

Grants to Newfoundland

has not been forgotten either, in Newfoundland, and it is not going to be forgotten for a very long time to come.

The Prime Minister made a great deal of the dissatisfaction of the government of Newfoundland with the report of the royal commission and, of course, it is quite true that they were dissatisfied. It is not at all surprising to me that they should have been dissatisfied because they had appointed a royal commission consisting of very respected and eminent citizens of that province to prepare a case to be presented to the federal royal commission. They believed in that case and believed they had a good case. They suffered the natural disappointment that perhaps the Prime Minister himself has had at times when he believed that he had a good case and was not able to convince the judge.

The recommendations of the royal commission were objected to on one count and on one count only by the government of Newfoundland and that is that its recommendation—its award—was inadequate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: And there was no review. I believe the hon. gentleman will agree that this was another ground on which objection was taken to the report.

Mr. Pickersgill: No, I do not think the Prime Minister will find that to be the case—well, it may be that the Prime Minister is right. The reason why there was no review, of course, the Minister of Finance told us today, was that the commission did not have the power to recommend a review under term 29. I was rather surprised that the minister said that. I know that Mr. Ritchie said that to the commissioners and that presumably is what impressed the commissioners. That may very well be the reason why they did not provide for a review. I should be rather surprised if the premier of Newfoundland would have been very insistent about this question of a review if the commission had in fact recommended what was asked for, but that again is another matter.

At any rate, there were these two difficulties. The Prime Minister will also recall that as early as August 11 last year the premier of Newfoundland made an appeal to the Prime Minister—to which, incidentally, he received no reply—by telegram, asking that provision should be made on an interim basis for these payments because of the urgent need of the money to provide employment during the winter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I know the hon. gentleman does not want to leave the wrong impression. A communication was made with me and then the premier and I had a discussion about this whole question.

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

Mr. Pickersgill: I remember the events very well. If the Prime Minister will look it up I believe he will find that between August 11 when the telegram was received and September, any discussions that occurred must have been conducted by telephone. I recollect very clearly what took place and I put the telegrams on *Hansard* on either September 4 or September 6 of last year. There were three telegrams. The first telegram on August 11 asked for interim payments. Some days later there was a second telegram which asked for the review. Then there was a third telegram consequent upon the unanimous resolution of the legislature which came in on September 3. That was the occasion of this matter being raised in this house on September 4.

I say that this whole matter, which could have been disposed of on the basis on which we are now being asked to dispose of it just as well last September or last August as now, was postponed and the excuse that was given to this house by the Minister of Finance was that, well, they are getting \$7,500,000 anyway that they would not have got if the Liberals were in office and therefore they can be denied their constitutional rights because they got some honey.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): On a question of privilege, if the hon. member is going to quote me I suggest that he quote me accurately and refer to *Hansard* and not use this mumbo-jumbo that he is now inflicting on the house. It bears little or no resemblance to what I said.

Mr. Pickersgill: The minister is pretty good at mumbo-jumbo. I was not purporting to quote him; I was purporting to paraphrase him.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): A pretty bad perversion of what I said and he knows it pretty well.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): You are not in this debate at all.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would like to say it seems to me that this government has never understood at all, never appreciated at all, what term 29 meant and what it was about. The Prime Minister, having delved into my past, I will recall one incident in his. It so happened that he and I arrived in Newfoundland on the same day in the same airplane in the year 1957, on the same general mission. The Prime Minister was on television that evening and I had the pleasure of watching him. He was asked by Mr. Don Jamieson of CJON about the royal commission provided under the constitution, and his answer was that he did not think this royal commission should be appointed; there were too many royal commissions anyway.