



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 33

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1976

SPEAKER; THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a short up-to-date report on the CFLCo negotiations which I am sure is of interest to all members. The conciliation officer, Mr. Noseworthy, met with both parties individually on Wednesday. There was a joint meeting of the parties yesterday morning. The meetings are still ongoing. They went all through yesterday and last night and will continue on through the weekend, if necessary, until such time as the dispute has been settled or otherwise. I will attempt to keep the House up-to-date as to the progress of the negotiations as they go along. I am informed by the conciliation officer that the meetings have been going very smoothly up to this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I advise the House of the death of Mr. John J. Deutsch who was a very prominent figure in Canadian academic and government circles. He was at one time an assistant Deputy Minister of the Department of Finance of Canada. He was also president of the Economic Council in Canada. He then became principal of Queen's University for a number of years, and in that connection he has been of great assistance to our own Memorial University of Newfoundland, which has a very close relationship with Queen's University, and helped our own university to develop many university programmes. As a result he was awarded an honorary degree by Memorial University, I think it was the year before last.

Mr. Deutsch also had some connection with Newfoundland due to the fact that he was a member of the royal commission that was appointed in 1957, I believe it was, to investigate or to report on the terms of union, in connection with Term 29 of the terms of union. The Chairman of that royal commission was Mr. McNair, and as a result

MR. CROSBIE:

the commission recommended that Newfoundland be paid \$8 million a year in perpetuity. As the House will remember that was changed by the then government of Canada and after some public discussion of the issue they reinstated it and we are still receiving the said \$8 million a year. I am sure that all members of the House will join me in forwarding the usual resolution to Mrs. Deutsch at our sorrow at his death.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I join with the Minister of Mines and Resources in an expression of regret over the death of Professor John Deutsch. I knew him very well indeed. We were personal friends for a good many years. The last time I met him was when he was president of Queen's University and I gave a lecture at the university and he was the chairman of that meeting. Then after the meeting we had a little social get together, he and some professors of the university, in his home.

Professor Deutsch, as the minister says, was one of the three members of the royal commission appointed by the government of Canada to make an award, to make a recommendation, under Term 29 of the terms of union of Newfoundland and Canada. The recommendation made by that royal commission headed by Mr. Justice McNair, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and Sir Albert Walsh, was \$8 million a year. That figure was one of the most bitter disappointments that Newfoundlanders experienced after we became a Province of Canada. Of course, bad as that disappointment was, great as it was, it was nothing at all compared with the bitter disappointment we felt in Newfoundland, everybody felt, over the decision of the government of the day of Ottawa to fix a time limit on the payment of the inadequate and unsatisfactory amount of \$8 million. That again subsequently was changed, as the minister says, by a succeeding government which, though it did not increase the amount above the \$8 million stated, did at any rate eliminate the time limitation on it. So that my

MR. SMALLWOOD: hon. friend, the Premier of the Province, today is still receiving that \$8 million a year recommended by Professor Deutsch and the other two members of that Royal Commission. I join with the Minister of Mines and Energy in an expression of regret in support of the resolution that he has moved.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, today I rise on a pleasant note. It is a very difficult position to be in, physically and literally in the House right now, to be passing on tributes to one of my colleagues who happens to be sitting right next to me.

Just a few weeks ago I had the honour as Premier to congratulate the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who was appointed to a very distinguished office in the Anglican Church, and today it is a great honour to equally congratulate the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) who is being named Chancellor of the Diocese of Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador by Archbishop Seaborn.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Kilbride has been active in public life, in public service in the community for a long while. And I know I speak on behalf of all of us when I offer him sincerest congratulations on his new appointment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I know that every hon. member of the House, those present and those momentarily absent, and those momentarily absent I think, perhaps, I might be bold enough to speak for - I am not sure that they would appreciate my speaking for them - but I am sure that every hon. member of the House feels a glow of satisfaction over the appointment of the hon. gentleman, the House Leader for the government, the hon. member for Kilbride, on his appointment as Chancellor of the Diocese, Chancellor, I think, to the Lord Bishop. We had another hon. member the other day whose appointment as Chancellor of the Central Diocese was announced.

We are getting to be very lucky and very fortunate in this House and I am sure now that the effect will be seen rapidly here in the good behaviour of all of us.

MR. NEARY: If we get the Our Father through now -

MR. SMALLWOOD: With two chancellors present we need only a bishop. If we had a bishop here, But I think that in view of the fact that the two chancellors are sitting on that side of the House, it is only right that the bishop should be on this side.

I join with the hon. the Premier in congratulating the hon. gentleman. It is a great honour, and it is an honour to this House, too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Further statements by ministers, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform the House that I met this morning with Mr. Donald Delaporte, who is the President of BRINCO and BRINEX, and Dr. Peter Grimley, who is the chief geologist, and Mr. Peters who is their legal authority in connection with their interest in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and particular to discuss their plans with reference to the Michelin and Kitts uranium deposits in Labrador.

The position on these deposits, of course, is that they are very promising and with the increased price of uranium over the last several years - uranium is now approaching a very good price - that things look promising for the development of that mine, but they plan to start their final feasibility study now and within the next six months, most likely sooner than that, but certainly within the next six months their final feasibility study will be completed and they will then make a decision on whether or not they are proceeding with the development of the uranium deposits at Michelin -

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is Monkey Hill?

MR. CROSBIE: - Michelin and Kitts deposits -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Same as Monkey Hill?

MR. CROSBIE: - right - near Makkovik and Postville. The people in those communities, Mr. Speaker, are anxious to find out just what is planned

Mr. COSBIE: in connection with the development, and I have assured them there is certainly no problem with BRINCO and BRINNEX, that they will be fully informed as to what is planned if the development goes ahead. And as a matter of fact Dr. Grimley and several of his associates and my executive assistant, Ross Reid, are going to Labrador tomorrow, and they are going to, weather permitting, visit Makkovik and Postville so that the local people or their representatives will have a chance to talk to them about what developments are likely to occur once a final decision is made to go ahead with that mine, or with

those mines. In addition, Mr. Speaker, the government has set up an interdepartmental committee. The Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Industrial Development are jointly heading the committee so that BRINEX will be able to co-ordinate their activities with government. Other departments involved are the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, Department of the Environment, the Wildlife branch of the Department of Tourism, so that there will be co-ordinating mechanism within the government to deal with the development there and all the matters that must be considered when it goes ahead, as I am sure that it will. As I say, the people of those two communities will certainly be kept informed as we learn more about what is planned and they will be able to have an input or give their views or opinions on how things should be done in the planning stage. So, as I say, there is no final decision yet. The final feasibility report is now underway and before the year is out there will be a final decision. I have no doubt myself that this development will be underway before the end of the year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the ministerial statement I am extremely pleased to hear from the Minister of Mines and Energy that this feasibility study is now underway with respect to the uranium deposits in the Michelin-Kitt mine area, which I believe, as mentioned by the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), is in the vicinity of Monkey Hill which is close to Makkovik.

Sir, I had the honour and the pleasure of working with BRINCO back in the late 1950's on geological surveys in that very area. There was no doubt in anybody's mind at that time that there is an abundant amount of uranium deposits in that particular area. The problem was, of course, is that it is peppered rather than nice good solid deposits. It was just a matter of time, of waiting for world conditions to change and make this economically feasible to develop. I am pleased with the minister's statement but I would like re-emphasize, and the minister himself did point this out, that this is not an announcement of a development, but

MR. F. ROWE:

instead it is an announcement of a final feasibility study being underway. I would not want the people of Newfoundland and Labrador's expectations to be raised in thinking that this may be an announcement of the actual development. I and I am sure all of my colleagues certainly hope indeed that we will have development of that particular mine. I knew this gentleman Kitts very well myself. He was sort of a prospector, a private prospector in his own right. He was hired by BRINCO and he just simply headed off into the bush and he discovered this deposit on his own.

I am pleased also, Sir, that the minister is planning to have meetings with the people in the area in order to explain the situation to them with respect to, of course, development, industrial or mining development and in the environmental effects and this sort of a thing. I think it is very important that people in the immediate area be very well informed of any developments in the area so that we do not have falsely raised expectations in case we in fact do not have development, because the thing will not be economically feasible within the near future.

Sir, I certainly hope that we will see within the very near future the uranium deposits in Labrador becoming economically feasible to deliver to the various markets of the world.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to me fell the great honour and pleasure of announcing in the first place the discovery of the uranium field in the vicinity of Monkey Hill inside of Makkovik.

Mr. Smallwood.

The discovery there was not just that of a deposit, or even as the hon. gentleman who just spoke says, a series of small deposits. Actually it was the discovery of what is known as a uranium - is it the word, field? Region? There is a word, a technical word.

MR. ROBERTS: I think it is belt.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not belt.

MR. CROSBIE: Field.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it is field, a uranium field, which means a stretch of territory, in this case running about fifty miles in length, that for a distance of fifty miles there is a whole succession of deposits of uranium. The reason, by the way, the reason they did not go ahead with the development of the uranium at that time was quite simple but insuperable. There was no way to get over it. The market closed off, and they did not quite get under the line. They had not proved enough tonnage at that point when the closing date came for new contracts, and so they had to wait until the expiration of those contracts, which is somewhere - it has either already happened or is about to happen, and provided now they can get the final proof that the minister mentioned. Like him I agree that there be really nothing to stop their going ahead with the new round - I think the word is round - there was a round of contracts made - what would that be ten years ago? I think covering eight years ago - covering a period of eight years and that has now expired or is about to expire and a new round will come in and, please God, the Monkey Hill area will share in it. And it will be a wonderful thing indeed for Newfoundland to become an important producer of uranium because as Brinco and Brinex put it to me at the time, this was probably one of the biggest uranium fields - I think the word is field - known anywhere in North America, which would make it, of course, a terribly important asset for this Province.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of a group of residents of Rodney Street in St. John's. The prayer of the petition, Sir, is: - "We the undersigned wish to protest vigorously the new rate increases that are being applied by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company." The prayer of the petition, Sir, is self-explanatory. I wish to have it placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates, and the petition is signed, Sir, on behalf of five residents of Rodney Street.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the matters transacted by the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations during 1975 and the provisions of the Labour Relations Act, the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, and the Newfoundland Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act. Under the same cover is the report of the Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for the year 1975, and the report of the Minimum Wage Board for 1975.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies of the Automobile Dealers Amendment Regulations, 1976.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I think at this time I should inform the House that we are ready on this side, as I undertook earlier this week, to begin the Come By Chance debate, and if it is the pleasure of the House, and if there is unanimous consent, then we would begin the debate today. If there is not then, of course, I would simply give notice and have the resolution put on the Order Paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would infinitely prefer that the debate on the Come By Chance situation not proceed today. And I hope the government can accommodate the House in that regard and put it off until one day next week. It is not going to make that much difference now at this stage-

MR. NEARY: They are not going to restore it now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - as to whether the debate is begun today, and I suppose it will last a day or two or maybe longer or held next week.

MR. WELLS: Well that is the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: In case there is any confusion with respect to what party or what opposition, I would like to go on record as having granted consent on behalf of my colleagues to debate this today.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before I agree or disagree, I wonder if the member could tell us if this debate, if it goes ahead today, would it restore the jobs at Come By Chance? If so, then we could proceed with the debate today.

MR. MURPHY: No, nor would it create any more oil refineries.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, in the circumstances then I take it that I should now give notice, which I will do, and put this resolution on the Order Paper. Is it necessary for me to read the resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes. Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it.

MR. WELLS: Whereas the Oil Refinery at Come By Chance, being a private undertaking has been declared bankrupt and is in the process of being closed; And Whereas the debt owed by the refinery to the Government of Newfoundland is approximately \$41,000,000.00, And Whereas the closure of the refinery has had a serious effect upon employment in the Come By Chance area and it is desirable that the people of the Province have the fullest knowledge of past events and future prospects for the refinery; Therefore be it resolved that this House debate the closing of the refinery so that Government may have the opinions and assistance of Honourable Members, in its efforts to bring about its reopening.

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A point of order has been raised.

MR. J. CARTER: It is my impression that unanimous consent for this debate today has not been withheld, I would like for that to be made absolutely certain before it is decided that this debate cannot go ahead today.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, in cases such as this if there is consent then of course it is with clear consent. Where there is any doubt I think it would have to be taken that there was not consent. I think it would be improper to assume from the hon. gentleman's remarks that he was consenting, but of course he himself could say so at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not want to be - I am afraid I cannot assent, to put it formally and officially. I would infinitely prefer that the debate - and I want to take part in the debate, obviously. It is pretty obvious. It's my baby. The baby is dead. I would like to talk about my dead baby, but I do not want to do it today.

MR. WELLS: You know, I think that clears up the matter, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I will take this notice of motion under advisement and will rule on its acceptability at a later date.

Further notice of motion.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Keeping Of Dogs". (Bill No.7).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not another Dog Act!

MR. NEARY: Are you going to licence everybody on that side of the House?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Everybody on that side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the dogs -

MR. DOODY: Rabies shots all 'round.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can the dogs read it?

MR. ROUSSEAU: As long as they keep away from my sheep.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, if he is in a position at this moment to tell us whether or not the tunnel underneath the Strait of Belle Isle is going to go ahead this year or not or is it going to be postponed? Can the minister make a definite statement at this time?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I answered a question similar to that four or five days ago, and there has been no change since then. If there is any change the House will be informed.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary: Would the minister indicate if there will be any change because the people in the area are anxious to find out if the work is going to go ahead this year? They are in suspense. Would the minister put them out of their misery? It is either going to go ahead or it is not going to go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) out of his misery, but I cannot.

MR. NEARY: Do not be nasty now.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. I wonder would he indicate whether he is aware of any proposed layoff on the Gull Island project this Summer, and if so how many jobs might be involved there?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: It is difficult to understand that question. Do I know of any layoffs on the Gull Island project this Summer?

MR. SIMMONS: The proposed layoff for this Summer.

MR. CROSBIE: The Gull Island project has not even gotten underway, Mr. Speaker. How could there be layoffs for this Summer. I am not aware of any layoff plan for the coming Summer. This is March and the Summer is three or four months away yet. So I certainly know of

Mr. Crosbie.

no layoffs planned. The work that is underway now, Mr. Speaker, is the work of planning and preparation for the work that will go ahead later this year, if the transmission line and the tunnel are continued. In the meantime there is certainly going to be employment in connection with the transmission line from the Churchill Falls down to Goose Bay, and that work will be carried on. That work is committed, and that work will go ahead. The cost is some \$20 million so that hydro power will be available in Goose Bay. As to the whole project, the situation is that our plans are still the same as announced last December, or at the end of November. There is a meeting coming up, as the Premier has already stated, with Mr. Bourassa on Monday. This will certainly have some bearing on whether there is going to be any change in that position or not.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary? The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the President of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, Mr. Groom, made a statement in February to the effect that seventy more people would be laid off this Summer, people presently engaged on the Gull Island development. Is the minister now denying the truth of that statement made by Mr. Groom?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any such statement made by Mr. Groom. Now if the hon. gentleman did me the courtesy of sending over to me the date and the place and the occasion, and the statement that Mr. Groom is supposed to have made, then I would be more than pleased to check it out and see just what he said, or whether he said it or not, or what he meant when he said it. We have a Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro organization. They have their own board. They are not run as a department of government. I am not familiar with

Mr. Crosbie.

the minutiae of what happens there. That is the whole point of having them as a Crown corporation so that they are not under the heel or the eye of a minister day by day. But if the hon. gentleman does that, I will certainly check it out for him and tell him later what all that means.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary! The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Mr. Speaker, this is not a detail. These are seventy jobs. I wonder would the minister undertake to determine whether there will be such layoffs this Summer?

MR. MURPHY: How do you know it is a statement? It might be a rumour.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman does what I just asked him a minute ago to do, when he sends me over a note, or tells me on what occasion the statement was made, what the statement was and so on so I can identify it and what was said, then I have already said that I will check into that and let him know and let the House know. So I cannot do any more than that.

MR. SIMMONS: Fair enough, I will give you the statement.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Education, Sir, indicate to the House if he is getting any complaints from employers and business people in this Province about the attitudes of graduates of our university and colleges, vocational schools and high schools and so forth? And if so would the minister indicate if he intends to canvass employers in the Province to find out how these attitudes can be changed, and if our young men and women are being trained in the right trades to find employment in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Education.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any complaints from employers generally. As I mentioned, I think, in answer to another question today, I hear general comments by various groups across the Province, and I think one was the Chamber of Commerce and that was not necessarily in Newfoundland. I think that was a general Canadian thing, and they

MR. HOUSE:

were referring specifically to what they called the illiterate graduate, but that is, as I say, a national thing, and we have not been dealing with it generally from that point of view, but only in the view of trying to continue to improve education.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister for his answer, Sir. A supplementary question. Would the minister indicate to the House if he has any plans to do an independent, impartial study by a non-academic of our whole post-secondary education system in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MP. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a similar question the other day, the answer is no, we have no plans for that. And I stated at that time, I think, it would be sort of presumptuous to have a non-academic to do a study of an education system.

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer, Sir, and I wish to debate the matter next Thursday afternoon.

I wonder, Sir, if the Government House Leader could give us an up-to-date report on the Come By Chance Task Force that was established to look into assistance for workers, especially mortgages on houses and that sort of thing? Has the Task Force reported yet? If so, would the minister give us the details of the report?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MP. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it is too early yet to give the details of the report. The Task Force has been working continuously since it was set up. It has made a preliminary report. It has been sent back again to get further information and I should hope by Wednesday or Thursday of this coming week the position will be able to be announced on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the acting Minister of Public Works. It relates to the Engineering and Applied Sciences Building at Memorial. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House whether there has been some problem with the slab on grade, the quality of the work performed there, whether he can indicate whether there has been some problem, whether the stories we are hearing about the work not being according to the drawings and specs is true? Would he confirm whether there is such a problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The acting Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I will have to take that question as notice, really. The hon. member is certain that it is the Engineering Building and not the Health Sciences Complex - is that correct?

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the Engineering and Applied Sciences Building. It is my understanding that there has been some problem in relation to the performance of the work by the slab on grade contractor, the company who performed the work on the floor in the building.

MR. NEARY: The Health Science Complex?

MR. SIMMONS: The Engineering and Applied Sciences Building not the -

MR. NEARY: Not the Health Sciences Complex?

MR. SIMMONS: No, no.

I also understand, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the minister that an investigation, a formal investigation, may well have been launched. I wonder would he undertake to find out the information for the House?

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all I can assure the hon. member that if anything is wrong the department certainly will check it out. I do not know the details but I will take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this is a question directed to the Minister of Mines and Energy and relates to the recruitment of people from across Canada and other parts of the world by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. I wonder if the minister could indicate whether or not in the correspondence in an effort to recruit people into Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, whether it was indicated to these people that the Gull Island site would not get underway for at least three years?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what was indicated in the correspondence. I mean the position on Gull Island is as I explained it in the House last November or early December. That is that work on the Gull hydro site is postponed at least a year and possibly longer, so therefore it may well be wise to say it might not proceed for three years. And the transmission lines and the tunnel we intend to carry on this year. That is our intention. Whether we can carry out our intention I will be informing the House

MR. CROSBIE:

about as soon as I can in the next three or four weeks. It is our intention. If we cannot do it for certain reasons which will become obvious if the statement has to be made, then the statement will be made at that time. The work on the hydro site at Gull Island is certainly postponed a year and it may well be three years.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Sir, I have good reason to believe that it has been indicated to potential recruits for Newfoundland Hydro, so therefore I would ask the minister if he would undertake to table any such letters, because the letters are far different from the policy statement that the minister has made in this House with respect to the start up of the Gull Island site.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to undertake to file any such letters. If there have been letters sent from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to prospective employees, well that is their business. I am certainly not going to table them. We are responsible for the policy of the government. I am responsible as the Minister of Mines and Energy for the policy of the government in relation to Mines and Energy. I have told the

MR. CROSBIE: House what our policy is. That is our policy, and no one in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will change it. But if they are trying to recruit people and they want to inform them that the Gull hydro site may not go ahead for a year to three years they are quite correct in doing that. But I am not going to table recruitment letters in the House.

MR. ROWE: Well is it one or three years? The minister said -

MR. CROSBIE: I had said at least one, Mr. Speaker, possibly three years, possibly five, possibly ten. We do not know. How can we tell? But it will be done when it is humanly, physically, and financially possible for this Province to do. But the Gull hydro site is delayed at least one year, and likely longer than a year.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The Acting Minister of Public Works and Services, Sir; I want to jog his memory, is he aware that he promised to get me certain information in connection with Scrivener project managers over at Memorial University, the Health Science Complex, especially in relation to peddling, selling government contracts like you sell a can of beans? Has the minister got the information now for the House on whether the project managers have changed or not?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I undertook no such thing. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) posed a question to me earlier this week. I felt that I answered the question in detail and accurately and I will do it once more to ensure that the hon. member understands what I said three or four days ago.

Number one: that Scrivener Newfoundland, or the receiver acting on their behalf, cannot sell the contract for management on the site of the Health Sciences Complex unless government agrees immediately when the contract is sold. The receiver, outside of government, who has

MR. ROUSSEAU: nothing to do with government, he is appointed as a receiver, decides to sell the shares of the company, then he certainly may do so. That is outside the government jurisdiction. However within the contract we have with Scrivener we have a three month period in which we can say yes or no to the person to whom the shares are sold.

Now I answered that a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, and the receiver is now, I presume, negotiating with various companies and if he wants to sell the shares, or if he proposes to sell the contract, then he will have to seek the approval of government.

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker, Sir, has the minister received any communications, then, in writing from the receivers, or from Scrivener Products Newfoundland Limited in connection with the transfer of either the shares or the contract to another company?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the department has.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to table the correspondence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, Mr. Speaker, the minister will not undertake to, because, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a job here of pretty big proportions, and I have issued orders to the departmental employees who are involved in looking at this proposal from the receiver to ensure that under no circumstances, and whatever advice I get, it is iron-clad, it is salted, there is no question as to any questions I will not be able to answer, and if it will take them a week, two weeks, five months, if it has to, I do not care how long, until we are certain that whatever is done is going to be the best and the lowest possible cost to this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: In the interest of economy, is the minister, or the government, the minister's department, thinking about taking over the project and

MR. NEARY: finishing the project themselves rather than lash out these gigantic amounts of money for employees of Scrivener or anybody else?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely, humanly impossible for the Department of Public Works to do that. We have two very fine -

MR. NEARY: Hire the staff if you have not got them.

MR. ROUSSEAU: - distinguished and energetic engineers down there, Mr. Tom Bursey, who is the Assistant Deputy Minister of Technical Service, and Ross Brophy, the Construction Engineer, two very fine gentlemen, who I might say are doing a great service to this Province, and both of them are down there trying to handle all the construction work in the Civil Service and -

MR. NEARY: Well, hire staff if you need them on a contractual basis.

MR. ROUSSEAU: What is the difference between hiring the staff and having somebody over there to do the job? It is the same thing we are hiring under management control.

MR. NEARY: We are paying \$250 a day for some of these flunkies over there. That is what you are paying them.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism. Will the hon. minister consider bringing the Norma and Gladys back from Spain, equip her and fit her with a lot of photographs and sail her up through the Great Lakes to protest against the Greenpeace and the Davies' outfit who are out trying to interfere with our seal fishery? Spread it across Canada and a good way to do it is do it with the Norma and Gladys.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, a very interesting proposition. I can inform

March 19, 1976

Tape No. 1298

NM - 4

MP. HICKEY: my hon. friend there is already plans underway to take care of the Greenpeace Organization and Mr. Davies with regards to adverse publicity being given the Province.

I suggest that the first place that we start a new PP programme and a new approach is right in this House by hon. gentlemen who sit here. We

MR. HICKEY: sometimes, all of us, do nothing to improve the image of the Province, maybe by our own actions. I might suggest to the hon. gentleman that to bring the vessel back home would indeed forfeit any benefits that would come to the Province in relation to the 200 mile limit. Surely the hon. gentleman, a former minister of Fisheries, and one who is well-aware and well-versed in the importance of that industry to the Province, would not want to do anything to slow down the progress which apparently is being made, whether it be by negotiated agreements or bilateral agreements or eventually unilateral action which the federal government will take.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, there appears to be some misunderstanding abroad, and, of course, that is not surprising with the way some people have played and toyed with this project. There seems to be a misunderstanding that this vessel is in Europe promoting Newfoundland from the point of view of tourism. If that message is abroad nothing could be more further from the truth. The vessel, indeed, once it went to Europe took on a different role altogether in terms of tourism. We are not promoting the Province from a tourism point of view in Europe, we are co-operating with a very worthwhile project which is headed up and mostly financed by the Department of External Affairs in relation to bilateral agreements and/or the establishment of the 200 mile limit.

DR. FARRELL: Hear, hear!

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WINSOR: Could the minister inform the House in which way is this being done on board the Norma and Gladys? Do you have a special P.R. man or a special man to present Newfoundland's case in every port the vessel calls? Or is it done through receptions? Which way is it done? We do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: He is very subtle, my colleague, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my hon. friend - because I find that there is not an hon. gentleman in the House who is more co-operative and more decent in his debate, but not so much in relation to him but in relation to his party - I would suggest that it just goes to prove that what has been said about this project from start to finish was just dismissed in a frivolous way and no attention paid to it. Because, Mr. Speaker, from the beginning -

MR. F.B. ROWE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, point of order!

Mr. Speaker, the minister certainly is not answering questions.

MR. HICKEY: What is the point of order?

MR. F.B. ROWE: The point of order is that the minister is not answering the question put to him by my colleague -

MR. HICKEY: Then give me an opportunity.

MR. F.B. ROWE: - but instead is taking -

MR. YOUNG: He does not have to answer it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: You are absolutely right, the hon. the minister does not have to answer, but he should not seize the opportunity to attack the Liberal Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F.B. ROWE: - which he is presently doing and that is the point of order.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there was no point of order as Your Honour, I am sure, will agree. I was simply alluding to the answer in a more direct way to the question by pointing out that it is quite obvious to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

In asking a question and similarly in answering a question there should be only such preamble as will make the question asked, or the question answered, intelligible. I would presume that hon. members will proceed along that line.

The hon. the Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly what I was doing because my answer will be much more intelligible by that

MR. HICKEY: preamble which I engaged in. Now let me give the direct answer. Right from the start of the project of the Norma and Gladys details were given with regards to the exhibit which is in the main hold of that vessel, even to the extent, Mr. Speaker, in terms of cost and discription of the exhibit which cost the federal government \$65,000 and which shows from start to finish what has happened to the fishery, what has happened to the marine life in terms of pollution, the need for conservation, the need for control through the 200 mile limit. There is an excellent exhibit, Mr. Speaker, and that is the main thrust of sending the vessel outside this Province under the finances of the federal government. That is the main and only reason the federal government became involved in the project from a financial point of view.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the minister tell the House if there is any foundation at all to reports that there may be a reactivation of the coal fields in the Southwestern part of Newfoundland, especially in the St. George's area and down the Codroy Valley, due to the use of new technology and the price of oil and so on? Is there any possibility that these coal reserves will now be reactivated?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, anything is possible, of course, but I do not think that is likely or probable, and I certainly have not heard of it. The coal deposits in St. George's on the West Coast are not such as are even attractive with today's coal prices or today's situation with respect to the fuel. So I have heard nothing new in the area of these coal deposits being developed. Unfortunately, it is not the kind of deposit that is readily available to economic utilization even with the better coal prices of these days. So there is nothing new on that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker would the minister tell the House, Sir, if -

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please! Is this a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): I recognize the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: The Burgeo bird dog.

MR. SIMMONS: I am not wanting to get into any area which may be before the courts at all. I am aware that certain matters involving - certain implications of my question involve the court proceedings which have recently taken place, and I am not wanting to delve into that, but I would like for the minister to bring us up-to-date on the investigation insofar as he is able with respect to the fire that occurred and also the alleged gear scandal, if I may call it such. Would the minister bring us up-to-date on these matters?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Maybe the question should more appropriately be directed to the Minister of Justice, but I can tell the hon. member in the House, Mr. Speaker, that the investigation is continuing by the RCMP and by the Newfoundland Constabulary, and certainly, for my part, I am anxious to have the thing brought to a head, but if the member wants any further information maybe he should direct the question to my colleague, the Minister of Justice.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a supplementary to the Minister of Justice, Sir. A supplementary has to go to the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: No, it does not.

MR. NEARY: That is a new question, Sir.

MR. W. CARTER: No, it does not.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no, no, no!

MR. SIMMONS: I will rely on Mr. Speaker for a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

If the question put is on the same subject matter and eliciting further information on the same subject matter and in the same line as the original question, I think the Chair would regard it as a supplementary no matter to whom it is addressed.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the Minister of Justice, a supplementary on this same point. I wonder could the minister indicate whether any charges are about to be laid in respect to either the gear programme or the fire in the building, the Viking Building?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, it would be highly improper, most inappropriate for me to answer that question.

MR. CROSBIE: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A supplementary - the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: I believe the minister knows what it is we are trying to get at:

MR. HICKMAN: I know what you are trying to get at.

MR. CROSBIE: We are trying to get at it, too.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as members of the House, we would like to have some indication of where this investigation is going and

Mr. Simmons.

whether arson has been established? Can the minister indicate that, or whether that part of the investigation has been completed to his satisfaction?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, th hon. gentleman knows that I cannot and should not and will not answer that kind of a question.

MR. MURPHY: How would he know?

MR. HICKMAN: There is an investigation ongoing. It is in the hands of the police. It is a matter of policy and prudence that I never interfere with a police investigation.

MR. CROSBIE: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKMAN: And when the police complete any investigation they seek the advice of the Director of Public Prosecutions and/or a Crown Prosecutor as to whether charges should be laid, and there should never, in my opinion, be public discussion on an investigation because that obviously may prejudice the rights of persons who may come before the court at a later date.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Sit down, 'Roger'!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please! Order, please!

The minister has indicated that he has no further information to give the House on this question, so I think we will not entertain further supplementaries.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir. Would the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House whether or not there is a possibility, or if there is any foundation to the rumours, the reports that a United States conglomerate are interesting in developing the Julienne Lake iron ore deposits?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there have been

Mr. Crosbie:

a number of, I do not know if they are conglomerates, but there have been at least several companies or corporations who have expressed an interest in having a look at the Julienne Lake deposits, but there has been no agreement reached by the government with any of them. There is considerably more information needed on the Julienne deposits as to the extent of the ore there and the quality of it, on that kind of work. So their interest has been expressed by several groups, in fact, I saw them in the papers recently and in some documents that a group that has been in the news recently claim they were going to develop it, which is the first I have heard of it.

MR. NEARY: You know to whom I am referring.

MR. CROSBIE: You are referring to Mr. Shaheen and Ataka? I think that is fallen by the wayside, but anyway it was the first the government heard of it. You know, there is nothing that can be reported. There are several groups interested but nothing - they will have to -

MR. NEARY: Are there active negotiations going on at the moment?

MR. CROSBIE: If you said active, you know, every few weeks, but not active in any sense that anything is imminent.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I think when hon. member's try to ask a question they should rise and await a moment to be recognized, because otherwise it gets rather confusing.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General's Report, page 91, refers to some advertising expenditures totalling \$43,000 which were done without a written contract.

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is not a question, this is the hon. gentleman reciting something that is in the Auditor General's Report.

MR. SIMMONS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The rules allow me to preamble briefly, just as the Minister of Tourism was allowed to preamble briefly a moment ago.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

I think the rules are clear on that point. They do state that to make a question intelligible a brief remark may go beforehand, but it should be as brief as possible, and directly aimed at making the question intelligible.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I submit it was brief. It was one sentence long as follows; the Auditor General's Report makes reference on page 91 to an expenditure, without any written contract, of \$43,000. I put this question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture a few days ago and he undertook to find the answer for me. I wonder would he now indicate what has been done about this matter, and in particular give us some explanation as to why this \$43,000 expenditure was incurred without any written contract?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I undertook to get an answer for the hon. member but unfortunately he was absent for the next few days, and I just happen to have the answer right here. He did not even phone me and tell me, but asked me.

With respect to the item raised in the Auditor General's Report, page 91, item (72), it is true that no written contract was signed between government and the public relations agency, however, the kind of work undertaken was firmly agreed to and the nature of the undertaking was such that the government expenditure involved was well protected. The agency undertook to design the materials required for a set fee, plus expenses for travel accommodations etc., and this amount came to \$21,506.33. The balance of the account, about \$22,000, was in fact paid by the firm to the various provincial media at their standard rates and the company was reimbursed for these payments. The firm, Mr. Speaker, was McConnell Advertising in Montreal.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: I am sorry, 'Roger'.

MR. SIMMONS: Who is that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: McConnell Advertising in Montreal was chosen based on

Mr. Rousseau:

their experience in this type of work, and their proven ability to get the job done quickly and efficiently. Nineteen different radio stations and newspapers and television stations received payments for these programmes, and I quote: Corner Brook, The Western Star, the St. John's Daily News, the St. John's Evening Telegram, The Clarendville Packet, The Corner Brook Humber Log, the Gander Beacon, Grand Falls Advertiser, the Lewisporte Pilot, the Port aux Basques Gulf News, the Marystown-Burin Post, the St. John's Bulletin of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, the Carbonear Compass; Stephenville, Georgian; St. John's, Newfoundland Herald, This is St. John's; CJON St. John's Radio, Newfoundland, Grand Falls, Musgravetown, Gander, Baie Verte; and radio West, Corner Brook, Wabush, Stephenville, Port aux Basques, and Port au Choix.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): A supplementary.

MR. SIMMONS: The same time I directed a related question to the minister about another item on page 91, the engaging of a surveying company, which company performed an amount of work, Mr. Speaker, before the tender date had closed.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. WELLS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to rule on that question as to whether this is a supplementary or not. It appears to me to be an entirely different question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member has to be given an opportunity to indicate and show that it is indeed a supplementary question. If he is given time I am sure he will show it.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): From my understanding of the question posed as a supplementary, it was not directed to the matter germane from the first question. So I would rule it not a supplementary.

The hon. member from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me. This will be the last question.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture -

MR. ROBERTS: Is the Question Period over?

MR. NEARY: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture, Sir, why he is getting so many resignations in his department, first an Assistant Deputy Minister, now the Deputy Minister. Why are they all clearing out of the minister's department? What steps is the minister taking to bolster up his department and to try to improve the morale by replacing the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister as quickly as possible?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, number one, the Deputy Minister has not resigned as yet. He has given his notice or resignation to Norm Patrick.

MR. NEARY: It is the same thing.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, if I had two Deputy Ministers down there I would be criticized for over-spending. But nevertheless the Deputy Minister will be leaving the middle of April and he will be returning to his job from which he was seconded, the Department of Agriculture in Ontario. It is this government's intention to procure a Deputy Minister, a Newfoundlander, to replace him as soon as is humanly possible after the date, and hopefully

MR. ROUSSEAU:

before that to have him trained. The other gentleman in question is not an Assistant Deputy Minister. It is Mr. Alec McEwen who was in Crown Lands who is now in the policy area. He has resigned merely because he has a better offer of a job with the Federal Government in Ottawa. The gentleman is going. We are sorry to see both go. But certainly we are not going to stand in their way. The Deputy Minister has a certain time limit in which to make up his mind, whether he is going to return to Ontario to his job in the Ontario Government. Otherwise he may have to forfeit certain fringe benefits he has, and he has made up his mind that he wants to go back and retake his old job.

MR. NEARY: What about the morale in the department?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. McEwen is going because he has a better job in the Federal Government. So I wish them both luck. They have done a great service.

MR. DOODY: They have a better job because we cannot pay them as much.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Well we cannot pay them as much. We wish them all the luck in the world. It is doubtful that Mr. McEwen's job will be -

MR. NEARY: We could use them over at the Health Sciences Complex to save the taxpayers' money.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It is our hope that the Deputy Minister will be replaced as soon possible. Whether or not the other position will be filled I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question period now having expired, Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MILLS: Order (1), Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order (1). When the debate was adjourned the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) was addressing the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, when I stopped the last time we were on this matter I was talking about the distinctions, if any, to be drawn between the present-day Liberal Party of this Province and the present-day so-called Tory Party of this Province. I was pointing out that there was no, or if any very little noticeable difference. I intend before I conclude this present speech to take up that subject again, to take up the same subject, to continue my examination of these two parties from that point of view, and to examine the prospects, the political prospects of this Province from that point of view.

However today I will not touch on that aspect of matters and instead I propose to touch on some eight or perhaps nine other different matters. One is

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the question of offshore rights, mineral rights. The other is the patriation of the BNA Act and what is involved for Newfoundland. Another is the question of centralization or relocation of population. Another is the future of our fishing industry. Another is the policy of industrialization and economic development of the Province.

I have eight or nine such themes that I would like to touch on, then I will revert to my discussion of the philosophical, the ideological, the programme, the policy differences or absence of differences between the present-day, so-called Liberal Party and the present-day so-called Tory Party in this Province.

Now, first with regard to the rights that somebody has, that somebody ought to have, the rights in the offshore mineral deposits in the earth, in the ground, underneath the ocean. When I was in office I was keenly interested in that matter because clearly there must be very great, maybe even fantastic - even perhaps the word fabulous might with justice be used - wealth, natural wealth underneath the land, the ground, lying under the ocean, off the shore of this Island and off the shores of the whole continent of North America, the Pacific Shores, the Atlantic Shores of Mexico, Central America, of the United States, of Canada. After all, Mr. Speaker, on dry land incredible quantities of natural wealth have in fact been found and have been developed and are under development now. Think for a moment of the vast deposits of oil and natural gas lying hundreds and even thousands of feet beneath the surface of the land up and down North America.

Why should anyone suppose that when the earth was made and when the laws of nature were at work that only under the part of this continent which is now dry, which has not got the ocean covering it, only in this part of the continent will you find natural wealth underground? This would be a silly supposition. It would be a silly assumption. And indeed enough wealth, natural wealth, has been found underneath the ocean on both the Atlantic and the Pacific

MR. SMALLWOOD:

sides of the continent to prove beyond all doubt that there is great natural wealth underneath the ocean up and down the Atlantic Seaboard of this continent and the Pacific Seaboard as well.

So therefore if you are premier of a Province such as Newfoundland which has a history of 500 years running back, a history of poverty, a history of need, a history of very slow moving progress, sometimes for a whole century no progress at all, if you are premier of that kind of a province, then naturally you look for wealth. The only hope of a breakthrough, the only hope of raising the standard of living, material living,

MR. SMALLWOOD: if you leave out charity, if you leave out handouts from Ottawa, the only hope of our becoming prosperous by our own efforts is the hope that we have natural wealth. That natural wealth, whether it be under dry land or under wet land lying off the coast, is really immaterial. It is a little bit more expensive and difficult to find it lying offshore, and it is a bit more expensive and difficult to recover it when you do find it offshore. It is a lot more expensive and difficult to recover oil, natural gas lying off fifty miles or eighty miles off the Coast of Labrador, to recover that, first to find it, then to recover it than if it were underneath the surface of the dry land. But more difficult to find though it be, more difficult to recover though it be, the fact remains that Newfoundland most desperately needs to have that natural wealth as ours.

So the House will not find it a bit difficult to believe that when I was the skipper, my hand at the helm of the Ship of State, I would be eager and anxious to have for Newfoundland what wealth might have lain off our coast. Of course the question was who owned it. That was the big question. Who was the owner of it? Legally, constitutionally, not morally, there was no doubt of that. Morally we owned it. But legally and constitutionally, did we own it? And if we did not, then obviously it would be owned by our nation of which we form a part.

We took steps, I do not know if the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of the present time was at that time a member of my Cabinet, but we did take steps either before he became a minister in my Cabinet, and I believe it was before, we took steps to get the best legal and constitutional advice that we could find anywhere in North America on that question as to whether or not we might legally, lawfully, constitutionally claim and establish our claim to be the owners of any wealth that lay offshore. We got that advice. We paid for it. It was not cheap. It was somewhat expensive but we sought and we got that advice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Sir, I am not going to say what that advice was. First of all I do not think I am called on to do it. If I were the Premier at this moment and a member of the Opposition were to ask for a copy of those reports, I might be bound to give them. Not bound constitutionally, no minister is required to give any answer to a question put by any hon. member of this House. I do not know if all hon. members are aware of that fact. But ministers of the Crown are not required to answer any question, any question put to him by a member of this House. He will refuse at his peril if he refuses too often to answer. He will plant very serious suspicion in the minds, not only of the House but of the people generally. And more than once I answered a questioner in this House when I was Premier by saying that it would not be in the public interest to answer that question and perhaps if I had been asked at that time to table the legal and constitutional advice that I had received on that question my answer might very well have been, I must decline to give this answer because it would not be in the public interest to do so.

Mr. Smallwood:

Anyway whatever I might have said then I have no intention now today to discuss the advice that we were given, but I have two observations to say about it, in the first place, the action that I took has some bearing on it, and in the second place, the action that the present administration have not taken has some bearing on it. It is not without significance that going on five years after taking the oath and taking the seals of office, and becoming the government of this Province, going on five years after we do not find the present administration acting differently from the way my administration acted. Indeed we find them acting precisely the same. The present administration have not gone in court, they have not sued, they have not sought an opinion from the highest court in the land, in the Canadian land, the nation of Canada. My administration did not either.

On the contrary, what I did was to seek another kind of solution. As a matter of fact, I was appointed Chairman of the conference of four Atlantic Premiers, - the Premiers of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland. We were a special conference on this question of offshore mineral rights; that means oil, gas or any other minerals. They appointed me Chairman and we discussed it among ourselves. Of course, I insisted in those meetings that whatever might be or might not be the rights that Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island had, Newfoundland we believed, in our opinion, Newfoundland had rights in that matter that they did not have, that no other Province of Canada had, we had rights arising from the fact that we had only quite recently entered the Canadian Confederation, and that arising out of that fact of our very recent entry into the family of Provinces, we had rights which we brought in with us, that no other Province had. Now I maintained that position quite stoutly, of course.

However we agreed among the four of us, I think it was Mr. Stanfield who was the Premier of Nova Scotia; Mr. Hugh John Flemming, I think it might have been, who was the Premier of New Brunswick; and I think the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shaw?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, After Shaw and before Campbell, in between Mathison, would it be Matheson?

AN HON. MEMBER: John Matheson.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the Premier - anyway whoever he was, at the time the Premier of Prince Edward Island. It was agreed among us that I as Chairman, and I as Premier of a province which was in that regard somewhat different from the other three provinces, that I would be the one to broach the matter to or with the Government of Canada. And I remembered so vividly it was in the City of Quebec, the federal-provincial conference that year was held in the Province of Quebec. The Prime Minister of Canada was Mr. Pearson, the Prime Minister of Quebec was Mr. Lesage, and in a closed sitting of that conference I raised the matter, and I pointed out that there were abundant reasons why the settlement of the question between Ottawa and the provinces should be on a political basis, not a legal one, not in court, not in any court, not a constitutional one, but a political agreement; that is to say, a settlement arrived at

Mr. Smallwood.

between the Government of Canada and the governments of the provinces. And I remember arguing that this gives you, Prime Minister, this gives you a glorious opportunity as the Prime Minister of Canada and the Leader of the Government of Canada, gives you a glorious opportunity to do something special that is practical, practical, easy to do and practical, but very special, something to help, to redress, the economic disequilibrium the economic disparity that we all admitted existed between, say, the Atlantic Provinces, for example, on the one hand, and the richer provinces of Canada on the other.

Now up to that time there had not been quite as much talk as there came to be subsequently about economic disparity, regional economic disparity, that certain provinces of Canada have more developed wealth than other provinces have, have more conveniences of all kinds, have better roads, better schools, better hospitals, better everything, and more of everything, and some provinces are a lot better off than others, that there is quite a disparity in the degree of prosperity between them. Subsequently there came to be a lot of talk of that. Indeed, a new department of state, a new department of the Government of Canada was subsequently created, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, aimed at reducing, if not totally eliminating, reducing the disparity, the economic disparity between them; and not only the economics but what flowed from the economic disparity, all kinds of other disparities as well. So I put it to him that day in the conference that if you want, genuinely want to reduce the disparity, here is an easy way, a cheap way, a fair way, a practical way to do it. Come to an agreement with the province that you, your Government of Canada, will leave to the provinces the rights, and therefore the profits, the rights to the offshore minerals. And then I gave him some precedents. I reminded him, and mind you I had been helped in this matter - the Premier of Nova Scotia was more familiar with it than I was - I reminded him of the fact that when Ontario was admitted into the original union, and Quebec was admitted, those two

Mr. Smallwood.

provinces did not embrace all the territory that they have now. It was just as though when the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were brought into the union, if they had been given the Northwest Territory and the Yukon - which they were not, because the Northwest Territory and the Yukon are still separate from those provinces. But in the case of Ontario and the case of Quebec, great areas to their north were included within their boundaries. And I said, the equivalent of that, just as their boundaries were extended by Canada to include those great areas, extend our boundaries to include the areas lying off our coast. In other words, push the boundary of Newfoundland 100 miles or 200 miles off. We were not then talking about fishing rights. We were not then talking about the ocean or the fish in the ocean. We were talking and thinking then only of the minerals underneath the ocean, deep down underneath the soil.

Well I argued as eloquently as I could. The relationship between Mr. Pearson and myself was very intimate, very warm, very warm indeed, but he had to answer, I suppose, the way he did. He said, "I feel that it is the duty of the Government of Canada to establish, not as a matter of opinion, not as a matter of favouritism, not as a matter of using this to help in something else, but to establish in law and in constitution, to establish the ownership, who, in fact, owns these riches lying off the Coast of Canada."

MR. SMALLWOOD:

So I said, I am afraid I have to tell you that we are going to submit the matter to the courts. And, as the House is aware, they did subsequently submit it to the court in an action between the Government of Canada on the one hand, and the Government of the Province of British Columbia on the other. I believe that Newfoundland had a lawyer there present with a listening brief. The Minister of Justice nods. He may even remember the name of the lawyer we had there.

MR. NEARY: Leo Barry was out there recently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who?

MR. HICKMAN: Hazen Hansard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, right. We engaged a lawyer, I think resident in Ottawa or Montreal.

MR. NEARY: And Leo Barry was out recently to research the case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. But this is long before, I would imagine this is before Mr. Barry even began at least very actively to practice law. I am talking now about something that is eight or ten years ago. It must be as long as that. I do not remember precisely.

Well, he said, we will have to submit it to the court. Now, he said, we will either win it or lose it. If we lose it, he said, if the government of Canada loses it, then you win your point. The Province gets the right if we do not. If we do, then, he said, from a position of strength we will deal with the provinces generously and I think perhaps they will not have too much to complain of. We did not like that answer but we had to be satisfied with it and that was the end of it.

The case did go to the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not know what division. I think it was then known as the Exchequer Court. Anyway -

MR. HICKMAN: The Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. The High Supreme Court itself with the nine judges. It went to the full bench of the Supreme Court of Canada

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and they found in favour of the Government of Canada. It was a bad moment for British Columbia, and I am afraid it was a bad moment for the other provinces that have a deep interest in this very matter.

Now, Sir, the government have been in office now going on five years. They have endeavoured to do precisely what I did, what my administration did. They have attempted to bring about a political settlement, not a court case, not a judicial settlement, but a settlement between governments. They have been joined in that by the governments of the nearby provinces of the Maritimes, so far with the same result as I had, a negative answer from the Government of Canada.

There is one small development. That is that under the present administration of the Government of Canada, under the leadership of Mr. Trudeau, they have offered the provinces off whose shores minerals may be found, they have offered to share the income. Now I am not clear in my own mind on this point. The Minister of Justice may be able to enlighten me. Possibly the Leader of the Opposition may be able to enlighten me, because I think he was aware of what was going on at the time because I believe he might have been a member of my cabinet at that moment. I am not clear on this point. When the Prime Minister of Canada offered to share the income, the governmental income, the official income, from any development offshore, did he mean, for example, that if minerals were found, meaning oil, gas or anything else off the shores of this Province, that he would share the income he got from that, the Government of Canada got from that with all the provinces, the ten provinces, or just with Newfoundland? And anything found off the Coast of Nova Scotia, would the Government of Canada share its income from that with the Government of Nova Scotia or with all ten governments? On that I am not clear. Perhaps the minister can clarify my mind. If not, maybe the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I fear -

MR. ROBERTS: The project is divided in two; half is for the littoral state and the other half for the great national park.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In other words, the Province off whose shores the mineral would be found would receive a portion of the Canadian government's income, but the portion that the Newfoundland Government would receive would only be part of what all ten Provinces would receive. We would get roughly one-tenth, at least in a numerical sense.

MR. DOODY: No. No.

MR. ROBERTS: If the gentleman would yield I will -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, of course.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I recall it there was a letter from the Prime Minister to the hon. gentleman in his capacity as Premier, as head of the government, which said that the proceeds would be - first of all in respect of oil inside the territorial limits of the Province, which in the case of Newfoundland Government would enclose the bays, the government of the Province were entitled to any revenue, and that was important in the case of Conception Bay or along the Southwest and the South Coasts.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was that? The government of the Province -

MR. ROBERTS: Would get all the revenue from any oil or gas or minerals found within those limits.

AN HON. MEMBER: Headland to headland.

MR. ROBERTS: Headland to headland, the bays, The second category was everything outside that to whatever the limit of Canadian ownership was, which would presumably be the 200 mile limit or the edge of the Continental Shelf as we now think, and that money, as I recall the Prime Minister's proposal, Mr. Speaker, was to divide that into two lots; half of the proceeds would go to the government of the province concerned. In other words, the offshore limits would be divided up as between provinces. And half of the money there would go as a gift from the Government of Canada to the province concerned,

MR. ROBERTS: the other half would go into a national fund from which every province would be entitled to draw, I believe, in proportion to its population. Now that is from memory. It was six or seven years ago, but I think that is the way it was. It was only a proposal.

MR. HICKMAN: But no controls in the Province for the development.

MR. ROBERTS: Agreed, there was some federal -

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank the Leader of the Opposition who has, as I have reason to know, an excellent memory, and I do not know if he was at that moment my executive assistant or my parliamentary assistant or my colleague in the Cabinet, but in all events in either of these capacities he would have read the letter from the Prime Minister of Canada. Indeed, if he were then my executive assistant doubtless he is the one who would have opened the letter and read it himself and then handed it to me to read. And if he had not done that it would be the only letter that he did not treat that way. That was his job and he did the job well.

MR. ROBERTS: First class letter opener.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt that any minister or any Premier in Newfoundland ever had -

MR. DOODY: A better letter opener.

MR. ROBERTS: My role in life.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - a more competent executive assistant -

MR. ROBERTS: And I have been learning about knife work ever since.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we are exactly where we were the day I handed over the seals of office on the 18th. of January, 1972. We are now gone past the 18th. of January 1966 -

AN HON. MEMBER: 1976.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 1976, Ten years can be here or there, it does not really matter all that much.

MR. NEARY: Just like a few million here and there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The next ten years do. The last ten do not mean all that much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So I do not ask, and I do not expect the government to take us any more into their confidence than they have done. I have to congratulate them on securing and appointing Mr. Martin as a legal adviser to them in this matter. Now I think that Mr. Martin, who is a young lawyer and who has concentrated heavily in the matter of research and so on as their legal adviser, he I think has done excellent work and I congratulate them for it. I do not ask them -

MR. NEARY: Leo Barry hired him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to say anything in public about the matter, but if they care to tell me anytime privately believe me I will keep it private but in any case I will watch the developments with immense interest.

Now a lot of excitement recently over the BNA Act; and the statements of the Prime Minister of our country, and the statements of the Prime Minister of Quebec, and the statements of the Prime Minister of Newfoundland on the BNA Act,

Mr. Smallwood:

a lot of excitement about it, I think all of it uncalled for, all of in the nature of a false alarm. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that every hon. member of this House is fully aware of the fact that the only thing that Canada has that might be called Canada's Constitution is an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. When the Premier of the Provinces - Ontario and Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick - when the Premiers of those four Provinces came at last painfully to an agreement to unite federally into a Confederation of Canada, as they called it, when they decided on that after many painful meetings, in some of which Newfoundland was represented by the great Sir Ambrose Shea and the great Sir Frederick Carter, when they decided on this after all the years of painful negotiation, they wound up in London, England and there they drafted, doubtless with English help, the help of English constitutional experts and drafting experts, they drafted an act, a bill to be brought before the House of Commons, and if adopted by the House of Commons then to be brought before the House of Lords, and if adopted by the House of Lords then to be signed by the Queen, Queen Victoria and become the law of England. This was done. The bill was enacted into law, and is the law of England today. The Constitution of Canada is today the law of England. It's an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, the House of Commons and the House of Lords, signed by the Queen of England. That is Canada's Constitution.

And when I attended federal-provincial conferences over a period of twelve or fourteen years - once, twice, and three times a year for fourteen years - the ten Prime Ministers, the eleven Prime Ministers of Canada, the ten Provincial Prime Ministers and the one federal Prime Minister, when I attended those conferences we wrestled and wrestled and wrestled with the question of, not of repatriation, but as the Leader of the Opposition reminded us the other day, the patriation of the Constitution, the BNA Act. We wrestled with the idea that the Constitution of Canada ought not to be the unique thing it is, because Canada is now still the only Dominion, and even the word "Dominion" is

Mr. Smallwood:

passé, the only great nation of the British Commonwealth, the only nation outside of Britain herself whose Constitution is not a Canadian document. It is an English document. It is an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. And the idea of patriating it is to bring it back to Canada; not that you send a messenger over and you lock up that act in a strongbox and he guards it with his life, a King's messenger bringing it back to Ottawa, Bringing the Constitution back is really a misnomer, That is not what is meant, What is meant is this, that the Parliament of the United Kingdom will repeal that act, so that it will cease to be, and the Parliament of Canada will enact a bill. The government will introduce a bill into the House of Commons where it will go through all the stages, and when passed will go to the Senate, go through the stages, and when passed will then be signed by the Governor General representing the Queen, the Queen of Canada, not the Queen of England, the Queen of Canada, As Queen of Canada she would give Her Royal Assent to that Canadian Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: What will we call it, the Canadian Constitution?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Constitution of Canada. The title would not matter all that much. It would, in fact, it would be an act to provide a Constitution for Canada. It would be an act,

Mr. Smallwood.

do not forget it would be an act, just as this House here is continually enacting legislation that are called acts, laws. We call them acts, a-c-t, act. It is brought in here not as an act. It is brought in here as a bill. The bill is given notice of, and another day comes and it is given first reading without any debate, and then it comes for second reading. That is the debating stage. We discuss the principle of it, where you can argue but only about the general principle or principles. There may be more than one principle embodied in a bill. You debate those principles, and you give it second reading. Then it goes into Committee of the Whole for clause-by-clause, line-by-line, word-by-word discussion, where you can amend it and change it about without changing the principle, because you have adopted the principle at second reading. You cannot, you have no authority - the Committee of the House has no authority to change a principle which has been adopted by the House. Finally, after it passes through committee stage, it is given its third reading. It is still not the law of the land, because the royal assent has to be given to it, and in this House we usually invite His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor to come to the Chamber, and he is shown in ceremonially. He takes his place, and the clerk of the House presents him with a number of bills, one by one, and he says, "In Her Majesty's name I assent to this bill, and he signs it." He is passed another one, the title is read out, "In Her Majesty's name I assent to this bill." And in this way it becomes the law of the land.

Now every single individual federal-provincial conference that I attended, and I attended all of them for twenty-three years, every one of them that I attended, where this question came up and was debated, the question of the patriation of Canada's constitution, the question of making Canada's constitution a Canadian document, not an English document - we had now got our flag. We have become a nation. We were appointing ambassadors around the world. The world was appointing ambassadors to Canada. We were making treaties with countries all around

Mr. Smallwood.

the world. We had our own tariff. We had our own financial matters all around the world - and now the idea was that the constitution itself should also be a Canadian thing originating in Canada, and getting its authority from Canada, and not from England, not from the United Kingdom. In every single individual conference where that came up there was one province that fought it tooth and nail, fought it, objected, obstructed, and that was the province of Quebec - they never failed. Under Premier Duplessis, following him, there were two Premiers, Barrette and another Premier, I forget, and then came Jean Lesage, and then came Johnson, and then finally came Bourassa.

That is about six Premiers I sat with in those conferences. The conferences were held in Ottawa, in Quebec, in the capital of British Columbia, Victoria, and, I think, one in Toronto over a period of fourteen or fifteen years. At every one of them - Alberta had some objection but that was finally overcome. It took a year or two. Saskatchewan had some objection. That was finally overcome in a year or two or three. British Columbia had some objection. That was finally overcome. Until in the end - we had some objection and that was finally overcome - until in the end every province of Canada, with one exception, agreed on patriating the constitution. Now, Sir, patriating it itself is nothing, nothing to it. It is just the parliaments of the United Kingdom and Canada both happening at a given time, so there would not be a moment when there was no constitution you know, from anywhere, at a given moment, the BNA Act would be repealed in England and at the same moment the Canadian Act would come into force. That is easy. There is no difficulty. There is no complication about that. That is simple. But what is not simple is what happened afterwards. How do you go about making amendments to the constitution, because, Sir, there never has, since man was on this earth, there never has been a country that had a constitution which did not have to be amended.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

From time to time it had to be changed and it was changed from time to time. Even the great Constitution of the United States, which they used to boast was the most perfect document produced by the mind of men, the great Constitution of the great United States was adopted by the Continental Congress and became the Constitution of America and after that was done they discovered that this great land of freedom had failed completely to put a single word in that Constitution guaranteeing any of the freedoms.

What is the term - the Bill of Rights? Do you know what the Bill of Rights is, Mr. Speaker?

MR. DOODY: John Diefenbaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell you what the Bill of Rights is. The Bill of Rights is a bill that was passed by the Congress of the United States. Years after they had adopted the Constitution, they adopted the Bill of Rights, which was only an amendment to the Constitution, and the amendment provided for freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom peaceably to assemble for redress of grievances. That famous Bill of Rights are the afterthoughts that they wrote into the Constitution years after they had adopted the Constitution itself. Can you imagine! In the land of the free this Bill of Rights was an afterthought, a second thought, that they did not remember to put into their original Constitution! So that, as I say, there has never yet been a country in the world that had a Constitution that was perfect from the beginning and that did not have to be amended from time to time.

MR. NEARY: We have the reverse in Canada. We have the Bill of Rights and no Constitution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the Bill of Rights - I am not going to say a word against the Bill of Rights, why should I? I never did think it was all that serious but however it does no harm. It certainly does no harm. It may not do a lot of good but it does no

MR. SMALLWOOD:

harm. It did good for Mr. Diefenbaker's psyche, there is no doubt of that. He felt good about it. Some others did. The hon. Minister there of Industrial Development and Rural Development was, I think at that moment a member of the House of Commons of our nation, a member of parliament, and no doubt he voted for the Bill of Rights and no doubt he was proud of the Bill of Rights and I would assume - who was the other minister, the minister sitting next to him - the two of them, no doubt, the Minister of Fisheries, were very proud of that particular Bill of Rights.

All right. I do not want to take any of their glory or any of their happiness away from them. It does not harm. I do not think it created a single new right for the people of Canada or anyone in Canada.

MR. LUNDFIGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not of order. I am not out of order. That is not a point of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: On a point of privilege. If the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker were privileged to listen to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, which he is not, he would rise on the question of privilege. But in his place I am sure he would be disappointed in my colleague and I if we did not stand up and say that the hon. gentleman certainly without misrepresenting the facts might in a very small, little subtle way be downplaying the importance of the manifestation of Mr. Diefenbaker through the years in an area of great importance and perhaps the thing that is closest to Mr. Diefenbaker's heart.

Now, the hon. gentleman of course and Mr. Diefenbaker for quite a number of years -

MR. WELLS: Great friends.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: - had this great, very healthy exchange of views. I believe right now perhaps they -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us settle for a liberal exchange of views.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I think right at the present moment they are perhaps

MR. LUNDJAN:

great admirers of each other. And I have sat in Mr. Diefenbaker's office on many occasions and I have heard the ramblings of the years of association with the hon. gentlemen and, perhaps really not in too much seriousness, I am really trying to say that this is something that Mr. Diefenbaker in particular was so very proud of, the Bill of Rights, and I think the hon. gentleman really recognizes that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, yes. I quite agree. I wrote a book - I wrote ten or twelve books - but I wrote this particular one and I have it here because I want to quote

Mr. Smallwood:

from it, not to this moment, and I have it here so that I can quote from it. But this book was published by the great publishing firm of MacMillan in Toronto, who are also the publishers of Mr. Diefenbaker. So we have that at least in common, if not a lot else -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We know this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: - that we have in common that we have the same publisher.

Now when this was published MacMillan's sent a copy of it to Mr. Diefenbaker, they sent a copy of it, and Mr. Diefenbaker read it and he found that I had been extremely successful in this book, extremely successful in keeping under stern control my mad enthusiasm for Mr. Diefenbaker. It was one of my undoubted successes, that I had not gone overboard. Anyway he read it, and he wrote a letter back to MacMillan's thanking them for their kindness in sending him this book by Mr. Smallwood. He had read the book carefully and he had enjoyed it immensely, and he would have no hesitation in recommending it for the Governor General's prize for fiction.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which I think is a delightful story.

MR. ROBERTS: The first time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That this is the first time it has been told in public. It will go into Hansard and one day someone, some historian or some researcher looking into the great affairs of this Chamber, will come across that story.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is the question of amending the Constitution, undoubtedly it will have to be amended. You know, maybe three, four, five amendments in the next twenty, thirty, fifty years. It will have to be amended. It is not perfect. "Time makes ancient truth uncouth," Not always, not in everything, but in many things. What was true last year is untrue next year. And maybe the word 'true' is not the correct word, The word is 'correct'; what was so, what was correct ten years ago is incorrect now or will be ten years hence.

Mr. Smallwood:

That is what - was it Longfellow who said it? That is what he meant when he said, "Time makes ancient truth uncouth." So time makes constitutions here and there, at this point or that point, in this matter or that, uncouth, and so they have to be amended. And the question is, who is going to amend it?

For example, in the BNA Act you have a section embodying the terms under which Newfoundland entered the Canadian Confederation. Our terms of union are merely a section of the BNA Act enacted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Do not forget that. Our terms of union which set out in writing the terms and conditions whereby we entered the Canadian Confederation, those terms were passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, not the Parliament of Canada, because they were passed as an amendment to the BNA Act by the United Kingdom Parliament.

MR. NEARY: We would not have to fight the battle of Confederation all over again, would we?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well now, when - if, as, and when the Constitution of Canada becomes a Canadian document and resides in the Parliament of Canada, which has the unrestricted right, let us assume, just for argument assume, we are not going to assume it, but for the sake of argument let us assume that the Parliament of Canada has the unrestricted right to amend that Act, that Constitution. At the present time the Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom says that the boundary of Newfoundland in Labrador, and the member from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) had better listen to this and any other member from Labrador, except the Leader of the Opposition who is so familiar with it he could give a lecture on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am aware of that. But the member for Menihek (Mr. Rousseau) had better listen very carefully to this. It is an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom which says that the boundary of Newfoundland in Labrador, the Labrador part, it spells it out in this British Act of the Parliament of Britian, it spells it out that Island of Newfoundland and the islands nearby, dotted around our coast, that is the Province, together with Labrador. What Labrador? Labrador as laid down, and it is laid down.

Now if the Parliament of Canada had the right, the unrestricted right to amend that constitution, might the moment not come when for political reasons, because of blackmail, because of threat, because of anything, the Parliament of Canada might decide to amend that section? Today it is an act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom and only the Parliament of the United Kingdom can change it. Remember that! Quebec cannot change it. The Parliament of Canada cannot change it. Only one authority on the earth, unless you have a revolution - if you had a revolution in Canada and it cut clear of the British connection and set up a republic they will write their own constitution without asking us or anyone else - but short of a revolution it is only the Parliament of the United Kingdom that can change the borders separating Labrador from the Province of Quebec.

We do not want the Parliament of Canada to have the slightest right to change that border. As a matter of fact, the same thing applies to Ontario. Ontario would not want the Parliament of Canada to have the right to change the borders of that great Province where they abut on Quebec or where they abut on Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba would not want it. No Province would want the Parliament of Canada to have the right to change its borders without its full, free and willing consent, of course.

Who shall have the right, when it becomes a Canadian document, to

MR. SMALLWOOD: amend it? Take the matter of education. Now that is not as touchy a subject in Newfoundland as it always was. It was always a matter of touchy conscience. The quickest way to start, if not a bloody row, a neary bloody row in Newfoundland was for anyone to dare suggest that this religious denomination, or that religious denomination, or some other religious denomination should loose one iota of its rights in education, its rights to have a share of any public money voted by this House for schools, for education. And when I was negotiating the terms of Confederation with the Government of Canada I had two terrible problems, one was really terrible, and the other one only appeared to be terrible. The one that appeared to be terrible was the question of divorce. We had no divorce in Newfoundland. There was no way for a Newfoundlander to get a divorce. He could go away and live in some other territory, and if he really established domicile there, not just put up a fake residence to qualify, because that might qualify him in South Africa, to which some Newfoundlanders went to get their divorce, or Utah, or somewhere else, it might qualify them there, but when he came back here to Newfoundland they were still married. There was

Mr. Smallwood.

no way to get a divorce in Newfoundland. Now when we became a Province the way was open to us, and that was to petition the Senate of Canada, and the Senate of Canada, every year, heard scores and scores and scores of applications for divorce.

MR. NEARY: That was the first time they ever had anything to do up there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not say that entirely. I do not think that that is 100 per cent true. Ninety-six maybe, ninety-four, but not 100. I am only joking, because as I expect to be appointed to the Senate one of these days and live out my life in the quiet of that quarter.

MR. NEARY: The Leader of the Opposition would probably recommend you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition would recommend me. I do not think he would want me to be in the Senate. No, he would want me to be here. He would want me to be right here.

MR. ROBERTS: Very much so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, he is very eager, very keen on that.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not think you would recommend the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very keen on that.

However, where was I?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Divorce.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we had that fight to get a clause put in on divorce. I do not mind telling you that I approached His Grace the Archbishop, not I personally, but I had someone do it; and I had someone approach the Lord Bishop of the Anglican Communion, and the head of the United Church, and the head of the Salvation Army, and the head of the Pentecostal body on this question, two questions. Divorce and education. I arranged a special private meeting with the Apostolic Delegate, the Papal Delegate to Canada in Ottawa, and I had long talks with the man who soon after became Prime Minister, and then when he did become Prime Minister, Louis St. Laurent and I had

Mr. Smallwood.

long talks with a famous Canadian statesman from Nova Scotia, who was the great Minister of Finance during the war - what was his name? - J.L. Illsey. It was a terrible, terrible problem, because it was no use to expect a certain large number of Newfoundlanders to vote for Confederation unless the entry into Confederation would protect, continue to protect, to give at least as much continuing protection as they had had already for their educational rights. But, you know, a lot of water has gone under the bridges since then, and the question of denominational rights for schools is not so violently a touchy question as it used to be. You have now nearly all of what I might call - I do not know just quite what to call them. If you call Anglicans, Protestants they sometimes get angry about it. If you call them non-Catholics they get even angrier. It is hard to know what terminology to use. However, if you take all the schools in Newfoundland that are not Roman Catholic, under the Roman Catholic authority, and leave out most or nearly all of the Pentecostal schools, you will find today that virtually all the rest of the schools in the Province are under one combined authority. What do they call it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Integrated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Integrated school system. So now you have in Newfoundland where you had about six - I was the one who brought legislation into the House creating the rights for the sixth, the Pentecostal. They did not have any legal rights until I brought that legislation in and the House very generously passed it. I think they were number six: Roman Catholic, Anglican, United Church, Salvation Army, Presbyterian -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: They did not have any constitutional rights?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they had no rights. Now I am coming to that. I am coming to that. They still have no constitutional rights, the Pentecostal people. I will always regard it as one of the creditable things

Mr. Smallwood.

I did in public life, that I brought legislation into this House, the House graciously and generously passed it, and it became the law of Newfoundland giving to the Pentecostal school authorities the same rights exactly as to the Roman Catholic school authority, the Anglican, the United Church, Presbyterian, Salvation Army, treating, you know - Either all or none was my argument to the House at the time. Dare we question a man's religion! Dare we question any man's right to any religious views he wished to have! Who gave us the authority to question them? All right! So if the Pentecostal people have as much right to their religious faith and belief as any other group in the Province, if they have that right, let them have it. Let them have it in education - and the House passed it.

MR. NEARY: Right in the Education Department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

But, Sir, though today this question of religious rights, church, denominational rights in the matter of schools, their rights to their share of any public money that this House votes is not as - what is the word? I would not say that it is not as important. I would say that it is not as urgently pressing as it used to be. Although let this House, when the budget comes down, and the estimates are presented here, let there be a variation in the principle that we have passed in this House for nearly 100 years - if Dr. Fred Rowe, Senator Rowe were here, he would tell me exactly the year that it was

MR. SMALLWOOD:

passed by the legislature of Newfoundland setting up equal rights for all the denominations. I do not remember. It is about 100 years ago. Let there be the slightest variation in that and you will see what you will see. But, Sir, that is only a right that this House gives, not a right that the Constitution of Canada gives. The Constitution does not give that right to the Pentecostal people.

Now, shall the Parliament of Canada have the right unilaterally, of their own accord, without needing an okay from Newfoundland, to change our borders? Shall it have that right? Obviously they must not. We would rather that - now we are good Canadians, and we as good Canadians, we are glad that Canada now is a fine respected nation in the world, with her ambassadors around the world, with the world's ambassadors coming to Canada, with our treaties, with our trade arrangements and our own tariff and our own flag; we are proud of all that and we will be proud to have our own Constitution but not, Sir, not we Newfoundlanders, not for one moment, not for a moment will we be proud or satisfied to have our own Constitution, Canadian Constitution, if that means that the Parliament of Canada, the House of Commons and the Senate between them, have any right to change anything that is vital to us.

Now, what are the vital things to us? One and first and foremost, boundaries. The boundaries of this Province must never be changed except with the free, willing, happy consent of Newfoundland. And that will never be given if it means boundaries that will make us smaller geographically than we are now. If they were to make us a bit larger I dare say if you twist our arm enough we would agree to it. They must not have the right to change the law on property and civil rights. That must remain of provincial jurisdiction. They must not have the right to change the terms of Confederation except with our free, willing and happy consent.

Let me talk a moment - now as to that, the Leader of the Opposition who was I think my colleague in the cabinet with me in

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Victoria at the last federal-provincial conference that I ever attended on - and I dare say the last that he ever attended - on the constitutional matter. Was the hon. -

MR. ROBERTS: I was there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the hon. gentleman was there. He will remember vividly, as I do, that there was virtually unanimous consent. At last there was unanimity in the ten provinces on certain matters that would have to be, and the word was, 'entrenched'. In other words, the borders of Newfoundland as they are now written in would be entrenched.

MR. W. CARTER: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister elects to unilaterally return the BNA Act to Canada does he require the permission of the provinces?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. W. CARTER: Well, all right. If he unilaterally elects to do that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not going to do that, but he could. Not he, but the parliament of Canada could do it. It has to be the parliament, not the Prime Minister.

MR. W. CARTER: That is the question I wanted to ask, Mr. Speaker. Would the parliament of Canada have to approve such a veto power on the part of the Prime Minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The parliament of the United Kingdom is not going to repeal the BNA Act, which is the United Kingdom Act of their own making, they are not going to repeal that except at the request of the parliament of Canada. Now they have amended -

MR. W. CARTER: Unanimous consent of parliament?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no. Not unanimous.

MR. W. CARTER: Just majority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The BNA Act has been amended from time to time

MR. SMALLWOOD:

since 1867. I do not know how many times. The last time I personally remember was when they amended it in 1949, was it, or 1948 to make Newfoundland a province.

MR. ROBERTS: In 1964 on the Canada Pension Plan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Canada Pension Plan was another amendment made by the United Kingdom Parliament.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And so every time that the United Kingdom Parliament did amend their own act, the British North America Act, it was at the request of the Parliament of Canada, not the Government of Canada, not the Cabinet of Canada, the Parliament of Canada; and the Parliament of Canada in that acts exactly as it does in everything else, a majority, fifty per cent plus one.

Now that is one of the reasons, by the way, that makes it so vitally important to us that the Parliament of Canada shall not have the right to amend the constitution in certain matters without our free, willing and happy consent. And one of them is the matter of boundaries.

So the device was adopted and agreed, even by Quebec. Now when I say, "even by Quebec," I am talking at the moment only about the agreement to entrench certain things, you know, entrench them. They are there, they cannot be changed, each Province involved has a veto on the Parliament of Canada; nobody but nobody can amend except with the free, happy, willing consent of the Province concerned.

One thing I want to tell the House about; I have told already of the bill I brought in here, which the House enacted into law giving the Pentecostal Assemblies their education rights such as they are today, they have them. They were conferred at that time, in that way. But they are not included in the BNA Act. The others are. The other denominations that had rights when the BNA Act, our part of it, was enacted in England, they continued to have their rights, none taken. They continued to have them. But those that did not have them at that time have not been given them since. And that is primarily the Pentecostal - I do not know if there are any others. But Pentecostals have not got any rights confirmed by the Constitution of this nation, by the BNA Act.

So I negotiated with a delegation of twelve of the leading pastors of the Pentecostal Assemblies on that matter, and it so happens that they did not complain to me that they had no constitutional guarantee of their rights. They knew that I was the one who had introduced the bill here, that the House had passed, giving them rights insofar as the Legislature

MR. SMALLWOOD: of this Province could give rights, they knew that. But it had not occurred to them that the Constitution of Canada did not confirm or confer those rights. And I am the one who suggested it to them. There were twelve of them in my office on the floor below here, and they looked at each other, and I said, "You know, the most unlikely thing in this world is that the House of Assembly will ever repeal or amend the Act to take your rights back from you. It is highly unlikely. It is not impossible, but it is highly unlikely." And they agreed that no House of Assembly would ever deprive the Pentecostal people of the rights that the House had given them in Newfoundland legislation. They agreed on that. But they were quite strong on this idea, namely that it was undignified for them to be a large religious denomination not enjoying the rights of the other large religious denominations, most of which were larger than they, but nevertheless, they being a large religious denomination.

MR. NEARY: And the fastest growing at that time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And a very fast growing denomination then and now too.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suppose the Pentecostal Assemblies build more places of worship than all the other denominations combined every year now in Newfoundland. It is

Mr. Smallwood:

a movement of tremendous virility, spiritual virility, enthusiasm, energy, it is tremendous, absolutely it is very impressive, it is very impressive.

I thought that yes, yes, why could not the thing be amended to include them. A simple amendment. Two or three words added on to a sentence that is already there. would include them, you see. Why not? I said, all right, all right gentlemen I will try to get it for you. So I did, I tried. I saw the Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, who from the moment I first laid eyes on him, which was here in this building, in the little dining room downstairs there on the ground floor. I had him in to lunch. For that moment -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was Minister of Justice then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - He was then Minister of Justice - and that was the very day when I pronounced after the luncheon, we came out in the - I think the present Minister of Justice was there, in fact I think it was the present Minister of Justice, who was then the Minister of Justice, went out to the airport to meet the Federal Minister of Justice, whose name was Pierre Elliott Trudeau, whom the present Minister of Justice admired ardently and went to the Convention to do his hardest and his damndest to get that man elected Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. NEARY: We all had our fingers in the Liberal pickle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And he worked, he worked hard. He worked hard to get Mr. Trudeau made -

MR. CROSBIE: Is the hon. gentleman in order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am in order, Maybe he was out of order, but I am in order now.

MR. MURPHY: He would not dare be out of order from what I hear about the Convention up there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyway -

MR. MURPHY: I hear the Leader of the Opposition was parading back and forth with a gun on his shoulder.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was he?

MR. MURPHY: He had them all barred in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which Opposition of that day or now?

MR. MURPHY: Now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh! Well I would like to see him with a gun, I have never seen him with a gun.

MR. MURPHY: There is dangerous stuff in that one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say he would be terribly dangerous with a gun, but more dangerous to himself than anyone else.

I discussed with the Prime Minister who, believe me, Mr. Speaker, believe me - of all the 23 million Canadians, if not the most tolerant man, urbane, tolerant, decent, civilized in his views on religious freedom and religious liberty and equality of rights for all people, if not the most tolerant as tolerant as any other man alive in Canada today - agreed with me. It was only right. It was only proper that the Pentecostal people should have their rights entrenched or at least included in the BNA Act along with Roman Catholic, Anglican, United Church, Salvation Army, Presbyterian churches. But he said, "Now you know, Premier, of course what is involved." Yes, an amendment. He said, "Exactly". "You know where that amendment would have to be made?" I said in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. "You know the attitude of Quebec, the people, and especially the government, more so the Government of Quebec than the people of Quebec, you know their attitude on the question of Canada going to the United Kingdom and asking them to amend Canada's Constitution?" Yes, yes, I know that all right. He said, "Do you want me to do that?" Yes, I want you do to it, but I am not happy that you would have to do it.

Now Trudeau at that time, and I suppose still, and I think I am giving to the house now the answer to recent statements and events of the last couple of weeks - Trudeau, I believe, is even more anxious to get Canada's Constitution made into a Canadian document, more anxious than Diefenbaker was to get the Bill of Rights, or Pearson to get the Canadian flag. Because remember that the Prime Minister who succeeds in doing that, in getting Canada's Constitution made a Canadian Constitution and not an English one, well if he does

Mr. Smallwood:

nothing else in this life will go down in the Hall of Fame in Canada.

He would be the father of Canada's Constitution as Sir John A.

is the father of the present one. He, I believe, I believe that

he is desperately anxious to get the Constitution,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

to use the Leader of the Opposition's word, 'patriated' to Canada, patriate, brought back to Canada - not brought back, brought to Canada. It was never in Canada. But to do that he has got to have the support of Quebec. Quebec is, what, 30 per cent of Canada in population. What is it? She has got 8 million people?

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty-three per cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One-third of us Canadians are Quebecers. It is really essential that he should have the support of Quebec in that matter.

Now, I saw him a stricken man, and the Leader of the Opposition will agree - in fact, I would dare him to disagree. He will agree - that the Prime Minister of Canada was a stricken man in Victoria, when all of us, all of us there, except Mr. Bourassa - to our absolute astonishment and our consternation when he stood there without giving any reason and said, no! Trudeau, you know, he looked like a man ready to throw in the sponge. Do you remember?

MR. ROBERTS: It was somewhat of a surprise, because all during the two or three days of the debate there was every indication that Quebec would go along with the other provinces.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. He went down to Quebec the other day and he had a long conference with the Prime Minister of that great province, two Liberals, two Frenchmen - at least Bourassa is French; Trudeau is half French or half Scottish - but two Quebecers, two loyal sons of Quebec, and they talked over problems and could not agree. Trudeau made a speech - was that at the Reform Club or one of the great Liberal bodies? - and he made what was made out by the press as being an attack on Bourassa. I doubt that it was an attack.

But what he did, in my opinion, what Trudeau did, was to threaten Quebec that the nine provinces will gang up on you. That is what he threatened. That is what he meant. He was laying

MR. SMALLWOOD:

down the law to the Government of Quebec, to Bourassa, in my opinion. I have no inside knowledge of this. He did not tell me this. But I have no doubt that Trudeau was saying to Bourassa, look here - what is his name?

AN HON. MEMBER: Pierre.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Bourassa's name.

AN HON. MEMBER: Robert.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Robert. Look here, Robert, I am getting just bloody well fed up with you. We had this thing done in Victoria and you threw the monkey wrench in. Now, are you going to throw it in again? The people of Canada want this constitution to be a Canadian document. The provinces want it. Are you going to block it? Look, Mr. Trudeau has no more intention, and never had any more intention, of having the parliament of Canada, the parliament, bringing a bill into the parliament of Canada and having it debated on the floor of the House of Commons and the floor of the senate, petitioning Her Majesty the Queen to be graciously pleased to lay before her parliament in the United Kingdom a request, a petition to repeal the BNA Act so that they may enact one in Canada, he has no more intention or thought of doing that - that is what it means for Canada, for Trudeau to bring the constitution back without the provinces, that is what it means, that is all it can mean - he has no more intention of doing that than he has of - what?

MR. LUNDPIGAN: Saying fuddle-duddle, or something like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, no. He must even -

MR. LUNDPIGAN: I disagree with the hon. gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. The hon. gentleman has perfect constitutional right, parliamentary right, moral right, philosophical right, every kind of a right to disagree with me, because I am not giving his view, I am giving mine. My view is that the last thing on this earth

MR. SMALLWOOD:

that Mr. Trudeau would even think of is anything except with the consent of at least nine Premiers, nine, to bring the bill into the House of Commons to get the thing done by the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England. It is all he can do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no other way he can do it. He can do it without consulting any of the ten Premiers. Sure he can, legally, constitutionally; he would be a fool and he is no fool. So what will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that he will talk to the Premiers and he will try to get them all to gang up on Robert, to gang up on Master Robert. That is what he will try to do and I would be surprised if he fails. I think he will succeed. I think that he will get the support of the people of Canada and probably even the people of the Province of Quebec, if not the Government of Quebec. He will get agreement across Canada for the Parliament of Canada to ask the Parliament of the United Kingdom to let Canada have her own constitution.

MR. NEARY: It is not really a major issue throughout Canada.

What would it do to help the ordinary people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The ordinary people are not going around holding public meetings and parading with placards and flags and signs, you know, demanding the patriation of the constitution.

MR. NEARY: Especially in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The unemployed, the people who are worried about inflation and the hundreds of other problems -

MR. PECKFORD: Do not tell Mrs. Browne.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mrs. Browne might. I do not know. She is an estimable woman, and I forecast to the minister that if she gets elected to the council in Summerford she will be an exemplary councillor, and that he will find no councillor in the Province more satisfactory and more eager to collaborate with him, and the collaboration will take largely the form of requests about every fortnight for another few thousand and another improvement in Summerford. In other words, exactly the kind of councillor that every council should have. The minister will agree on that. This is what he wants.

MR. NEARY: Tell me this. If we get a new constitution will we lose our margarine rights?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we will not lose the margarine.

MR. NEARY: How did that get into the terms of union?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I had large responsibility for that. Greg Power wrote a piece about, oh that little piece, it is in the Book of Newfoundland, volume five or six, about discontented cows up in Prince Edward Island you know, producing some strange thing called butter, and that there was some kind of dirty plot by the Confederates to run this down the throats of our people and deprive them of their fine delicious and nutritious mixture of cotton seed and fishes, you know, margarine. I felt myself that if the Newfoundland people were not going to be allowed to have a cheap substitute for butter, you know, we would lose so many votes. And I was eager to get votes then. That is the only time I have ever been eager to get votes. I was eager to get votes for Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Do you realize today if you take a pound of margarine to another Province you are breaking the law?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it was for a while you could not colour it and the way they sold margarine was white, like lard, and a little linen bag of colouring, and you would go in a grocery and you would buy your block of margarine, lard, white lard, and your little package and you would squeeze it on and you would squeeze it altogether and try to mix it to colour. That was the law until we became a Province. That was the law of Canada. And of course you were not allowed to ship it from one Province to another. I think you can now.

MR. NEARY: Or carry it with you in your -

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I think you can now. I think so.

MR. DOME: 'Steve' I have broken the laws a number of times.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is right. You did. According to the terms of union you are not allowed to even bring it with you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I said there were nine topics I wanted to discuss briefly before I get to the main burden of my speech, so I do not expect -

MR. TUPPNEY: We can come back tonight.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am quite happy to come back tonight. Incidentally if I run the risk - what I have got, two minutes? May I say this to the Leader of the House, Perhaps he would be kind enough to convey it to his Leader, the Leader of the Government, the Premier, And by the way you never heard any complaint from me during January and February. I think indeed there might be something to be said for never meeting in January and February so that all the members can go to Florida. It is the right time of year for everyone to go South. But now that we are met again, this business of three to six, three hours a day!

MR. MURPHY: It was ever thus.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was ever thus, but it was wrong. It is wrong. I mean every improvement and every reform has to come because what was before was wrong. It is not because it was always so that we may not change it and reform it. I say that three hours a day is not enough. We meet here three o'clock, by five we can start debating; so two hours of this and that, all terribly important stuff I agree, I have not a word against it, and then one hour of discussing the great issues of this Province.

MR. MURPHY: Will the hon. member not agree that when he was sitting in this chair here that we were ready to do the business of the House, Orders of the Day, between ten and fifteen minutes past three in the afternoon?

MR. ROWE: Not always, no.

MR. MURPHY: As compared to today when we go to a quarter past four.

MR. NEARY: If the rules are changed, the rules of the House must change.

MR. ROBERTS: It should be at nine o'clock in the morning. Get at it and get a good day's work in.

MR. MURPHY: You can get a good day's work if they want to do the work. But if they want to spend all day arguing points of order and everything else -

MR. NEARY: Let us start at seven o'clock in the morning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not want the House to meet tonight unless it is the desire -

MR. MURPHY: I have a nice piece of salt fish for dinner.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to meet. It is getting close to six o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I have the pleasure of moving the adjournment of the debate?

MR. ROBERTS: When do you go to your office then.

MR. NEARY: Six or seven.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I can only say in response -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, seven until seven is the right time.

MR. WELLS: Yes, I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that we will very soon be getting into longer sittings than three hours a day. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House until Monday, March 22, at three o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Order, please! Before I put the motion I would just like to say that I indicated to the House that the motion which the hon. House Leader put forward, the notice of motion in regard to the Come By Chance Refinery, I said I would take that under advisement and rule on it later. The reason for doing that I was concerned that the House would be able to express a clear opinion with an affirmative or a negative vote on the subject of the motion and if you will permit me I will just read the latter part of the motion, "Therefore be it resolved that this House debate the closing of the refinery so that the government may have the opinions and assistance of hon. members in its efforts to bring about its reopening." I was concerned that this may not allow a clear yes or no vote but having consulted Beauchesne, chapter 191 which states "A motion is a proposal made by one member that the House do something or order something to be done or express an opinion with regard to some matter or things," and this motion seems to fall into the latter category and it is therefore ruled that the motion is in order.

It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion; carried.

This House will now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

C O N T E N T S

March 19, 1976	Page
<u>STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS</u>	
Mr. Maynard made a statement on negotiations between CFLCo and the IBEW at Churchill Falls.	3444
Mr. Crosbie advised the House of the death of Mr. John J. Deutsch.	3444
Commented on by Mr. Smallwood.	3445
Premier Moores announced that Mr. Wells had been appointed Chancellor of the Diocese of Eastern Newfoundland.	3446
Commented on by Mr. Smallwood.	3446
Mr. Crosbie informed the House that he has met with officials of BRINCO and BRINEX concerning development of the uranium deposits near Makkovik.	3447
Commented on by:	
Mr. Rowe	3449
Mr. Smallwood	3450
<u>PRESENTING PETITIONS</u>	
By Mr. Neary in behalf of residents of Rodney Street, St. John's, objecting to further increases in electrical rates.	3452
<u>REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES</u>	
Mr. Maynard tabled the report of matters transacted by the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the provisions of the Labour Relations Act, the Public Service Bargaining Act, the Newfoundland Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, and the report of the Minimum Wage Board for 1975.	3452
Mr. Murphy tabled copies of the Automobile Dealers Amendment Regulations, 1976.	3452
<u>NOTICES OF MOTION</u>	
Mr. Wells gave notice of the resolution dealing with the Come By Chance refinery.	3452
Mr. Rousseau gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce bill No. 7.	3454
<u>ORAL QUESTIONS</u>	
Work on the tunnel under the Straits of Belle Isle. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	3455
Layoffs proposed for the Gull Island project this Summer. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Crosbie.	3455
News of the proposed layoffs attributed to officials of Newfoundland Hydro. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Crosbie.	3456
Complaints of the quality of post-secondary school graduates and their suitability in the job markets. Mr. Neary, Mr. House.	3457
Non-academic study of the post-secondary education system sought. Mr. Neary,* Mr. House.	3458

C O N T E N T S - 2

<u>ORAL QUESTIONS (continued)</u>	Page
*Mr. Neary expressed dissatisfaction with the answer and gave notice that he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment.	3459
Report sought on the Come By Chance task force.	3459
Quality of construction at the Engineering and Applied Sciences Building at Memorial. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	3459
Delay in construction work at the Gull Island site. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Crosbie.	3460
Query as to whether recruitment letters from Newfoundland Hydro indicate changes in the Government's policy on Gull Island development. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Crosbie.	3461
The Health Sciences Complex. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3462
Scrivener Products Newfoundland Ltd. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3463
Query as to whether the Department of Public Works and Services should take over direct control of the Health Sciences Centre construction programme. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3463
Query as to whether the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> should make a tour of the Great Lakes to present Newfoundland's case and protest the activities of the Greenpeace organization and the Brian Davies' campaign. Capt. Winsor, Mr. Hickey.	3464
Reactivation of the St. George's coal fields. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	3468
Investigation into the fire and alleged gear scandal at the Department of Fisheries. Mr. Simmons, Mr. W. Carter,	3469
Query as to whether charges will be laid. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Hickman.	3470
The Julienne Lake iron ore deposits. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	3471
Advertising expenditure of \$43,000 made without a contract. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	3472
Resignations in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	3475
<u>ORDERS OF THE DAY</u>	
Address in Reply (continued)	
Mr. Smallwood (continued)	3477
Mr. Smallwood adjourned the debate.	3519
Mr. Speaker Collins ruled in order the resolution of which Mr. Wells had given notice, concerning the Come By Chance refinery.	3519
<u>ADJOURNMENT</u>	3519