



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 11

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R.SMALLWOOD(Premier): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I sent the following telegram to Her Gracious Majesty the Queen, at Gander.

"As you fly over our Province Your Government and loyal subjects of Newfoundland and Labrador wish you Godspeed and a safe journey."

(sgd) J.R. Smallwood.

To which Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to send me a message in these words:

"Thank you very much for your kind message."

(sgd) Elizabeth P.

While I am on my feet I should like to express a word of very cordial welcome to some 75 Grade VIII students of Bishop Feild. These are made up of two classes and they are in charge of Mrs Beverly Lee and Mr. Meadus. I am particularly happy that they are here visiting us in the people's House today because it so happens that I am myself an old Feildian. I spent five years at Bishop Feild as a boarder, and I have a very soft spot in my heart indeed for Bishop Feild. When the girls come here as they do every year from Littledale Academy I am able to make the proud boast that I attended Littledale and that I am a fellow student or a former fellow student of those girls, because the school I went to was co-ed, boys and girls, both of us.

I do not think we have ^{had}/_{any} students here yet from St. Mary's, which used to be on the Southside. I was a student there as well. British Hall is gone, that was an Anglican School opposite the old tobacco factory. Later it was a branch of Bishop Spencer, but I attended it as a small boy I think it was the first school I went to, before it was a girls school Bishop Spencer, and finally, Centenary. So Bishop Feild; Little dale; St. Mary's Southside; British Hall and Centenary. I had the honour of attending, if they did not have the honour of having me, I had the honour of attending them. I am delighted these boys are here from Bishop Feild and I want them to feel very very welcome indeed as they sit and listen to the proceedings in the People's House. I hope indeed that some of them will form the ambition here today that they too oneday will sit down here on the floor rather than in the stranger's galleries; and sit on the proper side of the House and become the Queen's Ministers and perhaps the Queen's principal minister of this Province. It is a good ambition and it is one that can be realized.

Now every day we have students visiting us here and I end up my word of welcome

to them always by throwing out, (as the newspapers would call it) hurling a challenge to the Leader of the Opposition; but I can not do it today he is not present but no doubt someone will speak for him. A challenge to the Leader of the Opposition to get up and repeat what I have said. Repeat the same warm cordial word of welcome to these students and to say that he, too, welcomes them here and hopes that they will enjoy their visit.

There are six old Feildians sitting down on the floor of the House, I am not the only one, there are five others most of them on this side of the House and a couple I think on the other side and so it shows the students of Bishop Feild that that college, that school must have something or there would not be as many old Feildians over here, on the floor of the House.

MR.H.V.R.EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to usurp the privilege of the Opposition in welcoming these students but as he is away today, I feel perhaps I am the most appropriate person to do so, because, I, like the Premier, all of my scholastic career was spent in Feild. Bishop Feild College, I spent 11 years there. My whole education was not so mixed up as the Premier's and therefore, possibly I see in a much straighter line because I was not influenced by a girls school or another type of school. The ethics of Bishop Feild College in those days, and I hope they are the same today was one of absolute fair play. It did not matter if we won the game or lost the game, how many mornings did I go to prayers under the Headmaster and say, well fellows you lost 22 to 1 yesterday but you played a good game. And for the whole of 11 years that we were there we lost, but we still played the game.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not always! Not always!!

MR.EARLE: We always ^{lost} with respect to my hon. colleague.

MR.SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman is used to losing, that is where he got used to losing.

MR.EARLE: But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned that perhaps some of these boys will have the ambition to enter government some later date and perhaps become ministers. I filled three portfolios, that of Education, Welfare and Finance, and I repeated expressly on many occasions that I have no ambition to hold the position of Premier. Unfortunately I noticed this morning on a radio programme that although I was not running I got five votes, as the Leader of this party without my name even in. I wonder if I did throw my hat in the ring just how many votes I would get. Anyhow I do not wish to wonder off the subject only to extend to these boys a very hearty welcome indeed and hope that they throughout the years whatever the temptations of the country are, will live up to the high standards always laid down and set by Bishop Feild College.

MR. J. C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I might address a few words of welcome to the boys visiting this afternoon from Bishop Feild College. As the Independent Liberal Group in the House also has an old Feildian among them, namely, myself. The fact that two of the graduates of Bishop Feild are the Hon. the Premier and myself, is bound to show that graduates of the same school does not always agree. There is or was an old school song at Feild when I was there, I think went,

Boom chic a boom, boom chic a boom,
Boom chic a boom chic a boom boom boom
Sis boom bah sis boom bah, Feildians, Feildians, rah, rah, rah.

We intend to give the Hon. the Premier a few sis boom bahs as the Session goes on to show that the old Feildian spirit is still there. I hope you enjoy the Session. I think that the Hon. the Premier intends to speak this afternoon and I am sure that you will find that very interesting and that once you have listened for a while/the Hon the Premier you will be able to sit quietly through your classes for the rest of the week at Bishop Feild.

MR. SPEAKER: While we are on the subject of welcoming visitors to this Chamber may I say and I say this particularly for the benefit of the press in the hope that they will give us some assistance in this. We have been a little embarrassed in recent days by having two groups of students turn up on the same day. One group had arranged for reservations and had advised the Sergeant-at-Arms who makes these arrangements, had advised him, and had their day set down when they could come and visit the House. Another group showed up without having made any arrangements and much to his and our embarrassments we were not in a position to accommodate them. So if this word could be gotten out to the public generally, particularly to teachers and school groups and other organizations that if they do intend to come and visit the House in the afternoon or evening will they please get in touch with the Sergeant-at-Arms so there would be no conflict and some of them would not have to go away disappointed. And I trust as I say again that the press would give this a little bit of publicity so that it may save embarrassment both for students and for the House in general.

Presenting-Petitions*

HON. S. JONES (Min. of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the people from Clarke's Head, Victoria Cove, Wing's Point, Rogers Cove; Stoneville and Horwood in the District of Fogo, as well as Port Albert and Boyd's Cove in the District of Lewisporte. The prayer of this petition is that a school nurse, a public nurse be provided for the Centennial High School situated on the road between Gander Bay on what is called the Horwood Road. I may say that this petition is signed by each householder in the entire area. I might say as well

that in talking to these people concerned in this petition, it is thought that possibly if one nurse were provided to serve the Regional High School at Carmanville and also the one in the Gander Bay Area, that one nurse could service both schools. I may say, Sir, that this matter has been discussed with my colleague the Hon. the Minister of Health and it is my understanding that ^{it} is just the question of personnel at the moment as to when a nurse can be provided. I ask this petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker it gives me great pleasure to support the petition just introduced by the Minister of Highways, and member for Fogo District, I would certainly hope that with the concentration of pupils in larger schools today that one of the advantages to be obtained from this would be the provision of specialized services and certainly of a nurse looking after the health needs of the students can be considered in that class. Certainly the people of Clarke's Head and Wing's Point, Victoria Cove, and Rogers Cove, Horwood, Stoneville, Port Albert and Boyd's Cove are deserving of this service and I would hope that the minister of Health would be able to accommodate them. On motion petition received.

HON. H. STARKES (Min. of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition dealing with the town of Boyd's Cove, Port Albert are included. I hope everything possible will be done to exceed to their most reasonable request.

Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

MR. STARKES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Motor Regulations, Known as Highway Traffic Fees Regulations; Highway Traffic Licensing and Equipment Regulations, and Vehicle Regulations, made under the Highway Traffic Act during the past year.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to Question No. 14 in the name of the Leader of the Opposition, it is too long to read so I will present the document itself Question No. 123; on today's Order Paper, in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. This question has already been answered.

Question No. 125: in the name of the hon. member for Gander,

The answer to this question is that we have given some advice and encouragement to the committee and I understand that they have received some financial help from the Government of Canada.

Question No. 126, in the name of the hon. member for Gander,

(1) Yes.

(2) This will be answered in due course.

Question No. 127, in the name of the hon. the member for Gander.

(1) No.

(2) No answer.

Question No. 128 in the name of the Leader of the Opposition.

(1) Yes, but sometime in the very indefinite future.

(2) There has been no thought that all Crown Corporations or Commission should have their offices in Confederation Building.

Hon. E. M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health):— I have here, Sir, the answers to three of the Questions standing on the Order Paper and addressed to me.

The first, Sir, is Question No.47, asked by the hon. member for St John's West, to be found in the Order Paper of February 23.

The answer, Sir, is: No, neither I nor any of my officials has or have (I am not sure of the grammatical point), perhaps the young gentlemen from Bishop Field can help us, Sir - being an old Collegian myself). Neither I nor any of my official has told either of these two hospital corporations that they are not free to negotiate on financial matters with their employees without my concurrence.

In behalf of the Government, however, I did tell the board of each of these hospitals that the Government were not able to authorize any financial commitment above that which we have already authorized for the corporations for this year - the year in question, Sir, being the fiscal year which ends at the end of this present month.

This policy statement, Mr. Speaker was sent to each board in advance of their individual decisions to agree to the appointment of Conciliation Boards. In one case, Sir, the statement was conveyed in a letter from me and in another it was conveyed in a letter from one of my officials.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to Question No.121, which I believe appears on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St John's West, who seems to be a shadow minister of health - the question, Sir, is in four parts. Each of them deals with a matter of government policy. Government policy, Mr. Speaker, is not and never has been revealed in answers to questions. Questions seek factual information. In this connection, Sir, members may wish to refer to the Fourth Edition of Beausechene, 148, Citation 171, (w) and (b)(v), are the two precise references, Sir, which set forth rulings on this point. The construction of the new hospital facilities Mr. Speaker, or the expansion of present hospital facilities is a matter touching on major aspects of health services policy. I should add of course, there will be ample opportunity Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Address in Reply when the Estimates of the Department of Health are called, to go into any length on these questions, any hon. gentlemen may wish. It is subject to the Rules. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wishes to move a reduction in my salary I will even give him the wording

if he does not have the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the answer to Question No. 100 on the Order Paper February 27, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to Part (1) is No. The answer to Part (2) is No. I should add Sir for the sake of completeness, that a functional plan for the Medical School Buildings at the University has been completed, and was received by me some time ago. The answer to Part (3) Of course Sir, this is a matter of government policy, and will be announced at the appropriate time. Perhaps when the hon. gentleman wishes to debate the question of my salary. I have copies for the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, and for the press.

HON. STEPHEN NEARY (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to the part of Question No. 99 on the Order Paper of Friday, February 27, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. The question was directed originally to the Minister of Public Works, but if the hon. members will recall he redirected a part of the question to me as Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. Part (4) (5) the part that I am answering now. Thirty houses were built as follows: Rigolet 4; Makkovik 4; Postville 4; Hopedale 5; Davis Inlet 3; and Nain 10. The average cost Mr. Speaker, was \$7,238. Tenders were called for materials only, and the reason tenders were not called for labour Mr. Speaker, is that in northern Labrador, we have on the staff of the branch in my department of Northern Labrador Services, carpenters who do the work and drive the nails and all that sort of thing. On Friday's Order Paper also there was a question asked by the hon. member for St. John's East Extern. Obviously the hon. member did not know which minister to ask the question of, so he put "either or" and from my part I think the question should be answered by the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

On today's Order Paper Mr. Speaker, Question No. 122 asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to Part (1) is No. And the answer to Part (2) is that any decision taken in this matter will be announced in due course. And Part (3) Any action taken in this matter will be announced in due course.

On today's Order Paper also Mr. Speaker, there is the question from the hon. member for Gander. No. 124. I might say in connection with the answer to this question Mr. Speaker, that to save the hon. member's time, I am going to distribute with your permission your Honour, copies of a directory of services of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation. And this gives

some helpful information and might give the hon. members on the opposite side of the House an idea of what it is we are doing in this department. And I would suggest then Mr. Speaker, that in future before asking questions concerning the service or even statistical data, relating to this department -

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is not answering the question now, he is making a gratuitous insult to members of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may take it as an insult, but I am only trying to be helpful to him and save time for the House. And I might say Mr. Speaker, additional copies are available to members, to the general public and to the press, upon the request of the Deputy Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation.

The answer is contained in this booklet Mr. Speaker, but I will give it for benefit-of members of the House. It is up to fifty dollars with the approval of the Regional Administrator or Director, and up to a hundred dollars with the approval of the Minister.

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the answer which the hon. Minister just supplied us - it means that with the minister's approval, the Department of Welfare will pay up to \$100 rent, for welfare recipients in St. John's, but they would only pay up to fifty dollars a month for people in Gander and outside St. John's. Are they second class citizens?

MR. NEARY: If I may Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he really wants a comprehensive answer that he put it on the Order Paper, but the observation that he just made was incorrect.

HON. HAROLD STARKES (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I just tabled an answer to question No. 52 asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. And I have the answer to question No. 90, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. (1) The answer is \$6,585,344. (2) The answer is no. (3) Government policy in this respect will be announced in due course.

HON. E. N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question No. 102 on Friday's Order Paper, February 27, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to Part (1) The answer is no, but the recommendations are now being considered by the Government and its decision will be announced in due course. I might add that one of the major recommendations that is related to the land bank concept and land development has been going on

for some time throughout the Province, and that we have undertaken this recommendation on the broad scale for some time. Part (2) \$104,841.26.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 55 on the Order Paper, February 23, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. The amount of refunds of gasoline tax to taxpayers of taxes they have been required to pay on tax exempt gasoline during the financial year 1968-69. The total amount was \$4,700,071.17. Part (2) The names of taxpayers, their place of residence. Mr. Speaker, we are finding it very impractical if not impossible at short notice to get together all of these names, as many thousands of claims are involved. Part (3) The amount of refunds of Social Security Assessment Tax - The answer \$67,323.00, and the names of the taxpayers and their places of residence - Mr. Speaker, we feel that this is the type of information that is not the practice of governments to disclose. It is a matter between the taxpayer and the Government, and it is doubtful whether or not we should disclose the names of the taxpayers involved. The answer to Question 118 on the Order Paper of March 2, asked by the hon. member for Humber East. The Question, ^{is} the Price Water Report on the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission received by the Government. The answer is yes. (2) If the answer to (1) is yes; when will the Report be tabled in the House? Mr. Speaker, I am not in position to answer that section of the question at the moment. This is an interdepartmental report and I cannot say if or when it will be tabled. Part (3) How much did the report cost? The answer to that is as of the 28 day of February 1970 - it was just a few days ago. The total cost was \$53,708.54.

MR. EARLE: Have any recommendations of that report been implemented so far?

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, the report is still under review.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to Orders of the Day, I would like to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

MR. J.C. CROSBIE: I would like to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance and that matter is, the present situation in respect to the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission and the condition of the power transmission line from Bay D'Espoir to the Avalon Peninsula and other areas in Newfoundland in view of the major damage that occurred over the weekend in the ice or sleet storm in that area Friday and Saturday and to discuss the reason for the collapse of these transmission towers - what damage has resulted, suffered by the power commission and by uses of electricity and what steps, if any, are or will be taken to prevent any repetition of such a calamity with reference to the transmission power - with reference to the transmission of electric power within this Province?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter that is urgent and that the public and certainly the House should be informed and what the present situation is and what the likelihood is of this occurring again and that the matter should be discussed at this time.

I have here the written statement, the rules required for Your Honor to consider.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the urgency in these cases must be urgency of debate, not urgency of a matter - a matter we know, we know is urgent. I hold that it is not urgent that we should debate it now. The matter is in the hands of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company for their part and in the hands of the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission for their part, and the two bodies, one a commercial company and the other, a crown corporation, are working closely together. They are out in the field trying to get power restored and cleaning up the mess and debating it now, today, at this moment, deferring all other business of the House, is not necessary. It is not urgent that there be a debate and I will point out to Your Honor something that Your Honor does not need to have pointed out to him and I do it really for the purpose of pointing out to the House, that it is urgency of debate, not urgency of the matter itself - a matter maybe urgent, but that does not mean, it does not follow that it is urgent, that it be debated. It must be urgency of debate not urgency of a matter.

14

But, there is not point in arguing now that there is an urgency to debate it now. That will not help in the least and anything that can be said in the debate on that now can be just as easily said in the debate on the address in reply.

There is ample opportunity before the House to debate these matters without deferring all other business and just concentrating on that one topic.

MR. CROSBIE: I have already, Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to the hon. the Premier's comments that there has been no statement today as one would normally expect from the Government to the members of this hon. House as to what the situation is with respect to this transmission trouble - the lines from BayD'Espoir - that being the case the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission reports to the hon. the Premier, one would have thought that there would have been a statement as to what the situation is, how long it is going to take to clear up, what the chances are of a repetition of this. A stand in order of our rules, Mr. Speaker, makes no mention of whether the point is the urgency of debate or not.

It says, when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance which is what this is, an urgent matter, or a definite matter of urgent public importance.

And I think that an explanation is due the House and to the public and should be forthcoming now.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is entirely unnecessary for me to state what I did in the last sitting of the House, I think in a similar motion I stated - it is an established precedent, it is the rule that I think is accepted by all Parliament, that urgency of debate is, and I said it two or three days ago, is a question that the Speaker has to consider as to whether the matter, in his opinion, is urgent - an urgently requiring debate.

I will say, once again, that I - as I said the day before yesterday - that the matter is urgent. There is no doubt about that, but because I do not think that a debate on the matter right at this present time is of the urgency that it might be if the addressing replies were not on the agenda of the House right at the present time, plus the fact, that if anybody, required to obtain information about any of these things the Government has, that is the kind of question which could be asked on orders of the day and not even

put on the order paper. For that reason, I say that I do not think that the debate is urgent enough. The requirements of having an urgent debate on this, at the present time, and to dispense of all other business of the House, does not exist under the present circumstances.

MR. B.J. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honor sustains with the Orders of the Day, I have been absent from the House a week, with the flu? I returned to the House to find I have no place to hang my hat or to hang my coat and I was just wondering what the Internal Economy Commission is doing in relation to an office for the independent members.

I have been in this House fourteen years and I have no place to hang my coat.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is directed to whom? Would the hon. member please say? To whom is the hon. member's question directed?

MR. ABBOTT: The internal - the leader, I presume. The Internal Economy Commission ---

MR. SPEAKER: If it has to be directed to the Internal Economy Commission, then the question must go on the Order Paper, because obviously, the - as every member knows, the Speaker is the Chairman of the Internal Economy Commission and cannot answer questions to the Chair, but he will be glad to answer questions privately which he is obligated to do when the hon. members ask him the same questions privately, but he would direct it to the Minister of Public Works or some other minister.

MR. ABBOTT: With your permission, Sir, I direct the question to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. G. MYRDEN: Mr. Speaker, before you call Orders of the Day, I think I have a request here of the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources. This, I think, in the eyes of western Newfoundland should be debated.

There are great statements coming out of Ottawa these days, of millions of dollars lying up there, according to the papers reports over in western Newfoundland and ---

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a question?

MR. MYRDEN: Yes, it is a question, Sir. It is a question to the minister, and I would like to know if the minister has anything further to tell the people of western Newfoundland concerning the Gros Morne Park.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, when I spoke on Friday, I was guilty of a discourtesy which I wish to correct. I omitted the usual and time-honoured

practice of extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion to draft a reply. I would hasten to do so now because each of these gentlemen was very fluent, very able in his remarks. As a matter of fact, it causes me to wonder why the traditional practice of having some of the younger members do this job, was replaced by having two of the old stalwarts do the same task.

It would rather seem to reflect, I think, that perhaps it needed to be pointed out that some of the old faithful were so subdued that they could do the job rather than have some of these people over here who are always kicking over the traces, continually growling. There is to be some unity in the camp displayed so they did an excellent job in doing that.

It is rather surprising, though, I always admired the seconder's dexterity with words. In fact, I envied him. He is a very learned gentleman - a very deep reader and a constant reader and I have always wished his ability to say nothing in such a wonderful number of words.

In the case of the mover, of course, this is a rather different case because he - I think the Premier gave us rather a resounding spanking on the subject of people knowing what they are in for when they join Cabinet. If I recall the discussion at the time, it was to the effect that when a Cabinet minister accepts a post, he knows that he can be shifted from one to the other. He must accept that gracefully and even accept his dismissal from Cabinet gracefully.

We all know this. This goes without saying. It is rather foolish actually, because all of us or many of us who have been in Cabinet have moved from post to post without any comment whatsoever, without any disagreement and certainly, we felt compelled to obey the dictates of the leader and I do not see what relevance ^{that fact} had but, in the case of the hon. gentleman, it is quite well known that he had quite a lot to say about it when he was left, and I sympathize with him because he and another gentleman now on this side of the House, did in my opinion, receive rather scurvy treatment for two old faithfuls, and I felt very, very much - very sorry for them at the time, and I thought they were quite justified in making the remarks that they did, publicly.

617

I think perhaps in the case of the hon. gentleman who moved the motion, that perhaps his reversal of sentiments is more due to suspicions than it might be due to something more material than sentiment or emotion.

AN HON. MEMBER: His health is improved.

MR. EARLE: When I joined the debate on Friday, I was talking about the employment of people on contract and so on within the service who sometimes came in or were brought in at quite high remuneration which generally upset the standing and the expectations of other members of the public service and I pointed out that one of the purposes of this public administration survey was to remedy that situation.

There had been, from time to time, a number of people brought in who came in at perhaps, unjustified salaries, which were far above those being received by other people who had laboured for many, many years in the public service without possibly fair recognition and I am very happy that this situation will be remedied, I hope, by the public administration survey now going on.

Just to recap briefly some of the items which I mentioned in my speech, I brought to task the hon. the member for Bay de Verde, happening to pick upon the Koch Shoes as a good example of a small industry and pointed out that each of the fifty odd jobs over there had costed the Province approximately \$64,000.00 each which I did not think was quite anything to crow about.

I was also taken to task for the comments which I made on ARDA, FRED, and DREE which were apparently picked up over a radio program by the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. My only comment on that at the time, was that expectations had been built up to such a level by announcements on the ARDA, FRED and DREE programs that I hoped and sincerely hoped that the expectations for the DREE program will live up to the announcements which have been made about it.

I —

618

I did speak at some length about the salt codfish marketing board, and went to the defence of the old time fish merchant. And in being quoted on this in the press, there was one important point left out which I should like to have remedied. When I defended these old time merchants, I did make what I think was a very accurate comparison insofar as the help that they sought and got which was minimum is absolutely ridiculous was compared to the assistance and help which some of the so-called modern industries we are trying to bring in here are being offered. In fact, I think, that the amount being offered to one of these industries at the moment, and I speak particularly of the Oil Refinery at Come-by-Chance, or the proposed Oil Refinery, would total the amount of the bill which we will face on that, or the assistance which we will give, will in total more than cover all of the assistance to all of the fish merchants in Newfoundland since the day the salt codfish business started.

I did spend some time talking about my district of Fortune Bay, particularly emphasising the great need for roads, and I would just like to repeat that today that the crying need for that area, is communications and roads. And I direct my remarks particularly to the Minister of Highways and hope that the program which was started so many years ago, and which went ahead at such a snails pace, will at least go ahead at something ¹⁰⁻²⁵ than a snails pace this year. Because the people of that coast, not only in my district, but all around the South Coast feel that they have been, and are being very, very, severely neglected.

I did not get around in my speech to mentioning the forthcoming economic conference. Possibly the reason I did not do so was the fact, I think all of us are a little bit fed up with conferences and large announcements, they seem to be created more for the publicity which they created than what they accomplish. I recall very vividly of course the famous T.V. Conference where we brought in people from all over the world. And it was an exciting three days, it was a rather interesting one, but I do not actually remember anything at all having come out of it. I do not think there were any results that anybody can recall. And this, Sir, has always been the story about these conferences. In my opinion, economic conference, economic satisfaction, economics as such being the life blood of this Province, that probably the better way, if I might suggest to go about this sort of thing would be to hold regional get togethers of small groups of qualified people in different sections of the country first, before calling a conference. For argument sake in Corner Brook, on the West Coast we have a beautiful public building over there, a large part of which particularly the

government offices are not used, they are very elaborate and they are a wonderful place in which to see the scenery, but I do not think they are used an awful lot. And possibly this could be the place to hold sessions of small groups of qualified people to first of all get their thinking clear as to what could be done in that particular area. Then you could go to Grand Falls and in the same sort of situation there in the public building, which does not get all that much use, the same sort of situation could be developed. And if this were done over a period of a couple of months all around the Province, then possibly and then only would be the time, having correlated all of this thinking and all of this study, you might bring in to St. John's a relatively small group of people who had had time to think and discuss these matters, so it would not just be a great play ring circus with the band master and everybody getting up at the same time. I think economics is of such a tremendous importance that the approach to it should be of a more sensible and cautious nature and with a very, very firm desire of picking the best brains we have available, not just to have a public session where these best brains very often do not get a chance to speak at all, or if they do, they are not heard and certainly not listened to.

Opposition, this is of course the first year that I have been in opposition, some people would like to hope that perhaps I will be here for a long time in opposition, but that remains to be seen. But, oppositions are only opposing and never offering any sensible solutions or any sensible alternatives. I know that what I am about to say a great many people will disagree me, but in any case, I am going to throw out these suggestions, just as an illustration, I think over on this side of the House we can do more than just oppose.

First of all, and this seems to me to be a prime requisite of Newfoundland at the present time, we have a top heavy machine, I think to begin with the Cabinet of the Province is outrageously large. I think ten or twelve men would be just as capable of doing the work, as are the present eighteen. And I would hope that if ever another government comes into being that the Cabinet size would be reduced and that in so doing departments, reformation of departments, and divisions now would be drawn together for a more efficient working unit.

I can think for instance, the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development gave a given learned address the other night, as I told him it was rather erudite, I hate words like what is this one they are using all the time now about services, which is, infrastructure, (I cannot even remember the word). It is that type of word, it is just the sort of thing which to me is drawing a

cloth over what is a clear subject. But, the very title Community and Social Development is in my opinion wrong, because the crying need of this Province should not be stressed with social. It should be stressed as Community Development. Actually, our communities are not bad places in which to live, many of them are very, very fine places in which to live. The basic problem of these communities is that the people in them have nothing to do. They have no means of earning a livelihood, and this is where I differ with a great many people on the other side of the House.

In these small settlements around the country, ever so small an industry would satisfy the people and give them a good means of livelihood. You do not have to have a multi-million dollar industry to support a small town like Belleoram. If you had something in a place like that which was bringing in several hundred thousand dollars in wages, then you would have a very, very happy community indeed in that place, and I can think of many, many more in my district and around the country. And this is where I agree with the idea of Community Development. But, Social and Community Development is rather apt to put it in the field of sociologists, and people who are, as we term long haired, deep thinkers and dreamers to some degree, who are rather apt to put the emphasis on the social aspect of the thing. I feel that the economic aspect of the development is by far the most important, but the social aspect will work themselves out once the economic base has been provided. I do feel for that reason that this particular department, as a department could be abolished. And it should be brought in under a planning division of the Department of Finance. Because all of this is going to cost money. And to see that the money is spent properly and well, will be the prime objective in creating something which will last. Now there is no point in just dishing out money on perhaps a scheme that some sociologist dreams of, unless that scheme has a practical end and a practical purpose. And I always felt that when I was a Minister of Finance that within the department there could be built up a very, very strong division of economists and people who feel with vigor, the people who look into what an expenditure really means and what it will produce. And this is the type of person that I think should be looking into Community and Social Development.

I am not passing any bouquets to my hon. friend the member for St. John's West, but I think a man of his type or several men of his type would seem the right type of person to head up this kind of thing, because he would look at it in a hard nosed, very direct business like manner. And would see that we got good value for every cent we spent.

The Department of Labrador Affairs, I am going to make myself even impossible than some of the Ministers across the other side of the House by going on as I am. But, the department of Labrador Affairs, while I think is a very great complement to the people of Labrador. And possibly from a political standpoint is very necessary because after all Labrador does feel that it is a neglected part of this Province, and they need to have their identity shown at every possible chance. But, I do feel that the Department of Labrador Affairs could well be combined with a greatly strengthened division of Newfoundland and Labrador Affairs. I would replace the Department of Provincial Affairs, with a Department of Newfoundland Provincial and Municipal Affairs drawing in the whole thing into this one department, with separate divisions. Because under all that the development of these areas what needs to be done could be emphasized within divisions without having a necessity of a whole great clumsy departmental setup. You know the law, where once you start something, it just keeps adding. The fellow who wrote the book about it, I read it, it was very amusing. "Parkinson's Law" But this is happening all away along the line. And in our state and circumstances, and in our need to conserve our money, we need to condense and draw in all of our activities into better operating, more efficient and more practical control units. And I would feel that it is a very necessary step. I do not think, I am sure it would not hurt the present employees in government services. In fact with a combination of this sort of approach and the public administration classification and posts, you would then get the top brains condensed into an all out effort in these various divisions.

To pick on another department, my hon. friend, the old feildian, across the way, the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I would like to see his department very greatly strengthened. That is a very vital and essential department of Government. I would like to see the department given strong divisions of engineering, purchasing and building control. Now why do I bring purchasing into that, because I would abolish the Department of Supply, and bring it in under this one overall department. So that the purchasing which does fall much into the same category as building control and so on, its all the business operation could well be conducted under the Department of Public Works. But, even more important than that particular division, is a very, very strong engineering division because I would venture to bet if you look into what has been done throughout this Province in the last twenty

years in the way of public buildings and so on, that thousands upon tens of thousands of dollars could have been saved by proper engineering and study of the structures that were created. It has been a hodge podge of fast building and many, many mistakes have been made. We see them all around us. And this should have been much, much better controlled by a very, very strong engineering division. I think it would be money well spent, if we had within that department a very well qualified, well staffed division of engineering.

I then would go back and combine Health and Welfare. Because Health and Welfare, in my opinion, do much the same function right throughout the Province. They both operate institutions, it is not much difference whether you operate a hospital or a Hoyle's Home, or a children's home, or a home for handicapped children or something like this. It could all come under the same division, and as the Minister is very fond of pointing out, the Minister of Welfare, a lot of their services are not just related to the providing of social assistance, that is an important function of the department. But, an awful lot of their functions are related to looking after sick and disabled people. And in my opinion, this would better come under Health. And I can see the joining of these two departments which could be very effective indeed.

Now the key of all my remarks on the combinations of departments and cutting down the size of the ministerial staff and so on, would relate to the Department of Finance. We have seen the Auditor General's Department

MR. EARLE: The Auditor General's report, and some of the remarks in it are to say the least very disturbing. The criticism last year and again this year is most disturbing. I noticed in one paragraph here that the Auditor General himself said that the Treasury Board did not permit him to get the staff which he needed - this was true. I was Chairman of the Treasury Board at the time - there were six other ministers on it with me, and the reason for was that we were told to hold the line that we were trying to keep expenditure down - and we were trying to hold expenditures of Government within range. Not only his department, but many other departments suffered from shortage of staff and they could not fill posts which were approved by the Civil Service Commission - we just put the brakes on because we had to cut back somewhere on this growing expenditure.

I felt at the time as Minister of Finance that the most vital department of Government which needed staff was the Department of Finance, and possible some of these errors which had been reported by the Auditor General would not have occurred had we had the staff to look after them, and the properly qualified people.

The Department of Finance, like many other departments growing up over the years has a certain amount of dead wood in it which in time will have to be phased out - but in the highly complicated and complex operation of finance today, you need very expert people in that field. This causes me to say at the moment that I am terribly distressed and horrified actually that the leading man, and the Deputy Minister who served under me has tendered his resignation. I had nothing but the highest regard and respect for him. I felt he was doing an excellent job for Newfoundland and I am sorry to see him go. I think it is going to be very, very difficult indeed to get a man of his calibre to take up that job, because as I said at the time he worked under great stress, very trying conditions and it is not going to be easy to get a good man to replace him, but it is very, very essential. It is a great loss to Newfoundland, and I do think that every effort must be made to get the top best man we possibly can to replace Mr. Groom.

In the Department of Finance for I think it was six months before I left, he had no deputy or assistant Deputy Minister in charge of revenue - but revenue is the life-blood of the Province, if you cannot get revenue in, you do not exist. And some of this non-collection of taxes and so on was very much due to the fact that the personnel were not there to do it. I feel that one of the greatest obligations of Government is to continue and strengthen

the Department of Finance so that it is literally the controlling body of the Government. I feel quite sincerely that monies that we will be given to spend - from Ottawa in the future, many questions will be asked about them - they will not just be passed out on a platter to be spent on something which has no visible end - and therefore our economists and people who control the spending of money and study the best means by which it should be spent are really the most essential people in this Government. This is why I stress so particularly the Department of Finance as being the backbone of the Government.

There is a suggestion somewhere along the line that Treasury Board Chairman be not the Minister of Finance, well I occupied both seats when I was there and I think that he should - I think that the Minister of Finance should be Chairman of the Treasury Board because there is nobody sitting in the position of the Minister of Finance that from day to day and hour to hour almost has more idea of what is going on by way of expenditure. And in Treasury Board decisions are made of course, affecting huge blocks of expenditure in the Province. So who better should there be than the Minister of Finance to chair that Treasury Board. I do not agree with splitting it up - I think it would be a bad move.

Finally of the Department of Finance, if I were Premier, and I am never likely to be I admit it - but I would never appoint a man with Premiership ambitions as Minister of Finance. Because, a Minister of Finance is with his own colleagues rather unpopular. He has to put the screws on. In the public eye he is the scrudge who keeps the money from being wasted - and he is not the type of person who is going to get tributes or three cheers for what he does. He has a hard job to do, and a very difficult one. If his decisions are influenced at all by political considerations he cannot do his job properly. I feel that the Minister of Finance is in a very, very delicate position - he should be a man with the ability to try and divorce his political ambitions and his political thinking from the absolutely economic necessities which he faces from day to day.

Now again I think in this Province we are not using something which is very, very valuable and could be of even greater value to the Province - in the Memorial University. We are bringing in to that University, some of the most highly qualified scientists and other people economists and so on, who would teach over there and have a lot of time for research and so on - and are doing an excellent job I think with the students. But I wonder how many

times we use them in seeking advice on some times - Government problems which are of a nature that relate to a person of their particular background. For instance, I think that sometime before the trouble in Placentia Bay over the red herring actually got before the scientific people in Memorial University - I had been told, I do not know how correct it is, but I have been told that they had people over there some of the best in the world to discuss - examine that problem and perhaps to come up with some of the answers. Well, why did we not use them? Why did we not call upon them? We are bringing them into the country, and they are here - they are available and these are the people that should be consulted.

I think the university on the following matters should be a guide arm for the Government. Certainly on educational matters, they are the background and the corner stone you might say of our educational system. Scientific matters, we do not have any Government people of scientific training that can answer some of the questions that these fellows can, and they should most certainly be consulted in this. Environmental matters which is a study which they are conducting at some great length over there, I think they should be consulted on that. Certainly on social matters, because they have a very forward social course over there - and this is where some of our best social service people receive their training. And cultural matters - of course, culture without saying anything relates closely to a university.

In these particular fields, I do not think that we are taking advantage of the university personnel that we should. In fact, for my money I do not think that some of our best qualified people throughout the general public are listened to often enough - and I would like to see them brought into the picture much more frequently - much more often and certainly paid much more attention to.

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. EARLE: Yes, certainly

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Public Welfare, whether he consulted social welfare, but I know that I did when I was Minister of Public Welfare - but he preceded me in the portfolio - the social welfare people at the university to whom he has just made reference I believe Sir, in his remarks which we have been following with great attentiveness Sir.

MR. EARLE: Yes, some of these people were consulted, of course they were

very closely ...

MR. ROBERTS: By the minister?

MR. EARLE: Not by the minister as such. In my day - perhaps the hon. gentleman knew more about it than I did - I will leave that to him to decide.

MR. ROBERTS: I consulted with them, but the hon. member did not

MR. EARLE: Perhaps he did consult with many more of these - but I do not know how that got through the Government actually in solving some of the problems. Perhaps he was ~~be~~ successful in bringing it in - I certainly was not.

MR. ROBERTS: Perhaps I was a better informed Minister of Public Welfare

MR. EARLE: Quite likely, I think the hon. gentleman was probably better informed on a lot of things - infact he talks as if - he must be better informed so I defer to him in that case. He is certainly far better educated and he is probably much better informed, but I think on balance the conduct of the Department of Welfare when I was Minister, and the conduct of it when he was minister is not too much to point at, in that perhaps the staff of the department could answer that question better than anybody else.

Anyhow, I did not mean to be diverted in this particular thing. There is I feel within Government and there has been for some time, a very, very strong desire to depict for our people - and to show our people a grandeur - I mentioned this word before, but an ostentation which sometimes is far above what we can afford. The people, particularly in the smaller places around the country are more interested in their particular little problem and their place, than they are in seeing something grand and glorious develop from a Government source.

I will not refer to what I already spoke about in this connection because it is water under the bridge in these arts and cultural centres and this sort of thing. But there are a lot of things which do not run into the many many millions that these things do. But little activities of Government and so on, all sorts of frills and ostentations which I am quite sure could be abolished and could save the Province many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Now the word priorities was always a rather frowned upon word when I was sitting on the other side, but I still think it has great significance in this Province and there is no doubt - anybody does not have to stop to think at all that the priorities for Newfoundland are quite easy to distinguish in the following order in my opinion - Industries, small and large is the first priority for this island which interpreted means jobs.

Now, how we go about that, and how we provide it is the only basis of our disagreement. Our disagreement is on the free -wide and handsome handout

as against the careful, studious approach to the thing with absolutely essential planning before decisions are reached.

Education without question both vocational and academic must take second priority, because the industrial development of the Province most certainly cannot get very far without a vast improvement in our educational system.

Thirdly, I place as the third priority this idea of community development because, I do not know how much further resettlement will have to go around the Province of Newfoundland, how much is necessary, but I am quite convinced that there is a large part of Newfoundland - and a large number of settlements in Newfoundland that can live - the people of which can live a very enjoyable existence in their own immediate area, providing something can be done to develop these communities. I think we should go very, very slowly indeed from here on in encouraging people to leave them.

All of the other needs of Government I think to a greater or lesser degree will fall under these three headings of priorities which I have outlined. But Mr. Speaker, may I close my address today by saying that, in order that any priority can amount to anything, the planning for it must be careful, accurate and unbiased. Thank You.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take much time replying to the hon. gentleman who just sat down. There are one or two points he made in his speech today, and on Friday to which I think an answer ought to be made. He expressed the opinion here today that the Minister of Finance ought to be the gentleman in charge of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Speaker, although he was Minister of Finance for a year or so, a year and a half, he evidently still does not know what has happened - and that is that the Government have taken away from the Minister of Finance control over the spending of the Government and put it in the hands of the Treasury Board, and that the Minister of Finance as Minister of Finance, as a member of the Cabinet that is another matter, but as Minister of Finance he is just another member of the Treasury Board. It is commonly the case throughout the British Commonwealth that the head of the Treasury Board is not the Chancellor of the exchequer or the Minister of Finance or the Provincial Treasurer or whatever is the title used throughout Canada. We are following that practice in Newfoundland the British practice, and the Canadian practice at Ottawa, and the practice generally throughout the British Commonwealth, that the head of the Treasury Board is not the Minister of Finance. There will be legislation in the present

session to give effect to our decision to make President of the Treasury Board a minister who is not Minister of Finance - although the Minister of Finance will of course be a member of the board. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be aware of that.

Now Mr. Speaker, it does not matter how small or how big, it is the principle, it is the system, it is the technique, it is the methodology of doing it - it is the same here - it will be the same here as generally throughout the British Commonwealth. The hon. gentleman in his catalogue of reforms suggests a merger of two of the largest departments of state in this Province - the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare back into one department as indeed it was, they were at one time.

The Department of Welfare has 1,100 persons operating in it, and they spend \$42 million a year. The Department of Health has 3,000 persons working in it, and they spend \$60 million a year - so that is \$102 million spent by those two departments. One third of the entire expenditure of the Newfoundland Government by these two departments. With over 4,000 persons employed in them, you could merge them, you could merge them, and you would save about one deputy minister, and you might save ten or twelve other officials.

MR. ROBERTS: You will not even save a deputy minister

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is questioned if you would save a deputy minister. It is questioned if you would save one member of the two staffs of over 4,000 persons. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need, a pressing need for more staff not less - more in these two great departments, and I am afraid that that reform would not accomplish very much.

The hon. gentleman who just sat down told us here in this House that in connection with the last Budget Speech this document here, of 120 pages - fools cap - 120 pages of this Budget Speech, he is the author of sixteen words. He wrote sixteen words of the Budget Speech. Mr. Speaker, I wonder why he told the House this? Hon. members must have been wondering why he told the House - that he was in fact himself the author of only sixteen words of these thousands of words in the Budget Speech, that he brought down. He brought it down and we were all witnesses to that - we saw him, we heard him, bring down the Budget Speech. We cannot help being curious to know why he insists on telling us that he himself wrote only sixteen words of the speech.

In the first place Mr. Speaker, it was not supposed to be a personal document. It was not supposed to be a personal testimony. It was not supposed to be a bit of personal evidence. It was the Budget Speech of this Province and of this Government and he was the Minister of Finance and he brought it

down, why then did he tell the House that he had written only sixteen words of it? Does he mean to tell us now - does he want us now to believe that these sixteen words were the only words in the Budget Speech that he meant? Did he mean only the sixteen words that he wrote? Did he not mean all the words of the Budget Speech that he brought down himself in person? That the other words that he did not deliver - he delivered without meaning them - those that he did not write himself - that he did not believe them? Why did he tell us that he was the author of only sixteen words of the Budget Speech?

And having delivered the Budget Speech Mr. Speaker, in this House - why did he take credit for the Speech and act as though he had written every word of it - that is how he acted - he acted as though he has in fact written every last word of the Budget Speech. Then in the next case, why does he think it matters - why does he think it matters Mr. Speaker, who wrote the actual words of the Budget Speech in view of the fact that the Budget Speech is the policy and philosophy of the Government. And it is very properly brought down by the Minister of Finance - although of course, in most Provinces across Canada the Minister of Finance is the Premier. The Premier of the Province holds the portfolio of Finance because, of course, the Budget Speech does express the policy and philosophy of the Government of the Province or of the nation as the case might be.

MR. HICKMAN: Would the hon. the Premier permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes

MR. HICKMAN: Would he advise the House of the number of Premiers other than the Premier of British Columbia who is Minister of Finance in Canada.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, that would be an interesting one

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the Premier of Quebec

MR. CROSBIE: No he is not

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well normally he is, usually he is

MR. CROSBIE: He is not now

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes he is, has he is, and the Premier of Nova Scotia very commonly

MR. CROSBIE: He is not now, not now

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sometimes happens that a Premier in a Canadian Province has someone else. I did, I was Minister of Finance of this Province for awhile, but normally my practice has been to invite one of my - some other colleague of mine to assume the portfolio, and it sometimes happens in Canadian Provinces that the Premier does the same thing, that he invites some colleague to hold

the office, but whether the Premier holds the office himself or invites a colleague to do it, it is unthinkable - quite unthinkable in the British system - under the British constitutional system - it quite unthinkable that the Minister of Finance would bring down a Budget at variance with the sentiments, and the philosophy and the policy of the Premier, the Leader of the administration. Because, the Budget Speech has to be - it has to be there is no choice - it has to be the expression of Governmental policy and Governmental philosophy.

MR. ROBERTS: It is equally unthinkable that it does not represent any member of a Government who does not.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is unthinkable that the Budget Speech should be brought down in the House, in the people's House and not represent the view point of every individual member of the Cabinet. Because, any minister of the Crown who would sit in the House and hear his colleague bring down the Budget Speech with which he disagreed and had not resigned on it would be a most extraordinarily peculiar kind of a minister.

Mr. Speaker, here is the Budget Speech, on page four he says - the minister say "I think it is realistic to say" he said "I think it is realistic to say that from the educational point of view we are better prepared to face the future than we ever were in the past." Now he said that "I" On page eleven, again, he says in his Budget Speech "Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear that this Government do not regard with a complacent spirit the encouraging figures that I have just related." that was "I" the Minister of Finance on page eleven. On page twelve, he says "Mr. Speaker, I have been at some considerable trouble to come to an estimate of the grand total sum of money and so and so, and so and so." On page fourteen, again, he says "the estimate I have made for the twenty year period is as follows." I have made, the estimate I have made. Page sixteen, he says "I think it would be reasonable to estimate that about one third of the total was received in the first ten years of Confederation and so on, and so on." On page eighty-one, he says this, on page eighty-one, the hon. gentleman who just sat down said "Mr. Speaker, in my abbreviated review of the past twenty years, given at the outset of my remarks today, I showed that we are now incomparably better placed to launch a great forward movement in our Province than we would have considered possible twenty years ago. We are as a people, better educated, better fed, better housed, better clothed. We are better informed, more alert minded and more confident than we have ever been. Our transportation system has been enormously strengthened, our communications system has been vastly improved, 631

our municipal organization is beyond all comparisons stronger and better than it ever was. We have more and better hospitals than we ever had. We have a dramatic new electric power program, a vast development of our mining resources and a large number of very modern fish plants that have been built since the coming of Confederation. All of these things in the aggregate give us, as a Province and as a people an unheard of strength and readiness for the next great forward march.

Then finally on page 119, the hon. gentleman said this: He said it, who ever wrote it - he brought it down here in this House. He took responsibility for it. " It is our clear understanding of the final and supreme importance of this problem that brings us to the central theme of our policy as a government; the theme that it is economic development that must be our all-absorbing passion in Newfoundland. It is economic development that must command the best brains and the most ardent spirits of our Province. It is economic development and economic development alone that can provide the honest and enduring dollars to pay for true greatness in this Province.

True, we can attempt to win greatness by paying for it with handouts from the National Capital but there is no enduring future in that. We can turn our backs on it but that would not be profitable. We can adopt a policy of timid resolution, of inflexible resolution, we can go at the matter of economic development with implacable courage and determination. And it is our view in this Government that anything else (anything else but what?) but implacable courage and determination, anything else would fall short of accomplishing the great purpose we seek.

The words then must be "Go forward Newfoundland!"

The second twenty years of our union with Canada becons with that great challenge; may we have the stoud hearts, lively imagination and inflexible willpower to accept the challenge and realize our destiny. In this challenge lies nothing less than the future of our young people, the security of our middleaged and the comfort of our old. In our twenty year advance since Confederation the die has been cast - progress or perish."

Now he said that, he brought that down in this House and not only that but in the debate that followed he defended it and not only that but, Sir, he was interviced on the radio, immediately afterwards. And again and again and again in that radio interview he defended his

budget, he defended every position he had taken in it. He was interviewed, for example, by Mr. John Carter, a reporter of the "Evening Telegram", who was engaged by the "CBC" for the purpose of interviewing the Minister, the then Minister of Finance, and again and again (and I have a tape of the interview, by the way, of the radio interview with the hon. gentleman) and again and again in that speech he refers to "my budget" to "my budget." "I said in my budget." All through his interview it was "my budget."

Then the interviewer, Mr. Carter, said to him:

"Mr. Minister, there is a phrase in your speech which says 'Progress or Perish'." And the reporter remarked that the Premier frequently used the term "Develop or Perish" and he asked the hon. gentleman if there were any difference between what the Premier so commonly said - "Develop or Perish" - and what he had said in his budget speech - "Progress or Perish" - and he said; "No, not really. It was just the Premier's way of expressing the same thing."

And all through the interview, all through the debate in this House, this budget speech which he now tells us he wrote as to sixteen words only of it, he defended it. He defended it as his statement of the Government's policy. Now why does he come out and tell us, why, why, what compulsion was there in him, what lamentable, what surprising lack of knowledge, of understanding of, of grasp of the British Constitutional System, under which we operate, lead him to make that statement?

To begin with he did say it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a lamentable breach of Cabinet secrecy. A lamentable breach. Does anybody suppose in this House that the Budget Speech that is brought down in the Parliament of Canada, has been written word for word by the Minister of Finance. Does anybody seriously suppose that? Well then he is entirely wrong if he does. Does anybody suppose the Budget Speech is normally, ordinarily, across Canada written by the Minister of Finance, or the Premier, or the Provincial Treasurer, or whatever is the title - Does anybody suppose that the Budget Speech brought down by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the United Kingdom is a document that has been written by the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Does not everybody remember the famous anecdote of Lord Randolph Churchill when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer - the father of the great Sir Winston Churchill.

He was reading this Budget Speech and it was full of figures with decimal points, twenty-eight point one, or seventy-nine point six. And he got fed up with it - and he is famous for the exclamation he made Mr. Speaker, "what are these damn dots?" This is the Chancellor of the Exchequer - "what are these damn dots?" Now he was tearing up the author of that Budget Speech.

It does not matter who writes it. It does not matter who writes it. But who writes the Budget Speech - nobody ever suggested that chartered accountants wrote Mr. Gordon's speech. If it was suggested that they were brought in to help draft certain information and put together certain figures, but no one ever suggested that a couple of chartered accountants in Toronto, or chartered accountants from any other part of Canada were brought in to write that speech. And nobody knows who wrote the Speech.

I would suspect that it was written by maybe twenty different persons, at least twenty different persons. I would suspect that the minister of this, and the minister of that, and the minister of the other, each wrote a part of the speech, dealing with some particular aspect of the program and the policy and the philosophy of the Government, with which each minister would be most familiar. And I would suspect that ministers are invited to make contributions to the Budget Speech, as they are invited to make contributions to the Speech from the Throne.

But, who does it, who writes it, is certainly a Cabinet secret, about which every minister has taken an oath on the Bible - a solemn oath on the Bible

to maintain secrecy. And if you can pick and choose which oaths you will break - if you can pick and choose - you will kiss the Bible and take this over that, and if you have the right to pick and choose which oath you will break, it is a peculiar state of affairs to say the very least.

The hon. gentleman across thought very highly of me up to a few weeks ago, very highly. He thought I was the man to be Premier. Here is what he said, in print, in public, in print - "I feel, the hon. gentleman said, I feel that Premier Smallwood should continue as the leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, and as the head of the Government, because" - now he gives three reasons, and he numbers them - 1,2,3 "should continue as the leader of the liberal Party of Newfoundland and as head of the Government, because (1) his record shows that he has worked and fought incessantly for the advancement and progress of Newfoundland without sparing himself, and never giving in to disappointment and discouragement". That is one reason why he thought I should continue as leader and as Premier. The second reason (2) "He has abundant health and energy backed by the longest experience as leader of the Government with which to continue to spearhead our struggle - to lift Newfoundland to even greater achievements". And his third reason was; (3) "And above all, he strives constantly to overcome Newfoundland's greatest basic problem - more and more employment for its people, and places that objective ahead of all others."

This is the sentiment of the hon. gentleman up to within three or four, say five weeks of the elections of the leader of the Liberal Party, my re-election. This was his sentiment. The hon. gentleman went up to Fortune Bay with me, and he campaigned with me when I went up there as a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal Party. He accompanied me and he went around with me, and he wrote that piece, and he was an advocate and a supporter of mine.

And suddenly four or five weeks before the election, he suddenly became a supporter of somebody else, and then a few weeks after that he became a Tory.

I seem Mr. Speaker, to be fated, I seem to be fated to experience that sort of thing - I seem to be fated. The hon. the member for Humber East resented bitterly a statement I made out in Corner Brook at a public meeting, when I said that I had dragged him in to the House of Assembly on my coat-tail

He resented that. That was not true. It was not true that I had brought him in, lifted him, carried him as a baby into the House of Assembly. That was not true, he resented it. He did not like it at all. He denied it. He denied it - I am misquoting the hon. gentleman? Let us have it: correct -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am quite cheerfully willing to yield to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, I suggest to your honour, if he wishes to ask me a question - he cannot make a speech, but if he wishes to ask me a question, and if he has one-third of the brains that he needs to frame this question, he can frame it - he can ask me a question, and he can frame it in such a way as to put the answer in my mouth. He is a lawyer -

MR. WELLS: I am quite prepared to do that Mr. Speaker - I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question if I may? Does the hon. the Premier not recall that his statement in fact was, that he dragged me in screaming against my will, on one occasion - does he not recall that? And that statement I refuted as being wrong - Does he not recall that I have acknowledged publicly on many occasions -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. SMALLWOOD: He does not mind, he is going to finish anyhow - he does not care about you Your Honour.

MR. WELLS: I was permitted to ask a question Your Honour -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And he ended up by making a speech -

Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to have participatory democracy in the Chamber. The citizens are beginning to join with us, and I do not think it is right. I think it ought to be stopped right in the bud.

MRS. SPEAKER (NOEL): Order please! I have explained on other occasions that visitors to the galleries are not permitted to take part in the proceedings, or to make their presence felt by applause or laughter or movement or in any other way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do that Mr. Speaker, and I did it when other hon. members were speaking. The hon. member for Humber East told us in his speech in this debate that there was nothing whatever in the Speech from the Throne. Nothing - except the words "Mr. Speaker" and "members of the hon. House of Assembly".

That was all that was in it. Nothing in it he said, beyond those words that His Honour the Governor uttered "Mr. Speaker - he bows to me - he bows to the Leader of the Opposition - and hon. members of the House of Assembly." That was all that was in the Budget Speech, according to the hon. gentleman. Nothing in it - there was no reference in it to anything of any importance - such as for example, our engaging an eminent lawyer to put to the test our claim that we own the off-shore oil and mineral rights. That is not important - Such as for example, the reference to shell-housing and co-operative condominium housing - that is not important - nothing in it, such as the Education Acts, such as the Economic Conference, such as the Labrador Iron Ore Expansion - such as the introduction of a great new purchasing system for the Government.

Such as the Legislation to authorize the Government to appoint an ombudsman - such as legislation to control house rents - such as the reference to DREE. None of these of importance. The Speech was empty, except for the words "Mr. Speaker and members of the hon. House of Assembly." That was all that was in the Speech.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman then told us of the millions of gallons of water that were spilling over the dam in Bay d'Espoir. He said we do not need power that will be developed at Bay d'Espoir. And then again, in spite of that, although there is more power than we need being developed already right now at Bay d'Espoir with the water spilling over the dam, not needed, not generating any power - although there is more power being generated now already at Bay d'Espoir - we are spending forty, fifty, sixty millions more to build - or the Power Commission are, to build a great new Power Plant at Duff's, Seal Cove near Holyrood.

What is it for he says? We do not need this power, and yet we are building more at Seal Cove. We do not need it, we cannot sell it. Who is going to use it? And what are we going to do with it? These were his statements and his questions.

Well I am going to deal with that. As for the iron ore he says, there is no likelihood of that happening. That is it - that is it - The Governor in the Speech from the Throne says - the hon. gentleman said, there is no likelihood of this happening. And he probably also said that it was no likelihood of DREE happening either - probably - he does not believe, he has very little belief that there is going to be a great paper mill at Stephenville.

He has the greatest possible skepticism about that, and as for an oil refinery and a paper mill at Come-by-Chance, he just laughs that out of the Chamber. Yes that is right, he is extremely doubtful about the paper mill in Stephenville. That is right. And he also said in his speech that there is no likelihood of that happening, that is the development of the iron ore in Labrador.

And he also had another statement, he talked about the Government's waste and extravagance, such as students' allowances and mothers' allowances. Waste and extravagance. I noted it when he said it - I repeat it now, I repeat his statement - waste and extravagance, such as students' allowances and mothers' allowances. I repeat it now Mr. Speaker, to give it more currency, to give it further currency so that the hon. gentleman will never be able to get off the hook. He cannot deny it, it is in Hansard. He does not deny it, he confirms it again here now. This is what I want - this is what I am looking for. I am looking for indorsation from him that I am quoting him correctly.

These words will come back. Then again in his speech he refers to John Shaheen. John Shaheen. Now my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health will deal with the hon. member for Humber East, so far as concern the remarks of the hon. member for Humber East with regard to John Shaheen and the agreements. My hon. friend, the Minister of Health will deal with him, and if the hon. member for Humber East does not quit and go out with his tail between his legs, then he has a thicker hide than even I think he has, and I think it is thick enough.

He will do it. He will do it. The hon. gentleman had better just sit humbly and modestly and hear it. This hon. gentleman who speaks of Mr. Shaheen, this hon. member for Humber East, who speaks of Mr. Shaheen as a man getting \$5,000,000 from the Government derived by taxing chocolate bars.

That is right, that is right. He does not deny it. John Shaheen got \$5,000,000, and where did it come from? It came from taxing chocolate bars, this \$5,000,000. Now this is high statesmanship. This is profound, it is deep - it is thoughtful, it is tolerant, it is catholic (c). This is the real stuff of statesmanship, that John Shaheen got \$5,000,000 - he got it - he was given \$5,000,000, there is no doubt to go a big spree - no doubt to go on a big drunk. No doubt to entertain all his friends. No doubt just to pocket it and put it to his own personal use. And what a scandalous thing it is, that this stupid Government should give John Shaheen \$5,000,000 for his own personal

use, having forced - had to go out and tax chocolate bars to get the \$5,000,000.

Now this adds to the enlightenment of the Newfoundland people. This really enlightens our people - this makes them understand more clearly does it not? What the great oil refinery deal is at Come-by-Chance.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell him something about Bay d'Espoir, and the power of the Power Commission. Here is the situation. I have it here under the heading of Power and Power Commission. The wit is devastating. I am annihilated by that wit. I am burning. The hon. gentleman would be surprised if he knew how much he had taught me. He would be surprised if he only realized, if he had a hint of how much I have learned from him. He would be greatly surprised, but he would not be happy.

Now about this water spilling over the dam Mr. Speaker. You see, you have your choice of not building, not building the dam - not backing up the water. A dam is built to back up water. So that when you want to let it down over, it will come down and develop electricity - falling water...

You can decide not to build the dam and you can decide not to back up the water, and you can decide not to have any falling water there available to you. Until somebody places an order for the power and when he places the order for the power you will be in a position to deliver it to him two and a half years later.

Now two and a half years later might very well be two and a half years late. Too late. Not only later but too late. Get the order for the power then start building the dam and backing up the water and getting the fall of water and developing the power, and let the customers get the power as soon as they want it, or wait until you get the order then start ^{and} make the customers wait.

Now the other course open to you of course is to anticipate the power that will be needed. Based on all the estimates that you can get, based on all the data, all the information you can lay your hands on, practical, level-headed, hard-fisted engineers. George Hobbs, Wallis Reid and a core of men of 25 or 30 superior men in that Power Commission, who are watching the power development of this Province and of Canada generally, and are making their careful estimates of what power will be needed next year, the year after, the year after, the year after, every year, for the next five, ten, fifteen, twenty years; and planning accordingly. This Government that does no planning.

When the dam is finished, and the power is available it may well be the case that for a month, or three months or five months you have an excess of power. The customers may not be quite ready to receive the power. It is better to have the power surplus before your customers need it than to have your customers waiting on it and not being able to deliver it, not having it to deliver, surely it is better business, it is more sensible for the Power Commission to develop the power and have it there waiting for the customers rather than to have the customer there waiting on the power which is not yet ready. Surely, surely that is true.

MR. WELLS: If we can afford it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now this would mean, that the water might very well spill over the dam for a brief period. The other day Mr. Speaker, serious trouble developed in the powerhouse at Deer Lake. Now, I am in the Hon. gentleman's own district. Humber East. Serious trouble developed in Bowaters great powerhouse at Deer Lake. And they were out 30,000 horsepower, out, did not have it, it was not there for them. The trouble in their powerhouse was such that 30,000 horsepower that they most desperately needed for the mill and the town of Corner Brook was not there. The plant was not producing it, they were down, they were short, they were out 30,000 horsepower. If the Power Commission had not had 30,000 horsepower to spare. If

they were not developing it, if they had not built the dam or dams, if they had not built the canals, if they had not backed up the water, they would not have had that 30,000 horsepower to deliver to Bowaters and the mill would have closed down. The town would have closed down, in Corner Brook. But the Power Commission were there ready and waiting to deliver the power immediately so there was no dislocation.

It is absolutely necessary Mr. Speaker, for the Power Commission to have 20,30 40,000 horsepower in reserve always, always that much in reserve, available for any such emergency that might arise. For example, Mr. Speaker, give you another example, I have given you one from Deer Lake on the West Coast, I will give you one now on the East Coast, namely at Duff's. We are building a great 400,000 horsepower thermal electric plant at Duff's near Seal Cove, near Holyrood. It is costing \$40 or 50 millions, it will be on stream in the late fall of this year and in the early summer of next year. Two hundred thousand horsepower this fall, two hundred thousand horsepower next summer. Costing something of the order of approximately (from memory now) something of the order of \$50 million.

Now we have had a great storm, an ice storm, we had one, the House may remember a couple of weeks ago around St. John's. I took some movies of it. I took movies, I stopped on an overpass coming along the Trans-Canada Highway and underneath that overpass were two things, first, the tracks of the railway and second the transmission line of the Newfoundland Light and Power Company. And on that transmission line there must have been twenty wires and a cable would pass underneath the overpass. So I stopped the car got out and I took movies and still pictures of the overpass itself, one of the most magnificently handsome sights I have ever seen in my life then I shot the rails and I shot along the wires. Mr. Speaker the wires would not be as big as my little finger, the wires themselves but the ice on them was four inches, many many times the size of the wire, now, but however the wire held and it did not, may be there was not enough wind along with the ice, the terrible load of ice on the wire and on the poles to bring the thing crashing down. But they did bring them crashing down, the poles, the towers that held up the wires and the wires, with the enormous weight of ice they came crashing down nothing could stand that strain. I do not know what will happen whether there will be a good case against the insurance company. I do not know. Whether there would be a case against the engineers, the engineering company, that designed it. I do not know whether there would be against the construction people who installed it I do not know, I do not know but I do know that the enormous weight of the ice and the winds brought down some 25 to 35 towers and miles of wires. With what

result, with this result that for a week in St. John's everything is going to be rationed, for electricity, but not if the plant at Duff's were ready because Mr. Speaker what happens is this, wherever the power is generated, Bay D'Espoir, Rattling Brook, Duff's out here, or anywhere it is fed into the grid and the electricity runs either way. It is not like a river that has to run downhill. The electricity can go east or west, north or south or any point of the compass, just put a wire and the electricity will go in either direction on that wire.

If this plant were running now at Duff's there would be no shortage of power. Because if the power could not come in along the Isthmus of Avalon which is the weak spot of it all, you have the sea on both sides of the Isthmus, you have winds blowing both ways, you have salt water spray, you have a bad situation. If you have the powerhouse operating at Duff's it does not matter, you do not have to bring power in over the Isthmus of Avalon.

Mr. Speaker, here is the increase in power consumption in Canada, for the last three years. For the whole of Canada in 1967 the increase in consumption of electricity for the whole nation was 6.2 per cent that year over the previous year. Six point two per cent three years ago. And last year, in the same year in Newfoundland it increased 9.6 per cent. For all Canada 6.2 per cent for Newfoundland 9.6. For all Canada 1968, 7.3 per cent for all Canada, for Newfoundland 13.9 per cent. Last year 1969, for all Canada consumption of electricity increased 7.4 per cent, in Newfoundland 19.2 per cent. We led all the provinces of Canada. We had 2½ times the percentage of increase that the Canadian nation had. In the three years consumption of electricity in Newfoundland in three years not counting the present year we are in now in three calendar years ending December 31st, the increase in Newfoundland was 42.7 practically 43 per cent, increase in the consumption of electricity. And then the hon. gentleman asked what are we going to do with all the electricity? Answer, sell it. What are we going to do with it? Answer, use it. What are we going to do with it? Answer, consume it. Because the consumption of electricity is increasing faster in this Province than in any other province of Canada.

MR. WELLS: The figures are misleading, this is caused by ERCO primarily.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will deal with ERCO. We will deal with ERCO and we will deal with the ERCO situation. And we will deal with the phony and the imaginary figures the hon. gentleman keep flinging across.

MR. WELLS: They are true.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are untrue. I will give the facts. They are untrue. They are

not facts, they are misfacts. So much for power. But I am going to leave the hon. gentleman yet, He made a speech, Oh that mine enemy had written a book or made a speech. A speech that was recorded on tape and on paper. Oh that mine enemy, mine enemy had made a speech. Anyone Mr. Speaker who has walked around his district and knocked on the doors of his district and talked to the people of his district as I did during the election campaign (and he got that far when he was interrupted) and who do you suppose Mr. Speaker interrupted him, I did. I said "How many doors?" And I remember the statement, "Anyone who has walked around his district and knocked on the doors of his district and talked to the people of his district as I did during the election campaign and I interrupted, 'how many doors? 3000 exactly out of 3340 I could not make the other three hundred and forty. And then I interrupted again rudely, and I said: "Why not?" There were difficulties here in St. John's and I had to come in and help solve. I would have liked to have made the other 300, and I promise I will as soon as it can be done. Anyone who knocked on 3000 doors or any other 3000 doors in this Province and talked to the people knows full well the high esteem and respect and admiration held for the Premier. And what it means, when individuals, when citizens of the Province write to the Premier as opposed to any other member or anybody else in this Province.

I do not wish to get sentimental about this, but I would like to mention one thing that happened. I saw tears stream down the face of an 85 year old man who talked about the Premier, when I knocked on his door at supper time. And then I interrupted and I said that in the House too, that is they break down and cry, in a different spirit altogether. And he went on in an entirely different spirit and for an entirely different reason, he was upset, the old gentleman was upset by some remark made by some member of another party about the Hon. the Premier. He was so upset, he said, "I watched him, I saw it on television, if I had been close to him I would have jumped right into his eyes." That is absolutely a fact and the tears were streaming down his face. Now I have no illusions about the fact that I collected all of the votes that I got. I have no doubt about that. I would like to think that I did. But I must be honest, I would be a fool to be otherwise. No, although those votes were cast for me they were not cast for me as a person. I like to think that a fair number might have been but I know they were cast for me because I supported a party that was lead by a man admired and respected and loved in this Province. And then he denied, then he denied.

and then he denied, then he denied - then having made that speech in this House here, on december 9, 1966, a couple of years ago or more than that - having made that speech he then contradicted me when I said that I had dragged him in by the coattails into this House. I dragged him in alright. He said it here in his own speech.

MR. WELLS: I said it six months ago. I have got no elusions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman can have this consolation. He can have this consolation - he is not alone. He is not the only one over there. I can look to his left and to his right and I can see men who were dragged in by the coattails, also. I know how they got in here, and I know how they will go out. I know how they will go out. I know how they got in and I know how they will go out.

I know who will run. I know how many of the recent Liberals and the new Tories will run again. I do. I know how many will run as candidates and I know enough about politics in Newfoundland to know how many hon. gentlemen across the way are going to run again and whether they will run as Liberals or Tories and whether they will be elected.

I do not need to wait for the election. I know, I know. We will have an electorate and the vote will be held and the election will take place and I know, now, what is going to happen to most of the hon. gentlemen sitting across over there. I know now. Mind you, I am not overlooking the big mass movement. I am not overlooking the big mass movement that is going on, the great popular crusade to put me out and to back the Tories. I am not overlooking that. I am not ignoring the crusade. I am not ignoring the fact, for instance that down in Lewisporte, a day or two after two Liberals left the Liberal Party and joined the Tory Party, a couple of days after that. I remember that they, too, together with the Leader of the Opposition - that made three - together with Mr. Marshall, that made four, the President of the Tory Association and together with the member for Gander - that made five.

AN HON. MEMBER: I did not go to Lewisporte.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did not go to Lewisporte? All right, that made four, but there was one other. Who was the fifth? Who?

644

Well, I am glad to be corrected. I am happy to know the hon. gentleman was not there and he will be happy in a moment. He will be happy to know he was not there. In a moment he will be happy, too, because the five - the three Tories and the two new Tories went down to Lewisporte to launch the crusade - the popular movement that was going to sweep across the face of Newfoundland. They had forty-four persons present besides themselves.

Now, that was not for the town of Lewisporte, which is one of Newfoundland's biggest towns, but that was for the entire district of Lewisporte ~~to~~ to elect officers and executives of the Tory Association of that great district and there were forty-four persons present. Now, that was good, that was very good. That was not too bad altogether - forty-four persons.

If I ever went to Lewisporte to hold a meeting, and forty-four persons came, I would die. I would die if only forty-four came. And if I went there just absolutely alone and -- if I did not go there alone with four or five other prominent politicians, but just alone by myself, drop in there at five o'clock and get announced - send some boys around to say, "Joey is here. He is going to hold a meeting". And if only forty-four turned up, I would die.

I would say, that is the end of Joey. What an ignominious end! But, that is glorious compared with Burin and compared with Marystown. In Marystown, they held a meeting in Marystown. In Gillams, I had a meeting of about 300 persons.

AN HON. MEMBER: You got booed out of the hall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not get booed out of the hall. I went out of the hall and then I came back and I was given a glorious reception ~~in~~ there. I was booed in Lake Melville, in Happy Valley, but 1100 people - sure in 1100 people there must be even thirty or forty who booed me, out of 1100 people, but who won? Who won? And who won in Humber West. I did.

AN HON. MEMBER: By the skin of your teeth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not by the skin of my teeth. I won. All thirty-four - all forty of the delegates voted for me and against the hon. gentleman from St. John's West.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, in ~~the~~ Humber West, I won with a much better

majority, in Humber West, than they did in Humber East. ~~And I did not bring in one Tory - not one Tory was brought in to the meeting at Humber West, and two-thirds of them at Humber East were Tories, two-thirds of them were Tories.~~

Mr. Speaker, in Marystown, the great crusade, the great Tory crusade, they are now up in the south-west coast. The great Tory crusade in Marystown, was for the afternoon and five persons turned up - one of them a Liberal with his card in his pocket. The other a newsman from a radio station and three others. The audience was five, so they called off the meeting and they called it again for that night, and again that night, they had five, this great Tory crusade.

In Burin, twenty - fifteen - some say twenty and some say fifteen. I am going to call it twenty. Oh, Mr. Speaker! Oh, Mr. Speaker, this great Tory crusade that is going to sweep across the face of Newfoundland - when we get through with that crusade, you will not have enough of them to pad a crutch - not to pad a crutch.

I will advise His Honor, the Queen's representative, to dissolve this legislature at my own time of my choosing which is my constitutional right and I have exercised it on six occasions - I have exercised my constitutional right, to advise the Governor to dissolve the General Assembly and hold a General Election and on each of the six times, I won. On the sixth time, I won with the biggest majority of all.

That is when I brought a number of young gentlemen in by the coattails - by my coattails. They all had to hold on. "Hold on! Do not let go for dear life! Hold on to my coattails!" And I brought them in here - into this Chamber with the help of a lot of voters.

Well, this is what the hon. gentleman to the hon. gentleman's left, said in this House. He was not fooling himself that he got elected. I got elected. Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: He ~~is~~^{has} only left geographically, not politically.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has not left at all. He will get left. The newcomers are gone. The newcomers, the newcomers - the loyal old crowd will hear you and who is over there? Who is he? Who are they? Newcomers. Newcomers. Newcomers came in three years ago. Newcomers dragged in on somebody's coattails.

646

AN HON. MEMBER: This man's been here for fourteen years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, not all of them. Yes. That hon. gentleman I - look, I will refrain from discussing him at all. I have affection for him. I have a lot of respect for him. I understand why he is over there where he is and I am sorry. I am sorry, I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, on opening day, the Leader of the Opposition quoted rather copiously from the report of Lord Amulree, who is chairman of the commission, known as the Amulree Commission. He quoted rather copiously the telling of the pathetic conditions there were in Newfoundland in 1933. Pathetic conditions - so bad, such hunger, such starvation, such poverty, such disease in Newfoundland, that we were down and out. This people were down and out and on opening day the Leader of the Opposition quoted passage after passage from the Royal Commission's Report.

Then the hon. gentleman, the member for Humber East, in his speech, took up the theme and continued it. He carried on the speech about the quoting from the Royal Commission's Report, Lord Amulree's Report, and talking of the conditions in Newfoundland in 1933. Hearing as he did - the Leader of the Opposition - he said, "Now, here is a vein of gold, I must mine this one. I must really'---

MR. MURPHY: I acknowledged it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, yes, he acknowledged it, and mined it. He acknowledged it and mined it. Yes, I had not said he had hidden the fact that he said he quoted from the Amulree Commission. He read out passages from the same report as the report from which the Leader of the Opposition reported. He read out the passages from the Amulree Commission. Who - is this hint that he did plagiarizing. He did not plagiarize. He said - he told us and he did not need to tell me because I recognized the words and I am very familiar with that report anyway.

Now, Sir, why did the Leader of the Opposition on opening day, and the hon. member for Humber East, in his speech - why did they both read copiously from the Amulree Report? Why did they do it? They must have thought there was some point in it. They must have had a motive and a reason for doing it, and they soon made it clear what their reasoning was. Their reasoning

was that we are not close to that again.

There would be no point. That is right. That is the point and if the Leader of the Opposition were here, he would, I think, also acknowledge that is the point he was trying to make. Exactly.

Now, the hon. gentlemen - I do not know if he was born in 1933; I wish I could say that. I would be here for the next twenty-five years at least. If I could say that!

Mr. Speaker, let us compare 1933 with now. Is that a fair thing to do? I did not introduce it. It was the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Humber East who introduced the issue into this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier has been doing it for twenty years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I did not take 1933. I take twenty years, twenty-one, nineteen, eighteen, seventeen, sixteen, fifteen, fourteen - I will go back to 1949. I usually compare Newfoundland under the benign influence of Confederation compared with Newfoundland before Confederation.

But, now, we will take 1933 because this is the time introduced by these two hon. members of the House, comparing Newfoundland in 1933 with now, with the strong hint, with the very strong hint that we are now, again something like what we were in 1933 - heavy debt, heavy burden of paying the interest on the debt, a lot of unemployment, a lot of relief, and so on and so on.

Now, I have distributed the figures to the press because they are quite important. In 19 ---

Well, if there are any copies left, yes. It will be in Hansard in any case.

In 1933 and 1969 - these are easy to take down, by the way, and I have them in this form: I have 1933 here and 1969 there and over on the left side, I have the topics and then the two columns - '33, '69.

Total earnings of the Newfoundland people - that is the G.P.P. - in fact in 1933, it was the G.N.P.. Now we call it the G.P.P. Then it was the Gross National Product, now it is the Gross Provincial Product. We were a nation then. God forgive us! We were a nation.

648

But, the G.P.P. - that is the total earnings of all our people - in 1933, was \$35 million - \$35,400,000.00 - \$35.4 million. \$35.5 million - that was the grand total earning of the Newfoundland population in 1933.
For —

649

for our fisheries, that is what they got for their fish and their fish oils, the marine oils, the seal skins, flippers, vegetables, pulp, paper, pulp wood and minerals. The total value of the earnings of the Newfoundland people was \$35.5 million. Last year, now come over to the last column under 1969, it was that \$35 million plus another \$65 million, plus another \$100 million, plus a \$1 billion. Now I will give the exact figures, put down a dollar sign, then put down the figure "1" and a comma, and the figure "100" and a comma again, then three "000" and a comma, then three "000" \$1,100,000,000 last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is thirty-one times as much as in 1933. I am comparing the earnings of our Newfoundland people in these two years, 1933, 1969. Now in 1933, underneath 1933 over to the left put per capita earnings, that is take the total earnings and bring it down to per head, per capita for every man, woman and child in Newfoundland, it was a \$124.00. If you took the population of Newfoundland in 1933, and divided into \$35.5 million, it came to \$124.00 for the whole year. That is what Newfoundlanders had on the average \$124.00 a year. Last year per capita now, put down "2" under 1969, put down "2" comma, "140" \$2,140 for every man, woman and child in the Province. Now that is seventeen times as much per capita, per individual, man, woman, child, as in 1933. Seventeen times as much. Now come back over to the left side, and put down per family earnings for the year - that is a per capita. Now take it by families, under 1933, "620" \$620.00 a family that is what Newfoundland lived on in 1933. An average of \$620.90 a family. Now come over to 1969, and it is "10,700" \$10,700.00 was the average of the G.P.P. in this Province in 1969.

Now, Mr. Speaker, take another figure - we had a debt in 1939, it was \$105 million something of that order. \$106 million, a \$105 million around there, we had a population of 280 something thousand. Anyway to pay the interest on the debt we had no sinking fund remember, in those days, in 1933, we just paid the interest, when we could. It took of the total earnings of the Newfoundland people that year, of all they earned in the whole Island and Labrador, of all their earnings to pay the interest on the debt took, one-fifth of their earnings, the exact figure is nineteen and a-half percent, 19 and $\frac{1}{2}$ percent, 19 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent. of all the earnings of our people, just to pay the interest on the debt, one-fifth of their earnings went to pay the interest on the debt. No sinking fund, not reducing the net, not paying off any of the principal, just the interest alone.

MR. H. COLLINS: I wonder if I could inject here. I wonder would he inform the House what is the source of the 1933 figures which he is using?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, a variety of sources. Budgets, Department of Finance Estimates, and I am the author of some of them because they appeared in books of mind that have^{been} written in the last twenty-five years. I used to be the leading statistician, God forgive me, of Newfoundland. There was a time when I was the only statistician there was around Newfoundland, who went around compiling these figures. You will get it in my various books. I was always fascinated by it. I always took immense interest in compiling these figures. Sir William McGregor, the Governor in 1905 was the first man in Newfoundland's History to compile figures showing the value of manufacturers in Newfoundland. I did the same thing in my book, "The New Newfoundland" in 1925, twenty odd years after Sir William McGregor did it, I was the next to do it.

Now, Sir, to pay the interest on the public debt took, what I have just told you, nineteen and a-half percent of all the earnings, and this last year 2.9 just under three percent - 2.9 percent, it took of our earnings last year, to pay the interest and the service to debt. Now how much of the revenue of the Government that figure I have just given is the total income of the people, but now just take the current account revenue of the Government, in 1933 and in 1969. How much of the current account revenue of the Government was chewed up, was eaten up, was absorbed just to pay the interest on the debt? In 1933, sixty-three percent.

Mr. Speaker, can you ~~now~~ imagine bringing down a budget in Newfoundland later this month, can your ~~own~~^{honour} imagine the shock there would be in this House and in this Province, if the budget revealed that out of the entire current account revenue of the Government in the coming year, it would require sixty-three percent of all of that just to pay the interest on the debt, can you imagine Your Honour the shock and the horror it would be, and that is what it took in 1933. Of all the current account revenue of the Government that year sixty-three percent of it went just to pay the interest on the debt. Sixty-three percent. Last year it was fifteen and a-half percent, fifteen and a-half percent of our current account revenue, that is the year we are now in, the year that ends the end of this month. Fifteen and a-half percent as against sixty-three percent. We are comparing two years, Mr. Speaker, we are comparing 1969 or 70 with 1933.

Now, Sir, here is one of the most interesting tables ever produced on the floor of this Chamber. It is not my figures, I had the statisticians and economists in the Department of Finance do it. In 1933, the per capita debt was \$352.00. Every living soul in Newfoundland, we were not a Province then, owed \$352.00 public debt, that was the per capita, \$352.00. The per capita earnings were \$124.00 for the year. But, every dollar of the people's earnings that year

had to support \$2.84 of debt.

Now in case the hon. gentleman missed the figures just let me repeat them. In 1933, the per capita debt was \$352.00. The per capita earnings of the people that year was \$124.00, which means that every dollar of the G.P.P. of the peoples earnings had to support \$2.84 of debt. Now the significance of that table is seen when you apply it to 1969. Apply the same ratio to 1969, and our debt today would have to be \$3,100,000,000.

MR. COLLINS: We were not as proverty stricken now, as we were then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly, exactly, no one— but who is the one that raised the question of comparing 1933 with 1969? The hon. gentleman now wants to say away from that comparsion now, because little did he know when he made the comparsion what would turn out.

MR. J. C. CROSEIE: What was the per capita at the end of last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not got it here.

MR. C. WELLS: Was it more than doubled our interest in two years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whatever we have done, I will be most delighted to discuss that. I will be delighted to discuss our present debt, our present per capita debt, our burden of interest payments, and what we have to show for it. I will be delighted to discuss that. ~~At~~ the moment, however, I am discussing something that makes the hon. gentleman uncomfortable.

MR. C. WELLS: Oh, not really, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If he has an epidermis as thick as that of an elephant, maybe he is not uncomfortable. Maybe he is not uncomfortable. But, I did not raise this comparsion. Because I would have regarded it has the last word in absurdity to compare today in this Province, to compare the standard of living of our people. The standard of public services, our schools, our hospitals, our roads, our municipalities, the way of people's homes, the clothing they wear, the food they eat, the furnishings in their home, the cars they have, the skidoos they have, all the evidences of living better compare that today with the conditions in 1933.

Let me tell you ^a little about 1933. I have only told here Mr. Speaker about the debt, and the earnings of the people. But, if the earnings of the people in Newfoundland came to \$620.00 a year for every family in the Island and in Labrador, on the average, some would have twice that, but some would have half that. Some would have none. Some would have no income at all. Let me tell you that in that year, Mr. Speaker, the population of Newfoundland was, I believe, speaking from memory 281,000 souls. And the number on dole, and it was dole, it was not social assistance, it was dole, it was a wack, it was a maggoty brown flour.

652

The number on dole that year was 105,000 out of 281,000. What percentage is that? Forty percent? Not fifty percent. Not far short of/half the entire population men, women, and children were on the dole, eating the maggoty brown bread. And you know the amount of the dole? It was six cents a day. It was a \$1.80 a month - a \$1.80 a month for twelve months - at how much ? \$21.60 a year. \$21.60 a year was the dole in 1933. And how dare any man insult this Province, insult Confederation, insult the Newfoundland of 1969-70. Insult us all by comparing it with 1933.

When Newfoundland was rampanted with T.B. it was I tell you , Mr. Speaker, that in 1933 Newfoundland was half rotten with T.B. And half rotten with beriberi. And half rotten with all the malnutrition diseases.

I do not know, if I have ever told the story in this House, There was a young man here in St. John's. He was crippled, one leg shorter than the other, a bit tall, clever, clever. He use to write doggerel verses. He would collect a few cents here and there to pay a printer to print his verses on a sheet of paper, say fifteen inches long and four inches wide, a piece of newsprint paper to print his verses. He would go around selling them for a cent each. That is how he lived. Frank was a clever young fellow. I knew him very well and then I came to his home in Tickle Cove. I was in Keels, and I headed off for Tickle Cove there on the south side of Bonavista Bay, and I walked across the hills, Instead of following the road, I took what they told would be a -- excuse me I was in King's Cove. I had been in Keels then King's Cove and from King's Cove, I walked across the hills to Tickle Cove and the first man I ran into, as I came down out of the hill, out on the edge of the settlement was this man. He was amazed to see me coming down out of the hill, a stranger. In Tickle Cove, it did not happen very often, the hon. Minister of Fisheries will admit, It happens even less now. He looked at me with great and undisguised curiosity wondering who on earth I was, where I was coming from and we got talking, and I told him I had come over from King's Cove. He said, "you walked over." I said, "yes." He said, "alone." I said, "yes, it is only four or five miles." He said, "you must be hungary." I said, "yes, a little." He said, "come over and have a cup of tea."

We went over to his house, Mr. Speaker. He lived alone in that House. He was a widower and he was on relief. I never saw poverty like it, and I have seen lots of poverty and I have experienced poverty myself. I grew up in poverty. No hon. member in this House ever experienced the poverty that I have in my own life, in my own home, growing up as a boy. No one. Nobody here. I do not care who you are. I do not care where you came from. I do not care what you have gone through. I have seen a lot of poverty, but I never saw any poverty like that. The little house consisted of two rooms; a kitchen and one other room. I was not in the other room. The kitchen had a table which consisted of a bale box. He had a couple of small bale boxes for chairs. No covering on the floor, had no curtains, no blinds and half the windows were out, and they were stuffed up with something, brin bags or something. The stove had three legs and something

propped up under it where the fourth leg had been, but I still remember that it was an Improved Success stove, with an oven on it, a wood stove, Improved Success.

He was on the dole. Now mind you, nothing I say by way of description takes away from the man's kind heartedness. He shared what he had - a millionaire cannot do more. He put a square cover of a tin can that used to contain biscuits, may be your Honour, you will remember yourself, I think it was Brownings. They use to put up crackers in a square tin. There was a little shallow lid on it. He had that on the stove. He had a few bits of blasty boughs and twigs he had brought in to make a fire and he put that on the stove upside down and he put a bit of fatback pork in it to render out. There is one thing I cannot stand and that is fatback pork. I never can. I never will. I cannot eat it. That is why I cannot eat fish and brews. I cannot have scrunchings. I am cheated out of that, because I cannot stand it. I cannot eat fatback pork or the juice from it, the grease from it. I cannot do it. He melted - he cut of a little square of fatback and put it in to melt it down and he gave me some dole bread. It was fresh and he nacked of a big thick slice of it and without asking me to do it, he put that down in the improvised frying pan and soaked up the fatback pork and gave it to me. He did not have a plate. He just laid it on the bale box beside me and he brought along a cup with no handle and the edge around it chipped with tea, without sugar or milk. I did not mind the milk, because I never drink it anyway, but I always loved three heaping teaspoonfuls of sugar and that meal was a big thick hunk of dole bread, mopping up some fatback pork.

In 1933, comparing now with 1933, the young gentleman is greew and wet behind the ears. He does not know what he is talking about and a good thing, perhaps for him that he does not. It may be a good thing for his piece of mind. May be he can sleep better at night, for not knowing what it was like in 1933. Oh! what a year that was and the year before and the year before for three or four or five years. It got steadily better, when the Commission came. They began pumpin some money in. It was like giving someone a transfusion, pumping some blood into them, when the commission came.

655

AN HON. MEMBER: If the hon. Premier will permit, only a week or so ago, they put the dial telephone system in Tickle Cove.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dial telephones. There is your comparison of 1969 with 1933. There is your comparison. Do not ever again compare Newfoundland of 1969-1970 with all her flaws, all her weaknesses and all her mistakes and all her everything that is bad, with us all added up, do not ever compare it with six cents a day, a dollar eighty a month, twenty-one dollars a year and over nearly half the population living on that and taking sixty-three percent of the entire revenue of the Government. It ^{took} ~~is~~ all its revenue, sixty-three percent, just to pay the interest on the debt. Why, Mr. Speaker, I remember one year. I think it was the last year, the second last year before Commission of Government. No, the third last year before Commission of Government came. The total revenue of the Government that year was \$8 million and to pay the interest on the debt was \$5 million.- \$5 million out of the \$8 million. That left \$3 million for all light houses, all roads and bridges, all marine works, breakwaters and wharves, for the police, for the courts, for the magistrates, for the Supreme Court, for Civil Service salaries, for Civil Service pensions, for military pensions, for everything to run a country - \$3 million to pay the interest on the debt, \$5 million, total \$8 million. That was 1933 or 1932 or 1931. No comparison.

MR. WELLS: Mismanagement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mismanagement did not cause it.

MR. WELLS: The Amulree report ...

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Amulree report was as wrong as any document that was ever written.

MR. WELLS: Everyone is wrong about mismanagement in the Government today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, because everybody does not think it. A few malcontents think it. A few malcontents and when the election is held the hon. gentleman will find out. He will find out.

MR. WELLS: We will see. We will see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He will find out. Yes, he will see alright. He will see and everybody will see. I have never gone to an election yet after the first one,

in the first election I held of the six. The first election there was a sort of grudging admission from the few, the little handful of poor, benighted Tories who were around then, not the great and glorious party today that is sweeping across the face of our Province, but that poor, benighted little party in that first election - they said, "well no doubt Smallwood will win it." In the next one, the second, the third and the fourth and the fifth and the sixth, in those five general elections, they all forecast that I was going down to ignominious defeat, The people were fed up with me. They were sick of me. They were thirsty. They were thirsty for the Tory party. They were hungry and thirsty to get at the ballots to put the Tories in. Oh; yeah! Oh; yeah! We will see. There is nothing surer than that. We will see alright. We will see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I am supposed in this House to follow Parliamentary Rules, and to keep it clean. I want to be clean here today and tonight. Yes that clock is wrong, the electricity is on now - some of that water that is spilling over the dam in Bay d'Espoir, there it is - there is the clock to prove it.

I want to dispose of one thing quickly, I am just watching the time, because what I propose to do is speak until six, until His Honour - under the Rules as required to leave the Chair to eight. So I have to use up some of the less interesting stuff between now and six o'clock.

For example Mr. Speaker, there are men I understand so unfortunate, thanks be to God I am not one of them - I have been very fortunate. There are men so unfortunate as to have nagging wives, and nothing they do pleases their wives, nothing but nothing, but nothing. Their wives nag at them, and nag at them, and make their lives an utter and complete torment, almost until they die - and sometimes it is a happy release. They wear the pants.

Now every single individual thing that the Government propose meets the instantaneous opposition of the Opposition. Instantly they condemn it, they condemn it and they describe us as tyrannical. They describe me as tyrannical, they describe me as a dictator, and all the rest on this side of the House are poor slaves. Yesmen. Poor slaves, all the rest on this side of the House, a bunch of poor, dumb, silent slaves. But this tyrant here decides that the House will meet four nights a week. And actually, the brutal cruelty of it, the savage inconsiderateness of it - the cruelty of it, actually force members of the House - I myself mind you, did that. I did it. Not Mr. Speaker, not the House, but I did it - that I am forcing this cruelty on hon. members of working twenty-seven hours a week. A twenty-seven hour week. I only work about seventeen - ten hours can be clipped off that twenty-seven. I rarely work more than seventeen hours a week - very rarely. Not more than say once or twice a month do I work over seventeen hours a day.

But I am talking about twenty-seven hours, and I am talking about twenty-seven hours a week. Now Mr. Speaker, they do not help me here. I have sat in this Chamber last week from three o'clock to six on Monday, and eight o'clock until eleven on Monday. And three o'clock on Tuesday until six - and eight o'clock to eleven on Tuesday - and three o'clock on Wednesday until six - and eight o'clock to eleven on Wednesday - and three o'clock - I never left the Chamber for ten seconds. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. Thursday I was called

to the phone to take a call from Ottawa - one of the loveliest, one of the sweetest telegrams, messages I ever had. It was music, it was art - it was beauty, it was the loveliest phone call I think I ever got since I became Premier. And I was happy to go out and take that call. And it was followed soon after by an even more welcomed telegram, because it is nice to have it by voice over the phone, but it is even nicer to have it in the form of a telegram - and we all enjoyed the telegram here. And others will not enjoy it so much when they know what is in it. However, I was in this Chamber every single minute from three o'clock last Monday, a week ago today, until six o'clock Friday, except three or four minutes out to take that phone call.

And then another gentleman was up in the gallery there, and he nodded and I nodded. He went out there, and I went out and met him. And I was gone another three or four minutes. I was not out of this House ten minutes altogether. Now I am no different from anybody else -

MR. WELLS: I have no complaints about it - I like the twenty-seven hours a week in the House. I just like time to prepare -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well work late in the night - go home and do what I do. I drive home - it takes me the best part of an hour when we leave here at eleven o'clock. I get home around midnight, and I turn on the T.V. and I get the Late News - and then I go to work for an hour or two. Why not? What is wrong with work Mr. Speaker? What is wrong with work. I never heard anything or read anything that was wrong with work. If you are an invalid and you are sick, you cannot work. But if you are a healthy man, you love work. What in the name of God are we in the earth for except to work? What about Saturday, what about all day Saturday? What about all day Sunday? What about every morning?

Loads of time to work - we can to Church too, or turn on the radio and take a church service.

Mr. Speaker, here is the story on the other province. Nova Scotia, their Session in Nova Scotia runs about eight weeks. In New Brunswick, eight to twelve weeks. In Prince Edward Island, six to eight weeks. In Manitoba, eight to ten weeks. In Saskatchewan, nine weeks. In Alberta ten to twelve weeks. Now that is the total time they spend - I left out Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia - these are vast provinces - they are almost - you might call them small nations, all three of them. But I took the other seven provinces. So we sit in Session about the same time they do, maybe a wee bit more, a wee

bit more weeks than they do. Not much difference.

Now in Nova Scotia, they have five days in the daytime, and they have nights from eight to eleven, and sometimes eight to eleven thirty, and sometimes eight to midnight, when they have their night sittings.

In New Brunswick they meet five days, and they meet in the night in the latter part of the Session.

In Prince Edward Island, they have five days, and they meet two nights a week, and they meet for six to eight weeks.

In Manitoba they meet for five days, and on three nights. In Saskatchewan where they meet for nine weeks, they meet every day for five days, four nights a week, and the last fifteen days of the Session, they meet from ten in the morning to noon. So in the last fifteen days, the last two weeks of the Session, they meet fifteen days. Well that is right, because there is five days a week. The last three weeks of the nine, they meet morning, afternoon and night.

And in Alberta where they meet from ten to twelve weeks, it is five days a week, and three nights. And others if needed. So there is no difference whatever. No difference at all.

The hon. gentleman is a great -

MR. C. WELLS: If it was not for the bitterness of the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne had a reference to drugs. I think it had, has it? We did not put it in. I will rephrase my sentence. The Speech from the Throne might have had a reference to drugs. And even if it does not, I think I am in order to refer to drugs. And I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that my blood is beginning to turn cold over the thought of drugs in this Province. I like this place too much, I like Newfoundlanders too much to think of our becoming or any number of us, or even any trifling proportion of us getting to be drug fiends. I have children and I have grandchildren, and it kills me. And what kills me to, is to hear intelligent men stand up in public and try to soft peddle it, and try to make out that it is not really as bad as some people would make out.

Listen to this from the New York Times - January 25th. that is not too long ago. A month ago - New York Times:

"The clinical director of Odyssey House, a therapeutic organization for drug addicts, predicted yesterday that juvenile heroin addiction in New York city would rise to 100,000 children by summer.

The director, Dr. Judienne Densen-Gerber, spoke at a seminar for city school teachers at Queens College organized by the Institute for the Advancement of Criminal Justice and financed by the International Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Dr. Densen-Gerber, a lawyer and a psychiatrist, said 224 teenage deaths from heroin had been reported last year, with fifty-five of the victims under sixteen years of age. The rate this year, she went on, has already risen to one a day.

The "epidemic" began in August and coincided with Operation Intercept, a Federal campaign against marijuana smuggling that drove the price of the relatively harmless drug up to that of heroin and in consequence led many youngsters to try the "main line" narcotic, she said.

Erwin Tobin, director of health and physical education for the city's schools, denounced as "irresponsible" those who advocate the lifting of bans on marijuana, he said also that since September the school system had dropped the age for beginning anti-narcotics education from the eighth grade to the fourth grade.

He said juvenile drug use was increasing but he gave no figures.

Dr. Densen-Gerber said her estimate was based in part on the known ratio between registered adult narcotics addicts and adult narcotic deaths. She said that in 1968 a total of 60,000 addicts were registered in the city and 600 drug deaths were reported but that only 300 of those who died were among the 60,000 listed.

The deaths, she said, were one percent of those registered, which would mean that there were at least 22,400 juvenile addicts last year for 224 deaths, if the proportion is the same. However, since only 300 of the adults who died were under registry, it would probably be safe to change the ratio to one-half of one percent, she said, which would increase the estimate of juvenile drug addicts to about 45,000 last year. Addiction is increasing, she added, and the juvenile drug death rate is probably lower than that among adult addicts.

In consequence, she said, she feared the number of young addicts might reach 100,000 mid-year.

Last week, a private Bronx treatment centre for adolescent addicts run by Odyssey House was ordered vacated because it was in violation of the new Building Code. The centre, a former convent in the narcotics-ridden Hunts Point section, has housed as many as thirty-nine child addicts but has a legal occupancy for nine persons only.

Governor Rockefeller offered Odyssey House seventy beds in the children's centre at Creedmoor State Hospital in Queens Village as a substitute, but Odyssey officials turned down the offer.

There are three Odyssey Houses in New York City - one in the Bronx, one in Harlem, and one on the Lower East Side."

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: (MINISTER OF HEALTH) Will the hon. gentleman permit a question? Is the Premier aware that the Government are now trying to work out plans to get some kind of a permanent treatment facilities in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I would be a peculiar Premier, if I did not know that, would I not?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it is a peculiar type of question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It is a peculiar type of question asked by a peculiar minister of a peculiar Premier. And the answer as he suspects is, "yes", I have some suspicion of this fact, and this is why I am talking about this horrible subject of dope. I do not know, I have to know, I have to warn myself not to get carried

662

away, not to get hysterical about it, not to go off the deep end, that is not going to cure anything, just getting hysterical or getting excited about it. It has got to be treated coolly and with intelligence and we got to use our intellect as well, as our hearts and our emotions in the matter. But, there is always a danger that your emotions just overcoming you, just being flooded with the horror of the thought of fine, decent, clean cut young Newfoundlanders coming in from around the outports, and coming in here to the city, and running up against this - without this menace, without knowing, without learning, without anyone telling them of the horrible danger, and running into in such a way, as to make it look or sound romantic, to make it sound like a lark, sound like the "in thing", the thing that is in, the thing that we are all doing now. It is smart, you know mode, the modern youth are doing, and not listening to the old fogies, not listening to the parents, not listening to churches, not listening to anything, they know better. This atmosphere.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is a great tragedy, when whiskers, the whisker or any other person come out boldly, boldly, and saying it increases your appreciation of music. You can enjoy music better, take a few shots of dope of some kind. I do not know what kind, but take a bit of dope, and you can enjoy music, your senses are heightened, they are sharpened. Your senses are sharpened, so you can sit back and listen to music, if you are half doped up, if you are doped up a little more you can go out and commit murder can you not? If you are doped up a little bit more, you can go out and commit crime, can you not? And you can get so use to that, that you have got to commit crime to get the money to buy the stuff.

And you do not have to go back many days here in St. John's to have the horror of drugs driven home to you. Not very many days, you have to go back. And it is also the people who are pushing it, that are making money out of it.

Look start a house of prostitution, and that is not a very admirable thing to do is it? A house of prostitution. Who is the fellow in Dickens he used to train the young fellows to go and commit burglary. Fagan. You know you could not call that an honourable occupation, but these are the last words in honour compared with dope peddling, dope pushing is it not? Dope is the most horrible thing there is, is it not? And if we do not watch ourselves in Newfoundland, I do not know if there is anything we can do, I do not know if this House can do

anything. I think it is a Federal matter. There is a Federal Royal Commission, they are suppose to report this month - give an interim report this month to Parliament, we will all read it, with immense interest.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not know some children are made this way the more horrible it is the more adventurous it is for them to go and take it.

Mr. Speaker, it is now 6 O'Clock.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6 O'Clock, we will leave the chair until 8 O'Clock.

664



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Volume 1

Number 12

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD(PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I have to offer the House an apology for a bit of information I gave before dinner tonight, that was wrong and I have to correct it at the first opportunity, which is now.

I was talking about the great crusade - the mass movement of the people to push the Tory party into power in this Province and to push the Liberals out.

Your Honor may remember my talking of the great crusade - the great mass movement of the people and the great and the invincible Tory organization that is being launched throughout the Province.

Your Honor will remember that I said that the --

No, that is where I found that out. It would be good if the hon. gentleman across found it out.

I pointed out that the Leader of the Opposition had gone to Lewisporte and other places to attend great rallies - great popular and mass meetings of the people who were eager to get the Liberals out and the Tories in and the Leader of the Opposition was accompanied by the Federal member, I think, for that part of the Province, which made very two very prominent Tories and the President of the Tory Association, Mr. Marshall, went along to add his prestige and entice the crowds to the rally. That made three very prominent Tories and then, two converts, two recent Liberals, the present hon. member for Burin District and the present hon. member for Fortune Bay were along as well, so they had two converts and the converts were only two days old.

Two or three days before that, they had crossed the floor and joined the Tories. That made five very prominent Tories in Newfoundland, so naturally, their meetings out in Central Newfoundland would be uproarious, great, great, thundering great rallies of the people. There would be a virtual uprising of the population - a great mass movement, a veritable, popular crusade and in saying all that, I gave a wrong figure.

I said that in Burin, they had had twenty - some people say fifteen. In Marystown, five, of whom one was a card carrying Liberal who went in there to have a look. The other was a newsman. That left three of the public. That was in the afternoon, but they decided this was not the

great uprising of the people they were looking for, so they postponed the meeting and held it in the night and in the night the same number turned up. In fact, the same persons turned up but no one else.

That was in Marystown and in Burin. But the mistake I made, Mr. Speaker, was saying that in Lewisporte, the great town of Lewisporte, with a population of over 3000 people - a meeting that was not just for the town of Lewisporte, but to elect the executive of the great popular mass movement of Tories in Lewisporte District. So, it was a meeting for the whole district - forty-four persons turned up and I have to apologize to the House, I was wrong. It was thirty-three and so I wish to correct that and the mistake was in Gander.

I omitted Gander. They had another great public rally there - a great uprising of the people there - these prominent Tories, when all of forty-four persons attended.

Yes, that is the figure. That is the figure.

AN HON. MEMBER: They can hold their meetings in a telephone booth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In a telephone booth? Well, a small telephone booth.

Mr. Speaker, the great and expected uprising of the people to put in power to run Newfoundland - the hon. gentleman sitting opposite - that great popular uprising of the people is very conspicuous by its absence. It does not exist. It is just a figment of somebody's imagination.

Now, before - before -- I am on the address in reply. The hon. gentleman had not noticed? He had not noticed.

I am strongly tempted, Mr. Speaker, even to run the risk of offending against the rule, Parliamentary rule of tedious repetition, to speak again of the drug menace in this Province. I do not know but the House might forgive me, might, and that you might, Your Honor, forgive me if I draw attention once again, to this most horrible peril, I think, that has ever struck Newfoundland. You have the peril of a depression, you have the peril of hard times, you have the peril of destitution, you have the peril of poverty, you have the peril of starvation. All these can be cured.

These are economic. Money will cure these things; jobs, industries, employment - not easy to get, but they can be got and they can cure those troubles. But, drugs?

Young people - young, clean-limbed - clean-minded Newfoundlanders, pouring in from all around our Island home and Labrador and coming up against drugs? Not much cleanliness in that.

Now, a figure of 100,000 in Newfoundland would be horrifying. It would attract the attention of all mankind. Perhaps a figure of 100,000 in the great city of New York does not attract the enormous amount of attention because the city is so big. Nevertheless, when it is 100,000 youngsters who become dope addicts - even in so great a metropolis as New York - it does make you think. It does make you think about the peril of drugs here in our own little Island home.

In ^{the} New York Times - some say it is the greatest newspaper in the world. It is certainly among the half dozen greatest without any doubt. New York Times, in the Sunday edition of January 25 - not a month ago, yet, -yes, a month ago, a little over a month ago - has this: "The clinical director of Odyssey House, a therapeutic organization for drug addicts, predicted yesterday, that is predicted on January 24, that juvenile heroin addiction in New York City would rise to 100,000 children by summer - this summer, this coming summer now.

The director, Dr. Judian Denson Gerber, spoke at a seminar for city school teachers at Queens College, organized by the Institute for the Advancement of Criminal Justice and financed by the International Telephone and Telegraph Company. Dr. Denson Gerber, a lawyer and a psychiatrist, said 224 teen-age deaths from heroin, had been reported last year with fifty-five of the victims under sixteen years of age, ~~died from drugs~~

The rate, this year, she went on, has already risen to one a day - every day, a teen-ager in New York dying from dope addiction.

Erwin Tobin, Director of Health and Physical Education for the city's schools - all the schools of New York - denounced as irresponsible those who advocate the lifting of bans on marijuana. He said also that since September - last September - the school system had dropped the age of beginning anti-narcotics education; dropped the age for beginning that education against drugs, dropped the age from the eighth grade to the fourth.

In New York, now, in grade four, they are teaching anti-narcotic facts and information.

He said juvenile drug use was increasing, but he gave no figures, and then Dr. Denson Gerber goes on to explain her reasons for saying that the number would rise to 100,000 youngsters, in New York the coming summer.

Mr. Speaker, that is horrible, just horrible because how do you control it? How do you control the taking of drugs? How does one go about it? Has anyone yet found a way? If youngsters start taking even a fairly innocent, even a relatively, comparatively easy drug or innocent drug, to stop that youngster from going on to the next step and the next step and the next and becoming an addict, becoming hooked as they say.

And we all know that people hooked on drugs, if they are wealthy, will spend money lavishly to buy the drugs. If they are not wealthy, they will rob the money. They will steal. They will burglarize. They will commit assault and battery and then they will even commit murder. They cannot do without it. They cannot live. They will go crazy.

I hold that it is - I think that the great problem of Newfoundland is jobs. I have held that. I have held it all along. I held it before Confederation. I held it before we became a Province of Canada. I saw it as the greatest danger that faced Newfoundland if we should become a Province of Canada. I saw it clearly, said it, was afraid of it, frightened of it.

Jobs. The people will flock out of Newfoundland. They would rush out. They would become Canadians. Do you know what you would have to do if you were a Newfoundlander and not a Canadian before Confederation? You got aboard a train, you paid through the nose. The rail fares were chopped - more than chopped in half the night before Confederation came. The rail fares ---

MR. SMALLWOOD: Rail fares were horrible, you got aboard a train, you landed in Sydney, and there in Sydney you produced your X-Ray plate. Or they would not let you in to Canada. You produced your X-Ray plate, you had to bring it with you. You got it from the hospital to prove you were not T.B. because Newfoundland was reeking in T.B.

And this, in addition to that, the Customs opened up your luggage and examined your luggage, you were virtually coming from a foreign country when you came into Canada from Newfoundland. And I knew that the danger was if we became a province that everybody would flock up where the jobs were.

And I have fought day and night to try and keep our people here in Newfoundland. There is only one way to do that, that was to give them roads and schools, and hospitals and water and sewerage, and make Newfoundland a sort of pleasant place to live in - an adventurous place to live, and a place that not only could you get a job in, but you could live a pleasant kind of a life. And an adventurous kind of life for young people.

That has always been the great problem of Newfoundland, jobs, but now we have a new one super-imposed on all that, and that is dope. And you have citizens of this Province coming out willing to come out in public on Television, and talk about what a pleasant feeling it gives you to take a certain dope. How your nervous system becomes tuned up, you can listen to music and enjoy it. Your sensitivity is improved. I heard a Newfoundlander say that, heard and saw him on Television. How much your appreciation was improved by taking dope.

Well there you are. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk for a moment about FRED. FRED. This Government spent \$300,000 to work up a FRED plan. \$300,000 over a period from September 1966 to August 1968 - two years. Two years, we had a small army of people working to devise the FRED program. We had some twenty-three or twenty-four persons in our own department of Community and Social Development under the leadership, at first, of my hon. friend the present Minister of Fisheries, who at that time had his department with the Department of Fisheries. Subsequently my hon. friend the present minister of Community and Social Development, the hon. gentleman from White Bay South.

Two years, twenty-three of our own staff, consultants that were engaged and hired, and a small army that came down from the government of Canada. And for two years they worked to devise a FRED plan for Area 1. Now the FRED

609

as laid down by Ottawa said, that you had to devise the province of Newfoundland into three, into four. Because the fourth was only to exclude from FRED. Western Labrador was excluded, that is Labrador City, the City of Wabush, Churchill Falls and Twin Falls and so on - all were excluded. So that left the Province divided into three sections, Area one, area two and area three.

Area one was west of the line - if you could draw a line across the Island of Newfoundland slanting, starting at Middle Arm in Green Bay, and going diagonally across the Island and coming out on the southwest coast by Rose Blanche. Everything west of that line. That took in all St. George's district, all Port-au-Port, the Humber districts, the two St. Barbe districts, and the Straits of Bell Isle part of Labrador - southern Labrador.

All of White Bay north, all of White Bay south and most of Green Bay. That was what was west of that line, that was area one. Here is the plan. This is the plan. It cost \$300,000 - that is the scrap of paper - who said that, who called it a scrap of paper? The hon. member from Burin - a scrap of paper? Here is the scrap. Never used it - somebody else, some other recent Tory, or some other Tory, or some other renegade Liberal - it was not a Liberal who said it.

It is a scrap of paper - it is a \$300,000 scrap of paper. There is FRED plan area one. It took two years to do it. It cost \$300,000 and the work for two years of about forty to fifty men and women - for two years. \$300,000. I was happy with it, the whole of the Government were happy with it. I went down to Trout River, held a big public meeting. T.V. people, radio people and newspaper people came in there from Corner Brook to St. John's.

I went down a week or two later and held another meeting farther down the coast at Hawke's Bay, and again Radio, Television, and newspaper people were there. And I described the FRED plan to the people. I described it. Now the plan is here - every settlement in that whole area is there, and what was to be done is all here, and what it was to cost is all here. And the total cost was \$305,000,000. \$305,000,000 spread over a period of ten or twelve years, which would have been something around \$30,000,000 a year. Just for that area one.

Was that bluff? Did we spend \$300,000 on a bluff? Did we spend two years hard work on a bluff? Did we devise a great plan for area one just

as a bluff? Is it all just a lie? Well why did it not go ahead? Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why it did not go ahead. Because the Government of Canada changed its mind, or their minds. A far-reaching change in philosophical approach, a revolutionary change in the whole outlook on rural rehabilitation. The FRED plan would spend \$300,000,000's in area one, probably \$4 to \$500,000,000's in area two, which is east of that same line, and another couple of hundred millions in area three, which was all of Labrador except the Straits and western Labrador. The rest of Labrador would be area three.

And so you have \$1 billion, a \$1,000 million or more, spent over ten or twelve, or maybe in some instances, some parts of it - some parts of the scheme, some parts of the province - maybe fifteen years. A \$1,000 million, a \$1 billion dollars. Why? Because the idea of the concept was that in every place, where the people were, you would spend money. You spend it where people were. You would bring advantages to every individual place, to every settlement.

You would put in a park, you would put in fish stages, you would put in schools, you would put in roads, you would put in paving, you would put in water and sewerage. You would make each individual harbour, cove, settlement in the area, to bloom and blossom like the rose. In other words, you would say, "what is this area one?" Well area one, the answer would be, is everything west of that line. Well how many places are in it? Well there are one hundred and eighty, or two hundred or three hundred places in it. Okay - that is where we will spend the money. There is where we will bring the advantages of FRED.

Remember the meaning of FRED - F-R-E-D - Fund For Rural (that is countryside, distinct from city and urban) Fund for Rural Economic Development. F-R-E-D. This was a great scheme to bring money, to pour money in vast amounts into the existing settlements, and to bring infrastructure to use this new word of public services, into the existing settlements. Now that concept has been abandoned, it has been dropped by the Canadian Government, completely and absolutely. That is why they dropped FRED. They dropped FRED because they dropped the basis of FRED, the foundation of FRED, and what they have done is something like this.

Now just follow me Mr. Speaker, if you will. There was a man in Ottawa, a Minister of the Crown, he is no longer a Minister of the Crown, but

he was - who had this concept - that Canada's 21,000,000 people instead of stretching from St. John's, or from Cape Spear, which is only seventeen hundred miles from Cape Claire in Ireland, stretching from Cape Spear all the way to Vancouver Island - instead of that, living in a thousand places in Newfoundland, maybe a couple or three hundred in Nova Scotia, and maybe fifty or sixty in P.E.I. maybe two or three hundred in New Brunswick. Maybe seven or eight hundred in Quebec, and maybe a thousand or twelve hundred in Ontario, and so on and so on right across the nation, right across the Continent. Instead of that, Canada's population should be gathered together in about eighteen centers of population.

This theory is known as the megalopolis theory. Canada would consist of eighteen megalopolis - Is that good pronunciation? The idea - it is poor latin, but good pronunciation, and worse than any of it is the concept. That is even worse than the latin and much worse than the pronunciation.

Under that concept you take the half million souls in Newfoundland and you bring them around Halifax. And all the people in P.E.I. you would throw them in as well. You would have the 2 million population of the four Atlantic Provinces all gathered together around one megalopolis.

That would make it easier to provide roads and streets and paving and water and sewerage, and schools and hospitals - and infrastructure generally. You have a fine big city, or if not a city, a megalopolis, or a great urban area, maybe stretching out fifty miles in each direction, except seaward.

And then the next great megalopolis would be somewhere in Quebec, maybe three or four of them in Ontario, and so on right across the nation. That concept was rejected and I think rightly and properly rejected by Mr. Trudeau and the Government of Canada. They rejected it. I do not think it will ever be revived. I do not think that any government in Canada will ever come again, or entertain for a moment any suggestion of gathering all Canada's population into eighteen great centers.

But Sir between gathering all of Canada's people into eighteen great centers of population on the one hand, and on the other hand, spending tens of millions and hundreds and ultimately thousands of millions of dollars - to bring services, conveniences, industries, jobs - if every one of the existing settlements, every little settlement, six and eight and ten families - twenty and thirty families. Between these two extremes, they have come up with DREE -
D-R-E-E.

"D-R-E-E" - Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Regional, not rural. Regional. They look at Newfoundland and they see that in Newfoundland since Confederation, the Canadian Government have spent untold millions of dollars to build public wharves - dotted all around our coastline, 6,000 miles of coastline and literally, quite literally dozens of those same public wharves built with Canadian Federal money are today, dozens of them, idle, unused, except by the seagulls. Why? Because nobody now lives in those harbours. The people have moved out. They have gone elsewhere and the harbours are closed down. Nobody but a fool can look at Newfoundland tonight and not realize that 300 places in the last twelve, fifteen years have closed down.- 300 places. The day we became a Province of Canada, there were 1300 settlements in our new Province. They had been in here in Newfoundland and Labrador for fifty years. Roughly speaking around the year 1900. Go back a 100 years before that and the number of settlements in Newfoundland was not 200, but from the year 1800 to the year 1900 the number jumped from about 200 to 1300 and on the day we became a Province. Forty-nine years after the turn of this century, in 1949 the number was still 1300. Today there are fewer than 1000, because 300 places have closed down. The people have moved out, and gone to larger places. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because the women - mind you, it is doubtful that they would have moved out, if there had not been Confederation. I will put it another way. It is doubtful, if they would have closed all those places, if there had not been such a thing as radio and television. Doubtful if they would have done it if there had not been such things as this Government building 5,000 miles of roads - 5,000.

If you open up this Island with roads so you can get aboard a car and go anywhere or anybody can get aboard a car and come to where you are, you cannot help it. People's sights will rise, their ambitions will rise. There will be a rising tide of expectations. They will not be willing to stay in the old harbour and live as they lived and their forefathers before them. It will begin with the young people wanting to get out and the mothers who will want to follow them and then the old man will have to go whether he likes it or not. Three hundred places have closed down. You cannot help wondering what about the next twenty years, will there be another 300 close down, which will bring it down to 600 places. What about if 600 closed down and bring it down to 300 places.

Are you going to lash out millions, untold millions of dollars to provide infrastructure and try to do the impossible, bring industry to everyone of these little crannies and coves. If you are a skunk, if you are a dirty dog, if you are a political scoundrel, you will talk about putting industries in all the little harbours. You will cater to the simple innocence of people in little harbours with a 100, 200 or 300 population asking innocently why cannot we have an industry here. You will cater to that if you are a scoundrel. If you are an honest man and a good decent Newfoundland and if you are thoughtful and if you know anything, if you have your eyes open, if you can see what is going on in the world and in Canada and in Newfoundland, you will know without being told that it is highly unlikely, highly, highly, highly unlikely that five years from now, ten years from now, there will be anything like the number of places we have in our Province today. It will be highly unlikely. Alright, if that is so, then what are you going to do with Federal money.

The first thing you decide is FRED goes. You have to abandon FRED and the Canadian Government did exactly that. They abandoned it. They gave up the FRED concept which is that you can bring improvements and infrastructure and public services and industries into every little nook and cranny. That is gone. That is gone out the window and \$300,000 that has become a scrap of paper. The abandonment of FRED has made the FRED plan a scrap of paper, \$300,000 down the drain - not quite down the drain because the facts are there. The facts are there. A magnificent report, one of the most magnificent reports ever put together in our history. We have had an awful lot of reports. Now what is the DREE plan. My hon. friend the Minister of Community and Social Development in a brilliant speech here the other night, a brilliant speech, one of the most brilliant minded speeches ever heard in this Chamber, talked about the broad general concepts of DREE, and he has told us that he is going to table a white paper in this House, in the present session spelling it out, spelling it out what DREE is. I might as well tell the House right now, it is almost the exact opposite of FRED. The DREE plan for Newfoundland is based not on the FRED concept but rather on the DREE concept. The concept that it is arrant nonsense, simple and criminal waste of public money to try to make every little individual

one of the 1,000 or 900 places blossom like the rose - you may make it blossom like the rose, but there will be nobody in it to enjoy it, in three, five, eight, ten years from now. But that instead you would try to select within this Province a number of places, a number of areas that as far as you can see, as far as you can judge, as far as the facts are available to you will indicate, as far as you can judge, places that have in them a potential of growth, a growthiness about them. They may not actually be growing, but they have a potential of growth. The possibility is there that they will grow and they made indeed be growing.

Now there is where the wall starts. My hon. friend the Minister of Community and Social Development and I and our colleagues in the Cabinet have ideas. The Government of Canada might have other ideas as to how many of these special areas or growth areas there are. We will, of course, fight for our viewpoint. We know Newfoundland better than they do. They will put the things through their computers. They have done that. You can take settlement A, let us say. You can look at settlement A and put all the data through a computer. The population in settlement A in 1900 was this number, in 1910, in 1920, 1930, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970. From that you will see what the population is going to be in 1980. None. You can put through the computer how many fishing boats there were, in 1900, in 1910, 1920, 1930, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970. You can find out what the age grouping of settlement A was? How many people below ten years of age? How many above fifty years of age? How many in between? Is settlement A just a place where the youngsters live and the old people live and the vigorous, virile young people are gone away working and so on and so on and so on. You can feed all kinds of facts and factors into the computer and you can come up with a result, and I will confess that to fight the conclusions of a computerized exercise is not easy. Because the sheer, inexorable logic of it may dictate that settlement A goes. Not a mickel of DREE money goes into settlement A or settlement X or settlement Y or settlement H or settlement J or settlement G - not a nickel.

We may know here in this Province that they leave out settlements that are going to be there no matter what the facts are and what the figures are. There is room. There is lots of room for a battle royal between St. John's and Ottawa, but has the House noticed, I wonder, who wins? Has the House ever

taken notice of who wins? Who is the victor, where there is row between St. John's and Ottawa in the last twenty years? Who has always won? We will keep on winning. We will continue to win. "Thrice armed he who hath his quarrel just." We have a just quarrel. We have a just case in this Province or increasing help from the Government of our nation. Before this session is over, we are going to hear a lot about DREE. It is forecast in the Speech from the Throne, from the other side, not fifty words. In all their speeches last week, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Monday night, Tuesday night, Wednesday night, Thursday night - in all the speeches not fifty words were spoken about DREE, not fifty words altogether, and they were not very complimentary.

DREE will put many, many hundres of millions of dollars of Federal money, Ottawa money into this Province, many hundreds of millions of dollars but do it differently from the way it was proposed to be done in the FRED plan. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word, not at such length, but one word on another thing that is in the budget speech mentioned only by one hon. member on the other side of the House, the Speech from the Throne.

The Speech from the Throne says that the Government a year or so ago had engaged a famous firm from Chicago, a firm to do a job here for us, the same kind of job they had done for other Canadian provinces and American States, and that is to take our Civil Service, which has grown as the Speech from the Throne says, grown from 5,500 to 9,500 or 9,900 or roughly 10,000. The Civil Service - I said, 5,500. I was 200 out. The Civil Service which in twenty years has grown from 5,700 to 9,900 and which is now costing the Province \$45 million a year in salaries has been under close study for a year by Personnel Administration Services of Chicago. What are they doing? They are reviewing the entire Civil Service of our Province, and they are classifying every

classifying every civil servant, classifying them, let me give you an example. We had classifications before, almost a hundred. These 9900 men and women are at this moment classified in almost 100 classifications. For example, there is a classification known as "Manual", M A N U A L, manual. You will find it in the estimates. What is manual? What is a manual employee of the civil service? It is carpenters, one and two, number one carpenter number two carpenter. Electrician plumber, plasterer, painter one and painter two; maintenance repairmen, number one and number two; watchmen, stationary engineers, one, and two and three; boiler plant operator all these had one classification, namely manual. I will give you another example, Institutional Officers, who are institutional officers? Psychiatric Nursing Assistants, now there are three kinds of them. Psychiatric Nursing Assistant, (1), Group 1, Group 2, Group 3. They did not give me what I asked for. I asked for the presently existing classification. All of these I am going to read out to you. I am right. I am right. All of these were, are called Institutional Officers: All I am going to read now. Psychiatric Nursing Assistants, 1,2, and 3. Nursing Assistants 1 and 2. Occupational Therapists, 1 and 2. Assistant Occupational Therapists; Dormitory Supervisor; Supervisory Housekeeper; Cooks 1 and Cooks, 2; Cook-helper; Food Service Workers 1 and 2; Food Service Supervisor; Meatcutter; Domestic Worker; Laundry Workmen 1, 2, and 3. Custodian Worker; Elevator Operator; Laboratory Technician; X-Ray Technician; Lab and X-Ray Technician, all these are lumped together in our present civil service as Institutional Officers. But the names I have read out are, each of these is to be a new classification. So, that, if you are a Nursing Assistant working in the General Hospital, or in the Mental Hospital or in the Sanatorium or in any of the Cottage Hospitals, or Western Memorial or Grand Falls or St. Clare's or Grace or St. Anthony or Twillingate, in any of the hospitals that the Government pays for. If you are a Nursing Assistant 1, you are the same in all of them, or Nursing Assistant 2, or Occupational Therapist and so on and so on and so on. Now here is what we have done, or our people have done for us. We have divided the entire civil service into 550 classifications, 5 5 0, with a few more to come, when all the non-government hospitals are finished, they are doing those now, they will be finished towards the end of April or the middle of May.

Now what is the purpose of classifying all our 9900 civil servants? Putting them into 550 probably it will end up 570 different classifications. For this reason, every one in the same classification will get the same rate of pay. Let that sink in Mr. Speaker. Let that sink in. We are going to establish in this Province

uniform scales— and the word in plural,— not just one-scale, uniform scales there will be probably 500 of them. Everyone in the Province, who gets his or her pay from the Government will be in a certain classification and every one in that classification, no matter where they work, will get the same scale of pay in the same classification. Now the classification the scale of pay will have a variation in it. It starts at a certain rate and it increases each year until it reaches a peak. But that is the scale in that classification for another classification there is another scale. For another classification still another scale. A scale for every classification. This is one of the real reforms wrought by this Government to make for a more efficient civil service, and one in which there will be less grumbling, on the grounds of disparate rates of pay. We are very proud of this.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, what happened to the old Woods-Gordon Report, five or six or seven years ago, somewhat along the same lines was not that a classification? job analysis and the rest of it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: One of the charges made against this Government frequently but by no one more than the hon. gentleman who just asked that question. He more than any one has hurled—to use the newspaper term—blast, hurl you know—these violent words—he more than any one has blasted this Government for its lack of investigation and its lack of planning. The Woods-Gordon, it was this Government that decided to retain that famous firm, and had them make a report. This Government at the same time have hired a number of firms and a number of organizations to make studies but it is only now that we have the report that we think is sound and workable and fair and efficient.

Mr. Speaker, would you allow me to do a little bit of personal boasting, that would not be against the rules of Parliamentary Procedure. It might be against the rules of good taste. But I would like to do a bit of boasting about two things. One is the Fisheries College. I had some part in creating it. The correct name is the College of Fisheries, Navigation, Marine Engineering & Electronics. From the beginning of its life six years ago to now this College has become the greatest College of its kind in the Western Hemisphere. There is nothing anywhere else in Canada, nothing in the United States, nothing in Central America, nothing in South America, nothing in the Caribbean that is even in the class with our Fisheries College. There is nothing in Europe, nothing, in all Europe, in England, nothing in Africa, the African Continent, nothing in most of Asia until you go to two Asiatic countries I suppose you could call the Soviet Union an Asiatic country it is, in part,

and Japan. But apart from the Soviet Union and Japan, Newfoundland tonight after six years can boast, can throw out its chest and boast of having the world's finest College of Fisheries. Up to the present year, including the present year, that college has enrolled 12,700 students. And they came from every corner of our Province, of Newfoundland and Labrador. Twelve thousand seven hundred students, the number at the college in the present season is 1478. Fisheries College was not there six years ago, it did not exist. Now it is the greatest in the world outside of Russia and Japan and it has 1478 nearly 1500 students. The college recently by the way made a study of the careers of some 457 of the students who had passed successfully. Their programme of study during the year 1968 - 69, in the following departments of the college, 5 of them, Electrical Engineering Technology; Food Technology; Mechanical Engineering Technology; Nautical Science Technology; Naval Architecture and Shipbuilding Technology, these five.

The students included in that sampling came from all sections of the Province and no foreign or mainland Canadian students were included in that sampling just all Newfoundlanders. The students were asked to state what occupations they had before they went in the College and the type of work they were doing after they left the College, and where they were doing it. Here is the result: Eighty-five point four, 85½ per cent of the graduates were employed, they were graduated now from the Fisheries College and 85½ per cent of them had jobs, 71.1 per cent were employed by Allied Marine Industries and 14.3 per cent in other areas and 14½ per cent of the graduates were unemployed at the time of the questionnaire was completed. All over our Province today men have good jobs, as a result of their studies in fishing, navigation, marine engineering or electronics. In all probability Mr. Speaker, in all probability most of those men would today be unemployed without a trade, without any particular skill, if they had not got the training they got at the Fisheries College.

Twelve thousand seven hundred have entered the college up to now. Ten thousand one hundred have completed their studies, fourteen hundred and seventy eight are there now. The foreign students from other parts of the world came from British Honduras; Ceylon; England; Dominica; Ghana; Guiana; Hong Kong; Indonesia; Kenya; Korea; Mauritius; Malaysia; Nigeria; Pakistan; I am talking about a college in Newfoundland Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about some big college over in England or in the United States I am talking about the college here, on this old rock of ours. The Philippines; Singapore; Tanzania; Uganda; Zambia; Egypt; Jamaica; United States; New Zealand; Camerons; Maldives Islands; Brazil; Norway; India. From

those lands students have come from all around the world, here to St. John's. Are you proud of that, this old Rock? It has cost money. It cost \$300,000 the first year we opened but that was, we opened late in the year. It cost a \$1 million the next year, \$1½ million the next year, little more than \$2¼ million the fourth year and \$2¼ million the next year, \$2½ million the next year and this year it is \$2.1 million, that sounds more than six years, it is seven but that includes the year we are in now.

The staff is 141 persons. I am proud of that. I said I wanted to do a little boasting, that is one thing, I said I wanted to boast about two things, now I would like to do a little boasting about another institution that has been built in this Province, and now is among the best in the world. In the world I said, Mr. Speaker. That is what I said. Now among the best in the world. I would say perhaps among the half dozen best not the half dozen biggest but the half dozen best hospitals of its kind in the world. The Great Janeway Health Centre at Fort Pepperrell.

Here is the story of Janeway. It is called after the great pediatrician the great child's doctor in Boston. There he has a great hospital the same size as ours. It was advised by Sir, I went to see him in London - the head of the great children's hospital there the same size as ours. We have one of the highest children's hospitals of the world. It is. What has happened in the four years it has been there, it opened in August 1966

Now, here is what has happened in the four years it has been there. It opened in August 1966. Here is what has happened. In the first year, the number of in-patients admitted into the hospital - first year, 737 children; next year, 3387; third year, 5902; the year just ending, 6159.

Just think of that - admitted into the Janeway in the year just ending, 6159 children, for medical treatment and operations. The number of operations was 63 the first year, but then it only opened in August; the next year, 1245; the next year, 2800; the next year, 3360 operations, this year just ending 3360 operations.

Now, take the out-patients. The youngsters who were brought to the hospital, not to be admitted in as patients to sleep there, to live there, eat there, to be treated there, but brought in for treatment and then carried away when they got the treatment. Out-patients - none the first year. The next year, 16,267. Is not that something? Is not that something?

The third year, that is, last year, 31,000, and this year 37,000. In addition to the 6100 that were patients in the hospital, there were another 37,000 children brought there to get treatment, say, for an hour or two hours or an half an hour and carried home again.

The number of staff - 455 year before last; 600 last year and 427 this year. Why is the staff down? Last year it was 611; this year it is 427. The reason is that last year they had 105 Nursing Assistants included.

The percentage of children coming to the Janeway from outside St. John's is increasing steadily and rapidly. At first, obviously, most of the children - most of the patients would come from in or near the city - the capital city. But, the number now is already fifty-fifty. So, it has become a referral hospital. Doctors all around the Province now, will send their youngster patients - children patients - into the Janeway.

Why? Because the Janeway is the great children's hospital. One of the great ones of the world. There is only room in Newfoundland for one. There may not even be room for one. The cost is high - half a million souls to be supporting a great children's hospital is a tremendous accomplishment and there is room certainly only for one, if that, and so now doctors all around the Province are sending youngsters in to the Janeway to get the

~~652~~
681

kind of treatment that they cannot get in any other hospital. With all the good-will in the world, in other hospitals, they cannot treat them the way they have the facilities and the training to do in the Janeway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our proposal, and some hon. members may remember, the row that went on - the battle royal that went on in this House about establishing this hospital. I had the help of an hon. member of the House. He is no longer a member, although he is sitting in the gallery tonight. The hon. member - the junior member for Harbour Main, the colleague of my hon. friend, here - Dr. Cliff Joy, himself a pediatrician. I had his help and advice and guidance and information at my elbow right throughout and he and I, two men, fought everything in sight. We had to fight everything in sight. It could not be done without a gigantic battle that we waged, the two of us together, and we won.

Of course, we won because we piled up the evidence - unanswerable evidence. Unanswerable. No one could answer it. There was no answer. That is why no one could answer it. No answer existed. I piled up the evidence. He told me who to get in touch with. I brought the great Dr. Janeway down here to advise us in person. I went to London and I saw Sir Charles - I forget his name - the great English authority and I wrote to every pediatrician in Canada, right from coast to coast and got letters back from them all and we had an unanswerable case that the way to treat children is in a children's hospital.

Everything in it is geared to children. Everything in it - the personnel, the machines, the beds, the rooms, everything in it is geared to handle little children.

But, Sir, when we started that hospital, we did not mean it to be just a hospital. We meant it to be a Child Health Centre. A centre from which would emanate a comprehensive child health program for every part of our Province and certainly, these aims are being realized. In co-operation with the University Medical School consultants, the Janeway Health Centre have produced highly specialized, and previously, unavailable services.

. Listen ! Closely supervised, ultramodern medical and surgical methods for treatment of all diseases of children. We have that down in the Janeway. Preservation of health is stressed as much as treatment of diseases; Preservation of health. The discharge of a patient from the Janeway Hospital is more important than the admission. Do you follow the meaning

of that? It is more important to discharge the child than to admit him. And so you discharge the child healthy and well. And at discharge, steps are taken to prevent a recurrence of the disease.

Highly - now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker - highly qualified specialists; and I ought to have said that this hospital has some of the finest child health specialists in North America, and highly qualified specialists visit areas outside St. John's regularly. They go out regularly from the Janeway Hospital. They have gone to St. Anthony, to the Cartwright, and to Stephenville and to Corner Brook and to Baie Verte and to Grand Falls and to Gander and Placentia and Carbonear.

And then in addition to these specialists going out from time to time to these main population centres and hospital centres of our Province, there is constant consultation going on by telephone. Doctors all around our Province will phone in to the Janeway so that sometimes it becomes quite practical not to send the child in but for the doctor somewhere around the Province, to phone in to the Janeway and get - have a consultation on the phone, with specialists.

Then again, a part of the program is the training of nurses and doctors in that hospital so that these Janeway trained nurses and doctors can go out around the Province and work out around the Province.

Then bulletins on - and I do not mean the Newfoundland Bulletin, although if the Janeway wants to use the Newfoundland Bulletin, I am quite sure that the editor will make its columns available to the Janeway or any other hospital that wants to spread useful information. Bulletins are published on a fairly regular basis and sent to all doctors and nurses in the Province from the Janeway.

And then the hospital has something new for Newfoundland - a poison control centre. This is highly organized and ready to supply information on poisons to any area of Newfoundland and Labrador. Inquiring physicians may use as a direct hot line of which they have the number or alternatively, they may use the switchboard number. The hot line number has been sent to all the doctors and the doctors can take that hot line number and call the

Janeway any hour of the day or night and get these expert: specialized advice and information that can come only from a child health centre. That is not just for children although primarily, it is for children. Any poison case and the hospital have ready contact with University consultants and all major Poison Control Centres in Canada and the United States.

There is unrestricted visiting by parents. There is something gone wrong with one part of the plan I had in mind. I do not know what has happened. I had an idea and I thought it was carried out and I discovered after it was all done and finished and over with, it was not carried out. They were using it for - they subverted it. I had the idea in my own mind and I put it to my colleagues and the Cabinet and I understood they would agree and I understood the Minister of Health was carrying it out, not the present Minister of Health.

My idea was this. All right, so you have a youngster, two, three, four years old and you are living in Green Bay. You are living in Burgeo. You are living in Burin. You are living in Placentia. You are anywhere around the Island or Labrador. The youngster has to come into the Janeway. Well, how does the mother feel then to be separated from the youngster? How does the youngster feel to be separated from the mother?

So, I said, "Well, let us get over that. Let us build a fine big hostel there by the Janeway Hospital for parents where they can come in - put up a building that is neat but not too elaborate and where they can even do housekeeping. In each little apartment, put a kitchen - a corner where there is a stove and they can cook for themselves cheap."

In other words, a very low cost hostel for the mothers of the children. Well they did. They built it and I drove down a couple of times and from a distance, I saw these buildings going up, and I said, "That is fine." I felt good about it until last year I discovered that not one parent was in them. They have taken them over for the staff, have they not?

My! I did not even know. The dictator - the dictator did not even know. I was not even aware. Some dictator! Some dictator! Then in addition to the unrestricted visiting by parents, they have Child Guidance Psychiatric Clinics and comprehensive programs for handicapped children.-

that is deaf children, retarded, crippled, and children with congenital malformation.

And then there is the Dental Care Program. And then, Mr. Speaker, here is a boast for you. The Neurological and Neurosurgical Service at the Janeway is one of the best in Canada. Is not that something? Is not that something for Newfoundlanders to be able to say, the Neurological and Neurosurgical Service of the Janeway is one of the best in Canada.

And then they have highly developed laboratory techniques and x-ray services and this^{list} could go on and on. - audiology, that is hearing; hematology, that is blood diseases; growth and development investigations; congenital heart investigations of the highest quality - all down there in the Janeway.

The effect of all this on mental and physical health of our children, as well as on the outlook and attitude of all the people needing the Centre's help is very, very evident. Our children deserve the best medical care in the world and they are receiving it and they are going to receive it.

And I am proud to say that the hon. Campbell McPherson continues to be our highly respected chairman of the Board of Governors.

The Pediatrician-in-chief is the famous Professor John Dart - a world famous hematologist, as well as a pediatrician. Dr. Dart is a brilliant man who is very enthusiastic about the child health concept. He predicts a dramatic impact on our community life from Janeway. Yes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what good has all this done? What impact has it really had? Well, now, listen. You know, you spend millions of dollars, millions piled on millions and you hear everything about - all you hear about is the money. You do not hear anything about the hospital - just the money, just that money is part of our debt to put that hospital there, but you do not hear anything about the hospital and if you do, you do not hear anything about the impact the hospital is having on our population.

In 1965, there were 399 deaths. There were thirty-one deaths - no, I cannot read this. It says 1965 - 31 and then a dash and then 1000 live births.

685

Anyhow, out of all the live births, there were in 1965, there were 399 deaths in Newfoundland in our Province - 399 youngsters died. Then, the next year, 1966, the Health Centre opened and in 1968; we have not got the figures yet for 1969, but in 1968, the very year after the Janeway opened, here is what happened. The number of deaths was 295 as against 399 - a drop of over 100 in the very first year after it opened and we have - we will have other figures, of course, for 1969.

in the first year of the Janeway, last year, improved conditions saved 104 children, under one year of age, who would surely have died. The doctors believe those children surely would have died but for the hospital.

Now the infant death rate in St John's is twelve, in 1968, (No, I cannot read it. I cannot read it. I do not understand it. Who can explain it to me?) The death rate in St John's is twelve out of 1,000 live births, and in the Outports it is twenty-two. (No, it is "2250-1000 live births) - I just do not understand it.

But I do know this - that is down from twenty in St John's, down to twelve, from twenty-two in the Outports down to twelve. With that, in two years the Janeway has brought the death rate among infants under one year, in the Outports cut it in half and in St John's cut it in a little better than not quite cut in half. If that is not tremendous, I don't know anything that is. Because this is the name of the game, this is what is Newfoundland, this is the children, this is our population.

It is twelve per one thousand of live births, coming from twenty down to twelve per one thousand live births. For every thousand babies born alive twenty died and now it is twelve in St John's and in the Outports it was twenty-two died and now it is ten - so we have cut it more than in half. That is real, Mr. Speaker. We can be here - look, that is real, that is the name of the game, that is what governing a province means, bringing up a healthier generation, on the way up - that is the way to do it. It costs a wicked amount of money but there it is.

Now I want to say a word about the oil refinery:

I wonder, last week, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, I wonder how many people visited this Chamber and heard about the oil refinery for the first time, if there were any Mainlanders or Americans or people from other parts of the world who drifted in here last week and sat in the galleries and heard all the talk from the Opposition about the oil refinery, all the talk from the hon. member for St John's West and the other hon. member, for Humber East, all the denunciation, all the attacks on the oil refinery contract - then they would naturally assume, they could not assume anything else, it was unavoidable, they would assume that this was a new scheme that had just been brought into the House and that these hon. members were hearing of it for the first time and they were attacking it.

MR CROSBIE: M r. Speaker, on a point of order:

I did not attack the oil refinery last week. Our motion asked for information as to what the present status of the scheme was. There was no denunciation by me of any sort.

MR SMALLWOOD: That is not a point of order that is a point of debate.

MR CROSBIE: On a point of information then.

MR SMALLWOOD: Debate.

MR CROSBIE: It is not debate.

MR SMALLWOOD: That is what the Resolution said, but the speeches in support of the Resolution attacked Shaheen, brutally, savagely and unscrupulously, as virtually a scoundrel and a scallawag and a rogue. The Resolution was worded politely but the speeches made in support of it were a scandal. Anybody coming into the Chamber and hearing those speeches, and not having heard anything about it before, would naturally jump to the conclusion that this was a new scheme that had been brought in, that those hon. gentlemen had heard about it now or read about it for the first time and they were outraged over it.

MR CROSBIE: Let us have some facts on it.

MR SMALLWOOD: They were outraged -

MR CROSBIE: Let us have some knowledge of it - "Outraged!"

MR SMALLWOOD: They were outraged by this oil refinery deal, which was new, just brought in. Do you suppose any such stranger would have been a bit surprised if he had been told (1) this scheme was brought in here two years ago, nothing new to add to it, it is exactly now as it was when it was brought in here and passed by this House two years ago; would he be surprised to hear that? No.2 Would he be surprised to hear that the very men who drafted it, who wrote it and drafted it and brought it to the Cabinet are the same two hon. gentlemen - would he be surprised to hear that? Would he be surprised to hear that they wrote it, they drafted it, they brought it to the Cabinet, the Cabinet approved it, the Cabinet brought it to the House and they did not vote against it?

What suddenly calls for the denunciations?

MR WELLS: We resigned because of it.

MR SMALLWOOD: They resigned - they did not resign because of it. They did not cross the Floor because of it.

MR WELLS: The whole thing combined.

MR SMALLWOOD: They did not.

MR WELLS: Tell the truth.

MR SMALLWOOD: There is the truth. They devised the plan, they drafted it, they wrote it, they brought it to the Cabinet, they supported it and then they broke with the Government on one detail - one detail

MR WELLS: The whole thing.

MR SMALLWOOD: One detail. One detail and that one detail was the advance of five million of the thirty million dollars, under the plan. Mr. Speaker, there is \$30 million that the Government are to provide to the refinery - \$30 million, in the way of a second mortgage loan - a bond issue. And because of the state of the Bond Market at the time Mr. Shaheen said to the Government: "Look, I may be a year, I may be longer before I can float that \$30 million bond issue." Especially as we told him (remember this, Mr. Speaker) Mr. Shaheen was told by this Government - you are not to raise that \$30 million in the United States, you are not to raise it in Canada, you are not to raise it in Europe, you are not to raise it in England - especially as he was ordered not to try to raise the \$30 million on either side of the Atlantic Ocean. There was still the Soviet Union, it is true, there was India, there was China, there was Japan, there was Hongkong, there was South America, but you are not to raise it in North America nor in Europe nor in the United Kingdom. He was ordered by the Cabinet not to do that.

So he said: "All right, it may be a year or longer before I will be able to raise the \$30 million in the kind of bond market there is in the world today, tight money, etc."

The reason we told them not to raise it on either side of the Atlantic was that we had our own governmental needs. We had to go in those markets and we did not want that \$30 million raised.

So being told that he was not allowed to sell the bonds on either side of the Atlantic he said; "Well, all right, if I have to wait until the time is propitious to sell those bonds the whole deal will disappear, it will evaporate, the various people who are involved will one by one drop out, we will not be taken seriously and the whole project will vanish, will evaporate. Therefore, so that we can get going and save some time

advance yourselves \$5 million of the \$30 million."

This is known as bridge money. This is known as interim financing. The \$5 million would be repaid when the \$30 million was floated.

Now we did that. That is exactly what we did. We did advance \$5 million, but the two hon. gentlemen who sit over there, the hon. member for St John's West and the hon. member for Humber East, these two hon gentlemen said; "No" - They had approved the whole thing. They wrote it, they drafted it, they negotiated for long, long months, brought it to the Cabinet, the Cabinet approved it. They drafted it, we brought the draft before the House and they did not vote against it nor speak against it. What they did do was break on the \$5 million.

MR WELLS: We spoke against it at the time too and explained all the details.

MR SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman were wise, knowing that the hon. Minister of Health is waiting for his chance, the hon. member would hold his tongue

MR WELLS: I am not in the least concerned -

MR SMALLWOOD: Ah Well! The hon. gentleman is very bold and brazen and daring but he will be less so when the Minister of Health disposes of him.

MR WELLS: I welcome it.

MR SMALLWOOD: Will he? He may welcome it now, not knowing what it is. When he knows what it is he will not be so happy.

MR WELLS: Having listened to the Premier telling everybody we know more about it than anybody else.

MR CROSSBIE: Where is the feasibility study? You still have not got it, study. according to you, a few days ago - two years later, still no independent feasibility

MR SMALLWOOD: He will not be so happy -

MR WELLS: Having listened to the Premier telling everybody we know more about it than anybody else.

MR SMALLWOOD: Anybody coming into this Chamber would jump to the conclusion and there is no other conclusion you could come to, the way they have been attacking the refinery deal. You would think that it is something new that has come in, whereas it is the same deal that they drafted and brought to the Cabinet and got passed by the Cabinet and the Cabinet brought into the House and the House passed. It is that same deal, but with radical changes in it, that these radical changes had been brought in here and the House asked to make these radical changes. But no, there were no changes, none.

69.

radical nor otherwise, no changes have been brought in here. The deal is exactly as they drafted it, it is exactly as they brought it to the Cabinet, it is exactly as the House passed it, and they did not vote against it.

Now Mr. Speaker, anybody would assume hearing them here in this House and on T.V., and on radio that - that were knights on white horses rushing to the rescue of Newfoundland against what? Against what they drafted. What they drafted.

MR. WELLS: Be honest

MR. SMALLWOOD: Against what they drafted. They are rushing to the rescue rushing to the rescue of the Newfoundland people, rushing to the rescue of the people of this Province against what danger, the danger that they created.

MR. WELLS: Nonsense

MR. SMALLWOOD: They wrote it, they drafted it, they brought it to the Cabinet, the Cabinet adopted it, the Cabinet brought it in here, they did not vote against it, but they crossed the floor on one point.

MR. WELLS: That is distortion

MR. CROSBIE: All the way

MR. WELLS: Pure distortion

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole House is witness to that

MR. SPEAKER: (Noel): Order please

MR. EARLE: Point of Order. Is not the hon. the Premier now divulging Cabinet discussions

MR. SMALLWOOD: Allowed what?

MR. EARLE: Divulging Cabinet discussions

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not divulging any Cabinet discussions, they have all been divulged.

MR. WELLS: I am about to I can say that, having heard this tonight. This ridiculous tirade.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tirade uh!

MR. WELLS: That is right

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tirade

MR. WELLS: I will tell you just what I said in Cabinet

MR. SMALLWOOD: You will do no such thing

MR. WELLS: I most certainly will

MR. SMALLWOOD: You will do no such thing

692

MR. SPEAKER: Order Please, order please

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is public knowledge that the hon. gentlemen were a committee - it was announced here in the House, they announced it here last week - that they were a committee of four. They named the four which they ought not to have done. It is contrary to the rules to name any committees of Cabinet.

MR. WELLS: The Premier named them two years ago

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is contrary - I did not - that is contrary to the rules

MR. WELLS: The record shows it

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman here last week named the four committee and they pointed out that the President of the Council was one, but that he had left it to the three of them. The Minister of Justice then, the member for Burin, the Minister of Health then, the present member for St. John's West, and the Minister without portfolio then, the present member for Humber East. Those three, plus the President of the Council - it was pointed out here in this debate last week had been a committee appointed by me to draft this agreement, and they had drafted it, and they had brought it to the Cabinet. All this was said here on the floor last week. I am not saying it.

MR. WELLS: You, said it two years ago

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say it two years ago - or two months ago - or two weeks ago. I did not say it, period. It was said here in this House by the hon. member across the floor. Across the floor - he cannot take it now, he cannot take it. The fact of the matter is that they, all last week on radio, on television, in scandalized tones with almost evincing shock and horror and disgust, they are attacking the very thing that they drafted. Now remember they drafted it Mr. Speaker, they drew it up - they drafted it after long months of negotiations and they brought it into the Cabinet. This is what they are attacking. That is all they are attacking - there is nothing else to

That is all they are attacking, there is nothing else to attack, until we do bring in more legislation, which we have not done. Now what are they attacking? Legislation that has not come in yet or legislation that they drafted and the House passed two years ago.

Some of the hon. members on the other side of the House, more especially the recent Liberals, have attacked the Oil Refinery Project. And Mr. Shaheen personally with an animosity that borders on the indecent.

MR. T. ALEX HICKMAN: The House of Assembly record No. 7 February 25th. see one recent Liberal who assigned any attack or indecent attack?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will accept the hon. gentleman, he did not make any indecent attack, he did not reveal any Cabinet secrecy. He did not break his Oath. To this moment I think the hon. gentleman can be completely exculpated from that. Completely, but not his colleagues who sits on the immediate left or the one who sits on his immediate right.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my personal privilege. I did not attack the Oil Refinery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not talking about the attack, breaching cabinet -

MR. EARLE: Nor did I breach cabinet secrecy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will show it. I will show it. I will show it, I have it here. After these personal attacks of the utmost animosity on Mr. Shaheen and on the whole great ~~fixary~~ refinery project one wonders what their tune will be, Mr. Speaker, when that great project is operating in full and forms the foundation for a far greater industry producing petro-chemical of many kinds, and employing many, many hundreds of Newfoundland people. One wonders what their tune will be then. Or do they take the chance that people will forget all about what they have done now, and said now?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say about the shipyard at Marystown.

Mr. Speaker, the trades in Newfoundland in 1965, the fish trade, the owners of the frozen fish industry submitted an estimate to the Government of the trawler fleet that Newfoundland would need to have from 1965 to 1975 for those ten years or eleven years. I have it in my hand here - this is not the Newfoundland Government's estimates that is the estimate of the trade, the frozen fish trade. They estimated

they were then operating forty-seven draggers in this Province. And there were two then being built. And there were eleven being planned for the next year 1966. And there were thirty-four for 1967, and forty-nine and then forty and bringing it to a total, Mr. Speaker, of 179 draggers. Now that is a huge fleet, 179 draggers the fish trade of this Province estimated they would have to have and there would be that number. Now this did not mean a 179 over and above the number they had, they had forty-seven. Some of the forty-seven would be replaced, would become obsolete, they would be done away with, they would not be used and there would be a grand total of 179 nearly 180 draggers in 1975. And on the basis of that estimate of the trade, supported by an estimate of the Government of Canada through the Federal Department of Fisheries, and our own trade here in Newfoundland, the two of them together agreed that Newfoundland was going to need for her modern fish plant by 1975, that is five years from now, 179 new draggers. So the Newfoundland Government said, how much money would that be? \$250 million, now Mr. Speaker, let me ask any hon. member of this House had he been Premier of this Province, in 1965. Had he been the Leader of the Government? Had he been a member of the Cabinet of that Government? Had he been just a member of the House of Assembly, and it was left to him, he is told by the Fisheries Department of Canada, by the fish trade of his own Province that Newfoundland by 1975 is going to have to have, 179 new draggers, a quarter of a billion dollars worth of shipping, would he have reacted as I reacted, and as my colleagues in the Cabinet reacted?

How did we react to that news? Well, in God's name let us build the ships in Newfoundland and keep that \$250 million here, employ Newfoundlanders, build up a new industry, and distribute all those wages. That is how we reacted. I am quite certain, that we were right. We reacted correctly to the facts, as the facts were at that time. And we proceeded to build this great shipyard, which on the day it was finished was the most modern shipyard in this nation of Canada. Not the biggest. We built it. Here, Mr. Speaker, is a piece from the Globe and Mail of February 19th. that is not very long ago. February 19th. the Globe and Mail, from the business section - "Thursday, February 19th. - Shipping notes - Ship building industry in slump and outlook is just as gloomy. It starts of, "The Canadian Ship Building Industry is in a slump at the moment, and the outlook is grim. Richard Laurey adds, that apart from one lake vessel, one laker, apart from one lake vessel under construction at the Collingwood Yard of Canadian Ship Building and Engineering Limited of Montreal, there had been no new orders

694

for lakers for two years. And before five naval vessels being built, there had been no naval orders for about seven years.

Gerard Filion, President of the Marine Industries Limited of Montreal, which operates a shipyard at Sorel, Quebec similarly is gloomy about the outlook. The yard at present had no new orders for 1971 and none in sight. He sees no improvement in the local markets in the near future, and thinks some shipyards will have to close.

Durmont Taylor, Director of the Canadian Ship Building and Ship Repairing Association is optimistic for the long term, but not for the short.

So the 179 draggers have not been built, I do not know whether they will be built by 1975, the forecast was 1975. But, we do know this that the shipyard was no sooner built, the pride and joy of our hearts in Newfoundland, Canada's most modern shipyard was no sooner done, when the bottom fell completely out of the whole frozen fish industry that uses the draggers. We all know that. The great fish plant at Harbour Grace collapsed, the great fish plant here Ross Steers, on the waterfront of St. John's collapsed, and last year we were informed, by the Marystown fish plant, that they were going to close it. The frozen fish industry went on the rocks. There was only one fishing company in the entire Canadian nation that did not lose money. It in fact made money, in Halifax, the National Fish, the only fish company in Canada that made money. All others lost money except that one. The bottom dropped out of the frozen fish industry, which is the customer for draggers. Canada at the same time dropped the ship building subsidy for fishing vessels.

And the result has been that the shipyard in Marystown, that ought to have been busy day and night, the Government built a magnificent shipyard. The management where William Davies, Ship Builders of Quebec, they brought men in from Ireland and Scotland, key men, these key men took over a large number of men around Marystown and that part of our Province and trained them to be ship builders. Not an easy thing to do, ship building is a very special kind of trade. But, there they were learning more, getting more proficient and efficient as one day passed another, when the very bottom dropped out of the frozen fish industry, and at the same time out of the ship building industry of Canada.

Now, Sir, this has been a bad blow, the Newfoundland Government have to meet the losses. The losses the year before last were \$1 million. We had to pay it.

695

For the year just passed \$500,000, we will have to pay that. For the year coming I do not know. On thing about it is this, that the frozen fish industry is coming back, it is coming back, is it not? Improving substantially, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries told us here in the House the other night, in a very fine and thoughtful speech, that the frozen fish industry is stating a comeback prices are mounting, they are climbing again in the American market. And I think, we may assume that in the next year, two or three you are going to have a flourishing frozen fish industry. Right now they need draggers. Right now as the Minister of Fisheries told us the other night, the great Ross Steers Plant which was not six months old, was it not when it closed down, spic span new it cost millions of dollars to put there, and closed in six months. That plant would probably be re-opened tomorrow, if they had a fleet of draggers. Now it is probable that the Newfoundland Government are going to have to finance those draggers. All the draggers that will be built in this Province for some years to come, and of course, we are not going to finance any draggers to be built outside this Province.

So, I would say to my hon. friend the member for Placentia West, I know he has had heartache over that great shipyard. I know he was worried sick over the chance of the great fish plant employing 500 or 600 persons, 700 with the draggers, the dragger crews. He is worried sick over the danger that they would close. I say to him now tonight, he can be of a more cheerful disposition I think that things are going to be better at Marystown. They have done 119 repair jobs in one year. A 119 ships have been in that shipyard for repair. I have been there and seen five and six ships there at the one time, all up high and dry out of the waters. It is a tremendous shipyard, but it was never built just to do repairs, it was built to build fleet, after fleet of draggers in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken some big chances, big gambling chances in Newfoundland, this Government have taken to get industry here. And I am sort of proud that we were big effort, and had enough heart and courage to take big chances because, I know and anyone who knows anything knows, only an ignoramus does not know. Anyone who knows anything knows, that the only hope we have in this Province is to take chances. Big chances. Gambling chances. Or we will go down the drain. We would not have gone down the drain fifty years ago, you could not wash us down the drain fifty years ago, we had so little. We were so used to having so little, having nothing, we were just a poor poverty stricken

March 2nd. 1970

Tape 156

PK - 5

crowd on this rock here fifty years ago. You would not wash us down the drain. But, today with our sights raised very high. The educated with television, as to what kind of a beautiful world it is all around us. We can be washed down the drain today. If we do not give the people

MR. SMALLWOOD: gives the people of Newfoundland a nice pleasant and exciting kind of a province to live in. We will lose them, they will not live here, they will leave. We could be washed down the drain, and the one thing we must do, and one desperate effort we must make is to bring industry here, and we must take great chances.

I hope and pray to God that we will never be as unlucky in taking a chance as our neighbouring province of Nova Scotia has been. I was very excited one day when I got an inquiry about what concessions the Newfoundland Government was prepared to give for a starting of a great new industry in this Province.

I could hardly believe my ears because this new industry that was talked about was the most sophisticated industry that would be anywhere in Canada. And I was very excited to be asked, could we provide land, could we provide a harbour - what labour did we have and so and so forth - what supply of water - did we have a big supply of steam, was there going to be a big plant somewhere that would have a lot of excess steam?

And do you know what it was they were talking about building in Newfoundland? A heavy plant. Believe me, we worked to gather together the information to give those people - trying desperately to get them interested - keep them interested in Newfoundland because we did want that heavy water plant, but we did not get it.

Nova Scotia outdid us. Nova Scotia took a bigger chance than we were willing to take, and they got the heavy water plant. Mr. Speaker, the heavy water plant in Cape Breton was to cost \$40,000,000 to put there. And it cost \$40,000,000, and then it went broke. It was not built, it was partly built, and the \$40 million were spent - it was half built, and they went broke. So the Nova Scotia Government bought it out for \$40 million cash. Then the Nova Scotia Government spent another \$40 million to try to finish that plant. That was eighty. Then they spent another \$25 million - that was \$105 million cash, the Nova Scotia Government spent on that heavy water plant.

And by the time they had spent \$105 million on it, it was half built, and two years overdue. So they called in experts from the United States, and the experts reported to them, that the plant was a shambles. It could not possibly produce heavy water. It was rusted out and corroded inside - it was almost a complete shamble. It would take another two years to finish it -

it was two years overdue as it was. Take another two years to finish it, and another \$35.million, which would bring it - well actually it is \$141. - so it is \$106.million and some odd hundred thousand. And \$35.million added on would bring it to \$141.million - it would then be four years overdue. It was to cost \$40.million - it would cost \$140.million - \$141.million - and the product was not built to make - it could not make even when the \$141.million was spent on it - it would still only make a product that was only partly made, and would have to be shipped off to another plant to make it - to finish making it.

And the total number of employed men in it would be when it was finished 200. 200 jobs. And 200 jobs Mr. Speaker - it is \$6.5.million and \$35.million brings us to \$141.5 million. 200 men - 200 jobs - costing \$750,000 three-quarters of a million per job. Per job. You could have it easily in your heart to pity the Government and the Premier of Nova Scotia - because what he did and what they did and what that Government did, they did in good faith. They thought they were dealing with first-class people, and by all accounts they were. And I, in my happiness not having got into that awful mess, do not spare any pity for our neighbouring province for having got into it.

I am as sorry as a man could be because I came close to bringing it to my colleagues. I do not know what my colleagues would have done, but I daresay they would have done what the Nova Scotia Premier's colleagues did - his colleagues went for it in a big way.

And the trouble Mr. Speaker, is this. When and if it opens, if it ever opens, the heavy water it produces which will ^{be} used as a coolant in nuclear reactors, will not be a first quality, for the plant is equipped only to bring the water to the third of five stages. When that plant makes the heavy water, it will be at the third stage of five it must go to, and the next two stages have to be done in another plant elsewhere. It will therefore require other treatment elsewhere. In addition its sales, and remember it has contracted to sell all its heavy water to the atomic energy of Canada - the Government of Canada. Its sales of the 400 tons of heavy water a year, its sales to the atomic energy of Canada will probably not be sufficient to meet the cost of operating the plant, let alone the \$141.million.

When and if it opens it is expected to sell 400 tons of heavy water a year to atomic energy and fourteen dollars and fifteen cents a pound. That is a good price - when you have four hundred tons and you get fourteen dollars

and fifteen cents a pound. That is a lot of money for a yearly total of about \$16.million. Their sales will run about \$16.million a year. But because of construction delays and debt charges, the plant will run up a total bill of \$151.million by opening day. Now if a hundred and forty-one and a half is capital cost and the balance \$9.million or more is interest - so it will be \$151.million - the interest on that \$151.million is \$12.million a year. Hence with a yearly return of \$16.million - the profit margin is nearly \$4.million which is not enough to offset the operating costs of \$8.million.

What a sad tragedy - a small province such as Nova Scotia finds itself in, in their desperate effort to create jobs for their people. Remember Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia 's need for jobs is perhaps even more desperate than ours here in Newfoundland. You know why? Because in Newfoundland every year now - every year that passes, our population is increasing more and more, than the population of Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, and New Brunswick, all combined. Our population is increasing more than the three Maritimes combined.

You know why? Because their people are leaving Nova Scotia in droves. Premier Thatcher told me, told all of us in camera conference in Ottawa the other day, that Saskatchewan has almost the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. You know why? For the simple reason that British Columbia has a very high rate. Why has Saskatchewan got such a low rate and B.C. such a high rate? Because the people of Saskatchewan are flocking to British Columbia. That keeps down the unemployment figures in Saskatchewan, but sends them shooting up in British Columbia, and similarly in Nova Scotia. Their people have been going out in - literally in droves - droves - Nova Scotia have been pouring out of that province, literally in droves. They need industry, they must take chances. We must take chances. We will both be washed down the drain along with Prince Edward Island, and along with New Brunswick, we four are the most easterly provinces of Canada - can be washed down the drain if we do not watch our bobber - we will be washed down.

And you will then have people in other parts of Canada say, "so what, they have moved to another part of Canada, they are still Canadians". Yes, but not Newfoundlanders. And while we are proud to be Canadians, I think we are even prouder to be Newfoundlanders. We are not so proud of Canada that we are willing to give up Newfoundland, and just become Ontarions, or

March 2, 1970

Tape #157

Page 4

Quebecers, or British Columbians, Albertans. At least I am not. And I do not think most Newfoundlanders want to cease to be Newfoundlanders, and lose their pride in Newfoundland, in a new pride - pride of being Canadian. We are proud to be Canadian but we do not want to lose our pride in being Newfoundlanders. And we can cease to be Newfoundlanders because Newfoundland can cease.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to bore the House now for a moment. If I were to ask every hon. gentleman in this House to give me his opinion of what is basically the most important function in this House, apart from passing laws and getting supply for Her Majesty the Queen, getting the Budget passed.

Apart from these two what is the most important function of this House? I wonder what the answers would be. Anybody got any idea? Apart from passing laws, which is the prime purpose of the House, and getting the Budget passed to supply money to run things - apart from these two, what is basically, fundamentally, the most important function of this House? Anybody know?

AN. HON. MEMBER: Getting information for the public -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman almost hit it. Give a second try. Well I will tell the House. The most important function of the House of Assembly, or the House of Commons, anywhere in the British system, is the asking of questions. Not the giving, but the asking of questions. And of course, when one asks a question he is supposed to get an answer. The asking of questions by the Opposition.

I have in my personal library several hundreds of books - I do not know how many hundred on Parliamentary Government, Cabinet Government - the British Constitutional System. I have read them from cover to cover, all of them, and ^{of} some of them I have read them repeatedly again and again and again. It has been a life's hobby of mine to study the history of Parliament - the functioning of Parliament - Parliamentary practise, Parliamentary procedure.

parliamentary precedent and parliamentary principle, it is a life's hobby with me. I have hundreds of books on it. Here is one, volume 2 of Todd's, Alpheus Todd's, the great Alpheus Todd's book, parliamentary government in England. Volume 2. Here is what Todd says about questions. It is the practise in both Houses of Parliament the House of Commons and the House of Lords or in Canada the House of Commons and the Senate, or in this island, this country when we were a country, the Lower House and the Upper House. We used to have two Chambers as well. It is the practise in both Houses of Parliament to permit question to be addressed to ministers of the Crown, upon matters of public concern.

This proceeding is attended with great convenience to members and is of public advantage. As it affords an opportunity for removing erroneous impressions and disseminating correct intelligence upon a variety of topics of political importance or of general interest. It is also servicable as obviating the necessity in many instances of more extended debate and of motions for papers.

It was in 1731 I think when the first question was ever asked in Parliament. A member stood up, said, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I desire to ask the Right Hon. Gentleman such and such a question. That was question No. 1 in history, in the British Parliament. It was quickly, it was sanctioned Mr. Speaker did not rule it out. and it quickly developed into an established practise in parliament. 1731. But it was not until 1854, in 1854 a manual of the rules and orders of the House of Commons was prepared by Mr. May, that is, he was then Mr. May he became Sir Erskine May perhaps the greatest authority in history on parliamentary Government. A manual of the rules and orders of the house of Commons was prepared by Mr. May under the direction of the Speaker, which contains special rules embodying the existing practise as to the time and method of putting and answering questions.

Now Mr. Speaker, that is what he said. This book an encyclopedia of Parliament by Norman Wilding, librarian of the Federal Assembly of the Federation of Rhodesia Nyasaland, and Philip Laundry librarian of the Legislative Assembly of Southern Rhodesia, has this to say on questions. The practise whereby a member of Parliament can put a question to a minister on a matter concerning his department. It is universal throughout the British Commonwealth. The late Sir Herbert Williams who asked about 4000 questions during his parliamentary career, think of that Mr. Speaker, one-man the late Sir Herbert Williams who asked about 4000 questions during his parliamentary career I do not know how long his parliamentary career was, he might have been in parliament 40 or 50 years. But he asked 4000 questions, described he described questions in the House as quote: (perhaps one of the most powerful

implements of democracy in our country) And these authors go on to say questions to ministers cover the whole administration of the country and range from foreign relations to the individual claim of bureaucracy so that it is quite apparent how important they are in enabling the private member to investigate any government or departmental activity which does not satisfy him. Nothing could more weaken the control of Parliament or with the executive that is over the Cabinet, nothing could more weaken the control of the House of Assembly over the Cabinet than the abolition or curtailment of the right of a member to ask a question in the House. And so important has this method of ventilating grievances become that it has been responsible for the corresponding decline in public petitions.

The first formal question to a minister I was wrong by 10 years. The first formal question to a minister was put in 1721 and I said 31 in the House of Lords. And questions first appeared on the Order Paper in 1835. One of the most important rules is that questions can only be addressed to a minister who is responsible for the matter of the question and whose department is directly involved. That is why hon. members must always direct the question to the minister whose affair it is. He can shrug his shoulders and say: "He no speak English." Or he can be ruder and say you can go to — , you address your questions to the minister who is responsible and to no one else, and if one does then the man who receives it just rips it up if he likes does not concern him, that is the rule. I did not make that rule. But that is the rule.

Now here is a book on questions, that is all it is about, questions in parliament, by D.N. Chester and Nona Bowring, Clarendon Press at Oxford, here is what it says those two authors, Chester is warden of Nuffield College, Oxford; Nona Bowring is sometime research assistant at Nuffield College. The number of testimonials British and Foreign to the value of question time is legal. President Lowell of Harvard could say (quote) "The system provides a method of dragging before the House any acts or omissions by the departments of state and of turning a searchlight upon every corner of the public service. It helps very much to keep the administration of the country up to the mark and it is a great safeguard against neglect or arbitrary conduct or the growth of bureaucratic arrogance which is quite unknown in England."

S Sir Ivar Jennings who is one of the very greatest authorities on Parliamentary British Parliamentary Government that every lived on this earth. Sir Ivar Jennings refers to the quote: "Practice of asking questions now of the utmost constitutional importance. The late Hon. Right Hon. J. P. Clines wrote, (quote) The freedom of

the House is never better illustrated than during the daily question period . Important ministers may be questioned by the humblest members and if the members master the rules and if the members master the rules and procedure they can often render substantial service to their constituents." That was what Mr. Cline said. I knew him by the way, I met him in England. He was a great leader of the British Labour Party.

In 1906 Mr. Speaker Lowell Lauder is one of the greatest speakers in British History. In 1906 Mr. Speaker Lauder declared (quote) "If I had the decision of it I would not limit the right of asking questions at all." If he had to decide. I think it is a very valuable right Mr. Speaker, Lauder. In 1946 another speaker Mr. Speaker, Clifton Brown giving evidence to a Select Committee of the House express their opinion (quote) " I regard the question hour as a vital part of our proceedings and a little later he said, "I think the question hour is the most important private member's hour , so to speak. I think it is a fightfully important hour." Lord Campeon, one of the most able and prominent clerks of the House of Commons wrote that questions (quote) "Are the one procedural invention of the democratic period." Before the Select Committee on procedure in 1931, Stanley Baldwin said,-the great Prime Minister, the Tory Prime Minister of England, said: " There is no more unalienable right than that right of putting questions to the Ministers" Lloyd George said: " That he regarded question time as (quote) very valuable and supplementaries are very valuable." Sir Archibald Sinclair the Liberal Leader said: "he attached great importance to questions and particularly to supplementary questions." An experienced chief Government Whip Sir Bolton Ayrns Muncel said: "That questions and supplementry's were (quote) the one effective way of criticizing the Government ~~in the House of Commons~~ at the present moment." And so we could go on. Few elements in the procedure of the house of Commons indeed in the British Constitution itself. Now get the significance of that. Few elements in the procedure of the House of Commons indeed in the British Constitution itself have attracted so much attention or been so universally praised.as the system of allowing members to question ministers.

Herbert Morrison had the interesting experience at a banquet in London given by Lord Beaverbrook where I sat for a while next to Sir Winston Churchill and for most of the night with Harold MacMillan the Tory Prime Minister of England,they have a practise when the dinner is well advanced and some of the speeches are over, men coming for different parts of the banquet hall and sitting next to this or that person sort of mixing up of them. Herbert Morrison came over, and he leaned, he sat here, Harold

MacMillan was here and Lord Beaverbrook was there, and he leaned across me and the Prime Minister and he said to Beaverbrook "Max, he said, they have asked me to go in the House of Lords, do you think I should?" He did. He spent the last year of his life I think as Lord Morrison. Famous Herbert Morrison, Government and Parliament a survey from the inside. Speaking of questions he does not say very much himself but he quotes, the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons that reported on procedure, as follows: The exercise of this right, the right to put questions : The exercise of this right is perhaps the radius and most effective method of parliamentary control over the action of the executive. The committee would therefore deprecate anything which tended to diminish the effectiveness of this right. On the other hand, the very powerfulness of the right, on the other hand the very powerfulness of the right imposed upon members a proportionate responsibility in its use. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Opposition are in deadly determined to hear these opinions from the great constitutional authorities of the British system they are determined to be well-informed. I hope they are listening.

On the other hand the very powerfulness of the right, the right to ask questions imposes upon members a proportionate responsibility in its use. The departments very properly accord a high degree of priority to the answering of parliamentary questions. It is important therefore that questions especially oral questions should only be put down when other and less formal methods have failed, to produce the satisfactory result or when some information or action is urgently needed.

It was very good. I read every word of Canadian Hansard. I have done so beginning about a year before I became a Canadian and for some time, for ten or twelve years before that I read every word of Hansard of the British House of Commons. Mr. W. J. Carew was Secretary of the Commission of Government, and the Hansards used to come from the House of Lords and the House of Commons, from London, and the only one in Newfoundland who was interested in them was I. And I would drop in once a week and pick them up and carry them home and read them. For years - and I read them now. And every time Mr. Speaker gives a ruling I read it very carefully.

On February 18 - here is one. I save them. I mark them - I have a pile that high of Hansards with Speakers rulings. Mr. Stan Schumacher from Palliser. "My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Will Premier Thatcher's statement that he would have to reconsider being a member of the Liberal Party

if the White Paper on Tax Reform is proceeded with? Persuade the Minister that fundamental changes if not complete withdrawal of this document are now in order.

Question: - Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is argumentative.

And that ended that. He did not bluster, he did not roar and bawl. He tried to get away with something and the Speaker quietly said "The hon. member's question is argumentative".

And in your questions you are not allowed to be argumentative.

And, of course, here in this House Beauschene is one of the great final authorities. And Beauschene spells it out pretty carefully, what kind of questions you can ask and not ask. A question whether

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whether spoken with the voice or written a question must not and here is a long list of "don'ts"; Must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain epithet, innuendo, satire, or ridicule. (b) Must not be trivial, vague, or meaningless. (c) Must ~~not~~ multiply, with slight variations, of similar questions on the same point. (d) Must not repeat in substance a question already answered, or to which an answer has been refused. Oh, may answers be refused? Oh, yes indeed - no minister is required to answer any questions. (e) Must not inquire whether statements made in the newspaper are true. Questions must not contain an expression of opinion. Questions must not be hypothetical. Must not contain inferences. (i) Must not contain imputations. (j) Must not be framed so as to suggest it's own answer. (k) Must not be a speech, however short; nor be of unreasonable length. (l) must not seek, for purposes of argument, information on matter of past history. (m) Must not ask solution of a legal proposition, such as interpretation of a statute, a minister's own powers, etc. (n) Must not reflect on or relate to character or conduct of persons other than in a public capacity. (o) Must not refer discourteously to a friendly foreign country. (p) Must not be asked - no question must be asked that might prejudice a pending trial in a court of law. (q) Must not contain or imply charges of a personal character. (r) Must not refer to debate or answers to questions of the current session. (s) Must not embody a series of questions which should be moved for an address or order. (t) Must not impugn the accuracy of information conveyed to the House by a minister. (u) Must not suggest amendments to Bills, must not anticipate an order of the day or other matters, must not raise a matter of policy to large to be dealt with in the limits of an answer to a question. For instance, it is not proper, it is not lawful to ask a question of a minister the answer to which would be the Government stating it's policy. The Government's policy is not stated in answers to questions. (x) Must not deal with an action of a minister for which he is not responsible, to Parliament, or with matters not within his official knowledge. A question must not raise matters under control of local authorities not responsible to the Government or legislature. Must not refer to speeches made outside the House; but in the case of a Cabinet Minister, it is permissible to ask the Prime Minister whether such speech represents the policy of the Government. Must not seek information about the internal affairs of foreign countries or the Dominions. Must not ask the Government's opinion on matters of policy. Must not ask what advice the minister proposes to give the Crown, (but may ask what advice he has given). Must not deal with matters not officially connected

with the Government of Parliament, or which are of a private nature. Questions must not relate to communications alleged to have passed between a member and a minister. (ff) Must not seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner, in other words if a question is asked me, and my answer is that information is already available to the hon. member, what it means is that it is in the Auditor General's report or it is in some report, or it is in some document, equally available to him as to me, and he should not ask the question if ^{he} already has the answer. That is why I say to former Ministers "you should not ask that question, you know it as well, because you were a member of the Government when the matter involved happened. Why do you ask "

MR. WELLS: What about the rest of the members?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, a member has the right to ask any question himself. He has only the right to ask a question himself, and he can ask it only according to the rules, and he cannot ask a question the answer to which he already has.

MR. WELLS: Then why is questions so important if it is not for the public knowledge?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is of course for the public knowledge, but the means of getting the public knowledge is - that any member asks a question, and in asking a question he must be bound by the rules of asking a question. And under the rules he is not allowed to ask a question the answer to which he already knows. That is the rule, I did not make the rule - blame the man who made the rule, do not blame me.

MR. WELLS: It is not right

MR. CROSBIE: It is not in Beauschene

MR. WELLS: It is not in Beauschene, only where the answers are

MR. SMALLWOOD: (gg) Must not seek information about matters which are in their nature secret, Such as decisions or proceedings of Cabinet - advice given to the Crown by law officers. Must not seek information about proceedings in the committee which is not yet made it's report to the House. Must not introduce the name of, or contain reflection on, the Sovereign or Royal Family, or refer to influence of the Crown. Must not seek from an ex-minister information with regard to transactions during his term of office. No one may ask an ex-minister any question which reflects on, which bears on anything he learned as a minister. It is verboten, it is forbidden.

And an interesting item here is this: a question which could be

708

inserted on the Order Paper is not allowed on the Orders of the Day being called. And then again, reading telegrams, letters or extracts from newspapers as an opening to a question when the Orders of the Day are called is an abuse of the rules of the House. It is not good Parliamentary practice to communicate written allegations to the House and then ask ministers either to confirm or deny them. Still less is it to repeat anonymous rumors that reflect on the integrity and the honesty of the Queen's Ministers.

It is the members duty to ascertain the truth of any statement before he brings it to the attention of Parliament. There is that duty on each individual Member of the House before he brings anything to the House - to the attention of the House he is to ascertain the truth of it. He must assume responsibility for it. This has been decided long ago in the United Kingdom House of Commons. On the 14th. of June 1882, as long ago as that Mr. Speaker, Brand in preventing a member reading a telegram from the Newspaper, and founding a question on it, pointed out the extreme inconvenience of founding questions on every telegram and every newspaper. Quote " I am bound to say, he added, that it does appear to me that before questions of such gravity are put, an hon. member should take some measure to ascertain the truth of the telegram."

Questions addressed to ministers should relate to the public affairs with which they are officially connected. To proceedings pending in Parliament, or to any matter of administration for which the minister is responsible. A minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order. No debate being allowed. A refusal to answer cannot be raised as a question of privilege nor is it regular to comment upon such refusal. A member can put a question but has no to insist upon an answer. An answer to a question cannot be insisted upon if the answer be refused by the Minister on the ground of the public interest - nor can the question be replaced on the notice paper. The refusal of a minister to answer on this ground cannot be raised as a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker, the right of members of the House to ask questions of the ministry is one of the great basic fundamentals of Parliamentary Democracy. It is now two and one quarter centuries old - and is a precious right to be guarded almost with ones life, so long as one believes in Parliamentary Democracy. But Sir, that right can be exercised only within the rules. I am informed that Phillip Laundry, co-author of an encyclopedia of Parliament with Norman Wilding - Phillip Laundry, who was librarian of the Legislative Library of Southern Rhodesia

is now in charge of research in the House of Commons Library in Ottawa, and he is author of the Office of Speaker, a book "The Office Of Speaker."

What I have been quoting here tonight is very much Mr. Speaker, very much indeed from the great authorities on this great subject of Questions. The right to ask them, and the way to ask them. The rules governing the right - every right has a duty with it, attached to it - every right has a responsibility - the right of asking questions is absolutely precious to the continuation of a verile and vigorous Parliamentary democracy. Utterly indispensable, but the very powerfulness of it as one of the authors says dictates that it be asked with a great sense of responsibility according to the rules.

First of all the minister does not have to answer it

MR. WELLS: I realize that

MR. SMALLWOOD: And there can be no discussion of the answer that is given, and if there is not an answer there can be no discussion of that.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about secrecy - Cabinet secrecy. And the first one I quote is the great Harold J. Laskey, about whom I made the biggest fool of myself I think I have ever made of myself in my life. H. J. Laskey. When Mr. Trudeau was down here during the Federal Election Campaign we drove together in the car around Conception Bay. I said to him "you know Prime Minister, this book of yours, "Federalism and the French Canadians," is one of the most entrancing books I have ever read," and he said "Is that so Premier?" and I said "yes." I said "it is marvelously written, it is very, very compact, every sentence is honed, finely honed. Every sentence has thought and ideas in it, it is the most compact, finely honed thing I have read on politics since one book I read by a man I guess, maybe you never heard of." He said "oh?" I said "yes, this book was given to me by Mr. Paton who is president of Memorial University College in St. John's here, we had a very brilliant English Scholar - one of England's great scholars, one of the three great scholars of England, Gilbert Murray, Sir Alfred Zimmeran and John Lewis Paton." I said "we had them here as the first president of our university college" and he said "that is very good - you are very lucky," and I said "yes ~~we are~~^{we are}, that man put his stamp on the personality of hundreds of young Newfoundlanders and it is felt to this very day, the stamp of Paton's personality. He made friends with young men, and he made friends with me - I was not a student of his, and he gave me a book to read, and that is the book I mean." He said "What was the book?" I said "well it was a book called a grammar of politics, and it was written by an Englishman named Harold J. Laskey

710

He said " and you liked it?" And I said " Oh I liked it very much." And what gave me the shame and humiliation was to discover later that he had studied under Laskey in the London School of Economics as had John F.Kennedy before him. Or they must have studied much around the same time because they were much of an age.

John F.Kennedy studied under Laskey, and so did Pierre Elliott Trudeau in London University. And this is Laskey's comment on Cabinet Secrecy.

Re. He says - the Cabinet

The Cabinet, he says, is called Parliamentary Government in England - a commentary. The Cabinet, I have said, is a secret body, collectively responsible for its decisions. The significance of the secrecy, theoretically, it is safeguarded in three ways. Now, the secrecy of Cabinet by the privy councillor's oath, that is the Cabinet Minister's oath, the Official Secrets Act and the fact that since the Cabinet decision is advice to the King. Every decision a Cabinet makes is a recommendation to the King or the Queen - in Newfoundland, to the Queen's representative.

Every ordering council, every Cabinet order made, every decision of the Cabinet is the tendering of a bit of advice to the Governor who governs Newfoundland. The Governor governs Newfoundland on the advice of ministers and the way his ministers tender the advice is to pass orders in council which do not become the law until the Governor accepts and signs.

So, every decision of Cabinet is the tendering of advice to the - Her Majesty or Her Majesty's personal representative. This is the real nub of the secrecy of the Cabinet Minister.

By the privy councillor's oath, the Officials Secrets Act and the fact that since a Cabinet decision is advice to the King, the monarch's sanction is necessary before publication. But, none of these is so important as the fact that men who have to appear before the public as collectively responsible for their decisions could usefully work together unless they were assured, unless they were assured they could not work usefully together - a Cabinet could not, unless they were assured as normally they are, that the confidences of free discussion will be respected.

How can there be free and frank discussion in Cabinet if every member of the Cabinet is: (A) not one of the same party and (B) sworn to secrecy.

Collective responsibility is a different matter. The rule was well laid down by Lord Salisbury. Quote: "For all that passes in Cabinet each member of it who does not resign is absolutely and irretrievably responsible and has no right afterwards to say that he agreed in one case to a compromise while in another he was persuaded by his colleagues".

No member of the Cabinet, once he kisses that Bible and takes that oath of secrecy, can ever after, without a foul violation of his oath, can ever after, reveal what took place in the Cabinet except with permission. Now, we will find shortly how the permission is got and who gives it.

When you take the oath of secrecy in a Cabinet, which is absolutely imperative, or there cannot be a Cabinet. The Cabinet is not the Legislature. It is the Executive Government which meets in secret. An oath bound secret meeting - every Cabinet meeting, where every decision taken is a decision of the entire Cabinet - not every one man; about which meeting it is not even permissible to say, what minister was present and what minister was not present. About which it is not permissible to say, that this minister was for it and that minister was against it because it is one and all .

And as Lord - the great Lord Salisbury, the last Prime Minister of England, who is a member of the House of Lords - for all that passes in Cabinet, each member of it who does not resign is absolutely and irretrievably responsible and has no right afterwards to say that he agreed in one case to a compromise while in another, he was persuaded by his colleagues.

A minister, therefore, must accept a Cabinet decision or resign and if he does not resign, it is no less his decision than that of his colleagues, even if he protested against it in the Cabinet.

I have seen hundreds of times in Cabinet meetings where a minister - I am not privileged under my oath to say what minister - hundreds of times I have seen a minister protest vehemently against a decision of the Cabinet. He was opposed to it. He disagreed with it. He thought it was wrong and he said so, but he did not resign and so he took full and complete responsibility for that decision and was bound by his oath of secrecy not to reveal it.

I did not make that law. It is not my law, not the dictator who did that. That is the essence. That is the very guts of Parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy in the British system cannot operate without the Cabinet and secrecy and Cabinet solidarity of decision.

The minister, therefore, must accept a Cabinet decision or resign and if he does not resign, it is no less his decision than that of his colleagues, even if he protested against it in the Cabinet.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. I am content that I have never, yet, been able to find words to express for the people in British countries who run down political parties, who do not believe in political parties. Poor ignorant, poor unlettered, illiterate people so far as the great principles of British democracy, Parliamentary democracy are concerned.

The British system cannot function. This system we have in Newfoundland, in Canada and all the Provinces, in the United Kingdom, in Australia and New Zealand, cannot function without the political party.

Listen to this. The great Laski - perhaps the greatest political thinker England has produced in the present century. He must, that is to say, vote for the decision in Parliament and, if necessary, defend it there and on the public platform.

This is the minister who opposed it in Cabinet and does not resign. He must support it in Parliament or platform.

Mr. Gladstone, indeed, took the view that the actions of a minister from a division should be censured. If there is a division on it in Parliament, and the minister is absent, he should be censured for being absent. He is taking full responsibility for the decision of the Cabinet. He should be here in a division. Gladstone took a very strong view on that.

A minister - the implication goes much further. A minister must not make a speech contrary to Cabinet policy. If he seeks to large an attitude, he will, like Mr. Chamberlain in 1903, find it necessary to resign. You remember what Chamberlain, Joseph Chamberlain, the man after whom I am named - that is where I got my name Joe - Joe Chamberlain, Joe Smallwood. Two great people - one a Tory --

AN HON. MEMBER: He was a Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was a Liberal, yes, and became a Tory and he went down from that moment on. Politically speaking he went down. Like Mr. Chamberlain in 1903, find it necessary to resign, if he makes a declaration of policy in his speech about which there is no Cabinet decision.

Now, hear this. Where did I hear those words? Now, here this. If he makes a declaration of policy in his speech upon which there is no Cabinet decision, either like Mr. Lloyd George in the well known Mansion House Speech

of 1911 - he must have the agreement of vital colleagues who can assure him of Cabinet sanction afterwards, or like Sir William J Hicks, when in 1927 he pledged the Cabinet to women suffrage at twenty-one, with no such consultation he must take the risk that the refusal of post hoc consent will put him in a position where he has no alternative but to resign.

The Cabinet is, by nature, a unity and collective responsibility is the method by which this unity is secured.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. The rule is not only salutary. It is also a necessary one. There is no other condition upon which that teamwork, which is of the essence of the Cabinet system, becomes possible. Not only this. Collective responsibility begets mutual confidence and it makes possible that give and take in the shaping of policy without which any effective mutual confidence is rarely attained.

It is clear that ministers could not easily live together, if any Cabinet minister could at any time divest himself of responsibility for an unpopular decision or for one pivotal to the Cabinet's outlook. It is clear further, that no minister can speak on those topics, especially foreign affairs on which his colleagues are acting without seriously implicating them in his pronouncements.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker. This leads us to the conclusion that the secret of collective responsibility - the secret of collective Cabinet responsibility is in all normal circumstances, the fact that the Cabinet is rooted in the Party's system. It is its Party complexion that gives it its unity of purpose.

Now, remember, Mr. Speaker, that the first Cabinets were coalitions, not ministers of one Party. They had a Premier. He did not even have the title of Premier. He was the First Lord of the Treasury. Later on, he became to be called Premier - First Minister, top minister, but even before he was called that, that is what he was - as First Lord of the Treasury.

And he would bring men in from different Parties into his Cabinet and the Cabinet would be a coalition, but after awhile, I think maybe Pitt -- Was Pitt the first to have an all one party Cabinet? I think he was. Pitt the younger.

The fact that the Cabinet is rooted in the Party's system - it is its Party complexion that gives it its unity of purpose. It is its Party complexion also that provides the sanction by which that unity of purpose is maintained. The Party assures the presence, in the Cabinet, of light minded men with similar objects who will contemplate from a similar angle, the problems they will have to deal with. It is the Party also, which makes it possible for the Cabinet to follow a policy, which predetermined in its large outlines, is like the command that continues majority in the House of Commons.

That is why Disraeli could write

That is why Disraeli could rightly say that England does not love coalitions. For a coalition is essentially a suspension of the normal principles of our political life, for objectives disturbing to the habits by which men seek to live. But to destroy parties is necessarily to destroy representative government since they are the active principle of its life. You cannot have parliamentary democracy in the British system without the party system.

Now the King or as we would say in Newfoundland the Governor - there is obviously a wide intermediate ground. The King is ⁱⁿ constant touch with the Prime Minister on all the vital aspects of policy. He sees other ministers with some frequency and he has, as a matter of course, the Cabinet minutes and the main official documents relevant thereto. He will be aware of all proposals before decisions are taken in the Cabinet. He has the right to comment upon them and where he so insists to see that the Cabinet is fully informed of his opinion before the Cabinet decide. It is clear, therefore, that a King who so wishes can play a considerable part in the process of government. I have a particular reason for reading that sentence or two.

^{W O} Sir Iver Jennings, I suppose, the greatest of them all - the very greatest, Sir Iver Jennings, next to the great Alpheus Todd who died must be fifty years ago, third edition, "Cabinet Government." It is just a book written about cabinets and how they operate and how they have to operate under the British system. On secrecy, Sir Iver Jennings says this: "the Cabinet deliberates in secret. Its proceedings are confidential. The Privy Councillors' oath imposes an obligation not to disclose information and the Official Secrets Act forbid the publication of cabinet as well as other official documents." Now that is what your oath prevents you from doing, the Official Secrets Act prevents you from doing, but the effective sanction is neither of these. The rule is primarily one of practice. Its theoretical basis is that a cabinet decision is advice to the Queen whose consent is necessary to its publication. Its practical foundation is the necessity of securing free discussion in cabinet by which a compromise can be reached without the risk of publicity for every statement made and every point given away. A minister who resigns from the cabinet usually desires to make an explanation in parliament. Natural enough, normal enough, very human. A minister who resigns from the cabinet usually desires to ~~make~~ an explanation in parliament. Since this involves an explanation of cabinet

discussions, he must secure the Queen's consent. A cabinet minister resigns. He wishes to explain his resignation, his reasons to parliament or to the public, but he must first obtain the Queen's consent. For this purpose he asks permission through the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is the Queen's chief adviser. Her first minister. Her Prime Minister. Her Premier. It means the same thing - all interchangeable terms.

For this purpose, he must secure the Queen's consent. For this purpose, he asks permission through the Prime Minister. Lord Melbourne objected in 1834 to the King giving consent without consultation with the Prime Minister as subversive - Lord Melbourne thought it was subversive of all the principles upon which the Government of this country has hitherto been conducted. When Lord Darby resigned he asked permission to state his reasons and permission was given, but four months later he returned to the subject - this Queen Victoria said, "is a most unusual and she cannot but think hardly constitutional course."

wrote:

In reply to Lord Darby's explanation, General Ponsonby that was her secretary "Her Majesty expects that when ever a Privy Councillor makes any statement in parliament respecting proceedings in Her Majesty's Council that is in the cabinet, the Queen's permission to do so should first be solicited and the object of the statement made clear and that the permission thus given should only serve for the particular instance and not be considered as an open licence."

Lord Salisbury described this statement as a valuable edition to Constitutional Law. "There comes a time, when cabinet proceedings pass into history. Full information is now available as to the proceedings of the nineteenth century cabinets and only the absence of biographies of leading statesmen prevents us from having detailed knowledge of the cabinets from 1900 to 1905." Certainly, when a cabinet minister resigns, for the next ten years his lips are sealed. Thirty years in England by law, by statute. That is the home of our system. That particular law about thirty years does not - the principle, of course, does. In Canada never - in England thirty years.

Here is a case, Mr. Speaker, Thursday, February 5. A quotation from the Right hon. John G. Diefenbaker, the new ex-leader of the new Tories. They have to acknowledge him as their ex-leader, they now being Tories, you see. It

makes strange bed fellows, does it not? This member of the House of Commons is speaking and he says: "the Right hon. John G. Diefenbaker, then Prime Minister put the matter succinctly on February 4., 1960 in reply to the following question by Mr. Paul Martin, who was then the hon. member for Essex East. The question by Mr. Martin was: "Has there been a meeting of the cabinet committee on Economic and Industrial Development since September, 1957?"

The Prime Minister of the day that was Mr. Diefenbaker replied: " The means by which cabinet conducts its business are traditionally regarded as its own domestic affair and questions on the subject are normally neither asked nor answered. It is well known that many committees of ministers are formed from time to time and meet as and when required to facilitate the working of the cabinet as a whole. Only the two established by statute have power to exercise any legal authority."

Now the cabinet, the Premier will appoint many, many committees and subcommittees of cabinet. The whole cabinet does not deal with every individual item that comes up - this problem, that problem, this matter, the other matter will be referred to a committee of the cabinet or a subcommittee of the cabinet for them to go out, three men or four men or five men to meet and they will wrestle with it, and they will get to the bottom of it and finally they come into the cabinet with their recommendations. Ten chances to one the cabinet will accept the recommendation of their colleagues, the committee or the subcommittee of cabinet.

But, Sir, the names of these committees are not given, the names of the members of these committees are not given. The fact that these committees exist is not made known.

MR. WELLS: How about the Melville plan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This was made known in this House on the other side of the House. Not by the Premier. No. The Premier knows too much about the principles and practices and precedence of British constitution to make that kind of an inexcusable mistake. He does not do it.

MR. WELLS: He does not always practice what he preaches. That is the answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Again talking of secrecy, here is an extraordinary book written by Wangteh Yu, a great and famous Chinese scholar -- "The English Cabinet System." Not from a Presbyterian family, no. He is a Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. of Philosophy, the Book was published in London 1939. In fact it is his Ph.D thesis on the English Cabinet. He wrote it at the London School of Economics and Political Science, in the University of London. And it is a magnificent book. One of the finest I have read.

A cabinet minister, he says, is under an obligation, not to disclose any of the proceedings of the cabinet. If he should desire to explain to Parliament the cause of his resignation in a case where it is undoubtedly connected with cabinet proceedings, he must first obtain permission from the Sovereign, whose rule acts on the advice of the Prime Minister. The permission which the Sovereign is empowered to give is limited to a particular instance, and does not extend beyond this. And then he quotes, the section that I have already quoted from the letter to Queen Victoria, Second series, Volume 2, page 34, and General Ponsoby to the Earl of Darby. I have already quoted that from another volume.

So I dealt now with the question of questions, and also with the question of solidarity. Here is one by Marriott, J.A. E. Marriott, a fellow and lecturer and tutor of Worcestershire College at Oxford. This is the second edition, 1915.

Here is what Marriott said, "The Doctrine of departmental responsibility died hard, that of cabinet responsibility developed slowly. At what precise point in our history it can be said to have been definitely established it is difficult to say".

Then he quotes Lord Morley, the famous John Morley, the great scholar in politics. John Morley, the Right Honourable John Morley, Lord Morley of Blackburn. Morley said, "as a general rule every important piece of departmental policy is taken to commit the entire cabinet, and its members stand or fall together. The Chancellor of the Exchequer may be driven from office by a bad dispatch from the foreign office, and an excellent home secretary may suffer from the blunders of a stupid minister of war. The cabinet is ~~un~~unit, ~~as~~ unit, as regards the Sovereign and ~~un~~unit as regards the legislature. Its views are laid before the Sovereign and before Parliament as if they were the views of one man. It gives its advice as a single whole, both in the Royal Closet and in the hereditary or representative chamber. The first mark of the cabinet, as that institution is united and undivisible responsibility." With this famous and authoritative passage from the pen of Lord Morely, we may compare the even more authoritative utterance of his late chief.

This is Gladstone,"as the Queen deals with the cabinet, just so the cabinet deals with the Queen. The Sovereign is to know no more of any differing views of different ministers, than they are to know of any collateral representation of the monarchy colossus. They are ~~a~~unity before the Sovereign, and the Sovereign is an unity before them. The cabinet is one. The Queen is one. The Queen is not to know the differing views of different ministers. The cabinet is one in relations with the Queen or with Parliament or with the public. The cabinet is one it is ~~a~~unit. The Queen is one. The Governor is one. And again, Gladstone, while each minister is an advisor of the crown, the cabinet is ~~a~~unity. I am quoting exactly as it is written. We used to say "an hotel" , ~~a~~unity a few years ago, it has become a bit archaic for him now. While each minister is an advisor of the crown, the cabinet is an unity. And none of its members can advise as an individual without or in actual opposition or presumed to his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, these are unmistakable principles of foundation of the system, Sir David Lindsey Keir, Master of Balliol College Oxford. A very proud office Master Balliol , Fifth Edition. Sir David Linsey Keir. It may in general be said, he says, " that except in the rare instances when questions of a kind in which cabinet solidarity is not essential, ministers must stand or fall by one another and the Premier. They must not merely abstain from opposing, but must actively support the decisions of their colleagues. That is the obligation that is on every cabinet minister, when he takes the oath, when he accepts the invitation to come into a cabinet. Someone has to invite him into the cabinet. He just does not walk in, he has to be invited in. And when he accepts the invitation to join the cabinet, and then takes the oath on the bible administered to him by the Queen in England, or by her representative the Governor here. When he takes that oath, he takes on him the solemn obligation as a man, and as an oath bound subject of the Queen. He takes on him the obligation of complete loyalty to the cabinet and its Leader, and complete solidarity, collective responsibility not individual, the cabinet is a unit, and everything is secret.

AN. HON. MEMBER: There is no oath.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is not in the oath, but a man's acceptance of the Leader's invitation and only the Leader can invite him, the Governor cannot. Only the Premier can, only the Premier in a British country can invite any man into the cabinet. The monarch cannot. A couple of hundred years ago, yes, but not today, only the Premier can invite anyone to join his cabinet. It is the Premier's cabinet. It is

the Queen's Government. This is not the Smallwood Government. This is the Smallwood Administration of the Queen's Government. It is the Queen's Government and the Smallwood Administration of it. The Government of Canada today is the Queen's Government of Canada. The administering of it, is in charge of Mr. Trudeau. And when the Leader invites a man into his cabinet, that man should not accept - accept on the basis that he will be loyal to the Leader, who invited him in. And that he will be loyal to the cabinet. That he will respect the secrecy of cabinet, and he will respect the solidarity of cabinet, and that he will accept and respect collective responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the office of Prime Minister by Byron E. Carter, he says, "a cabinet decision need not be unanimous for a policy to be a cabinet policy. For those who disagree, they have decided it is better to publicly support the policy than to resign. Some decide otherwise.

Arthur Balfour once said, "what we require is common action and common responsibility. Nobody asks for uniformity of speech. Nobody who knows how human nature is constituted, nobody who knows how cabinets are constituted, would expect among members of a cabinet absolute uniformity of opinion. You do not get that in a church. You do not get that in a school board. You do not get that in any kind of a body of human men. Absolute unanimity. You cannot get it. It is impossible. It is asking the impossible to have absolute unanimity of opinion on everything among all the members of the cabinet. But, Sir, a cabinet is a unity, and the minute any decision is taken by that cabinet, with which any member of the cabinet disagrees, there is only one honourable and honest thing for him to do and that is resign. If he does not resign, he takes the responsibility, just as my hon. friend the member for Humber East and the hon. member for St. John's West, were members of the cabinet and took responsibility for this Come-by-Chance Oil Refinery. They took responsibility for it. They did not resign.

MR. C. WELLS: Not as it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They later resigned on one particular point, as we have already heard.

MR. WELLS: It was a minor matter of \$5 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, a minor matter of \$5 million. The rest of the agreement stood. And it is not changed.

Mr. Speaker, I could bring up a couple of hundred books from my own library that I have been collecting throughout the most of my life. And they all say the same thing, that the most essential thing about a cabinet is secrecy. That

you take an oath. The Minister of Education who is home with the flu, said here the other night in his speech, he read the oath. I will not reveal directly or indirectly, that is the oath, the oath of secrecy. And everyone of the authorities says the same thing. There is no variation in hundreds of these great authorities of our system. This is our system we have here, Your Honour. It does not vary that much from the system in the United Kingdom or in Ottawa or in the other Provinces of Canada, except now they are beginning to introduce changes in the Province of Quebec.

MR. T. ALEX HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Is it not a fact that the Oath of Secrecy works two ways? There was a cabinet minister or an ex-cabinet minister bound by the oath, that it equally follows that remaining ministers of the crown are bound to use the same secrecy toward the decisions of that whilst he was a member of the cabinet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, once the oath is taken it is applicable to those who continue in the cabinet, and those who leave the cabinet. And it is as much an obligation as those in the cabinet as those who have left, and as much the obligation as those who have left, as it is on those who remain in. An oath is an oath.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Everything that is passed.....

MR. SMALLWOOD: Everything that is passed up to the moment a man ceased to be a member of the cabinet. Thereafter he is not responsible, he did not share in the decision. He did not help to make the decision. He did not accept the responsibility, the cabinet solidarity ceased to apply to him, when he came out of the cabinet. But not cabinet secrecy. That applies to him forever, until he is specifically released from it.

MR. HICKMAN: After a person resigns from the cabinet, I suggest it is not the prerogative or right of a cabinet minister either passed or present to say that when so and so was a member of the cabinet, he was for this or he was against it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In excusable. It is in excusable. Suppose, Mr. Speaker, and your Honour I know will shortly see 11:00 O' Clock in a matter of minutes, but suppose a case of some matter coming up before cabinet. Here is a minister who is

is a minister who is cute, and he says to himself, "now this is going to be an unpopular thing, and I am going to oppose it and I am going to be let it be known outside that I oppose it". And he tells some friend of his, who tells another friend, and it is spread - the word goes all around. Dr. Frecker opposed, and that is the last thing on this earth that the hon. member would do. You see a "cutie" could get the word out around. Oh yes, he is in the Cabinet, but he is against it. The Cabinet overruled him, but he put up a gallant fight. He tried to stop it, and he failed, but he deserves a lot of credit for trying to stop it.

Now that is having it both ways. That is having membership in the Cabinet - that is being there, and yet escaping the responsibility. The whole purpose of it is to have utter frankness in your secret meeting - utter and complete frankness. Now to do that you have to have two things. (1) Your members must be loyal to the Cabinet and to its leader, and (2) they must be bound by oath. If you have that, and only when you have that, you can have utterly frank talk, then you do not have leaks out of the Cabinet - planted leaks, deliberate leaks. Someone planting a leak deliberately. You do not have that then. If all the members of the Cabinet are loyal to the Cabinet, to the Party, to the leader; and bound by oath to keep all the business secret. If you have that - then in the Cabinet you can have the thing without which you have no hope in the world or having a successful Cabinet that is complete frankness.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion the House stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday at 3 P.M.

723