



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

---

Volume 1

Number 66

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

---

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend a very warm welcome to some fifty students in grade eight at the Queen Elizabeth Junior High at Foxtrap here with their teacher, Mr. Rideout, fifty of them and thirty-two students in history at Gonzaga High with their teacher, Mr. N. Connolly. These eighty-two students come from within St. John's and without. They now run the total number of students coming to the House of Assembly in the present session, I think, well up over 1,400, between 1,400 and 1,500 students altogether this year. About half of them were from the capital city and about half coming from outside St. John's which is a very good proportion indeed. We are very glad here in the House every day, every work day of the House, to see students come here from the different schools, young Newfoundlanders, male and female, all of them, virtually all of them bright, intelligent and above all I think and I certainly hope above all patriotic, that is to say lovers of Newfoundland, lovers of their native Province and with a love big enough to embrace all of Canada and a lot of the rest of the world as well. But with their first love a love of native land and love of Newfoundland. If they do not have that their education will not be enough to build this Province into what we all want it to be, a great Province. It takes more than just education to do that, it takes education yes, but it takes more, it takes a deep seated love of Newfoundland and a deep seated devotion to Newfoundland and if our schools today in our Province do not make an effort, an intelligent effort to inculcate, to implant love of Newfoundland in the breasts and the hearts of the young Newfoundlanders it will be a sad, sad thing, a sad day indeed for the future of our Province because if our people growing up in Newfoundland do not have a very special love for Newfoundland higher and greater than their love for Canada in general then in the absence of such an affection they will not have any particular desire to stay in Newfoundland and the loss of the fine young idealism and intelligence of the growing generation would be an irreparable loss, a loss that could not be repaired, that could not be overcome, it would be a fatal loss to Newfoundland, it would be a deadly loss, it would be a loss that would mean the death of Newfoundland. So I do hope that all these students that are coming here this year and every year from our schools

MR. SMALLWOOD:

are not only intelligent, not only well educated but dear lovers of their native Province.

I welcome them here today and I hope they will enjoy the business of the House. They are going to hear a brilliant young orator delivering a brilliant speech full of error, full of inaccuracy, full of false reasoning, as wrong as a speech could possibly be but it will be error magnificently delivered and it will be a fair test of the intelligence of the students. Can they see behind the facade of oratory, can they see behind it the illogic, can they see the fallacious argument, can they see the meretricious presentation? This will be a fair test of their analytical ability whether they will throughout their lives be capable of being deceived by eloquence or whether they will look behind the eloquence for accuracy and real truth.

However, the Leader of the Opposition may have something to say about that but whatever he is going to say there is one thing I am sure of, he is not going to get up here today and contradict me. He is not going to contradict me when I say that these eighty-two young Newfoundlanders are splendid people, bright, intelligent, handsome males, beautiful females, the finest looking young people that have been here today inside this building. On this I will have his complete consent and approval and I challenge him, I dare him to say otherwise.

On behalf of the whole House I extend a warm welcome to all of them.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Premier in welcoming those students. Unfortunately those students are in class at 10:15 on weekday mornings when they have an opportunity to hear perhaps some of the finest oratory that would be ones pleasure to hear on station VPCM but I am very happy indeed to see all those young people here. When the Premier speaks of Newfoundlanders and Canadians I do not think we can differentiate for these young people because I do not think any of them knew the time when we were Newfoundlanders or such as a Dominion of Britan. They have been all born since we have been a Province of Canada.

Each day the Premier always has some remarks to pass about different events in his life but unfortunately he did not graduate from either one of those schools today because there are many that he has been associated with and a few days ago we had some students here from Bishop Spencer and it reminded me of

MR. MURPHY:

something that for many years I have been puzzling about. There are different phrases that arise particularly in sport and in hockey as most of you boys know there is one that there is an expression used "Kitty bar the door" and this is used when you get a few goals ahead and you just play defensive hockey. When the Premier referred to Bishop Spencer he referred to a lovely young girl he more or less had a crush on, her name was Kitty -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not now, that was some years ago.

MR. MURPHY: Some years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: So I often wondered where that statement originated but I can see now when Kitty's mother looked out the window and she saw the Premier coming across Bond Street her natural response was "Kitty bar the door here is young Smallwood again." This is all in fun as the Premier poked fun at someone, he did not name the person, some orator and there are many orators in the House, unfortunately some of them are very quiet when we are discussing matters in the House but there are two or three or four that make their feelings known and possibly one of the ones that he refers to might have a few words to say after me.

We are very happy indeed to have these fifty students from Queen Elizabeth in Foxtrap with their teacher, Mr. Rideout and from Gonzaga High thirty-two with their teacher, Mr. Connolly and I am sure that all you students will enjoy your stay here in the House whether you learn something or not is of some doubt but do you best anyhow and see your Parliamentarians in action.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to welcome the students from Queen Elizabeth Junior High at Foxtrap and Gonzaga High School here in St. John's. Gonzaga is in St. John's Centre located -

MR. MURPHY: In the members district.

MR. CROSBIE: In my district.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir. St. John's West.

MR. CROSBIE: I thought that I was the Leader of the Opposition for a moment. Well, Mr. Speaker, you can see that I do not have much trouble with Gonzaga High School as I did not realize that it was Gonzaga that is on Smithville Crescent in my district so I doublely want to welcome the students from Gonzaga High

MR. CROSBIE:

School particularly if they live in St. John's West and are nineteen years old by the time the next election comes.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier in one of his light moments, he does not have too many of them in the House these days, said that the people who stay here today will hear a speech magnificently delivered and I think he was referring to the member for Humber East who will be speaking today on the Bonne Bay Park resolution. Students will notice the speed at which the House deals with resolutions from this side of the House. It was originally introduced in the House here on March 6th and anyone who has been listening to that debate in the intervening weeks will realize that not all wild creatures are in the National Parks, there is a few in this Chamber. But they will hear a speech not only magnificently delivered but one magnificently prepared, one that will be truthful and doubtless they will notice any eggs thrown in here today as there was in Rocky Harbour last Saturday night when the Rocky Harbour rooster was attempting to crow in Rocky Harbour on the Bonne Bay Park.

They will also hear discussed, Mr. Speaker, the tattletale grey paper on the Bonne Bay Park today and if these students are really interested in politics and are watching current affairs they will have noticed in the last couple of weeks what I have described as the greatest retreat since Napoleon pulled out of Moscow in the Russian campaign.-

MR. SMALLWOOD: On a point of order. If we cannot greet the students in this House each day without dragging partisan politics into it let us stop greeting them. Let us stop this cheap politics, let us stop it.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that point of order, only the only the hon. the Premier apparently is allowed to interject politics into this House during his greetings. What absolute rubbish and who does the hon. the Premier think he is and if he cannot take any light kidding then do not start it himself. If the hon. the Premier does not wish to greet students or anyone else in this House we will abide by that ruling too. What a display. He can give it but cannot take it so I will end up, Mr. Speaker, by just greeting the students.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Before the hon. member proceeds -



MR. CROSSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I will not sit down on order to do so by the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: I am now speaking and I want to speak to this point of order. I have been tempted to say this for many, many days and many weeks now that it is customary to greet students and other visitors to the House and it is very proper that they should be welcomed and the fact that they are present should be recognized by all hon. members of the House. I do not know of any other legislature where the greetings are extended at such length. I know that they are none the less sincere because they are lengthy but at the same time I think that it has reached the stage now and this gives me the opportunity of saying this, we are very proud and very happy to see particularly students from the various schools visiting this House but what has been happening here for many weeks now is that we are getting into the realm of making political speeches. I will not comment on the order of the political speeches because it is not my place to do so but if we cannot just welcome students and others to this House without going into political forays I think it is about time we followed the custom in other Parliaments throughout Canada where the Speaker draws to the attention of the House the visitors from certain schools or from certain groups and the House will acknowledge their presence by their applause and we will not take up half an hour of semi-political or political speeches in welcoming students to the House. I think it is high time we changed the rules.

PETITIONS:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I take leave to present a petition from some 103 electors in the district of Humber West and dwelling within the area from Halfway Point to Frenchman's Cove in the Humber Arm of Bay of Islands. The prayer of their petition is that the existing telephone system be replaced and a direct dialing system be put in its place.

In presenting and supporting this petition I have to say that it is one of a number of communications that I have had in one way or another from the district of Humber West dealing with the matter of telephones. Some of these communications were from one side of the arm and others were from the opposite side. I have taken up the matter with the telephone company and I have been treated by them with an account of all their plans for this year, next year and the year after for telephonic installations and improvements in our Province and I am

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Happy to say that both sides of Humber Arm are slated for this substantial upgrading of the telephone service.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Telephone Company has made a list of every place in the Province that either has no telephone service today or service that is inadequate, old-fashioned, insufficient and unsatisfactory and they have made out a time schedule of the improvements they propose to make and they are doing it on what might be called a point system that is to say it costs so much a telephone to install a telephone system and the amount it costs per telephone depends on the average distance between the telephones. If the population of a place is fairly heavy and the people live fairly close to each other, the dwellings are built fairly closely together then of course the per telephone cost of putting in the telephone system is relatively low. If the houses are a considerable distance apart and from one end of the settlement to the other is a mile or two or three or four miles then obviously the per telephone cost will be relatively quite high. I notice in this list that the Telephone Company have given me that the per telephone cost runs all the way from \$500 or \$600. each up to more than \$3,000. per telephone to install and obviously the cheaper it is to install the telephones the more the company is encouraged to do so because obviously the more revenue

Mr. Smallwood:

obviously, the more revenue they might expect to take in for the amount of capital they have to invest. The situation in Humber Arm is not altogether too bad. They are not among the cheapest nor are they among the most expensive, but I suppose a public utility, if given a free hand, if they follow their own desire, whether it is in a telephone system or an electric light system or any other kind of public utility, they will go only where the population is fairly congested and where they do not have to invest so much capital and where the return on their capital will be so much larger and if they cannot stay away altogether from the sparsely populated parts of the Province, then their desire will be to go to them last,, rather than first. I am glad that Humber West is not among the more sparsely populated areas, even if it is not among the more thickly congested parts of our Province from the standpoint of population.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the petition be received by the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WELLS: I rise, Sir, to support the petition. I think the petition makes a fairly reasonable demand but all I ask of the petitioners and of the Premier, when representations are made to the Newfoundland Telephone Co. Ltd. or to any company supplying telephone services in this Province that before they consider the additional expense of installation of dial telephone systems in certain areas, they consider the installations of telephones, in the first instance, in rather substantial areas where no telephones exist today, that the community of Cormack which has one or two pay telephones, through their community council and others who have been after the Avalon Telephone Company, the Canadian National Telecommunications to provide service for some considerable time and they keep extending the time. Every time representation is made, they keep extending the time for a further period of a year.

4074



Now while I realize and recognize the convenience of having your own dial system and that it is quite convenient and we who live in larger places just take this convenience for granted. Nevertheless, Sir, I think we must be aware of the needs of those people in other areas, not just Cormack, but that is classic example, but in other areas of this Province that do not have telephone service at all and I would ask the Government to strongly recommend to the telephone companies involved that they place priority on their expenditures for providing telephones in areas where none now exist ahead of providing dial service. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates. Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have, what I believe is a petition. It is from the Musgrave Academy, Musgrave Harbour, Newfoundland, Mr. Edgar Abbott, the Principal and some teachers at the Academy. Their letter states: "On March 10th., they forwarded a petition to Mr. Eric Jones, M.H.A. for Fogo concerning water and sewerage for the Musgrave Academy." As we all know, the hon. member for Fogo district has been ill and not in the House. This petition was signed by the head of every family in Musgrave Harbour. They say, "at the Academy we have an enrollment of 160 pupils. We have no source of water and the sewerage must be removed every day in plastic bags. I am sure you will agree that this is a desperate situation and it needs urgent attention. As of this date, we have no knowledge that our petition was put before the House of Assembly, and they say a duplicated copy has been sent to the Premier, Dr. Rowe, Mr. Edward Roberts and Mr. Eric Dawe."

I would like to draw this to the attention of the House, because it seems to be a very serious matter and the member for Fogo, of course, has

not been in the House due to ill-health.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

HON. F.W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I should like to have leave of the House to table the annual report of the Department of Education for the year ending March 31st., 1969. In doing so, I should like to direct the attention of hon. members - I realize, Mr. Speaker that very few of us ever get the time to read through all these annual reports which are made by most of the departments of Government. However, some of them do contain some very valuable and very pertinent and indeed very necessary information. In the case of this particular report, I would draw hon. members' attention to, when they receive their copies, the very first section which is a summary written by the Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Hanley, of what has happened in Education as he sees it during the past couple of years. There are other matters in this report that might be of interest, for example, Mr. Speaker, the list of scoutership winners is given, and I am sure every hon. member is glad to take note, when some student or students from his district are recipients of Government scholarships, University scholarships of one kind and another.

I have a sufficiently large number here, I think, to be distributed to all hon. members, and there are more available, if necessary.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Revenue And Audit Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. CURTIS: I will answer just a few questions, Mr. Speaker, Question no. 468, asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. The question.

concerns penitentiary - Question no 468.

AN HON. MEMBER: What date?

MR. CURTIS: I do not know the date.

AN HON. MEMBER: April 17th.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, April 17th. The answer to the question is, the penitentiary, physicians; one part-time physician employed. Number of hours per week, variable. It holds two clinics per week and is on call.

Dentists: one employed on a fee basis. Number of hours per week, variable.

Psychiatrists: none. Psychiatric and other specialist services provided on referral by part-time physician.

Part (2) - Salmonier Prison Camp, none. Inmates returned to penitentiary for medical services. Training programs are (a) at the Penitentiary, day school, complete course in barbering, training in steam, laundry operations; (b) Salmonier Prison Camp; general farming, logging and sawmilling, maintenance of vehicles, carpentry; (c) Both penitentiary and Salmonier Prison Camp, general vocational therapy by voluntary community workers and by district vocational schools given to prisoners on parole. I have a copy of this for the press. This is public - this is of public interest.

Question 201, March 9th., 1970 asked by the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern). This deals with legal aid. This amount is paid in a lump sum to the Legal Aids' Committee and is dispersed at their discretion.

Question no 202, March 9th., 1970, asked by the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern). No bills received for 1968/69. In 1967/68 the amount of \$17,424 was paid to Kates, Ogilvie, Bishop and Cope covering cost of reference to the Supreme Court of Canada re: Offshore Mines.

Question no. 171, Friday, March 6th., asked by the hon. member for Bonavista North. (1): H. H. Cummings, \$5,000; James E. Nurse, \$5,000; E. J. Phelan, \$5,000; D. J. Riche, - I did not propose to, but I have a copy of it - the above amounts are paid on account of consolidation of Newfoundland Statutes. The only other money paid that year was to Mr. Robert Wells, \$500 as a defense counsel in a Supreme Court case.

Question no. 183, Friday, March 6th., asked by the hon. member for St. John's West: Is the work of consolidation of the Statutes of this Province assigned to certain members of the Law Society of Newfoundland now completed? I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this work is practically completed and that it will be completed when the Bill for the present session have been assented to so that they may be included in the consolidation. The amount paid to date is \$20,000 and the list is, as I have just given it..

Question no. 188 of March 6th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's West: Has Dr. Gushue now completed his serious of studies? The answer is, yes. I received the final reports last week. What action has been taken by the Government to date? Legislation has been drafted by my department in one case and that may or may not come before the House during this session. It all depends on whether we have time or not. I think so. The amount paid to date. I got this figure by the way from the Department of Finance. It is not paid through Justice, \$76,584.48 .

Question no. 145, March 4th., asked by the hon. member for St. John's East (Extern).

AN HON. MEMBER:    That has been answered already.

MR. CURTIS:        Has that been answered.

AN HON. MEMBER:    Yes.

MR. CURTIS:        That is good. I do not have to answer it again.

Question no. 101, February 27th., 1970, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. That

is answered too. That is all.

HON. ERIC N. DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing):

Question no. 500, Wednesday, May 6th., asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. Has the Government of Newfoundland agreed to the revised Public Housing Rent Scale announced several weeks ago by the hon. Mr. Robert Andras, Minister in Charge of Housing for the Government of Canada, with respect to public housing operations in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador? The answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Newfoundland has not yet adopted the revised Public Housing Rent Scale announced on April 21st., 1970 by the hon. Robert Andras, Minister responsible for Housing in the Government of Canada. In his announcement of April 21st. Mr. Andras stated that he had proposed to the provinces a revised rental to income scale. In his statement he also emphasized that any revisions will be undertaken after consultation with the provincial governments and with their co-operation. He further stated that a round of talks had already been held with provincial authorities and a substantial measure of agreement has been reached. I am currently corresponding with Mr. Andras concerning the proposed revision, but up to this point, but the point has not been reached in which an announcement can be made concerning the adoption of the revision of the scale.

The second part of the question, therefore, does not arise.

Question no. 501, Wednesday, May 6th. asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to the question, the amount paid for the house in question, total cost to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador Housing, including renovations and repairs made, following a fire department and electrical inspection, the purchase price was \$9,000 and \$1,891.65 spent on repairs, to the electrical system and repairs to the house.

The second part of the first question - a specific location, the



name of the vendor and the number of persons occupying the house are not for me to answer, as they involve the policy of another department of Government.

MR. CROSBIE: I am going to have to ask that again.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. T. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with orders of the day, if I may ask a question of the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs relative to his ministerial statement on Monday, in connection with the new air subsidy policy of the Government, whereby the subsidy is available only to residents of Labrador or those permanently employed in Labrador. Are those persons employed in the present construction work at Churchill Falls and the hundreds of seasonal construction workers employed on the building of homes in Labrador City? Are they included?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that this type of question could be more appropriately put on the order paper, particularly, as the minister concerned is not even in his seat at the moment.

MR. BURGESS: Mr. Speaker, it is a question that I would like to have answered.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on orders of the day, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice and the House Leader, whether he can tell the House what the order of business is for tomorrow, whether it is legislation or estimates or the budget?

MR. CURTIS: I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow we could start the debate on the budget, and possibly do some estimates. We will start with the budget.

MR. CROSBIE: Will the estimates be done in order of department?

MR. CURTIS: I suppose so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It depends on whether the minister..

MR. CURTIS: If the minister is available.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Judging from the successful wage negotiations with civil servants and others which has been announced and bearing in mind the ever-increasing cost of living, the ever-increasing cost which is taking place - would the minister indicate to the House, if the Government have given consideration to increasing the minimum wage and if so by how much?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Gander can put the item on the order paper, if he so wishes.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice, whether he can advise the House whether the law officers of the Crown have given any opinion as to whether the deposit of \$1 million by the Government in the Franklin Bank of New York is legally permissible under the legislation of this Province?

MR. CURTIS: I would like that question to appear on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I remember, Mr. Speaker, about three or four weeks ago, I asked a question of the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Supply. I was requested to put the question on the Order Paper, which I did and that is about one month ago, concerning Eastern Provincial Airways and the move to relocate Government aircraft and do the maintenance for them at Torbay Airport? That is about one month ago. I put the question on the Order Paper and I still have not gotten an answer, so what is the point of putting questions on the Order Paper anymore?

MR. SPEAKER: You can always ask the question in another form on Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. C. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, Motion four, as all hon. members know, is the motion on the Bonne Bay Park. Before I get to extensively into it, I would like to comment briefly on statements made earlier in the House by the hon. the Premier when welcoming the students, I share the welcome extended by hon. members and endorse it, I do say to the students not to take everything they heard to be total truth up to this point. The phrase I believe, if any of them take Latin is "Cum granum sal", with a grain of salt. It is a common expression for having some doubt or allowing some room for doubt about what one has heard. The statement obviously, I do not know really what it indicates, perhaps the Premier is living in fear and trepidation concerning what I am about to say about the Bonne Bay Park, I do not know. Well, if it is not that, it shows a rather obvious prejudice about anything I say. All I ask the students to do is what I asked all other hon. members to listen to what I had to say and make up their own minds. Do not prejudge any hon. member or any hon. members views until they have been heard.

The Bonne Bay Park to date has been on now, Mr. Speaker, for sometime. It has not really been thoroughly dealt with, the opposition has not been given an opportunity to debate it in the evening, as they wished, the House is always closed at six o'clock on Wednesdays to ensure that members sitting on this side of the House do not have an opportunity to put these comments together and follow one after the other and put forward any logical argument. So that if to the public, who read what goes on in this House through the media of the press and hear it via television and radio, the matter of the Bonne Bay Park resolution seems somewhat disjointed, I would hasten to add that the explanation is not that the argument presented by members are disjointed, but that it is disjointed by means of time. It crops up every Wednesday and has cropped up every Wednesday now for the last six or seven weeks, again at the instance and by the desire of the Government to have it that way.

I quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, think they are somewhat ashamed of it. And so they should be. This so called White Paper is certainly not deserving of the name, as I started out to say the last day. But before I forget it, let me correct something, the hon. the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and

MR. WELLS:

Resources was quoted after that infamous meeting in Bonne Bay, he was quoted in the paper as saying, now I do not know whether in fact he said it or not, but he was quoted as saying, that all hon. members of the House supported the White Paper. Now I cannot really believe that he said it, I am sure he will confirm later that he had been misquoted. Because many hon. members have applied other names to it other than White Paper.

MR. CALLAHAN: Some hon. members

MR. WELLS: Some hon. members - quite frankly the proper description of it from what I can read of it, Mr. Speaker, I will plagiarize something the Premier said on another occasion, I will give him the credit for saying it, It is ninety percent trash, I think that properly assesses the so-called White Paper. I cannot believe that the hon. member made that statement and I am sure he will correct that, he has been quoted as saying that all hon. members of this House supported the White Paper.

Well, I for one do not, but I have to qualify that, I do not condemn it out of hand, contemptuously as the Premier would say, I do not do that with it Mr. Speaker. I think it has some merit. I suspect that the minister when he was making it up and preparing, <sup>d</sup>and his staff when they were doing the work in preparing it, here at the outset confining their recommendation to the quality of the park itself, what should or should not be in the park, and considering what they have here in the White Paper on the quality of the park, I must say I cannot help but agree, most of it is outlined on page 8, I think, it starts on proposals. The National Park a Proposal: They have recommended the kind of park that the Government would like to see, and with what of much they said, I cannot but agree. I think it is pretty sound. I would like to see most of these things in the park, but I am not prepared to go quite so far as to say, either all of this or nothing, which is apparently what the Government are saying amongst a few other incredible statements, they appear to be taking that attitude. But I think it is probably fair to assume their negotiating position. I think it is a good idea for the park to have certain recreational facilities, such as a swimming pool, and a golf course, and skiing facilities and so on to attract

MR. WELLS: people to the area, I think that this is a very good idea. However, if the Federal Government are not prepared to do those things right at this time, I would still say go ahead with the park, do not delay it, the people in that part of Newfoundland in particular, and in all of Newfoundland in general, have been waiting a very long time for this. I would say go ahead with it, and over the period of the next few years persuade the Federal Government to this Government's point of view, that these other facilities should be available in the park. Now there is nothing wrong with that kind of an approach, my argument is with the Government's approach, the minister's in particular, saying we want the sky or we will take nothing. Now Newfoundland has never been in a position where they could say that to Ottawa.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that after the minister's somewhat eventful trip to Bonne Bay, the meeting in Rocky Harbour -

MR. CALLAHAN: And I came back alive.

MR. WELLS: And the fact that he survived it, and the mixed up of reports that have come out of this, I think it might be worthwhile trying to assess what the White Paper is. Because the general opinion that is expressed in that part of Newfoundland is that the minister went down to Bonne Bay to try and unsell the park, in other words, to try and persuade the people of that area, that a park was not really a desirable thing, that is the impression they came away with. The Minister came away with this impression, that he could not understand the educated people thinking that way and not seeing his point of view. This I think is probably a reasonable assessment of what the minister had to say, which was almost incredible. I cannot imagine a minister saying it, I do not know of any other minister that ever said it before, or said anything similar, and I think that is a fair representation or at least it is a net result of what he did say. He could not understand the educated people in the area speaking the way they do and not agreeing with his ideas. It is quite obvious from the comments and the opinions that have been expressed recently or in the last few days, since the minister's hectic visit, that the people of that area are not satisfied with what the Government has said, through the hon. minister, with



MR. WELLS: the explanation given by the Government, for this Government's position on the park, they are not satisfied with it, they expected the minister to go down there and answer simple questions, but instead he is said by those who attended it, to have gone down there and spent four hours circumlocuting, talking around everything except the question which was directed to him. The people never got any real answers.

So what I am going to try and do today, Mr. Speaker, is to give the people some of the answers. The minister was given an opportunity through two meetings, one was the Chamber of Commerce for Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Stephenville and the NORDA group, the executive of the NORDA group. I incidentally, Mr. Speaker, had a part in setting that meeting up, but deliberately refrained from attending. I happened to be on the executive of the Corner Brook Chamber of Commerce, and I discussed that with some of the other gentlemen who are on the executive, and decided that because I wear another hat as well, and rather than cause any embarrassment to the Chamber or to the hon. minister, I voluntarily suggested that I should not attend.

MR. CALLAHAN: Well, I would not have embarrassed him

MR. WELLS: Well, perhaps, he would have not.

MR. CALLAHAN: I was disappointed the hon. gentleman did not come.

MR. WELLS: Well, may be he is disappointed, but we thought it would be better, and easier on the hon. minister, if I did not go. I could not stand there and hear all this circumlocution without making a stab at the truth myself. So we felt on the overall that perhaps we should give the minister his chance. The minister has been given his chance and while I was not at the meeting I understand there was an egg or two thrown around, even though they had not yet been hatched, and there was some other adverse comments, so the people are generally dissatisfied, and they have expressed in rather strong words what they think of what the minister has said so far, what he has said on behalf of the Government in explaining the Government position.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to the people of this Province and to the hon. members of this House, that once anybody reads this White Paper, one can rather quickly come to the conclusion of what it is or what it is not. One has to go over it

MR. WELLS: to try and determine why all of these things. Look on page 2 for example, of what is called the Historic Coast section of the White Paper. The minister calls it the essential elements of the Historic Coast Proposal. This emerges as follows; then he lists all of those things. Now a summary of those things, Mr. Speaker, would be as follows. Do not forget we have up to this point been talking about the development of a national park, and everything that, that can show, and nothing beyond what that can show. Then all of a sudden this White Paper makes a flying appearance. And what the minister calls essential, and I interpret that to mean, that all of these things must be done or nothing, otherwise his word essential is wrong. So if we give him credit for knowing what the word essential means, then we must interpret this statement on page 2 to mean, "that the Government's position is, they will agree with a national park at Bonne Bay provided they have the following; The Gros Morne National Park itself, they have included that, a National Park at L'Anse aux Meadows, the Viking Site, another National Park at the Dorset Eskimo and Indian Site, the development of the fishery, forestry, and mineral resources of the area. They want the Federal Government to do all that, it is spelled out there, it is Item 3 on page 2 - development of fisheries, forest and mineral resources of the region. They want a highway, a paved all-weather highway from Deer Lake to St. Anthony, it must be a staggering cost, I do not know what it would cost to build such a highway. But it is 300 miles, I really have no idea, Mr. Speaker, what it would cost to build a paved all-weather highway, probably in the vicinity of \$60 million or \$70 million for the highway alone, but that is a guess, I do not know with certainty. They want the ferry maintained across Bonne Bay, presumably by the Federal Government, the Bonne Bay Ferry that is under Item 4. They want a ferry from the St. Barbe Coast to Labrador South. They want an airstrip build at Port au Choix. They want another airport built at Porteau. They want an extension of the DREE area or a designation of consolidation centres in the area. They want funds for visitor accommodation and they want funds to buy property and rights.

Now all of those things are listed there, and the minister in the White Paper says, "the essential elements of the historic coast proposal thus emerges as follows. Those are essentials, without all of those, nothing. Now that is

MR. WELLS: the only way that I can interpret the word "essential", presumably that is the Government's policy.

Somebody used the word "blackmail" earlier in this debate, I think it was

MR. CALLAHAN: It was you.

MR. WELLS: I do not think it was me, I think it was the minister, who was talking about blackmail.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was the member for St. John's West.

MR. WELLS: No, no, it was before this.

MR. CROSBIE: I would be proud to claim it.

MR. WELLS: Yes, he may of well done so too, he may well have done so too..

MR. CROSBIE: Extortion.

MR. WELLS: He may well have done so too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did indeed.

MR. WELLS: But I think the hon. minister referred to blackmail earlier. And believe me he choose the proper word, except he choose a poor victim. If he thinks that the Federal Government is going to sit still for this kind of blackmail by the Government of this Province, he has got rocks in his head, whether they are from Bonne Bay Park or otherwise:

MR. HICKMAN: He has got silica in his head.

MR. WELLS: Maybe it is silica. What else can it sound like. We want all of this or nothing, the essential element. In other words, we will not take advantage of your policy to develop national parks, unless you do all of these other things, airports, highways, development of fisheries, two more national parks, one for visitor accommodations, funds to buy property and rights and so on. All of those things that are listed, an incredible list, that would probably run into a wild, wild, wild guess may be a \$150 million, \$200 million I do not know. There is no way that I could sit down and figure it out without having a group of experts. It is a wild guess, I do not accept the \$60 million figure, I would have to be insane to accept that, and I can assure the hon. minister I am not, neither am I naive or stupid, which he seems to think that most

MR. WELLS: of the people in this Province are, otherwise he certainly would not have presented this paper in this form. All anybody has to do is just look at it and see.

Then he talked <sup>of</sup> the park in relation to the region, and he clearly sets out the musts in details, the musts. It follows, Mr. Speaker, as night follows day, that the Government's position is, we must have all of those things or nothing. We will take nothing. If you stop

MR. WELLS: if you stop to think Mr. Speaker, that is almost an incredible position for the Government to take. I would say it is sort of the equivalent - we will not accept from Ottawa their payment of fifty percent of the welfare cost of this Province, unless they pay one hundred percent of the cost of education. They paved the Burin Peninsula highway. They take over Holiday Inns or some other such thing or pay all the cost for running the school for the Deaf and Dumb. We will not accept it from you unless you do all these other things as well. It is that kind of blackmail. It is the kind that does not even make sense. So is it really blackmail? I seriously doubt that it is. I do not think that blackmail is really the appropriate word, because it just does not make sense, to be sitting and pouting and saying, "if you do not give me all of that, I will not take anything," like a child taking a whole bag of candy instead of just one. That kind of blackmail if that is what it is, does not make sense. I cannot really believe that the minister or the Government was attempting to blackmail the Government of Canada. What is the real answer? It is a little hard to figure out from this White Paper. When they come up with a statement like this, that they will not accept hospital beds, the Federal Hospital Plan - they will not accept anything, unless the Federal Government pays the entire cost of the Medical School. They paved the roads down the Burin Peninsula, or repaved the Curtis Causeway to Twillingate or something like this. That kind of blackmail just does not make sense. That cannot have been the purpose behind the White Paper. The whole of the White Paper is set out in this light. So I have to look Mr. Speaker, for what are the real reasons behind the White Paper. And I do not think we can give the Government credit for trying to blackmail the Government of Canada. It is too silly to even talk about, that they could so blackmail, or the Government of Canada could sit still for such a proposal as this. It is ludicrous. I am sure that the minister must have told his Federal counterparts quietly, to ignore it, that it is being done for another purpose. But quietly to ignore it. We are not really trying to blackmail - just do not say anything about it for awhile. We have our own reasons for doing



this. So we have to look and try to find what those reasons are. What are those reasons? I do not think it is blackmail, because that is unrealistic. What is the real reason behind this charade? Because the primary rights down there, and the only person or corporation that wants any money for rights is John Doyle, that I know of. The only other rights that I know of down there, belong to Bowaters and Reid Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAHAN: There are more than that.

MR. WELLS: Well why does not the hon. minister tell us what they are? Reid Newfoundland Limited and Bowaters and Doyle. Now maybe there is one or two small ones here or there. But I can assure the House that I took the trouble to consult with Reid Newfoundland. They want no money whatsoever, none at all. They are quite prepared to accept a similar acreage anywhere else in the Island. Similar rights on acreage anywhere else in the Island. They would just do a straight exchange no money involved. The Government does not have to put up a cent. I also took the trouble to consult with Bowaters. They do not want a cent. They do not want money. All they say is, give a similar acreage in lumber and you can have it all. Just give us a similar acreage. We do not want any money. I took the trouble to go to both these companies and find out. They do not want money. All they want is replacement of rights for rights. So there is no money involved there. Who is looking for the money that the minister is talking about? These are the minister's words. They are not mine. "It is submitted that since the acquisition of property and extinction of right is for national purposes, the Nation should bear the burden of the cost." And there are two or three other references to it Mr. Speaker. So who is incurring these costs? The only one that I can figure out of any consequence is John Doyle, because the others do not want money. All they want is an exchange of the right. That is all they have asked for. Is that the reasoning behind it?

MR. CALLAHAN: Realistic plans.

MR. WELLS: Realistic plans. To get money out of the Government for John

Doyle. Is that is what is being planned? Now surely the minister is not admitting that is he? I am not sure what his comment means. Maybe that it is it. Maybe he is admitting the truth of it. Maybe that is the real reason behind it. I do not know. But nothing else, no other things seem to make much sense. Now should John Doyle be paid one single cent for any rights down there? It is a basic principle of law, that when you take anything from anybody, you compensate it. It is well recognized that Governments in the interest of the whole population may well have to take some property from an individual. But they just do not do so forcefully, without compensation. This Your Honour, is quite familiar with. It is a well recognized principle of law. And I may say Mr. Speaker, that it is not just a well recognized principle here. It is well recognized throughout the whole democratic world, and as a matter of fact it finds good solid foundation in international law because the international Court of Justice, has on many occasions called upon nations to compensate individuals, or other countries for property within their boundaries that have been expropriated without compensation. So that this is a well recognized principle All right. What should the compensation be? That is the next test. What should Doyle be paid for his rights down there? Well, to figure that out we have to consider several matters. One of the first and foremost thing that any Arbitration Board who might settle this question would consider - what did they cost them in the first instance? How much did those rights cost them? The answer is nothing, as nearly as I can figure out, although it has gone through such a maze of transactions, it is nearly impossible to trace it down. Because those rights in the first instance were given to a Crown Corporation, Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, which at the time it received those rights, was a Crown Corporation. So that this House in approving the granting of such rights to NALCO, would bear this in mind. It is a Crown Corporation, never thinking for a moment that the Government would dispose of that Crown Corporation to private interests, as they did. NALCO is no longer a Crown Corporation. It is owned by John Doyle's maze of companies, I am not sure of the technical ownership, whether it is Javelin or one of the other - there is a whole variety of

May 13, 1970

Tape #868

Page 4

companies, I have gone through them and I forget most of the complex corporate structure but it does not matter. It is basically John Doyle's ownership. NALCO after it got all these special rights and NALCO at that early stage Mr. Speaker, was given the same rights as the minister under the Undeveloped Minerals Act. The minister has the right under the Undeveloped Minerals Act to go into a known mine that is not being developed and take it and assign it to somebody else for development. There is a certain formula and a way of doing it, but he has that basic right to go and do it. And there is no obligation under the Act to pay compensation. Under the original NALCO Act, NALCO itself as a Corporation was given that right. That has since I think been removed. It is now out of it. But that will tell you what NALCO was at the time it was given those rights in the Bonne Bay area. It was a Crown Corporation and one to which the Government would even give those rights to go in and develop a known undeveloped mine that was owned by private interests. Now when you give a Corporation those rights, it has to be very strongly associated with the Government. So no wonder these things were given to NALCO in the first instance. Mr. Doyle, through NALCO did not acquire those rights down through a chain where they were granted years and years before as the minister indicated in the House a number of days ago, when the question was raised. I was immediately led to believe and I might say deceived by the minister's answer whether he intended it or not I do not know, but I was led astray, deceived by the minister's answer, that these rights had been granted many, many years before, back in the 1920's or 1890's sometimes, to private concerns and they came down through. So that I assumed immediately, that Bisan Petroleum or Doyle Companies had gotten these rights by buying them privately. And so had a real stake in them. So I went looking for the truth. I found it Mr. Speaker. The truth is there were two statutes passed in 1951 and 1952. The Parson's Pond Oils, Lands Vesting Act. And this was an Act that referred to these old leases of oil lands that were granted and recognized that there was no way to trace the owners or the descendants of the owners. So that nobody knew

who owned them. It was just on record that they had been previously granted. This Act sets this out and then vests these rights in NALCO after it divests anybody else with any interest in them. There is a clause in the Act that says "any of the descendants down through are hereby divested of any rights under these original grants, and they are hereby vested in NALCO." There was an amendment in 1952 to include another certain lease area. And then NALCO was sold, although I am not sure that is the proper word either, handed over I think probably more accurately describes it, to John Doyle. I think there was supposed to have been an exchange of Jubilee Shares or something at five dollars per share and they are now fifty cents a share. Something like that. I think the Province is supposed to have gotten a flock of Jubilee shares in exchange for the shares of NALCO. They were appraised at something like five dollars a share. They are now down to fifty cents or less or something of that order. So that in effect what we have done is handed that over to Doyle, so when it comes to taking these rights by expropriation as the Government can do, and as the Government has done in many instances in the past, and as they have done all over this Province where they feel it is in the public interest. And so I agree, the Government should have that right. For instance, they expropriated property in Corner Brook for the Elizabeth Street housing area, where they felt it was in the public interest, where they built the subsidized housing off the Ball Diversion in Corner Brook, because it was in the public interest. But they compensated the people on the basis of their initial investment under the Expropriation Act, and what the land was worth at the time. So when we are giving consideration to what Doyle should be compensated, and when the minister talks about money from Federal resources to extinguish these rights, bearing in mind that Bowaters do not want any money, Reid Newfoundland do not want any money. That leaves Doyle and the Minister has indicated there are one or two others. I do not know whether there are others or not. He has indicated there are. Probably a couple of other small ones. On Page 4 of historic<sup>his</sup>(Quote)Section, he said that very substantial costs are involved in the repatriation of property. They are nice fancy words, and rights in the proposed National

Park area for the purpose of providing to the Government of Canada a clear title to the area. Among these costs are those associated with the relocation of communities and compensation to owners of properties and rights granted for resource development purposes. And then he goes on to submit, that since the acquisition of the property and the extinction of rights is for national purposes, the Nation should bear the burden of the cost. Now I would imagine that the Federal Government are not too happy about putting money in John Doyle's pocket to compensate him for something that never cost him anything in the first place. Not the slightest happy about that. Now they are laughing at the White Paper, so-called White Paper. Is that the reason for it? Is that why all this elaborate facade called a White Paper? To put money in Doyle's pocket? I do not know. I believe BRINCO might have some rights down there. I am not sure of that, but I would imagine Mr. Speaker, that BRINCO would only be too willing to exchange those rights for similar rights elsewhere. And in recognition of what this Province did for BRINCO, and what the Government of Canada has done for BRINCO to promote the development of Churchill Falls. And they have played a fair role in it in their tax rebates. BRINCO bearing all these things in mind, I would imagine would only be too reasonable and happy. So that takes care of BRINCO, Bowaters and Reids, and leaves Doyle. The only money needed. Maybe that is the purpose of it. I do not know. It is not apparent on the face of it, but neither is it apparent on the face of it either that it is a totally honest document. Because it is so obviously ludicrous to try and say to the Government of Canada, we will not take your ruddy old park unless you build us a couple of airports and an all-weather highway and develop the resources and do all these other things. That is so blatantly ludicrous on the face of it, that that is obviously not the reason for the White Paper either. Is it Doyle's money? I do not know. I would hate to think so. I hate to think that this is the reason behind this elaborate thing. Look at Page 6. Policy Statement, it is called, of the Government of Canada.



The basic purpose of the National Park system is to preserve for all time areas which contain significant, geographical, geological, biological or historical features as a national heritage for the benefit, education and enjoyment of the people of Canada. Now the Minister quotes this as the philosophy underlying the National Parks concept in Canada, as stated in the 1965 Policy Statement. If that is so, what has that got to do with oil and mineral rights. What has that got to do with airports? What has it got to do with the paved highway all the way down? What does it have to do with development of Fisheries and Mineral and Forestry Resources? There is nothing in that Policy Statement that reflects that. If that is the Federal policy for National Parks, then be honest and say okay, let us go ahead with the National Park on the basis of the Federal policy, we will try to get them to put a swimming pool in it, or a golf course, or a ski run, or a marina, or an underwater park area over a period of time, which would seem to be a rather reasonable approach. Then the minister states his own philosophy on Page 6 of White Paper, and says, "it is that representative areas of our Province and thus of the nation, must be preserved for their esthetic, ecological and recreational value for present and future generations. That an adequate balance be struck between present and future life needs. And the need for conservation for conservation sake. And that when conflicts arise, value judgement must be made regardless of the consequences in the light of what appears to be at any given moment, to the entire public interest. Well Your Honour heard me mention circumlocution a little while ago, this is a classic example of it. It is just beat right around the bush. The Federal Government has clearly stated their parks policy. Then the minister has attempted to state this Government's philosophy, and that is what I just read. What I get out of it - the gist of it I think is that they like National Parks, and they think there is a value in preserving certain geographical areas for their esthetic and ecological values, and recreational values. They recognize this, but then they say a balance must be struck between that and present day life needs. Well I am not sure what he means by that. If he means

by that, that all of the people of the great Northern Peninsula are going to be on some kind of a starvation diet if the National Park goes in Bonne Bay, I will tell them quite frankly I do not believe them. I do not believe a word that he says is that is what he means by it - what else can he mean by it? I do not know. Circumlocution perhaps, talking around it, beating around the bush. Then he goes on to make a statement that, I have only read Mr. Speaker, in the great philosophers and others, he says there is a corollary to that. It is an international law. He has now attempted to take on to this Government's policy on National Parks as they stated there, a kind of divine status of natural law. Well I do not see where natural law enters that picture. The minister thinks it is a kind of natural law. I agree that people have to be maintained and this is first and foremost, and these people on that part of the coast are very concerned about being maintained. And they feel that the placement of a National Park will go a long ways towards contributing toward that. So that I do not see that there is any offense against natural law to have such a park in Bonne Bay. Yet this is what the minister would lead us to believe in this White Paper. That the philosophy of this Government is a kin to natural law. There is something terrible about the philosophy of the Federal Government and National Park. It does not quite make sense.

The resources are required for life to sustain life I presume. It is that where resources are required for life use are barred from such use, there must be compensation. So they now attempt to set up the argument that if this Government conveys six or seven hundred square miles of territory to the Government of Canada, there may be natural mineral or forestry resources within that area. There certainly are, some forestry resources. They want compensation for it. This is the first time that I know of that the Federal Government have been asked to consider paying compensation so they can set up a National Park, and have taken responsibility for maintaining it. It just does not make sense. It does not jive that we should ask the Government of Canada to set a National Park and maintain it and operate it. Then ask them to pay us for it - some imaginary figure based on the

minister's view of natural law. It does not make sense. So I am still looking for the explanation to the White Paper. Why the White Paper? The only thing sensible out of it so far is Page 8,9, and 10, where they say they we would like to see these things in the Park. And with those basic suggestions I agree. I do not agree in total with everyone of them, but I am close enough, not exactly heart to heart, but I am on the same wave length, if you know what I mean, Mr. Speaker, with the hon. minister on those things.

Now that is the only thing in the White Paper out of all of this including the pictures of the dense algae beds and what not, that seem to make any sense. So we still have to look further for the explanation. Maybe it is on Page 7. He says, that the objective must be to obtain for the people of the region and the Province generally, economic and social benefits at least as great as those accruing or likely to accrue from the use of the resources to be locked up, including extractable minerals, merchantable forest, fish and game, both as the food resources and as a basis for income from guiding and catering, and also

also compensation for properties and rights necessary to be acquired and extinguished to make way for park development. And again this compensation for rights crops up, as it does in several places, in the paper. May be that is where the answer lies Mr. Speaker. This government's total inability to live up to its obligations.

The National Park's policy is not a thing that has been a matter of dispute in Canada. We have one National Park under that policy. There are other National Parks throughout Canada. It is not a matter of dispute. Either we go under that policy since they are paying for it or we do not go at all. That is as plain as the nose on one's face. May be that last statement is the real explanation. That this Government is unable to live up to its obligations to put a park there, namely, to acquire the properties and rights in order to turn them over to the Government of Canada, and with that I do not disagree. I know they are unable. The Government is unable to do many other things that it should be doing because it does not have the financial resources.

But we are wasting our money on numerous other things, Mr. Speaker. We had the resources. We do not mind borrowing for Shaheen or we do not mind spending on the Newfoundland Bulletin or Expo buildings or all those other crazy things. But we do mind apparently spending it on the development of the National Park in that area that has been promised for so long. We do apparently take STRONG objection to spending provincial funds as the minister says on something that is going to be turned over to the Federal Government, despite the fact that this is the federal parks policy. We take strong objection to spending provincial funds on that. Is that the real answer? Is that why the charade of a white paper, is facade? Is that the reason for it?

Anyway the people of Bonne Bay still do not know. They did not get the answer from the minister, and they said so, in no uncertain terms. We still do not know what the real answer is. It is hard to believe that is is blackmail. It is unpleasant to think that the purpose is to get money for Doyle. It is unpleasant to even contemplate that. It is probably a little more practical to realize that the Government cannot afford it because it has

so wasted the funds of this Province on other things that it cannot afford. They estimate \$3 million. I do not know whether or not that is an accurate amount. I have no idea. The white paper seems to talk about \$3 million to acquire property and extinguish rights. The people find that hard to believe. Mr. Speaker when they watch on television what they saw go on in this House when Mr. Shaheen was here. And the way the tens and hundreds of millions were tossed around then. They find it hard to believe when the Government says we do not have the \$3 million to buy the properties to allow this park to go ahead at Bonne Bay. So they are still uncertain as to the reason. It is unrealistic. The whole thing is unrealistic. It is unrealistic that the Government could be that ruthless with the people of this Province. Or that they could think that we are so gullible as to accept the nonsense that is contained in this paper without question and say "Oh, what a wonderful Government, look what they want to do." They want to develop the whole northern coast of Newfoundland. What a wonderful Government they are?" Do they think we are that gullible, that we are going to accept that nonsense? The people are not that gullible. The Government of Canada is not such a howl of jelly that they are going to knuckle under it, and accept it without question and take it lying down.

Simple answer, they will build another park in P.E.I. first or New Brunswick, that is all. They will not waste time fooling around with us and our nonsense. And quite frankly I do not blame them, I am much of their mind. If I were, wherever I was from in Canada, Newfoundland or otherwise, if I were an advisor to the Government of Canada I would advise them to throw that paper in the waste basket and perhaps write a courteous letter to the minister here and say, when you are prepared to be reasonable and send us a reasonable proposal we will give you a reasonable answer. But do not bother us with any more of that nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

MR. WELLS: Yes, a question, not a comment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A question, yes. Did I hear him correctly to say that if he were an advisor to the Canadian Government he would advise them to throw this white paper in the waste paper basket? Did I understand that correctly?



MR. WELLS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will explain it. It is simple. If I were advising the Canadian Government to whether or not this park should be developed in Bonne Bay and that white paper came across my desk I would say throw it away, I would not dignify it with an answer. Sure, it is nice, if we can get that road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony and a couple of airports and a couple of ferries and all the fisheries and minerals and forestry resources developed. Sure it is marvellous if we can have all that. But if we think the Government of Canada are going to sit still for us saying either you do all those things or we will not let you put a National Park here, we are insane all of us if we think that. And I for one do not think it. And if I were advising the Government of Canada and I received this in this circumstance I would put it exactly where it belongs, in the garbage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the garbage!

MR. WELLS: In the garbage! That is right! In the garbage! It is a nice proposal. A wonderful proposal. Is it practical, is it reasonable in the circumstances? Of course not. Of course not. And if we think for one minute the Government of Canada are going to accept that and say, yes, that sounds reasonable we were talking about developing a National Park in Bonne Bay but we are so naive and silly and stupid that we overlooked all of the other good things they have down there. We should have come up with this idea about building a road all the way from St. Anthony to Deer Lake. We should have come up with the idea of building a couple of airports. What is wrong with our advisers that they are so stupid they did not think of that? Is that what the Government of Canada is saying or thinking? Anybody who believes that, (I will not say it it might offend the dignity of the House Mr. Speaker) suffice it to say that I am quite confident that the Government of Canada is not going to fall for, or accept that without questions. I can readily agree with the kind of park, I do so, that is recommended. And that is what the white paper should have confined itself to, the quality of the park. And with that I take no strong exception. I have a few views on it but I am not going to take up the time debating those minor things. My argument is with the Government's

approach. There is not one of us in this House Mr. Speaker, that would not like to see a paved all-weather highway from Deer Lake to St. Anthony. Not one member here. Not one member here who would not like to see the airport and everything else there. But Thank Heavens Mr. Speaker, Thank Heavens that some of the hon. members of this House are not so silly or so naive as to think that the Federal Government will sit still for this kind of nonsense.

The Government is not dealing with the quality of the park in this white paper, far from it. They are dealing with an overall development programme and if the Government wants to talk to the Government of Canada about what responsibility the department of Regional Economic Expansion should take in the development of that great Northern Peninsula, fine, do so, and make these recommendations and he will get no criticism from me, whatever minister does it. Will not be criticized by me. If he recommends to the Government of Canada the coast should be so developed, there will be no criticism and I do not think from any hon. member on this side of the House.

When he attempts to put it into this so-called Bonne Bay Park proposal and attempts to lead the people of this Province to believe that this is genuine then it is time that somebody told them the truth. High time that somebody told them the truth. This kind of blackmail if that is what it is and I am not sure it is not, but I really do not think it is, if this is blackmail I do not think it is necessary. I think the Federal Government have over the years recognized that Newfoundland exists. Now I agree that they have not done all that I would like to see them do for Newfoundland but there are other parts of Canada too and I think we have to recognize that. But I think that Mr. Marchand, Mr. Chretien, Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Jamieson and the others that are members of the Privy Council and make these decisions, are prepared to sit and negotiate with us as reasonable people, making a reasonable proposal under the DREE programme for the development of the great Northern Peninsula.

But Mr. Speaker, when we give them this we insult them. And I would be so insulted if I were there. That is what we do. When we put it in this light and tie it into the National Park, we insult them and make them laugh at

us, perhaps they feel sorry for us, for a stupid naive people down there. That is why, Mr. Speaker, that is why we criticize them. Though I still have not found the same logical reason anywhere in this for it. Page 11 talks about the other sites. There is a historic parks and sites programme in Canada. There is a historic National Park now at Signal Hill. The Government of Canada have erected other placques on certain areas marking it as a national historic site because of a significant event that occurred on that particular location.

We do have a historic parks and sites programme in Canada to take care of L'Anse aux Meadows and the Dorset site. These things are good and I would like to see them done. I would like to see them developed. I would like to see them now but I am not so silly or naive as to say to the Federal Government we want these too as well as Gros Morne or we will not give you the land for Gros Morne. Utter nonsense! Utter nonsense! The good, the desirable, it should have been started may be as soon as the first ruins were discovered at L'Anse aux Meadows. But they are not essential to the Bonne Bay Park. As the minister describes it, as essential he calls it! How is it essential? True, if you had that site down there at L'Anse aux Meadows developed as a National Historic Site perhaps more people would travel through the Bonne Bay Park to get down there. True statement nobody takes exception to that. But if you do not have the Bonne Bay Park darn few people are going there regardless of what else is there. That is why it does not make sense. It is good and desirable, to have all these things very desirable to have all these things but they are not essential to the Bonne Bay Park as the Government has set out. They could all come later. Then they want the special areas, Port au Choix, Port Saunders, Hawke's Bay area. Where there are certain developments centered, they want this expanded under a special, <sup>area</sup> that is not essential. The highway as desirable as it is a paved all-weather highway from Deer Lake to St. Anthony is not essential. It may be of some value to the parks to have paved from Deer Lake through the park. that makes more sense, There is more reason to believe that that might be essential to the successful operation of the park. But there

is nowhere in that white paper anything that justifies claiming the highway to be extended beyond the park all the way to St. Anthony to be essential to the park. How? Under what guise can that be claimed? There is none, Mr. Speaker. The Bonne Bay ferry as desirable as it is, is not essential but I agree that it is desirable, and I would like to see it maintained. Because it has a certain attraction all its own. As well as being able to drive around now by Wiltondale you can use the ferry to go across from Woody Point to Norris Point. But it is still not absolutely essential to the development of the park. Nobody for a moment would suggest that it is. But the Government have done so. The minister has included it as an essential element. How? No wonder the people in Bonne Bay do not believe it. No wonder he has to go down there and beat around the bush, all day. No wonder. This white paper or so called white paper is such a fraud that he could beat around the bush until Doomsday and he could still never explain it. Such an obvious fraud on the face of it. None of these items that they list are essential to a successful ~~in~~ a Gros Morne National Park.

Page 17, in conclusions, when he talks about the possibilities about the development of the Indian, and Eskimo site and the Viking site and so. Given this clear possibility the Government cannot be satisfied with a piecemeal uncoordinated approach or with a lesser concept. The Government cannot be satisfied

MR. WELLS:

cannot be set aside with a lesser concept. Why did we not include the whole island, why confine it to the Northern Peninsula, why not the whole island? Why not pave every road in the island, put in a half a dozen more airports here or there if we could find a few places free of fog to do it, why not recommend all that? Why not recommend national historic sights all around the path where Cormack walked across the Province, why not make that whole strip a national historic park? It makes just as much sense. That is just as essential to the Bonne Bay Park as any of the other things they have named, just as essential. Many of these other things may be more beneficial to the Bonne Bay Park but they are not essential and that is the word the Minister used and that is the word the Minister has to justify because they have in effect said, "all of these or nothing." He can justify his statement that they are beneficial. I cannot argue that an airport across might be beneficial to the Bonne Bay Park, it is hard to see just how beneficial but it might be beneficial. ~~Air service across~~ from Labrador, the paved road all the way down to St. Anthony and the development of the L'Anse-au-Meadow sight that would I would say be beneficial to the park. I do not think that that could be successfully argued against but not essential.

If you want to carry it to that ridiculous extreme, rebuilding or repaving the Hill O'Chips in St. John's might be beneficial to the Bonne Bay Park because anybody coming through there and going on to St. John's would have a paved road to drive over there and so would be more inclined to come through in the long run but what kind of sense does that make but that is what the Minister has offered, that is what the Government have offered. Why, what is the real reason, what is back of it all? I do not know, it is not obvious on the face of it, it is very hard to figure it out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it is not for Doyle it has to be for Sheehan.

MR. WELLS: No and I cannot see Sheehan's connection there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, he must be there somewhere, Doyle and Sheehan.

MR. WELLS: No, not that I know of.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, he must be.

MR. WELLS: Unless it is in the secret registry.



MR. SMALLWOOD: There you are, there you are, that is it.

MR. WELLS: The Premier is the one who raised it, I did not. I never suggested for a moment that Sheehan was there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Getting warm, the hon. gentleman is getting warm.

MR. WELLS: Maybe he is, I do not know. Full explanations is something that this Government is not noted for, Mr. Speaker, so that we in this House should not know exactly who is involved in what is not at all unusual. There is an incredible fear of truth permeates this House and in particular the Government side of it. Government, the White Paper says, cannot accept a lesser concept. Why could not the Minister just as well have said, we cannot accept less than development of the whole island, why confine it to the great Northern Peninsula? It does not make sense. If they cannot accept that lesser concept why not the whole area?

He talks about earnest of good faith, what good faith? What have the Government done so far? I do not know. There is no obvious signs of it other than going down to Bonne Bay and trying to fool the people, concoct stories, develop big silica mines. The big thing last year was we cannot move until we know about the silica, we cannot move and I think somewhere in this paper it is indicated that the silica is worth seven dollars a ton and there is one million tons there. Well, that is gross \$7. million and it would probably cost \$10. million or \$15. million to take the stuff out in that quantity, that small quantity. What money is there, what value is that and they are still hanging on to silica, they are still talking about the value of that silica at seven dollars a ton. What is it going to cost to mine it and deliver it to the market and it is worth seven dollars a ton, big deal. What earnest of good faith? For something to be in earnest of good faith there has to be something obviously done in good faith toward achieving the specified end.

What has this Government done toward achieving the completion of the Bonne Bay Park or the start of the Bonne Bay Park? I cannot point to a single thing that they have really done except throw these red herring across the path of everybody that is involved in it. One of the last statements, Mr. Speaker, says, "It should be born in mind that this Government took the initiative in respect of Grosse Morne National Park. The request went from St. John's to

MR. WELLS:

Ottawa, not the reverse." Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is so, if they say it is so I suppose we accept it, I have no reason to challenge it, I assume it to be so but if it is so what the Government is now doing is even more incredible, if the Government made a request to Ottawa to develop a national park at Bonne Bay, on what basis did they do it? The only sensible basis, the only reasonable basis is the national parks policy, the basis on which the park at Bonavista Bay was developed, the Terra Nova National Park. Then all of a sudden when it came time to pony up, to put up and carry out their obligation they did not have the money, it had all been given away. There is a million on deposit in the Franklyn National Bank, is there not? If we could use that million right now we would get some of the properties and get started anyway.

We spend \$3. million that it would have taken to do this we spent that on the Expo buildings and they are rusting out in Gander and Grand Bank. We could have used that. All of a sudden the Government has greater need for the \$3. million and they cannot live up to their obligation. Ottawa then said yes after the request was made if we are to believe what has come out of Ottawa. The Government said now that you have said yes we want you to do so and so and then it sets up this White Paper. Is this good faith, is this what the Government calls earnest of good faith? Having requested it and then the Government of Canada comes along and agrees with it they say, "ha, ha, now you have agreeded, now we want you to do a road from Deer Lake to St. Anthony, a couple of airports and develop the mineral resources and so on." Is that good faith, is that bargaining in good faith? I hardly think so, Mr. Speaker. It does not sound like good faith to me.

Page 18, the effect has been greatly to alter the nature and character of the situation and to introduce many new considerations in terms of quantity and character of the resources to be alienated, the numbers of people disrupted and the costs of acquiring rights entitled. This is a highly complex negotiation and those who demand that the Province just hand over the land have on their side a beautiful simplicity that there is no relationship to the nature of the situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose job is that?

MR. WELLS: I assume the hon. Minister, I am not sure but I give him credit

MR. WELLS:

for it.

This is the first time this has been mentioned in the White Paper, first time anybody every heard of this idea that the Province should be compensated or the people of the Province should be compensated, nobody had heard of this before. All we heard of before was silica. We are going to have a silica mine, not only are you going to have a mine, you are going to have a mine and a park, that is what we heard before. This is the first time this idea of compensation was introduced into the discussion in six years of carrying out discussions.

The Grosse Morne National Park must not be considered or developed in isolation so that makes quite clear what the Government's position is. They do not want the park by itself they want all of these other things that they had detailed, none of which is essential, all of which is desirable and everybody in this House is in favour of it but none of which is essential to the park. That is the honest statement so what is the purpose of this White Paper, what is the whole purpose of it? Blackmail, I do not know, excuses for inaction, failure to take any activity, certainly not reasonable or practical or realistic in any respect. There is only one conclusion and I had come to this conclusion some time ago, Mr. Speaker, but it was more recently confirmed when I saw a copy of the letter going out over the hon. the Premier's signature to all the residents in that area sending a copy of the White Paper, this is what the Government is going to do for you in your district. That is what I suspected it was, I did not really want to say that or I did not really want to think the Government would stoop that low to attempt to dignify an election manifesto with the title White Paper, to offend the dignity of the House by calling this a White Paper. It is the Government's election manifesto for that area, it is as simple and as plain as the nose on your face when you stop to think of it.

This was confirmed the other day when this was all sent out together with a letter over the Premier's signature saying this is what your Government is going to do for you and that, Mr. Speaker, makes it a fraud. Representing that as a White Paper and entitling it as a White Paper and delivering it in this House as a White Paper, that, Mr. Speaker, makes it a fraud when you go and examine the whole thing and you find out that this is what it is, it is nothing

MR. WELLS:

more nor less than an election manifesto that the Government is attempting to dignify with the name White Paper.

The national parks people in Ottawa have indicated they never heard of this extensive proposal before it was announced on the news media. That is the negotiations that have been going on that the Minister have been talking about. The motion, Mr. Speaker, should go further and no doubt with all due respect to the hon. member. In the Premier's words it should condemn the Government contemptuously for treating the people of Newfoundland this way and hammering this in at them and saying here is what we are going to do for you when it is such an obvious fraud. I hear that the Minister is so pleased with it that he is going to be running in St. Barbe North for the next election, I am not sure whether he changed his mind as a result of that meeting down in Rocky Harbour the other night or not, maybe he has.

Yet the Government would not answer the questions that have been tabled in this House. Question No. 400, "Have the rights of NALCO been extinguished by their failure to live up to the obligations under the Act?" I suspect they have but because the Government will not table the answers or will not give any information it is impossible to assess. Why, if everything is so straight forward and honest and above board what has the Government got to hide, why are they hiding anything? Other questions have been asked but no answers have been given. Question 401 on the order paper is not answered, question 400.

The general reaction of the people of the Bonne Bay area is that the Minister refused to answer their questions not by saying I refuse to answer or by just ignoring the question but by beating around the bush for fifteen or twenty minutes on every occasion when a question was asked. What are the Government hiding if everything is so straight forward and above board? Why do they not answer these questions? Because, Mr. Speaker, everything is not so straight forward and above board. The simple truth is that the whole thing is election bait and it covers nicely, makes a nice election manifesto for the Government for that area of Newfoundland. They do not have to worry about making further promises as they have made all the promises not on their own behalf but on behalf of the Government of Canada. You can see, in fact, what



MR. WELLS:

they have done. They said it is our policy to have the Government of Canada do all these things. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that makes sense at all, if there is one iota of sense in that I will put forward to this House a more reasonable policy. It should be the policy of every hon. member of this House to have the Government of Canada do similiar things for the whole of this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. Why confine it to the great Northern Peninsula? If there is one iota of sense or honesty in that White Paper why confine it to the great Northern Peninsula? Have the policy for the whole of this Province. Now under the guise of the White Paper, under the DREE program the Government of Canada is prepared to consider that and they would consider that, they would consider a DREE program in that area and as a matter of fact one of the areas down there, the Port aux Choix, Hawkes Bay area is a designated area under the DREE program and to receive certain benefits.

The Government of Canada has no intention of just lashing out money to this Province in whatever amount we ask for and quite frankly I do not blame them. I expected something from the Minister's White Paper. I certainly did not expect this fraud from the people of this Province and I expect, Mr. Speaker, that when their opportunity comes the people of this Province will tell the Minister and his cohorts what they think of him and his White Paper.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I would move, Sir, that, Mr. Speaker, at 6:00 o'clock leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock and that the House resume at 8:00 o'clock until 11:00 o'clock unless sooner adjourned by motion put.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is it in order for me to speak to the debate now?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the hon. member asks leave to dispose of the matter. The motion<sup>is</sup>/that the Speaker leave the Chair at 6:00 o'clock and resume at 8:00 o'clock.

Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay". In my opinion the "Nays" have it. Some hon. members on division.

MR. ROWE: This matter of the Bonne Bay Park, I find myself asking this question. Why is that my hon. friends on the other side are spending and devoting so much of their time to this particular matter? Most of them talked about it in the Debate on the Address in Reply and most of them talked on it to some length and



MR. ROWE:

now we have had this very lengthy debate. It is true the hon. Minister of Mines Agriculture and Resources took very considerable time to deal with that and he had every right to do and he not only had every right but in view of all the statements and misstatements that had been made in those previous debates and in the present debate certainly it was his duty to take a long time. I do not see how he could have disposed of all these allegations and all these charges and countercharges without taking a long time. Nevertheless having allowed for that and having allowed for the fact that the hon. member for St. Barbe South in whose district some or all or part of the proposed park would fall or all of the park in the original sense of the Grosse Morne Park, we expected him to speak at some length to it and he did. I might say well if all that the hon. gentleman has had to say on it were put together in his several statements here it would come to some considerable length but I must confess I find myself wondering why so much time is being devoted to this and I hasten to say, Mr. Speaker, that certainly, and I have said this before, there are very few people in this House who could have a more direct interest and certainly a more sentimental interest in this area than I myself have.

I have mentioned it before and probably it bears repetition in view of what I have to say later that I did live there in that area for three years and I think the House is aware of my other connections with that part of Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, as a matter of interest to me in retrospect for where I live in Bonne Bay every single morning of my life when I got up and looked through the window the first thing that I saw was Grosse Morne mountain. If there is a more beautiful sight on a winter afternoon or on a fine night in the winter when the moon is shining, if there is a more beautiful sight than the reflection from that great dome because that is what it is than Grosse Morne I have never seen it. It is and it has been said here before it is one of the great scenic sights of Newfoundland, the appearance of that mountain itself from certain directions, from certain angles that and the Table mountain almost directly across the bay from it, that great table land, unique in shape and form and appearance in this Province and indeed unique, I think, perhaps in Canada. Nobody disputes that. So anything I have to say here on this

MR. ROWE:

particular matter today should not be construed and I have no doubt someone will try to construe it, well anybody should not be construed at any lack of interest in this proposed development.

There have been so many points made and so much importance has been attached to so many relatively insignificant aspects of the matter that it makes me wonder why is this thing being belaboured, why is it being batted back and forth like a tennis ball, why is it being held up as an example of this Government's stubbornness and obstinacy. The hon. member just spoke of that, he professed ignorance as to why we are doing this, all he knows is we are doing it. Doing what? We are obstructing a great development on the West Coast, that is what we are doing and he does not know why we are doing it unless and he finally comes up with this argument which certainly has been trotted forth in respect of ten thousand things in this last twenty years that is now a piece of election bait, a piece of political chicanery devised by the Government in order to try presumeably to win the election in St. Barbe South. This to me is silly, this to me is stupid because if that is all the Government had in mind presumeably all we had to do to win then St. Barbe South was to do what a number of the more vociferous people in that district have asked us to do and have asked the Government of Ottawa to do and pressed so that we would have the district. We have the district so why go to all this tomfoolery, why go to all this waste of time, all this clumsy way of wining an election. What clumsy way? Developing the blueprint, developing the White Paper and spending all this time going back and forth to Ottawa negotiating and arguing and fighting and allowing ourselves to be put under the charge from these hon. gentlemen on the other side that for some obscure reason we are trying to prevent development on the West Coast of Newfoundland and in particular development of a park over there.

In fact the member for St. John's West said, these are his exact words as I wrote them down when he was saying them and I wrote down quite a number of his exact statements, quotations made, the allegations made and I am going to deal with a number of them. The hon. gentleman said the Government is not interested in a park. These words he said are plain to me, the Government is not interested in getting a park in Bonne Bay. The hon. member for St. John's West said that. Now I ask this question, assume, let us assume that it is true, let us assume that -

MR. ROWE (F.W.): Measure of truth to that charge. Why on earth would the Government not want to have a park in Bonne Bay or somewhere in Bonne Bay? Surely it could not be because there might be a mine there or somewhere else because, then the mine could be just excluded out and the rest of the area - surely it is not because there might be an oil well somewhere in the northern part of that park area or proposed park area. Surely that is not the reason the Government would object to a park. Well what reason is it? What reason would the Government have for not wanting another park, even a park if it was no more than and I say this advisedly, if it was no more than the Terra Nova National Park. Why would we object to it?

Yet the hon. gentleman has said, from St. John's West has said, the Government is not interested in a park anyway. This is the reason we are not interested we do not have the money. As a matter of fact I made a note when he said that. He said that before and I made a note of it. He has gone outside this House and he has said it in this House, that this Government is giving the Shaheen Interests \$155 million. That is what he said. We are not of course, but that is what he said. We are giving the Shaheen Interests \$155 million. He has said that over and over again. That is one thing.

What a Government we are, Midas himself. Old King Midas, old Croesus was never better off than that. We can give \$155, and remember Mr. Speaker it is the give that is always used. We could give \$155 million to the Shaheen Interests but, why are we not putting, why are we not going ahead with the park over there? Because we do not have the money. What money? \$3 million, \$3 million, we cannot find \$3 million for a great development on the west coast but we can find \$155 million. What for? To give to Mr. Shaheen.

Mr. Speaker, these two statements are so ridiculously contradictory that nobody needs to dwell on them at all. If we could find \$155 million to give to Mr. Shaheen, if we could find that and if as a result we are going to lose a district over there, one whole district or maybe two districts in the next election next month, or next fall or next year, whenever it is held.

MR. WELLS: Ah, you slipped

MR. ROWE: I did not make any slip at all. I did not make any slip at all. If we can find \$155 million to give to Mr. Shaheen, to give to him, what kind of political nitwits must we be not to find, not to deprive Mr. Shaheen of \$3 million of the \$155 million and reduce it down to \$152 million, and say "look, just do with your \$152 million now, put up with that for two months or three months or six months till we get this election over and that will allow us \$3 million?" What for, to build a park? No to win the district of St. Barbe South or to win the district of St. Barbe North and maybe even other district as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am not, as a matter of fact the hon. Minister of Health just pointed out what we should really do if we are that affluent is to stall off Mr. Shaheen for a few months and take a few more \$3 millions if \$3 million will win one district in St. Barbe South, then surely \$3 million will win Lewisporte District and another \$3 million will win White Bay South and another \$3 million. We will stall off Mr. Shaheen and use up part of the \$155 million.

Mr. Speaker, this is too ridiculous. A stranger listening to this, someone who had never heard this before and heard me saying this, what I am saying now would not believe that this has happened. That in the one breath the hon. member for St. John's West could say that we are giving away \$155 million to Shaheen, but, we cannot find, we do not have enough money, we are too bankrupt to find \$3 million for a great park in St. Barbe South. This is nonsense in the first order. Pure nonsense of the first order.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman used the term also, that what we have done within this white paper is to, and his exact words were, and he held it up, this is attempted blackmail he said. Blackmail of whom? Blackmail of the Government of Canada. The Government of Newfoundland is trying to blackmail the Government of Canada. Blackmail the Government of Canada into what? Into doing what? He did not elaborate. Into doing what? Does he mean we are trying to blackmail them into doing something more than they want to do? Is that what he means? Does he mean that we are trying to blackmail



them into adopting this white paper, the proposals for the whole west coast? If he means that, and if he would change the word blackmail to something else then he is 100 per cent right. He was never more right in his life. This Government is trying to compel, and trying to persuade the Government of Canada to adopt some measure that they have not adopted up till now, up to this moment. Is there anything wrong in that? Is there a precedent for it?

Surely I find myself Mr. Speaker, having sometimes to remind myself that some of these hon. gentlemen who speak have not been around very long, that politically, chronologically, they are wet behind the ears still. Because, any hon. member who would try to chastise us for trying to put pressure on the Government of Canada surely is not familiar with the history of the Trans Canada Highway in Newfoundland. He cannot be. In 1950-51 the Government of Canada came to us with a proposal and that proposal was that they would, as they had planned to do for the rest of Canada, share in the cost of building a road. A first class road across the Province of Newfoundland, at least across the Island of Newfoundland. Their offer was fifty-fifty.

The Government of Newfoundland would have to acquire the right of way and having done that, and having agreed mutually on a route from, across the Island, Ottawa would reimburse us for fifty per cent of the cost. We had to find the money Mr. Speaker. We had to pay out the money, and having done that we would then bill Ottawa for fifty per cent of the cost. We protested that arrangement at the time and got nowhere with it at all, but we protested it. We said at that time, and this Mr. Speaker, is very relevant to the matter at issue right now, we said, "look your giving Saskatchewan fifty per cent of the cost, you are doing the same for Ontario, you are going to do the same for every Province fifty per cent of the cost. Here, in Saskatchewan and we took that as an example and used it later with some effect. Saskatchewan had twice our population, nearly 1 million. Therefore, if everything else was equal the burden of finding their fifty per cent would only be one half of what our burden would be. Simple arithmetic.

As it happened other things were not equal. Saskatchewan had only



three hundred miles. We had six hundred miles. That then assuming other things were equal would make the burden on us four times as heavy as it was on the people of Saskatchewan. But, everything else was not equal. Saskatchewan's Provincial income, the per capita income at that time was twice ours, twice ours. Therefore, the burden of providing that money on the part of the Newfoundland people had to be twice as heavy again. In other words, eight times as heavy as on the people of Saskatchewan. Even then other things were not equal. Because, in Saskatchewan as I know having done it, and everybody who has ever done it knows, if you start at the eastern border and drive across those three hundred miles, and if there is a hill there, if there is a hill there as high as Barter's Hill I have not seen it. Except for the little ridge there in the Qu'Appelle Valley. It is the only place I have seen in Saskatchewan and I have been in most parts of the Province, where you have a hill as high as Barter's Hill in St. John's here.

In Saskatchewan you get in and you drive. You have one or two rivers to cross and that is it. In Newfoundland you left here and you had to either go up hill or you went down hill. If you were not going through granite you were going over a bog. If you were not dynamiting granite as we had to do for about I suppose two hundred miles here in Newfoundland, you were digging out miles and miles of bog down to twenty and thirty feet deep.

The ultimate result was that the burden on Newfoundland was infinitely higher than it was on Saskatchewan. We put these things to Ottawa even in the early years. Ottawa said "no, we are not paying any attention," In effect they were not as crude as that, but they said we are not paying any attention to it. But we did not desist, we kept it up and kept it up and kept it up and finally Ottawa made a concession, thanks in part to the role and the intercession that our Cabinet Minister Mr. Pickersgill was able to play. That concession was this, that for ten per cent of the road in Newfoundland, just ten per cent, they would pay ninety per cent of the cost and that is how we did the pavement from St. John's out to Whitbourne. That is how we did it. That is why we were able to do that in one year or two years and why we were able to build a pretty good road there.

There was another short section out there in some other part two other parts of Newfoundland. Ten per cent of the total highway, Ottawa paid ninety per cent of the cost. But even then that was not enough. Still the burden of building these at that time nearly six hundred miles, of having to build scores of bridges many of them great bridges, having to cross every river, practically every major river in Newfoundland had to be bridged from between here and Newfoundland. We were going against the grain all the time. Having to dynamite through granite mountains, having to dig out all these bogs, the burden, the cost, the cost was far too heavy for the people of Newfoundland to bear and we said this over and over.

The only way we could do it, we could have done it in a reasonable time, the only way we could have built it under that fifty-fifty was to deprive the other services of money. Give nothing to the municipalities, build no hospitals, cut down on your school building, do nothing in vocational education and so on. We decided not to do that and we did not do it. But, we kept on pressuring Ottawa Mr. Speaker. This is the point I want to make. We kept on pressuring Ottawa on it, and finally we went to Ottawa and the House will remember. There was a great convention on in Ottawa, and we met, the Government of Newfoundland, a delegation headed by the Premier of Newfoundland met with the man who was not then Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Pearson, the man who was seeking the leadership in fact of the Liberal Party of Canada.

We said to him, in effect, now you may call this blackmail. It was not blackmail, it was a simple piece of horse-trading, that is all it was. We said to him " Mr. Pearson, we are going to support you, we are prepared to support you, but we feel that you have to do more for Newfoundland than you have done and we are going to introduce into this convention," into that great convention in the colosseum in Ottawa, "we the Newfoundland delegation are going to introduce a resolution into that convention which will make it obligatory on the part of the Liberal Party if that party takes over power in Ottawa, we are going to make it obligatory," I do not remember the exact dates I can get the dates anyway, at any rate we introduced the resolution.

The resolution was introduced into that Liberal Convention, it was the year that Mr. Pearson was elected leader of the Liberal Party, whatever year that happened to be. It might have been '58. That resolution was that if the Liberal Party was restored to power the Liberal Party should assume responsibility for paying ninety per cent of the cost of completing the Trans Canada Highway in Newfoundland.

Mr. Pearson said " I will regard myself as bound by that resolution." He gave us his pledge, he was not able to implement it, he was elected leader it is true, but his party as the House knows did not gain power at that time. It was not until after some five years afterwards that he did get in power. When he did get in power we got a new Act put through the House of Commons in Ottawa, the Parliament in Ottawa, and that new Act contained a new agreement authorizing the Government of Canada to make a ninety-ten agreement, not only with Newfoundland, not only with Newfoundland, but with certain other Provinces where they had not been able to complete their Trans Canada because of the unequal burden on their people. Notably in New Brunswick.

MR. MURPHY: Did we complete ours?

MR. ROWE: We at that time, at that time when the Act was put through we had about ninety per cent of the Trans Canada built. But remember this Mr. Speaker, (I am sorry, we had about fifty per cent of the Trans Canada built) remember this, the fifty per cent that we had built apart from this small section out here was built to minimum standards as we were able to do under the law and under the agreement, and as indeed most of the other Provinces did, and as we were compelled to do because of the cost involved. Minimum standards meant that you had fairly sharp curves in some places and fairly steep grades in other places, and that you had a five foot shoulder and that you only had twenty-two feet of pavement across the road. That was the minimum standards.

There were other things as well, any engineer can tell, the pavement would not as heavy as it was possible to do under the maximum standards. We did exactly what they were doing in Quebec at the same time and what they did in most of the other Provinces. We built our.....

MR. ROWE, F.W.: fifty percent, we built it to minimum standards. Mr. Speaker, we had a great concession from Ottawa and we took full advantage of it, and we went ahead with it, and then we went to Ottawa again, and we said to Ottawa, we have had to <sup>re</sup>build the early parts of our highway, the fifty-fifty part, we feel that that part should be upgraded to maximum standards, and we think that the Government of Canada should help us to do that, and the Government of Canada after, and it was not easy, it was not easy, the Government of Canada, and I might say we were able to do it partly because we had the support of Prince Edward Island, the Premier of Newfoundland and the support of the Premier of Prince Edward Island and of New Brunswick at that time. And whatever the reason for it, we were able to get additional concession which brought into Newfoundland tens of millions of dollars, and which enabled us to start to rebuild those portions of the Trans-Canada Highway, much of it on the West Coast of Newfoundland, some of it in Central Newfoundland, between Grand Falls and the National Park at Terra Nova, that portion of the highway these are the two main sections of highway which has been built under the fifty-fifty the original part, and these were built to minimum standards. But because of this additional concession, from Ottawa we have been able to rebuild the Trans-Canada Highway to a maximum standards, the work is not completed yet, it is still going on. My hon. friend knows one portion of it the other day was opened, last fall, between the Exploits River and Notre Dame Junction, in fact only the first paving was put on that, and the second paving has to go on I believe next month. So this is part of the work, it is not all completed yet. But the all important point, Mr. Speaker, is that we were able, these were not free gifts from Ottawa, Ottawa did not come around and say to us; on a platter here, take this. Ottawa did not offer us this. We got this from Ottawa, partly through bargaining, if you want to put it so crudely as that, was most of all by bringing reasonable arguments to bear, and by presenting those arguments over and over again. Finally, Ottawa gave in, not all at one time, but it gave in, and we got what we wanted.

MR. ROWE, R.W.: Now the hon. member for Humber East just now, and I will deal more fully later with what he had to say; and I am dealing for the present in the most part on what the hon. gentleman for St. John's West said. The hon. member apropos this, the hon. member for Humber East said just now, "is Ottawa going to knuckle under this?" These were his words. "Is Ottawa a bowl of jelly?" Here is what he said; "the Government of Newfoundland have gone up," he said, "to Ottawa and blackmailed them," or words to that effect, tried to blackmail them. No fear that Ottawa is going to knuckle under this? He said, "Ottawa needed to be told? He said, "what is wrong with our advisors up in Ottawa?" He said, "Is Ottawa a bowl of jelly? Are they going to knuckle under?" Well, I refuse the word, "knuckle under", I do not like it, it is a derogatory term. All I know is this, all I know is this, that Ottawa, and I use the word concede, that Ottawa has conceded on other matters after they had taken an irrevocable stand. All the reasonable matters they did not win, we told them about Trans-Canada in the first instance, they did not say it <sup>was</sup> reasonable, they said it is absurd.

MR. WELLS: They did not.

MR. ROWE, F.W. No of course not, well I will come to the other part in a moment.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that <sup>in</sup> Ottawa Government, like most governments, most governments, are subject not merely to argument, but are subject at times <sup>to</sup> pressure and as a result of the pressure, and I do not use this now in any cheap or vulgar sense, as a result of the pressure that we, and other provinces mind you, were able to put on the Government of Ottawa, we today have a Trans-Canada Highway number one, and we are in the process of rebuilding a major portion of that with a result that we will have a Trans-Canada Highway which will be second to none across Canada. And we would not have had it, Ottawa did not come and offer it to us. Ottawa did not come and say, we are going to give you ninety/ten. As a matter of fact our original proposition to Ottawa was seventy-five/twenty-five, we argued for that. We would have settled for that. And had Ottawa agreed to it at that time, had



MR. ROWE, F.W. they agreed to it, in our case and in New Brunswick's case and one or two other provinces, we could have had the Trans-Canada completed probably in 1958 or 1959, in stead of in 1966, and we might even had most of it done to maximum standards, in stead of minimum standards, not sub-standards, minimum standards.

I will deal later with some other points made by the hon. member for St. Barbe South. The member for St. John's West said this, and he said it and he banged his fist when he said it, Mr. Speaker, he said, "we cannot lay down the conditions", that is what he said. I have news for him, I have news for him. We were told that in as many words eleven or twelve years ago in respect of the Terra Nova National Park. You cannot lay down the conditions, they said. You got to do, we have a national park policy. My hon. friend said the other day, when he was speaking, a week ago, I think, when he said this, it came across my mind, it could have been the same officials from Ottawa who were down here thirteen or fourteen years ago, saying to us, you cannot lay down the conditions in respect to that Terra Nova Park. We have an National Park Policy and we are going to adhere to it, and bless me, if the hon. gentleman from St. John's did not use almost exactly the same words the other day, he said, <sup>we</sup> we do not like the kind of park that Ottawa will give us, we have no choice anyway, we have to take it or leave it."

MR. Speaker, let me again give a very brief summary of what happened in respect of the Terra Nova National Park. Ottawa was prepared to come in 1952 around that point and meet their obligation, their constitutional obligation to us, it was really constitutional, I am not sure, I think, it is in the Terms of Union, if it is not, it is certainly a constitutional obligation to give us the same treatment proportionally as they had given to other provinces and their policy had been to establish at least one national park in every province, therefore we were entitled to one too, and they were prepared to come in, and they came in here and the area that they picked out was that area, it was not precisely the same area that the present Terra Nova Park occupies, but it was in that general area. It was in the Bonavista Bay Area of Newfoundland.

MR. ROWE: F.W. Among other things it took in the complete watershed, the original delineation took in the complete watershed of the Terra Nova River and it took in certain other things as well. And Ottawa was going to lay down the law to us, and they did lay down the law to us. Among the laws that were laid down was that we are going to have that river, we want that river and we are going to have it, and once we get it, no development, no matter how hungry you might be for hydro-power, never again, although there might be a 100,000 horse power, and that is what is there, a 100,000 horse power in that river, never again, will you have a chance to develop it or to touch it in any way. They said, also too there might be some wood there, but once we establish the park there, not one tree will ever be cut out of it, except the trees we cut out in the course of landscaping. They said, there might be some minerals there, we do not know. But, if there are mines there, that is too bad, once we establish they are there forever more, forever more that is it. And then they also said something else, they said that there are some communities out around there too, and they are going to take these over, we want these communities in effect liquidated. This is in effect, I am putting this very blatantly and very crudely but this is in effect, what they told us, Mr. Speaker. Now this was Ottawa's National Park Policy. And if we adopted the philosophy of the hon. member for St. John's West, we would have said; "yes, Sir, thank you, Sir, you are very kind to tell us this. We are so anxious to get an national park here, right away, because if we employee thirty or forty or a hundred men out there, and because it will bring a bit of business out there, we are so anxious to get this done, that we will not demure in the slightest, we will not criticize your offer at all, we will not look a gift horse in the mouth, give it to us right away. Thank you, Sir, very much." And that would have been it. And we did not do it. And we were abused right, left and centre for not taking the offer, and we were threatened with political extinction out there in Bonavista Bay, my hon. friend remembers it very well, because we refused to take the offer, we have had it. That is it, we were going to lose that district and other districts out there as well.

MR. ROWE:F.W. And of course there was some nefarious nobody knew exactly why, but there was some reason, there had to be some reason why the Government was so stubborn about it, there is some reason and obviously it was not a respectful one why the Government was obstructing this Terra Nova National Park development, and it dragged on and Mr. Bickersgill became the Federal Member for Newfoundland in Ottawa and he too was anxious to get this park going, because apart from any other reason it was in his Riding, naturally he had a double concern. And he came to us almost on his knees, I know I speak with complete familiarity of this because of the position I occupied at the time, and he came to the Premier and to me, and he said, "look in God's name let us get this park going," and we said, "we cannot in the interest of Newfoundland, we cannot give in to this at this time". And we are not prepared to give in. And as a result of these delays, we were delayed and the people of <sup>the</sup> east coast were delayed and Newfoundland was delayed by several years in getting the first national park. But, I submit, we won a victory, a very great victory. I will explain why, in the first place Ottawa agreed to leave out the Terra Nova River, it is right by the park. People who go to the park can enjoy the beauties of that river and they can visit that river and they can use the river, and we can always use the river if we want it, right there a reservoir for us to use, a 100,000 horsepower, if we ever got stuck, and the day might come, when we might be stuck.

We also got Ottawa to agree to delay until we could have a mineral survey made, and we did, we concentrated, we put on an intensive survey. I remember this very well, the Deputy Minister was Mr. Claude Howse and the geologist was Dr. Baird and we had other well known men as well, indeed we had a lot of reports already, but not enough. And they put on an intensive mineral survey put there including the magnetometer survey. And they came back to us and they said, "as far as it is humanly possible, now there might be riches gold mine on earth out there right under that part, but they said, as far as it was humanly possible for us to ascertain, to determine, we do not think

MR. ROWE: F.W.: there is any economic , and notice the word, Mr. Speaker, any economic deposit of ore in that general area, and therefore, you would not be running any risks. That was another concession.

MR. WELLS: How many airports .....

MR. ROWE: F.W. You did not need an airport, but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that if there had been no airport within reason<sup>u-l-t-k</sup> distance of that National Park, it is quite possible that we would have stood out for one, and if we had I have no doubt that we would have gotten one, we did not get any airport, we did not need any airport. There was an airport within a reason<sup>u-l-t-k</sup> distance anyway, a great International Airport. But in any case that matter at that time was not crucial.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing was this, we were negoti ing for a third paper mill on the Island of Newfoundland, we said to the Ottawa people, "there is a lot of pulp wood there or potential pulp wood", they said, "if we create a park there, you cannot take a stick out of it". And they also said something else, Mr. Speaker, which was interesting, they told us in effect there was no real stand of pulp wood out there. They told us that there was no economic stand of pulp wood out there. We refused to accept it. We got the most respected and experienced woods surveyor, probably in North American, Jenkins who did the preliminary wood surverys in Labrador in Commission of Government time. We got him to come in and at summary cost, I have forgotten the exact amount now, but it was<sup>u</sup> very considerable cost, we got him to do a survey and that survey took two full years, and he came back to us, and he said, "there is a potential in that park area of merely 700,000 cords." And we were told to lock that up forever more, and here we were at the same breathe at that very moment negotitating with one of the great paper companies in the United States Crowns Zellerback to come in here and they almost did come in here, it was touch or go, they came here and they spent a lot of money, and finally they decided not to, for reasons, for reasons, incidentally, which did not have too much relationship to the economic value here. It was a policy decision on the part of that great company, and we knew that there was this indcision on their part when we met with them for nearly two weeks down in California, their

MR. ROWE: F.W. decision was whether or not they would ever go east in Eastern North America. They had concentrated on the West Coast in British Columbia and in Oregon and in Washington and in California itself. And their decision was whether they expand down in the south west of the United States over towards Texas and Tennessee and these place or whether they would come out and start in eastern North America. And if they had, if that great company one of the great company's of the world, had decided on this matter of policy that they would come in eastern North America, we would have had a great development there right in Newfoundland at that time, we would have had the third paper mill then. There policy was not predicated on the economic of a paper mill as such in Newfoundland, it was a company policy which resulted in a decision that they would not come to eastern North America, they went down to Tennessee and built their mill. And this is a policy that other companies have adopted too.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is though, that we did get proof that there were 700,000 cords and then we went to Ottawa again, and we said to them, "what do you expect us to do with those 700,000 cords?" Do you expect us with our people looking for work, with loggers because of the automation that is taking place in our logging industry with loggers looking for work, with another paper mill absolutely essential, if they are going to get work, if they are going to<sup>be</sup> absorbed in the labour market. Do you expect us to lock up with one stroke of the pen 700,000 cords? Well, we did not, we got from them a concession. And Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to this, and the hon. member's attention to this, we got the Government of Canada to introduce into the Parliament of Canada an amendment to the Parks Act specifically for Newfoundland for the Terra Nova National Park, and that Amendment repealed that portion of the Act which prohibited the commercial exploitation of wood in any national park, and gave us the right which we have to this moment, a right that in the event another paper mill is established in Newfoundland, we can go into that National Park there under control now, you cannot go in there and just put a bulldozer and destroy the park, under



MR. ROWE: F.W. control, under proper supervision we can or our agents, and our agents would be another company, any company that establishes a third mill in Newfoundland can go into that National Park and extract from it the annual increment of that 700,000 cords, and that annual increment has been estimated to be 25,000 cords a year, 25,000 cords a year is not much when you consider the mill at Corner Brook, but if you take it for fifty years it is a lot or a hundred years.

Look my hon. friend to this moment has never, never, never voted against a single motion that I am aware of, that the member for St. John's West or Humber West- ~~listen to this, my hon. friend to this moment has never~~ criticized a single point made by the hon. member for St. John's West. Indeed, he has voted with him on every single matter, every single issue to this point.

MR. WELLS: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE:F.W: What I am telling him is this, just listen, just wait a minute.

MR. WELLS: For what?

MR. ROWE: F.W. Just wait a minute, I will tell you for what?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please.

MR. MURPHY: Let us get back to national parks.

MR. ROWE: F.W. Mr. Speaker, if- I may I could answer his question. His question is, the answer is that the amendment passed by the Government of Canada, by the Parliament of Canada gave us the authority to put a third mill into that park and remove 25,000 cords a year of wood for that third mill, that is the answer. That is what the amendment was.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, am I incorrect then in saying that the people in the area are permitted to cut wood for their own use, fire wood etc?

MR. ROWE: F.W. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea of what the national park policy is in respect of local inhabitants, there may be some concession, I do not know. I might say there was another concession

another concession as well. And incidentally all these delays,

MR.BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question? I can say this Don. Spracklin or L.D. Spracklin & Bros. in Charlottetown do cut logs. They do not cut them in the park they cut them on the Terra Nova Road area, towards the community of Terra Nova.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Are they allowed to be cut in the park?

MR.BARBOUR: No, Sir, not allowed to be cut in the park.

MR.ROWE: We have heard the answer anyway.

MR.BARBOUR: There was a case where they was one man cut some logs in the park and he happened to get arrested, and got four months in jail and I had to see the Attorney General, and I had to get him out again, through the Attorney General. I got him out again, I got him out, I got him out.

MR.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, there were other concessions as well that we obtained. For example the original park area is designed in such a way that the park authorities would have to build only ,I think it was something like ten miles of highway through the park. Ten miles of highway. In other words the park would be responsible for ten miles of Trans-Canada Highway. We negotiated and argued and insisted and finally got, and finally got again this concession. A concession where the boundaries of the park were changed in such a way that Ottawa built, I think it was whatever the distance is the Trans-Canada is through the park, I think it is twenty-five, or twenty-six, twenty-five miles, instead of ten miles. And another concession that was not there to begin with, and that if we had accepted Ottawa's terms we would never have gotten in a thousand years. And yet Mr. Speaker, we have the member for St. John's West - I do not know why he left whether he could not stand it or whether he got tired of it - oh, he is over here, he can hear me fine - and yet Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's West said this: Here are his exact words, he said: "Who are we to lay down conditions, who are we?" I do not know who we are, all I know is that we laid down conditions, and we got it and every condition we laid down every condition we laid down it caused a delay." But it was for the long-term benefit of Newfoundland. Is there any man, is there any member in this House today who would say that those

conditions that we laid down excluding the power rights for example, on the Terra Nova River. Elongating the park for twenty-five miles instead of ten miles of beautiful highway through it. Getting the right to take 25,000 cords of wood out of it. Making sure that there was no mineral deposit there, economic mineral deposit there, and incidentally preserving some of these communities. The communities where the Spracklins live, Charlottetown and the other communities in that area, preserving them. When some of the officials said these communities had to go, what relevance has that got Mr. Speaker. Well I will say what relevance it has. The point I want to say is this; and emphasize it: That when the hon. member for St. John's West says, we cannot lay down the condition we have no business in effect it will be blackmailing Ottawa, he is one hundred per cent wrong on it, he is one hundred, and history shows he is wrong. Our record, our negotiations and the results of these negotiations with respect to Terra Nova National Park alone, these show that he was wrong. Our negotiations with the Trans-Canada Highway show that he was wrong. He was completely wrong. Well they were not frightened they did it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the minister is right in his assertions here. The Government did lay down conditions for the Terra Nova Park. Were they so far-sighted or was it because of lack of interest that they did not insure that there was a golf course, and a swimming pool and other facilities provided there?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to leave the impression, I do not know, I do not remember all the details that came out afterwards and to start off with it must be remembered that in providing a National Park there is no obligation certainly at that time. There was no obligation on the part of Ottawa to put a swimming pool in there or a golf course, I think they should have put them in there. I will deal with that later. I plan to deal with swimming in the waters of Bonne Bay that my hon. friend up there is advocating from St. John's West. The only thing I can say on that Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West has never swam in the waters of Bonne Bay as at least two hon. members, three hon. members I know in this House has done and - I plan to deal with that very point later on Mr. Speaker.

What was some of the original suggestions made about that West Coast Park? Well to start off with this suggestion was made by certain people certain responsible people that we would segregate 1500 square miles, to start off with. And this would be a great wilderness area, and this would be, people could go in there that is about all. You would be allowed to go in there that is all, go in, take a look and watch out and you might in ten years see an arctic hare you might if you looked around long enough. Or you might even see a caribou or you might see a weasel. But this was the original proposal. And in order to do that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You do not have to go that far to see a weasel.

MR. ROWE: In order to do that Mr. Speaker, in order to do that we would be relinquishing all rights to fifteen hundred square miles. That is what it amounts to. Just the right to go in there. We would have the right to look Mr. Speaker, as far as the Newfoundland people are concerned we do not need to segregate 1500 square miles over there in Bonne Bay area, or on the Northern Peninsula to have wilderness areas, to go in to see weasels or ever perhaps arctic hares. You do not see many on this side I know. WE do not need that. This was essentially this proposition is essentially something that would not benefit in itself the people of Newfoundland to any great extent, but it would be to their detriment because it would lock up resources. N

Now I want to say this again. I have gone through perhaps more than most any member in this House. I have spend more time in Trout River Gulch I am familiar with that area. I do not believe that there is a single part there is no part of North America which is so unique. In other words there is nothing else like it. And I would like to see that preserved. Of course it is a park. It should be part of a park, but I also know Mr. Speaker, that from between the great Table Land there and going south towards Bay of Islands in other words the Cape Gregory plateau there, high land, most of it 2000 feet, a great plateau that I suppose not one thousand people in the history of the world have ever put a foot on, no more than that. That great plateau, Cape Gregory plateau, I know also what Dr. A. K. Snelgrove told me and in case

any of the younger members are not aware who he is, he is one of the most eminent geologists in the world. The head, a great geologist, the head of the great mining school at Michigan University. The former professor of geology at Princeton University. A man who, one of the two or three who knew most about Newfoundland for many many years a Newfoundland government geologist. He would get leave from Princeton and come to Newfoundland and spend his summers here. I know one of the first areas of exploration was that great Cape Gregory plateau. And I know what he told me about it. He told me that if that great plateau does not have economic minerals he said I do not know what I am talking about. And as a matter of fact we came within, almost within an ace of having a mine up there. There was a very considerable development up on that plateau. I think the name of the company was Independent Mining, it was not Independent, it is immaterial Mr. Speaker, and this is a serious matter it is not a joke. This was, they were up there and spent a lot of money and the chief promoter of it I think his name was Penman, I am speaking now, this was back in about 1952 or 1953. I think the chief promoter was Penman. They had an establishment up there. They ploughed an awful lot of money into it. And he was very optimistic about it. The fact of the matter is he had a breakdown in his health and he died shortly afterwards and the thing collapsed. And so as often happens when the chief promoter gets out of the picture. And it collapses.

Mr. Speaker, it is almost six of the clock. I wonder if I could move the adjournment of this debate please?

MR.SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this debate be adjourned.

MR.CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day be transferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Thursday May 14 at 10.30 a.m. and that the House do now adjourn.

MR.SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow Thursday May 14, 1970 at 10.30 a.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

MR.SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until Thursday at 10.30 a.m. May 14, 1970.