of this proposal, and then it repeats the history of this proposal started in 1959. And it goes through the history, a selective history of this proposal. Now this Government, Mr. Speaker, refused to permit the Government of Canada to table in the House of Commons at Ottawa correspondence between the Government and the Government of Canada refused to permit that. Yes, here is a document presented as part of a White Paper that selectively chooses some of this correspondence to present to the public in this House. A very most improper; most improper, why

MR. CROSBIE: not table all the correspondence. There has been questions asked in this House for all the correspondence to be tabled. Refused, and refused by the Government of Canada who said that the Government of Newfoundland would not agree to it being tabled, a word to that effect. So we cannot take all this history that is given in the last section of the White Paper as being the complete show. In November 1967, page 14 the national park proposal became in effect a part of a FRED Program for Western Newfoundland. Well the FRED Program for Western Newfoundland got the coup d'etat after the hon. the Premier shouted about it in Trout River. And this White Paper confirms really for the first time that the FRED plan that the Newfoundland Government prepared for Western Newfoundland was unacceptable. Now we have been told in this House before Mr. Speaker, that it was just that the Government of Canada changed their minds, they did not want FRED any longer, they wanted a new approach, they wanted the coordinated DREE approach that is why the FRED plan did not go ahead. On page 15, the last section of this monumental White Paper, it says that it subsequently was declared unacceptable is no reflection on either the plan or the planners, Ottawa found the Western Newfoundland FRED Program to be unacceptable, and they found the other plans put up by the Government of Newfoundland in the last two or three years unacceptable. Because they cannot get a rational, reasonable, responsible, economical development agreed to or submitted by this Province, that is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And we have lost years and ten of millions, because this Government will not put up a sensible development plan to Ottawa. That is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. New Brunswick was in the two FRED Plans, the minister or someone made a statement here the other day, the Minister of Community and Social Development, oh! he said, "look how we have got more money in Newfoundland under our DREE Plan than New Brunswick!" Yes, because New Brunswick has got two FRED plans operating, and if you take what is being spent in New Brunswick under FRED and DREE it will outdo what is being spent in this Province, just going to start this year under DREE. There is a few little things left out of that statement the hon. the minister made in this House.

MR. CROSBIE: On November 1st, 1968, this history goes on page 15, is Director of Mineral resources filed a report, this is about silica.

MR. ROWE: F.W. Who?

MR. CROSBIE: Silica the name will live in the history of Newfoundland forever. But the hon. gentleman is going down in the immortality, when he goes down in the next election he will not be forgotten. He will never be forgotten as long as silica is remembered in this Province, the hon. minister will still be remembered. The six million tons of silica is going to go right after him. It goes on into the silica bit, and correspondence with the Government of Canada about it. Page 20 the Government of Canada said, we cannot accept a mining operation within the park boundaries nor adjacent to a park road. No wonder the silica did not go ahead, that is page 20. And the telegram for the Minister of Indian Affairs to the Premier saying on what bases the silica could proceed with. That is what put the end to the silica, whose is then discovered not to be so valuable as it is formerly being thought.

Here is an interesting item of correspondence not included in this White Paper page 24, "In May 1969, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources with particular responsibilities in connection with silica met in Ottawa with the National Paris Branch. And as a result of this meeting the Minister of Indian Affairs of Northern Development wrote on May 26th, 1969, setting out certain basic elements in the Federal position including the proposed development schedule leading to the official opening of the park in 1973-74. Why is not the letter from the Minister of May 26th, 1969 not included in here, so we can see the certain basic elements in the Federal position? All that is in this document is selective parts of correspondence, why will not the Government do what this resolution asks, table all the correspondence in the House. Let us see what the basic elements of the Federal position are, not this self-serving stuff here, this so called White Paper, this is an insult to every White Paper that a credible responsible Government ever created. It is a monument to the minister's ineptitude.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak for two or three hours as the hon. minister did, I want to speak just common sense. And so far I think I have been able to do that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I was going to rebut the minister, but I find that I have already rebutted him. I rebutted the minister in my preliminary remarks

Mr. Speaker. Because of all the three or four hours that the minister spent

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I was going to rebut the minister, but I find that I have already rebutted him. I rebutted the minister in my preliminary remarks Mr. Speaker. Because of all the three or four hours that the minister spent speaking,

MR. CALLAHAN: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: all that three or four hours this is a note I got from his speech which I thought was revelent, some crows feet on two side of the paper, and on this side here it only goes down that far. After three or four hours oratory, purgatory, April 8th, April 22nd, the 24th., the 29th. Now the minister does not say what negotiations have gone on with the people, the ordinary property holders in this area? Have they being approached? Have prices for their land and property being negotiated with them. The minister says nothing about that in his three or four hours speech.

MR. CROSBIE:      The minister has told us nothing about that. He has told us nothing about anything, nothing about anything. I heard a statement the other day, Mr. speaker, that the hon. minister is going to send out thousands of these White Papers. Well this White Paper is going to have as much affect as the Newfoundland Government Bulletin up in St. Barbe South and St. Barbe North, and we all know where that ends up. We all know where that ends up.

MR. HICKMAN:      The tissue is not very soft.

MR. CROSBIE:      That is where that White Paper is going to end up.

It is an insult. It is a monumental insult to the people of Newfoundland to have their Government try and pretend. April 6th. this thing concocted between March 6th, when the member for St. Barbe South introduced his resolution and April 6th., when we reassembled - hastily concocted and sped up to hon. John Chretien. It is so obvious. It is so obvious that the Government did not want this resolution debated, without having some position to fall back on, that they could pretend that the Government was trying to achieve something and at the same time the Government was doing nothing. The Government has written off the Bonne Bay Park. It has written it off certainly for this year and perhaps forever, if the Government of Canada gets irritated by this nonsense, this foolish White Paper, this attempt to put the responsibility on the Government of Canada. The hon. minister does not have, in his Estimates, \$3 million to acquire the land. That is why - but he has 10,000 bucks or 20,000 bucks to make up White Papers, - White Papers, - fallacious White Papers, full of nonsense, misrepresentation. You know what Ottawa's attitude is. When Newfoundland learns how to conduct business, they are ready to listen. In the meantime, let the minister stew - stew in his own juice down here, while the Bonne Bay Park disappears out of our reach for this year and perhaps forever. That is what they are doing up there. Ludicrous! Ludicrous! The Minister of Community and Social Development should be disgusted and



shocked that the hon. Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources tried to interrupt and interfere with his delicate negotiations with Ottawa with the likes of a White Paper like that. I saw the hon. Minister blanch, when that White Paper was produced. He does not blanch easily.

I must say that the hon. Minister of Education is still in their pitching. The hon. Minister of Education is a man we respect highly on this side of the House, when he has something to say, he says it interminably, but says it well. It is always interesting to listen to that hon. gentleman. He has a great vast experience in Education and can easily fit back into the educational scheme, after the next election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded my few remarks. I say that this White Paper is a monumental attempt to fool and bluff the people of the Northern Peninsula. If we do not get a government that can sensibly administer our affairs and that will agree with Ottawa rationally and sensibly on how to develop Newfoundland, we have lost tens of millions in the last few years, and we will continue to. We are going to lose the Bonne Bay Park this year and perhaps we will lose it for a good many more years.

The real reason why Bonne Bay Park is not going ahead this year is that this Government does not have the money to pay for the land within the boundaries of the Bonne Bay Park. That is the substantial reason. They do not have the \$3 million. The Government is, therefore, attempting to blame the Government of Canada by pretending to the people that the Government of Canada desires the park, and our Government can set down conditions. Our Government is in no position to set down any such conditions.

The people of Bonne Bay do not want such ridiculous conditions set

down. They want the park now and the rest of this development plan, when the Minister of Community and Social Development gets the plan agreed upon with Ottawa, which we hope he will do. He has had two years now - some two years to work on it. He has had a lot of chaff and old plans have cluttered up the place, he had to sweep out of the way first. So we have every sympathy with that hon. gentleman, every sympathy. After all, there is a generation gap between him and the rest of the Cabinet, the most part. Certainly with reference to one of those hon. gentleman, and we are waiting with eager anticipation the announcement of a sensible development - economic development plan for Newfoundland.

We know we are unlikely to get that, while the hon. the Premier leads the Government. So, Mr. Speaker, we say to the Government forget this nonsensical attempt to fool the people of the Northern Peninsula politically. Do what this resolution asks. Proceed expeditiously with the Bonne Bay National Park this year. Give us the facts. Table the correspondence. Get on with the job. Let us get on to develop the Northern Peninsula. It will never be developed the way you are going about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that when the Speaker rises at 6:00 p.m. he will adjourn until 8:00 p.m. this evening.

MR. WELLS: There is a motion on the floor, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House adjourn until 8:00 p.m. when the House rises at 6:00 p.m. That is the motion, I understand it.

MR. WELLS: You can adjourn debate until 11:00 p.m. unless sooner adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay."

AN HON. MEMBER: On division.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion lost.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on this Bonne Bay Park issue, I have a few words, I would like to say about this so called White Paper. I am going to find it very difficult during the course of my remarks to refer to it as a White Paper, because generally, Sir, in the British Parliamentary system the White Paper is a means whereby the government puts before the House and through the House to the people involved, its proposal and policy in a given area of its responsibility, whether it is financial or health development or otherwise.

This White Paper, Sir, is such a fraud - this so called White Paper is such a fraud that it is certainly not worthy of the name "White Paper." It is a piece of junk for the most part. Primarily an election manifesto that they attempt to dignify with the name White Paper.

I have listened to the comments of the hon. member for St. Barbe South, when he gave this house the background of the proposal for the park, the Gros Morne Park at Bonne Bay. He spelled out how it had developed and who had made the effort and what the original intentions were and so on. He also gave us quite an insight into what Dr. Pruitt had said about it and what Dr. Pruitt, with his credentials, felt that park should be, and I must say that I was really impressed and fairly well informed, when that hon. member sat down. I think most other members of the House were.

MR. MYRDEN: It was so long ago, you cannot remember.

MR. WELLS: It is difficult to remember and then the minister stood up and then the minister stood up and that ended sense, information. He is an obvious master of circumlocution. He beat around the bush until it was hardly anything of the bush to recognize and has said nothing of any real importance or significance, wasted private members' day for nearly three days and the minister is naive enough to feel proud of himself. He is

apparently - naive enough to feel very proud of what he has done.

If he had any real sense or any real sense of feeling of what the people of this Province want, or their views about him and his proposal, he would have an entirely different view of himself and what he has done in the last three or four Wednesdays.

The hon. member for St. Barbe South made it quite clear what the purpose of the park was and what its value would be to this Province. He also made it quite clear that we agree with the kind of park, that is strictly keeping to the park, the kind of park that the minister suggested that we should have. It is pretty well outlined in the bunch of papers we got on pages (8), (9) and (10), I guess it is, of what the park should be and what it should contain. Quite frankly, I would like to see the kind of park there that would have the facilities to attract people, not only from this Province, but from other parts of Canada, that would attract families to spend a number of days in the park, with facilities/would be provided or rented, in trailer parks and tenting areas and so on. Most of us would like to see this and we take no objection to this.

I think this makes a reasonable degree of sense. I would also like to see facilities - the kind of recreational facilities that would be an attraction to these people. Quite frankly, I do not see anything wrong with having a golf course in the park or a swimming pool. It would be very nice, I am quite prepared to accept, as a start, Mr. Speaker, accept the park without those things and then we could add to it after. There is nothing wrong with that. We can get started on this basis and get these things after. I agree with his putting these proposals to the Government of Canada now, asking for them now. There is nothing wrong with that. I do not agree with the insanity of saying, the absolute insanity

Tape no. 794 Page 6 May 6th., 1970

of saying, either all of this or absolutely nothing. That is an insane approach. Of course he has...

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Thursday at 3:00 p.m.

3597