



# Proceedings of the House of Assembly

---

During the Fourth Session  
of the  
Thirtieth General Assembly  
of Newfoundland

1954

---





PROCEEDINGS  
of the  
FOURTH SESSION  
of the  
THIRTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF NEWFOUNDLAND

---

WEDNESDAY, March 24, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor delivered the following Speech from the Throne:

**MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF  
THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF  
ASSEMBLY:**

Since you last met all the people of the Commonwealth and Empire have been deeply moved by the crowning of a new Monarch as Queen and Head of the Commonwealth. The accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second to the Throne constituted a brilliant milestone in the magnificent story of the British race and its partners. The Coronation itself and the many celebrations that marked it drew to the centre of the Commonwealth and Empire tens of thousands of men and women from all parts of the globe to share, as representatives of tens of millions, in the historic crowning of the Queen. My Prime Minister and my Minister of Education shared with me the privilege and honour of representing you and all the people of this Province in those mighty events.

In conformity with my Government's policy of encouraging the development of the natural resources of

the Province, and in keeping with my Speech to you of about a year ago, my Government have procured the appointment of a Royal Commission on Agriculture. Distinguished men have accepted appointment to this Commission, and several specialists in particular aspects of agriculture have been brought to Newfoundland to assist the Commissioners. Members and officials of the Commission on Agriculture have travelled widely throughout Newfoundland and have devoted themselves industriously to the task of investigating all the problems of agriculture in this Province. My Ministers look forward eagerly to the receipt of the report and recommendations of the Commission, for they hope that these recommendations will form the basis of a firm and practical policy for the more rapid upbuilding of agriculture in all its branches.

The Royal Commission on Forestry has more recently been appointed, and again my Ministers have been fortunate in securing the services of men who are noted for their experience and ability in this field. My Ministers hope that from the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry there will emerge a clear and practical forestry policy that they can follow with confidence and resolution.

My Government hold the view that these two Royal Commissions are amongst the most important bodies ever brought into existence in Newfoundland, and they are sparing no expense to ensure that exhaustive and thoroughly competent investigations will result. Our forests already are the means of providing a living for a large number of our people, and there is not alone the problem of ascertaining whether larger numbers might be supported by our forest wealth, but the even more important question of discovering whether those who at present live by the forests may continue to do so. Agriculture, in the widest possible meaning of the word, and including not merely ground-crops and grasses, but fruits, livestock, poultry, and fur-bearing animals, already provides a living for a considerable number of people. My Ministers fervently hope, that their belief that agriculture could support many times the present number, will be well borne out by the report and recommendations of the Commission. Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries (to which I shall refer at greater length in a moment) together support the great majority of our population. While I believe that all will welcome other industries, and other sources of income for our people, I believe also that there will be general agreement that the long-run prosperity of Newfoundland depends mainly upon the continued expansion of her fisheries, forest industries and agriculture.

I feel it unnecessary, in view of the great efforts being made and the great sums of money being expended, to do more than merely mention today the significance of the mines and mineral resources of the Province.

It is a matter of common knowledge that provision is made, in the Terms

of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, for the appointment by the Government of Canada of a Royal Commission to review the effect of Confederation upon the finances of Newfoundland as a Province of Canada. The reasons for this provision, and the governing conditions, are set forth in the relevant Term. My Ministers realize the importance of this matter and they are resolved to be prepared adequately to present Newfoundland's case in the review. To this end they have invited several well-known citizens to accept membership in a special Commission that will organize and supervise the preparation of Newfoundland's case. I am sure that you have been favourably impressed by the willingness of such prominent citizens to accept membership in the special Commission. They will have the good wishes of all in this Province as they perform this vital service on behalf of Newfoundland.

You will be asked to consider a new Election Act and a new Redistribution Act.

In the view of my Ministers the most important business to be laid before you this session is a Bill to authorize the creation of a Fisheries Development Authority. Almost one half of our people are more or less directly dependent upon the fisheries for their livelihood. Due to a number of causes the fisheries are languishing, and the greatest single need in Newfoundland's economy is some plan for the rehabilitation of the fishermen. It was for this reason that my Ministers urged upon the Government of Canada the wisdom of having both Governments join in the creation of a Fisheries Development Committee. This Committee, which worked for about two years, produced one of the most notable economic

documents, quite possibly the most notable, ever produced in Newfoundland. The report and recommendations of the Fisheries Development Committee constitute a practical guide for the development of our fisheries, and my Ministers have adopted them for that purpose. It is the view of my Ministers that many millions of dollars will have to be spent this year and next year and for some years thereafter to carry out the recommendations of the Fisheries Development Committee. Great skill and great care will be needed in the supervision of this spending, and my Government are convinced of the need for a board or body of men of first-class experience and ability in this field. They are confident that in the members of the recently created Fisheries Development Authority they have men who possess these high qualifications. The Fisheries Development Authority will be charged with control and supervision of the spending of a great many millions of dollars in fishery development, and at the same time they will be charged with the responsibility of a close watching-brief, in my Government's behalf, in the day-to-day and week-to-week operation of the many fishery enterprises that their supervision and control will have brought into existence. It is extremely doubtful whether a small group of men in Newfoundland were ever before called to exercise personal control over so many affairs of economic and financial importance as will come under the supervision of this body.

You will be invited to make provision for the needs of the Public Service and to grant Supply to Her Majesty.

**MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF  
THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF  
ASSEMBLY:**

I am confident that you will give these and all matters that come before you, your most careful attention, and I pray that Providence will guide and bless your labours.

**MR. M. M. HOLLETT** (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you William Joseph Browne, Member for the Electoral District of St. John's West. Mr. Browne has taken the oath and has signed the roll and now awaits your Honour's pleasure to assume his seat in this Honourable House.

**Presenting Petitions**

None.

**Presenting Reports of Standing and  
Select Committees**

None.

**Giving Notice of Motion**

**HON. L. R. CURTIS** (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled; A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretations Act."

Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have to inform the Honourable House that as of 3:00 o'clock this afternoon His Honour the Lieutenant Governor most graciously presided over and opened the Fourth Session of the 30th General Assembly of Newfoundland, at which time His Honour delivered a most gracious Speech from the Throne. For the purpose of accuracy I have now obtained a copy and will now read it to the House.

The Speech from the Throne read by the Clerk.

### Orders of the Day

Address in Reply :

MR. MERCER : Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to move that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has been so graciously pleased to open this session of this Honourable House. It gives me very much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to do so. I can assure the House that I am truly grateful for the honour which the Premier has conferred upon me. I realize, of course, that in granting me this honour today he must have had in mind the great and important part the constituency generally and in particular some of her distinguished sons made in the development of this country from the great and historic district of Port de Grave which I have the honour to represent. It is on behalf of myself personally and on behalf of the district of Port de Grave that I acknowledge this honour.

Now, Sir, I was very pleased to note the reference to Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. This being the first session of this House since her gracious coronation I again renew my allegiance to Her Majesty and I humbly express our best wishes for a long, happy and peaceful reign. May success crown the remainder of that terrific undertaking in the globe encircling journey of Her Majesty and the Duke of Edinburgh. May God speed them to a safe return home.

It was with much pleasure too, Mr. Speaker, that I noted in His Honour's speech a reference to the view held by the Government that the two

Royal Commissions, on Forestry and Agriculture, are, in the mind of the Government, the most important commissions ever to have been appointed in Newfoundland. I realize, Sir, that it will be said, perhaps in the not too distant future, by certain people, that such commissions have been appointed at various intervals down through the ages, and therefore there should be no special significance attached to the creation of these two commissions during the past year by the Government. But, Sir, I note something particular or it might even be spectacular about the appointment of these two commissions: In the first place not only are the commissioners themselves, according to the Speech from the Throne, experts in their respective fields, but they have been and will be assisted by other experts in the various fields which they are investigating. In the second place we have the assurance in His Honour's Speech that this Government will spare no expense to continue and assure the existence of the Commission, and I think in the words of the speech; "until exhaustive and thorough, competent investigations will result."

I am sure there will be general agreement in this House and throughout the country that the Government is well justified in spending any amount of money necessary to continue these two commissions until they do complete a thorough and competent investigation particularly into the possibility of enlarging what I will call our present agricultural sideline undertakings, and change them into real industries which may be a great source of additional employment for our people; and secondly investigate into the best measures to be taken in order to assure con-

ervation of our present timber resources, and find out the best methods of reforestation in order to continue with our present employment in the forest industries, and perhaps increase them in this Province. Their efforts to what I might refer to as external administration in that these Bills will help to simplify and modernize the methods of electing members to this House, and at the same time make the representation in this House more equitable.

Now, Sir, if there is one thing that can be singled out in the Speech from the Throne which would be called really great, or greatest of all, then I say that the greatest of all from the Speech from the Throne today emanates from the last paragraph of the Speech with regard to the fisheries. Because this Speech today serves notice to this House and indeed to the country generally that the Government will this year and for years to come concentrate much of their time and effort and money upon the fishing industry. That notice, Sir, in effect states that the Government realizes that the greatest single need in Newfoundland's economy today is a plan to help the fishermen earn a better living. People generally will agree, I am sure, that it was a very wise decision taken by the Government to have the Royal Commission appointed some three years ago to deal with a fishery investigation. It was two years before a report could be completed by that Commission, and it has been another year since it was received. During that year top level discussions have been held between the Government of the Province and the Federal Government. I am sure it will also be agreed that during this three year period it was useless for the Government to

spend any money worthwhile on the fishery because it would be merely working in the dark. During that period the Government concentrated on what has now become known as the "New Industries." Now, the Speech from the Throne says the Government will concentrate this year and for years to come on the fishery industry. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, if this Government, with its well known driving force, concentrates on the fishing industry of this country, this year and in the years to come, and with the co-operation of the fishermen and the trade, there will be no doubt about its successful outcome. But we should and must get the co-operation of all people concerned in all phases of the industry.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to say that even if no other work is brought before this House during this session than those things mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, particularly that part of it dealing with the fishing industry, and if we can as a body discuss and deal with it intelligently, then, Sir, I say, this session will be one of the most profitable ever known in the history of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I move a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was so graciously pleased to open this session of this Honourable House.

MR. NORMAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion that has been proposed by my honourable friend. I do not intend to go over the ground that he has covered, and I shall not delay the House by taking up every point dealt with in the Speech from the Throne.

There is, however, one matter I would like to touch upon. In speaking on this subject I know that I am voicing the opinions of the great majority of the people I represent in this House—I refer to the fisheries—

The Speech with which His Honour the Lieutenant Governor opened this House today deals with the fact that the most important business to come before this session is the fishery legislation that will be laid before us. This is legislation having to do with the recently appointed fisheries development authority. I am delighted that the fishery is to come in for such discussion in this session. I am sure all our fishermen will be delighted to know their industry is to receive such consideration and debate.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a short-sighted man indeed who would dismiss our important industries, our mines, our agriculture. These are important sources of wealth and they give a living to a great number of our people. It is not necessary to underestimate them nor pooh-pooh them. No matter how strongly we may feel about the fisheries we can still admit the importance of the forestry, fields and mines. The more mineral development we have the better, the more agricultural development and forest development the better. At the same time we must remember that one half of our population gets its living from the fishery, or, if they do not get it wholly from the fisheries they get the bulk of their living. The majority of us in this House have been sent here from fishing districts where the fishermen are in the majority. The membership of this House represents about twenty-five districts altogether. About nineteen of these districts are districts in which the fisheries are the principal

industry of the people. The fishing districts can make or break a government in any general election that may take place in this Province.

I am glad that the two governments have adopted a policy of close and friendly co-operation in fishery matters. I refer to the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland. The two governments got together about three years ago and decided to act together to set up the Fishery Development Committee under the chairmanship of Sir Albert Walsh. I expect we all awaited their report with a great deal of impatience. I can speak for myself and say that I found it very hard indeed to exercise patience while they did their investigating and wrote their report. I am glad today they took the time necessary to do a real job of investigating for it would have been a real tragedy if they had stinted time or trouble to do a real job. It is now and in the future we will benefit from the fact that they took time, all the time they needed, when they had the chance. I fully agree with what the Speech from the Throne says about the great responsibility that lies upon the shoulders of the newly appointed Fishery Development Committee. Sure it is a tremendous job that they are undertaking. It would be a very plain and simple job if they had to take over the management of the biggest fishery firm in Newfoundland. At least it would be a simple and easy job compared with what they would have to do and will have to do in the years at hand. I doubt very much whether there are many in this House today who would like to be in their shoes. They will be responsible for examining in detail every proposal for fishery development pro-



posed by the government or by private enterprise. It will be their task to break down every application for financial assistance to examine it in close detail and decide whether the proposed plan is worth going ahead with. Their "Yes" may decide the fate of many fishing settlements along our far-flung coast, their "No" may spell disaster to dozens of places. It is a responsibility that I would not wish to carry, Mr. Speaker.

I respect and admire this present Government for their fishery policy. They could have rushed in before they were ready; they could have gone ahead without consulting the Government of Canada. Instead of doing so they kept in very close and friendly touch with Ottawa. What they are doing today they are doing after very close consultations with the national capital. I respect their decision to entice very experienced and able men away from private industry to take charge of the actual carrying out of their fishery development programme. I expect there will still be many failures, many disappointments and many heart-breaks before our fisheries have been fully re-organized and fully developed. Anyone who thinks that progress will be steady and unbroken is doomed to disappointment. There will have to be many attempts and experiments and many failures before we can be sure that we are on the right road. I have heard it said that it will cost a hundred million dollars to get our fisheries really organized and really on their feet, and I can well believe it. I do not begrudge a dollar of it. Who is to look for perfection and look for perfection immediately? Wise men know it is not given to mortal men to be perfect, and this great effort to rebuild our fisheries will be

marked by some failures. As these failures become known, and the mistakes become apparent, shallow minds will take full advantage of hindsight and will be able to say "I told you so." Wise and thoughtful men will take careful note of the mistakes and failures and try not to repeat them. They know they will make mistakes but they will try not to make the same mistake twice.

Mr. Speaker, as the elected representative in this House of the great fishing district of Burgeo and La Poile I am sincerely delighted this year of 1954 to see the launching of the fishery development programme. I say it is not a year nor a month too soon. The fishermen had begun to be very discouraged indeed, but I believe the tide has turned. It has been given to this present Liberal Government of Newfoundland to launch many good things for our people, and now once again, it is their province to do something for the fishermen. I shall back them in it through thick and thin and I believe everybody on this side of the House will do the same.

I have great pleasure in seconding the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising in support of the motion, shall I say, ably moved by the honourable member for Port de Grave and even probably more ably seconded by the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile, I wish, on behalf of our Opposition to couple with theirs, our loving thoughts and our gratitude for our Gracious Sovereign and all that



she means to us in this country and in this Commonwealth. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we couple our feelings with theirs in a sentimental manner in regard to our beloved Sovereign. We are loyal to Her, we love Her. We may say, Mr. Speaker, we have not the same love for Her Majesty's Government here in Newfoundland. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that we hate Her Majesty's Government. We give them all the respect which they are entitled to, and I am quite sure that they are entitled to some, and we gladly hand out that respect and we appreciate many, many things which the Government of the day has done for the people of Newfoundland in the past four or five years.

I am glad that the seconder of the motion has stated that they are not unmindful of the mistakes and failures which the Government has made. They say that all wise men make mistakes and failures. I take it therefore, Mr. Speaker, that all good governments make mistakes and failures. However, they have had some crowning achievements, Sir, but unfortunately in the Speech from the Throne today I have not noticed one remark about these crowning achievements of this Liberal Government. To me, Mr. Speaker, the Speech, and I am not going into any detail on the Speech, Sir, the time is not ripe at the moment for that. To me, Sir, and I think to our Opposition too, the Speech sounds somewhat, shall I say, "Fishy." "Fish," "Fish," "Fish," that is all that has been talked about in this Speech from the Throne. I believe they did mention having appointed a couple of Commissions. That is correct. But we do share with the mover and seconder many of the thoughts they have expressed about the fishery. We do hope that

in this coming session, much of our time and thoughts will be devoted to the development of our fisheries, Mr. Speaker, although it seems to me that almost like Pontius Pilot they have washed their hands of the fishery and passed it over to the Federal Government in Ottawa if things we hear from day to day are correct. However, we shall not wash our hands of the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, and we of the Opposition will join with the Government in every move they put forward to benefit the people in many hundreds of our fishing settlements around our coast.

The honourable member who moved the motion, Sir, when he saw me as I escorted our newly elected member for St. John's West into this House today, must have had some feeling possibly of regret, for, if I recollect, I did hear the honourable member stand up in another place and say such wonderful and excellent things about our newly elected member for St. John's West. I feel quite sure that he must have had a heart tremor today as I escorted our newly elected member in on the opposite side of the House.

I am glad, Sir, I had that honour today. I have known the member we brought in here today as a man for many years. This man, Sir, is highly educated, at St. Bon's, Victoria College in Toronto, he was a Rhodes Scholar and was elected as a Jubilee Scholar prior to that. He was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford and was elected to the bar at London and came back here and was elected. And, would you believe, Sir, thirty years ago he walked in here for the first time as a member. In 1925, Sir, I believe, this House was honoured by his presence and it appears we are doubly honoured today, and we

are proud that St. John's West put out that feeling which made our honourable Premier hesitate to put in a man in St. John's West against our newly elected man here. I am very proud of the addition to our Opposition, Sir, and I am quite sure he can help us in our deliberations here in regard to the fisheries and all other matters of government of this country. It is a happy augury, Sir, that we have been able to increase our strength whereas the Government on the opposite side have not been able to increase theirs. We have increased our strength at least by one, and I am quite sure we have increased it in many other ways.

We are with the Government in everything they do for industry, not only, Sir, for the fishery and agriculture and mines, but others also. I believe we have backed them on certain economic development which they had aforetime undertaken and about which very little has been said by the mover and seconder of the motion. We shall have more to say about that as time goes on. However, Sir, not to delay this House, I wish to join on behalf of the Opposition with the mover and seconder in setting up this committee, and we hope, Sir, when this year draws to a close the happy sunshine of prosperity will shine down on this little country of ours even as today, Sir, the sun of Heaven has shone down almost for the first time in this year of Our Lord 1954. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker —

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Premier will close the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to those already expressed to

the honourable gentleman who moved the motion now before you, and to the honourable gentleman who seconded that motion. I have taken particular notice of the fact that ever since parliamentary government was restored to Newfoundland, this House has been especially fortunate in the quality of the speaking that has taken place here. I have followed the movements of this House and the business of it for quite some years, as a newspaper man before I entered it five years or so ago as a member. So that I am somewhat familiar with the quality of the speaking that has taken place here for some thirty years past. These past five years compare, I assure you, more than favourably with the thirty before.

I, like my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, will not go into any of the details of the Speech from the Throne. That is another innovation I have noticed in this Chamber in the past five years. Before that it was the practice on opening day for the Leader of the Opposition to review the Speech from the Throne at some considerable length, sometimes taking as much as an hour to do it. It was usually a very strong speech which attacked the Government in terms, I assure you, much more vehement and much more enthusiastically than those adopted by my honourable friend here today. But in these past five years, beginning with one of the Leaders of the Opposition, one of the long procession of leaders they have had in those past four or five years, (it was the first or second or it might have been the third or fourth of the string of leaders) that began the rather strange practice of dismissing the motion on opening day with a few cursory remarks (and I will have a word "Cursory" under-

stood in its proper meaning). Therefore I will follow my honourable friend's example and deal in no detail whatsoever with the Speech from the Throne beyond saying, as it is my duty and great pleasure to say, that I join in the sentiments expressed in the Speech from the Throne and echoed by the two honourable gentlemen on this side and by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about Her Majesty the Queen. I had the honour of sharing with my colleague the Honourable Minister of Education, the privilege of attending the Coronation on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs also attended the Coronation but not as a representative of the Government. He attended as a representative of the War Veterans of Newfoundland. So that there were three of us from this side who had the great privilege of being present at the Coronation of Her Majesty the Queen. I am glad that I became Premier of Newfoundland if, for no other reason than that, holding that office, it also gave me that opportunity. I don't suppose I will ever live long enough to see the like again. Few in this Chamber perhaps this afternoon will live long enough to see another Coronation. At least we pray that it will be many, many years before another occurs. Therefore I shall always appreciate it as one of the greatest moments of my life, that I was privileged to sit in the very heart of the British Commonwealth, Westminster Abbey, where all the monarchs have been crowned for a great many years. The world is changing and so great nations have sprung up in late years; Russia is one of the greatest nations the world has ever known, great in size, in wealth, in strength; the United States of Am-

erica the greatest nation the world has ever known in size, in wealth and strength, and other great nations. The Mother Country of this Commonwealth has gone down, gone down greatly since the war, but there is some evidence of her climbing back again. I, like most of us, have refused to believe that the great spirit that is the heart of the British can ever lie long prostrate or in the dust. I learned a little more during that visit of what it means to be British, of the pride that one might quite legitimately take without cheap sentiment, cheap flag waving, with honest pride, deep down pride which a man may take in the fact that he is British, that he sprang from these two little islands, England, Scotland and Wales which makes one of them and Ireland North and South the other, that he sprang from that kind of stock. We, of that stock, like to feel that the greatness that is the United States had much the same origin.

I noted carefully what my honourable friend said: "That they are not in love with Her Majesty's Government in Newfoundland." I am disappointed to hear that. I have yearned so for the love of the Opposition, I have needed the encouragement that would have given me, and we all feel the need of it, I am quite sure, on this side of the House.

I noted too what my honourable friend said about the mover and seconder of the motion, their failure to mention the new industries. He asks: "Is it in fact 'Fishy'?" That was the word he used "Fishy." My friend is going to hear so much about fish in this session that he will feel like a fish before it is through. But I was interested in noticing that a note of disappointment with the Speech from the Throne by my two honourable

friends about no reference to the new industries. "All we have heard about," he said, "is fish, fish." Now in the previous years during which he has been here the same honourable gentleman has complained that all the talk was about new industries and there was nothing about fish. His complaint was that he could not get the Government to talk about fish and all they would talk about was new industries. Today his complaint is that all the talk is about fish. What the honourable gentleman never seems to understand is that this is the way this Government works. When we go at fish, we go at fish, blood, brawn and brain, everything we have, just as when we went into new industries we went into it with everything we had. We are a one-track government, we take one thing at a time, mop it up, clean it up. If it is the Opposition we clean them up, if it is a by-election we go in and win.

MR. HOLLETT: Why did you not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will deal with that now. I will tell my honourable friend why.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me here ask the visitors to restrain themselves from making any comment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I had intended in any case to offer very sincere congratulations to the honourable member (the senior or junior member for St. John's West, I am not sure which. Where and when I use the term I refer to age and not in order of the position or honour or academic prestige or standard of education, but I refer always to age. I am not sure which is the senior and which is the junior member) I refer now to the more recently elected of

the two. I congratulate him on his election and welcome him here quite sincerely because, when I am called away from this House or call myself away from it, I should like to leave behind in it some assurance at least that the traditions of the House will be carried on. I am supposed to be the one who sold and hocked the "Pine Clad Hills," sold out our independence, gave away the glorious traditions of Newfoundland. I am supposed to be that "Judas Iscariot" which was the name put on me in this very Chamber by a gentleman who sat on the Opposite side of the House but who is no longer here, I regret to say. He added at least to the colour of this House and somewhat to the gaiety of the nation. But if he were here my honourable friend recently elected could not be here, they could not apparently both be here. But I happen to be one who treasures the very considerable traditions of this House, and one of these traditions undoubtedly is that there should be an opposition. There was not one but now I believe there is one. There was not one but I believe that the honourable gentleman, the recently elected member for St. John's West, is in himself an opposition because of a number of things; because of his educational qualifications to which my honourable friend referred. He is twice a university man, the University in Toronto from which he graduated, I believe, in civil engineering. (Incidentally he will need all his engineering ability in dealing with his new colleagues in this House). He is a graduate of the University of Oxford where he was a Rhodes Scholar. I believe he was graduated in a branch of learning, exactly what I don't know, law or something leading up to law. So that

he is a man undoubtedly of great education, few in this House if any, can equal him in that regard. He is a man of great energy, a worker. I like him for that. He is a worker, he works, he is not afraid of work. He is a student, reads and studies and is not afraid to take a document and read study and master and understand it. I like that about him. He is the first member of the Opposition in the five years who will have tackled his work as a member of the Opposition with a sense of his mission and a sense of duty. No other member has done so. The other members of the Opposition from the day this House was restored, five years ago, no other member has given his duty a thought until he walked into the Chamber—perhaps that is going too far—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw it.

MR. HOLLETT: I only do so on behalf of my learned colleagues. It is my duty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw it unreservedly. But I have heard many speeches in this Chamber during the five years that suggested powerfully to me that those who spoke had not given a thought to the matter until they got on their feet, judging only from the content and quality. The inference would be they had never given the matter a single moment's thought until they stood up; and I have stood in this Chamber on at least twenty-five occasions and pleaded with the Opposition to debate as Bill after Bill after Bill went through this House without a solitary syllable coming from the Opposition side.

MR. HOLLETT: We are not under your thumb.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Opposition does not need to be under the thumb of the Leader of the Government to speak, debate and add their contribution. That is what they are here for. If legislation comes before Mr. Speaker, it is as much the duty of the Opposition to debate it, hammer it out, thrash it out, discuss and analyze it as it is the duty of any member on this side. I say; repeatedly the Opposition failed to do it. While the "Daily News" and the "Evening Telegram" condemned this Government for muzzling the Opposition, we sat here with a sense of futility over the complete failure of our efforts to provoke the Opposition into taking part in debates. Every newspaperman knows that to be true and every member of this House.

Now, that won't be so if I know my honourable friend the newly elected member for St. John's West. I know his record, and I believe my knowledge goes back beyond any honourable colleague of his at this moment. He is a worker. We worked together ourselves many years ago in drafting a Workmen's Compensation Act. Perhaps he knows that I have had the privilege since then as head of the Government of introducing that Bill and it now is a law of the land. My honourable friend was not aware that twenty odd years ago, his new colleague, and I collaborated in the drafting of a modern Workman's Compensation Bill which the Government of that day, of which he was a strong supporter in this House at that time, had promised to introduce, and indeed it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. Nevertheless they failed to introduce it so that it was left to this administration to bring it

before the House and seek its enactment. If the honourable gentleman did not gain a great deal from his membership in this House, I am sure he has gained a great deal from his membership in the House of Commons in the past five years. He will notice many changes here compared with when he was here before. He will notice that the vandals, the betrayers of Newfoundland, the hockers of the South Side Hills, the vendors of the pine clad hills and our glorious traditions, are the Government who have made at least some little effort to collect and put on display some little symbolism of the greatness of the past. I don't know if my honourable friend has been in the Chamber before today or yesterday? If he has he has noticed these paintings. It was the vandals who did this, the destroyers of Newfoundland's traditions. He will see the Premiers of Newfoundland here upon the walls, the speakers and the premiers. If we are spared he will see other evidence in this building as time goes on that this Government does honour and prize the best of our traditions of the past.

I am glad for the Opposition's sake that he is here. If I were the Leader now of the Opposition I think my joy would be rather mixed with dread and apprehension. I think that would be so if I were the Leader.

MR. HOLLETT: You are suspicious.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As I remember he is the third in the line. As I remember the fact of the—I don't remember whether it was three, four or five, I get mixed up. I have to be told how many leaders there have been. Like the parent party in Ottawa, in my own personal recollection

I have known three leaders of the "Tory" party in Ottawa. I well remember Gordon Graydon when he was the leader and John Bracken and now Mr. Drew—three leaders within seven or eight years. So that, if I were the present Leader of the Opposition, if a man who is a parliamentarian, a student, a worker and an educated man of great industry and patience and great determination, I may say that with such a man as that becoming my colleague, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I would not sleep much at night wondering who is to be the next leader, if it would be I or the new man with five years' experience in Ottawa. As far as we are concerned on this side of the House anyone they care to select as leader will be quite acceptable to us. We will be glad to have anyone of the five of them as leader.

But my honourable friend wanted to know why we did not contest St. John's West. I will tell you now. I will be very candid about it and very frank: If we had gone up and taken this district in this by-election, my honourable friends would still be four, and certain people who should be nameless for the moment, certain people who have been on the pivot, penny-on-edge, as to whether to continue to support this Opposition as the Opposition to the present Liberal Party or to scrap it and create a new one would, I think, have slipped down on one side if we had gone up and taken this election as we could have done so easily. We had done it in August so there was no reason we could not have done it a few weeks later. If, then, these important people who had been considering whether they would continue to support the present Opposition as the Opposition to this Government or create a new



one, would have slipped, I think, away from their support of the present party and who knows, perhaps a stronger party might have emerged. So I said to myself; "Better the devil you know than the devil you don't know." "The Opposition you have may disappear and perhaps another be created." So I said; "Let us give this thing support, let us give them another man." Now we were in some doubt as to who that man would be. We thought it might be the man it turned out to be and we thought it might be a former colleague of his in the opposite end of the City. They both had found themselves suddenly suspended between winds and water, both of them parliamentarians with no parliament, politicians with no politics. So we kept our fingers crossed and said; "Whichever it will be it will strengthen the Opposition some." Mr. Speaker, along with all the other assistance we have given, all the effort, all the concern for the things introduced to this House, now you must add another, our determination that we would create an opposition where there was not one. We will now watch and if it should be necessary for them to have one more member, say, I think even that could be arranged.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Motion carried.

The following members will comprise the committee:

Honourable member for Port de Grave.

Honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile.

Honourable junior member for St. John's East (Mr. Higgins).

### Giving Notice of Motion

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act," and a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act," and a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

### Notice of Questions

MR. HOLLETT: 1. To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. A full report on the activities of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Ltd.

2. How much money from the Treasury has been paid to NALCO?

3. How many shares in NALCO are presently owned by the Government and how much was paid for each share?

4. How many shares are owned in NALCO by (a) Private Individuals, (b) Corporations, and what price per share was paid for these shares?

5. What percentage of shares in NALCO is presently owned by the Government?

6. What, if any, interest financially or otherwise has Canadian Javelin in NALCO at the present time?

7. Did Canadian Javelin purchase any shares in NALCO, and if so how many and at what price per share?

8. What salary was being paid Dr. Alfred A. Valdmanis by NALCO at the time of his resignation?

9. What, if any concessions to date have been granted by NALCO? State to whom such concessions were granted, the extent of the concession, and in what areas were such concessions granted?

10. Where has been situated the Head Office of NALCO during the past twelve months?

11. Give an itemized account of all expenditures made by NALCO since its incorporation, and table a statement showing income and the amount of money on hand at the present time by this Crown Corporation.

12. Give the names and addresses of the present Directors of NALCO. How many shares are owned in

NALCO by each of these said Directors?

2. To ask the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Give a detailed account of steps being taken by the (a) Provincial Government, (b) by the Federal Government to implement the recommendations of the Newfoundland Development Committee, relative to the fullest utilization of known Fishery resources.

2. On the North East Coast what, if any, steps have been taken towards centralization of the salt fish industry, and what centres have been selected for the establishment of suitable plants to take care of the inshore fishery along that coast?

3. Have any negotiations thus far taken place relative to the establishment of small meal plants along the Northeast Coast as recommended in the aforementioned Development Committee Report?

4. Have either the Provincial or the Federal Government taken any steps to implement the recommendations in the memorandum dated November 20th, 1952, by the Walsh Committee relative to (a) reconnaissance survey begun in 1952, (b) selected sites, (c) essential services at those sites? Give details of any such implementations.

5. What encouragements have been offered by the Government for minor centralization of curing operations in small settlements. Give locations where any such efforts have been made.

6. What, if any, efforts to this end have thus far been made by the Co-operative Division of the Dept. of Fisheries and Co-operatives?



7. Have the Government given any consideration to the choice of Salt depots in strategic locations as recommended by the Committee, if so, what centres have been selected?

8. Give a detailed account of any Housing Schemes envisaged for fishermen.

9. What, if any programme of market research has thus far been instituted by either the Provincial or the Federal Government?

10. Who is Newfoundland's representative on the Fisheries Research Board of Canada?

11. Who are the personnel of the Standing Joint Committee on Fishery matters and who is Executive Secretary, and what is the salary of said Executive Secretary?

12. What was the total cost to the Treasury of (a) the Newfoundland Fisheries Survey? (b) the Royal Commission under Sir Albert Walsh? Give a detailed statement of said costs.

3.—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

(1) Table certified copies of all warrants of the Lieutenant-Governor since March 31st, 1953, having to do with the authorization of issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, and as found in the Minutes of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

(2) Table reports as required by Section 37 (a) of The Audit Act, showing manner in which such expenditures were urgently needed for the public good.

(3) Table copies of the Public Accounts.

(4) How much money has been credited to the Sinking Fund set up in connection with the Ten Million Dollar Loan raised last year, and where and how is this money invested?

(5) Lay on the Table of the House a detailed account of all Temporary Loans since March 31st, 1953, as authorized by Section 26 of The Revenue and Audit Act. Show amount of each Temporary Loan, the date of raising it, the date when paid off, and the rates of interest charged by the bank, as also the name of the bank.

4.—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. How much money has been advanced to the following three Companies by the Government since March 31st, 1953, either as working capital or on Capital Account: Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd., Atlantic Gypsum Ltd., The North Star Cement Co.?

2. Give the total amounts to date paid out to, advanced or loaned to the following Industries, including Capital Account Expenditures and working Capital:

- (a) Eckhardt Mills Ltd.
- (b) Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.
- (c) Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.
- (d) Newfoundland Tanneries—William Dorn.
- (e) Atlantic Gloves Ltd.
- (f) Canadian Leather Goods Ltd.
- (g) Koch Shoes Ltd.
- (h) Superior Rubber Co.
- (i) Hanning Electric Co.
- (j) Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Ltd.
- (k) North Star Cement Co.
- (l) Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.

- (m) United Cotton Mills Ltd.
- (n) Atlantic Films and Electronics Ltd.
- (o) Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.

3. Give the number of men and women presently employed in each of the above named factories or plants.

4. How many Newfoundlanders are employed in each of these plants.

5. Table Balance Sheets, and Profit and Loss Accounts to the end of February as from March 31st, 1953 of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd., and Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.

6. What amounts if any, have been raised by way of Government guaranteed loans by companies listed in question (2) above, and what amounts if any, have been paid back to the Government by said Companies on account of (a) moneys advanced by Government, (b) interest on moneys loaned or advanced by Government?

7. What is the total value of machinery brought into Newfoundland by companies listed in (2) above, and who certified as to said value? Give a statement in the case of each company, showing Invoice, Cost, Freight, Insurance, Duty and Cartage. Table a copy of all mortgages held by Government on machinery and buildings of said companies.

5.—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. A list of all brands of alcoholic liquors including wines and beers, purchased by the Board of Liquor Control since January 1st, 1953. Give names of manufacturers of each brand and the names of all local agents.

2. What local agents have sold alcoholic liquors to the Board of Liquor

Control since March 31st, 1953, and what was the total quantities purchased through these agents over the same period? Give amounts purchased through each individual agent.

3. Give the amount of money paid out by the Board of Liquor Control for alcoholic liquors since March 31st, 1953, and state the amount of moneys received by the Board over the same period on account of the sale of alcoholic liquors including wines and beers.

4. Give the number of persons employed in carrying out the work of the Board by classifications, together with wages or salaries for each classification of worker.

5. List all Taverns, Hotel and Club Licenses in Newfoundland, with name and address of the proprietors, together with names and addresses of the owners of premises from which alcoholic liquors are sold.

6. What, if any, Licenses have been issued for the sale of liquor from premises in which any member of this Honourable House has a proprietary interest or a monetary interest of any kind. List names of such members and location of buildings concerned.

7. In all cases where owners of premises where alcoholic liquors are sold are a Limited Liability Company, and in all cases where licenses have been granted to a Limited Liability Co., list the names of shareholders of said Companies.

6. MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. The total amount of money to the credit of the Provincial Government in the Bank of Montreal or other

Banks as at April 1st, 1953, and at March 15th, 1954.

2. The total amount of each surplus to the credit of the Province on deposit with the Government of Canada as at April 1st, 1953, also state if there has been any withdrawals from the surplus during the present fiscal year.

3. Table statement showing the total Revenue collected under the various Departments from April 1st, 1953, to February 28th, 1954, Revenue on Current Account, Capital Account, and Financial Surplus Account to be shown separately.

4. Table statement showing the total Expenditure under the various Departments from April 1st, 1953, to February 28th, 1954. Expenditures on Current Account, Capital Account, and Financial Account to be shown separately.

7.—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Table statement showing the total amount received by the Department of Finance from the Federal Government during the present fiscal year, under Subheads of Revenue, 453 Tax Rental Agreement, 455 Transitional Grant, and 460 Interest on Exchequer Balances, also state if there are any balance due and payable on these items of Revenue to March 31st, 1954.

2. Table statement showing the total revenue collected under Subhead 470. Social Security Assessment, for each month April 1st, 1953 to February 28th, 1954, also inform the House if any substantial amounts have been collected by the Department of Finance by reason of the recent Court action in respect of this item of Revenue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment may I say that it would be our hope that the Opposition would be ready on Monday to proceed with the debate on the Address in Reply.

I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, March 29th, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 29th, at 3:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, March 29th, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

HON. MR. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I beg leave to present a petition to the House, and before doing so, I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the honourable member who came into this House a few days ago. The honourable and learned gentleman has had a most distinguished record in Newfoundland affairs. He is the only man in the House who had a seat in the House of Assembly when we had Dominion Government and he is the first Newfoundlander who has sat in this House and also in the House of Commons at Ottawa. I am sure the honourable gentleman will do much to bolster up the arguments of the Opposition.

My purpose in rising, as I said, was to present a petition. As you know it is the inherent right of the people to lay petitions before the House whereby they can seek redress for wrongs.

In a year or two we will be celebrating the centenary of Responsible Government in Newfoundland. In those one hundred years a great many petitions were presented; some of them frivolous and some of them of the utmost importance to the people concerned. I very much doubt if ever a petition was presented which had so much natural justice behind it as the petition I am about to present. The petition is from the people of Trepassey, signed by every adult in the area—men and women; from Renewes and Fermeuse, as well as Kingman's, Admiral's, Riverhead, Aquaforte, Briggs and Bauline. The number of signatures on the petition is between 2500 and 3,000 and what these people are asking for in this modern day and age is telephone and electric light.

If a stranger were to come to this country, knowing its history, knowing it is one of the places that were earliest inhabited, knowing its proximity to St. John's, I think such a stranger would say that these people have a legitimate and natural argument for these amenities which are the right of any civilized community.

But that is only a part of the story. In this very district there is generated more than 80% of the hydro-electric power used on the Avalon Peninsula. At Horse Chops, Tors Cove and Mobile hydro-electric power is generated, passes through the transmission lines and is taken out to be used in St. John's and other areas. Forty-five thousand horse-power is generated there and yet these people are sitting down to read by kerosene lamps and are denied the use of telephone and other modern amenities. It is a situation that should not exist. It is a monstrous injustice.

At Fermeuse one of the most mod-

ern fish plants in Newfoundland is built and they have to generate their own electric power by means of diesel engines. Diesel engine power is very expensive; that means operating costs are high; and that means that the fishermen are getting less than they should.

Similarly, at Trepassey, there is now in the course of construction a fish plant which will go into operation this summer. That plant has to depend on diesel power rather than electric power, while 45,000 horse-power is generated in the area and transmitted elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: Time!

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): I rise to support the prayer of the petitioners so eloquently begun to be moved by the honourable member for Ferryland.

When I invited the honourable member to represent the Liberal Party in the last election, I authorized him to say to the people up there that the Government would make every honest effort to see that electricity was brought to them. We have, indeed, been making and are now making every possible effort to fulfil that pledge, but there are difficulties in the way, with which the honourable gentleman is thoroughly familiar. The fact of the matter is, the company which is generating electricity on the southern shore have not the right to sell electricity in that district.

The Newfoundland Light & Power Company are making electricity, but the United Towns Electric Company have the right to distribute and sell it. In order for the United Towns to generate more electricity, they have to have more equipment; they cannot have more equipment unless they

have money; they cannot get the money unless we give it to them. Unless the Government is prepared to give them the money with which to develop, the fact is the United Towns cannot supply any more electricity than they are already supplying.

You have, therefore, the surprising situation, as my colleague has just said, that 45,000 horse-power electricity is being generated, while people just a few miles distant have to use kerosene lamps and industrial establishments are using diesel power.

Quite frankly, in order to supply the power necessary, we have either to nationalize the hydro-electric plants and set up an hydro-electric commission or we must persuade the Newfoundland Light & Power Company to buy out the existing companies in Newfoundland. The Newfoundland Light & Power Company have all the facilities, the capital and the know-how. If we can get them to take over the Union Electric Company at Port Union as well as the United Towns Electric, then, with their drive, their energy and their capital, they will be able to develop all the horse-power potential on the three peninsulas.

It is well in hand. My honourable friend can be of good cheer. He can inform his constituents that they can be of good cheer, that it will not be many years—perhaps even months—before they have the electricity for which they yearn and which they deserve.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: I would like to thank the honourable member for Ferryland for his remarks concerning me, and although I know he is a good historical student, I would like to remind him that the honourable member sitting in front of him—

the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island—was also a member in this House when we had Responsible Government. In 1932-34 we had the pleasure of sitting on the same side of the House.

I do not think anybody on this side of the House expected such a discussion this afternoon. We all agree with the desirability of bringing light and telephone to those areas. Every member must know that this a private company and the first thing it figures is how much will it cost to bring the power to the people; and how much revenue it will receive. This is a very broad subject as the Premier knows. The Premier not being able—or the Government has not been able to solve it. I think the Government should certainly give its attention to this proposition.

It seems strange that a member of the Government should present a petition when that petition has to be referred to one of the departments of Government. I presume that is still the procedure; and it will be referred, probably, to the department of Economic Development. I am sure it will have the blessings of this side of the House when the matter is matured.

Moved and seconded that the petition be referred to the department concerned.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

HON. MR. POWER (Minister of Finance): With the unanimous consent, I move the House into Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act granting an interim supply to Her Majesty." It is calculated on one-eighth of the total vote for 1953-54.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair, Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

1. Carried.

Schedule: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 carried.

12. Board of Liquor Control—\$40,000.00.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): It strikes me as unusual that \$40,000 would be needed for the Board of Liquor Control. I was under the impression that it is in good standing; in fact, could advance money to the Government. How correct I am on that I cannot be assured, but it does seem strange to vote \$40,000 to the Board of Liquor Control. Perhaps the Minister could explain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are statutory salaries voted by the House. The authority to pay is contained in the Motion, otherwise the Board could not pay its employees. The purpose is to authorize payment of salaries and other operating expenses for a short period.

Carried.

13. Municipal Affairs and Supply—\$100,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the same apply to this? The payment of salaries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And other expenses.

13. Carried.

14. Carried.

15. Economic Development — \$750,000.

MR. BROWNE: Could we have some explanation of this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is on Capital Account to clean up items which became due in the year just dying. It is in the form of a revote.

MR. BROWNE: It would help in future if the amount of the re-vote was itemized.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is done in the estimates.

MR. F. FOGWILL: Would the Premier inform the House how the vote will be spent during the next two months—what particular plants in operation or under construction to which the money will be devoted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say quite frankly that I do not know. We can get it from the Controller of the Treasury. My informed guess would be Eckhardt Mills at Briggs who are drawing from time to time, and who might need to draw at any moment—the shoe plant at Harbour Grace and the new company that took over the White Clothing Company and are now building at the north west corner of the city near the textile mills. These three companies are in the course of construction and under agreement made between them and the Government, we have to make payments from time to time under certain conditions laid down. I assume and believe this three quarter million is reserved for this purpose.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister of Economic Development if any of these amounts is to be given to the Hardwood Mill, the Birch Veneer Mill as working capital?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. This three quarter of a million, I admit, ought to have been broken down. I



would rather think that as this thing is prepared by the Controller of the Treasury, we are merely acting as the medium presenting it to the House.

MR. BROWNE: May I direct a question to the Minister of Finance to tell us whether any of this money is going for working capital for any of these institutions?

MR. POWER: What institutions?

MR. BROWNE: Is any of this seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to be used for working capital for any of the industries?

MR. POWER: I must say that as far as I know I don't think so. I can get that information.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable Premier stated that some of the money was going to the Eckhardt Mills, but I have no recollection of passing any Bill or amount for the Eckhardt Mills. I am wondering why we have to vote supplementary supply to give these people money unless the thing had been before the House. I can see how we have to pay people's salaries and live up to our commitments relative to any industry. But I don't recollect any legislation dealing with the Eckhardt Mills. Maybe the Premier can refresh my memory. I wonder if the Premier could tell us about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already said I don't know. I do know it can be only for the purpose of enabling the Government to fulfil its financial commitments. I know that is all the Controller of the Treasury would have in mind when asking the Minister to ask the House for this three quarter of a million dollars pending the bringing down of the budget and the estimates at the pro-

per time. I don't know the breakdown or the details. Frankly, I don't know. I think it is a perfectly simple matter for the Minister to ask someone to phone the Controller of the Treasury for a breakdown, and I am sure he would have no objection to doing it.

MR. POWER: I would like to point out that this amount of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars will not necessarily be spent. It is a rough shot.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, we would like to have some information. After all it is only seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars they are asking. It might very well be twenty-five millions—but if we had some little information from the Minister as to what the various amounts, apart from salaries, are for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do suggest Mr. Chairman, as this is merely interim supply and the estimates proper must come before the House, when, as always in the past, ample opportunity will be given for debate on each and every individual item of the estimates.

As my honourable friend on the opposite side knows they don't need to exercise their watch-dog functions and duties on what is merely interim supply, which also must be debated when the estimates and supply in the main are brought before the House. That is clear, and I think my honourable friend will agree.

MR. BROWNE: I think though the proposal here, seven hundred and fifty thousand for a department that had only two and a half million last year on current and capital account, which is not one eighth. I think it

is one-eighth, I could not hear distinctly. It is one sixth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, one-sixth. But my honourable friend must not suppose that this is the rate at which the money is to be spent throughout the twelve months. Any money to be spent in the Department of Economic Development must be spent over the next few months, after which none is spent except the current expenses of the department. It is only a matter of cleaning up outstanding commitments which would necessitate any money.

MR. HOLLETT: It shows entries for advances for which we have no legislation whatsoever. Items passed in the House I have no objections, but I object to voting supplementary supply for companies we know nothing about. In one instance we have the Eckhardt Mills on which we are asked to vote supplementary supplies. Surely we are entitled to ask about that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister bring us this information tomorrow?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To save time, if it is the pleasure of the committee and later of the House to pass this through, and dispose of it so that we can get on with other business, I suggest we get the information now. Somebody has gone, I believe to get it. We can give the information as soon as it comes in even if this business is passed.

Item 15 carried.

Item 16—Labour—carried.

Total \$5,750,000 carried.

Schedule carried.

Resolution read, carried.

Moved and seconded the committee report having passed the resolutions.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have passed certain resolutions and have instructed me to report same.

Resolutions ordered received—read a first time and concurred in, read a second time.

Honourable Minister of Finance asks leave to introduce a Bill based on said resolutions—read a first time. Ordered read a second time now. Read a second time. Ordered read a third time. Read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for the Minister of Finance to make that explanation?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, does it not go back into committee again?

MR. SPEAKER: This Bill does not of necessity go to a committee of the whole since the contents of the Bill were discussed in the present committee on supply, which duly referred the annual expropriation Bill to the Committee of the Whole for discussion. This has been a breakdown merely representing one-eighth of the total amount voted on capital and current account last year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is quite one-eighth of last year's vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One-sixth, the same proportion as the rest.

MR. BROWNE: Is it one-sixth or one-eighth?



MR. SPEAKER: I read one-eighth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Current and capital together.

MR. BROWNE: As you pointed out most of this is to be spent in the next few months, it is not a proper proportion as far as this vote is concerned.

Bill passed.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I submit here a printer's proof for the public accounts of the Province of Newfoundland 1953 with the Auditor's Report thereof. I request these be laid on the Table of the House forthwith.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very voluminous document and contains vital information of importance to all the people of the country. A mere tabling of it is not very much help. I wonder if the practice has been considered of appointing a standing committee to examine into the public accounts. They have such a committee, of course, in most legislatures. They have one in Nova Scotia, and I feel sure in other Provinces of Canada. I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, like to propose to the Minister of Finance and to the Premier, the desirability of having a standing committee composed of members of both sides of the House to examine the public accounts just laid on the table.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to know that my honourable friend for St. John's West so early in his new career as a member of this House is endeavouring to introduce the much superior technique with which he grew familiar in the House of Commons. I promise him we will give further thought to

the matter. I will not promise action in this session, but do promise to give it further thought; we have already thought about it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the Premier's reply as being one which would be regarded very highly by the people of this country. These are the accounts of the expenditures of some forty millions of dollars. As they are now they are meaningless, unless they can be examined by a committee and details given where necessary. They can have no significance otherwise, and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is sufficient that we should be told the Premier is going to give further thought to it, and won't promise to bring it in this session. It may be no good if it is not brought in this session. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I trust he will reconsider what he has just said, and make every effort to have a standing committee to examine the public accounts appointed in this session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure my honourable friend will be a tower of strength to his own party, and to that side of the House, and insofar as he seeks to advise and guide his colleagues on that side, whom, I am sure, are most happy to be guided by him. But I assure him that as on the first day after opening day that this side of the House will not too readily agree to take guidance from him. I have no doubt whatsoever that procedures in the House of Commons at Ottawa was vastly superior to anything in this little House in Newfoundland. The practice of having the Auditor General examine all the accounts of the government and reporting on them and the practice of seeking permission to having these printed, then printing them and cir-

culating them and allowing the Opposition and the public to have them and to put them on sale in the shops. That practice has been carried out for over a hundred years in this little Island of Newfoundland and has somehow or other seemed to meet the need of the people. If my honourable friend now discovers it does not meet the need of the people, it means he has some mysterious access to the thoughts and desires and needs of the people denied to the people's government on this side of the House and up to now to his own colleagues on that side. As I have said, we will consider it. We have already done so on more than one occasion. If ever we decide to follow that procedure, we will say so, soon after we decide that it is convenient so to do.

MR. BROWN: I would like to correct the honourable Premier. He is mistaken if he thinks the public accounts were never produced in this country in detail before. They were prior to 1934 when they were produced and brought up item by item. There was a large book brought in here and any member could examine it. We did not, it is true have a committee. I think you will agree that, since the government is so progressive in so many ways and are so anxious to have the last word, I think they will agree it is desirable that a committee be appointed. Then, I think we could think of them with even greater admiration than ever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't think I have nearly as much admiration. There is no change whatsoever in the way it is done now and what was done when my honourable friend was before a member of this House of Assembly. The procedure is that the public accounts are audited. The only difference is that there is a real audit

now, there is a treasury control. In addition to the present audit and treasury control, there is a post audit and the results are brought here, as they were today, and permission only asked to have them printed. If this permission be granted they are printed and are circulated. That is exactly as it had been done for over a century in Newfoundland. There is no change whatsoever. The only change is the ~~one my honourable friend has suggested~~. No doubt, he is full of admiration for what they do in Ottawa, and no doubt he will try to impress all of us on both sides it is better we do it the way they do it in Ottawa. I venture to advise him to hesitate, to suppress any temptation he may have to get us to improve all our ways by merely copying Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will realize all this is highly irregular. Honourable members have not only spoken more than once but more than twice. I said that just for the matter of clarification. If any other honourable member wishes to speak.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask one question, just one, a plain question that can be answered with a plain "Yes" or "No." It is a supplementary question, whether we on the Opposition side will have made available to us this day a copy.

MR. POWER: The honourable member will be given a copy. I think all the discussion is a little premature as I have not yet had permission to have these copies printed.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly. The honourable minister tabled the report with the request to have the printing done. I rather imagine he could now perform a feat of wizardry and have them printed in a few seconds. Does

the House give permission to print these reports?

Permission granted.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I have had a quick job done, and ask permission to table these.

### Presenting Reports

MR. I. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a report of the select committee appointed to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech with which His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor has been so pleased to open this session of the legislature. The draft of the reply is as follows:

To His Honour the Lieutenant Governor,

Sir Leonard Cecil Outerbridge,  
Knight Bachelor, C.B.E., D.S.O.  
May it please your Honour,

We, the Commons of Newfoundland, in Legislative Session assembled, beg to thank Your Honour for the Gracious Speech which Your Honour has addressed to this House.

(Sgd.) Isaac Mercer.

G. M. Norman.

James D. Higgins.

Assembly Room,

March 29th, 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is this report be adopted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, might we defer the debate.

Moved and seconded the debate be deferred to a later hour this day.

### Notice of Questions

(8) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What were the amounts of money spent in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953 on the maintenance of the Deer Lake-Corner Brook Highway, including the paved section from Steady Brook to Corner Brook?

2. How much money was spent on snow clearing on the same section of Highway during each of the said winters, that is 50-51, 51-52, 52-53, and 53-54?

3. State the number of men employed at the Highroads Garage at Deer Lake during the winters of 51-52, 52-53, and 53-54.

4. What salaries or wages are paid to the following personnel at the Highroads Dept. at Deer Lake: District Roads Shop Foreman, District Roads Accountant, and the District Roads Storekeeper?

(9) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. The number of men and women employed at the Birch Plant as of March 22nd, 1954, and the exact number of men and women laid off work on March 23rd?

2. What reasons have been given by the operating Company to the government for this lay-off?

3. Can the government give any assurance to the House that those people recently laid off work at the Birch Plant will shortly be re-employed by the company?

4. State the rates of pay for the different classifications of work performed at the aforementioned Birch Plant.

5. State the amount of salaries be-

ing paid to Manager Baird, Mr. Merritt, and Mr. Bell at said Birch Plant.

6. Table a statement showing (a) Salaries and wages paid out by the Birch Plant since March 31st, 1953; (b) the amount of moneys paid for birch and other materials for said plant since said date, as well as amounts owing to suppliers of birch and other goods and materials for said plant for same period; (c) amount of money received for birch products of said plant since March 31st, 1953, as well as amounts due for goods delivered; (d) the value of stocks of birch on hand both raw and manufactured as of the present date; (e) the exact amount of cash working capital on hand as of this date.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: The value of birch on hand. The point of order is that it is out of order for any honourable member to ask a question once it becomes apparent this question is out of order. That is my point of order. I ask Your Honour to rule on it. The honourable gentleman is asking a series of questions about the affairs of a private, limited liability company. By now, I suggest, it has become apparent that is what he is doing. I therefore suggest the question is out of order, and he is out of order in continuing to put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is giving notice of a question that he is about to ask on tomorrow. It would be difficult to rule on the question at this stage.

MR. HOLLETT (Cont'd):

(9) 7. How much money has been advanced to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. as Working Capital since March 31st, 1953, and what amount, if any has been paid back to the gov-

ernment on account of Capital Account and of Working Capital?

(10) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. A complete list of all outright loans from the Treasury to individuals or Corporations since April 1st, 1949, whether for economic development, fishery development, or for any other purpose, showing name of individual or corporation, the amount loaned, and the present amount still outstanding on said loan.

2. A complete list of all guaranteed loans made by the government to individuals, or corporations since April 1st, 1949, whether for economic development, fishery development, or for any other purpose, showing the name of individual or corporation, the amount guaranteed, and the present situation with regard to said guaranteed loan?

3. List the loans made by Commission of Government for fishery development or encouragement of the fishery industry and state what amounts are still owing on each.

(11) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What amounts have been collected to date during the present fiscal year on account of (a) Social Security Assessment Act; (b) The Gasoline Tax; (c) Cancer Control Tax; (d) Mineral Leases; Royalties, etc.

2. What, if any, is the amount of the overdraft loan or advance of the Treasury at the Bank of Montreal at the present time? If there is no over-



draft loan or advance what amount stands to the credit of the Treasury at the Bank of Montreal at the present time?

3. What loans were negotiated with the Bank of Montreal by the Treasury since March 31st, 1953? Give the date of each loan, advance or overdraft, the amount involved on each separate occasion, and the interest rate charged by the said Bank.

4. Give the amounts of Revenue and Expenditure by Departments to the present time, both on current account and on capital account.

(12) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Give a statement showing the number of persons receiving able-bodied assistance in the Province for each month since March 31st, 1953. Also give statement showing the number in each Electoral District in receipt of able-bodied relief.

2. Give detailed statement showing the cost of said relief each month, by Districts. Show also the amount per person or per family, and whether in cash or by order on merchants.

3. Give the number of persons per

the cost of same

since March 31st, 1953, how much has been paid out by Districts on account of (a) Dependents' Allowance, (b) Mother's Allowance, (c) Maintenance of Children, (d) Board and Lodging of Indigents, (e) Old Age Assistance?

5. Give statement showing total cost or expenditure in detail of Northern

Labrador Affairs since March 31st, 1953. What revenue have accrued from same?

(13) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. How much money has been loaned to help fishermen to finance new and better methods, new and better boats and gear, by the Fisheries Development Loan Board since its inception? Give names of individual fishermen, address and amount of loan in each case?

2. What is the exact amount of money which has thus far been placed at the disposal of this Loan Board, for said purposes by the Government?

3. How much money has been loaned by the Co-operative Loan Board since its formation? Give names of individuals or Societies to whom money has been loaned in each case, the amount of the loan, as well as the date of same?

4. How much money has thus far been placed at the disposal of this Board, and what is the present status financially of each Society to whom money was loaned relative to its association with the Loan Board?

5. How much money was loaned by

MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What is the total number of paid-up shares to date of the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited, commonly known as Brinco?

2. What is the total moneys thus far

expended by this Corporation on the exploration and investigation of natural resources contained in the 60,000 square miles of exploration leases given to said corporation by the Government?

3. Give an itemized statement showing expenditure incurred by Rothschilds prior to the signing of the leases, under headings (a) Incorporation; (b) exploration; (c) investigation in Newfoundland and Labrador?

4. Give a detailed account of operations undertaken to date by Brinco along the lines of investigation and exploration in the leased areas, showing the number of geologists, mining experts, timber experts, hydro-electric experts and other specialists engaged on the work.

5. To what extent has Brinco exercised its option to take up exploration leases as granted under section No. 3 of their Agreement with the Government?

6. Give the names and addresses of all Directors of Brinco, and list the shareholders in same, with number of shares held by each.

(15) MR. HIGGINS: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing:

(a) The names, (b) the nationalities and (c) the salaries of all engineers, architects, surveyors and draughtsmen employed by the Department of Public Works.

(16) MR. HIGGINS: To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Is it the intention of the Government of Newfoundland to make any appointments to the Magistracy?

2. If so, how many appointments are to be made and in what areas are such appointees to be located?

3. Are appointees to the magistracy to have any legal training?

(17) MR. HIGGINS: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Does the Government of Newfoundland maintain a cabin or cabins on the Gander River?

2. If so, when was this property acquired and from whom and at what price?

3. For what purpose is this property maintained?

4. Was this property used during 1953? If so, during what periods and by whom?

5. Is there any staff employed to maintain this property? If so, list the names and salaries.

(18) MR. HIGGINS: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to publish the report of the inquiry conducted into the administration of the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases?

2. In the case of employees suspended during the inquiry but exonerated by the findings thereof, is it the intention of the Government or the Department to reinstate any or all of such persons in their employment?

3. How many employees in all were suspended or dismissed during the investigation carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

4. Have any of these persons since been employed in the Department of Health or any other department of Government?

(19) MR. HIGGINS: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. The total amount spent on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) since April 1st, 1949; (b) in each fiscal year since 1949, how much of this amount was expended (1) by the Federal Government, (2) by the Provincial Government?

2. Give (a) the total number of men employed last year on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland and (b) the total moneys spent in wages.

3. Give the total mileage of new road construction on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) since April 1st, 1949; (b) in each fiscal year since April 1st, 1949.

4. How many miles of road remain to be constructed, and the number of bridges together with approximate costs apart from paving?

5. How many miles of secondary roads were constructed during the past fiscal year and where located? Give the cost and the names of the contractors or builders.

6. How much money was spent on repairs to secondary roads during the past fiscal year?

7. How much money was spent during the past fiscal year on roads in (a) the electoral district of St. John's East; (b) each of the other electoral districts (not including the Trans-Canada Highway)?

(20) MR. FOGWILL: To ask the

Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Under what head of expenditure was the one dollar and fifty cents per quintal advance payment to fishermen made, what is the total amount expended to date, and what is the estimated amount required to finalize these payments?

2. Table a detailed statement showing the total number of bottles of rum, whiskey, gin, beer and wines, sold by and through the Board of Liquor Control, since April 1st, 1953, to February 28th, 1954.

3. Table a statement showing the total amount of Import Duties, Excise Taxes and or Excise Duties, paid to the Federal Government by the Board of Liquor Control, in respect of the importation of liquor, beer and wine, since April 1st, 1953, to date.

(21) MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Table statements showing how Subhead of Revenue, 1953, 1953-54 estimates of Revenue, interest on industrial loans, is made up, giving the names of all individuals, firms or companies concerned, also the interest rate, the interest due date, as well as the amount paid in each case under this head of revenue.

2. Table statement showing the total salary paid to Doctor Alfred Valdmanis as Director of Economic Development, since he was employed by the Newfoundland Government, giving the date when he entered and ended his services with the Government, as well as the total amount of travelling and living allowances paid to him during his term of service.

**Answers to Questions**

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can answer some of the questions that make up No. 1; some of the sections. The Annual Meeting of NALCO is to be held on the 8th or 6th of April. Following that Annual Meeting, the Annual Report together with the Auditor's Report and Balance Sheet will be available to the Directors and then will be available to the House. As soon as possible after the Annual Meeting, I will table the Annual Report, the Auditor's Report and the Balance Sheet.

(2) How much money from the Treasury has been paid to NALCO?

The answer is \$900,000.00.

(3) How many shares in NALCO are presently owned by the Government, and how much was paid for each share?

The answer is 900,000 shares at \$1.00 each. That was the original number and it has never been changed.

(4) How many shares are owned in NALCO by (a) Private individuals. (b) Corporations, and what price per share was paid for these shares?

I am not too sure that it is proper to give a complete answer to that part of the question; but as I am in doubt, I will give the House the benefit of the doubt.

Shareholders	No. of Shares	Price Per Share
Government of Newfoundland .....	900,000	\$1.00
Harriman-Ripley & Co. Inc. ....	40,000	1.00
Wood Gundy & Co. Ltd. ....	28,000	1.00
Cement & General Development Corporation .....	2,000	1.00
Edward W. Bickle of Toronto .....	9,000	1.00
Littleton B. P. Gould .....	8,000	1.00
Charles S. Payson .....	6,000	1.00
Michael Lewin .....	5,000	1.00
Sir William Stephenson .....	2,000	1.00

That is one million shares at \$1.00 each.

In addition:

L. J. Forget & Co. of Montreal .....	500	\$5.00
Jackson & Co. of Montreal .....	500	5.00
Rittenhouse & Co. ....	500	5.00
Burleigh & Partners Ltd. ....	500	5.00
Canadian Javelin Foundries & Machine Works, Ltd. ....	76,672	5.00
(Total of that group 78,672 at \$5.00—\$393,360.00)		
Michael Lewin (amount paid in \$833.34) .....	1,250	\$5.00
Jackson & Co. (amount paid in \$166.77) .....	250	5.00

(Total in that class 1,500 shares at \$5.00—\$1,000.11)

Five million common shares were issued and paid fully to December 31, 1952.



One million shares to December 31, 1953. 78, 672 shares at \$5.00.

Issued and partly paid up 1,500 shares.

Total amount paid into the Treasury by shareholders \$1,394,360.01.

Amount transferred to paid-in surplus as in (sec. 7 of the Act) —\$697,180.01.

Half the capital has to be surplus; that provides for that.

I leave it to my honourable friend to work out the percentage.

I have answered (6) and (7).

(8) What salary was being paid Dr. Alfred Valdmanis at the time of his resignation? Answer \$30,000 a year.

(9) What, if any concessions to date have been granted by NALCO—areas where such concessions granted? The answer is, first, The American Zinc Company of Tennessee has a lease of approximately 745 square miles in South East Newfoundland. They have a three year lease in Fortune Bay—exploration lease.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Hon. the Premier to table the answer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will do that. The American Zinc lease expires May 31st, 1956.

Question 1 (9):

#### NALCO SUB-CONCESSIONS

March 26, 1954.

1. American Zinc Company of Tennessee, St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A.

Note: Completion of a formal agreement approved and final document not yet signed. However, NALCO and American Zinc are proceeding as if a final agreement were signed, i.e., exploration proceeding during 1953 and will, it is expected, continue during 1954.

Area: Approximately 745 square miles in South East Newfoundland.

The southern boundary rests on Fortune Bay between Anderson's Cove and

Grand Le Pierre, with Meta Pond near the northern boundary.

Extent: 3 year period from May 1, 1953 for exploration.

Up till May 1, 1956, in which to apply for a Development Permit for 5 years.

Up till May 1, 1961 in which to apply for a 99 years Mining Lease for an area not to exceed 50 square miles.

Minimum expenditure \$45,000 over 3 years exploration period.

NALCO to have right of 30% participation in any new company resulting, as well as 10% royalty.

2. Canadian Javelin Foundries and Machine Works Limited, Dominion Square Building, Montreal.

Area: Approximately 2,300 square miles in Southwest Labrador on each side of the railway from Seven Islands to Knob Lake.

Extent: 3 year Exploration Period from January 1, 1954

Up till January 1, 1957 in which to apply for a Development Permit good for 2 years.

Up till January 1, 1959 in which to apply for a 99 year Mining Lease for an area not exceeding 50 square miles.

Minimum expenditure of one million dollars over 3 years exploration period, less expenditure by NALCO of

\$299,208 up till December 31, 1953 and any moneys expended by NALCO subsequently to January 1, 1954. (Such latter sums expected to approximate \$150,000 are refundable by Canadian Javelin by December 31, 1954.)

NALCO has the right of 30% participation in any new company resulting, as well as a 10% royalty.

3. Newmont Mining Corporation of Canada.

This company which previously had a sub-concession area in Central Newfoundland (Notre Dame Bay area) amounting to 1,450 square miles @ \$250,000 over three years.

Dropped its option as of December 31, 1953.

(10) In the building at Fort Townshend, once occupied by the Chief of Police.

(11) Except in so far as that information is contained in the Balance Sheet audited by Peat, Marwick & Mitchell, I shall have to decline to answer the question.

(12) The Directors are J. R. Smallwood, Hon. L. R. Curtis, Hon. Gregory Power, Mr. Victor P. Geffine, J. C. Doyle of Montreal, Col. J. A. Mercier, George M. McIntosh of New York.

No Director of NALCO owns any shares of NALCO.

MR. HOLLETT: J. R. Smallwood owns some.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We own none.

MR. HOLLETT: Who owns the 900,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government. No director of NALCO owns any shares of NALCO.

MR. HOLLETT: J. R. Smallwood on behalf of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps I own one—No—The answer is none. We own none in any way.

MR. BROWNE: Who owns the nine hundred thousand?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government. My honourable friend owns them just as much as I do. Now, the only part of the question remaining to be answered is the annual report and the balance sheet of the company, which I don't think we are obliged to table, but I think I shall—the balance sheet and the audit and the annual report.

Question No. 2:

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to question No. 2.

Question (1): Give a detailed account of steps being taken by the (a) Provincial Government, (b) by the Federal Government to implement the recommendations of the Newfoundland Development Committee, relative to the fullest utilization of known Fishery resources.

Answer (1): (a) Opportunity for reply will arise during consideration of 1954 Estimates. (b) Question improperly directed.

Question (2): On the North East Coast what, if any, steps have been taken towards centralization of the salt fish industry, and what centres have been selected for the establishment of suitable plants to take care of the inshore fishery along that coast?

Answer (2): Steps have been taken towards centralization and the places

where development is being commenced is a matter of public information.

Question (3): Have any negotiations thus far taken place relative to the establishment of small meal plants on northeast coast as recommended in the aforementioned Development Committee Report?

Answer (3): Investigations have been under way for some time to ascertain the practicability of small fish meal plant operations but not exclusively for the Northeast Coast.

Question (4) Have either the Provincial or the Federal Government taken any steps to implement the recommendations in the memorandum dated November 20th, 1952 by the Walsh Committee relative to (a) reconnaissance survey begun in 1952, (b) selected sites, (c) essential services at those sites? Give details of any such implementations.

Answer (4): (a), (b) and (c) Yes. By the Government of Newfoundland within constitutional responsibilities. The Government of Newfoundland cannot speak for the Government of Canada.

Question (5): What encouragements have been offered by the Government for minor centralization of curing operations in small settlements. Give locations where any such efforts have been made.

Answer (5): Encouragements have been given for minor centralization of salt fish curing operations in small settlements where fishermen have shown the desire to help themselves and have assumed their equitable and just proportion of costs and responsibility for community enter-

prises—i.e., Forteau, West St. Modiste and Pinware.

Question (6): What, if any, efforts to this end have thus far been made by the Co-operative Division of the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives?

Answer (6): The Co-operative Extension services of my Department have been encouraging discussions and promising study of the problems involved in the management and operation of centralized shore handling and processing facilities.

Question (7): Have the Government given any consideration to the choice of salt depots in strategic locations as recommended by the Committee. If so, what centres have been selected?

Answer (7): Yes. Investigations are not conclusive.

Question (8): Give a detailed account of any Housing Scheme envisaged for fishermen.

Answer (8): Housing schemes for fishermen are under consideration.

Question (9): What, if any programme of market research has thus far been instituted by either the Provincial or the Federal Government?

Answer (9): Market research is a continuous function of the Division of Fisheries Economic Research of my Department. The Government of Newfoundland cannot speak for the Government of Canada.

Question (10): Who is Newfoundland's representative on the Fisheries Research Board of Canada?

Answer (10): Question improperly directed.

Question (11): Who are the personnel of the Standing Joint Committee on Fishery matters and who is Executive Secretary, and what is the salary of said Executive Secretary?

Answer (11): There is no Standing Joint Committee on fisheries matters.

Question (12): What was the total cost to the Treasury of (a) the Newfoundland Fisheries Survey? (b) the Royal Commission under Sir Albert Walsh? Give a detailed statement of said costs.

Answer (12): (a) Improperly asked. (b) No Royal Commission was appointed under Sir Albert Walsh, March 29, 1954.

Question No. 3:

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is being prepared. (c) has already been tabled. (Public Accounts).

Question No. 4:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, question No. 4 is in the course of preparation.

Question No. 5:

MR. POWER: The answer is being prepared.

Question No. 6:

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to that question.

#### Question No. 6

##### (1) Money at credit of Provincial Government:

	At 1/4/53	At 28/2/54
Bank of Montreal .....	5,895,788.91	1,973,385.26
Crown Agents .....	478,161.45	540,100.00
Government of Canada .....	10,850,000.00	10,850,000.00

##### (2) Cash Surplus on Deposit with H.M. Government of Canada:

(i) At 1 April, 1953: \$10,850,000.

(ii) There have been no drawings since 1/4/53.

##### (3) Departmental Revenue 1/4/53 to 28/2/54:

Department	Current	Capital	Surplus
Finance .....	\$22,839,197.58	13,636.36	83,453.29
Provincial Affairs .....	5,729.67	—	—
Education .....	354,682.01	—	4,858.34
Attorney General .....	110,410.94	—	—
Mines & Resources .....	598,233.63	5,796.75	6,371.47
Public Works .....	1,058,167.87	1,112,191.76	1,273.92
Health .....	1,403,486.59	26,720.00	—
Public Welfare .....	1,070,258.34	—	—
Liquor Control .....	2,705,000.00	—	—
M. Affairs & Supply .....	105,472.60	57,940.95	40,930.48
Fisheries & Co-ops. ....	35,971.55	287,000.00	38,722.21
Economic Develop. ....	28,299.30	105,000.00	—
Labour .....	13,335.13	—	—
	<u>\$30,328,241.21</u>	<u>1,608,285.82</u>	<u>175,609.71</u>

## Question No. 6 (2)

(4) Departmental Expenditures 1/4/53 to 28/2/54:

Department	Current	Capital	Surplus
Consolidated Fund Services	1,067,466.63	—	—
Legislative	54,772.98	—	—
Executive	52,968.62	—	—
Finance	993,990.41	—	10,785.70
Provincial Affairs	51,505.35	—	—
Education	5,649,292.59	649,271.60	—
Attorney General	1,490,875.12	—	—
Mines & Resources	1,086,998.64	30,000.00	—
Public Works	4,683,573.14	4,861,797.47	—
Health	6,919,118.07	332,846.54	—
Public Welfare	6,097,068.75	—	—
Liquor Control	239,707.38	—	—
M. Affairs & Supply	837,277.33	667,917.44	—
Fisheries & Co-ops.	1,166,588.57	1,439,586.66	—
Economic Development	145,683.20	2,667,283.06	—
Labour	94,218.84	—	—
	<u>\$30,631,105.62</u>	<u>\$10,648,702.77</u>	<u>\$10,785.70</u>

## Question No. 7:

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the answers are being prepared.

## Orders of the Day

## Address in Reply:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to me to be given the privilege of opening the debate on the motion for an address in reply. This is the first time I have been on the Opposition side of the House, but I have had some experience elsewhere. We are only a small group, but at the same time we represent many thousands of people outside of the House. Further than that, it seems to me that the role of the Opposition in a Legislature is more than being responsible to the people who sent it there or supported its power. It is our duty to probe as far as we can the affairs of the country as they have

been administered by the government during the time that has passed. We know the task is big for such a small group as we are here; it may well be it is too big for us, we may not be equal to it. But I wish to say I am very pleased to be here today and associated with these honourable gentlemen on this side of the House, who, in my opinion, have carried on their task so well in spite of the difficulties confronting them. I don't think that the public realizes the difficulties of the Opposition. Whereas the Ministers of the Crown have their offices and their trained staffs and plenty of secretarial help to enable them to answer the questions put to them, and to keep them up-to-the-minute on matters of public importance, the Opposition has no clerical staff whatsoever. It is true that this House provides one stenographer for all the members who are not Ministers. But

the Opposition has no staff and is therefore in a predicament in regard to obtaining information or preparing speeches. What we must do we must do in our own time and at our own expense.

I hope that the Premier will pardon me if I draw to his attention, that in other places provision of this kind has been made. I don't know if it has been done in all the legislatures in the different provinces but it has been made in some. He who has proven himself so generous in providing the Opposition with another member and expresses his willingness if it is necessary, to add another to the list, will not hesitate at the mere implementing of our work by supplying clerical assistance. If, therefore, the Premier complains that the Opposition gives him the impression of not having prepared its speeches and that Bill after Bill has gone through the House here without any comments, I think the Premier himself sometimes, from what I have heard (I have not heard him speak here but from what I have heard outside) I have been given the impression of his saying things that he did not intend to say before he started. I have been myself so far removed from the House of Assembly that I have not been as familiar with things that have been going on here since 1949 as I would have liked. I believe it will take me some time to become familiar with things that have been going on.

Now, everywhere, it is the custom to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on opening day. As I had the honour when I was a member here further back, a long time ago, of moving the same motion and seconding it on another occasion, I can appreciate the feelings of the

honourable members. I would therefore like to tender them my respect for the good work they have done. As far as my honourable friend, the member for Port de Grave is concerned, he is an experienced lawyer. The honourable Premier may not agree he is as good a one as I think he is myself, but he did the job we expected him to do. As regard the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile, I think he approached his task in a very sensible fashion. I think it was wise for him, looking over the Address in Reply, and seeing the promises that are made there, to remind us that even the best intentions go astray, and that the fishery development programme is only an experiment, and there are likely to be many failures and experiments before we arrive at the right solution of the problem. I can point, I think, to some mistakes that have been made in the past in connection with the fisheries. I will only instance one, and that is one in which so much faith was placed at the time, i.e., the importation of Icelandic fishing vessels and crews to show our people how to catch the millions of tons of herring swarming in the waters around our coast. I believe that cost nearly half a million dollars, Mr. Speaker, and the amount of herring caught was insignificant. I remember a captain in Placentia Bay well recognized as an authority on the location of the herring informing me that the boats were out in Placentia Bay and did not know where to catch the herring. He went out in his boat and loaded alongside of them. Because they were ashamed the Icelandic Skippers went away.

MR. MURRAY: If the honourable member knew where they were he



should have told the Icelandic Fishermen and saved us money.

MR. BROWNE: Well he went out and caught them. He was in the same business. The Icelandic crews did not come here to learn but to teach our people where to get this vast source of wealth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Someone pulled the honourable member's leg. There was not a boat-load caught anywhere that year by anyone.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think the gentleman would be telling lies. He is a man from Ship Harbour, Placentia Bay, one of the Powers, and has a reputation for being a straight-shooter and for telling the truth. I don't believe he would tell me anything false. He told me about this instance. In any case it cost this country five hundred thousand dollars. That was one of the failures and mistakes the Government might profit by in the near future. Experience is a dear teacher. The Premier should remember that and the rider which goes with it. "Fools learn in no other school."

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of having an invitation to the coronation ceremonies this year. Unfortunately I was unable to attend because there was a general federal election in the offing. I am sure all of us join in the sincere expression of loyalty and devotion already expressed so well to the person of Her Majesty, and we hope she may live long to reign over a happy and prosperous commonwealth.

Now, Sir, when I was in Montreal, very recently, I had the privilege and pleasure of meeting some of the members of the Newfoundland Society in that city. I learned there what I

think is a rather extraordinary thing, i.e., that last year when the "William Carson" was being launched, (that is the vessel which is going to run between Port aux Basques and Sydney, and from Sydney to Port aux Basques and bring over these millions of tourists that were announced a few years ago), there was no Newfoundlander to speak on that occasion. Out of a thousand guests, I believe, present, there were only six Newfoundlanders. It seems to me, we should have been considered to have had a greater interest in the future of that vessel, and there should have been representation from this country present at that ceremony. Now, it was suggested to me there, that this vessel was built, not so quickly as my honourable friend the Premier predicted when he gave us his famous speech of 1949. He then told us she would be on the Gulf in 1951. It will be some time in 1954, and she will be there a long time before the Minister of Public Works has the Trans-Canada Highway to take the traffic coming over, before the motor cars can be carried away from Port aux Basques. That ship is going to be ready, I believe, some time in July. Now, what are they going to do about that situation? Has the Government any recommendation to make to the Government of Canada or the Canadian National Railway as to how that ship is going to put in its time. She is ready long in advance of the highway. I would suggest, as it has been suggested to me by the members of the Newfoundland Society, and perhaps the Premier may know about that; that ship should begin running between Montreal and St. John's. This year for her maiden ship's trip should make an excursion from Montreal to St. John's. I believe from what I have heard that it would be a very popular



move, and many Newfoundlanders, not only in Montreal and the City of Toronto, but in the United States would be glad to come here by that ship and bring their motor cars and tour the country, as far as it is possible on the Peninsula of Avalon, where at least there are several hundreds of miles of roads available.

Another suggestion was made to me, i.e., since June 24 is a holiday in this country it will be recognized by the Newfoundlanders living in Montreal, where they are going to have a ceremony at Atwater Park on that particular day. They have suggested to me that perhaps a hook-up could be arranged for a two-way conversation, and an expression of greetings between Newfoundlanders here and those who live in Montreal. I believe these Newfoundlanders there are interested in the welfare of Newfoundland and would welcome any such arrangement. I trust it can be arranged, and I hope that no politics will enter into it.

I mentioned a moment ago about the roads. The Trans-Canada Highway will certainly not be ready. Now, we know that at this time of year we can't expect all the roads to be in good condition. But I believe a certain general principle must be recognized in regard to road building in this country. I am not sure it has been recognized. This is it: We are not living in a horse and buggy age. The traffic over the roads today in Newfoundland is almost as heavy as over the highroad between Montreal and Toronto, and unless you get modern roads they can't stand up to traffic. The highroads out of St. John's carry the bulk of traffic in this country, and is where most of the motor traffic is concentrated. The roads, therefore, must be improved. I

would suggest to my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, as soon as feasible we should have paved roads leading out of the city in other directions than those which are now there. We have a paved road to Carbonear; from Waterford Bridge Road to the Goulds, a distance of about six miles; and another, I don't think we are responsible for its building, from here to Torbay Airport. But I would suggest that it is desirable that the pavement should continue on past the Goulds at least to Witless Bay Line. As he told me himself in the past some connection was made with the highroad that runs out to Holyrood. On this highroad you see more traffic in line than at Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal, hundreds of cars in line. There is not very much pleasure in having a motor car when all you can do is get in a procession of other cars and keep on going like that. One has only to go over the road to Torbay, six miles, then get on a road that is absolutely disgraceful, certainly, it was much better twenty years ago than it is today. I was down there a few days ago, and my car stalled on the rough spots, and I got stuck on them and went aground on them. There are huge holes in the road and boulders sticking up.

MR. SPENCER: Having made that remark, can you explain now, why they were better then, than now?

MR. BROWNE: That can be inferred from my remarks. I am not saying they were better to be sarcastic, what I am saying, is that these roads should be paved roads, the roads leading out of the city of St. John's should be paved also important roads leading out of other places where there is a good deal of traffic. It is impossible today to have the roads

stand up to the traffic on them if they are not well built. Now, I know in Nova Scotia, I was there a few days ago and I heard the Premier make an explanation about the complaints received up there because the roads had to be closed. They have fifteen hundred miles of paved roads up there. I don't know how many hundred we have here, but I doubt that we have much more than one hundred.

MR. SPENCER: One hundred and twenty-five.

MR. BROWNE: And they have fifteen hundred miles in Nova Scotia. So that my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Works, has a big programme ahead if he wants to put this country in a position to benefit by good transportation. I don't believe this country can make progress until it gets transportation facilities of a modern kind.

Now, Sir, when the Terms of Union were being considered, it seems to me there was a big bargaining factor in connection with the Terms of Union which seems to have been neglected. I remember I believe, hearing my honourable friend, the Premier, referring to the railway as a couple of streaks of steel. Perhaps he did not say, but he did not regard it as a bargaining factor here. I believe we are the only province today out of the ten provinces that has a narrow gauge railway over which the express goes at the terrific speed, twenty miles an hour on an average from St. John's to Port aux Basques. It takes a full day and night to get across. Well, we could have asked, as the other provinces now possess wide gauge railways, for a wide gauge railway. If we could not get the wide gauge railway, which the Federal

Government gave the Maritimes, then instead of the wide gauge railway why not the Trans-Canada Highway to be built at Federal expense? If it is the intention of the Government to put this province in as good a position as the Maritime Provinces then it seems to me we should have either a wide gauge railway or a Trans-Newfoundland highroad equivalent to the roads they have in the Maritime Provinces. Since this committee has been appointed to prepare a case for the Royal Commission perhaps it would take that into consideration.

MR. SPENCER: I wonder if the honourable member would say something else the Premier said when he was listening to him?

MR. BROWNE: If you wish to give me a sketch.

MR. SPENCER: I am not complaining. I appreciate very much indeed as a matter of fact his comments, which are very near to my heart. I agree very largely with a lot of things he has said.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable Minister wish to ask a question?

MR. SPENCER: The question I want to ask is whether he would explain some other points the honourable Premier for Nova Scotia made when referring to roads in Nova Scotia. He referred not only to the fifteen hundred miles of paved roads but referred to the mileage of dirt or earth roads. I believe he told the public it required two hundred and sixty million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Well, my honourable friend has been the Minister of Public Works for nearly five years

now, and I would not like to tell him too much about road building. He ought to know that himself, and what it costs. I think that the Premier of Nova Scotia said, and he is now the Minister of highways there, that to build good roads would cost about twenty thousand dollars a mile, with stone and gravel. Well, unless you get that sort of road you are going to have continual costly repairs. Roads which were built last year are in poor condition now, and will be in poor condition. I don't see how you can get roads with good driving surfaces unless you build them in a modern way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, realizing my deficiency about the affairs of this country during the past five years—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman allow me? Could he be a little different in this respect from all his colleagues and sometimes say "The Province of Newfoundland." I sometimes find myself thinking of British Columbia when he says "Country." This is a province now.

MR. BROWNE: I am sorry I hurt the feelings of the Premier by referring to my country. It is still my country, and I thought it was his.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did hope that five years in Ottawa might have—

MR. BROWNE: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I have been reading the different speeches from the Throne which have been made since my honourable friend took office in 1949, which is now five years. I encountered in looking up these speeches from the Throne some difficulty in that there is no public journals of the House. These were published always since

1893 when we had Responsible Government, for a hundred years down to 1934, and I am very sorry that they are not being published at the present time. But I would advise honourable members, if they have copies of these speeches from the Throne they should preserve them. It is certainly my belief they are going to be literary rarities. In these Speeches from the Throne there are included many lavish promises and fond hopes about our future. I believe that there will be a great demand for them as curiosities in time to come. I hope the honourable members opposite will forgive me if I make some references to their contents. First of all Mr. Speaker, to be fair, I want to give credit to the Government for the executive appreciation they showed of the necessity of improving our public welfare legislation, especially the introduction of widows' allowances and mothers' allowances and dependents' allowances and workmen's compensation. I want to thank the Premier for his kind reference to me the other day and for informing the House that he had the privilege of putting into law a Bill which I had drafted twenty-seven years ago. These are very valuable and beneficial pieces of legislation, and I congratulate the Government on the speed with which they put them into effect. I believe that the dependents' allowances is something that is not in effect in all the Provinces of Canada. I think we have the edge on some of the provinces in so far as that is concerned.

Now, I want to draw the attention of the Premier to the present Speech from the Throne. On the front page I read "Speech From The Throne—Delivered at the Opening of the Fourth Session of the Thirtieth Gen-

eral Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland." Now, I would like to draw to his attention that this is not the thirtieth general assembly of the Province of Newfoundland. We only became a province in 1949. This is therefore only the second assembly of the Province of Newfoundland. This matter was correctly referred to in the first Speech from the Throne which was made in July, 1949, when it said: "This is the First Session of the 29th general assembly of Newfoundland but the first session of the first general assembly of the Province of Newfoundland." My honourable friend who assured us the other day that he has such a great respect for the traditions of the House and country, will, I am sure, in the future, if he ever has the occasion to draft a Speech from the Throne, again have the right inscription on the front page.

Now, lest I might seem too critical about the Speeches from the Throne delivered in this Chamber, let me remind the honourable members that the Speech from the Throne is drafted by the Premier and so one is satisfied it is taken word for word as the policy of the Government and should forecast the legislation to come in the forthcoming session. Frequently it contains a lot of information concerning the past history of the Government, but generally it should indicate the legislation which is to be forecast. I don't want to labour the House too much, but I refer to what takes place in other legislatures such as ours and point out this fact, because I took particular interest in the matter, and I hope I will be pardoned for referring to it: The Speech from the Throne given at Ottawa contains all the legislation that is going to be introduced during the session, and it

is outlined in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nonsense.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not nonsense. I have carefully watched, and unless some emergency arises—oh yes, I have watched and I have studied those speeches from the Throne to see how far the Government has carried out its policy. Now, my honourable friend calls it nonsense, but that is exactly what he did himself in 1949 when he referred to some twenty pieces of legislation, whereas, in this Speech from the Throne heard here last Wednesday, we had only a reference to three Bills that are going to be introduced. Yet today on the Order Paper there are eight Bills that were given notice of after the Speech was finished on Wednesday last. I think it is a good practice for the Premier to follow, i.e., to refer to these things in the Speech from the Throne. I noticed that amongst the Bills that he gave notice of there was one Bill to establish the Newfoundland Research and Conservation Association. I don't know if that ever came to life, but it is good to hear him talking about conservation, it sounds like a conservative but I don't think he is a conservative yet. He gave notice at that time to a hydro-electric commission. Today we are told that before many months or years pass, I don't know what kind of promise that is but it certainly gives the Premier a way out. Before many months or years have passed we will have a hydro-electric commission. Then some consideration was given to improving the tourist trade. Now, I have kept some of them. They were well written and some of them I heard him deliver over the radio, and they were certainly well delivered, no one would

find fault with them in that respect. I remember one occasion in particular: The Tourist Trade has not developed very much since 1949. I think the Premier realized its importance—he appointed a very able man as Tourist Director, but that man has not been able to give all his time to the job. He found time to go into the hustings with another official and campaign for Liberal candidates. Where are we going to draw the line? If a person were to go out and campaign for the Conservatives, how long would he remain in a public position in this country?

The Premier told us he had regard for the traditions—he pointed to the enlarged photographs which covered two walls of the Chamber. I had the feeling that these men were looking down in surprise and consternation, and even a look of disdain, when these remarks were made.

Did the honourable gentleman have regard for the traditions when he tolerated members of the Civil Service to go into Poll Booths and into the hustings on behalf of Liberal Candidates? I say it is a disgrace and shows an unfair attitude. Once a man takes a position in the Civil Service, he may take an interest in politics, he may vote, he may go to meetings; but he has no business to go on the hustings or to go into Poll Booths on behalf of any party. Unless it is recognized on both sides, we will not have justice.

Did he have regard for the traditions when he persuaded an official of the Justice Department to resign his position and contest the district of St. John's West.

Did he have regard for traditions when he told the people over the radio that it was a matter of life and

death that all Liberal Candidates should be returned with large majorities? The voice of the sorcerer! And the people listened to his appeal.

Did he have regard for traditions when, almost before the signatures were dry on the Terms of Union, he persuaded the Government of Canada to violate one of the Terms of Union. I will be specific. I am now face to face with the honourable gentleman I refer to Section 80 of the Terms of Union—"Salaries of Lieutenant-Governor and Judges."

The salary of the Lieutenant-Governor and the salaries, allowances, and pensions of the judges of such superior, district and county courts as are now or may hereafter be constituted in the Province of Newfoundland shall be fixed and provided by the Parliament of Canada."

My honourable friend persuaded the Government of Canada to take my position off the list; no salary was voted for me. Neither did the Commission Government vote a salary as they expected it to be voted in Canada. So, I was forced to resign in 1949.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: I was warned about the Premier's denying things. The Deputy Minister of Justice in Ottawa told me that it was true. Other prominent officials told me it was true. You can take either my statement or the Premier's. After I resigned, the position was abolished, and was not renewed in this country until last year.

The Federal Government made provision for five District Court Judges. There are still three vacancies. Where

are the two who were appointed functioning? These gentlemen are paid \$8,000 a year and are soon to get \$10,000. For what? For doing nothing. The District Court Judge for the district of St. John's is in Corner Brook with his family. Surely this Government is interested, or should be interested in those appointments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have nothing to do with it.

MR. BROWNE: We have. They were appointed on my learned friend's recommendation. These two gentlemen—one was a Federal Member at Ottawa, the other was a Liberal supporter—were appointed to these positions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By whom?

MR. BROWNE: Appointed by the Federal Government on your recommendation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who appointed them? Whose employees are they?

MR. BROWNE: I am not going to be cross-examined. The Premier will have an opportunity to explain his misdemeanours, mistakes and injustices.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He will withdraw the word "misdemeanour" or it will be the last word he will utter in this House.

MR. BROWNE: I did not say the Honourable the Premier committed a misdemeanour.

MR. SPEAKER: The word "misdemeanour" was used; a point of order was made accompanied by a threat. I know it is not the intention of the honourable member to accuse the Premier of a misdemeanour and he will be glad to withdraw the word.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps it was an unfortunate word to use; but I cannot think of a suitable substitute. What I meant to say was that the Government of Canada, on recommendation of the Premier, appointed two gentlemen to positions of \$10,000 a year and that they were doing nothing. The Premier will have the opportunity of explaining that fully.

Perhaps my honourable friend who has such regard for the traditions of the country will explain to us why he told the people in the District of Ferryland in 1949 that unless they voted for the present Minister of Finance, not one cent of money would be spent in the district.

MR. MURRAY: The Premier was bantering.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I heard the Premier made that explanation. But that is not what he told the people in the district. He told the people "make no mistake about it, if you vote for Billy Browne there will not be one cent of money spent in this district." My honourable friend is a socialist.

MR. MURRAY: Not a Communist.

MR. BROWNE: I do not think he lives like a Communist. He is more socialistic than the Premier of Saskatchewan.

MR. MURRAY: Anything wrong about that?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, a great deal. If the honourable member wants to justify the socialism of the Premier he will have an opportunity of doing so. I know how newspapermen ran after the Premier; educated men have admired his genius in putting through Confederation. Is it not a little too soon to put a halo around the head



of the Premier? Should we not wait until we hear more of the industries about which nothing was said in the Speech from the Throne the other day? Nothing at all!

In the address which the Premier gave us on that historic occasion in 1949, the piece d'resistance was in the end, when he told us that a Corporation which he would not even name—so sacred was the name—a Corporation which had control over hundreds of millions of dollars—was coming to Newfoundland. This was the biggest news he had for us, that one of the most famous, most wealthy organizations in the whole world was now interested in Newfoundland. He referred to the way he was received by them. He referred to them as a corporation of wealth and experience. I understand they were the Rockefeller Foundation. They came here. They went away with more wealth and we were left with more experience. It cost \$250,000 for that benevolent Corporation to come to Newfoundland, to look over the prospects here and to give my honourable friend a Report. A report which I believe was never published.

The 1950 Speech from the Throne had some good words about agriculture. "My Government is fully aware of the possibility of agriculture." How many people have seen white-tailed deer on the tables or in the butcher shops?

I cannot see much evidence to support that "my Government is giving close study to the problem of finding ways and means—"

A young fisherman was sent to Norway, England, Iceland, Scotland and Denmark. He was suddenly dismissed and was later re-established at the instance of the Premier. He visited

those countries and was supposed to come back with the last word on the type of boats to be used. Where are the fishing boats? Who is using them? How many are in existence? Is the Premier satisfied and is the Minister satisfied that that gentleman brought back the last word on the type of boats to be used?

And the long-liners—where are they? We were told the fishermen were going to have more modern means of fishing; they were even going to be told how to market what they had. I remember very well the fishermen coming to me and showing me their little receipts for 25 quintals of this and that, average \$4 to \$7.00. Men who sold fish earlier got good prices but when October came the price of fish was down so low, men were accepting \$4 and \$5 a quintal. That was the year I agitated to have the price of \$1.30 paid by the Price Support Board. That was the time I considered to be a time for a fishermen's organization. I went to different places, talked to people about it. I talked to my honourable friend the Deputy Minister about it. On February 6, 1951, I advocated it in the House of Commons—the Federation of Fishermen. The Premier took up the idea and I think he made politics out of it. That was a great mistake. There should be no politics in it. Members of the Opposition were not welcome to the Conferences held when those men came here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole Opposition sat on the platform.

MR. BROWNE: I can only say that that is the first I knew of that. I am very glad to hear it. I hope it will be kept non-political. It is not, of course, a magic formula. There is another feature about the organiza-

tion—the fishermen, to get the full benefit must work along co-operative lines as do the Maritime United Fishermen, therefore, there is a great need for training along co-operative lines and field workers will have to be used to assist fishermen so that they will get the full value out of the Federation.

In that year, 1950, my honourable friend also mentioned the Royal Commission on the Cost of Living. That royal body sat for months, brought in a beautiful report, did my honourable friend satisfy himself as he promised to do—he was going to tear the profiteers limb for limb—was anybody prosecuted? Did the cost of living get cheaper? It was going up while the Royal Commission was sitting. My honourable friend, before Confederation, encouraged the people to think that the cost of living would not go up after Confederation. He did not choose to tell them that in Canada they had subsidies which made certain articles cheaper than if they were on the open market. After the subsidies were taken away and those commodities went on the open market, the prices went up until in Canada itself the cost rose 80 or 90 per cent over what it was in 1949.

In the Speech from the Throne in 1951, mention is made of the new industries and the expansion of others. I do not know how far it was prudent for the Premier to give us information about these industries, but I do not believe the information to which the public is entitled has yet been given. I would like to see a statement here showing how the money which went into the Birch Plant was spent. I challenge the Minister for Economic Development to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement of how that \$1,600,000 was spent. Why should

we not know? Who owns the money? Is it the money of the Premier or his ministers or is it the money taken from the people of this country when Commission of Government was in power? If it was the people's money, it is our duty to demand from the government full details of every cent spent, and I challenge the Minister to lay that information on the table of the House. There have been rumours unfair to the gentleman who built the plant. It will be readily recognized that a man placed in his position with a free hand in ordering supplies, he is in a difficult position, and he should be given an opportunity of showing the public what each item cost and how much the mill cost. I do not know if any information was given to the government about the cement and gypsum mill.

In that speech too, we were told that the government had won an appeal in regard to freight rates paid from Sydney to St. John's and along the railway line. Mr. Speaker, we were given an award, but that award only showed that Newfoundland had been overcharged by the C.N.R. since April 1st, 1949. At the present moment, and when that award was given the people of this country had been overcharged by millions of dollars, and I don't believe it is possible for my honourable friend to recover that money. I hope it is. I asked for it when I was a member of the House of Commons, but I was told by the minister of Transportation they were not going to pay it. I believe it runs into something like seven millions of dollars, overcharged the people of this country. I wonder if the people of Newfoundland realize that as a result of Confederation our trade has been changed. Most of our trade today is with the other nine provinces of

Canada and we buy from these provinces ten times as much goods as they buy from us. They sell us over a hundred million dollars worth of goods a year, and we export to them only about ten million dollars worth. Now there may be some variation in the figures, but I think that is generally true; they sell to us over ten times as much as they buy from us. On these goods coming from Canada we have to pay these high rates.

One of the things which benefits the people of Canada and is not taken into consideration is the profit they make on goods they sell us, and the taxes the Federal Government collect on the same goods. Now, it seems to me that, if the Terms of Union were not settled in such a hasty manner, a proper term would have been drawn up to protect our people at that time. There is a term in the Terms of Union but it was not good enough to protect us.

Then we were told about the Fisheries Development Committee and the appointment of Mr. Clive Planta as deputy minister. I won't say anything about Mr. Planta. We were told then that a commission was being appointed by the Newfoundland Government to inquire into the prices paid for salt codfish in 1950. Mr. Bruce Feather was appointed a Royal Commission of one to investigate. He investigated it, but I believe his report has never been published. I have not seen it at any rate.

Then we were told about the "Buy Newfoundland Campaign". Now I suppose it is not very pleasant to resurrect these things, but, as I said before, it is the first opportunity I have had to talk about the "Buy Newfoundland Campaign."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am beginning to think I made a mistake. That is all we are going to have, this old re-hash.

MR. BBROWNE: I know my honourable friend does not like this old hash, but I am very sorry he has to listen to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who else does?

MR. BROWNE: That was, I believe, sufficiently aired in this House, and it showed thousands of dollars belonging to this country spent without any vouchers to show for the expenditures.

Now I come to the Alcoholic Liquors Act Amendments Act. I think I remember about the Premier telling about the alcoholic liquor act, and saying that was not really its name as it was really a temperance act, was going to limit the sale of hard liquor. Well I don't think I will find many people to believe that he or his minister of finance are very active in trying to limit the sale of hard liquor. We had the other day in a newspaper an account of a complaint which was made by a parish priest in Kilbride, Monsignor Rawlins, in an attempt to limit the sale of hard liquor in the area for which he is the pastor. He took the trouble to write to the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control last October saying that he had learned that a tavern or club was to be erected within his parish, and he wanted to object as he had previously done against such an institution being established there. He received a courteous reply to say that, if and when an application was received for a license to sell spirits, beers or wines in the area, the Board would give every consideration to his protest be-

fore making a decision. Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in my mind the whole operation of the Board of Liquor Control has been unsavory ever since this government took office. I can well understand the reluctance of my honourable friend the Premier or the Minister of Finance of having a standing committee appointed to examine the public accounts, where the chairman and the past chairman of the Board of Liquor Control could be brought before it and examined as to the things that had gone on in the office of the Board of Liquor Control. Why were three politicians appointed to the Board of Liquor Control in the first place? Was it not being properly operated by the commission of government? Could it not have been done in the same way since 1949? I think the country could have been saved thousands of dollars in the salaries being paid to the friends of the Premier. It is an unnecessary expenditure without any increase in efficiency, and that is not justified. But during the past few months, Mr. Speaker, the residents living in Kilbride were puzzled about the magnificent building going up in their neighbourhood, out of keeping with all its surroundings. It was obviously being erected by people of means, and something extraordinary was expected. Then we saw in the newspaper an advertisement. This advertisement appeared on March 6th, for the first time, to be inserted four times. Signed "Old Mill Properties Limited."

Now, let us see what Section 52 of the Act says. I hope my honourable friend the Premier won't think this is "Old Hash". Section 52: "The board may grant licenses to owners, operators or managers of hotels, clubs, an airport establishment, railway or steamship companies, restaurants, or

taverns." Now that is what he is looking for here, a club. What does a club mean? According to the definition here: 'A club means a corporation, society or association of persons which is the owner, lessee, or occupant of an establishment used solely for objects of a social or athletic nature, but not for pecuniary gain and includes the premises occupied or used for any such purposes.

And the regulations which have been published by the Board of Liquor Control contained in sections 13, 14 and 15 deal with a club as well. A license may be granted to a club when it is operated for the object of a society, fraternal or athletic purposes. Now, if you want an illustration my honourable friends will know the sort of club envisaged, City Club, Bally Haly Golf Club or, I believe, the Veterans' Club. I don't know how many others there are. But there are only three or four genuine clubs in this city. I don't know how many there are outside which come within this definition.

Now, my honourable friend annually holds or is the sponsor to a certain extent, I believe or graces with his patronage a ball which is held in honour of a distinguished Liberal statesman, Sir Wilfred Laurier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, in honour of the distinguished Liberal statesman, Mr. St. Laurent.

MR. BROWNE: Well, "The Less Distinguished Liberal Statesman." He holds on his birthday this Liberal Ball. On the programme there that was distributed to the guests was an advertisement by this Old Mill Properties. I don't know how long ago that was, but it was a couple of months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: February 2.

MR. BROWNE: The 2nd of February, certainly before the advertisement was inserted in the paper. That was not inserted until March 6. Now, Mr. Speaker, either this is law or this is a farce. I think it is a farce when a group of people can go to work and spend forty or fifty thousand dollars in the construction of a modern building on the Mt. Pearl Road, knowing full well they are going to get a permit. I say now, they knew full well in advance they were going to get a permit. They would not have gone to that trouble and would not have blazoned it in the programme of the Liberal Ball that they were going to open soon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is pretty sound reasoning. They would be very stupid to build without assurance of getting a license.

MR. BROWNE: I think the law ought to be properly carried out. It has not been carried out. I refer back to 1951 amendment again, introduced to limit the sale of hard liquor.

"Every applicant for a license to sell alcoholic liquor under this section shall before filing his application with the Board give notice of his intention to apply for such license by advertisement in the form prescribed by the Board once a week for three consecutive weeks preceding his application in a newspaper published in St. John's and in a newspaper circulating in the electoral district in which the premises in respect of which the application is made are situated and by posting copies of such notice in conspicuous places in the said area.

If the applicant is going to build a building he must do that and get the permit before he builds the building.

Here is a case where he built the building knowing full well he was going to get the permit, and did not advertise it until they had the building. Then practically all the residents in the area protested and the complaint was completely disregarded. It shows that the Premier, the honourable gentleman who sits over there, had given the green light to go ahead with the building. Is this then a genuine club? Is the government really sincere in its liquor legislation? Or is a club only an excuse for selling more liquor and bringing in more revenue into the coffers of the Board of Liquor Control? Does my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Welfare approve of a farce of that kind? What is the name of the club? "The Old Mill Properties Limited." I don't think there is any one here except those personally interested who know anything about such a club.

Now, 1951, that was a big year; that was the year when we had the general election. There was a session that year, a month before the general election, October 23, 1951, the House opened. As my honourable friends probably know there was going to be an election on November 27 of that year, the speech from the Throne was more flamboyant than ever, "Newfoundland," he said, "was never more prosperous." A quick recovery. Newfoundland must be a very buoyant country when it can recover so quickly from a depression which we had here in 1950 when we had thousands of people on relief work. "The outlook was bright—No difficulty in selling products—I think it is going to be doubled or trebled in capacity. As for the Gypsum plant the story is very much the same as for the Birch plant. The market demands are incapable of being supplied."

Then we have a proposition for a second mill from people in Europe. The tannery is going to be built. Here is the best one of all. The machinery plant at Donovans. In writing he put the little word "CMIC Donovans." The machinery plant at Donovans. They made a mistake in the Speech from the Throne that time; they meant the "Octagon." It was to be the largest single labour giving enterprise in Newfoundland next to the fisheries. In the next two years it was to employ five thousand men in full time work. Well how could the people of Newfoundland refuse the charmer when he promises them five thousand men in full time work? Why, you have to go to Montreal to get a business as profitable, as prosperous as the machinery plant that was going to be erected at Donovans. You can go in there now and into the factory and if you can see five men around without having to look around the machines you will be lucky. Well, the Premier cannot escape the accusation that he has been very extravagant in the promises he made to the people from time to time. But in the 1952 Speech from the Throne more than twenty different industries were to be in production or in the course of construction. I have here another interview given by my honourable friend. He gave so many interviews and made so many speeches it was hard to keep up with him. My stenographer got tired of putting them away. But this was one he gave January 8, 1950 to his friend of the "Sunday Herald," "In the past six months I have discussed Newfoundland's position with men owning wholly and controlling no less than three thousand million dollars. Their need is to be shown that we

have resources that can be developed at a profit, and you won't be able to keep them out. In fact, if things we now know about come to pass, we will need to import labour in the next five years." That was in 1950. It has only been four years yet. Perhaps by next year we will need a lot of labour for these industries, perhaps we will yet see the five thousand men at the machinery plant at Donovans.

My honourable friend was lost until he found a pilot. That pilot was the Latvian gentleman who was trained in the Hitler Regime, who was a member of a dictator government before he left Latvia and was trained under Hitler's Regime, and worked with Hitler's Regime during the war until he found he was losing. Then this great financial wizard came into the picture and the Premier was on the white course again with a good pilot at the wheel—we are bound for prosperity—Newfoundland would never be more prosperous—I seem to remember statements made by the honourable Premier that one day Newfoundland would erect a monument to the memory of Dr. Valdmanis. The monuments are there, there is no need to erect any more monuments. "I would rather lose my right arm than lose Dr. Valdmanis." "If ever Dr. Valdmanis resigned I would resign my position as Premier of Newfoundland." These were the statements which were made. Well, we have new industries, and is it not a strange thing that in the 1954 Speech from the Throne there is not a mention of them. Why are they not mentioned? The Premier is not ashamed of them, is he? He is proud of them, is he not? He has, I suppose, a little misgiving sometimes. That is the only thing that might be



in his mind. But the Government built three plants, the gypsum plant, the birch plant and the cement plant as socialistic enterprises, government-owned, government operated. These were very extreme things for a Liberal Premier to do. Then he calls a snap election in the Fall of 1951 and says he must go to the country for a mandate, when he had already made a Speech from the Throne, speaking about the twenty industries to be in existence within the next few months. I say that election was a fraud, a fraud upon the people of this country. The Premier had embarked upon a socialistic scheme and had already arranged to finance twenty other industries and needed no mandate other than what he already had.

The Government then in 1952 started looking for oil. I can't say that I utterly disapprove of a moderate effort. But my honourable friend is so impetuous that when he goes looking for oil he goes looking for oil, and he is not going to be satisfied with anything else but oil. So we have Mr. John Fox spending his own money, a wonderful thing. I believe he spent a considerable amount in his search for oil. I am not going to condemn him too strongly for that.

Then NALCO promises important development but as for NALCO a firm or corporation known as Canadian Javelin Foundries and Machinery Company became interested. We heard today an answer to a question which came in to my honourable friend on my left telling us about certain dealings with NALCO. I don't think they told us the whole story. I have here an article taken from the "Financial Times" I am sure my honourable friend the Premier has seen it. It has certain

statements which were not given here this afternoon.

I think the answer my honourable friend gave this afternoon will not affect this statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should not be too sure, with his opinion of me he ought not to be too sure. Don't take it for granted. Have a select committee appointed to find out.

MR. BROWNE: My honourable friend sneers at my suggestion to have a standing committee to investigate the public accounts. Perhaps we will have that yet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1952 we were told a firm known as Coverdale and Colpitts had been engaged by the Government to investigate the cement, the gypsum and the birch plants, because it was the policy of the Government to sell these plants. That was in 1952. Now, two years later have they been sold? And if so, what money has been received? Because at that time over nine million dollars of Newfoundland money had been put in to these three plants, and it was the intention of the Government to use that money, not in the same way, but for the encouragement and assistance to other industries for further economic development. How much has been returned so far? How much have they got back out of the birch plant? I would like to know how much money we have spent on the birch mill since 1952, I will wager it is over a million dollars. Also on the gypsum mill—it seems to me Mr. Speaker that, that report was not published. I have not seen it, nor any of our members here have seen that report.

I wonder if the Premier later on

will make available to us a copy of that report.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was tabled in the House.

MR. BROWNE: I have not seen it. A report of the value and prospects of these plants.

In 1953 we were still prosperous. Never before were we so prosperous. Never before have we experienced such prosperity. Economic development is going on, mills and factories—now, we are going to develop the natural resources; the fisheries are going to be given attention, the mines and forests and soil of Newfoundland. Now, that these things I have mentioned are established the Premier goes on to first things. In other words the Premier put the cart before the horse, the secondary before the first. He should have given attention to the primary industries in the first place. How much more valuable would it be to the people of this country if he had for their money put in fish plants in 1949? How much more value to the people of this country, for their money, if he had put it into roads since 1949? How much better off would the people of this country be, if the money, put into the development of industries for the benefit of people living in Europe were put into the soil?

The chief cause of the prosperity of this country for many years has been the large expenditure by the American Government on defence work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: Millions of dollars have been spent by the Americans in this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but there are millions on other things.

MR. BROWNE: To qualify that—I have not finished my sentence—since 1949 we have had the benefit of old age pensions and family allowances, improved veterans and other legislation of that kind, and the Government's spendings on public works.

The Rockefellers came and left us and we did not benefit. Now, my honourable friend recently has introduced another financial corporation, the Rothschilds. I hope that their effort in this country will be more beneficial to the people than their counterpart in the United States. I hope that all this talk of helping the fisheries is really going to mature, and that all the talk about helping the farmers and the soil this year, in the Speech from the Throne, we have promises of that. Action is now heading up for us in connection with the fisheries. There will be general agreement, I believe in welcoming, other industries and other sources of income for our people. I believe also there will be general agreement that in the long run prosperity in Newfoundland depends upon the continued expansion of the fisheries, forests and agriculture. I wish my honourable friend had recognized the importance of that statement five years ago. I don't think he did. One would expect, with the experience he had in farming and in raising various kinds of agricultural animals that he would have given more assistance to the development of agriculture in this country.

Now, Sir, I am going to cut my remarks short, because the hour is getting late and there is not much time left today. But, I think that we have come to the end of an era in this country, we are starting a new chapter when we get a Speech from the Throne that does not mention

these great industries in which so many millions of dollars of Newfoundland money have been invested. We are told we are going to get fish, fish, fish until we become fish. I think my honourable friend is drawing a great red herring across the industrial trail he has blazed in this country. It will remain to me a mystery why no mention has been made of the industries and the uncertainty of the prospects for so many of these industries, and the fact that it is a matter of great concern for all the people of Newfoundland. I feel the Speech from the Throne should have referred to them and told us how they are going along. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my honourable friend the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, that, "We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this House regrets the Speech from the Throne contained no reference to the financial conditions or progress of the industries in which so large an amount of the surplus of the people has been invested."

MR. SPEAKER: I see six o'clock.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, are we going to sit tonight?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not our intention. The honourable gentleman wishes to move the adjournment.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's West made an amendment seconded by the honourable member for Harbour Main-Bell Island.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable members are confusing themselves quite unnecessarily. The honourable member has spoken. It is six o'clock and an honourable member has mov-

ed the adjournment. I am now about to put the motion to adjourn the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 3:00 of the clock.

The House adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, March 30, at 3:00 of the clock.

---

TUESDAY, March 30, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I have the annual report for the Department of Education, and beg leave to table same. I may say I have not sufficient copies for each member to receive one, but we shall have them in a day or so.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

(22) MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. In connection with the block provision of three hundred thousand dollars for adjustment of salaries in the Department of Health Estimates, state exactly how this amount was appropriated.

2. State the number of Orderlies at the General Hospital; what are the

hours of work and what salaries are paid to said Orderlies? What is the number of Orderlies whose homes are elsewhere than in St. John's.

3. How many student nurses are presently in training at the various hospitals throughout Newfoundland. State number at each hospital and what exactly are the terms of their service with regard to salary and allowances? What are the hours of work each day or night?

4. Give the names of all interns at each of the hospitals in Newfoundland.

5. How many Ward Aides are employed at the General Hospital? What wages and salaries are paid and what are the hours of work?

(23) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(a) A statement showing the number of Documentary films made for the Government by the Atlantic Films and Electronics Ltd.

(b) What amount of money was paid by the Government for each of these films?

(c) Is the said Company under contract with the Government to make any further films and if so, state the amount of money involved?

(d) What was the total amount of moneys loaned, guaranteed, or advance to the said Company apart from monies paid for said films?

(e) What amount of interest to date has been paid by said Company on account of loans or advances from the Government?

(f) What number of people is employed by this Film Company?

(24) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What amount of money has been paid by the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust to (a) the Government, (b) the North Star Cement Co. Ltd. under agreement between the Government, the North Star Cement Co. and the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust dated October 16, 1952?

2. What is the exact amount required to be paid yearly by said Holding Trust under said agreement?

3. Is it correct that the Government sold 997 shares of the North Star Cement Co. out of a possible 1000 shares to the said Holding Trust for the sum of two hundred thousand dollars?

4. Did the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust make the necessary improvements in the cement plant according to agreement dated October 16, 1952?

5. List the names of the Directors and of the Shareholders of the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust. Where in Switzerland is the registered office of this Company, and in what Swiss Government office is said Company or Trust registered?

6. Who signed the Agreement of Oct. 16, 1952 on behalf of, or as attorney for the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust?

7. What proportion of the share capital of the Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Ltd. is held by the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust?

8. What is the total amount of insurance carried on the North Star

Cement plant and with what Insurance Company is said insurance carried? Has the North Star Cement Co. executed a first mortgage in favour of the Government on the Cement plant, and if so for what amount?

(25) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Give names of the recently appointed Fishery Development Authority.

2. State the amount of salaries being paid to (a) the Chairman, (b) the members of said Authority or Committee, and state what if any contract has been entered into with these individuals by the Government. Table copies of said contract or agreement.

3. State in detail the exact duties of this Fishery Development Authority, and state under what section of the Consolidated Statutes said Fishery Authority is set up.

4. Give the dimensions of the 23 ft. boat recently purchased in Europe by said Authority. From whom was this boat purchased, at what price and on whose recommendation?

5. Table an account showing the following particulars of (a) the Charlotte II, (b) the Matthew. (1) The original building or purchasing cost. (2) The cost of machinery as installed in said boats, (3) The running expenses during the period said boats were in possession of the Government. (4) The total earnings of said boats and (5) the amounts received on the sale of each boat. Table a complete account of each of these boats as it exists at the Department of Fisheries.

6. On whose authority was each of

these boats built or purchased and on whose recommendation? On whose recommendation were they ordered sold?

(26) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. The total number of Newfoundland long-liners and Danish Seiners operating in Newfoundland waters during the year 1953.

2. The total number of men employed fishing on these boats.

3. The total quantity of fish caught by these vessels and the total landed value of same.

4. How many such vessels were operated under Government sponsorship? Give names of skippers of said vessels, the number of the crew and the ports from which each such vessel operated, together with total quantities of fish caught by each such boat and value of fish caught by each boat. Give also the total expenditure by the Government or any of its Departments upon each such boat, together with amounts spent in wages for boat's skipper and crew, during the calendar year 1953. Give tonnage of each such boat.

5. Is it the intention of the Government to continue with its experimental fishing from such boats in future?

6. In the Minister's opinion what is the correct tonnage for such fishing boats, the correct crew number; and what is the approximate cost of construction of such a boat, and total cost including engine when boat is ready for sea?

(27) MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

Table a detailed statement showing all capital account expenditure made under Subhead 1422 since April 1st, 1953, to date. This statement to include the names of all individuals, firms or companies to whom moneys were paid and the amount paid to each, together with an explanation with some detail as to why these expenditures were made.

#### Answers to Questions

MR. SPEAKER: Prior to making a ruling I want to remind Honourable Members that the greatest latitude possible is allowed both in the asking and answering of questions in this House. However, there are certain principles which Mr. Speaker has to keep in mind when assessing the admissibility or otherwise of questions. I would refer you to Question No. 5 on the Order Paper of yesterday for I am about to rule as inadmissible sub-questions (5), (6) and (7).

Now, let it be understood at the outset, I could permit these questions to go to the Minister who might, I do not know, refuse to answer. However, because of the principle involved, which I shall make clear, I am not doing that. I must disallow the questions on a number of specific grounds. I would refer you to "Beauchesne" p. 119. "Questions may not contain: Innuendo, inferences, imputations, relate to character or conduct of persons in other than a public capacity. Questions may not be asked which deal with matters not within the official knowledge of the Minister nor those dealing with matters of a pri-

vate nature, nor may they seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner."

I do not know what answer the Honourable Minister would make if the question were allowed, but for the purpose of this ruling I must assume that he would answer. Instantly the question becomes dangerous in the extreme and capable of effecting great mischief. I feel sure the effect in that direction would be much greater than is foreseen by either the Opposition or by the Government at this stage. For example: I doubt if any list of shareholders is up-to-date and many of them would therefore contain names of people who in actual fact are not shareholders at all but merely stenographers or other office employees who were present in the office where the act of incorporation was done. Honourable members must be aware that the very idea of selling alcoholic liquors or handling or being associated with them in any way is extremely repugnant to a great many people in this country and most especially in Newfoundland. Therefore I think it follows, that to table in this House a list of people who are shareholders, and so by the most modern and rapid means disseminate the information to the public at large would be, to say the least, to bring shame and opprobrium to a great number of innocent people who have absolutely no chance whatsoever to defend themselves.

The House therefore must agree that this would constitute a breach of parliamentary privilege. While Mr. Speaker does not sit as the guardian of the public yet he does hold custody of the rights and privileges of the parliament.



Referring to sub-section 6: It must be inferred, for the insinuation is that some honourable members have a proprietary or monetary interest in the sale of alcoholic liquors or in places in which such liquors are sold, I say; "It may be inferred" whether that is the case or not I do not know. But it must be remembered that when a gentleman becomes a member of a House of Assembly he does not forfeit his right to his life as a private citizen. True while he sits in this House or in any House as the mouth-piece of his constituents his actions and his life insofar as it is public and his actions in a public capacity are subject to the scrutiny of the House; but it is no concern of the House nor of the public at large, how any member earns his living or invests his money provided such is done in a legal and legitimate manner. If otherwise be the case it would be a matter for the courts and not for this House. There are two main principles I see here, the one I have already stated that of personal questions. I burned considerable midnight oil on this subject and I find that questions much less harmful than these have been ruled out of order time and again. The most important principle I see here seems to me to reach so far afield as to be alarming in its proportions. If I permit these questions to be asked and answered and especially answered, you must see that I hereby set up a precedent which will remain to haunt the occupant of this Chair for years to come, and since new precedents are made common property to all parliaments in the Commonwealth the results are so far-reaching as to be positively alarming.

You see, if I allow a Minister to answer questions relating to the priv-

ate life of any honourable member I shall have then empowered Ministers to investigate the private lives of members of this House. What protection can any honourable member then seek from Mr. Speaker in any attempt which might be made in future to impeach his honesty or integrity. If I permit the Opposition to apply this dangerous and far-reaching method of attack today it follows that honourable members on the government side might very well employ such tactics, and much more effectively tomorrow. Once started how can such great public mischief be stopped or even controlled.

Further I must take cognizance of the purpose of the questions as intimated by the honourable member who spoke yesterday. (The honourable member referred to these questions, therefore I may here make this reference to his speech). Since I must instantly rule out of order any attempt by one honourable member to impute criminal or other forms of misconduct to other honourable members, it is difficult to see how I could permit the same object to be attained even in an indirect or circuitous manner. Therefore, for these reasons I must rule the questions out of order, on the grounds that, if answered, they would constitute a breach of parliamentary privilege since they would work harm against certain innocent members of the general public, impute misconduct to members of this House, and that they would create a precedent which would be attended by incalculable dangers.

I have gone to some length in making this ruling and to make it clear that I am merely ruling on the principle involved.

Finally I have to say that there is no debate on Mr. Speaker's ruling. However, it is possible for any honourable member who wishes, to appeal the ruling to the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I say just a word: I have no intention whatsoever of questioning your ruling except to make this remark about sub-section (5) of Question No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no debate. If the honourable member is permitted to make a statement, Mr. Speaker must reply and instantly he takes part in a debate. It is contrary to all standard practice. The ruling is merely on the principles involved which I take it upon myself to state are probably more far-reaching than any member of the House realizes.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if Your Honour would indicate again the principle involved in sub-section (5)?

MR. SPEAKER: The ruling has been given.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Would it not be more in order, or if you could give us notice in advance that you are to give a ruling so that if we have any argument we might raise it before a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be very happy to answer—in order to do that we would have to bring into effect a system of dealing with questions which does obtain in other Houses. As a result I can assure the honourable member the Opposition would suffer greatly. The greatest latitude is allowed—for instance it is not correct for a member to give notice of

questions to be asked. In order to tell the honourable member in advance what I am to rule out of order, I must have at least two days, therefore they must be either placed in the bag on Mr. Speaker's Chair or passed to the clerk so that it can be indicated whether answers are to be given or not. Therefore, by giving notice of questions, which might be disallowed, certainly there is no other thing for the Chair to do other than ruled.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder would it be possible for Your Honour to order that typewritten transcripts of Your Honour's remarks and other remarks since be prepared at the earliest possible moment and circulated to the Leader of the Opposition and a copy to me and we perhaps could have a copy to circulate to the press. Your Honour could, I think, order that.

MR. SPEAKER: It will appear in Hansard so I see no reason why it could not be done.

Then, in fairness, does any other honourable gentleman wish to appeal?

MR. HOLLETT: By doing that and casting no reflection I would not wish to have the matter circulated. I abide by your judgement, Mr. Speaker, but reserve the right to refer to it in debate but not to your ruling.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I suggest the ruling of Your Honour be circulated.

MR. SPEAKER: I think honourable members are entitled to it, because if we had a daily printing of "Hansard," honourable members would have it in the morning.

## Answers to Questions (Cont'd)

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. 4; the answer is being prepared.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Section 4 of No. 5 tabled.

## BOARD OF LIQUOR CONTROL

No. Persons Employed	Classification	Scale
ADMINISTRATION		
1	Chairman of Board	(6,000)
2	Members of Board	(5,000 each)
1	Shorthand-Typist, Grade II	(1,900-100-2,100)

—  
4

## GENERAL OFFICE

1	General Manager, (Director) Grade II	(4,900-100-5,300)
1	Asst. Manager, Grade VII	(4,200-100-4,500)
1	Accountant, Grade VI	(3,900-100-4,200)
1	Asst. Accountant, Grade V	(3,400-100-3,900)
5	Clerks, Grade IV	(2,700-100-3,400)
6	Clerks, Grade III	(2,100-100-2,700)
2	Clerks, Grade II	(1,500-100-2,100)
1	Chief Inspector, Grade IV	(2,700-100-3,400)
3	Inspectors, Grade III	(2,100-100-2,700)
2	Shorthand-Typists, Grade I	(1,500-100-1,800)
1	Messenger, Grade I	(1,200-100-1,800)

—  
24

## SALES AND MISCELLANEOUS

5	Branch Managers, Grade V	(3,400-100-3,900)
5	Asst. Branch Manager, Grade IV	(2,700-100-3,400)
6	Salesmen, Grade III	(2,100-100-2,700)
8	Salesmen, Grade III	(2,930 Personal)
2	Salesmen, Grade III	(2,900 Personal)
1	Salesman, Grade III	(2,830 Personal)
4	Departmental Managers, Grade V	(3,400-100-3,900)
5	Asst. Departmental Managers, Grade IV	(2,700-100-3,400)
2	Departmental Clerks, Grade III	(2,100-100-2,700)
12	Utility Workers (Manual), Grade III	(1,800-100-2,200)
3	Utility Workers (Manual), Grade I	(1,200-100-1,500)
1	Driver (Manual), Grade IV	(2,200-100-2,600)
1	Watchman (Manual), Grade II	(1,500-100-1,800)
12	Labourers	(\$30 per week)

—  
67—  
95 Total

MR. HOLLETT: Is it the intention to answer 1, 2, and 3?

MR. POWER: Yes. (6) Was answered yesterday. (7) Is being prepared.

MR. FOGWILL: On that point, would it be possible for the Opposition to be given a copy of questions separate from the ones tabled; or, if the copy given to the Clerk could be given to me to have a typewritten copy made?

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is quite easy to make more than one copy.

MR. BROWNE: Would it be improper to have only the questions which are not answered carried forward to the next day? Then we would have only the questions which have not been answered on the Order Paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not agree with that.

MR. SPEAKER: It will not be lost sight of.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Question No. 8. The answer is in the course of preparation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In connection with (9), I must decline to answer all sections of it except subsection 7 which I will answer, because it deals with money advanced to this private Company by the Government out of the Treasury. I will not answer the others because these are questions which should be more properly addressed to the Company itself. Perhaps they will answer them. The Opposition may as well give notice of questions about Bowrings or Harvey's or Bowater's or any other private Company. The questions would be

much more properly addressed to the companies concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: May I interrupt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have the floor; if he asks me to relinquish it, I shall do so. He should not ask the Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask you for nothing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You will get nothing, except to stay in Opposition. As long as he is elected he will stay there.

Regarding Section 7, I will give the information tomorrow or whenever I get the information in my hands.

MR. POWER: Answer to Question No. 11 tabled.

Question No. 11:

(1) (a) Social Security Assessment, See Answer to Question 7 (2).

(b) Gasoline Tax—\$1,980,826 (to 28/2/54).

(c) Cancer Control Tax—\$73,629 (to 28/2/54).

(d) Rental Mineral Leases, Royalties, etc.—\$278,455 (to 28/2/54).

(2) (a) No overdraft at present time.

(b) \$1,793,585.26 (at 28/2/54).

(3) Information being tabled in reply to Question 3 (E).

(4) See Answer to Question 6 (3).

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): The answer to No. 12 is being prepared and also the answer to No. 13.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In connection with No. 14 (1). I do not think it is any business of this House and I decline to give the information. I suggest that question be more properly addressed to the Company. They

might or might not care to give the information.

(2) \$300,000 has been spent by the Corporation thus far.

(3) After the annual meeting of the Corporation and the information is supplied me, as soon thereafter as is feasible, I will furnish that information to the House.

(5) "To what extent has Brinco exercised its option to take up exploration leases as granted under Section No. 3 of their Agreement with the Government?" These leases, I believe, are leases referred to in sub-section (2) of the question. Actually it is only within recent days that the Corporation has taken up its option on the 50 square miles in Labrador and the ten square miles in Newfoundland for the purposes of exploration.

Answer to No. 14 (6) tabled

Answer to Question 14 (6):

Directors of Brinco: B. C. Gardner, H. M. S. Lewin, Sir Eric Bowater, E. A. Bowering, Phillip Gruchy, Col. Henning, R. C. W. Hobbs, Dr. T. H. Hogg, Senator C. C. Pratt, Angus Reid, Lord Rothemere.

MR. SPENCER: Question 15 is in the course of preparation.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): In reply to No. 16 there are some vacancies in the Magistracy and I have no doubt but that appointments will be made in due course. As regards the other part of the question, I may say it is still under consideration.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): With regard to No. (17), the answer is "yes the government has one cabin on the Gander River. The Cabin was built

with the consent of the Departmental officials of the Commission Government in 1947 at an approximate cost of \$1500."

(3) It is used mainly by parties coming to Newfoundland at the invitation of the Government.

(4) The property was used in 1953 from August 8th to August 12th. The party consisted of Brig. Genl. Lovett, Colonel Lux, Colonel Anderson, and Mr. Gwathmay of the United States Army Engineers, accompanied by the Chief Game Warden.

(5) Yes. Guide-Caretaker, Orlando Gillingham, approximately 1½ months at \$250 per month; Aaron Layte, cook, approximately 10 days at \$250 per month.

The Honourable Minister of Health tabled the answers to question No. 18:

Question: Is it the intention of the Government to publish the report of the inquiry conducted into the administration of the Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases?

Answer: Yes.

Question: In the case of employees suspended during the inquiry but exonerated by the findings thereof, is it the intention of the Government or the Department to reinstate any or all of such persons in their employment?

Answer: Each individual employee's case will be considered on merit as vacancies occur.

Question: How many employees in all were suspended or dismissed during the investigation carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Answer: Fourteen.

Question: Have any of these per-

sons since been employed in the Department of Health or any other Department of Government?

Answer: Yes. Dr. G. J. O'Brien as Consulting Psychiatrist at the St. John's General Hospital with effect from December 1st, 1953.

The Honourable Minister of Public Works tabled reply to Question No. 19 by Mr. Higgins:

1. Question: The total amount spent on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) Since April 1st, 1949; (b) In each fiscal year since 1949, how much of this amount was expended (1) by the Federal Government (2) by the Provincial Government?

Answer: (a) 7,247,830.

(b)	1949-50	1950-51	
(1)	Nil	957,844	
(2)	208,675	1,376,832	
	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54
	998,670	527,345	945,003
	1,059,492	463,679	710,290

2. Question: Give (a) the total number of men employed last year on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland and (b) the total moneys spent in wages.

Answer: All work on Trans-Canada Highway is carried out under contracts. Payments to contractors are made on the basis of units of work performed. Records are not kept in the department of the number of men employed by the contractors or the moneys paid in wages.

3. Question: Give the total mileage of new road construction on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) since April 1st, 1949; (b) in each fiscal year since April 1st, 1949.

Answer: (a) 120 miles of road have been rough graded.

(b)	1949-50	4.5 miles
	1950-51	49.2 miles
	1951-52	29.1 miles
	1952-53	12.4 miles
	1953-54	24.8 miles

4. Question: How many miles of road remain to be constructed, and the number of bridges together with approximate of costs apart from paving?

Answer: 480 miles. As the final route of Trans Canada Highway has not yet been decided, it is impossible to give the exact number of bridges, but the approximate number is 40, approximate cost, including bridges \$33,000,000, apart from paving.

5. Question: How many miles of secondary roads were constructed during the past fiscal year and where located? Give the cost and the names of the contractors or builders.

Answer: 90.5 miles at the following locations:

Cape Island to North Cape.  
Roads on New World Island.  
Random Island Road.  
Port aux Basques—Isle au Mort.  
Allan's Lane, Curling—Trans-Canada Highway.  
O'Donnells—Admirals Beach.  
St. Anthony—Cooks Harbour.  
Bunyans Cove—Musgravetown.  
Extension Road North Harbour, Placentia Bay.  
Buchans—Badger Road.  
Rocky Harbour—St. Pauls.  
Lumsden—Musgrave Harbour.  
Kings Point to Indian Brook.  
Rock Harbour Spanish Room.  
Meadows—Irishtown.  
Cook's Brook—Frenchman's Cove.  
Phillips Head—Point au Bay.



Bobbys Cove—Paradise.  
 Road to Wharf at Seldom.  
 Fredericton—Carnanville.  
 Roaches Line—Mahers.  
 Epworth—Corbin.  
 Terrenceville Road to Parkers Cove.  
 Halls Bay to Roberts Arm.  
 Cannings Cove—Musgravetown.  
 Point au Mal—Lewis Brook.  
 Queens Cove—Southport.  
 Bay L'Argent—St. Bernards.  
 Wild Bight—Little Bay.

Most of these roads were constructed by Departmental forces. The others were done by J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd., Western Construction Co., Ltd., and W. J. Lundrigan, Ltd.

6. Question: How much money was spent on repairs to secondary roads during the past fiscal year?

Answer: \$2,100,000.

MR. POWER: (20) the answer will be ready in a couple of days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (21). I guess it is in the course of preparation. I have not got the answer.

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: The question now is the amendment submitted by the honourable member for St. John's West. I must inform all members that this amendment constitutes a motion of "no confidence." Every member of the House may speak to it with one exception—that being the honourable member who moved it. Honourable members must confine themselves strictly to the subject of the amendment.

MR. FOGWILL: I rise now to support this amendment so ably proposed by the honourable member for St. John's West.

If I may be permitted, I would like to take a moment or two. I would like to congratulate the honourable member on his being elected to the District of St. John's West and in taking his seat on this side of the House. I feel sure, Sir, that the honourable member will be not only a great help to the Opposition and will be a great asset to them, but because of his wise experience in Government matters and as a Rhodes Scholar, he would be a help not only to the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, but would be of great assistance to this whole Assembly.

Now, in support of the Amendment, much can be said. In the first instance it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that when this Government took office in 1949, they were at their wits end as to how to go about laying down some foundation whereby the people of this Island could be employed at work of a permanent nature. Of course, at that time, in 1949, our industries were limited. But in 1950 the Government did begin to bestir itself in respect to the introduction of new industries into this Island.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when a group of people such as we have in this House—and I would include the members on this side of this House as well as those on the opposite side—after so many years of no experience in government life, suddenly find themselves in the saddle, so to speak, in the place where they have to govern Newfoundland, it seems to me that the government took fright, knowing our industries were limited—that they were confined to those old industries like the fisheries, or the comparatively new ones like mining and pulp and paper—in 1950, shortly after they were elected, they decided to branch out

into something new—industrial development!

The first thing they did after acquiring the services of that great man (who is now lost to us)—Valdmanis—after acquiring his services, the government did decide to invest certain amounts of money in the building of a Cement Plant. So in 1950-51 the government did put \$1,119,945 into the building of a cement plant and in the following year 1951-52 they spent \$2,222,635.75. And, Mr. Speaker, in the next year, into this same plant they spent an amount of \$895,738.93 of the people's money. That was for the building of the plant.

Besides this amount, they spent other amounts. In 1951-52 they spent an additional amount of \$436,432.36 and also in 1952-53 they spent \$63,567.64. A total investment, not of government money, but the people's money—the people of this Island—of \$4,738,319.00.

Now, one thing I am disturbed about—the cement plant cost \$4,738,000 in round figures. The Auditor General's Report of March 31, 1952 had this to say:

"Cement Mill: Since the close of the 1951-52 financial year the Cement Mill has been sold to North Star Cement Limited for \$4,340,000 and the shares in this Company, owned by the Government and having a par value of \$100,000, have been sold to Canadian Machinery Holding Trust for \$200,000. Funds to purchase the Cement Mill were advanced by the Government to North Star Cement Limited and this amount together with \$400,000 advanced to the Company for working capital, making a total of \$4,740,000, is secured by a first mortgage on the fixed assets of the Com-

pany in favour of the Government and bears interest at the rate of 4¾% per annum. The amount for which the Mill was sold represents approximately the sums expended by the Government in the construction and equipment of the Mill plus certain commitments amounting to \$115,000 approximately, made by the Government in connection with the erection of the plant, and unpaid as of the date of sale."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1953, it says:

**"Department of Economic Development—Statement No. 17**

36. Subhead 1553. (01) Interest on Loans, \$195,899. Since 31 March 1953 Executive Council have ordered, subject to ratification, by the Legislature, that agreement made with the operators of Industrial plants, to whom Government loans have been made, be amended to provide that:

(1) Payment of interest of such loans be deferred for the first two years from the date of commencement of construction;

(2) Any interest paid by the operators be refunded, and

(3) Amortization of the loans start four years from the date of commencement instead of two years.

To date a total of \$121,994 of the above amount has been refunded."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the same Report handed us a few days ago, on Page 17 it says:

**Agreement of Sale and Mortgages Receivable—Statement No. 38**

20. North Star Cement Co. Ltd.

\$4,623,213.—The repayment of this amount is secured by a first mortgage on the fixed assets of the Company. The mortgage bears interest at the rate of 4¾% per annum payable in equal half-yearly instalments beginning 5 January 1953. The Company is required to repay the principal sum in yearly instalments of not less than 3% thereof beginning 5 July 1953 and terminating 15 July 1964. Any balance outstanding as of the latter date is to be refinanced."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Cement Plant: It appears to me that the Cement Plant, whereas it cost four million seven hundred thousand dollars, it was sold for approximately one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars less than it cost the Government of this Island. I would like to know why? Whereas the cost of the plant to the Government was four million seven hundred and thirty eight thousand three hundred and nineteen dollars. It was sold for four million six hundred and twenty three thousand two hundred and thirteen dollars.

Now, Sir, as far as the Gypsum Plant is concerned the total cost of the Gypsum Plant was two million one hundred and ninety-nine thousand eight hundred dollars and working capital four hundred thousand, share capital one hundred thousand. The total cost, Mr. Speaker, three million one hundred and ninety-nine thousand and eight dollars. The Birch Plant, Sir, the cost was one million, seven hundred and eighty thousand, eight hundred and forty-eight dollars, and working capital advanced by the Government nine hundred and sixty thousand dollars besides which the Government has guaranteed a loan of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to these people, a bank loan.

So that the total cost of the Cement Plant, the Gypsum and Birch Plants amount to ten million five hundred and thirty-two thousand—That is a lot of money, Sir. Some of these I read before. I gave you the total for 1950-51 on the Cement, Gypsum and Birch and the Newfoundland Fur Industry, Newfoundland Canadian Machinery and Industrial Construction Limited, United Cotton Mills, Leather Goods, Asbestos and North Star Cement and Atlantic Gypsum, total nine million six hundred and thirty-six thousand six hundred and sixty-three dollars and sixty-two cents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another amount in this for another year ending 1953 where we find a total expenditure on capital account of five million four hundred and fifty-six thousand eight hundred dollars and sixty-one cents, embracing cement, gypsum and birch, Newfoundland Tanneries, Canadian Machinery and Engineering Limited, United Cotton, Newfoundland Asbestos, North Star Cement, Atlantic Hardboards, Atlantic Optical, Hanning Electric, Atlantic Films and Electronics Limited, a total, Mr. Speaker, of eighteen million, five hundred thousand dollars. Now, what I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is—We have heard quite a lot in this House on questions by the honourable members of the Opposition—But in the press, as we go along day by day, there are black headlines every day, every week—The present government is living on headlines. But how many people are employed and are to be employed and what hope is there for the future, etc. I would like to know how many people have been employed by these industries by the spending of this eighteen million dollars? Is there two hundred, five hundred, six hundred or a thousand? I will say there

are less than a thousand persons. But I will take the figures of one thousand persons employed by spending this eighteen million five hundred thousand dollars. If we have only one thousand persons employed, which I don't think, it is costing this Island eighteen thousand dollars to make work for one person. That is a lot of money and people of this Island can't afford it.

I want to say something about this machine plant, but let us have a look at the cement plant first. Now the figures as outlined by the Department of Economic Development in this book which was given to the Opposition some time ago indicate there is a total, Mr. Speaker, of roughly about one hundred and twenty people, for an expenditure of four million seven hundred thousand dollars. Further, Mr. Speaker, this plant is supposed, according to the great Doctor Valdmanis's summary of the total revenue of the plant, the money which it was supposed to earn, the total revenue, was supposed to be two million less the cost of bags for cement, one hundred and eighty-two thousand, so that the net was two million two hundred and fifty-two thousand seven hundred dollars, less the cost of one million sixty-two thousand nine hundred and ten dollars, leaving a balance net revenue of one million two hundred and eighty-nine thousand seven hundred and ninety thousand dollars, less depreciation. This plant should, according to that, produce a revenue each year of eight-one thousand five hundred and forty thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker.

The Gypsum Plant, Mr. Speaker, is similar. I am not going through all the details of this, it is not necessary. But the number of people employed in this plant is roughly about

the same as those who would be employed in the Cement Plant. Mr. Speaker, according to this file which we have, this Gypsum Plant is supposed to bring in to the Government a revenue in the vicinity of seven hundred thousand dollars per year, with an employment roughly of one hundred and twenty or one hundred and twenty-five people.

Now, this one here, this Machinery Company, Mr. Speaker, this is the best one of all. This is the one that was going to put Newfoundland on its feet, this Machinery Company. I remember in 1952 when this plant was opened, the great fanfare, Mr. Jamieson on the radio, CJON I think it was, in his explanation of the operations of this plant said very emphatically over the air in speaking of its opening, of the great roar of machinery which somebody or other would produce by pressing a button. I don't know if this House pressed a button or not, probably it may have done so, but, Mr. Speaker, this plant which was supposed to build many things, that little place in there, an ordinary machine shop such as you would find in any town wherever you may go. Then we find here in the prospectus of this plant that they can build all these things including elevators, pipe systems and crushers, and even in general the treatment of steel and other goods, Mr. Speaker, for defence purposes. It goes on to say that in no way does this list give a complete picture.

Then the report goes on to say: "It is planned to start the operation of the plant August 1, 1952," I believe that was the day it started. "On that date the plant will be put in working condition and will be tested."

How many conveyors did they build

in the first production period? Any? That is what the Opposition wants to know. What have they built out there?

Steel construction for high-tension power lines—How much have they built? These are the things they were supposed to build in the first period of operation. Have they built any? We people on this side have been asking these questions and we would like to know. The people are entitled to know. It is the people's money that has gone into the plant in the amount of two and a half million dollars. We would like to know, and the people want to know.

I feel sure the second period should be in effect now. Have they done any of this work? Now they are also supposed to manufacture cleaning machines, washing machines, cleaning machinery for mills, etc. Have they done any of this work? They have not done any of it, Mr. Speaker. I will go on further and say this much: It is to be expected, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, any plant of this size would have some little difficulty getting into operation. There is no doubt about that. But this plant went into operation in August 1952, and that is quite some time ago. If this plant is supposed to build the things which were outlined to this House of Assembly in this volume by the Director of Economic Development for which the Minister is responsible, it is time we are informed whether or not this plant is doing this work. To my knowledge it is not doing this work. To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, this plant out there in no small measure is interfering and taking away the work formerly done by some of the small machine shops in St. John's as well as the Newfoundland Dockyard. From my own knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I do

know that there have been bearings sent up from one of the fishery firms on the Southside, bearings of an engine in one of these boats, and not only one but several occasions they have been sent to the Machinery Plant out at the Octagon to be remetalled and machined and what happened? These bearings had to be sent back by the Machinery Plant to the dockyard to be remetalled because of the fact that they were unable to do it. It was only last week, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, I know one of the employees of that Machine Plant at the Octagon came to the dockyard and asked one of the mechanics there how you go about the operation to make the metal stick to the bearing. He did not know how to do it, and he, with a mess of spots of metal all over his pants, and he did not know how to make it stick to the bearing. Now this work, Mr. Speaker, is going from these firms. I do not know why. I do know this, much of the government's money, much of the people's money is invested in some of the firms on the Southside. Whether or not that has any bearing on why the bearings were put into the Octagon Plant for remetalting I don't know. It is possible nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, this Machine Plant, which in the first instance has no foundry could not melt a piece of cast iron, had no panel shop, no panel maker, no motor, they could not melt a piece of brass, they do not have a crucible to melt it in. In fact, all this plant is doing now is interfering with the small shops which had previously done all this work in this city. I know they are interfering with the work which formerly went to the dockyard. I am not saying this as an appeal for the Newfoundland Dockyard, but only as a fact, so much of the work formerly

went to the dockyard now goes to the Machine Plant at the Octagon. I don't know whether the people concerned who have this work to be done are advised to send it in there because of the fact that government money is invested in their business. I don't know whether it is true or not, it is possible. But in any case much of the work that is going to the Octagon comes back to the dockyard to be reprocessed and is returned to the Octagon to be machined. Now I know, Mr. Speaker, quite a number of the people employed in small machine shops in St. John's and have been personally associated with many of them, they are my friends, I worked with them this last thirty-five years, and I don't have to tell this House or divulge the name of any people who give me any information, because it would not be right. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say this now: That in July 1953, according to the Minister of Economic Development, the Machinery Plant at the Octagon should have had three hundred and fifteen workmen, they have about one hundred and forty. These three hundred and fifteen men would be working 63,024 hours a month at a wage rate of \$61,763 per month.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this plant has failed in its purpose. It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, to see how the plant can succeed, some orders are forthcoming from the Mainland so that they could set up a production schedule. But it is my opinion, as far as this Machinery Plant is concerned, the Government took a gamble and put the money in this plant with the idea in mind they were going to depend upon some Department of the Federal Government putting defence orders in this plant. That is the way I look at it. Now, they have not re-

ceived any order whatsoever, as far as I know, from the Department of Defence, nor perhaps is it likely that they will receive any. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, all of this money which the Government has spent in the amount of roughly about eighteen million five hundred thousand dollars, and if at a conservative estimate one thousand people employed because it was spent it would have cost the people of this Island eighteen thousand dollars for each person who possibly got permanent employment.

Now, one more thing, Mr. Speaker, when we passed a Bill in respect to new industries in this House in October 1951 and while that Bill was being passed we were very few here while that Bill was being passed in this House, Mr. Speaker. There were more people, more honourable members on the opposite side of this House reading the evening paper while we four or five were trying to do our best to find out how the people's money in this Island was being spent, disinterested, that is what you were, it was not water you were spending but money, hard earned money. I don't blame the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, for being curious about how they spent the money and with what reason. What reason did the Government have to believe these industries could succeed. There was no reason given in this House yet, Mr. Speaker, no reason by the Government. What reasons did they have? Why did they think these industries could succeed? Could they give us any reason? No reason at all, Mr. Speaker, except on the advice of a slimy politician from Europe. Now, if this Government is going to adopt the attitude that any slimy politician who can come in here and be employed by the Government, make his



salary while employed and then gently get out and say good-bye, then I don't thank God that Dr. Valdmanis came here even if the Premier does so. He was no gift from Heaven to this Island. I say this much, Mr. Speaker, he made his pile and beat it and the Government are the suckers, and Mr. Speaker, by being advised by somebody who lived a very short time on this side of the water, by being advised by this person, I say the Government made a great mistake, Mr. Speaker, in spending the people's money not your own money. I only hope and trust there will be some lasting benefit accrue to the people of this land by the spending of their own money. It is nothing to be laughed off or sneered at. We are very few, we have been given very little information about the things which have been going on, and we want to know, and the people want to know, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion of want of confidence from such a small band of, shall I say incompetents as we have been described by the Leader of the Government, and thinking of our audacity to imply a lack of confidence in the Government on the opposite side of the House; I have been thinking as the last speaker my honourable friend from St. John's East has been speaking; just where and what cue would I take to justify myself for supporting a motion of want of confidence in the Government, the only Government we have ever had, according to some people, and the last speaker gave me the cue, and it was Valdmanis. Valdmanis, the man who in co-operation with the Government brought in these new industries about which we have been trying to get

some information but consistently are being refused. Why do I say; there is the cue? Because, Sir, I am lead to think, convinced by events which have happened in the last few weeks, either the Premier of the country has lost confidence in Valdmanis, or Valdmanis has lost confidence in the Premier. There is a lack of confidence somewhere on the other side of the House. Therefore, we, Sir, are justified in moving a motion of want of confidence, particularly on account of these new industries.

Now, the last speaker, the member for St. John's East, has gone into the details very thoroughly on some of the industries, but it will be my duty to perhaps repeat some of the things which he has said. I will start with the North Star Cement Company Limited. We find that as of March 31, 1953 that that plant, that cement plant had cost the taxpayers so far four million six hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars. That was so of March 31, 1953, and I have to refer, as did my colleague to page 17 of the Auditor General's Report in which the Auditor General makes a comment \$4,623,213, and says the repayment of this amount is secured by a first mortgage on the fixed assets of the Company. What Company? The North Star Cement Company, Sir, has as directors as of December 19, 1952, Joseph Smallwood, one share, Edward S. Spencer, one share, Leslie R. Curtis, one share, and the Minister of Economic Development, 996 shares.

These shares, Sir were later sold and allotted, but Donald holds on to his share.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—any more disturbance from the galleries and

they will be cleared. Visitors must keep absolutely quiet.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, I have here a copy of the agreement, and if anyone can tell me, after I read it, who owns the plant; I would like to know.

"THE AGREEMENT made in St. John's . . . BETWEEN Joseph R. Smallwood, Minister of Economic Development" (I believe he had 997 shares) "acting for and on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen (hereinafter called the Government) of the one part AND North Star Cement Company . . . (hereinafter called The Company) of the other part AND Canadian Machinery Holding Trust, a Company incorporated under the Laws of Switzerland of the third part . . ."

There it is—the Minister of Economic Development, the Company and some mysterious Company in Switzerland.

"WHEREAS the Government owns the Cement Plant—" (that is a statement of Fact).

"NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH—the Government will sell and the Company will buy—" (The Company is not the Holding Trust) "purchase price of said plant shall be the amount spent therefor by the Government."

The Government has advanced \$400,000 for working capital. The Government sells to the Company and the Company consists of the Cabinet. They advance them \$400,000 for working capital.

The Government sold to the North Star Cement Company this plant, but they sold their shares to the Holding Trust.

That is about all there is to it. They do not get anything; there is no consideration. They sold without consideration. It is signed "James A. Power." The Common Seal of the Company was affixed in accordance with the regulations; it is signed by J. R. Smallwood as Director and E. S. Spencer as Director. It is also signed by another name which is indecipherable. I defy anybody in this House to make out that name which is signed as Attorney for the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust. Now, I would like for somebody to tell me the position with regard to the Cement Plant. We cannot get any information on it. We know it was sold to the North Star Cement Company who indeed owned it in the first place and operated it. The shares passed to the Holding Trust and what they are doing is anybody's guess. The people are not supposed to know anything about this deal in which they have four and three-quarter million dollars which was squeezed out of them in the days of Commission Government.

That is about all I wish to say about the Cement Plant. We shall be asking more questions on that. I do hope the Government will see fit to give us some information on this Holding Trust Company. We would like to know what happened. We would like to know if the North Star Cement Company has paid interest into the Government. They were definitely supposed to do it; but I see now that that has been deferred too. They are going to give them four years before they have to pay and if they want a little more time, they will probably get that too.

Now, the Birch Plant. That is operated by the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited. We shall see who

are the Newfoundland Hardwoods. Nominal Capital \$100,000. Directors: Chester E. Dawe (now in Florida sunning himself); Phyllis M. Dawe; Joseph R. Smallwood (I know him); R. C. B. Mercer. 253 shares of \$100 each. The shareholders of the Newfoundland Hardwoods: Chester Dawe, 251 shares; Phyllis M. Dawe, 1 share and R. C. B. Mercer, 1 share. That is the Newfoundland Hardwoods.

Now the Auditor General's Report, Page 18, has this to say:

"BIRCH PLANT: \$1,788,649—The Birch Plant is operated by the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.' (which is, in other words, Chester Dawe) "under a fifteen year lease, the consideration being an annual rent of one-half the net profits of each year's operations plus depreciation on buildings, plant and equipment. To date no revenue has been received from this source. In addition to the cost of the plant, Government has made advances from time to time to the Company for working capital. Such advances, on which no interest has been paid, totalled \$906,645 as of 31 March, 1953. At that date the Company also had a bank loan of \$150,000 which was guaranteed by the Government."

That was at the end of March, 1953; it has probably gone well over that now. I would say, without fear of contradiction that they have probably been advanced another \$200,000 or \$300,000 since that time. The Birch Plant was built by the Government out of the people's money. Yet, when I ask a question what do I get? "We cannot give you the information." They do not even say it as nicely as that. And in connection with that plant, something has happened which, to me, is very serious. The Birch Plant was, I always thought, the

great hope of the Government industries. There was apparently lots of wood; lots of birch (so we were told); plenty of veneer wood and all sorts of wood. Yet, on the 23rd of the month, sixty-three men and women were laid off. When one of the radio stations approached the Manager, Baird, asking why these people were laid off they were told "there is no work." I have been told there is no wood. I am told that there was some political interference in Springdale over the cutting of birch. If any big factories costing nearly four million dollars are going to be interfered with by politicians, and the birch could not be cut on time, how can the Birch Plant win? There was no birch cut in Springdale until late in the Fall and then it was too late. Sixty-three men and women (mostly men) laid off; told to go home; possibly there was no birch; while the man responsible suns himself in Florida. I presume he is in Florida—he may be in Montego Bay, but I imagine he would steer clear of that.

We have been charged here in this House with neglecting our duties. We are told we come unprepared. We have to be well prepared, we are told. Now, I wish every industry had been a success. Some would have been if there was any business ability on the other side of the House. I have here a list of Wage Rates and hours of labour in Canada in 1952 on Plywood and Veneer, etc. I find Clipper Operators, general rate across Canada \$1.12 an hour; rate here in Newfoundland, 85c. an hour. Core Layer and Sheet Layer, 82c. in Newfoundland, across Canada, \$1.53. Dryer-operator, in Newfoundland, women—48c.; men 82c.; across Canada—\$1.00. Lathe Operators, across Canada, \$1.31. We get 92c. (And

yet, sixty-three employees are laid off. Is it any wonder there is lack of confidence? We, too, lost confidence in Dr. Valdmánis and a lot of people, a long time ago). Press Loader, 82c. in Newfoundland; \$1.18 across Canada. Press Operator, 85c. in Newfoundland; \$1.27 across Canada. Veneer Grader, 82-85c.; across Canada \$1.17; British Columbia \$1.55. (They have bigger trees out in British Columbia). Veneer Grader (women), in Newfoundland 48c.; across Canada \$1.21; 65c. in Quebec; \$1.48 in British Columbia. Veneer Patcher, women, in Newfoundland 50c.; across Canada \$1.28.

When we look at the amount of money spent—the people's money, not the Government's—when we think that sixty-three people have been laid off—(there are only 80 left there)—at this time of the year; when we think the answer given is "no work;" when we look at these wages and compare them with those across Canada—is it any wonder why we brought in a motion of lack of confidence in the Government. I say that if we had done less, we would have been lax in our duty. Personally, I never had much confidence in the people on the other side. I do not dislike a man because he is not a business man; but I do not like a person who believes he is "it," that everything he touches will turn to gold. Unfortunately, that gold turns back into dross, and it looks like that will happen to the \$4,700,000 which we put into this Birch Plant.

Now, the Gypsum Plant. My colleague has already referred to it. The prospectus for that was presented to us, with gold letters across the front, and it showed that on paper it would make a profit of \$780,000 a

year. And the Cement Plant was to make \$800,000.00.

Before I leave the Birch Plant, I would like to say that in "Newfoundland Is On The March" (I believe we all heard of that), there is one reference to this Birch Plant.

"We have, as you know, established a very modern new industry on this birch. This new factory is now manufacturing veneer, plywood, flooring from birch. Shortly it will be manufacturing 2,000 flush-doors a week." I wish they would open some of the doors and let the people go back to work. That would be much better.

Now, the Atlantic Gypsum Limited. The directors as of February 9, 1952—(and I have no reason to suspect they have changed)—Messrs. Smallwood, Curtis, Spencer, Ballam, Valdmánis and Leja—they all have a share each. Page 18 of the Auditor General's Report has this to say:

"GYPSUM PLANT \$2,599,008—The Gypsum Plant is operated by Atlantic Gypsum Ltd., a Crown corporation with a paid up capital of \$100,000. In addition to the cost of the plant, advances for working capital totalling \$400,000 have been made to the Company. No revenue has been received by the Government from the operations of the Company." I am tempted to ask what did they do with the revenue they made? Why have they not paid it to the Government? This was to turn in a revenue of \$780,000 in each and every year of operation. This thing cost two million, nine hundred and ninety-nine and some odd dollars—three million dollars. I suspect it has gone well over that amount now.

That is the Gypsum Plant, Sir. I have some more information on that;

but whether it is worth taking up the attention of the House, I do not know. I doubt it.

Now, there was a shipment of plasterboard, I believe, sent up to Montreal and we tried to get some information as to what happened to that but never, Sir, could we get anything at all about it except we know it cost about \$946.00 to send it up there. Now, before I go on to the other industries, Sir, here is something else, in "Newfoundland on the March" and I believe we are all familiar with it. "My estimate of the total number of new jobs to be created by these new industries and mines is something between six and seven thousand people. That will be full-time employment and another fifteen hundred will get part time employment. I have no doubt such a volume of employment will result in another thousand people getting their living indirectly out of these industries. The total number of Newfoundlanders involved would thus run perhaps as high as 30,000. The annual wage bill should run to something around \$10,000,000."

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that we should move a vote of want of confidence. The various industries, these which I have mentioned and others I am about to mention cost this country anywhere from twenty to thirty million dollars. I cannot get any nearer than that to it and nobody else, and we are told we are to get all these jobs, yet we find people getting laid off practically every day.

These first three plants, Sir, to which I have referred, we are told that they were built by the Government on the advice of Dr. Valdmanis, "that great man without whom I would not want to be Premier." That

great man, Sir, to whom we were to erect a monument out here in Bannerman Park. By the way I have seen some cement blocks out there now. I wonder if these are the ones we are to use to erect a monument to that man's departed spirit from Newfoundland.

MR. FOGWILL: Tombstones.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh tombstones? A new industry? As a matter of fact I have heard it said, Sir, that if Dr. Valdmanis resigned then the Honourable the Premier would resign. He has not yet passed in his resignation, Sir, to my knowledge. But Dr. Valdmanis has gone, and I think we shall not see him again, according to the Premier, unless he comes back on personal business. Yet three days later he is back here sitting in on a conference with a certain company.

I was going to say something about the Canadian Machinery and Industries, Sir, but I think I will leave that as I go along and turn to page 109 and 110 of the Auditor General's Report. There is something there which I think is very important for the people of this country to know, but we will come to that later, Sir.

Now I have already mentioned the three industries and I want to run through the others quickly just to give the House an idea, and I am quite sure that some members on the opposite side have no idea at all as to how many new industries there are. I have touched on Newfoundland Hardwoods and on the North Star Cement, and now I come to the latest one formed up, the "Eckhardt Mills Limited," share subscribers, Alfons Eckhardt, Fred Peck of St. John's, he must be a Newfoundlander, yes he is a caretaker. Witnesses Florence Nof-

tall and Marjorie Dawe. Do you notice that "Dawe" name, Mr. Speaker,, it will occur quite often as I go through these.

I mentioned the Atlantic Gypsum already, Sir. Newfoundland Tanneries, William Dorn; share capital three hundred thousand dollars. I note that Donald Dawe has one share. But I think he has lost it. They have transferred it. Atlantic Gloves, Limited—That is a beauty; share capital two hundred thousand dollars. Gazelle skins, Sir, I can smell them now. They come from the heart of Africa and are to be brought here to manufacture 114,000 pairs of those gloves so they can pay off all the loan. It will employ fifty, sixty to one hundred people and make a profit from the 114,000 pairs of gazelle skin gloves. Sir, a gazelle is just an ordinary buck that is almost like our caribou. But it is a long way away from here. It is a raw material which has to be brought in here. The director of Atlantic Gloves Limited comes from Hamelin where the Pied Piper came from.

Canadian Leather Goods Limited—Koch—He gives his address as Harbour Grace. I am sure he is not a Harbour Grace man, and Donald Dawe, I think he is a St. John's man. The deeds contain an agreement between Koch and Canadian Leather Goods Limited where Koch sells for forty-five thousand dollars and Koch, Shaffer and Dawe have one share each. We have "Koch Shoes" I suppose it is the same "Koch"—Share capital \$1,000,000—Directors as of August 24, 1953—Koch, Donald Dawe, Marguerite Dawe, registered office, Curtis and Dawe. Koch gives his address as Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Superior Rubber Company, share

capital \$1,000,000. We have Braun Wogan, Mr. Speaker. He is the man we all remember so well. We all remember him—Signal Hill—shades of Gander—shades of Dr. Sennewald. He took him up on Signal Hill, Mr. Speaker, and put an imaginary gun to his head and said—"Do this or else"—I will come to Sennewald in a moment. That man, Sir, has an interest in about three plants, I believe, to which the government loaned all sorts of money. Of course here again we have Donald Dawe.

Hanning Electric—Solicitors Curtis and Dawe.

Canadian Machinery and Industrial Construction—Two million five hundred thousand dollars. There is something wrong there, two million five hundred thousand dollars, because I saw in the Auditor General's Report last night as I went through it, it is listed there as two million five hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. One of us asked a question as to why this extra twenty-five thousand dollars was paid out. Perhaps the Honourable Minister could answer that question now? We shall ask it, Sir, but of course the Government will reserve the right not to tell us anything, at least I suppose it is a right.

Under agreement dated October 10, 1952, CMIC transferred twenty thousand shares to Canadian Machinery Holding Trust Company, a mythical company, Sir, incorporated under the laws of Switzerland for machinery received and valued at two million dollars. I made the strictest inquiry, thorough inquiry at the Registrar of Deeds and Companies, and they have no knowledge whatsoever of this company. They don't know who they are, or nothing at all about them. Yet



they have this deed there registered by the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust, transferring twenty thousand shares to them, in a company in which we have invested two million five hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Could we ask a question, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, as to the identity of Donald Dawe? I take it that would be answered. We shall ask it. Canadian Machinery Company, Switzerland, 30,000 shares. In other words this is the story: There is a mysterious company not registered in Canada and a search reveals no particulars whatsoever of the personnel of the company, the significance of the trust company, and the signature at the Registrar of Deeds Office is indecipherable. Can you imagine any official contracting a deed like that where even the registrar himself could not decipher the name of the man, nor the address. The whole picture is there. The government made an agreement with these people to send in machinery and said, we will give you two million five hundred thousand dollars to go ahead. They did that and got in the hole. Then the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust, exactly the same fellow, takes the twenty-five thousand dollars shares as security against the machinery they perhaps sent over.

Then we have Canadian Hardboards Industries Limited and Atlantic Hardboard Industries. United Cotton Mills, two million dollars of the people's money up here in St. John's West. I know all about it. Dawe has one share there also. He is always there in every one of them. Solicitors Curtis and Dawe.

Atlantic Films and Electronics Limited, we have a question going on the Order Paper about that. I don't sup-

pose we will be told about it. We know the government advanced them some of the people's money and we know the directors of the company as of Sept. 24, 1953. Dawe is there again, I noticed there is a bit of Newfoundland there.

Terra Nova Textiles, the latest one, capitalized at one hundred thousand dollars.

Now, as far as I can find out, Mr. Speaker, these are the new industries introduced by the Government. These are the new industries into which have gone anywhere from twenty to thirty million to forty million dollars of the people's money, squeezed out of the people's sweat and blood away back from 1942 to 1949, I suppose or from 1944 to 1949, that is when all that money came in, forty-six million dollars. Yes, well over half of it has gone out to these companies. Yet when we, the people's representatives, ask the government to give us some information about these and ask questions, in our opinion legitimate questions, since we ourselves are the shareholders in the birch, gypsum and cotton mills just as big and bigger than any German, Latvian, Swiss or anybody else. Yes, we are shareholders, and we are the directors because the government are the directors, yet they can't tell us because it is not in the public interest; not in the best interest of the public to know what happened to public money. Did you ever hear the like?

Sir, I will make some remarks about the Atlantic Optical Company. That is Sennewald, but I won't go into the story.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do — Yes— Tell us.

MR. HOLLETT: Would you like to hear it. I will tell it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't miss anything.

MR. HOLLETT: That man, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sennewald came out here and he wanted —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who brought him out and paid his way? Mr. Gordon Higgins, and paid him a thousand dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: You can't put me off that way. I am going to tell the rest of it now. We all remember the trip the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable the Attorney General made. I think it was to Hamelin. It is a pity the Pier Piper was not there. They went over and advertised this promised land of Newfoundland with all sorts of opportunities for industries, Germans, Austrians, any kind of industrialists to come out here and out comes Dr. Sennewald. But you know, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Valdmanis did not like Dr. Sennewald. Dr. Valdmanis would have nothing to do with Dr. Sennewald. Doctors are jealous, I suppose, of each other. He told him to go back and he went back, I believe he paid his expenses to get him out of the country. He went back to Germany. Anyway he then said in the newspapers about the rumpus going on in Newfoundland between Mr. Gordon Higgins and the Honourable the Premier. At that time he heard all about it, and he said to himself: "This is a chance for me to make a quick dollar;" I can try to tell the truth as much as I can—He immediately wired or cabled Gordon Higgins that he could come out and give certain information. Do you know the information he said he would give? He said that if Gordon Higgins had

the information which he, Sennewald, would give, then certain Germans who were carrying on here, who were getting money from the Government to build new industries would be kicked to blazes out of the country, as quick as a flash of lightning. That is the information, not in so many words, he gave to Gordon Higgins. He, being a politician, thought if there is information over there the people should know, if these Germans and foreigners were coming into this country were as this fellow said, then it would be as well to get him out here, and he paid his passage. A great laugh—And the Honourable the Premier, Sir, heard all about it, heard he was coming out—then who did they get to do the job? Who did they go to? A man, Sir, who I believe is the chief in two or three industries for which this country, this government, have paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars—Max Braun Wogan—said Valdmanis: "This is the boy to do the job." Called him up and said to him: "Get out to Gander, and in the name of the "Lord" get hold of that fellow Sennewald, put a stop to it." And he went out and literally put a gun to his head and said: "Don't do it!—It won't be good for you to do it! We will do everything the Premier promised—if he said he will give you two hundred and fifty thousand to start an eye-glass factory." Sir, that is what happened. He held him off, brought him in and barred him in a room in the hotel and took him on Signal Hill to talk, the place where previously the wireless was started, but he was not afraid of that, and he took him up there and finally persuaded that poor, little, innocent Dr. Sennewald—May I inject here, Sir, that man is at the present time interning at the General Hospi-

tal, and where do you think he goes but into the Veterans' Ward. I would not say here what has been told me by one or two of the veterans whom he came to see. I have advised all veterans to tolerate him as long as they can. This Dr. Sennewald is now interning there—But I am ahead of my story—He got two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, Sir. At least the government voted it to him to build an eyeglass factory and make sure everything would go all right, already paid Al Vardy, I believe, and his associates a good many thousand dollars, a hundred thousand dollars for a building up in the West End and was going to put this fellow, Sennewald in the top flat. He came and did not like it very much and did not see much chance to make eyeglass frames so he got cold feet and went back and forth and back and forth and back and forth between Newfoundland and Germany trying to get machinery out here. Finally he got some out here, but he gave it up. Of course he could not do it. I see now the government advanced him one hundred and ten thousand two hundred and ninety-three dollars and fourteen cents of which now he has paid back one hundred and five thousand dollars. I am going to ask the government now what happened to the other five thousand dollars? Is he going to pay it back to us or is he not? He is now an interne down at the General Hospital. Sir, if we could only be living twenty years hence when the history of this government on the opposite side is written and understood by the people—It is not going to take twenty years though.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** We have nineteen years to go.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I think it has

only about eighteen months to go. I was talking about Sennewald, but I think I will leave him now.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** No—let us hear more Sennewald—do.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I can tell you more. If you like hearing about Sennewald we will go along. We are wondering about that \$5,290.14.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Yes, you get after that.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Sure will.

There are one or two other little things I have to mention if I may—Page 19 of the Auditor General's Report regarding security for cash loans and guarantees on bank loans in the Auditor General's Report, March 31, 1954—Agreements relating to loans listed under the heading Economic Development and under the heading of Guaranteed Bank Loans requiring that assets of the companies concerned be insured and that any loss under such policy or policies of such insurance be made payable to the Government. The Auditor General says: I have to state that in a number of cases the insurance coverage in effect is substantially less than the cash loans on or the bank guarantees as the case may be. All such cases as have come to my notice have been brought to the attention of the department concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we asked a question on that point last year. All we got in reply was about half an answer. Now, we find the Auditor General has drawn it to the attention of the various departments concerned. Everyone is supposed to be insured to cover the amount of the mortgage, but they are not insured in that amount. I go on to page 21 of the same Auditor

General's Report, and I know that my colleague has read it, but it is so important that I want to read it again.

"Interest on Loans, \$195,899. Since 31 March, 1953 Executive Council have ordered, subject to ratification by the Legislature, that agreements made with the operators of industrial plants, to whom Government loans have been made, be amended to provide that : " (This is from the Auditor General's Report) " (1) payment of interest on such loans be deferred for the first two years from the date of commencement of construction; (2) any interest paid by the operators be refunded, and (3) amortization of the loans start four years from the date of commencement of construction instead of two years."

In other words according to agreements passed by this House they would start to amortize the loans at the end of two years, and the Executive Council, without leave or license of the Government, go to work and say increase that, after passing it here they could not wait to bring an amendment in here. Remember, Mr. Speaker, I did ask questions about the interest last year, and the Government told me, and they have gone to work now and paid that back to these people—then they expect us to have confidence in this Government with regard to these industries. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid our people are blind to what is going on and they have reason to be. I recently picked up a magazine issued by the Board of Trade here in St. John's and I came across a description of the various new industries. It was authoritatively the verdict of the Board of Trade of St. John's and it went down to list one by one of all the new industries which I have listed. And

Mr. Speaker, if you can find where they say any reasons to doubt one hundred per cent success in each of these new industries then you are able to find things much better than I. Everyone was described by the Board of Trade as a going concern, a paying proposition, and great praise was given to the Government for what they have done—that was the Board of Trade—I was shocked. They put it in that magazine; they put it in the Board of Trade Journal as facts. The Birch Plant is 100% ! Same thing with the Gypsum Plant and the others. Their magazine not only goes across this country, but every country in America. Of course, the Board of Trade is all right. It is okay. I take it that the Government and the Board of Trade are like "that" (placing two fingers together). They love each other, Vote of confidence ! Anyone who takes the trouble to look at these things—it would break your heart. I wish everyone of them would succeed.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Sure you do—always did.

MR. HOLLETT : I always did. William Dorn manufactured one coat and gave it to the Premier. No wonder the Premier would say Wm. Dorn was okay.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Is that an honourable thing to say? For the sake of honour, take it back.

MR. HOLLETT : When the people get to know the facts—and please God they will. I wish we could inject some common sense with regard to new industries into the individuals who are trying to run them.

The Birch Plant cost three million dollars; 63 people are now walking around—laid off; the others are under-

paid. Some had to leave it; others were told to get out. The Birch Plant was one of the places where they were looking for a 5c. increase. They got it from the Conciliation Board set up by the Government. But when they came to the Premier, the Premier said "No." He said "we cannot afford it." Will you deny that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is true.

MR. HOLLETT: You ought to be ashamed of it. As my colleague has said, the railway is laying off men—men who used to do the work now being done by the Machine Plant. The Cotton Textiles and Terra Nova Textiles are taking the place of the White Clothing Company and the Newfoundland Clothing Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not that a good thing?

MR. HOLLETT: No. If you had helped these industries instead of crying "shame!" they might have done better. I believe the Newfoundland industrialists have calibre equal to any part of Europe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Bring in a flag so that it can be waved.

MR. HOLLETT: We will wave flags, if you will follow them. We honour and respect the Flag, and for that some of us got pretty harsh treatment from some of these who are now the "babies" of the honourable gentlemen on the other side. But that does not make us love them any more.

MR. SPEAKER: Could you get back to the subject of the new industries?

MR. HOLLETT: I was speaking of foreigners and the new industries.

I have been called a "traitor" in this House. I have been called a "skunk" on the subject of new industries. I hope they will succeed every one of them. I am anxious that they do succeed, but with all the mollycoddling they are getting, I do not see how they can. The cost of the Birch Plant has gone up and up. They come to the Premier and say "we want \$200,000," "we want another \$250,000" running expenses; so that from one million it has gone up to three million or more. And now people are laid off and they expect us to have confidence. I hope they can keep going until the honourable gentleman on the opposite side sees fit to adjourn this House and call an Election, which will not be long. We have no confidence with the management of the new industries—no confidence in the way in which they have been handled by the present administration. If they could give us the facts to create in us confidence—but they refuse to give us the information—they refuse to tell us anything about the new industries. The only thing they give us is what is already public knowledge. Valdmanis was getting \$25,000 a year when this industry was begun; that was small stuff for him. I do not know whether the Honourable the Premier fired the man who concocted the new industries or whether the shoe was on the other foot. Definitely we are going to know.

I support every word spoken by my colleague. It is not much for the Government to do—give the people of Newfoundland the facts; it is just as well to give the facts now, not prolong the agony. There is nothing like the truth. Suspicions will make us all—and not only us—turn against the Government, but will make the

people of the country turn against them. Give us the facts and let the devil take the hindmost. They promised the Government to do a job and they are not doing it. Some of the industries must pay off. There is very little sense in bringing in industries which will sink beneath the surface the industries already established here, unless the ones coming in can pay higher wages. We see labour discontent and unrest in the Government instigated new industries.

I heartily support and second the Motion for Want of Confidence in the way the new industries have been handled by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to close the debate with a few remarks. Most of the things I wish to say, I intend to say them in the debate on the motion. I want to say now one or two things about the Birch Plant. In my view and in the view of my colleagues, the Birch Plant is certainly one of the most promising of all the new industries. It is one of the most natural of the new industries, because the raw material is found within the Province in great supply and high-grade quality.

At the moment, the Birch Plant is practically prostrate, as also is every plant of that kind on the North American Continent at this moment—every plant of that kind—every veneer and plywood plant in North America—all across Canada—all across the United States—all across Mexico and Central Canada—the entire industry is virtually prostrate. That is a fact. This Government did not bring that fact about. It is virtually impossible today to sell veneer or plywood any-

where across Canada or in the United States. It has become a complete drug on the market. Doubtless when it recovers, as it will, it will again be a drug on the market. It has happened before, but it has always recovered. This condition, then, is reflected at the plant at Donovans. Anyone is at liberty to check that statement—they can check with or communicate with plywood manufacturers, St. Therese, Quebec; the manufacturer at MacMillan, B.C. They can ask the Board of Trade for the names of plywood manufacturers or they can write the Department of Trade & Commerce of Canada, or the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, or Canadian Manufacturers Association, Toronto. The plywood and veneer industries are in a worse condition than they have ever been in history. As I say, that condition is reflected in the plant at Donovans. I hope there is no jubilation over that on the other side of the House. I hope no one is glad that sixty odd Newfoundlanders have been laid off. I hope no one is glad of that. No one on this side of the House is glad of that.

An attempt has been made to justify lack of confidence in the present administration. It was made in the abysmal ignorance of the fact that the industry is in a perilous condition.

MR. HOLLETT: For how long?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has been so for months—it began last Fall. I have unshakable faith in that Birch industry. The Birch Plant is the best there is. We have one of the last great reserves of birch timber in the New World. Here in Newfoundland and on Labrador we have great reserves of timber; we have proved that. It cost money to prove it, but now we know.



We have a thoroughly modern, thoroughly efficient, high-class management within the walls of the mill. We had come to the point where we were breaking even—getting out of the red. We had come to that, when, unfortunately, this happened. It is the sort of thing that happens and which you learn to expect in these industries; namely, that its progress is never even—it is now up; now down; now back; sometimes holding its own, marking time. But it will come back. it will succeed. If it takes a million to do it, we will find it and spend it and make a success of the plant.

I will not go into the one hundred and one mis-statements made by the honourable members of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Unless the Premier intends to tabulate the mis-statements or falsifications or whatever they are, he should not refer to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say lies or falsifications.

MR. SPEAKER: A mis-statement does not mean a deliberate attempt to falsify; it might be made with the best of intentions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A misinterpretation of fact. The Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues made statements which, if I wished to take the time, I could blow to smithereens. But I do not think the public are interested. I think, after all, it is what they expect from the Opposition. They do not expect us to take up every little misinterpretation and answer it; because my policy since I have been in office is to answer one in one hundred mis-statements made. I see them appear daily, every day of the week, in both newspapers. I hear

them daily on radio stations and in this House. I will not try to answer them. After all, your friends do not need it and your enemies will not believe it.

Here is one from his colleague when he says that approximately 18½ millions were spent on each industry—he called it “approximately 20 millions,” to be generous, to be optimistic, to be conservative. Of course his colleague has always had a bitter hatred of me.

MR. FOGWILL: I have never expressed any hatred for the Premier of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: No Mr. Speaker in this world has powers as omniscient as to say if a person loves anybody or hates anybody.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I apologize to you and to my honourable friend and to the House; and I do it generously, and I expect to be quoted as I have often been, as having been ordered to do so. I do not expect the newspapers to have any influence on the public of Newfoundland. It does not matter what they print. In my district not one hundred families see both of the newspapers put together. CJON is a fine, decent radio station; so is VOCM. It is in the newspapers that the malicious mis-quoting is done, and I do not have to jump thirty feet to reach those who are doing it. I know who they are. I will not waste any more time of the House. Every word I have said was wasted; let them go ahead and say it. And now let us have the vote and vote down this silly amendment, this silly stupid amendment. Let us push it aside.

MR. BROWNE: I suggest the Premier has no right to use the terms “silly” and “stupid” here; there is nothing to justify it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not call the Opposition "silly" and "stupid;" I merely said the amendment was stupid and silly. They moved the amendment and we discussed it. If the use of these words hurt their feelings, if I ought not to use them, then I will withdraw them. It is not silly and stupid. Let us push it to one side. Let us have the vote on it and give it the treatment it deserves. That being done, let us get down to the people's business.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable members supporting the amendment please stand.

Messrs. Hollett, Browne, Fogwill and Higgins.

Against the amendment:

Hon. the Premier, Attorney General, Minister of Public Works, Minister of Finance, Minister of Public Welfare, Fisheries and Co-operatives, Minister of Health, Minister of Provincial Affairs, Minister of Labour, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Minister of Mines and Resources; Messrs. Courage, Morgan, Button, Janes, Brown, and Norman.

Supporting the amendment—4.

Against the amendment—18.

The amendment is defeated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: With your indulgence and that of the whole House, could we call it a half minute to 6 o'clock and dispose of the Order Paper in that form? Would you call No 1 and we can dispose of that in a moment?

MR. SPEAKER: That item is called now. If time remains, we will move to the debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. HIGGINS: I move the adjournment of the debate.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 31st at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, March 31, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth anniversary of the greatest single blessing under God that ever came to Newfoundland. It is the fifth anniversary of Confederation! I am aware of the fact that there are still a few people in Newfoundland who have never become reconciled to Confederation and never will; and as I would not wish to mar the happiness of this anniversary, I shall not claim that Confederation has been a complete success for all our people; I think, though, that an overwhelming majority of the Newfoundland people bless the day that their country became a Province of Canada.

I thank God that I was privileged to play a part in bringing Confederation about. I thank God that I am privileged today, in this House, to rejoice in this fifth anniversary. I thank God that the blessings of Confederation have come to our people.

The thousands who favoured Confederation and voted for it have the satisfaction of having fought for a great and good cause. The thousands who did not favour it and voted against it, have the satisfaction of having opposed Confederation in sincerity and honesty of purpose.

Most of the tiny band of us who launched and led that great movement—that greatest, that most idealistic movement in Newfoundland's history, are still together. One or two have gone to their final rest. One or two have deserted our ranks. The rest of us offer thanks to Heaven that we were privileged to play so great a part in our country's destiny; that we still have life; that we still have respect and friendship for each other.

I pray that as a Province of Canada we shall continue to go forward as we have done this five years past and that our people will go on from triumph to triumph.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. COURAGE: I ask leave to present a Petition from the people of Bay D'Espoir for a road connecting Bay D'Espoir with the Trans-Canada Highway. Approximately six thousand people live in this area and feel that the road is an absolute necessity. The construction of such a road, too, will greatly develop tourist trade; aid transportation to hospital, and to one of the finest salmon rivers and big game areas.

This petition is signed by some 1,500 residents of Bay D'Espoir and I have much pleasure in recommending it to the House. I may say, that coupled with this Petition for a road connecting Bay D'Espoir to the Trans-Canada Highway, there is need for a road around Bay D'Espoir itself. That is being attended to little by little. I am this year asking the Department of Public Works for two bridges for the Bay D'Espoir area. Bay D'Espoir is one of the richest and most beautiful areas in Newfoundland, it is a tourist's delight and it is a district which, one of these days, will come into its

own as one of the beauty spots of the Province. If we are to develop tourist trade, there must be a road connecting Bay D'Espoir. There is also an argument in the fact that in the valley back of the bay there is a great deal of land which, to my mind, would be suitable for farming and fruit raising. It might surprise honourable members to know that I brought back quite a number of large apples. I know it was a great surprise to the Minister of Mines & Resources. Those apples were much larger than tea cups and as for taste, they were comparable to the best Nova Scotia apples.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Petition and in asking that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned.

Moved and seconded that this Petition be received and referred to the Department concerned.

Carried.

MR. DROVER: I beg leave to present a Petition from the residents of Raleigh, Ship Cove and Whiteway asking for a branch of road going from St. Anthony to Cooks Harbour. This branch of road is less than a mile long and will be of great service, particularly to the people of Cooks Harbour and Raleigh; it will be of great assistance in getting people to hospital and will eliminate much suffering and hardship. This branch road would be of great assistance also to those who are smelt fishing and salmon fishing. We feel also it would encourage tourists to come there to trout and fish.

The Petition is signed by 150 voters from Raleigh and Ship Cove. It is understood by me that the road that

was planned to go from St. Anthony to Cooks Harbour would go by way of Pistolet Bay. Apparently this is not so.

I wish also to say in support of this Petition that the cold storage at St. Anthony plans to take this year, 1954, 150,000 pounds of smelt from Pistolet Bay. That will mean that approximately \$25,000 will go into the pockets of the people in the area. Already Mr. Ashbourne the Federal member, has begun negotiations to see if it is possible to have a wharf built to take care of the needs of the fishermen.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Petition and respectfully request that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I rise to briefly state that I support the prayer of the Petitioner.

It has been my privilege to fish in the area to which the honourable member refers and I know the road leading from St. Anthony towards Cooks Harbour around Pistolet Bay in a "U" form. As has been the practice of the Department, and the policy of the Government, wherever a main road is put through, we always aim where reasonably possible, to connect spear roads to communities through which the road passes. The prayer of the Petitioner requests that this be done there.

I support the Prayer and have a fair knowledge of the good which can come from such a road, the assistance it will be to the fishermen and to those visiting the hospital at St. Anthony.

Moved and seconded that this Peti-

tion be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned.

Carried.

At 3:20 p.m. His Honour the Lieutenant Governor arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, her faithful Commons of Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of supply granted in the present session and to request your Honour's assent thereto.

"An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five and for other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: In Her Majesty's name, I thank Her loyal subjects and I accept their benevolence; and assent to this Bill.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor leaves the Chamber.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House a Petition from the residents of Howley, praying that a road be built to connect that town with either Deer Lake or the main highway going through to the north of that town.

Deer Lake, as you know, is a town of some one thousand people. It is in the heart of the country, south and east of the Humber River and the main highway going along thereby.

Howley is a lumbering centre, as most of its people engage in pulp-

wood business and in lumbering of other kinds, chiefly for Bowaters and in some cases they conduct private businesses of their own. Deer Lake is some ten or twelve miles away, but it is separated from Howley by the main dam at the foot of Grand Lake and Grand Brook, which would present a very difficult proposition in getting a road through by that route. There is another alternative route to the north, joining up with the main highway, by way of a narrow neck of land and water over which a bridge is built at the foot of Grand Lake.

The people of Howley have no resident doctor and no Nursing Station, and in the case of illness very great difficulty is had by the people there in getting the sick to hospital for medical aid. It has only one piece of railway, and they do not have a train every day.

In connecting up Howley with the main road, you would be opening up some good country, a country that would lend itself not only to good woods operations but also to a good tourist centre. There are many rivers at the foot of Grand Lake. There are many farms in the area also and it is one of the best game countries in the Province.

I certainly support this Petition to the utmost and I would ask leave to lay it on the Table of the House for the consideration of the Department concerned.

Moved and seconded that this Petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned.

Carried.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

(28) MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Supply to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Were tenders called for the purchase of provisions since March 31st, 1953 for the following institutions: General Hospital, Fever Hospital, St. John's Sanatorium, West Coast Sanatorium, The Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases, Gander Hospital, and Nursing Stations? If so, were the lowest tenders only accepted, and if not, why not?

2. What firms or individuals supplied the following items to the institutions named in question 1 and what were the prices paid in each instance—Eggs, Hain, Bacon, Beef, Pork, Bread, Butter, Fish (Salt and Fresh Frozen) and Fowl? Also Drugs and Dressings?

(29) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What was the cost to Government of the 35-man Geological Survey on the holdings of the Newfoundland-Labrador Corporation in Labrador last summer?

2. If Government paid for this survey has Nalco re-imbursed the Department for said costs?

3. What was the cost of the 3-man Survey party under Mr. Gillespie on limestone outcrops in the vicinity of the Humbermouth Cement Plant and of the spotting and drilling of holes at the Quarry of the Cement Plant last summer?

4. Who paid these costs and expenses, and if the Department of

Mines and Resources has said Department been reimbursed by the present owners of the Cement Plant?

5. Give total cost to the Department of all surveys made by said Department since March 31st, 1953, together with locations of each separate Survey, its cost and the number of men employed on each Survey. List total number of Newfoundlanders on each Survey Party.

(30) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to table the following information:

1. A statement showing the number of machines, bulldozers, graders, tractors, etc., purchased during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954. From whom were they purchased and what prices were paid for same?

2. List the number of motor vehicles of all kinds purchased during the same period. For which Departments were they purchased and from what firm and at what prices. Give type of vehicles.

3. What used vehicles and road building machinery were sold during the period. To whom were they sold and at what prices?

(31) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. A complete statement of amounts due the Government by the St. John's Housing Corporation, as also of amounts due the Government by any other Housing Projects throughout the country.

2. A statement showing the original amounts advanced the various Hous-

ing Projects, and showing whether or not said Corporations are carrying out their financial obligations with the Government.

3. Who are the personnel of the St. John's Housing Authority?

4. In computing the amount payable for rent-purchase per month by the occupier of a home is it a fact that family allowances and war pension cheques are treated as income?

(32) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Who are the Directors of Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.?

2. Who is the Manager of this Plant and what salary is being paid to him?

3. How many people are presently employed in this plant and how much is being paid in salaries and wages?

4. What is the cost to date to the Treasury of this plant?

5. What number of Newfoundlanders is employed therein and what number other than Newfoundlanders? Give total wages and salaries paid out since March 31st, 1953 to Newfoundlanders and total to other than Newfoundlanders.

6. Give a statement showing the net profit or net loss as the case may be of this plant since it started production.

7. Lay on the table of the House a copy of Auditor Doanes Report for the period between October 1st, 1951 and August 31st, 1952. Also a copy of auditor's report since August 31st, 1952.



8. Table negotiations relative to the sale of this plant.

(33) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

(a) The total amount of moneys paid out by Mr. James Thompson of the firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. since April 1st, 1949 and the services performed by Mr. Thompson for said moneys? Give amounts paid him in each fiscal year since April 1st, 1949.

(b) Is said Mr. James Thompson the Chairman of the Committee set up by the Government to prepare Newfoundland's case to be laid before the Royal Commission on financial terms as called for in the Terms of Union?

(c) As Chairman of said Committee is Mr. Thompson to be paid a salary

or fee, and if so in what amount or at what rate, and for what period?

(d) List the names of the other members of this Committee, together with any agreement or arrangement with each individual member as to a monetary or any other form of recompense for their services.

(e) Who is the Secretary of this Committee, and what salary or other recompense is he to receive for his services?

### Answers to Questions

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question No. 3. I would like to apologize to the honourable members of the Opposition in as much as I don't have copies for all but will have them tomorrow.

### Question No. 3.

(a) and (b) Tabled herewith.

(c) Already tabled.

(d) \$299,882.20, of which all but \$13,585 was, as of 28/2/54, invested in bonds of the Development Loan Issue.

(e) Temporary Loans:

Amount Authorized	Date	Amount Actually Borrowed	From	Date Repaid	Rate of Interest
\$1,500,000	17/11/53	\$219,621.88	Bank of Montreal	—	3½%
225,000	Feb. '54	225,000.00	Fish. Dev. Loan Fund	—	1½%
45,000	Feb. '54	45,000.00	Indust. Dev. Loan Fund	—	1½%
30,000	Feb. '54	30,000.00	Co-op. Dev. Loan Fund	—	1½%
750,000	2/3/54	.....	Bank of Montreal	—	3½%

I table Minutes of Council authorizing them.

## COPY

(Sgd.) Albert J. Walsh  
Administrator

Date of Signature  
27th June, 1953.

*By His Honour the Administrator,  
Sir Albert Walsh, Kt.*

### The Administrator's Warrant

Under Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In Accordance with Minutes of Council numbered 403 and 428 of the 12th of June, 1953, copies of which Minutes are attached hereto, together with the reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minutes, in an aggregate sum of Twenty-five thousand one hundred dollars (\$25,100) and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

Entered:

(Sgd.) W. J. Carew,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) G. J. Power,  
Minister of Finance.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 12th June, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 22nd May, 1953.*

428-'53: Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Administrator be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$50,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Mines and Resources to cover the cost of the Commission of Inquiry appointed under authority of Minute of Council No. 427-'53.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 12th June, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 19th May, 1953.*

403-'53: P. Works 15-'53. Ordered that the necessary repairs recommended in this Memorandum be made to the breakwater at Sandy Point. Ordered further, that under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Administrator be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$7,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Public Works to cover the cost involved.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Gregory J. Power, as Chairman and on behalf of the Treasury Board, recommend that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Administrator in an amount of Twenty-five thousand one hundred dollars (\$25,100) being the sum required, immediately, to defray the costs of the Commission of Inquiry

into Agriculture and repairs to the breakwater at Sandy Point, St. George's, the total costs of which new services are estimated at Fifty-seven thousand dollars (\$57,000).

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 26th day of June, 1953.

(Sgd.) G. J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance and  
Chairman of the Treasury Board  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, F. W. Rowe, Minister of Mines and Resources, do give it as my opinion that the grounds for making issue of up to \$50,000 in respect of the costs of the Commission of Inquiry relating to Agriculture, are urgent.

The basis for this opinion is that it is essential to press forward, with all possible speed, the work of the Commission so that the Government may be enabled to formulate an Agricultural Policy for the Province as a whole.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 26th day of June, 1953.

(Sgd.) F. W. ROWE,  
Minister of Mines and Resources.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, E. S. Spencer, Minister of Public Works, do give it as my opinion that the grounds for mailing issues of up to \$7,000 to cover the cost of making essential repairs to the breakwater at Sandy Point, St. George's, are urgent.

The basis for this opinion is that it is essential that storm damage be repaired as early as possible lest future gales further damage and eventually completely demolish the structure to

the grave damage of the inhabitants of the area.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 27th day of June, 1951.

(Sgd.) E. S. SPENCER,  
Minister of Public Works,  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Gregory J. Power, Minister of Finance, do report that no Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates 1953-54 for issues aggregating Fifty-seven thousand dollars (\$57,000) to cover the costs of the Commission of Inquiry into Agriculture (\$50,000) and repair to the breakwater at Sandy Point, St. George's.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 26th day of June, 1953.

(Sgd.) G. J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant-Governor.

Date of Signature,  
14 September, 1953.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### **The Lieutenant Governor's Warrant**

Under Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minutes of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated the 30th June, 14th July and 26th August, 1953, copies of which Minutes are attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the

Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minutes, in an aggregate sum of THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$321,900) and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

Entered :

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council

(Sgd.) S. J. HEFFERTON,

Minister of Finance (Acting) and  
Chairman of the Treasury  
Board (Acting)

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 1st September, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 26th August, 1953.*

M.A. and S. 50 and 57—'53. Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$120,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply to enable loans to be made to the Co-operative Housing Societies named in these memoranda.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the*

*Lieutenant-Governor on 14th August, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 14th July, 1953.*

631—'53: M.A. and S. 59—'53. Ordered that under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$20,900.00 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply to cover the cost of printing and illustrating a booklet descriptive of the progress of the Province since the date of Union with Canada.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 14th July, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 30th June, 1953.*

582—'53 H.48 (a)—'53: Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$181,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Health, to enable a payment of a like amount to be made to the International Grenfell Association to assist in the completion of the fifty bed Sanatorium Unit and the provision of special equipment.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, S. J. Hefferton, Minister of Finance (Acting), do report that in-

sufficient Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 and no countervailing savings are available for issues aggregating THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$321,900) to cover payments in respect of a grant to the International Grenfell Association, the printing of a booklet illustrating the progress of the Province since Confederation, and a loan to various Co-operative Housing Associations.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 4th day of September, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) S. J. HEFFERTON,

Minister of Finance (Acting).

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Philip S. Forsey, Minister of Health, do hereby report that the proposed grant of \$181,000 to the International Grenfell Association is urgently required in order to enable the Association to proceed with the completion of a fifty bed Sanatorium Unit which will provide most essential medical and hospital care facilities for a large section of the Province.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 14th day of September, 1953.

(Sgd.) P. S. FORSEY,

Minister of Health.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, S. J. Hefferton, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, do hereby report that the amount of \$20,900 is urgently required in order to enable the Government to meet an outstanding commitment for printing which was incurred in 1952-53 but for which insufficient Legislature provision was made in 1953-54. If the

amount is not provided, it will impose an unjustifiable burden upon the Company which accepted the Government's order in anticipation of full payment on completion of the work and will render it impossible for the Crown to discharge its obligations.

I do further report that the amount of \$120,000 is urgently required in order to enable nine Co-operative housing societies to continue with construction work now in progress. If funds in this amount are not made available to them immediately, their activities will have to be curtailed and this, in view of the present severe housing shortage, is not in the public interest.

Dated at St. John's this 4th day of September, 1953.

(Sgd.) S. J. HEFFERTON,

Minister of Municipal Affairs  
and Supply.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-ONE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$321,900) being the sum required to provide for issues in respect of certain existing services.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 4th day of September, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) S. J. HEFFERTON,

Minister of Finance (Acting)  
and Chairman of the Treasury  
Board (Acting)

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

(Sgd) Leonard Outerbridge  
Lieutenant-Governor.

Date of Signature :  
14 September, 1953.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### **The Lieutenant Governor's Warrant**

Under Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minutes of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated the 27th June, 10th July and 20th August (2), 1953, copies of which Minutes are attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minutes, in an aggregate sum of Two Hundred and Twenty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$226,500) and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

Entered :

(Sgd) W. J. Carew

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) S. J. Hefferton

Minister of Finance (Acting) and  
Chairman of the Treasury Board  
(Acting).

—  
*Certified Copy of Minutes of the  
Honourable the Executive Council*

*of the Province of Newfoundland  
approved by His Honour the  
Lieutenant-Governor on 27th June,  
1953, relating to the Meeting held  
on 25th June, 1953.*

539-'53 : Ordered that, in accordance with the proposal set forth in Memorandum F. and C. 41 (a) - '53, the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority be established. Ordered, further that the Honourable the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and the Attorney General be and they are hereby appointed a Sub-Committee of Council to consult persons who will have no other interest in the fisheries should they accept positions as members of the Fisheries Development Authority, of which there shall be three who shall be paid remunerations to be agreed upon, and one of whom shall be Chairman. Ordered, further, that under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$150,000 to defray the costs of administration. Ordered, further, that the Honourable the Attorney General be and he is hereby authorized to prepare the necessary legislation to be submitted to the next session of the House of Assembly to incorporate the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority.

(Sgd) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

—  
*Certified Copy of Minutes of the  
Honourable the Executive Council  
of the Province of Newfoundland  
approved by His Honour the  
Lieutenant-Governor on 14th Aug-  
ust, 1953, relating to the Meeting  
held on 10th July, 1953.*



602-53: Ordered that the proposal set forth in a letter dated July 6th, 1953, from Mr. Stewart Bates, Deputy Minister of Fisheries on behalf of the Honourable James Sinclair, Minister of Fisheries of Canada, of a joint loan scheme between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland to enable fishermen to replace their lobster gear lost through storm damage in 1953, the said loan to be administered through the Fisheries Loan Board and the Government of Canada putting up 75% of the funds required for such loans, be and is hereby approved, and Ordered, further, that the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives be and he is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada in respect of the funds to be made available to be administered by the Fisheries Loan Board, and, Ordered, further, that under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in an Amount that will represent 25% of the total required to implement this loan policy under the agreement to be entered into between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland but not to exceed the sum of \$5,000.00.

(Sgd) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 1st September, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 20th August, 1953.*

Ordered that, under authority of

Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$46,500 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Education to cover the purchase of motion picture films required for the use of the Government.

(Sgd) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 1st September, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 20th August, 1953.*

Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$25,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of the Attorney General to cover the erection of a Warden's dwelling which is urgently required at the Prison Camp at Salmonier.

(Sgd) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, S. J. Heffer-ton, Minister of Finance (Acting), do report that insufficient Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 and no countervailing savings are available for issues aggregating Two Hundred and Twenty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$226,500) to cover payments in respect of the establishment of a Newfoundland Fisheries Development Au-

thority, the replacement of lobster gear lost by fishermen through storm damage, the purchase of certain motion picture films for the use of the Government and the erection of a Warden's dwelling at the Salmonier Prison Camp.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 4th day of September, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd) S. J. Hefferton,

Minister of Finance (Acting).

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, W. J. Keough, Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, do give it as my opinion that it is urgent that a provision of \$150,000 be made for the recently established Fisheries Development Authority and \$5,000 to enable fishermen to replace the lobster gear lost by them through storm damage during the present calendar year.

The basis for this opinion is that it is in the public interest to press forward, with all possible speed, with Government plans for the encouragement and assistance of the fishing industry and that, if these provisions are not made immediately, the resulting delays and obstacles will severely retard progress.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 9th day of September, 1953.

(Sgd) W. J. Keough,

Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, J. R. Chalker, Minister of Education, do hereby report that the amount of \$46,500 is urgently required in order to enable the Government to proceed with the purchase

of certain motion picture films depicting the activities of various Departments of the Government and the progress of the Economic Development Programme. Such films will be of considerable value in encouraging the co-operation of the Newfoundland public in the carrying out of Government undertakings and will also serve to arouse interest outside the Province in our economic and industrial possibilities.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 9th day of September, 1953.

(Sgd) J. R. Chalker,

Minister of Education.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Myles P. Murray, Attorney General (Acting) do give it as my opinion that it is urgent that a provision of \$25,000 be made to cover the erection of a Warden's dwelling at the Salmonier Prison Camp.

The basis for this opinion is that the accommodation facilities presently provided for Wardens at the Camp are most inadequate in view of the fact that, due to their schedule of duties, they are required to be in attendance continuously for long periods. It is considered essential and in the interests of the Crown, therefore, to proceed immediately with the erection of a dwelling which will ensure satisfactory board and lodging facilities for them during their periods of duty.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland this 9th day of September, 1953.

(Sgd) Myles P. Murray,

Attorney General (Acting).

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and

Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of Two Hundred and Twenty-Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$226,500) being the sum required for issues in respect of certain new and existing services.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 4th day of September, A.D., 1953.

(Sgd) S. J. Hefferton,  
Minister of Finance (Acting) and  
Chairman of the Treasury Board  
(Acting).

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

(Sgd) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant-Governor.

Date of Signature :

22 October, 1953.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### The Lieutenant Governor's Warrant

Under Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minutes of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated 16th September and 13th October, 1953, copies of which Minutes are attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minutes, in an aggregate sum of Six Hundred and Sixty-One

Thousand Dollars (\$661,000) and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

(Sgd) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd) Gregory J. Power,

Minister of Finance and Chairman

of the Treasury Board.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 16th October, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 13th October, 1953.*

Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$100,000 in favour of the vote of the Department of Economic Development to provide an advance to the Newfoundland Knitting Mills Limited on account of the loan of \$387,400 authorized by Minute 835-'53.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 25th September, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 16th September, 1953.*

790-'53: Ordered that the revised road programme for 1953-54 be amended by an increase of \$1,211,000 under Subheads 9070301, \$150,000; 9071501, \$226,000; and 9071502, \$835,000. Ordered further that, under authority of Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and

Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$561,000 for these purposes, the residue of \$650,000 to be covered by countervailing savings under Subhead 9061501.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$661,000) being the sum required for issues in respect of certain new and existing services.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 22nd day of October, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER,

Minister of Finance and

Chairman of the Treasury Board.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Gregory J. Power, Minister of Finance, do report that insufficient Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 and no countervailing savings are available for issues aggregating SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$661,000) to cover expenditures required to be made in respect of a revision of the road programme for 1953-54 and a loan by the Government to Newfoundland Knitting Mills Ltd.

Dated at St. John's this 22nd day of October, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER,

Minister of Finance.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, J. R. Smallwood, Minister of Public Works (Acting), do hereby report that the amount of \$561,000 is urgently required consequent upon a revision of the road programme for 1953-54. This revision has been found necessary in the public interest and it is essential that it be undertaken with all possible speed.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 22nd day of October, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) J. R. SMALLWOOD,

Minister of Public Works (Acting).

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, J. R. Smallwood, Minister of Economic Development, do give it as my opinion that a provision of \$100,000 is urgent in order to facilitate advances required to be made in Newfoundland Knitting Mills, Limited, pursuant to an Agreement recently completed between that Company and the Government relative to the establishment of a Knitting Mill in Newfoundland.

The basis for this opinion is that it is in the public interest to press forward with the construction and equipment of this mill as part of the Government's policy of industrial development and that, if the above mentioned provision is not made immediately, the resulting delay will severely retard progress.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 22nd day of October, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) J. R. SMALLWOOD,

Minister of Economic Development.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant Governor

Date of Signature:

26 November, 1953

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

### **The Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant**

Under Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minute of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated 24th November, 1953, copy of which Minute is attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minute, in an aggregate sum of NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$900,000) and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

Entered :

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER  
Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Gregory J. Power, Minister of Finance, do report that no Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 for issues aggregating NINE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOL-

LARS (\$900,000) to cover expenditures required to be made in respect of an advance of \$1.50 a quintal (112 pounds dry weight or its equivalent) to fishermen on salted codfish of 1953 production.

Dated at St. John's this 26th day of November, A.D. 1953.

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER,

Minister of Finance.

(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$900,000) being the sum required for issues in respect of the new services referred to in this Warrant.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 26th day of November, A.D., 1953.

(Sgd) Gregory J. Power

Minister of Finance and

Chairman of the Treasury Board.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, W. J. Keough, Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, do hereby report that it is urgently necessary to make an advance to Newfoundland fishermen of \$1.50 a quintal (112 pounds dry weight or its equivalent) on salted codfish of 1953 production and that if such expenditure is not made grave damage to the interests of the Crown and the public will occur.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 26th day of November, A.D., 1953.

(Sgd) W. J. Keough,

Minister of Fisheries and  
Co-operatives.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 25th November, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 24th November, 1953.*

Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$900,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives to implement the Government's undertaking to make an advance to fishermen of a \$1.50 a quintal, 112 pounds dry weight or its equivalent, on salted codfish of 1953 production.

(Sgd.) W. J. Carew,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant-Governor.

Date of Signature :

30 December, 1953.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### **The Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant**

Under Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minute of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated 14th December, 1953, copy of which Minute is attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby author-

ized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minute, in an aggregate sum of ONE HUNDRED AND NINE TY - SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$196,000) of which One hundred and ninety-five thousand nine hundred dollars (\$195,900) will be provided from Countervailing Savings and the balance of One Hundred dollars (\$100) by Special Warrant, and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

(Sgd.) E. S. SPENCER,

Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board (Acting)

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 18th December, 1953, relating to the Meeting held on 11th December, 1953.*

F.52-'53. Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant for a token sum of \$100 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Economic Development in order to permit refunds of interest payments to the various new industries in accordance with the decisions contained in Minutes of Council 328-'53 and 8910-'53.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.



Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, E. S. Spencer, Minister of Finance (Acting) do report that no Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 for issues aggregating ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-SIX THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$196,000) to cover expenditures required to be made in respect of the refund to the various new industries of certain interest payments made by them to the Government.

Dated at St. John's this 30th day of December, 1953.

(Sgd.) E. S. SPENCER,

Minister of Finance (Acting)

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, L. R. Curtis, Minister of Economic Development (Acting), do hereby report that it is urgently necessary to make refunds to the various new industries of certain interest payments made by them to the Government and that if such expenditure is not made grave damage to the interests of the Crown and the public will occur.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 30th day of December, 1953.

(Sgd.) LESLIE R. CURTIS,

Minister of Economic Development  
(Acting)

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of ONE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$100) being the token sum required to permit issues to be made in respect of

the new service referred to in this Warrant.

Dated at St. John's this 30th day of December, 1953.

(Sgd.) E. S. SPENCER,

Minister of Finance (Acting) and  
Chairman of the Treasury Board  
(Acting)

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,

Lieutenant Governor.

Date of Signature:

18 February, 1954.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### **The Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant**

Under Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minutes of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated 10th November, 1953, and 10th February, 1954, copies of which are attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purposes designated in the governing Minutes, in an aggregate sum of THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$395,000), and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in ac-

cordance with, the provisions of the above Act.

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board  
(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 5th January, 1954, relating to the Meeting held on 10th November, 1953.*

995-'53: M.A. & S. 103-'53. Ordered that under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$85,196 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply to be allocated as follows:

\$47,727 for Slum Clearance under Subhead 13151501.

\$26,215 for Land Assembly under Subhead 13151504.

\$11,254 for Public Housing under Subhead 13151505.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 15th February, 1954, relating to the Meeting held on 10th February, 1954.*

F.8-'53. Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$300,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Economic Development

to cover increased expenditure on certain new industries under Subhead 1505 (15).

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable the Executive Council of the Province of Newfoundland approved by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor on 15th February, 1954, relating to the Meeting held on 10th February, 1954.*

M.A. and S. 8-'53. Ordered that, under authority of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved to sign a Special Warrant in the amount of \$200,000 in favour of the Vote of the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply to be allocated as follows:

Subhead 133301—\$15,000.00.

Subhead 133302— 500.00.

Subhead 133303— 2,000.00.

Subhead 133304— 2,500.00.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Gregory J. Power, Minister of Finance, do report that insufficient Legislative provision has been made in the Estimates of 1953-54 for issues aggregating THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$395,000) to cover expenditures required to be made in respect of certain existing services which cannot be met from Countervailing Savings.

Dated at St. John's this 18th day of February, 1954.

(Sgd.) G. J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, Samuel J. Hefferton, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, do hereby report that the amount of NINETY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$95,000) is urgently required in order to permit my Department to make payments in respect of the Government's housing programme which cannot be deferred without serious interferences with the said programme and to continue to operate certain existing services until 31st March, 1954.

Dated at St. John's this 18th day of February, 1954.

(Sgd.) S. J. HEFFERTON,  
Minister of Municipal Affairs  
and Supply.

(Sgd.) W. M. MARSHALL.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, I, J. R. Smallwood, Minister of Economic Development, do hereby report that the amount of THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$300,000) is urgently required in order to permit my Department to make payments in respect of certain new industries which cannot be deferred without serious interference with the Government's economic development programme and to continue to operate existing services until 31st March, 1954.

Dated at St. John's this 18th day of February, 1954.

(Sgd.) J. R. SMALLWOOD,  
Minister of Economic Development.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour

the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$395,000) being the sum required to permit issues to be made in respect of certain existing services.

Dated at St. John's this 18th day of February, 1954.

(Sgd.) G. J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board.

(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant-Governor.

Date of Signature:

18th March, 1954.

By His Honour Sir Leonard Outerbridge, Knight Bachelor, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland.

#### The Lieutenant-Governor's Warrant

Under Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951.

In accordance with Minute of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council dated the 9th of March, 1954, copy of which Minute is attached hereto together with reports required in accordance with Section 37 (2) of the Revenue and Audit Act, 1951, which documents are identified by the signature of the Comptroller of Finance, the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized to make issues from the Newfoundland Exchequer Account, in such sums as may be required from time to time for the purpose designated in the governing Minute, in an aggregate sum of FOUR HUNDRED AND FORTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$443,000), and the Minister of Finance is hereby authorized and required to do whatsoever may be necessary in pursuance of, and in accordance with,

the provisions of the above Act.  
Entered :

(Sgd.) GREGORY J. POWER,  
Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board.  
(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.

*Certified Copy of Minutes of the  
Honourable the Executive Council  
of the Province of Newfoundland  
approved by His Honour the  
Lieutenant-Governor on 12th Mar.,  
1954, relating to the Meeting held  
on 9th March, 1954.*

F.15—54. Ordered that a Supplementary Vote of \$2,154,900 be provided to cover the expenditure of various Departments up to 31st March, 1954. Ordered further that, pending the enactment of the necessary legislation, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be moved, under authority of Section 37 of the Revenue and Audit Act, Chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, to sign a Special Warrant in the sum of \$443,000, in anticipation of the granting of the Supplementary Vote of \$2,154,900.

(Sgd.) W. J. CAREW,  
Clerk of the Executive Council.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the terms of Section 37 (2) of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1952, we, the Ministers of Finance, Mines and Resources, Public Works, Health and Municipal Affairs and Supply do hereby report that it is urgently necessary that additional funds and/or funds for new services, not contemplated when the Estimates 1953-54 were prepared, be provided for disbursement by our respective departments of Government and that if such expenditure be not made, grave damage to the interests of the Crown and the Public will occur.

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland,  
this 18th day of March, 1954.

Finance \$12,500  
Board of Liquor Control \$3,300  
(Sgd.) Gregory J. Power,  
Minister of Finance.  
Mines and Resources \$200  
(Sgd.) F. W. Rowe,  
Minister of Mines & Resources.  
Public Works \$200  
(Sgd.) E. S. Spencer,  
Minister of Public Works.  
Health \$348,000  
(Sgd.) Herbert L. Pottle,  
Acting Minister of Health.  
Municipal Affairs and Supply \$78,800  
(Sgd.) S. J. Hefferton,  
Minister of Municipal Affairs  
and Supply.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (2) (a) and (b) of Chapter 31 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, I, Gregory J. Power, Minister of Finance, do report that inadequate provision has been made in the Estimates 1953-54 by an amount of \$436,100 and that no Legislative provision has been made in respect of certain other services in an amount of \$6,900 to cover expenditures required to be made by various department of Government in respect of the year ending 31 March, 1954.

Dated at St. John's Newfoundland,  
this 18th day of March, 1954.

(Sgd.) Gregory J. Power,  
Minister of Finance.  
(Sgd.) W. M. Marshall.

Under the provisions of Section 37 (a) of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, the Treasury Board hereby recommends that a Special Warrant be prepared for signature by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in an amount of Four Hundred and

Forty-Three Thousand Dollars (\$443,000).

Dated at St. John's, Newfoundland, this 18th day of March, 1954.

(Sgd) Gregory J. Power,  
Minister of Finance and Chairman  
of the Treasury Board.

(Sgd) W. M. Marshall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer to question No. 4 is in the course of preparation. I will also have to say that of all questions directed at me which have not yet been answered—they are in the course of preparation—

MR. POWER: The answer to question No. 5 is in the course of preparation.

MR. POWER: The answer to question No. 6 is in the course of preparation.

Question No. 7:

(1)

		To 28/2/54	Estimated Bal. Due
Subhead	45201	\$8,806,366	\$2,935,434
"	45202		100,000
"	45203	82,793	
"	453	4,800,000	
"	46001	189,596	200,004

(2) (a)

April	\$342,257
May	458,994
June	387,362
July	489,170
August	402,159
September	496,109
October	445,215
November	503,492
December	589,209
January	652,242
February	429,877

(b) Recent enforcement measures have resulted in the payment of a

substantial number of arrears of assessment.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Question No. 8, Mr. Speaker, these answers are, I understand, being typed today and it is hoped we will have them for the next sitting of the Assembly. That applies also to all other questions directed to me.

MR. POWER: The answer to question No. 10 is in course of preparation.

DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the answers to question No. 12 are being prepared. I think I should add that the records of the Department of Public Welfare are not in this respect as a rule set up to give information with regard to electoral districts. But I may say for the information of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the answers being prepared are being adapted as far as possible to the form of the question asked.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I will be in a position to supply the answer to question No. 13 tomorrow.

MR. SPENCER: The answer to question No. 15 is in course of preparation.

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): The answer to question No. 18 and to all questions, Mr. Speaker, directed to the Department of Health are being typed today.

MR. SPENCER: The answer to question No. 19 is in course of preparation.

MR. POWER: The answer to question No. 20 is in course of preparation.

Question No. 24:

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, that question should be directed to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. (Answer in course of preparation).

Question No. 25—In course of preparation.

Question No. 26—In course of preparation.

Question No. 27—In course of preparation.

MR. SPEAKER: With reference to Question No. 26, sub-section No. 6 in its present form is out of order in that it asks for an expression of ministerial opinion. However, Mr. Speaker does have the authority to amend the question under certain circumstances, so that I do then strike out the words "The Minister's Opinion." The Honourable Minister is then at liberty to answer or not as he sees fit.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we could go on with items No. 3 to No. 10.

First Readings:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister in all these cases could give a brief statement as to the purpose of this legislation so that we can have some idea of what they are about before the second reading?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In reply to

that it is not the custom, and I don't propose to suggest it become one.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition deserves a little more consideration. The Premier jumps up and answers any question asked the opposite side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order.

MR. BROWNE: I am speaking to a point of order too.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman did not so preface his remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the honourable gentleman is out of order in debating the matter now. This is not the time for a debate on that matter. The honourable gentleman is out of order for that reason.

MR. BROWNE: Surely, Mr. Speaker, I can debate the point of order the Premier has raised? We are given notice here now of a certain amount of legislation and the Premier is asking the consent of the House to change the Orders of the Day. He got up here a few moments ago and said he would like to go on with No. 3 to No. 10 and then came back to No. 1—If we did not agree to that he could not do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman cannot disagree.

MR. BROWNE: I have made a reasonable request, that an explanation be given by the Minister concerned of the Bills introduced—just stating the purpose of the measure—Is not that a reasonable request? How are we going to study these matters and be prepared for second reading



coming up tomorrow if we are not given some indication as to what the legislation now to be introduced is about?

MR. SPEAKER: These questions can be very easily answered from the Chair. I do feel constrained to suggest the practice of that great virtue, patience, on the part of honourable members. The Orders of the Day were entered upon and it is the right of the Leader of the House to call government business in the order in which the Government prefers to take it up. True, today is Wednesday—but as we have no private members' business on the Order Paper, government business then takes precedence for the simple reason that there is no other business. Were there any private members' business on the Order Paper then that would be called first.

Now as to first readings: While it is true that at first reading Honourable Ministers may make statements as to what the legislation proposed to do, it is not very often done, and has not been the practice in this House to do so at all. The Minister can do little more than state the title of the Bill. On the order for second reading the Minister introducing the Bill explains its purpose at some length and debate follows thereon. But whenever the honourable members on my right ask for a postponement of the debate in order to study the Bill I shall always entertain that motion for the reason that we do not have the machinery in this House to provide all members with the Bill days beforehand. I may say that honourable members on my left have always been prepared to grant such extensions and when honourable members on my right ask for a postponement honourable members on my left are always willing to grant it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask then another question—Is this Bill a money Bill?

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I think my honourable friend is referring to the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949." I presume it could be a money Bill more or less. But it loses that character to us, Mr. Speaker, because it is an amount we do not collect ourselves. I think I can give my honourable friends a full explanation on that tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: It is only that I think it should be introduced by way of resolution.

MR. CURTIS: It is not a money Bill in that respect. It does not impose a tax but amends a Bill in some details, and therefore, I don't think it is strictly a money Bill, inasmuch as it only provides for the method of collection and does not change the rate.

MR. SPEAKER: On motion Bill has been read a first time. Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I ask that first reading of this Bill be deferred, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave to have this Bill deferred?

On motion leave was granted.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act," on motion read a

first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the sort of Bill which empowers the raising of money re taxation. I don't know how far the Act goes, but from what I have read in the paper I believe this is intended to deal with the sale of certain property over there from one corporation to another. Is the Minister in a position to say whether this is a money Bill or not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it is not, Mr. Speaker.

On motion the Bill was read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Underdeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Address in Reply:

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate my first duty is to pay tribute to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, the honourable and learned member for Port de Grave and the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile. It is not the first time that the honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile has spoken, indeed if I mistake not, he discharged the same duty last year. But his stay on the Government benches seems to have moved him out of that quiet, honest and unassuming manner of saying things, and this year he spoke with much more gusto, he intoned the praises of the government's programme with a fervour which really deserves commendation. Of course the honourable and learned member for Port de Grave could be expected, coming from the profession he adorns, to be able to make a case for anything. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, both of these gentlemen deserve well of the House.

I would like also to be associated with the welcome that was extended to the newly elected member for St. John's. I agree wholeheartedly with everything that the Honourable the Premier said on opening day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't remind me of that now.

MR. HIGGINS: I can't help it if a man likes hash—We will get on to the hash later. As I said, it is one of the few times I could subscribe wholeheartedly to the Premier's expression of opinion of the way things are done. And I know that I speak for my colleagues when I say he has already proven his worth to us.

The Speech from the Throne itself; as my Leader said, we in this House are all as one insofar as our loyalty to the person of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen is concerned.

I noticed the reference in the Speech from the Throne to representation of this country or province at the Coronation last year, and as it is perhaps the last time I will have a chance to be honestly —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nonpartisan?

MR. HIGGINS: I was going to pay an honest tribute to the Honourable the Premier—I will say it now exactly as I said it last year when this House was told of the personnel of the delegation going over to the Coronation, the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Minister of Education as representatives of this House—Whatever else one may think of the Premier, whatever one may say of him, when the occasion arises to represent this country in a non-partisan manner, he does it and does it well—So that I say, Sir, with that reference to the Coronation we are all in accord.

Now, so far as the Speech from the Throne itself is concerned there is very little to be said. We have all heard that old saying—indeed I believe reading the first Hansard, the only Hansard that has been published of proceedings of this House since its revival, the Premier himself remarked that it is usual to say that the Speech is remarkable more for what it did not contain than for what it did. That certainly was true of the Speech from the Throne the other day, so true in fact, that the Editor of the Evening Telegram was moved to write an editorial on it, whether by way of praise or blame I do not know, although

judging from the comment that paper daily gives to the Premier I would be inclined to say it was by way of praise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that dominated that speech was "Fish." We have been told that we are going to have fish in all its forms and manifestations for the greater part of this session. His Honour said; "While I believe that all will welcome other industries and other sources of income for our people, I believe also that there will be general agreement that in the long run the prosperity of Newfoundland depends mainly upon the continued expansion of her fisheries, forest industries and agriculture." Now that, Mr. Speaker, is a far cry from Throne Speeches of the past few years. All that we heard last session and the session before was new industries. On opening day the Premier said that the Leader of the Opposition had complained in the last session that the Government insisted on talking about new industries while the Opposition wanted to talk about fish, and he raised quite a chuckle when he said—when the Government wants to talk about fish the Opposition wants to talk about new industries. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition does want to talk about new industries, but more important, the people want to hear about the new industries, the people want to hear the Government, their Government, tell the whole story of these industries. It has been said, "Look, we are fed up talking about this stuff, about industries, it is only cold hash." I don't know whether it is cold hash or warm, but hash properly describes the mess the Government has made of this industrial programme, it is a beautiful hash, and unfortunately somebody has to keep stirring up that

hash and trying to get a few bits of meat out of it. So far the people of this country have no idea as to where their money has gone. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Government cannot properly keep putting off questions about these industries by trotting out the stock answer—it is not in the public interest—or even more hypocritically by saying it is not proper to ask these companies to give any information because after all we have only loaned them money and that does not give us any right to find out what they are doing with their business. Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, that may be very sound ethically, I do suggest it is very bad business. I could not conceive of any member of this House particularly any member who might be in the real estate business who would advance money to any outfit and not want to know what they are doing with it. That might be all right in the early stages when drawing up the prospectus or sales talk, but that cannot hold water at the present time. I suggest that if these industries were as sound as we were assured they were when the Government was breaking its neck to give them money, they should be in a position to show that they are able to make money, employ Newfoundlanders and pay back the loans made to them.

What is the position? I do not know how many were assisted. I remember the Leader read off a list of companies—Eckhardt Mills, Newfoundland Hardwoods, Atlantic Gypsum, Newfoundland Tanneries, William Dorn, Superior Rubber Company, Atlantic Gloves, Canadian Leather Goods, Koch Shoes Ltd., Hanning Electric Company, Canadian Machinery & Industry Construction, North Star Cement Company, Atlantic Hardboards,

United Cotton Mills, Terra Nova Textiles. That is fifteen. Apart from those fifteen, we do know there was one company which was going to do a lot of work—the Optical Plant. Who does not remember when the Agreement to give Dr. Sennewald \$150,000 was presented in this House? Who does not remember the Premier's paying tribute to this renowned physicist who was offered the Nobel Prize, when he belaboured the fact that he had just escaped the Iron Curtain? We remember his telling us that this man had satisfied the Government, despite earlier misgivings; he was going to manufacture glass frames, going to bring the Imperial Optical Company of Canada and any other supplier to its knees: Where is he now? He is now a house-man at the St. John's General Hospital. That is one Company.

I do not want to harrow the Premier's feelings by referring to the Birch Plant, but it is a wrong way of answering the situation by taunting the Opposition with "Are you happy that sixty-five Newfoundlanders are out of jobs?" That is not answering the question. If this was a good proposition it should not have gotten into this temporary slump. It should have been established to weather any slump. It was not located in a place where it could not help being a success. Although people in that business—people who should know—(I will not name names)—advised that the location foredoomed it to failure. In the position in which it was located, all the raw material, everything, would have to come to St. John's by rail and boat and then trucked to Donovans. It need not have run into the trouble if it was properly sited. But, no, it was put next door to Chesfer Dawe; so that when the time comes,

if Chester Dawe wanted to, he could knock down the fence and put his fence right around it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman realize the seriousness of what he has just said?

MR. HIGGINS: I am entitled to state my own opinion, I suppose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In public? It is a pretty violent statement.

MR. HIGGINS: If my utterances were half as violent as some I have heard in this House—it is a case of the pot calling the kettle “black.” In commenting with reference to the Birch Plant, we have got the position that as far back as the end of January the local papers were carrying notices that the Premier had told a man named Andrew Cooper, a Union Representative from Toronto, that the plant had already cost three million dollars, that it was losing money every day and every hour of the day. I do not know if that was one of the misquotations which the local press carried; but if that is a correct statement, then I say the time has come to give us an explanation of what happened there.

Now, there is one good thing I do say for the Government, they have taken a new interest in fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: “New?”

MR. HIGGINS: I use the word “new” advisedly. For a change, we will be dealing with people known to us, we will be dealing with fellow Newfoundlanders, that is, of course, unless the Government decides that the revival of fisheries can only be accomplished by outside talent such as Mr. Planta or another crew of Icelanders. That is not beyond the realm of possibility. Indeed, this

Government has shown such proclivity for exotic schemes and strange sounding names, it is going to be interesting to see how they reconcile themselves to talking of such prosaic things as fisheries—an industry associated with good old English names. That the Premier can do it, I have no doubt. He has demonstrated his ability in going overboard on any scheme that appeals to him. I am quite sure this House will have a meal of tongues from the Premier when he elaborates his address on fisheries and what needs to be done. I wonder how the honourable member who told his constituents to “haul up their boats,” will now be able to go back and suggest that they should put them back into the water? How can the member who made the statement that a million dollars invested in fisheries, is a million dollars down the drain—how is he going to be able to ask them to forget that? The Premier can accomplish a reversal of policy without loss of face. He has a peculiar genius in sounding as if he meant everything he said; but to lesser mortals that power is not given. It is going to be most interesting to hear the gentlemen on the Government side of the House—the former prophets of the doom of the fisheries—now renounce their former statements and adhere to the new party line.

When we think back on all the talk already poured out in this Chamber in the past few years on the creation of these great new industries—these industries which were going to free our people from the bondage of fish merchants; when we were told of the thousands of jobs which were going to be opened up; when we remember we were told they were going to the Mainland and the United

States to coax back Newfoundlanders to fill the jobs which were going to be opened up—when we think of these things, and then look around us and find these industries doubtful and uncertain, then I say that before this House is a party to allowing the Government to continue with any policy involving major expenditures, we should have an accounting from that same Government of its stewardship. Let us know the position of these industries. Let us have the truth. Yes, before we are asked to consider fisheries, or any other development scheme (and I use the word scheme advisedly)—in view of the history of the new industries, let us find out the real position in this country—let us find out what propositions can be a success and if there are any, in the light of recent history which do not show any prospects of paying their way, let us stop fooling ourselves and wipe them off. If the Government has made mistakes, surely they are not so overwhelming that they cannot admit them. Until we do come to a real and honest appraisal of the situation as it exists today, we can do nothing. It is all very well for the Premier to say they are going to be a success; this House and the people are entitled to know if they can be a success. I would not sacrifice a million dollars on his opinion alone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is why he remains in Opposition.

MR. HIGGINS: That may well be. Some day the people will find out and the Premier may be speaking from a different place. While the Government persists in wrapping this cloak of secrecy around the industries, it can only expect rumour and suspicion abroad. I heard the Premier say (I cannot say I heard him say it

in this House)—that St. John's is nothing but a "rumour factory." That may be true. The very things which give rise to rumour are the things the Government is doing—lack of information, evasive answers, putting off replies because they "are not in the public interest." The truth may be a whole lot better than the rumours would have them believe. If the Government wants to hold the respect of the people, it must make a full and free disclosure of the whole story.

We were told by the Premier that he would be prepared to put another million dollars into the Birch Factory because he was convinced it was going to be a success. Now, just how good is the Premier at estimating the success of any given project? Turn back to two years ago—March 31st, 1952—in this very Assembly the Honourable the Premier delivered a speech in which he outlines the history and the future of his Government's industrialization scheme; a speech in which, it would appear, is clearly represented the course which the Government had charted for itself. That speech was printed in booklet form and circulated, not only in Newfoundland, but far beyond the boundaries of Newfoundland. That speech was entitled "Newfoundland Is On The March."

Now, on the day that this debate opened, my colleague from St. John's West referred to some of these first-edition Speeches from the Throne of earlier years—Speeches which he felt might some day be collectors' items. Certainly this speech deserves to rank with these, because, Mr. Speaker, it comes from the same source and it displays the same prediction of boundless prosperity, with never a suggestion of misgiving or the possibility of failure.



If I may, I should like to refer to some of the statements made in that speech in which, firstly, the Premier referred to a three-pronged drive for economic development — exploring, measuring and mapping our natural resources.

"The second prong is quite unconventional, and was devised as a non-recurring expedient to challenge attention to Newfoundland and to produce convincing evidence for our own people that Newfoundland was truly launched upon the road of progress. It has served its purpose, and need not be repeated. I refer, of course, to our decision ourselves to build, out of public money, the three new plants of which we are now so proud; the birch veneer, plywood and flooring plant; the cement mill; and the gypsum plaster, plaster-board and plaster-lath mill.

—Before building these three factories at a total cost, with temporary working capital, of just over nine million dollars, we satisfied ourselves beyond all doubt (1) that we were getting them built at most economical, even phenomenally economical cost; and (2) that they had every good chance to be economically successful. As the Speech from the Throne announced, we are selling these three plants and recovering to the Treasury the money they cost us."

The Minister of Finance has not yet recovered any money. The Gypsum Plant, so we have been told, has not yet been sold. The Cement Plant? I do not know if you could call that a deal—a horse-trader might call it a sale. The Birch Plant—not only is it not sold, but it is in a depressed condition and not likely to be sold.

The Speech continues:

"As I have said, our decision to build these three plants ourselves, out of public money, was quite unconventional, and we realized that fact when we took the decision. We were well aware of the risk we ran of being regarded as a Socialist . . ." (I wonder if that is where my learned friend picked up that word). ". . . rather than a Liberal Government. It was a calculated risk, and we felt that we were handsomely justified for Newfoundland's sake in taking it."

Now comes the happy part:

"We shall not, however, repeat this formula—" That is a good thing to know. The Speech goes on:

"The third prong is our economic drive—" (picturesque phrase!). "I have described before as one of "fishing in troubled waters." By this of course I mean seeking in Europe for industrialists who might be induced to establish a branch of factories in Canada and in Newfoundland in particular."

"One thing I wish to make abundantly clear. We did not offer financial assistance to every firm that indicated its willingness to come to Newfoundland. We rejected far more than we accepted."

"We insisted that each firm should make careful market surveys, as well as careful surveys of costs of production in Newfoundland. And our formula required that the firm in question should take at least as great a chance as we did."

"We are confident that every European industry we have been instrumental in bringing to Newfoundland meets these conditions and will be successful."

And then he says:

"As of this moment agreements have been made with European firms for the establishment here of a leather tannery, an oil-hardening plant, a leather-goods factory, an optical-goods factory, a machinery plant, a press-board factory leading to a furniture factory, a cotton textile mill and a fur-dressing and dyeing factory."

All of these, as of that moment, the Government was confident would be successful. But the oil-hardening plant failed to jell. The optical plant disappeared. The others, we do not know how they are doing.

And then further on in the same Speech he refers to helping local industries, mind you! The Speech said:

"I should not fail to mention the financial assistance we have given to Newfoundland companies to enlarge and expand their industries, or to establish new industries. For the most part these are firms engaged in our historic industry, the fisheries."

What did this Government do for local industries that needed help? What happened to the Newfoundland Clothing Company? What happened to the White Clothing Company? It got no help from this government. It folded up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It did not need money. It was enormously wealthy.

MR. HIGGINS: I know the public has not been told why the local industries folded up and other gentlemen brought in. I can tell you that only this morning I was talking to a father of a family. He was telling me about outfitting his boys for the annual sports next month. A

simple thing like flannel trousers used to be manufactured in the thousands here and can no longer be bought here. They have to be imported from Toronto or Montreal. I do not know why the Terra Nova Textiles do not make them. Maybe they are more interested in making cushions.

MR. CURTIS: Give them time.

MR. HIGGINS: Time? But the sports are being held next month.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are only now erecting the building. Go out and see the building being built.

MR. HIGGINS: They do not like for us to talk about the industries. "It is nonsense; it is dribble," they say. They want to go fishing, but we are not ready to go fishing; there are a lot of things to be done before this craft is ready to go to sea.

To get back to that same Speech, and at the risk of being repetitious, I would refer to the phrases contained in that Speech with regard to employment. The Honourable the Premier says, "My estimate of the total number of new jobs to be created by these new industries and mines is something between 6,000 and 7,000. That would be full-time employment, and another 1,500 would get part-time employment. I have no doubt that such a volume of new employment would result in another 1,000 persons getting their living indirectly out of these industries. The total number of Newfoundlanders involved would thus run perhaps as high as 30,000. The annual wage bill should run to something around \$10,000,000.

Thirty thousand people could be employed—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Be fair! I did not say "employed."

MR. HIGGINS: "Involved." The people were going to benefit directly or indirectly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not 30,000 employed.

MR. HIGGINS: Give them the benefit of the doubt—But, Mr. Speaker, there is no ten million dollars annual wage bill coming in. But then go on—These were the details the Honourable the Premier was dealing with, either established or very shortly to be established industries—Then he goes on later and talks about our hopes for Newfoundland and the first thing was to be the doubling in size of Grand Falls and Corner Brook. Well, I don't know that they have doubled as yet. Then —

MR. SMALLWOOD: A failure of the Government? Another mess?

MR. HIGGINS: Well, if they had the Government would have grabbed the credit for it. Mr. Speaker, these two are safely established and the Government can not do much but brag.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Liberal Government put them there.

MR. HIGGINS: A Liberal Government. I wonder if the Liberals of these days would recognize their own sons—I wonder.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he goes on and says—"At the present time about a million gallons of white sulphite liquor is pouring out of our two paper mills every work-day of the week, and if and when these mills double in size the gallonage of sulphite liquor will likewise increase. It is not difficult to imagine a factory using this liquor for the manufacture of industrial alcohol and other base materials"—this is not old mills, this

is new mills. It is a funny thing the basic ingredient applies to both (1) industrial alcohol and the other social. It goes on: "The fact that becomes brilliantly apparent is modern industrial chemistry is one of the wonders of the world. When I remind the House that at least 150 separate and different articles of merchandise are today manufactured from industrial alcohol, I foresee the day, not very far distant, when thousands of Newfoundlanders will find employment in factories manufacturing many useful and profitable articles from alcohol distilled from the thirty thousand million gallons of spent sulphite liquor now draining away from our two mills to the Atlantic Ocean."

And we were going to have an aluminum industry and a steel mill and finally more birch development. All these things, Mr. Speaker, only two years ago were envisaged.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are still envisaged.

MR. HIGGINS: That, Mr. Speaker, is the type of enlightened prophet who is prepared to pledge another million in the birch mill because he thinks it might be a success.

Mr. Speaker, the last item in that speech was the reference to Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, that economic arm of the Government that boasted Sir William Stephenson, Mr. C. A. Pippy and all the other eminent men—Mr. George Thomas who was fortunately acquired on the termination of his services at Buchans, and Sir William—Mr. Speaker, he did not last long. Poor Sir William came up, struck out, to a minor or major wherever he came from — Mr. Thomas departed — Mr.

Pippy, I don't know what happened to Mr. Pippy—and of course over and, above all that the Great Alfred. Alfred is gone now and I don't know who is left to run NALCO. Of course they got clear of Mr. Doyle, he seemed to get in trouble on his own grounds. He was no sooner jumbling around with NALCO than he was suspended from the stock market for reasons unnamed to us. It was certainly given widespread publicity in these same papers both foreign and local which nobody seems to read.

Now, in all these schemes, Mr. Speaker, the Government has sunk millions of dollars of the Newfoundland Taxpayer's money, not money earned by this Government but money the Government inherited from the Commission of Government. Mr. Speaker, this Government does not own this money, the Government is only trustees for the people of Newfoundland. If the Government has any real regard for its obligations to the people of this country they would be the first to agree it is time to give an accounting. It is not enough to say there may have been some mistakes and we will write off these losses to experience. Everyone of these industries was examined and reported on and recommended by Dr. Valdmanis whose qualifications were such that the one who ventured to question them brought down on his unhappy head the anger of the Premier.

Time brings many changes. If twelve months ago my colleague from St. John's East had referred discourteously to Dr. Valdmanis he would have been threatened with dire reprisals, would have been told just what a wretch he was. But yesterday he attacked Poor Alfred, and there

was none so poor as to do him reverence. I don't know what happened to that statue, I don't know if the Gavlin Foundries are going to cast it—but Alfred is gone and the only ones sorry are the people of this country that they did not find out about him earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I know this discussion is boring—I know the Government does not want to talk about it—the Government is not interested in talking about past mistakes—the Government wants to go fishing. But, Mr. Speaker, before we put out to sea with such a harum-scarum crew as are running this ship, I think we will have to make sure it is safe to go out in deep water—let the Government tell all the story. Their great Liberal Guardian, Bradley, the man who by implication was mentioned so reverently today, was frequently so fond of saying; the people shall know the truth and the truth shall set them free. Then let the people know.

MR. JANES: I join, Mr. Speaker, with other speakers in this debate in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion. I also join with other speakers in welcoming the honourable member for St. John's West. I might say though, Sir, that any great hopes which I had, and I had great hopes because I was informed that the coming of our new member for St. John's West was going to make quite a lot of difference in this House, and I sat here the first few days rather shivering, wondering what was going to happen next. Then he made a speech and all my great hopes were dispelled. Sir, his reason for coming here, if I am to infer from his speech was that he had lost his job sometime ago down in the District Court. How many people in Newfoundland knew that the honourable member had a

job in the district court I don't know, there are certainly none in the District of Fogo.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about "hash," and it has been a great rehash of everything that has been said here by the Opposition for the past four or five years. But they have missed one point: As any good housewife in Newfoundland will tell you, hash is a good meal for Monday's dinner provided it has a little bit of pepper and salt. But the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, gave us hash without either pepper or salt. We have had this thing rehashed up by the genial Mr. Higgins when he sat on the opposite side of the House and had us in a trance here at times when we could see him dash over Carters' Hill and at the point of a lance demolish the slums down there. Then the fiery major who packed up his bags and moved out of this House never to return any more and after a few days in Montreal he was back again, after having a holiday I presume. All this we have seen for four years and in 1954 after five years of it we come back and sit here and at least for the first four or five days we have it again, and I suppose we must endure it a little bit longer. It adds nothing to the information the people of Newfoundland want nothing whatever, to help the people of Newfoundland to earn higher wages, nothing whatever, not too many people are too impressed.

The honourable member for St. John's West also raised a few points with which I would like to deal. He speaks of the roads on the Avalon Peninsula. Now, I happen to have the honour to represent the District of Fogo here in this House. While I have every sympathy for the people of the Avalon Peninsula for the con-

dition in which they find their roads, I hope to live here for a little while. I know too that half of the people of Newfoundland happen to live on the Avalon Peninsula, but the other half of the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, happen to live off the Avalon Peninsula. But the great difference is that all of the roads in Newfoundland are on the Avalon Peninsula, all of them, they have always been here. But the other half of the people who have not lived on the Avalon Peninsula have had to sit by and watch the Avalon and see the road system of Avalon being built up while they have had nothing—they have had nothing. If we have half the people here surely the most the people might expect is half the roads. Instead of that we have it all here. There are not very many more places on Avalon that we can build roads. I don't say but those roads can be improved. But surely in the name of common sense, before we start to do very much with the road system on Avalon, we should think about the other sections of this province which have been crying out for roads for years and years and will still have to wait for them for many years.

He speaks of the Icelandic Boats, Mr. Speaker. Of course that is so old I don't know where it came from, I actually don't know where it came from. He talked about the herring, Mr. Speaker, and about the fishermen in Newfoundland—they are great fellows, Mr. Speaker, and have a habit of pulling a fellow's leg once in a while and enjoying it. The scheme of the Icelandic Boats was one programme in which the Government was involved, Mr. Speaker, in which I had real faith. And there are many times now when I am convinced that probably had the boats been held on to

longer, had more experimenting been done, we would have had many hundreds of herring fishermen in Newfoundland, possibly even this year, getting ready for a good fishery. Somebody must spend an awful lot, many more millions than the half a million spent on the Icelandic Boats before we have a herring fishery in Newfoundland, somebody has to spend it.

As for the fisherman in Placentia Bay telling the honourable member for St. John's West that there was plenty of herring in Placentia Bay but they did not know how to get them; he was pulling the honourable member's leg—take it from me—because if the fishermen knew the herring were in Placentia Bay—there are twenty thousand people in Placentia Bay looking for these herring—if that fisherman had that information and that had been passed along to the honourable member, then that knowledge is of supreme importance and I am not talking about a fisherman going out in Merasheen and getting two tubs of herring—then it is the duty, Sir, of the honourable member for St. John's West to tell this House where these herring are.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, I did not say I knew where they were. I said the fisherman from Ship Harbour went out and caught herring alongside the Icelandic Boats who did not know where to get them. I did not say where they were.

MR. JANES: I am repeating what the honourable member said—a fisherman told him where they were—if he told where they were I presume he caught them. If he caught them then he should tell us how he caught them. Surely he gave the honourable member that information.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps you might like to give him a half million dollars to tell you like you did for the Icelanders.

MR. JANES: The Government spent a half million trying to find out. They may have to spend a million and probably five million before they find out. If the honourable gentleman had an alternative it is his duty to tell the people of Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Ask the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. JANES: You are the man who started on the Icelandic Boats and dug it up from me—

MR. SPEAKER: I must deprecate the use of the word "Your" or "You," it tends to create argument from one side of the House to the other.

MR. JANES: Then, Mr. Speaker, he slipped in the silly question, "Do the people of Newfoundland any longer have any faith or belief in the present administration?" Where has the honourable member been since 1949? I can recall at least four elections here in Newfoundland, and if the last Federal Election here in Newfoundland means anything to anybody—if the members of the Opposition have any power to see what happened, any perception at all, it can be interpreted only as the people expressing a greater faith in the Honourable Premier of this Province today and the Liberal Party of this Province than ever they had before, and that is merely twelve months ago. Our people, Sir, like doers. That is something which the Opposition has failed to see for the past four years. The people of Newfoundland like people who do things. This administration in its four years in office has continu-



ed to do things, to do the things the people believe should be done. Now, they can criticize all they like, but unless they produce an alternative, unless the Opposition produces an alternative, they can talk until they are blind and they will not make one little impression on the people of this Province of Newfoundland. They can continue to criticize, and the criticism which has emanated from the other side of this House has not impressed me, it has impressed nobody. If the industrial programme were wrong, if it were crazy, did they have an alternative to it? They did not. If they did they kept it very quietly to themselves and certainly did not tell the people of Newfoundland what that alternative was.

Then, Mr. Speaker, he ended his speech by trying to convince us that the alternative to our secondary industries was not to build these industries but to build primary industries to concentrate on the fisheries and on agriculture as against concentrating on secondary industries. That argument, Sir, of the primary industry against the secondary industries is as old as economics, it has been the cry of the economists for the past two hundred years and the honourable member can enjoy himself for the next hundred years without getting very far with it.

As a result of Confederation, Mr. Speaker, the peasant complex which has plagued the people of this Province for generations is fast disappearing and whether we like it or whether we don't we are on the march, Newfoundland is on the march. We are not prepared to go out and haul in a few quintals of fish and say, on this we must live. We are no longer prepared to go out and put down a bucket of potatoes and say, this is the

way. That is finished. We got to have a little more than a few quintals of fish, more than a bucket of potatoes in the fall.

Mr. Speaker, we have had ever since this House opened and long before this House opened the amazing spectacle of the Opposition turning to this House, turning to the Province of Newfoundland and saying that this Government, this Liberal Government—look at what they have done—they have spent twenty, thirty, forty million dollars in these industries. Then it suddenly dawned on the one member to take the accounts and do a simple sum in addition, and lo and behold it, he could only find eighteen millions, and all of that had been properly accounted for by the Auditor General's Department, except five thousand which had been loaned to the Atlantic Optical Company. Then we had a round of Sennewald again.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, do the Opposition think that sensible people in Newfoundland are taking them seriously?

Now, Sir, there is only one other little point which I would like to touch upon in referring to the arguments the Opposition has used. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition and others from time to time in this House and out of this House have been referring in words which I don't like to European Communities living here in St. John's. Now, Sir, this city of St. John's is not very cosmopolitan.

**MR. HOLLETT:** May I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition never referred to such communities here in St. John's never.

**MR. JANES:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Sir, referred

to the German Industries here yesterday in this House. I call them the European Community as they are not all Germans. St. John's Sir, is not a very cosmopolitan city and has the reputation of being old and friendly. It has been our tradition for years to extend hospitality to strangers who might come within our gates.

MR. HOLLETT: We are doing it all right.

MR. JANES: But never in our history that I know of have we shown vindictiveness and hatred of the stranger. Nor, Sir, am I impressed by an ex-serviceman who stands up and says "Look at my medals" and that sort of thing. I also was out there fighting these fellows a few years ago, but it does not impress me one little bit. The fact that they were Germans and we were fighting them a few years ago was not the fault of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition nor was it my fault nor their fault, as he very well knows. It was the fault of the political and economic world in which we live and have been caught up in and can't escape it. They cannot escape it any more than we can. I could not escape it any more than they could escape it. I sat in the trenches and fox holes as they sat and held on there. I said my prayers and hoped to God I would be alive a minute afterwards.

MR. HOLLETT: Watch your medals!

MR. JANES: They don't go on—like yours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. No personalities.

MR. JANES: Well I have no hatred for them, Sir, nor have they for me. I say we are all part of the

political and economic system we are caught up in and we can't escape it. The honourable member could not escape it nor could I escape it. If the same thing happened tomorrow we could not escape, none of us in this world. If we are to have peace, or if there is any hope for peace then it is time we recognized that these things will happen as they have happened in the past and could very well happen again. The man from the street the little boys who are called into the army or air force or navy, the civilian who has no control over the circumstances. If we have an European Community, Mr. Speaker, whether they came from Italy, France or Germany if they are here in our midst surely God we have the decency to know they are strangers in our midst and this old city of St. John's with all its traditions of hospitality can at least bear with them; if we don't like them we don't have to tell them we hate them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that never in this House will this topic be brought up again because I think it is wrong. I don't believe it belongs to the spirit of this House nor to the spirit of St. John's.

Now, Sir, the speech itself refers to two commissions, a commission on forestry and a commission on agriculture—two Royal Commissions. I hope, Sir, that out of these commissions we will have—out of this forestry commission that there will develop out of its findings a sound policy of forestry such that we will be able to exploit our forests not only for ourselves but for the generations which are to come after us. I would like to say too, Sir, that there is a wealth of knowledge amongst our trappers and amongst our woodsmen which probably has not much scientific background in itself,

but which I believe, if all brought together, especially the information with regard to our fur-bearing animals, their habits and that sort of thing—our trappers have a wealth of information which would take investigators a long, long time to obtain. I think that this commission should make full use of all the knowledge which over the years has been accumulated by our woodsmen and trappers.

As far as agriculture is concerned, Sir, I hope too that we are not too far from the day when our chief activity is not going to be picking stones off the rocky soil in an attempt to turn rocky soil into good arable ground. We have had a lot of that in Newfoundland, a lot which has not been much use. It has probably stood us in good stead in times past. But these times have changed and economic conditions are becoming such that little patches of rocky soil could stand us in good stead again. I am not beyond thinking that to be true. But as far as agriculture is concerned, I believe we have some good arable land in Newfoundland, in certain sections of Newfoundland, but we have to get beyond the thought, Sir, that the horse and plow can compete with mechanized industry such as we have on the Mainland of Canada. No doubt if we are to have an agricultural industry in Newfoundland which is to produce food for our industrial centres that industry must be mechanized. I think also, Sir, that in agriculture there is a need for our farmers to get together in co-operative marketing. There is a case in the agricultural areas for farmers to get together for the co-operative use of capital equipment—those things can be done, I think—it is only needed to provide leadership. Probably in the Royal Commission on Agriculture's

Report we shall have some sort of programme of that sort mapped out for us to follow.

The most important point in the Speech, as far as I am concerned, is contained in the last paragraph but one. It concerns the fisheries. I was the fellow who said "Haul up your boats!" and I meant it. I mean it just as much when I say today "Launch your boats. It is going to be profitable to launch them!" Yes, I told them to haul up their boats; that it was more profitable to go to Seven Islands to work than to try and catch a quintal of fish.

We are approaching the time when, I believe, the new fisheries development programme is going to get into full swing. That programme will be appreciated by all the people, particularly the fishermen of Newfoundland. We have hundreds of communities in Newfoundland in the most awful position as far as fisheries are concerned. Certain things are needed—the industry must be centralized; there must be introduced into the industry the same divisions of labour which we have in all modern industry. The fishery means the catching of fish in the first place; secondly it means processing it and thirdly the marketing of that fish.

All down through the years, ever since I was a boy and ever since, I have seen the fishermen go out in June, fish until the voyage was over; then go hand-lining; then bring in their fish and try to make it. They end up with the fish made at the end of September, then they sit and wait at home for a month or two—until Christmas and afterwards—waiting for some buyer to come along the Atlantic Ocean to buy his few quintals of fish which are rotting in the stage. That

is the history of the Newfoundland fishery. They cannot live on it.

Looking back today, when I first came to this House, I was most impatient—I was most impatient with the Premier; I was impatient with the Minister of Fisheries; and most of the time I was pretty fed up. Now, I see they were right. It was right for the fisheries of Newfoundland that this fisheries programme which has been launched, should not be rushed into. It needed careful planning. The lives of 20,000 or more were at stake; their livelihood was at stake; the future of hundreds of communities was at stake. Never before, I suppose, in the whole history of Newfoundland was the welfare of so many people tied up as is tied up in the fisheries development programme which is now coming into being.

The fisheries are still the great hope of Newfoundland. And when I say to them to launch their boats again, I do not mean that 20,000 fishermen are to be sent into the Atlantic Ocean in motor-boats to fish.

If I may detain the House a little longer, I would like to refer to the district which I have the honour to represent. The requirements of Fogo District are no different than the requirements of other districts on the North East Coast. We require roads, hospitals, health services, fish plants and better boats, so does every other district on the North East Coast. Insofar as Fogo is concerned, I would remind the members of the Opposition that they should go down there and see what is going on. It is strange to have the Opposition members sitting here criticising the industrialization programme which affects all of Newfoundland, yet most of them never get off the Avalon Penin-

sula as far as Newfoundland is concerned.

MR. BROWNE: How does he know how far we get off the Avalon Peninsula?

MR. JANES: I know where every-one of them go. I am always on the go myself.

MR. HIGGINS: That is our private lives.

MR. JANES: I never met one of the honourable members in my travels around Newfoundland. I have not seen them or heard of them either on motorboats, steamers, the railway, C.N.R. or anywhere else; and I do a lot of travelling. Yet, they come here and they talk about fish, above all things in the world. Returning to my own district—I say it would be nice if they would come down to Fogo and see what is going on. We have more cars on Fogo Island per mile of road than they have on the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. HIGGINS: How many cars?

MR. JANES: We have more cars per mile of road. We want roads. We want them badly. We want roads up the Strait Shore. It is my hope that before the season is ended, our roads to Musgrave Harbour will be completed, and I will have the privilege of going down with the Minister of Public Works and with the Premier to see the road open.

For the information of the gentleman on the other side, it was the last Tory Government in Newfoundland who started the road on the Strait Shore. They started it in an effort to win an election. They went down there—it was not necessary to build the road; God had built it; but they took up blackberry earth and shaped

up a road. When the election was over, the project disappeared. That was thirty odd years ago and it was never touched again until this administration came into office in 1949. Since that time, they built a road from Valleyfield to Musgrave Harbour. We had to wait all that time before Confederation, up to the coming of the Liberal administration, before we got that road around the Strait Shore to Cape Freels. We hope to see the Government build a road from Gander there. It seems rather tragic with three thousand people in that area, to have no road to Gander when they are within 30 miles of it; and Gander is the crossroads of the world. We point at Gander and say "It is the Crossroads of the World" yet the only road these people have over there is up the Gander River and when they cannot use the Gander River, they use aeroplanes.

Our need for health services are similar. We have a small Cottage Hospital on Fogo Island and it is doing a fine job, but it is not large enough; we have not the bed space. But we have the assurance that this Government will give early attention to the necessity of improving the Hospital.

As far as fisheries are concerned. I have probably said enough. I want the people whom I represent to know—the people of Fogo to know that while the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was browsing around in the Office of the Registrar, trying to find out who are the Directors of some of these industries which are here, I have been kicking the door of the office of the Minister of Fisheries and the door of the office of the Premier, trying to get something done for fisheries.

MR. HOLLETT: And you got nothing.

MR. JANES: I believe in 1954 we will see three projects in Fogo—one in Change Islands, one in Joe Batt's Arm and one in Seldom. And I am not going to stop kicking at the door of the Minister of Fisheries until I have a programme going for every community in Fogo District which is worthy of development. I want to serve notice on the fish firms of Fogo—some of them have been there for 200 years in one shape or another—one going out; one coming in—that unless they are prepared to put their shoulder to the wheel, either with Government assistance or without (I am not particularly interested), we are going to have fisheries development. If they are not going to do it, I am the boy who is going to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: Elections or no elections?

MR. JANES: Yes, elections or no elections. When I move out of this House, I want to see that during these years I have been here as a member for Fogo that there has been fisheries development in the district of Fogo in the form of plants, in the form of boats, and in catching, processing and marketing. I shall not be content until that has happened. I want to see a road from Gander to Carmanville constructed. I would like to see the road to Musgrave Harbour completed. Some of these things may not be done, but I want to leave the district a little better than when I came here to represent it.

Let us, on this eve of the Anniversary of Confederation, let us put the praise where it belongs; because if any man worked for the people of Newfoundland, that man is the Leader

of the present Administration, and the people of Newfoundland know it only too well.

MR. FOGWILL: I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to move on to No. 2.

MR. CURTIS: I move the second reading of this Bill—"An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act, Chapter 1 of the Revised Statutes."

As this House will know, the Interpretation Act is an important Act inasmuch as it defines the manner in which all the Acts and all the chapters of the Consolidated Statutes are to be construed and interpreted.

The Amendments proposed are not numerous. They are in all, five or six, but they are to bring our Interpretation Act in conformity with the Interpretation Acts of the other Provinces, so that when the courts are asked to construe them, the construction by the courts for one Province will be of assistance to those in the other Provinces.

There is a Committee on the uniformity of Legislation, and we are represented on that Committee. My Deputy or the Director of Prosecutions or somebody from the Department attends the sessions.

We are trying to make all our Legislation conform, more or less, certainly from the point of view of verbiage, with the other Provinces.

In Section 2 of this Amendment, "repeal" is made to include revoke or cancel. As it stands, you repeal an Act, revoke an Order in Council, cancel a Regulation. Now "repeal" covers these.

Another Amendment deals with the

time a Regulation comes into force. Section 3 of the proposed Amendment provides that when a Regulation comes into effect, as for instance if it was to come into effect on tomorrow the first day of April, it will come into effect as from midnight tonight and will have effect all day tomorrow. Likewise, if it expires today, March 31st, it will continue until midnight tonight. It defines when it comes into force and when it ceases.

The next clause, is a clause which amends by adding to the power of a Commission or a body before it is formally put into operation.

The House will remember that a couple of years ago we set up a Workmen's Compensation Board. Before it operated, the Board has to get its groundings and consequently the Board was appointed some months before it actually came into operation. This is an amendment to that clause. Until the Act comes into operation, the Board or other authority will have this power. It is similar to clauses in other Acts.

Section 5 is a clarity of existing law. Her Majesty is not bound in any enactment unless so stated in the Act.

Section 6 makes reference to Section 60 regarding the changing of the wording in the first section.

Section 24 provides that when you cite an Act, that citation includes reference to the Act and any amending statutes.

Section 8 defines "Her Majesty" and section 9 makes reference to the effect of the repeal of an Act on regulations made under that Act, and it is provided in such cases where a new Act is passed in substitution for one



amended, the rules and regulations not inconsistent with the new Act shall remain in force.

There are the amendments and I move that it be read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: One of the reasons why I asked earlier that some explanation be given in order to deal with the second reading, was that it is very difficult for honourable members to follow the explanations. The Attorney General has given us a detailed explanation which seems perfectly in order, as far as I am concerned. I presume it is the intention to refer it to Committee tomorrow.

MR. HOLLETT: Just one section—Section 5—I would like to have time to refer to Section 13 of the original Act. There seems to be a principle involved.

"No provision in any Act passed after the 11th day of May, 1951, is binding on Her Majesty or affects Her Majesty or Her Majesty's rights or prerogatives in any manner unless it is expressly stated therein that Her Majesty is bound thereby."

I recollect certain Acts passed since 1951 where that was apparently forgotten or neglected, left out. We passed a good many Acts in relation to new industries, as I recollect it. I may be wrong, but I believe there were one or two where Her Majesty is not mentioned. I would like to go through these Acts. I take it we will have time. If there are any Acts since 1951 to which this regulation applies, which releases these people without obligation, I think we ought to go into the principle of the Bill more thoroughly. We have to live up to contracts. I do not know if the Attorney General would make it clear to me.

MR. CURTIS: I may say the effect of the Clause is already there. It re-defines the position. I am not quite sure we are in order in discussing details at this stage. We should do it in Committee. Perhaps, on that account, I will not break the Rules of the House, but will discuss it when in Committee.

There is nothing revolutionary in the Section. It is only a re-statement of the present Law, which is that Her Majesty is only bound by legislation if it is so stated in the Act or she becomes so by necessary implication. This just re-writes that section to meet present practice. That is a matter we can go into in Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: There are no remaining orders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there being no remaining orders I rise to move the adjournment of the House until tomorrow. In doing so I should like to say two things:

In the first place it is the purpose of the Government to continue the practice of the past five years in this House of giving the Opposition all the time, in giving the House including the Opposition all the time they may want for the discussion of or any business that the Government brings before the House. If at any time the Opposition are not ready to proceed with discussion of any legislation at any stage, second reading especially, when the principle of the Bill is proposed to be adopted, then they have only to say so and any Minister on this side will gladly defer discussion, defer debate until the Opposition are ready. Now, we have been doing

that for five years. My honourable and learned friend for St. John's West who has been newly returned to the House is probably not well aware of that fact. That fact is what makes his observations today certainly unacceptable and probably inappropriate.

The next thing I have to say is that I have received news within the past few minutes of the death of a great and prominent and quite notable Canadian Statesman in the person of the Late Premier of Prince Edward Island, Senator Walter Jones. Senator Jones has visited Newfoundland more than once, notably at the invitation of the Liberal Party at its convention in the C.L.B. Armoury. He has been for quite a number of years now a close personal friend of my own. When I was in Ottawa a week or so ago with other members of the Government, on my last night in Ottawa, Senator Jones came into my room and we talked until midnight. I hope that long talk had no part in this early death. We discussed farming and agriculture generally. He was over seventy years of age I believe, and one of the really great stock breeders of the whole world. He held until his death the world's record in cows of a certain breed or type, I forget exactly, and I believe at one point he sold a bull for \$40,000. That is a higher price than any members opposite have been able to sell any bull here or anywhere else. He was unquestionably a very great agriculturist, and I think that Canada has lost in him a great Canadian.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 1, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw attention of the House to an editorial which appears in the "Evening Telegram" of today, which contains, I fear, what is inferentially an attack upon Your Honour, upon the Speaker of this House. As far as I can interpret an illiterate paragraph with atrociously bad grammar, it is an attack upon the integrity of Mr. Speaker. The words are as follows:

"However, Honourable Mr. Speaker, has ruled that any probing about the ownership of taverns, licensed clubs and liquor agencies, particularly where the question affects individual members of the Legislature, are taboo."

Mr. Speaker has ruled that any probing *are* taboo—that for the grammar of it!

Mr. Speaker, I recall vividly your ruling of yesterday on the question put by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, to my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance. My understanding is that the Minister of Finance was eager to answer the question, and was well prepared to answer it, and if there is any regret over Your Honour's ruling the regret is on the Government side, that we are precluded by Your Honour's ruling from answering the question we are anxious to answer. But the statement here, notwithstanding the bad grammar, means, if it means anything, that Your Honour ruled that any probing about the ownership of taverns, licensed clubs and liquor agencies particularly where the question affected not only, but particular-

ly where the question affected individual members of the Legislature is taboo. The editorial says "Are" but we know "is" is the correct grammar.

The paper has fallen on evil days I fear when illiteracy appears in the editorial. I noticed a very reputable and honourable person in the person, of Mr. Jefferies who fell ill recently. I fear, if I may judge from this issue of the paper, the editor is still ill, and someone illiterate is taking his place. It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that a leading and honourable paper, especially the old "Telegram" should now be edited by an illiterate from the standpoint of public taste and literature in Newfoundland. That is serious enough but not nearly as serious as the fact that the Ruling of the Speaker of this House is misrepresented by a newspaper and by this misrepresentation brought into ridicule and contempt.

Now, Sir, the members on each side of the House may lambast each other, and I hope as long as I am a member of the Chamber they do so, with some sense of integrity, some sense of responsibility perhaps, but that they will continue to enliven the proceedings, that they will challenge and awaken public interest in matters by debating them with spirit. But when it comes to Mr. Speaker we all of us here on both sides of the House and without any difference of degree or quality, on both sides of the House, agree in honouring Mr. Speaker, in honouring the Chair, in honouring the authority of the Chair, in honouring the authority of Mr. Speaker, and above all in honouring the impartiality and the integrity of Mr. Speaker—we do that but the "Evening Telegram" does not. The honourable Leader of the Opposition and I agree

in honouring the Chair and in honouring Mr. Speaker and in honouring his ruling. Nobody disagrees in this House with his ruling. The way was open to us to challenge it but none challenged it. We all accepted your honour's ruling but the "Evening Telegram" apparently does not because it referred in contemptuous terms to your honour's ruling. I am not going to move a vote of censure on the "Evening Telegram." I think that would be unfair to take advantage of a newspaper caught in a moment of weakness through bad editing and the unfortunate illiteracy having command for the moment of the editorial column. To attack the paper at a weak point, I think, would be unfair. If Mr. Jefferies were there I think he would be the last man in Newfoundland who would commit a great newspaper to such an unfortunate blunder.

#### **Presenting Petitions**

None.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Notice of Motion**

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Areas Planning Act."

#### **Notice of Questions**

(34) MR. BROWNE: To ask the honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What amount of money has been paid to legal firms since April 1, 1949? Give the amount or amounts

paid to each firm with the name of the matter for which such amount or amounts was paid.

(35) MR. BROWNE: To ask the honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What amount of money has been paid to architects by the Government since April 1, 1949? Give the amounts paid to each architect or firm of architects and state the work for which the amount or amounts were paid.

2. How much money was spent in roads in the District of St. John's West in the years 1952 and 1953? Give the amount spent on each road together with the name of the foreman in each case.

3. Were tenders called for the construction of the ferry boat to operate on Placentia Gut, or for the construction of the terminals on each side? Give the names, if any, of those who tendered, with the amount of each tender. What is the estimated cost of this project, and how much has been expended to date thereon?

(36) MR. BROWNE: To ask the honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

Has the license of any tavern, hotel or club been cancelled or suspended during the period from April 1, 1952 to date? Give the name of licensee and reason for suspension or cancellation with period of suspension, if any.

(37) MR. BROWNE: To ask the honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Copies of correspondence between any members of the Government and Dr. Valdmanis relative to NALCO. Also copies of correspondence between the Government and Canadian Javelin Company relative to their selection of mining leases.

2. Copies of all correspondence between the Government and Chester Dawe, relative to granting amounts of working capital for the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited.

3. What amount or amounts of money have been paid by the Government built or Government assisted industries on account of: (a) principal; (b) interest to date? What amounts of interest have been returned? Give names of companies in each case.

4. How much money was spent on advertising during the past year? Give names of publications in which advertising appeared, together with the cost of same.

(38) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the honourable the Minister of Finance or other appropriate Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Give the total amounts spent to date during the present fiscal year by each department of Government on account of travelling expenses

2. Are any such amounts charged to Suspense Account. If so what amounts and on account of what particular travelling expenses?

3. Give the total amounts of travelling expenses incurred by each ministerial head of Departments, indicating amounts incurred on each particular journey since March 31st, 1953.

4. Give dates of absence from the Province of each Ministerial head of a Department, showing number of days spent on each sojourn abroad, and amount of expenses charged to each said trip.

(39) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the honourable Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What is the exact financial relationship now existing between the Government and the Bonavista Cold Storage Company Ltd?

2. Is Mr. H. Dustan still an associate of Mr. H. A. Russell on the Board of Directors of the said Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd?

3. How much money has been loaned by the Government to the Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd. and/or to H. A. Russell and associates of Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.

4. Is Mr. H. Dustan still an associate of Mr. H. A. Russell and the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd. in connection with the Government's Agreement with the said Company under date June 2nd, 1952?

5. What is the exact financial relationship now existing between the Government and the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd?

6. Table copy of Mortgages securing repayment of loans made by the Government to both these two companies.

7. Who is the Government nominated Director on the Board of Directors of (a) Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd., (b) Bonavista Cold Storage Ltd?

8. What amounts have been paid out in Director's Fees to each Direc-

tor on the Board of Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd. in each and every year since June 2nd, 1952?

9. What is the relationship between Mr. H. Dustan of Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils, and of Bonavista Cold Storage, and Mr. Dustan of the recently established Fishery Authority?

(40) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

(a) What is the total amount of money paid out to Dr. Lothar Sennewald for the establishment of the optical or eye-glass frame factory?

(b) Has Dr. Sennewald paid back to the Government any of this money? If so, what amount?

(c) Has Dr. Sennewald abandoned the scheme to manufacture eye-glass frames in Newfoundland? If so. Why?

(d) What is the present relationship between the Government and Dr. Sennewald—(1) Contractually (2) Financially?

(41) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What is the total amount of money received by the Treasury during the past fiscal year for the hire or rent as the case may be, of the building known as the Memorial College Annex?

2. What amount was paid by the Liberal Association on this account, on the occasion of the recent Annual Ball in celebration of the birthday of the Hon. Louis St. Laurent?

3. Generally what is the arrangement with regard to the use of this

building by parties other than the Memorial University College authorities?

(42) MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Who operates the ferry service across the Exploits River and under what arrangements with the Minister's Department is such operation carried on?

2. Has the Government paid any moneys to the operator since July 1st, 1953, by way of subsidy or otherwise, if so, what amount? And how was said amount arrived at?

3. Has the operator paid any moneys to the Government from the operations of said service, if so, what amount? And how was the said amount arrived at?

4. Will the Honourable Minister lay on the table figures showing:

(a) the number of persons crossing the Exploits River by this ferry service;

(b) the number of vehicles ferried across;

(c) the total amount of fees collected since July 1st, 1953.

5. If any moneys have been paid to the operators by the Government or to the Government by the operator, what person if any certified to the correctness thereof?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 28—Mr. Hefferton: Not yet ready.

Question No. 29:

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of

Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to this question prepared, but I think I owe it to the House to add a word of explanation here and there to the answers. If my honourable friend wondered how we came to have these answers prepared so quickly, the answer lies in the fact that our department is now almost ready to publish its annual report, and much of the information required in those questions is already prepared for our annual report. However, I shall be placing the copies on the table in a moment. However, I should like to say in connection with these answers that the general policy of the Commission of Government with respect to leased areas as mineral areas was to assume one hundred per cent responsibility for the cost of any survey or drilling work that the government itself might do on those areas. That was the general policy. However, the present government has, I believe, since 1949, since it came into power, modified that policy but even so it still has not relinquished, nor for that matter has any government I know of relinquished its responsibility for carrying on the geological surveys and diamond drilling for general or specific purposes on these areas. No government in any country that I know of for that matter by virtue of having leased an area has then disclaimed any responsibility for the geological survey.—But the present government has modified the policy of the Commission of Government by applying a general rule by requiring that the lessee would pay fifty per cent of the cost, and that principle has been adhered to rigidly, half and half.

In connection with one of the questions which the honourable member asked, the question being the list of the different surveys on the Labrador



and in Newfoundland with the number of persons in each survey together with the number of Newfoundlanders employed in each survey—I have the answers here. But the variation arises from the fact—I think I am entitled to give the honourable gentleman who asked the question this information—For the most part a survey party involves technical men, and we have—and when I say we I mean our department—scoured this province looking for technical men but they are difficult to find. In consequence we had to go outside and bring in a comparatively large number of men. For example: you will find on the Hamilton River Survey there were seven, of whom only three were Newfoundlanders. The reason is that they were the only three we could obtain at the time. In this connection perhaps I should say this, Mr. Speaker, we have been greatly worried in our department, as I am sure the government has, generally, over the fact of skilled personnel, and I am sure the House will be glad to know that we have been able to make arrangement with the Memorial University, whereby the University makes use of our provincial men, noted geologists, to give a number of geological courses at the University.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask this question? Is this in answer to my question? I did not ask for an apology. It was just a straight question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: However, while the honourable minister may not make the answer an occasion for a speech, he is permitted to make an explanation of his answer for the purpose of clarification.

DR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I have just finished these

elaborations. I would say, however, that as a result of this arrangement between our department and the Memorial University we hope that the shortage of skilled personnel will gradually be eliminated in Newfoundland. This year, for example, a number of Newfoundlanders will be interested in geology at the Memorial, and at the completion of their year they will be engaged by one or more of the various surveys if they are seeking summer employment. The procedure followed in employing Newfoundlanders is to give priority to those who are studying mining engineering, and next to that those who are studying engineering. Since there are never enough students of engineering nor mining engineers, to make up the necessary complement on these survey parties. I think that covers my elaborations on these answers.

Answers tabled.

Question No. 30: Mr. Hefferton, this answer is in course of preparation, Mr. Speaker.

Question No. 31: In course of preparation.

Question No. 32: Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to questions No. 4 and No. 32 but I have not any of the others today.

Question No. 33: In course of preparation.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I have here the answers to Question No. 10 and Question No. 20, but I have the answer to no other questions today.

Question No. 22: Tabled by Mr. Forsey.

Question No. 23: Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I might answer question No. 4 and dispose of that and then come on to No. 23?

Question No. 4: On the Order Paper of the 29th Monday.

(1) Ans. \$144,944. Atlantic Gypsum Limited \$191,825. North Star Cement, answer, nil.

(2) (a) That is answered by the answer to Question No. 10 (1) which I think has been tabled.

(b) \$1,051,589, (c) \$691,825. (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j) all of these have been answered in the answer to No. 10 (1) tabled here today.

(k) \$500,000. (l) (m) (n) were answered in No. 10 tabled here today.

(o) No advances made.

(3) and (4). I will give that information a little later. I am asking all of them for the latest figures and when I have them all I will be glad to give them. I may indeed not be able to give the answers to these two particular questions until I come to participate personally in the address in reply. Indeed I hope in that speech to answer many questions put on the order paper and to some questions just asked in passing by honourable members of the opposition.

(5) I am afraid my answer to this question must continue to be that the answer to this question would much more properly be addressed to that private liability company. On the Atlantic Gypsum Ltd. I will table the answers as soon as the company holds its annual meeting and the report of the accounts is audited by the auditors and is laid before the board of directors and released to the government. I will very quickly there-

after table the balance sheets in this House as this is a public company wholly owned by the Crown.

Answers to Question (29), Mr. Hollett, Order Paper April 1, 1954:

Question: 1. What was the cost to Government of the 35 man Geological Survey on the holdings of the Newfoundland-Labrador Corporation in Labrador last summer?

Answer: 1. \$50,523.30 (This does not include \$6,394.62 paid by Nalco or \$2,730.07 due Party Chiefs on completion of final reports).

Question: 2. If Government paid for this survey has Nalco re-imbursed the Department for said costs?

Answer: 2. Nalco has paid \$10,000.00 on account and will pay an additional \$15,261.65 on receipt of final maps and reports to be delivered within the next few weeks (i.e. half of total cost).

Question: 3: What was the cost of the 3-man Survey Party under Mr. Gillespie on limestone outcrops in the vicinity of the Humbermouth Cement Plant and of the spotting and drilling of holes at the Quarry of the Cement Plant last summer?

Answer: 3. \$738.00 (cost of 3-man survey party). \$19,264.49.

Question: 4. Who paid these costs and expenses, and if the Department of Mines and Resources has said Department been re-imbursed by the present owners of the Cement Plant?

Answer: 4. The Department of Mines and Resources has billed the present owner of the Cement Plant for half the cost of the drilling.

Question: 5. Give total cost to the Department of all Surveys made by

said Department since March 31st, 1953, together with locations of each separate Survey, its cost and the number of men employed on each Survey. List total number of Newfoundlanders on each Survey Party.

Answer: 5. \$61,508.50.

Labrador:

Ashuanipi Lake, seven men, one Newfoundlander.

Red Wine, seven men, three Newfoundlanders.

Hamilton River, seven men, three Newfoundlanders.

Minipi, five men, one Newfoundlander.

Base Camp, North West River, five men, five Newfoundlanders.

Total—\$50,523.30.

These parties were operated as a unit and all serviced by one aircraft. Newfoundland:

Corner Brook and St. Fintans, three men, three Newfoundlanders, \$3,294.90.

Proposed National Park area, Bonavista Bay, \$7,691.30.

Total for Newfoundland and Labrador—\$61,508.50.

#### ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 4:

1951

May 23:

1 Pr. Yates E-1 End Matchers DMD 60/3/220 .....	\$19,100.00	
1 Yates G-50 Rip Saw MD 60/3/220 .....	7,880.00	
4 Yates G-171 Knot Saws 2LH, 2RH, 3/60/220 3HP ....	1,360.00	
1 Yates G-11 Lightning Cut off Saw .....	770.00	
Cut off Bar Gravity Swings and Table .....	600.00	
1 Yates Century Grinder 60/3/220—"32" .....	1,425.00	
1 Only Tally Meter No. 5 .....	98.00	
1 Only Model A 1HP 60/1/100 Blower .....	165.00	
1 Only 270 Balance .....	150.00	
Insurance Trip Transit Policy .....	94.64	\$31,642.64

May 31:

1 Only 8" Collar Gate .....	9.50	
1 Only Saw Dust Pan for V-54 LH .....	147.50	157.00

May 31:

1 Only 26XE Mill Exhauster .....	}	2,050.00
1 Only 30 HP Motor and Base 60/3/550/1750RPM .....		
1 Only "V" Belt Drive .....		

May 31 :

2 Only 11XE Mill Exhausters each complete with 10 HP 60/3/550/1750 RPM Motor, Base, "V" Belt Drive	1,488.00	
900 Ft. 11" dia. Pipe made up of 320-3' lengths	988.00	4,526.00

May 31 :

2 Only Shafts 1-15/16" C.R. X 24" of 1/2" KW each end and 12" in middle	30.70	
75 Ft. only 6" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt—4 ply	54.90	
547 Ft. only 6" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt—4 ply	360.36	
5 Only No. 3 AM Red-Drives	1,287.50	
2 Only 4.4 PD, 3 Groove A Section Sheaves	16.02	
2 Only 18" PD, 3 Groove A Section Sheaves	53.28	
5 Only 3 HP, 1800 RPM, 3/60/220 Protected type Motor and Base	630.00	
5 Only Starters, 2510 W 5, Square	89.25	
3 Only 4.4 PD, 2 gr. A Section Sheaves	21.06	
3 Only 15" PD, 2 gr. A Section Sheaves	51.30	2,594.37

May 31 :

1 Only No. 2 AM Red Drive No Motor	257.50	
1 Only No. 4R AM Red Drive with overload release	392.43	
1 Only 4" PD, 4 Groove A Section Sheaves	9.81	
1 Only 18" PD, 4 Groove A Section Sheaves	32.31	
1 Only 5 HP, 3/60/220 X 1800 Motor, Protected type with base	149.00	
1 Only 2510 W, 5 Square D Starter	17.85	
16 Only A-80 Vee Belts	28.48	
270 Ft. 12" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt, 12" wide	353.97	
175 Ft. 9" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt, 12" wide	181.65	
2 Pcs. 1-15/16" Ground Shafting X 14' Keywayed 1/2	134.10	
2 Pcs. 1-15/16" Ground Shafting X 14' plain	49.20	1,606.30

May 31 : Back Charges 104.06

June 22 :

1 Yates A -23 Harwood Flooring Matcher, DMD 2/60/220	28,600.00	
1 Yates F-23 Feeder	2,390.00	
1 Yates No. 137 Grinder 3/60/220	1,010.00	
Insurance-Trip-Transit Policy	96.00	32,096.00

June 22 :

1 Starter for E-1 Conveyors CR 1062, 1200 RPM	17.13
---	-------

June 22:

12 6 dia. X 6" Face X 1-11/16" Base, Canadian Pressed Stat. Pulleys .....	86.40	
12 P2-127-1-11/16" Link Belt Pillow Blocks .....	235.20	
12 P2-127R-1-11/16" Link Belt Pillow Blocks .....		
12 No. 1531-1-15/16" Angle Pillow Blocks .....	158.40	480.00

June 22: 12 1-15/16" Safety Collars ..... 18.48

June 22:

4 25 lb. Pails Yamco Hudralube .....	33.00	
2 25 lb. Pails Yamco Gearlube .....	16.50	
1 5 gal. Can Yamco Translube .....	17.50	
10% Sales Tax .....	6.70	73.70

June 22:

1 108" Cyclone Collector with Spiral .....	1,535.00	
1 12" 2 way Sheavings Valve .....	119.00	
1 48" Cyclone Collector with Spiral .....	302.00	
2 Barbed Wire Tying Machines .....	607.00	2,626.00

June 22:

1 Magnetic Switch P.B. in Cover for 30 HP, 3 HP 60cy. 220 Volts, 1800 RPM .....	122.65	
2 Magnetic Switch P.B. in Cover for 10 HP, 3 HP 60 cy. 220 Volts, 1800 RPM .....	138.70	
2 4 X 14'-0" (Tape Measure)—Combination Belts for Splicing on Machine with Cement .....	115.20	
1 4" wide X 23'-" Combination Belt with lap for Splicing on Machine .....	94.72	
2 3" X 8'-7" Endless Combination Belts .....	55.20	526.47
Bank Charges .....		67.60

October 10:

1 Yates Type No. 177 Double Surfacers 30" X 14" M D 60/3/220 .....	12,100.00	
Extra for 6 K Cylinders .....	210.00	
Parts to use M-22 .....	65.00	
Top Outfeed Sectional Roll .....	380.00	
1 M-22 Cylinder Grinder 60/1/110 .....	265.00	
Insurance-Trip-Transit Policy .....	39.06	13,059.06

October 10:

2 Desmond-Sherman Dressers No. 2 .....	9.50	
4 Doz. No. 2 Cutters for Dresser .....	45.00	54.50

October 10 :

1 No. 207 Left Hand Belt Drive Band Saw Gummer and Sharpener .....	846.00	
1 PV 1502 X Saw Bumping Wheels .....	16.65	862.65

October 10 :

4 PS 273 Cut off Saws .....	44.68	
4 PS 107 Cut off Saws .....	36.68	
6 PS 274 Circular Saws .....	70.20	
1 84" Left Hand Cyclone with Spiral .....	616.00	767.56
Bank Charges .....		24.80
Bank Charges .....		5.15
		<u>\$91,309.47</u>

## QUESTION NO. 4 (Mr. Hollett).

1. Advances since 31/3/53 as working capital or on capital account :
  - (a) Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. .... \$144,941
  - (b) Atlantic Gypsum Ltd. .... 191,825
  - (c) North Star Cement Co. .... Nil
2. Total amounts paid by way of advances or loans (as of 28/2/54) to—
  - (a) Eckhardt Mills Ltd. (See answer to Question 10(1))..... (\$150,000)
  - (b) Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. .... \$1,051,589
  - (c) Atlantic Gypsum Ltd. .... 691,825
  - (d) Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1) (390,000)
  - (e) Atlantic Gloves Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1) ..... (221,648)
  - (f) Canadian Leather Goods Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1) ( 50,000)
  - (g) Koch Shoes Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1)..... ( 262,000)
  - (h) Superior Rubber Co. Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1) ..... (1,000,000)
  - (i) Hanning Electric Co. Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1)..... (325,000)
  - (j) Canadian Machinery Indus. Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1) (2,500,000)
  - (k) North Star Cement Co. .... \$500,000
  - (l) Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd. See answer to question 10 (1) (920,000)
  - (m) United Cotton Mills Ltd. See answer to Question 10 (1)..... (372,999)
  - (n) Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd. See answer to question 10 (1) (150,000)
  - (o) Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.—No advances made.
3. Number of employees in each of the above plants :
4. How many Newfoundlanders are employed in each :
5. Balance Sheets and P. & L.
6. Raised by Government guaranteed loans :



Sub-Numbers a, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, and n : None.

b. Newfoundland Hardwoods

l. Atlantic Hardboards

o. Terra Nova Textiles

See Answers to Question 10 (2)

7. Value of Machinery.

QUESTION NO. 10 (1) (Mr. Hollett)

**Cash Loans Since 1/4/49**

Name	Amount Loaned as of 28/2/54	Amount Outstanding as of 28/2/54
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd. ....	40,000	40,000
Atlantic Films & Electronics Ltd. ....	150,000	150,000
Atlantic Gloves Ltd. ....	221,648	221,648
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd. ....	920,000	920,000
Atlantic Optical Company ....	110,290	110,290
Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd. ....	40,500	40,500
Canadian Leathergoods Ltd. ....	50,000	50,000
Canadian Machinery & Industry Construction Ltd. ....	2,500,000	2,500,000
Eckhardt Mills Ltd. ....	150,000	150,000
Fishery Products Ltd. ....	1,337,000	1,337,000
Gaultois Fisheries Ltd. ....	425,000	425,000
Hanning Electric Co. Ltd. ....	325,000	325,000
Koch Shoes Ltd. ....	262,000	262,000
Lourdes Co-operative Society Ltd. ....	50,000	10,000
Nfld. Asbestos Ltd. ....	250,000	250,000
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd. ....	390,000	390,000
Northeastern Co-operative Fisheries Ltd. ....	57,733	57,733
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd. ....	1,000,000	1,000,000
Thomsen & Nickels ....	33,500	33,500
Trepassey Fisheries Ltd. ....	316,000	29,000
United Cotton Mills Ltd. ....	372,699	372,699

## Guaranteed Loans Since 1/4/49

(2) Name	Amount Guaranteed	Amount Borrowed	Amount Owed as of 28/2/54
Alberto Fisheries Ltd.	\$ 65,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 62,328
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	160,000	160,000	80,000
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	125,000	78,000	78,000
Arctic Fishery Products	125,000	125,000	100,000
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Ltd.	40,000	40,000	40,000
Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	1,050,000	1,018,000	1,018,000
Dunphy's Ltd.	45,000	45,000	27,000
Fishery Products Ltd.	110,000	110,000	44,000
Fishery Products Ltd.	350,000	350,000	279,500
Fishery Products Ltd.	350,000	350,000	350,000
Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.	425,000	425,000	—
Hollett Sons & Co. Ltd.	125,000	125,000	112,500
MacIellan, C. F.	75,000	75,000	75,000
Nfld. Asbestos Ltd.	180,000	85,000	85,000
Nfld. Hardwood Ltd.	150,000	150,000	—
Nfld Hardwoods Ltd	50,000	Revolving Credit	150,000
Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.	200,000	Revolving Credit	Cancelled
Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.	50,000	Revolving Credit	50,000
Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.	500,000	258,000	258,000
Northeastern Fish Industries Ltd.	400,000	387,591	387,591
Northeastern Co-op. Fisheries Ltd.	35,000	35,000	—
Oison Whaling & Sealing Ltd.	425,000	425,000	300,000
Penny & Sons Ltd.	90,000	90,000	81,000
Richard Ltd.	250,000	250,000	—
St. Lawrence Corp. of Nfld. Ltd.	537,500	537,500	355,000
Springdale Fur Farmers Co-op. Sct. Ltd.	7,500	7,000	7,230 (Including interest)
Seaway Co-operative Society Ltd.	20,000	20,000	—
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	150,000	75,000	75,000
Town of Carbonear	22,000	22,000	8,796
Town of Corner Brook East	10,000	10,000	4,000
Town Council of Stephenville	150,000	*	*
Town of St. Lawrence	20,000	20,000	—
Northlantic Fisheries Ltd.	675,000	650,450	—
United Church Board of Education	40,000	40,000	20,234
United Engineers & Contractors Ltd.	75,000	30,000	25,000

\* Information not available at present.

(3) : Cash Loans prior to 1/4/49

Name	Amount Loaned as of 28/2/54	Amount Outstanding as of 28/2/54
	\$	\$
Blue Water Shipping Co. Ltd. ....	225,000	.....
Geo. T. Dixon Ltd. ....	15,000	7,500
Lake & Lake Ltd. ....	42,000	31,251
Nfld. Dehydrating Process Co. Ltd. ....	200,000	200,000
Northeastern Fish Industries Ltd. ....	280,000	260,000
Northlantic Trawling Co. Ltd. ....	400,000	250,000
Penny & Sons Ltd. ....	40,000	40,000

NOTE: (1) and (3) above do not include cash loans to individuals for such purposes as breeding of fur animals, farming development, etc.

Question No. 20:

(1) Subhead 14220507  
\$821,465 (to 28/2/54)

Information regarding estimated amount required to finalize payments should be obtained from the Hon. Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives.

	Bottles
(2) Rum .....	579,113
Whiskey .....	198,681
Gin .....	74,844
Wines .....	252,431
Beers .....	7,241,172

(3) Total amount of Import Duties, Excise Taxes, etc., paid to the Federal Government by the Board of Liquor Control from April 1st, 1953, to February 27th, 1954, amounted to \$1,401,357.16. This does not include duties paid at Distilleries in Canada on goods shipped Excise paid.

Answers to questions asked by Mr. M. Hollett on March 29th., 1954:

(1) In connection with the block provision of three hundred thousand dollars for adjustment of salaries in the Department of Health Estimates, state exactly how this amount was apportioned.

Salary adjustments were made on the approximate basis of a ten per

cent increase. When the Estimates for 1954-55 are printed and released shortly, this information will appear in detail.

(2) State the number of Orderlies at the General Hospital; what are the hours of work and what salaries are paid to said Orderlies? What is the number of Orderlies whose homes are elsewhere than in St. John's?

The number of Orderlies presently employed at the General Hospital is 24. They work 8 hours daily for 5½ days weekly less mealtime. Salaries paid are on the scale \$2000-100-2100 per annum. 7 of these Orderlies live outside St. John's.

(3) How many student nurses are presently in training at the various Hospitals throughout Newfoundland. State number at each Hospital and what exactly are the terms of their service with regard to salary and allowances? What are the hours of work each day and night?

There are 105 Student Nurses in the General Hospital School of Nursing, of which 8 are affiliating at the Grace Hospital, 4 at the Fever Hospital, 4 at the St. John's Sanatorium and 4 at the Hospital for Mental and

Nervous Diseases. These Students receive a salary of \$660 per annum, of which \$360 per annum is deducted for full board and lodgings, including laundry services. In addition, free medical care and hospitalization is given. Student Nurses are on duty 9 hours daily or nightly, six days or nights weekly, but this period for the Students on day duty includes two hours classroom study. Those on night duty also spend two hours daily in the classroom for lectures which are scheduled for the late afternoon. It is understood that Newfoundland Student Nurses are the highest paid in Canada. There are other Schools of Nursing in hospitals not operated by Government.

(4) Give the names of all Internes at each of the Hospitals in Newfoundland.

Regarding Internes, we have no records of the staff of hospitals in Newfoundland other than those operated by Government. The only Internes in Government hospitals are those employed at the General Hospital, as follows:

Dr. D. S. Lyon, Dr. G. M. Ogilvie, Dr. Augustus Rowe, Dr. Lothar Sennewald, Dr. R. Sinclair, Dr. A. Taylor, Dr. E. John Scales.

(5) How many Ward Aides are employed at the General Hospital? What wages or salaries are paid, and what are the hours of work?

There are 51 Ward Aides employed at the General Hospital and their salary is at the rate of \$1160 per annum, from which \$360 per annum is deducted for full board and lodgings, or \$100 per annum for one meal daily. The normal working week would consist of 5½ eight hour days, less meal time, but because of the

serious shortage of Ward Aides and the absolute necessity of caring for the patients, there has been no alternative but to ask these employees to work long and tedious hours until such time as sufficient Ward Aides can be secured. The period of greatest demand has been during February and March, when some staff worked as much as 66 hours weekly, but, the situation is expected to improve gradually.

(6) I have to say in regard to (a), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) (j), (k), (m) and (n) the answer is nil. With regard to (b) and (l) and (o) the answer is contained in the answer to No. 10 (1) tabled here today.

(7) I am not ready yet with this answer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before we leave that question—I take it the figures which were given with regard to Newfoundland Hardwoods and Atlantic Gypsum and the North Star Cement—it has not been tabled—if the answers had been tabled I need not ask a supplementary question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have it here—tabled—these questions or answers are in direct reply to the questions tabled by the honourable gentleman. I am not privileged to word the honourable gentleman's questions, I am not privileged to answer them. It is direct answer to the honourable gentleman's questions, I assure him of that.

Question No. 23:

(a) Answer 13.

(b) \$20,000 for one, \$14,674 for one; two of them cost \$14,500 each, one cost \$12,500, one cost 12,000, six cost \$10,000, one cost \$4,875.

(c) They have a further contract

to make five pictures; three at \$10,000 and one at \$14,000 and one at \$20,000. We aim at making an average of about ten or twelve pictures a year running at a cost to the Treasury of something like fifty thousand to a hundred thousand dollars a year. I may say that those pictures, in addition, to being shown in many many hundreds of places right across Canada are shown in something between four and five hundred places in Newfoundland.

(d) \$200,000.

(e) Nil.

(f) 65, that is fifty permanently and fifteen temporary or part time, with an annual wage bill of \$120,000.

Question No. 24 :

MR. POWER : I think I referred that to the Department of Economic Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD : That has not come back to my department since it was submitted by the Minister of Finance. When it comes, we will put it through the usual process, and as soon as this is done, I will be glad to table the answer. I have not even read it.

MR. SPEAKER : Question No. 25, No. 26, No. 27—addressed to the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD : I have to apologize for the absence of the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries. At my request he is absent, holding most important negotiations with Fish Industrialists with a view to furthering our programme and policy of developing fisheries. He may be here before we rise, if so, if he has the answers prepared, he will gladly table them.

MR. SPENCER : I have the answer to Question No. 8 and the an-

swer to Question No. 15—Order Paper March 30th.

1. Question :

What were the amounts of money spent in each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953 on the maintenance of the Deer Lake-Corner Brook Highway, including the paved section from Steady Brook to Corner Brook?

Answer :

1950-51	\$83,146.80
1951-52	54,799.08
1952-53	30,456.74
1953-54	33,396.04

2. Question :

How much money was spent on Snow Clearing on the same section of highway during each of the said winters, that is 50-51, 51-52, 52-53, and 53-54?

Answer :

Accounts are not kept for individual sections of roads for Snow Clearing.

3. Question :

State the number of men employed at the Highroads Garage at Deer Lake during the winters of 51-52, 52-53 and 53-54?

Answer :

1951-52	30 men
1952-53	25 men
1953-54	22 men

4. Question :

What Salaries or Wages are paid to the following Personnel at the Highroads Depot at Deer Lake—District Roads Supt., District Mechanical Supt., District Roads Shop Foreman, District Roads Accountant, and the District Roads Storekeeper.

Answer :

	Per Annum
District Roads Supt. ....	\$4,600.00
District Roads Mech. Supt. ....	3,900.00
District Roads Shop Foreman	3,400.00
District Roads Accountant ....	3,900.00
District Roads Storekeeper —	2,700.00

Question No. 15, asked by Mr. Higgins :

(a) The names (b) the nationalities and (c) the salaries of all engineers, architects, surveyors and draughtsmen employed by the Department of Public Works."

I shall not take the time of the House to read these names but shall make one or two brief comments. There are altogether 31 engineers and/or draughtsmen. Of the total of 31, nine are Europeans. I shall par-

ticularly refrain from trying to name these gentlemen; I might run into the same difficulties as the Leader of the Opposition in trying to pronounce them.

MR. HOLLETT: How do you know I ran into difficulty?

MR. SPENCER: You announced it yourself. In connection with the 31 engineers. I have stated that nine are Europeans. Our only regret in the department is that due to large demands being made upon it, we have been unable, with all the effort made in the last three or four years, to obtain even more men of the calibre we have employed. I regret very much indeed that we have been unable to get twenty or more of these men from Europe. We have only been able to get nine.



The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Public Works in reply to Question No. 15 (Mr. Higgins)—Order Paper of March 30th, 1954 :

QUESTION NO. 15—(Answer Tabled) .

1. Question :

(a) The name, (b) the nationalities and (c) the salaries of all engineers, architects, surveyors and draughtsmen employed by the Department of Public Works.

Answer :

Name	Position	Nationality	Salary Per Annum
C. H. Conroy	Chief Engineer	Canadian	\$6500
Dr. Steinbrink	Architect	German	\$4200
J. White	Draughtsman	Canadian	\$2460
R. M. French	Chief Highway Engineer	Canadian	\$8500
C. A. Knight	Asst. Chief Highway Engineer	Canadian	\$7000
W. L. Ball	Resident Engineer	Canadian	\$6000
H. Hermanson	Resident Engineer	Canadian	\$6000
E. Jakobsens	Chief Bridge Engineer	Latvian	\$7000
E. Snikeris	Resident Engineer	Latvian	\$5600
H. Effsen	Resident Engineer	Danish	\$5600
S. Mikelson	Resident Engineer	Latvian	\$5300
N. Strauss	Resident Engineer	Latvian	\$5300
V. Saulite	Resident Engineer	Latvian	\$4800
A. L. George	Jr. Resident Engineer	Canadian	\$4800
R. Wasmeier	Resident Engineer	Austrian	\$4800
C. Elliott	Jr. Resident Engineer	Canadian	\$3900
J. Mahoney	Engineer Assistant	Canadian	\$3900
C. Miller	Engineer Assistant	Canadian	\$3900
C. White	Engineer Assistant	Canadian	\$3900
J. D. Penney	Engineer Assistant	Canadian	\$3900
R. G. Dawe	Engineer Assistant	Canadian	\$3900
R. Sutherby	Transitman	Canadian	\$2900
C. Gosse	Levelman	Canadian	\$2580
J. Moore	Instrumentman	Canadian	\$2540
A. Genge	Instrumentman	Canadian	\$2540
P. Earles	Levelman	Canadian	\$2300
L. Gilbert	Levelman	Canadian	\$2280
J. Goodberg	Levelman	Latvian	\$2280
L. Fahey	Rodman	Canadian	\$1980
J. McNeill	Rodman	Canadian	\$1980
P. Bolsis	Rodman	Latvian	\$1980

Adjourned Debate on Address in Reply.

MR. FOGWILL: Before saying anything else in respect to the Speech from the Throne, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty.

I wish to offer congratulations to the mover and seconder who moved that a Committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply on opening day.

Now, before continuing, I would like to say something in regard to something that may have been said in respect to the debating ability of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. I do not care, personally, what any member on the opposite side of the House may say in respect to me, but I would like to take this opportunity of saying something about the first Leader of the Opposition since we became a Province of Canada. The first Leader, Mr. John G. Higgins (he was our first Leader after we became a Province of Canada)—I may say—I will say—he is a debater of no mean ability. He took part in every debate in this Chamber while he was here, on every occasion which demanded him to take part. Mr. Higgins was at all times honest, forthright and to the point. Sometimes his remarks were witty and when Mr. Higgins and the Premier crossed swords, it was my opinion that the Premier came off second best.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Always!

MR. FOGWILL: He was not dropped from the leadership of the Conservative Party, but he declined to become a Member because of personal reasons. If anyone in this House cares to take the time to look up the 1949 Hansard of the Proceedings, he

will find that the debating ability of Mr. Higgins is unquestioned. I have no doubt at all that if Mr. J. G. Higgins cares, at any future time, to become a candidate, he will be welcomed as a member. I think his presence here will be an asset to this Chamber.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. FOGWILL: I think we need this man. I am glad and happy to be associated with the present Leader of the Opposition, with the member for St. John's West, the member for St. John's East and also the member for Bell Island. I hope I will have the opportunity of being associated with them for many years to come, whether in this House or out of this House, because I believe, regardless of what may be said by the members opposite, I believe the members I spoke of—the two on my right and the two on my left—I believe they are needed in this Chamber.

Some may say that yesterday was the anniversary of Confederation of Newfoundland with Canada; some may say it is today. It does not matter whether it is yesterday or today. I do not intend to go into details as to how Confederation was brought about, except to say that one of the main features of how it was brought about was because of the promises held out to Newfoundland people of Family Allowances, Old Age Pensions and Unemployment Insurance. These benefits are benefits which go out to all Provinces. We got the benefits when we became a Province, but of course we pay for them. We pay for all of it. We pay for every cent through Federal and Provincial taxation.

Confederation was brought about

also by promises of full employment, reduced living costs, industrial expansion and lower taxation.

And so we became a Province of Canada. We have been a Province for five years. Where do we find ourselves today? We find ourselves, with the exception of social services, in practically the same position we found ourselves in, in 1949. In fact, the cost of living has increased. It has gone up. It is higher now than it has ever been before perhaps. Taxes have gone up. Income taxes have increased. It has been the record of the Government of this Province that they have increased taxation year by year. That has been part of their program or policy ever since they came into office. In the first session of the House, they put on a Social Security Assessment which I would call a General Sales Tax of the Province, now bringing in a revenue of some six million dollars. Anyway, we were promised no new taxation, but that taxation would be lower. In that respect alone, the Government has failed the people of this Province, just as they failed the people of this Province in many other things.

Insofar as Unemployment is concerned, the workers pay for it, along with his employer. There is an assessment on the employer and one on the worker himself. Both these assessments are passed on to the consumer. You get nothing unless you pay for it.

We were promised industrial development. We were told in no uncertain terms that risk capital of Canada and of the United States were only willing and ready to put money into this Province to develop our natural resources. That did not hap-

pen. Up to the present time, with the exception of the development on Labrador, which took place long before we became a Province of Canada, we have had no risk capital coming into this Province to help us develop our natural resources.

I want to read to the House something in respect of our being a Province of Canada—words of the Premier himself which he uttered to this Chamber in 1952:

"From the moment that Newfoundland became a Province of Canada a great and far-reaching question presented itself to us and pressed inexorably for an early answer. It was a question that could not be dodged, the answer to which could not be postponed. To any person of ordinary perception this question overshadowed all else in his contemplation of union with Canada and his assessment of that union's effect upon Newfoundland. Was Newfoundland to go ahead, or behind? Was her population to grow, or decline? Would the end of, say, the first ten years of union find Newfoundland stronger, more populous, more truly prosperous?"

We are entering upon the sixth year of Confederation. Five years have gone past. I bring this to the attention of the House, because it seems to me that the Premier himself, who was one of those responsible for bringing about Confederation with Canada, expressed doubt when he uttered words as to whether it would bring lasting benefits upon this Island. I will not say any more about Confederation, but it has not brought to this Province the things the people thought it would bring to them. It has not brought full employment. It has not brought a solution to our

perennial problem the fisheries. It has not brought about the development of any of our natural resources, with the exception of the jumble which the Government has made in spending so much of the people's money in new industries under the Economic Development program. In 1949 the then Minister of Finance, the Honourable Mr. Quinton said:

"However, the Government is keenly aware of the many and intricate problems which will undoubtedly confront salt fish exporters in the future and, in conjunction with the Newfoundland Associated Fish Exporters Limited, the Newfoundland Fisheries Board and the Department of Fisheries, Ottawa, these problems are being carefully studied in an effort to arrive at a satisfactory solution."

That was said in 1949 in November, and the Government is responsible for this utterance. They knew in 1949 that the fisheries of this country needed some aid, some assistance and an early solution to the problem.

They were promised that before 1949. That is one of the reasons why we became a Province; because the people concerned thought; they were told to believe that the solution to the fisheries problem would be brought about through Confederation—if not then it would be brought about by the Liberal Government.

In 1949 also we find this was said in the Budget Speech:

"We believe that great changes must come in the production side of our fisheries. Over half our people are directly dependent upon the fisheries, and overall improvement in our Newfoundland economy is unthinkable without far-reaching development in the fisheries.

That was said five years ago and it has taken this Government five years to come to the point. They are lax in their duty to the people of this country. I think it is time they got down to trying to solve the problems of the Newfoundland fisheries.

In 1950 this was said in the Budget Speech:

"I am happy to say that the Government of Newfoundland agrees wholeheartedly with the Government of Canada in the opinion that our Newfoundland fisheries must undergo, in certain respects, some sweeping changes. These changes will not take place overnight, and they will not take place without the expenditure of considerable sums of money. There will always be a sale for some salt codfish, but we must aim at reducing the overall quantity of codfish to be marketed in Europe in that form. We must aim at reducing our present degree of dependence upon the codfisheries, by turning our attention increasingly to other fisheries which Providence has bountifully placed within our reach. We must aim at breaking the age-old dependence of our inshore fishermen upon small, open boats, and turn to more modern boats, more dependable types of engines, and newer types of fishing gear. We must aim at the establishment of many new fishing plants to handle our various types of fish by freezing, by reduction to meal and oil, and by other and even newer processes.

"Since we united with Canada, the business side of our fisheries—inspection, and the like—is the care of the Government of Canada, through the Newfoundland Fisheries Board and Nafel. This fact leaves the Government of Newfoundland free to devote

its attention, so far as our fisheries are concerned, to the immediate questions of methods of production—such as types of boats, engines and gear—and methods of handling and processing our fish. Even in this the Government of Canada, with a generous realization of our problems, is willing to assist in many practical ways; and between the two Governments, with the willing and eager co-operation of the fishermen and the trade, some notable strides should be made in the next few years in these new directions which I have roughly outlined. Speaking for the Government of Newfoundland, I can say quite frankly that we are somewhat impatient in the matter, but I hasten to add that it is far from being our intention to rush headlong into innovation and change. We are giving careful and thorough study to the whole question, and each move we make will form a necessary part of a general pattern of action being worked out."

That was in 1950.

In 1951, they have this to say; and I quote from the Budget Speech of that day:

"Nor have we been content, in the past year or two, just to talk about economic development. On the contrary, it is the simple truth to say that more has been accomplished in the past two years than in any similar period throughout the whole history of Newfoundland. In the fishing industry we have guaranteed bank loans to every fishing firm that was able to meet our conditions and was anxious to expand and enlarge its modern facilities. We have refused no firm that was willing to expand and was able to meet our terms, and this policy we shall continue to practise.

"We have lately undertaken to arrange financing that should result in two large new fish plants being established, one at Placentia and one at Grand Bank. We have been assisting to secure the establishment of another large new plant at Gaultois. All of these are on the South-West coasts. We have urged the owners of the plants at St. Anthony and Bonavista to double their present capacity, and the owners of the plant at Englee to reopen and considerably to enlarge."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote something from the Budget Speech of 1953. It says here:

"A very large proportion of our people still get their living, such as it is, from the fisheries; so it would be idle to suppose that Newfoundland can be enduringly prosperous if the fishermen do not thrive. This Government, who owe their very existence so much to the warm-hearted support of the fishermen, would be false to their destiny if they failed to devote a very large part of their energies to a great program of developing the fisheries. This the Government have seen clearly from the beginning."

The Government did see that from the beginning—then why did they not go out and embark on some kind of a fisheries program, starting from 1949? They did neglect the fisheries. It is a well-known fact. It is a well-known fact that fisheries have been neglected by the Government since they came into office. Suddenly we find them going out on a fisheries program. They say they are going to spend millions this year on expansion of the fisheries. Why did not the Government lay down a program in 1949 and start from there? Because

of the inexperience of the various members of the Government, not only the back benchers, but of the Ministers concerned. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they did do their best, but it is no use, Mr. Speaker, for them to hide the fact that their inexperience did not allow them to embark upon the fishery programme, so what did they do? They embarked upon a program of industrial expansion of a different nature. They put thousands of the Newfoundland Surplus into an Industrial program which is entirely foreign to us. Some of it may pay off and some may not pay off, but Mr. Speaker, I think that also it is possible that the Government this year may be able to do something and lay down some program to bring about a permanent solution to the fisheries program, but it is very difficult for me to understand how they can do it at this late time. Because Mr. Speaker, we have had a declining market in this past five or six years in our fisheries to an extent that, in fact, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, some of the members on the other side of the House advised the fishermen to haul up their boats. Sir, we have had a program of seiners, draggers, trawlers and the rest this last few years, plus the Labrador schooners converted to long-lining at a cost of \$110,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we have done nothing.

MR. FOGWILL: Something but not enough. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to talk about the Icelandic boats. The Government admitted their mistake.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not give us a little more—do!

MR. MURRAY: Tell us about the man from Tors Cove.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I will say this. As far as I am concerned the Government's programme since they came into office has just been a question of expediency from day to day and from month to month, and you will find in the press startling announcements which have been made from time to time. In the first instance, Sir, if we remember, we had Rockefeller, I.B.E.C., Seigheim, Icelandic Boats—a half million dollars gone down the drain. Where does it leave us?

It is time, Sir, the Government did get hold of itself and begin to do something, for what I call one of the main industries of this Island, the fisheries. So many of our people are dependent upon the fishery for their livelihood. It is no use for the Government, Mr. Speaker, to blame the failures of the fishery upon NAFEL. It is no good for the Government to tell me, nor, this Island of Newfoundland that NAFEL should have its teeth kicked in—we still have NAFEL, we still have it here. It is a selling organization, Mr. Speaker set up long before this Government set up office. This Government accepted the fact they were here as a selling organization, and a couple of years ago they agreed they should still continue to sell Newfoundland fish, and regardless of the fact that only a short time ago it was said, and the Premier was the man who was supposed to have said it, that NAFEL should have its teeth kicked in, and while NAFEL existed, and if it is not abolished the fishermen will starve. Why say these things, Mr. Speaker? We still have NAFEL. If the Premier and the Government think NAFEL should go, why don't you put them out, if they are useless to the fishery why not dispense with them?



No, Mr. Speaker, they don't dispense with NAFEL, they continue to work with NAFEL and so does the Federal Government continue to work with NAFEL. If they don't want NAFEL dispensed with; it is useless putting headlines in the press so as to becloud some other issue which may be tormenting the Government at the time. That is what is happening in regard to the fisheries, the Government don't know what to do and they never have. We are supposed to have fishermen on the other side of this Honourable House. We may have some men over there who worked at fish, I never have. They have some little experience in catching a fish over the side of a boat, but they have no experience, Mr. Speaker, in the marketing of our salt cod, none whatsoever. And it is time they started to learn something about the fishery. They have been telling us people here so long now what they know about fish, they come from fishing settlements, their fathers and uncles and aunts and nephews and nieces were fishermen, everyone belonging to them. It is time they stopped talking about all their relations who were fishermen and begin to talk sense.

Mr. Speaker, I will say this much; if the Government does bring in such a programme to help and assist the fisheries of this Island we are only too ready to go along and agree with anything that would be sensible, something that would help to bring along a permanent solution to the fishery problem. I am going to finish with fisheries now, Mr. Speaker and speak about agriculture.

That is another point, Mr. Speaker, which the Government has been attacking. They have done very little,

Mr. Speaker, this last five years in regard to agriculture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Name another government that ever did!

MR. FOGWILL: I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is time the present Government should do something about it. Agriculture in Newfoundland was always faced with the problems of selling its products in competition with those coming in from the mainland. After we became a Province of Canada, Mr. Speaker, our farmers were faced with stiffer competition, that is a well known fact. Although perhaps the Government did not realize it, or were not prepared to face that fact for the first two or three years of union with Canada, I believe they have come to the point now, Mr. Speaker, where they have to face that a considerable portion of our population do earn their living from agriculture. Mr. Speaker, there is room for considerable improvement in agricultural activities of those who work at that particular work. It may be of interest, Sir, to the House if I quoted some figures in respect to the amount of meats and vegetables imported into this Island prior to Confederation. We did import, Mr. Speaker, something in the vicinity of twenty million pounds a year of meats, fresh, salt and meat products.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is possibly double that now.

MR. FOGWILL: It could possibly be. In the way of vegetables; cabbage, onions, potatoes in 1944-45, 2,851,000 lbs; milk products we imported eight and a half million pounds. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has gone up since then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is three or four times that now.

MR. FOGWILL: Well, if it has gone up three or four times you will see our farmers must have a very difficult time trying to compete with stuff coming in from the Mainland.

I have not very much more to say, Sir, I am not going to say anything about our forests because I don't know much about them. But in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to make some remarks upon one of the deficiencies of the Government responsible for bringing so much poor relief to this Province, and that is the Department of Liquor Control. My honourable friend from St. John's West did say in his speech a few days ago that when the Bill was brought in here, "An Act to Control the Distribution of Alcoholic Liquors," it was introduced as a Temperance Act. That is quite true. I remember that quite clearly, it was introduced as a temperance measure. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, including this year that it was introduced, the Government sold twenty-seven million dollars worth of alcoholic liquor including beer. Twenty-seven million dollars, Mr. Speaker, including beer sold through the Board of Liquor Control. It was the hope, I think, of many people in this land when this temperance act was brought in, it would reduce the consumption of alcoholic liquors. It did not do so, and of the twenty-seven million dollars worth of liquors and beer the Government sold in the last five years they realized a profit, Mr. Speaker, of fourteen million dollars. I got these figures from the Auditor General's Report. Fourteen million dollars, Mr. Speaker, representing profits from the sale of liquor which was controlled by a temperance measure. What did that amount to, Sir? In just a couple of years ago, I think it was the year

after this temperance measure was brought in, the Government sold eight hundred thousand dollars worth of alcoholic liquor plus several million bottles of beer. But in this past three years, Mr. Speaker, the average sale of bottles of liquor has amounted to one million for each year, one million bottles of liquor for each year and ten million bottles of beer. That is quite a lot of revenue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the smallest consumption in all Canada.

MR. FOGWILL: It does not matter whether it is the smallest consumption this side of Timbucktoo, or anywhere else. I am speaking of this having been brought in as a temperance act and it was not. I said on that occasion it was in my opinion a revenue act, and it has been proven since, Mr. Speaker, that it is a revenue act because it brought in additional revenue to the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker I will close, and in doing so I will say this: Newfoundland's economy is not of a very robust nature, we are deficient in power, we have no coal, we have no oil and we have a very limited supply of water power. Any country which has a deficiency in power, Mr. Speaker, is going to find it very difficult in industrial expansion, such as the Government has endeavoured to bring about in the past two or three years. I think we should endeavour to bring about a great expansion of our natural resources and our greatest natural resource is that of our fishery and our mines and of our forests. This is where the future of Newfoundland will lie. Whether we get a good living from it or frugal that is where our future lies on our own natural resources. Providing, Mr. Speaker, they are carried on in

a right and proper manner, we possibly may be able to survive and maintain a decent standard of living as a Province of Canada. But it is useless, Mr. Speaker, for anybody to go into rhapsodies about industrial expansion by way of heavy industry the way the Government has in the past few years, because we are lacking, Mr. Speaker, in many of the raw materials used to bring about such industries.

So, I will close by saying I do hope if the Government brings in a programme here in regard to some permanent solution to our fishery problems, I believe it will find the Opposition very sympathetic to it and that we will support it. Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the address in reply I shall confine myself to the Speech from the Throne. Like all members of this House I associate myself with the expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen whose coronation took place since we last met here. The coronation is a dedication, it is an ancient ceremony of very religious significance. But we must remember that Her Gracious Majesty, the Queen, was a dedicated woman long before her accession to the Throne. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that her reign over us will be long and glorious.

I should like also to congratulate and welcome to this House the Honourable the junior member for St. John's West. I took the trouble to find out who was the senior and who was the junior member, and I found out that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is the senior by some five years. I think, Sir, that the Honourable member will add much to

this House, and that we will profit by his wide parliamentary experience.

There were not very many points made by the Opposition to which I can reply. They did go back over the industrial programme and try to show that it has been a failure. No doubt the picture of the industrial programme will be presented to the country by the Premier when we are discussing the budget speech.

All the speakers of the Opposition right up to the last speaker did prove to me that a person must be very careful what he says, because they did go back and quote word for word many speeches made by the Premier in this House, and with the persistence of a nagging woman they tried to prove that all is ruin as far as these industries are concerned. I cannot agree with that Mr. Speaker, and I am certain that the Premier will refute these arguments at the proper time.

Now, I cannot let today pass without some reference to Confederation. It was mentioned yesterday by the Premier and for once the Opposition departed from their usual practice of deriding Confederation, and those who brought it about. Perhaps it was because last year I told them I always liked to hear them do that. I am one of those who in some small way supported Confederation. I am Mr. Speaker, proud I was a Confederate many years before the National Convention came into being. I grew up in Nova Scotia from the time I was four until I was nine, and I was not back in this Province very long, though only nine years old, before in my own opinion I began to see that Confederation could bring many blessings to this Province. Before the days of family allowances I own that

I was a Confederate, and I was one of the very first to congratulate the man who is now Premier, this could not have been any later than 1947, on the stand he was taking in the National Convention, and offered to help in whatever small way I could. I believe, Sir, that Confederation is the beginning of a good way of living for the people of Newfoundland. It has not been proven as yet. It has only been in being for five years, and this Government has only been here five years. I believe that the fallacy of all the arguments that have been put forward by my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House is this, that they are expecting too much too soon. They have not given the Government credit for things which the Governments has done.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes we have.

MR. COURAGE: They have pointed to the money spent on the industrial programme. But that was only eighteen millions out of forty million that has been spent. They have mentioned nothing about new roads, about the new schools, the bridges, about hospitals and the many increased medical services, about doctors and hospital boats on the South Coast, the raises in teacher's salaries. I could go on for a long time and show that only about one-third of the surplus was spent on the industrial programme, and that we cannot write off this eighteen million dollars as a dead loss, not yet anyway. I would ask them to reserve their judgment and possess their soul in patience and wait. You know, after all, what was there sacred about those forty million dollars? What would the opposition have done with them? Would they have put them in the bank, or put it in a chest and sat on it—would the people of Fogo

who wanted a hospital, the people of Fortune Bay who wanted roads, would the other people who were crying out for increased services have thanked the Opposition if they had said; "We have the money but we are sitting on the chest"? No. They would have been forced, Mr. Speaker, to spend the money in the same way this Government had to spend the money.

MR. BROWNE: Not in the same way.

MR. COURAGE: I don't know whether you would have spent it wiser or as wisely as the Government. The Opposition, Mr. Speaker, certainly could not have given more thought to the welfare of this country than has been given by this present Government—I say that in all sincerity. And if they could have spent it a different way, why don't they say so? Why do they persist in walking backwards across the stage of history? I say walking backwards because according to all the speeches made here from the Opposition, they have been looking backwards. It is time, Mr. Speaker, we turn around and look forward into the future.

MR. HOLLETT: To what?

MR. COURAGE: The fishery has been mentioned, and we have been told nothing has been done about the fisheries. That is not so. Let us look at the record: Quite a number of things have been done to encourage the fisheries. As much has been done in the past five years to encourage the development of the fisheries as has ever been done before by any government in ten years. The Federation of Fishermen was set up under Government sponsorship—that was one step forward. Fish plants

have sprung up under Government sponsorship in different parts of the country. I am very happy to be able to report that one of the fish plants built was at Gaultois, and that, Mr. Speaker, was a good thing for the fishing economy of Hermitage Bay. There are also many other fish plants. I can think of two on the South Coast that are now in being. There are some sixteen Danish Seiners operating at the present moment on the south coast. I might say that I agree with my friend from Fogo when he says more money will have to be spent on the herring fishery because at the present time we are taking a very small number of herring from the sea. Up until this week I was very sad as day after day I listened to the radio, and letter after letter came in to me from Fortune Bay, and they all had the same cry—No herring! No herring! This week the report showed that they are catching herring everywhere in Fortune Bay. People are catching and packing the herring and they are busy. But, Mr. Speaker, before these herring came into Fortune Bay there might have been a way, if we had known as much as they know in British Columbia, whereby we could have known when they would come in, where they come from, and where the main body of the herring were. Because it is my belief that we never see the main body of herring—that there is a main body of herring somewhere off Newfoundland but never comes to the shore. I would recommend to the Government that a great deal of money be spent on the development of this herring fishery, in finding out the facts.

It has been asked—why did not the Government go ahead sooner with its programme for fishery development?

—The Government, as the Opposition very well knows, and the country very well knows, was waiting for the Walsh Report. The Walsh Report is one of the most significant documents ever produced in the history of Newfoundland. I believe this is the first time in this session that reference has been made to it. This book, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend to the Opposition for study. This book is to be the guide book of the fishery development programme. I submit that the Government could not rush blindly ahead until it knew where it was going, and there are many things in this book to be followed in working out the development programme. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a future for the fisheries in Newfoundland, and particularly in the future of the fisheries of the South Coast. One thing we lack in this country at the present time is leadership.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh no!

MR. COURAGE: I am speaking of leadership for those who have the money and the initiative to start fishing. That is the kind of leadership I am speaking of. I am not speaking of political leadership now. There is a great future, Mr. Speaker, for young, educated people today to take up the fisheries as a vocation. I know that even now with what fish plants we have, there is a great demand for managers, for top personnel in fish plants. And I would advise young people leaving school with their grade XI, or leaving Memorial University to get in on the fisheries development programme, to get into a fish plant to start working at a filleting machine or to start working right at the beginning of the processing of fish, to study very carefully with an aim to becoming managers of

fish plants themselves. I believe that they can be of great service to their country by doing this, and certainly the monetary rewards paid to top personnel in fish plants are very attractive.

Now, it is quite easy for Honourable members on the other side of the House to make little of what the Government has done and is doing. After all, we would be surprised if they did not do that. It is much easier to tear down than to build up. Let us have more constructive criticism. It is not enough to say the Government should have done this or it should not have done this. What would the Opposition have done?

I am glad to know that the Opposition is behind the fisheries development programme. I am delighted to know that. I look forward to constructive criticism on their part. We must remember we are all Newfoundlanders. We are not here to bark at one another across the House, but as Legislators, trying to do what we think best for the Province and the people.

There are many things I could speak about. There is need for roads in this country. Development of roads must go hand in hand with our economy. Yesterday I presented a Petition from the people of Bay D'Espoir asking for a road connecting with the Trans-Canada Highway. I understand there is a road of sorts connecting it, some eighty miles distant. There are other roads I shall ask for. On the South Coast we need roads, and roads can be built. I believe fisheries development is going to depend largely on what can be done on the South Coast. They are near the Grand Banks there. There are good harbours there, they are ice-

free; there are good fishermen and good fishing all the year around. They are fishing at this moment. When other people have the misfortune to be ice-bound, the people on the South Coast have good fishing. It would not occur to them to do anything else. I am very glad to see that the Government is embarking upon this well-planned program of fisheries development.

Later on I shall have more to say in the Budget Speech debate regarding this development programme, especially as it affects the district which I have the honour to represent.

At the present time I would end my brief speech by saying I have confidence in Newfoundland and in its people; that we must turn around—no more looking over our shoulders at the past; we must go forward strong and firm in our faith and in this way we will let the other Provinces know that Newfoundland is on the march.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, in the few moments I propose to give to this debate, I aim to follow the example set by the member for Hermitage and confine my remarks to matters contained in the Speech from the Throne or to matters which may be incidental in illustrating some points I might endeavour to make.

To me it seems that the members of the Opposition who have thus far spoken have singularly failed in two particulars in dealing with this debate. First, they have criticized the Speech from the Throne for what they claim it does not contain. In other words, they have put forward the inference or statement that the Speech from the Throne is a defence of everything done. To the best of my knowledge and to the best of my



reading, that has not been the practice of the Speech from the Throne at any time in the past.

Secondly, they have endeavoured to criticize the Speech from the Throne for what it does contain, and in doing so they have failed to note the significance of the four basic points which are outlined therein.

There are four basic things mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. They refer specifically to agriculture, forestry, fishery and the revision of the Terms of Union. Very scant reference has been made by any speaker on the other side to any of these four important basic factors in our economy.

We do not live in the past. Past experiences are of some use to us inasmuch as we might endeavour to learn from mistakes in order that we may chart a course for the future. Listening to the remarks of the honourable members of the Opposition, we must assume one of two things. Either they have been guilty of ignoring the significance of the things set down in the Speech from the Throne; or they failed to grasp their significance to the people of this Province.

Reference has been made to various events of the past five years. It might help if we went back to September, 1949 when the devaluation of the pound took place, we were confronted with something which had recurred frequently in the past and all at once, overnight, we found the basic industries on which our people depended were in short demand, and we were unable to market our products. In other words, because of the fact that we had all our eggs in one basket, we were unable to find subsistence on which to exist.

Happily world conditions changed quickly, and because of war conditions there was a rapid trend in their improvement in early 1950. Since that time, of course, we have gone through a period of comparative prosperity, but the lesson to be learned was one that impinges itself upon our consciences and we felt, rightly or wrongly, that it was up to the Government to try and diversify the products of our economy, in order that we might increase the opportunities of holding on to our subsistence in such an event. That was the reason why we embarked upon an energetic and enthusiastic search for products we had, in order that we might even up the various products which we thought we might be able to export. There was another reason, however, why we engaged upon this research and it has already been referred to. The minute the depression struck us in 1929, it was necessary to focus the attention of the people upon the potentialities before us in our Island home. As a Government, we were mainly concerned in trying to bring about changes in the economy which might entice more people to remain at home rather than emigrate, and thereby make poorer the economy of our Island. During the past five years we have embarked upon various enterprises by enticing people to come in and make use as much as possible of some of the materials which are to be found in our Island home.

We have a strange paradox in the arguments of the junior member for St. John's East when he criticizes the Government for building the Cement Plant which exported hundreds of thousands of tons of our materials and also decreasing importations from abroad; and at the same time

criticizes the Government because they failed to establish an oil-hardening plant in Harbour Grace. If there is one thing remarkable about the speeches of the Opposition, it is the consistency of their inconsistencies.

Having tried to do what we could, during the past four or five years, to broaden the basis of our economy, we at no time during that period neglected the basic factors on which we previously existed and which are now important to our livelihood.

The criticism has been made that we neglected agriculture during our five years of office. In 1949-50 we were confronted, shortly after our coming to Office, with the situation that large importations of potatoes were coming from Prince Edward Island. Immediately the Government took steps to have rigid inspection and grading, so that the local farmer was able not only to raise his crops, but to get clear of them. It is on the record that we were fairly successful at the time. There were various complaints reached us, showing, that the steps taken by us were taken cognizance of by those who had been selling us goods.

It is not my purpose to deal with any matter which relates to the department of Mines and Resources, but I would like to say, without infringing too much on the field of the Minister of that particular department, that it is common knowledge that during the past four or five years we have encouraged the raising of sheep, the clearing of land and a number of things in connection with farming.

Speaking of the department of which I happen to be in charge, our yearly requisitions of meats (to which the member for St. John's East re-

ferred), they amount to approximately 500,000 pounds a year in St. John's alone. The bulk of that is supplied by local farmers. Our requisitions on eggs alone, annually, for the Government institutions of St. John's, is somewhere between eighty and one hundred thousand dozen. Most of these are supplied by local poultrymen. Wherever possible, the Government's policy is to buy from local producers, not only the primary products but the manufactured products as well.

In spite of that, we are only too conscious of the fact that there are a number of things—difference in soil, for instance—of which we are ignorant. Hence the royal commission to go into these questions and give us the necessary means to formulate a policy, whereby agriculture will become more and more a basic factor in our livelihood.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the speech from the Throne refers to a commission on forestry. Every member of this House is conscious of the important part that forestry and forestry products play in our economy. We are aware that in all our industries, in dollars and cents, forestry products are the greatest contributors. Apart from the six hundred thousand tons of paper exported annually from our shores and which contributes so largely to our export trade, we have hundreds of thousands of cords of wood cut and consumed as fuel; hundreds of thousands of cords of lumber used for various purposes in fishery development—fishermen's flakes, fishermen's houses, and including boat building. On the other hand, we realize that the two paper companies have large areas of our forests, the control of which is lost to the Crown in per-

petuity, yet we also know there are many areas in this Province which are being denuded of the trees and wood which played so important a part in the livelihood of the people living in the area.

But, so great is the increase in the consumption of paper, people are now studying and experimenting with various kinds of substitutes in order that they may find something that will ease the complete usage of pulp in paper at the present time. But consumption is so rapid we need not fear that paper made of wood shall not be wanted. Because of the important part it plays in our economy, it was desirable to have a forestry commission to go into the situation and see if we are making the most of our resources and for the purpose of conservation, research, the expanding of forestry policy in holding on in perpetuity to an industry which we have, without any diminution.

Thirdly, we come to the fisheries. Again, one of the arguments advanced repeatedly by the Opposition at various times is the allegation that this government ever since 1949, has done very little for the fisheries. There was a very good reason in 1949 why we did not take all the money out of the kitty and put it into a fishery development programme. As long as I can recall either from personal experience or from reading, we have had problems in the fishing industry. Those problems have changed during the years. In 1914, 1915 and 1916, when I was fishing, we considered \$6.00 a quintal for No. 1 merchantable shore fish to be a good price. We considered \$1.00 per hogshead for salt to be as much as we should pay. Today, fishermen are paid \$12. At least that is what they should get—

twice what it was forty years ago; and they have to pay six times as much for a hogshead of salt. It would be an easy matter indeed to say that the cost of production is too high; the final returns to the fishermen too low. It would be equally simple to say "Let us subsidize the fishery." I have no intention of debating protection versus free trade. I would call to the attention of the House that subsidies create within themselves, very often, the germs of further taxation. We have only to look at the huge surpluses piled up in the United States and in Canada to some extent, during the past two years and note the loss which has been incurred on some of these surpluses, resulting in a decrease in trade operations; in some instances resulting in a curtailed flow of trade; in order to realize what danger there may lie in subsidizing even primary products.

To argue, on the other hand, as the Opposition has done, that nothing has been done for the fisheries during the past four or five years, is to state something which is definitely untrue, because right from the very beginning, most of the members on this side of the House whose representation is being made from fishery constituencies, were conscious of the fact always that something will have to be done for the fisheries. Not only would it benefit the constituents, but would determine largely the fortunes of themselves, if the time should come when they wanted re-election to this House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, a word; I did not quite understand the honourable member, but what I understood him to say was that the Opposition are guilty of untruth, or some remark that he made to that

effect. If that is correct I would like the honourable gentleman to retract his statement.

MR. HEFFERTON: If I said the wrong thing I take it back. Apart from the various things that have been done during the years under survey, we have to bear in mind that right from the very beginning we felt that it might be a good thing to draw off some of the people dependent solely on the salt codfish industry and bring them into other branches of the fishery. Therefore, during this period, sir, the government has been responsible for lending and making grants and helping and assisting certain firms engaged in the fish processing business of somewhere between seven and ten million dollars altogether. In addition, during that same period the government has done quite a bit of experimental fishing in different areas, in different places in order to ascertain the best time of year that might be required by the fishermen in order to make their living more productive and in various kinds of boats. Yes, the experiment with the herring fishery was carried on and like my colleague the honourable member for Fogo, I am not quite convinced that the herring fishery might not become far more important than it is at the present time. I am not going to give the whole history of the various attempts made during the years to try and help the fishermen but only a few months ago when the returns to the fishermen were based on a very low price per quintal, the government was instrumental in giving to the fishermen upwards of one million dollars in fishery payments in order to bolster up prices they received in marketing their product. I am not suggesting for a moment, I am not arguing or contending we

have done all we might have done for fisheries. But I do say that before venturing in, it was necessary for us to accumulate more information on the problems with us for centuries. One of the earliest steps was to set up a commission which after nearly two years gave us a report which has not yet been implemented in full, but which, because of the effort put forward by this government we now have the government of Newfoundland and the government of Canada collaborating to some extent at least in trying to bring in a better system that will yield more to the producers in the various stages of the fishing industry, whether that be in actual securing and catching, whether it be in the processing or the culling or finally in the marketing, the whole thing has been under review for a considerable time, and only now within the last few months have we been in a position to formulate a policy, which in our opinion will resound to the benefit and prosperity of the people whom we represent in this House, Mr. Speaker, that in many ways is the most significant of all that is contained in the Speech from the Throne. Those of us who have been in this House since 1949 will recall that annually at this time there was propounded on the floor of this House dire cries against the terms of union, how badly they have been bungled, how inefficient they are, and calls were repeatedly made for some attempt at revision. They were aware, as we all were, that written into the Terms of Union there was a proviso that within a certain number of years after union these terms would be open for at least consideration. More than half the time has gone, and before the presentation of our case we felt, and I think rightly and properly, that

we should start to prepare our case, and get a very fair idea of the things which happened to us since union with Canada, and thus give us a basis which we did not have in 1949 for trying to compare some of our services with those similar provinces on the Mainland. We are in a better position to assess the taxable capacity of our people. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the senior member for St. John's East referred to the social assessment, complained bitterly that we had placed a social assessment on our people and as a consequence the cost of living had gone up, not entirely because of the assessment but that it had been a considerable factor. Had we remained free or as we were prior to 1949 expenses would have gone up, but the income would not have been there to meet them, consequently we would have had to seek for more than a three per cent social security assessment. As I was saying, sir, half the time has gone, and some months ago we felt that it was necessary for us as a government to appoint a representative body in order to try and assess the position of Newfoundland since that union, to try and ascertain how far we have come up the hill during this period; to make comparisons with social services and public services in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for example, and see whether the terms granted us in 1949 were adequate to us during the years until the terms will come up for revision. I say that during the last four or five years the members of the Opposition have continuously remarked on the fact that the terms of union were inadequate, and yet they ignore entirely that item in the speech from the Throne which says that we are aiming to remedy, if a remedy is found to be desirable and necessary,

that which their predecessors year by year and session by session have been clamoring for.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think it is fair to say we ignored it entirely. I did make a reference to it while I was speaking—as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, every year in the House of Commons I have asked that consideration be given to that question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was the House of Commons—The honourable member as a Member of the House of Assembly merely mentioned it.

MR. HEFFERTON: I still think, Mr. Speaker, I was perfectly correct in my criticism—They laboured over quite a number of things, particularly happenings of the past, but they passed over almost completely any reference to what may be the most significant thing in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, it is very easy at any time to stand and criticise the sins of commission because as a rule they are open and can be inspected. But it is not so easy to make amends for the sins of omission except where there are glaring instances; where we felt that people have for some reason or other best known to themselves ignored in whole or in part the things which are a vital concern of the constituents who put them in office. I feel that the decision taken some months ago by the government to set up a Royal Commission in order to prepare for and present a case for the terms of union revision—That, I contend, Sir, is one of the important things that this speech contains—It shows that this government as a whole is conscious of the part which that presentation and that possible revision may have on the future economy

and upon the prosperity of our island home.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow.

On motion the debate on the Speech from the Throne was adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I should like to give notice of a question.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a Rule of the House that no question may be asked once the Orders of the Day have been entered upon, therefore, it has to be by leave of the House. Does the House give leave?

MR. SPEAKER: Since leave has been granted, the honourable member may give notice of his question.

MR. DROVER: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay on the table of the House the following information:

A table showing the total amount of money given or advanced to the International Grenfell Association in each year from 1949 to 1953 inclusive.

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the honourable Minister goes in to second reading I would like to rise on a question of privilege. Yesterday I raised the question that this might be a money bill, and stated that if so it should be proceeded with in a different fashion. Now, I feel that the Minister in charge of this Bill realizes that if it is a money Bill the correct procedure has not been followed and that very often there is difficulty in deciding whether a Bill

is a money Bill or not. So, I have been giving consideration to the question—in my opinion I believe that is a money Bill and should be proceeded with in the usual way in which money Bills are dealt with.

Our own rules are not very detailed with regard to money bills. Therefore, it has been necessary to have recourse to the rules that guide the House of Commons at Ottawa and in Great Britain. I think it will be admitted there are sufficient authorities on this subject. Our own rules seem to be confined to Standing Order No. 46—"If any motion be made in the House for public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint, and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereupon." Now, this is a Bill dealing with the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act. It is an amending act, and I believe introduces some new provisions. It may be a surprise to some members to know that we have an Income Tax Act on our statute books. We have this particular Corporation Income Tax Act 1949, and is collected I believe in co-operation with the Federal Government. Now, having examined the provisions of this section there seems to me to be very little doubt that certain of its provisions at any rate involve new charges upon those corporations concerned. That being so, it is a money Bill, and the Minister should have, or the Minister of Finance at least, should have brought in resolutions which should have been referred to committee in the same way as a supply Bill, or any other



ways and means Bill. I have the same argument to advance in regard to another Bill of which notice was given to be read here this afternoon. I would like you, Sir, to give ruling upon these questions. I agree with the manner in which the Attorney General yesterday seemed to depreciate my raising this suddenly, but I feel it is important for us to know whether we are going about the matter in the right way. It is an ancient privilege of the representatives of the people that no charges can be made upon them, no taxation can be laid upon them nor upon the public revenue, except by resolution brought in in the first place in committee. So, Sir, I spent a good deal of time in going through various provisions and comparing them with the present Act, and I find that there are at least two new provisions which involve new taxation upon our people. I will just refer to one briefly which refers to rebates. At the present time if a corporation is overcharged, and if by a decision of the judge of the Supreme Court it is finally determined, that tax payable is less than the amount assessed and collected, then there has been an overpayment for the taxation year. As the law stands at the present time the interest which the Government must pay on the amount they have received in overpayment is 2%. By this Bill the amount is increased to 6%. I know it seems only a small point, nevertheless it is a tax upon the people. Therefore, I suggest it should be proceeded with by way of resolutions. I think it will be admitted an Income Tax Act as in any case of such a nature it is almost sure to be one page 171—I don't know if Mr. Speaker has that set out very much more fully which should be raised by resolutions. Now, Sir, in "Beauchesne 2nd. edition,

in "Beauchesne, 3rd edition—this is the 2nd edition. Section 576 is where a money Bill is defined.

It seems to me this Bill could certainly come within that definition.

Now, there are some reservations made and these are set out very fully in "May," page 737, but as I read them through I could not see anything to correspond to the provisions in the Act here. In Beauchesne 3rd edition the details for each day during the progress from the resolutions stage up to the third reading are set out, but I would ask your ruling upon that question, Sir.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, before you give the ruling, I do think there are one or two points in connection with the point brought out by my learned friend, which I would like to refer for the consideration of Mr. Speaker. Of course, this question of money Bills is most interesting, but it is much less important now than it was when we had a legislative council. My honourable friend, of course, has just come from a place where they have a legislative council, and Beauchesne, of course, contemplates a parliament which has two houses. Now, we are not in that position. It will be remembered that up to 1911 when the Parliament Act was passed in Great Britain, and up to 1951, I think, it was when we passed our legislation act, (which by the way I had the pleasure of drafting) up to these days a money Bill was important they were brought into a House by way of resolutions, when they created a tax on the people, and when they provided for the expenditure of public money. But their powers decreased greatly in 1911 in Great Britain and in 1951 here, because on those dates money Bills be-

came second reading Bills, and consequently, I think the situation now is largely technical. I doubt very much if it would be wise for us as a House to adopt a motion to go beyond our own rules, which only provide that a Bill is a money Bill, when it makes calls on the exchequer or creates taxation on the people. Now, this is a simple act, Mr. Speaker, which does not create any new taxation. It is really almost in the nature of rules and regulations to be followed in the parent act. Although it does, as my learned friend has said, increase the rate of interest payable by a collecting organization to people who have overpaid that money, it is not payable by us. That money is payable by the Federal Government because it is the Federal Government which collects the tax, and the Federal Government who has to pay it back. There is no charge whatsoever on the exchequer of Newfoundland. So that I don't see the relevancy, which is the only one my learned friend raised, this payment of 6% instead of 2% which is not in any way a charge on our exchequer. It is not; it is a charge on the Federal Government paid by the Federal Government. So that, Mr. Speaker, my learned friend has not shown that it is a money Bill. Although technically your honour may feel that your honour has to hold that it is a money Bill, I may feel that Your Honour has to hold that it is a money Bill, I suggest Your Honour do so only after very careful consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given the matter some thought myself, although perhaps not so much study last night as the honourable member who has raised the point. I find that Beauchesne, page 163 quite clearly states that all Bills providing for payment

of salaries or any expenditure whatsoever out of public funds must be considered as resolutions. Further, in the same paragraph—whenever the main object of a Bill is payment of public money it must directly originate in Committee of the Whole. Further in the same paragraph I find quotations from a Parliamentary Act passed in the British House in 1911.—A Money Bill means a Public Bill which within the opinion of the Speaker of the House of Commons contains provisions dealing with all or any of the following situations, the imposition, repeal, revision, alteration or regulations of taxation. I do not see how this Bill proposes to do any of the above. With reference to "May": Page 703 gives tests used to determine when the expenditure involves a charge—there are, I see, pages of this relating to matters required—the question is: does this Bill contemplate any new and distinct exemptions payable to the exchequer? Does it contemplate any expenditure out of the exchequer? It does slightly, I suppose in that interest increase, but I am rather inclined to think the amount if any to come from the Exchequer of the Province of Newfoundland would be infinitesimal if anything at all. Machinery is already set up here to impose that expenditure, and I hardly see, although I appreciate the opinion offered by the honourable member, how I could rule that this is for that purpose a Money Bill, and I do so rule.

MR. CURTIS: That being, Mr. Speaker, your ruling, in view of the lateness of the hour, it is impossible that I now move the second reading. I therefore move that the second reading and all further Orders of the Day be deferred.

On motion this Order deferred.

On motion remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, April 2nd, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. BUTTON: I have here a Petition from the people of Green's Harbour asking that the road be repaired and extended. The road is in a horrible state and said road is essential to the community. This road also leads to blueberry grounds, which is a very important industry. On behalf of the people of Green's Harbour I ask that this Petition be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned. The Petition is signed by 115 voters and I may say that I support it wholeheartedly.

I have another Petition from White-way asking that electric lights be given them in the near future. It is signed by forty residents. In connection with this Petition re the lights, it is a matter I will take up later in the session. I ask that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the Department concerned.

Moved and seconded that these two Petitions be received and referred to the Departments concerned.

Carried.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney

General): I beg leave to table a Petition on behalf of the residents of Birchy Bay, Boyd's Cove and Port Albert asking to have the highway from Lewisporte to Loon Bay continued on as far as these settlements. The Petition points out the need for the road and they say that during the winter months it is almost impossible to get patients to the hospital at Twillingate and due to the absence of a road, they very often have to depend on Mercy Flights.

They also point out that a lot of the men are working at Bishop's Falls and Bolwood and some are engaged at work at Gander. There are no passenger boats. If a road were built, the men could get home, attend to their gardens, sell their crops to Lewisporte and through Lewisporte to the rest of the Island.

Thousands of people pass through these places, Mr. Speaker, I have given much thought to the matter during the past four years. I feel that if such a road were finished, we could do without the services of the coastal boats in that neighbourhood. I have been often naive enough to hope we might make a dicker with the C.N.R., whereby in exchange for a contribution towards finishing the road, we would release them of the services of the boats. I do not know if that is possible, but I have not given up hope of the possibility.

I would ask that this Petition be received and be referred to the Department to which it relates.

### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): I table the Third Annual Report of the Fish-

eries Development Loan Board as required by legislation under which these Boards function.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): I table Regulations made under the Mothers' Allowance Act, gazetted July 14, 1953.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

How much was spent by the Director of Tourist Development for travelling expenses during the past fiscal year. Give dates of trip, destination and cost of each trip.

#### Answers to Questions

No. 34.

MR. CURTIS: The answer is being prepared.

No. 35.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): The answer is being prepared.

No. 36.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): The answer is being prepared.

No. 37.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): The question is in three sections. In reply to the first, the answer is "none." There has been none, so none can be tabled.

The reply to (2) is the same—the same answer. Number (3) the answer is, under (a) none; under (b) none.

My meaning there is, some of the industries had, when the interest payments became due, paid the interest; not all of them, but some had; all who

were liable to pay, had paid; none were in arrears. Then the Government made a decision to make the period two years from the commencement of construction, during which time no interest would be paid. At the expiration of that time, they would pay interest. Those who had paid interest in the meanwhile, would be paid back what they had paid into the Treasury.

We found that what we were doing was collecting payments out of the funds we had advanced them. We were collecting interest out of the dollars we had loaned them. It was impractical; so we exempted them from interest payments on loans for a period of two years, commencing from the date on which construction began. If you assume it would take a year to get the plants constructed, they would have an additional year to get the plant going, get operations started, get some sales made and some cash back by way of returns for sales. Then they would begin to make payments. If my honourable friend insists on having the names under (b) those who did pay and who were paid back, we would be glad to give it.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to have it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The fourth part of the question—"How much money was spent on advertising, etc." I would refer that to the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply under which stationery and advertising come.

MR. BROWNE: In connection with (2), does my honourable friend mean that there was no correspondence concerning that matter with Mr. Chester Dawe or the Newfoundland Hardwoods?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There has been no correspondence. The negotiations were oral in nearly all instances. I would not swear there was not a letter saying "may we meet you?" But there was no discussion by written correspondence.

No. 38.

MR. POWER: The answer is being prepared.

No. 39.

MR. POWER: I think that should, more properly, be addressed to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. KEOUGH: The answer is being prepared on my part.

No. 40.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This question is under four headings. The answer to (a) is \$110,000.00. (b) He has paid back \$105,000.00 in cash, which has gone back to the Treasury. Another amount by cheque which will cover the complete amount of the loan—the (the difference between the amount of the loan and the amount paid back) was paid by cheque which is not yet cashed. (c) Yes, he has abandoned the scheme. Why? Because it has developed, it would be an impractical project, which I strongly suspected from the beginning, as the House is well aware. (d) (2) Financially? I do not know that he has any relationship whatever with the Government, beyond the fact that that uncashed cheque is in the possession of the Department of Economic Development. When that is cashed, it will put an end to all further financial relationships between Dr. Sennewald and the Government.

(1) Contractually? I do not know if there is any, unless it be between him and the Department of Health

under which he is serving in the General Hospital in order to qualify to be a registered Medical Practitioner on the rolls of Newfoundland and Canada to be able to practise his profession. I do not know if there is a contract or whether it is a case of straightforward employment for a year.

The Minister of Health nods his head, so it is just for a year. I believe he is under no contractual relationship to the Government.

No. 41.

MR. POWER: I referred that to the Minister of Public Works.

No. 42.

MR. SPENCER: I have some information in connection with that question and I propose to give it to the House orally.

1. The answer is, it is being operated by Mr. Joseph Hampton. There are no specific arrangements with the Department with the exception that in the early stages of completing the Trans-Canada Highway up both sides of the Exploits River, I was approached by the people in the area asking that we endeavour to have a ferry of some kind placed on the River while we were waiting for steel, (which was the drawback at that time). to begin construction of the bridge.

Following that request, I happened to meet this gentleman named Hampton from Bishop's Falls. I suggested to him that there was need of a suitable ferry; asked him if he would be interested, and if so we would be glad to co-operate with him. I asked him to look into the matter. He did look into the matter and found at Botwood (I recommended that) there was a scow that I had been associated with the building of, in the early days of the Newfoundland bases and which be-

longed to the Imperial Oil. They agreed to loan us the scow temporarily. That was done until the Imperial Oil decided they would sell that piece of equipment; and so they did and sent a bill to me in the Department of Public Works, which I forwarded to Mr. Hampton and he paid. The scow in question was 96 tons. The owner set himself to work and put in shape this floating stage or ferry. It is operated on the Exploits River and has been enlarged from the original arrangement to take three vehicles. The matter is a private one, owned by Hampton and operated by him.

(2) The answer is "No, there has been no money paid."

(3) The answer is "No, there has been no moneys paid the Government."

(4) Inasmuch as it is a private venture, the question should be directed to the operator.

(5) That is obviously answered in (2) and (3).

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health: Answer to question No. 43: Total payments to International Grenfell Association from Provincial and Federal Health Grants over the period 1949 to 1953 inclusive, \$830,819.77.

Payments by Province						TOTAL
	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	
T.B. Grants	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	15,000.00	45,000.00	
Gen'l Grants	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00	75,000.00	
102805	—	—	29,942.00	7,500.00	13,000.00	
Nurse	—	—	—	900.00	1,800.00	
Capital	—	—	—	175,000.00	181,000.00	
	55,000.00	55,000.00	84,942.00	238,400.00	315,800.00	749,142.00
Payments From Federal Health Grants						
	1949-50	1950-51	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	
Grants	11,690.00	11,690.00	11,690.00	8,767.50	353.50	
Equipment	—	13,247.46	—	23,465.35	773.96	
	11,690.00	24,937.46	11,690.00	32,232.85	1,127.46	81,677.77
						\$830,819.77

No. 28.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): I hope to have the answers on Monday.

No. 32.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could, from memory, answer most of the question—not all of it. Perhaps my honourable friend would prefer to wait until I have prepared the answer.

No. 33.

MR. POWER: (a) No payments have been made to Mr. James C.

Thompson since 1/4/49 but the following amounts have been paid to the firm of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co. in respect of services rendered to the Newfoundland Government by Mr. Thompson in connection with the revision of the Accounting system and financial advice.

1949-50	\$4,419.85
1950-51	1,544.83
1951-52	2,133.49
1952-53	4,261.32
1953-54	1,414.63



(b), (c), (d), and (e) : These questions should be referred to the Honourable the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD : (b) Mr. Thompson is not Chairman of the Commission. He is not even a member of the Commission.

(c) That is answered in the answer to (b).

(d) The members are : Hon. P. J. Lewis, Q.C.; Mr. P. Gruchy; Senator Pratt; A. B. Perlin and Gerald S. Doyle, O.B.E. They receive no salaries or recompense for their services in any shape or form.

I may say that we almost insisted that they receive payment and most of them, nearly all, were just as adamant that they should not receive recompense. I may say that the Government felt very strongly that the Chairman of the Commission, upon

whom the burden, to a large extent falls perhaps more than it does upon the shoulders of the other members of the Commission, ought to be paid. We may ask the House to change the law; not that he has asked for it. We have asked him to devote virtually all of his time to this important piece of work for Newfoundland. To do this he has had to abandon his own work as a practising Barrister and Solicitor in Newfoundland. But, more of that, if and when we ask the House to deal with the matter.

And the final part—(e) "Who is the Secretary—" The Secretary is Mr. Douglas Hunt, I.L.B., who receives a salary of \$6,000.00 a year.

MR. SPEAKER : Any answers to other questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD : Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 21—Tabled—

#### QUESTION 21 (Mr. Fogwill)

##### I. Composition of 1953/54 Revenue

	1953/54 Revenue		Due Date When Estimates Prepared
	Amount	Interest Rate	
Canadian Machine Industry .....	\$100,000	4	30 days; 31 Dec.
United Cotton .....	6,880	4	"
Atlantic Hardboards .....	12,555	4½	"
Newfoundland Tanneries .....	16,000	4 5/6	"
Atlantic Optical .....	1,200	4	"
Superior Rubber .....	11,500	5	"
Hanning Electric .....	2,912	5	"
Newfoundland Asbestos .....	12,500	5	1 October
Canadian Machinery Holding Trust ..	140,718	4¾	5 Jan.; 5 July
Atlantic Films .....	2,500	5	23 Jan.
	<hr/> \$306,765		
Interest on further advances (arbitrary)	20,035	4	
	<hr/> 326,800		

##### II. Subhead 1953 :

2. Dr. Valdmanis.

(a) Salary: From 27/5/50 to 31/12/52: \$55,927.32.

(b) Travelling and living allowances, same period, \$16,749.84.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table replies to Question No. 13 on the Order Paper of March 30th, and Question No. 25 on the Order Paper of March 31st.

QUESTION 13 (1) (Mr. Hollett).

How much money has been loaned to help fishermen to finance new and better methods, new and better boats and gear, by the Fisheries Development Loan Board since its inception? Give names of individual fishermen, address and amount of loans in each case.

Answer:		
Name	Address	Amount
Arthur Osmond and Wilson Osmond	Margaree, Nfld.	1,087.50
Walter Sheppard and Frank Sheppard	Badger's Quay, B.B.	4,850.00
William John Vater	Frenchman's Cove, Nfld.	6,000.00
Michael James Croke, Thomas Croke and Joseph Croke	St. Brendan's, B.B.	3,500.00
Felix James Johnston	St. Bernard's, F.B.	2,585.00
Peter Billard	Margaree, Nfld.	937.00
Levi Whitefield Davis and Edward Augustus Davis	Pound Cove, B.B.	12,000.00
Stanley Harding Shears	Rocky Harbour, Bonne Bay	7,200.00
Field Parnell Bursey	St. John's, Nfld.	6,000.00
Jeremiah Tobin	Daniel's Point, Trepassey	850.00
James Furlong	Plate Cove West, B.B.	1,350.00
Malcolm Rogers, Garfield Rogers and Reginald Rogers	Fair Island, B.B.	4,400.00
Maxwell Clyde King	Burnt Islands, Nfld.	1,350.00
Stanislaus Farrell and Edward Farrell	Little Bay Marystown	2,635.00
Harvey Frampton	Indian Island, Fogo Dist.	1,275.00
George Howell	Wesleyville, B.B.	2,492.00
Dorman Regular	Northern Arm South, Botwood	1,106.00
Lawrence O'Brien	Lower Coast, Trepassey	600.00
William Minty Morry	Ferryland, Nfld.	5,700.00
Eli Russell Tucker	St. Jones Within, T.B.	1,040.44
Ronald Sturge	Wesleyville, B.B.	4,000.00
Victor Manuel Fiander	Coomb's Cove, F.B.	10,000.00
Felix James Johnston	St. Bernard's, F.B.	4,285.00
Michael Joseph Burke	Long Harbour, P.B.	4,875.00
Allan Vincent, Raymond Vincent and Bramwell Vincent	Newtown, B.B.	6,843.00
Chesley James Price	Grand Bank, Nfld.	5,745.00
William Street	Bonavista, B.B.	4,700.000

John Kean	St. Brendan's, B.B.	13,500.00
James Kicks Ellsworth	Carmanville, B.B.	3,063.00
Michael Richard Power	Portugal Cove South, Trepassey	9,676.00
William Charley Hancock and Victor Hancock	St. John's, Nfld. and Brooklyn, B.B.	5,000.00
James Furlong	Plate Cove West, B.B.	1,125.00
Wilson Evans	English Hr. West, F.B.	15,185.00
Samuel Bragg Barbour	Safe Harbour, B.B.	2,989.00
Ralph John Lester Burton	Port Anson, C.B.	3,000.00
Lawrence Cullen Spurrell, Herbert Weston Spurrell, Eric Wilson Spurrell, Noah John Spurrell and Esau Llewellyn Spurrell	Valleyfield, B.B.	6,000.00
Russell Warren Decker	St. John's, Nfld.	6,000.00
Leo Coombs	Portugal Cove South, Trepassey	710.00
Charles Joseph Cheeseman, Joseph Richard Cheeseman	Rushoon, P. B.	3,780.00
Howard Patten Lake	Fortune, F.B.	12,951.75
Reginald Buffett	Fortune, F.B.	26,700.00
TOTAL		\$218,865.69

Question (2): What is the exact amount of money which has thus far been placed at the disposal of this Loan Board, for said purposes by the Government?

Answer: \$500,017.00.

Question (3): How much money has been loaned by the Co-operative Loan Board since its formation? Give names of individuals or societies to whom money has been loaned in each case, the amount of the Loan, as well as the date of same.

Answer: The Co-operative Loan Board has loaned \$28,000 since its formation. Loans were made to the Corner Brook Consumers' Co-operative Society Ltd. and the Hodge's Cove Consumers' Co-operative Society Ltd., in the respective amounts of \$25,000 and \$3,000.

The loan to the Corner Brook Consumers' Co-operative Society Ltd. was made in 1951 while the loan to Hodge's Cove Consumers' Co-operative Ltd., was made in September, 1953.

Question (4): How much money has thus far been placed at the disposal of this Board, and what is the present status financially of each society to whom money was loaned relative to its association with the Loan Board?

Answer: \$100,000 was placed at the disposal of the Co-operative Loan Board.

The financial position of a society is the business of the society and the Government is not free to divulge such information.

Question (5): How much money was loaned by each of these Loan

Boards since March 31st, 1953?

Answer:

Co-operative Loan Board .. \$28,000.00

Fisheries Loan Board ..... 273,365.69

Question 25 (a) (Mr. Hollett): Give the names of the recently appointed Fishery Development Authority.

Answer: Information will be made available when the Bill (An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority) is introduced to the Legislature.

Question (b): State the amount of Salaries being paid to (a) the Chairman, (b) the Members of the said Authority or Committee, and state what if any contract has been entered into with these individuals by the Government. Table copies of said contract or agreement.

Answer: Same as (a).

Question (3): State in detail the exact duties of this Fishery Development Authority and state under what section of the Consolidated Statutes said Fishery Authority is set up.

Answer: Same as (a) and (b).

Question (4): Give the Dimensions of the 23 ft. boat recently purchased in Europe by said Authority. From whom was this boat purchased, at what price and on whose recommendation?

Answer: Length 22' 6", width 7' 6", depth 3' 3"; Hundested Motorfabrik Denmark; £3,010 f.o.b.; the boat was purchased on the recommendation of the officers of the Vessel Construction and Inspection Division of the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives.

Question (5): Table an account showing the following particulars of

(a) the Charlotte I (b) the Matthew; (1) the original purchase or building cost, (2) the cost of machinery as installed in said boats, (3) the running expenses during the period said boats were in possession of the Government, (4) the total earnings of said boats and (5) the amounts received on the sale of each boat. Table complete account of each of these boats as it exists at the Department of Fisheries.

Answer (a): (1), (2), and (5)—The Charlotte I cost \$22,000 inclusive of machinery installed and was sold by tender in 1951-52 for \$7,500 to Mr. Clyde Hollett of Burin and Halifax.

(a): (3) and (4)—The Charlotte I was not operated by the Government and the expenses and information on the earnings are the private property of the firms which operated the vessel under bare hull charter.

(b): (1) and (2) the building and cost of machinery and equipment of the Matthew II is \$36,683.

(a) and (b): (3) and (4)—It is not in the public interest that details sought be made public as such information could be construed as the actual cost of such vessels in full scale commercial fishing operations which would convey an entirely erroneous impression of the practicability of commercial operations with such vessels and methods of fishing. The Matthew II was constructed and equipped as a new type of vessel for multiple fishing operations—the first of its kind in Canada—and to be used for the purpose of experimental fishing, the training of prospective owners and crew members of such vessels. The Government's action in building and operating the Matthew II for Danish seining, introduced for the first time in Newfoundland waters

resulted, in the discovery of an abundant fishing species not prosecuted in Fortune Bay and other areas on the south coast of Newfoundland. The success of the Matthew II in proving the operations of Danish seining for red fish, flounder and gray sole as a practical commercial undertaking has resulted in a number of vessels being built or converted and equipped for Danish seining. Several vessels have been built along lines of the Matthew II and others are at present under construction. The Matthew II was chartered to Messrs. Hollett and Sons and Company Limited of Burin for commercial fishing in 1952. Experimental fishing is acknowledged to be a function of the Government of Canada carried out through the Department of Fisheries and the Fisheries Research Board. In 1953 the Matthew II was chartered to the Government of Canada for experimental fishing.

Having performed the function for which the vessel was built, viz.: to establish and prove the operations of a modern vessel equipped for multiple fishing in Newfoundland waters, the Government have decided to offer the Matthew II for sale by tender for commercial fishing. The responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland in respect of the demonstration of commercial fishing with new types of gear and equipment is a matter of policy which is being developed at the present time and will be carried out in future under the direction of the Fisheries Development Authority.

Question (6): On whose authority was each of these boats built or purchased and on whose recommendation? On whose recommendation were they ordered sold?

Answer: The Charlotte I was purchased on the authority of the Govern-

ment of Newfoundland. The vessel was offered for sale by tender by the decision of the Government on my recommendation. The Matthew II was built by authority of the Government on my recommendation and is to be offered for sale by tender.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the answer to Question No. 19 on the Order Paper of March 30th.

1. Question: The total amount spent on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) Since April 1st, 1949; (b) In each fiscal year since 1949, how much of this amount was expended (1) by the Federal Government, (2) by the Provincial Government?

Answer: (a) 7,247,830.

(b) (1): 1949-50—Nil; 1950-51—957,844; 1951-52—998,670; 1952-53—527,345; 1953-54—945,003.

(2): 1949-50—208,675; 1950-51—1,376,832; 1951-52—1,059,492; 1952-53—463,679; 1953-54—710,290.

2. Question: Give (a) the total number of men employed last year on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland and (b) the total moneys spent in wages.

Answer: All work on Trans-Canada Highway is carried out under contracts. Payments to contractors are made on the basis of units of work performed. Records are not kept in the department of the number of men employed by the contractors or the moneys paid in wages.

3. Question: Give the total mileage of new road construction on the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland (a) since April 1st, 1949; (b) in each fiscal year since April 1st, 1949.

Answer: (a) 120 miles of road have been rough graded.

(b) 1949-50	4.5 miles
1950-51	49.2 miles
1951-52	29.1 miles
1952-53	12.4 miles
1953-54	24.8 miles

4. Question: How many miles of road remain to be constructed, and the number of bridges together with approximate of costs apart from paving?

Answer: 480 miles. As the final route of Trans-Canada Highway has not yet been decided, it is impossible to give the exact number of bridges, but the approximate number is 40. Approximate cost, including bridges, \$33,000,000.00 apart from paving.

5. Question: How many miles of secondary roads were constructed during the past fiscal year and where located? Give the cost and the names of the contractors or builders.

Answer: 90.5 miles at the following locations:

Cape Island to North Cape.  
Roads on New World Island.  
Random Island Road  
Port aux Basques—Isle au Mort.  
Allans Lane Curling—Trans-Canada Highway.  
O'Donnells—Admirals Beach.  
St. Anthony—Cooks Harbour.  
Bunyans Cove—Musgravetown.  
Extension Road North Harbour, Placentia Bay.  
Buchans—Badger Road.  
Rocky Harbour—St. Pauls.  
Lumsden—Musgrave Harbour  
Kings Point to Indian Brook.  
Rock Harbour Spanish Room.  
Meadows—Irishtown.  
Cook's Brook—Frenchmans Cove.  
Phillips Head—Port au Bay.  
Bobbys Cove—Paradise.

Road to Wharf at Seldom.  
Fredericton—Carmenville.  
Roaches Line—Mahers.  
Epworth—Corbin.  
Terrenceville Road to Parkers Cove.  
Halls Bay to Roberts Arm.  
Cannings Cove—Musgravetown.  
Port au Mal—Lewis Brook.  
Queens Cove—Southport.  
Bay L'Argent—St. Bernards.  
Wild Bight—Little Bay.

Most of these roads were constructed by Departmental forces. The others were done by—J. Goodyear & Sons, Ltd., Western Construction Co., Ltd., and W. J. Lundrigan, Ltd.

6. Question: How much money was spent on repairs to secondary roads during the past fiscal year?

Answer: \$2,100,000.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the first amount under (b) 1—in the question is the amount contributed by the Federal Government towards the expenditure on the Trans-Canada Highway and (b) 2—is the amount spent by the Provincial Government.

No. 2: The answer there may be somewhat disappointing for my honourable friend who has requested the information—All work on the Trans-Canada Highway is carried out by contract and, of course, we do not know the number of men employed. All we know is the contract price that we pay to the contractors. Incidentally, I might add that that as a rule is paid on a unit basis. My honourable friend the member for St. John's West will understand what I mean when I say that is so much per cubic yard as he has had some engineering training. In fact the House may have some slight interest in knowing the honourable member and I worked



together for a while in the engineering business, we are still pals, but not in engineering nor in politics, as the Honourable Premier has reminded me. So that prices then paid to contractors are on a unit basis, so much per cubic yard.

No. 5: This particular question will be of interest generally to people around the Island and I am grateful to the honourable member for asking it so that the public may know. As a rule the department responsible for this work does not exactly go out flag waving and telling people to look at what we have done here and look at what we have done there, so that I am glad to have the opportunity to give the public a report of the work accomplished during the period about which the question is asked.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I wonder if you would bear with me a moment while I draw to Your Honour's attention and through Your Honour this House's attention to an editorial comment in tonight's edition of the "Evening Telegram" on the matter about which I spoke at the opening of the House yesterday, I would have done so at the opening of the present sitting had I had a copy of the "Evening Telegram" at that moment.

The House will remember that I drew attention yesterday to an editorial appearing in yesterday's edition of the "Evening Telegram" which seemed to me constituted an attack upon Mr. Speaker. The House will be aware that the remarks I made arose out of a discussion in this House before strangers were admitted; the House will be aware that I spoke as Leader of the House and that I spoke for all members of the House on both

sides, and that I particularly said so in my remarks at the opening of the public part of the sitting of yesterday. My remarks were directed solely to one paragraph of the editorial in question, and that was the paragraph dealing with Mr. Speaker's ruling, not dealing with members of the Government, not dealing with anything other than Mr. Speaker's ruling—it was a paragraph which was completely in error, it was a mistatement. Now, I don't think it was a lie, I don't think think it was meant to deceive, but it had to deceive anyone who did not know the difference, nevertheless, it was an unintentional deception, it was not intentionally done, or I don't think it was—I am quite certain it was not. Nevertheless, to one who did not know the difference it was deceiving because what it said was that Your Honour's ruling was given to prevent all probing—now, obviously it was given for no such purpose. In tonight's edition of the same newspaper, again editorially, it refers to the whole matter in the following words:

#### Impartiality of the Chair

The Evening Telegram sincerely hopes that no one other than Premier Smallwood read into yesterday's editorial entitled "Liberal Liquor Law" a meaning which certainly was not intended. This paper never has challenged a ruling of the Chair, and never proposes to do so. The editorial in question was directed at Government policy and the dabblings of Liberal Party members in various phases of the liquor business. It mentioned Mr. Speaker's ruling without commenting on it in any way. Even to say that we agree with the Speaker's ruling would be improper, since to agree would imply the pos-

sibility of disagreement. The ruling stands, it was made at great length and covered many important points of procedure concerning the asking of questions, and the banning of questions about members' dabblings in the liquor trade was just one of those points. One of the effects of that ruling was to suppress, at least for the time being, information that might have been useful to the Opposition. Surely to point out that fact, in the course of general criticism of the Government's liquor policy, is not to accuse the Speaker of being partisan, or of yielding to Government pressure for censorship?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have these two comments: First—"The Telegram" sincerely hopes—in answer to that I think all members of this House read into the editorial exactly what I read into it, and indeed it was Your Honour whom I was defending, and indeed Your Honour first drew the attention of the House to the editorial in question, and I stood here as a representative of the House, as Leader of the People's House and not as Leader of the Liberal Party, I stood here as the defender of Mr. Speaker, and I acted, therefore, as spokesman of the whole House on both sides, and I specifically said so. I was not the only one who read the meaning into yesterday's Telegram Editorial. Now, the second sentence is this: "Referring to this editorial in question it mentioned Mr. Speaker's ruling without commenting on it in any way." It is agreed, that is true, the Evening Telegram in its editorial did not comment on Mr. Speaker's ruling. It did much worse, it misreported Mr. Speaker's ruling because here is what it said, and this is what I quoted bad grammar and all: "However, Mr. Speaker, has ruled that any probing about the

ownership of taverns, licensed clubs and liquor agencies where the question effected individual members of the legislature are taboo." That is the paragraph to which I took exception on behalf of this House, and on behalf of His Honour the Speaker. The paragraph did worse than comment on Mr. Speaker's ruling, it misrepresented Mr. Speaker's ruling, and that is to bring Mr. Speaker's ruling into the worst kind of contempt. Far better if it had been an honest disagreement with Mr. Speaker's ruling than to do what the paper did—misrepresent, misstate it. Therefore, all who read that editorial and who did not know the difference believes that Mr. Speaker must be an autocrat, a tyrant who wishes to practise press censorship, and censorship of the Opposition as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, again I shall not introduce a motion of censure of the paper in question. Whether the paper in question is believed or not is beside the point. Censor by the People's House for a newspaper is not to be lightly disregarded or lightly dismissed, but I shall not do it because I still believe that although the editorials of yesterday and today must have been written by two entirely different persons, one illiterate and the other literate, both, I believe, misinformed and both subject to honest misinterpretation, therefore, I shall not move this House condemn them.

MR. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege—

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition may be heard.

MR. HOLLETT: We, of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, agree entirely

that the Speaker's ruling, as far as we are concerned at any rate, we dare not question it. As a matter of fact here is a case in point where we refuse to be inveigled into questioning your ruling, Sir, and never shall we question your rulings as long as Your Honour has the privilege and the honour to sit in that Chair. But the point which I wish to make, apart from that which is the most important point, is that I fear we cannot go along with the Leader of the Government on all the remarks which he has made relative to the editorial in question. I, for one, do not agree with him, Sir, that the editorial in the "Evening Telegram" of yesterday in any way misrepresented the ruling of Your Honour, the Speaker, and in that connection, therefore, we cannot agree with the Leader of the House. We would be the first, along with the Honourable the Premier, to resent any such interference with Your Honour's ruling be it the "Telegram" the "News" or "Sunday Herald" or any other paper or any radio station. We must have law, we must have authority. We, like little children, from day to day must obey the Chair—even though the Speaker may rule on something we do not all personally agree with, we have to abide by it. But, Sir, I must stand here on this side of the House and say I do not agree with the Leader of the Government when he makes the remarks he has made relative to the editorial in question. I don't want to go into any argument now, but I think I would convey to you ample reasons to show why I and the Opposition do not agree with all the remarks of the Honourable the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't understand, Sir, why the honourable gentleman did not say so yesterday

when I represented myself as speaking for the whole House and when I said what I did. He agreed yesterday by silence, but does not agree today.

MR. HOLLETT: In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, if I may, we were not given an opportunity to reply to that yesterday. The only thing that we did agree that he said was that both the Opposition and the Government agreed that the Speaker's ruling should not be questioned by the press—we agreed with that entirely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think yesterday the honourable gentleman had exactly the same opportunity to comment as he has today. The fact that he sat silent when I said I spoke for the whole House, I think, indicates that as of yesterday I spoke for the whole House, but that as of today, from what he has said, I do not speak for the Opposition in that matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no useful purpose in prolonging this slightly out of order debate. I consider the incident to be closed—proceed with the Orders of the Day.

#### Orders of the Day

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I wish to join with the other speakers on this side of the House in congratulating, or at least join with their congratulations on the able manner in which the honourable members moved and seconded the motion. Certainly we agree with them in the expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. We of the Opposition, Sir, represent the New-

foundland people as does the Government, and I can say for ourselves and for the Government that loyalty is treasured. Newfoundlanders, wherever they may be, are loyal to the Crown as something which is always and ever present with them.

I would like, Sir, to join with the Honourable the Premier in some of the remarks which he made yesterday on the sudden decease of Senator Jones of Prince Edward Island, a former Premier of that Province. Certainly we agree with the Honourable the Premier in expressing to his relatives our condolence and also to the people of Prince Edward Island and of Canada as a whole. We are reminded, Sir, by the sudden demise of the honourable Senator that we are all mortal, even though we may perhaps, like the Premier himself, be sometime or other elevated to the august seat of Senator. We ought, therefore, to be reminded that when we do get to the Senate, whether it be six months from now or a year from now, that even there the hand of fate may reach out and take a grab at us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne—to be honest, Sir, when I received it the other day, and took it home, and went through it, I searched from “A” to “Z,” from one end to the other to find out just what might be the policy of the Government, just what we might have to debate in this address in reply. To be honest, Sir, there was very little that I could find there—but lo and behold! in the morning when we received our morning paper I discovered what the speech was all about. The editorial in the “Daily News” has this to say: “From time immemorial it has been the custom of the members of the Opposition in speaking to the

debate on the Address to refer to the Speech from the Throne as being much more notable for what it does not contain than for what is actually in it.

“The criticism has become trite from excessive use but many a thing that is trite is also true. And, of course, it is true in this case for a very good reason. The Speech from the Throne is principally designed to provide a formal basis for a general policy debate and does not necessarily represent a detailed prospectus of policy and legislation for the session it opens.

“There is in the Speech read at the opening of the present session the assurance that much expected legislation, some of it of great length and complexity, will be brought down for passage at the present session. This will include the revised Election Act and the first Redistribution Bill since 1928.

“The Election Act will require a great deal of patient study in Committee of the Whole and it is a pity that there is not machinery for the submission of legislation of the kind to an all-party committee of the House for detailed examination before it is the subject of debate. The 1913 Act is cumbersome and creaks with antiquity. The new Act will provide for much more efficient counting of votes but must make sure that no safeguard necessary to the protection of the voter and the parliamentary election system is omitted.

“A major piece of legislation will be concerned with the creation of the Fishery Development Authority and this will provide an opportunity for a comprehensive survey of fishery policy. It is a pity in this connection

that the same wide range of first hand knowledge of every phase of the fishing industry that was once represented in legislature is not to be found today. In former times when fish was of paramount importance, exporters, suppliers, skippers and producers were usually included in the membership of the House. But it may be expected that all members will endeavour to saturate themselves with information on all aspects of the modern fishery in preparation for this important debate.

"No reference to the industrial development policy of the past few years or to the activities of Nalco and Brinco are contained in the Speech although they will naturally be the subject of exhaustive exploration by the Opposition. It is here and in the sphere of finance that the Conservatives will undoubtedly see their best opportunity to carry on a frontal assault upon the Government.

"The question of road policy has not been mentioned in the Speech but it has long been hinted that a major expansion of the local road system was under consideration and that the Government was preparing to raise a substantial loan for local road and highway construction.

"These and other matters to come before the House promise to make this one of the most interesting and significant sessions since Confederation."

That same Editor has told us, time and again, how inept we are and how inexperienced we are. And, I am sure that a man of his years (and I am not making caustic criticism) — would be a good judge as to whether we are inexperienced or whether we are not.

However, having found out that that was a basis of general policy, I decided I would try to get a few remarks together relative to that. I could not find very much in the Speech. I did see that the fisheries programme was recommended; that there was to be a Commission on Agriculture and a Commission on Forestry, also a Commission to prepare Newfoundland's case in the review of the Terms of Union. Then I began to remember that all that had been done months ago; Orders in Council have been passed and they are paying salaries on these accounts in a good many instances.

Now, the "Advertiser" from Grand Falls read something into the Speech — "Provincial Legislature Opens" — "Loan Bill" — "Rural Electrification" — "Among the items of business is the new Provincial Loan." That is correct, I take it. I cannot find it. These are things which, apparently, the "Advertiser" in Grand Falls knows all about. We have not been told; and study it as I may, I can find nothing. I am surprised the Leader of the Government did not refer to them. "Redistribution Bill," and it goes on to tell all about that. Evidently these two papers have been contacted by the Government and have been told what their intentions are. It looks to me that the Editors of both these papers are in close contact with the "Powers that be" on the opposite side of the House.

Paragraph 2 of the Speech from the Throne states: "In conformity with my Government's policy of encouraging the development of the natural resources of the Province, and in keeping with my Speech to you of about a year ago, my Government have procured the appointment of a Royal Commission on Agriculture."

"In conformity with my Government's policy—" I do not know what time the policy was mooted. I might find it in the records.

"Distinguished men have accepted appointment to this Commission and several specialists in particular aspects of agriculture have been brought to Newfoundland to assist the Commissioners. Members and officials of the Commission on Agriculture have travelled widely throughout Newfoundland and have devoted themselves industriously to the task of investigating all the problems of agriculture in this Province. My Ministers look forward eagerly to the receipt of the report and recommendations of the Commission, for they hope that these recommendations will form the basis of a firm and practical policy for the more rapid upbuilding of agriculture in all its branches."

Then the next paragraph "The Royal Commission on Forestry has more recently been appointed, and again my Ministers have been fortunate in securing the services of men who are noted for their experience and ability in this field. My Ministers hope that from the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry there will emerge a clear and practical forestry policy—"

Then we come on "My Ministers fervently hope that their belief that agriculture could support many times the present number will be well borne out by the report and recommendations of the Commission. Agriculture, forestry and fisheries (to which I shall refer at greater length in a moment) together support the great majority of our population. While I believe that all will welcome other industries, and other sources of income for our people, I believe also

that there will be general agreement that the long-run prosperity of Newfoundland depends mainly upon the continued expansion of her fisheries, forest industries and agriculture."

That decision, although it comes rather late in the, shall I say, surplus era, is welcome in the Speech from the Throne. But, I would remind the House that I have seen it in practically every Speech from the Throne since 1949.

I would say we might very well call this "the Hope Speech." There have been various publications—"Newfoundland Is On The March," and so on—why not put this in as "The Hope Speech?" And, I hope it is not the last Speech of the present administration; although there are rumours very persistent, which I will not hope about at the moment.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): What a hope!

MR. HOLLETT: Something I have said has tickled the palates of the members on the opposite side?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, your fond hope that this Government will soon be handing over to them. That is amusing.

MR. HOLLETT: I should say so; but not if you remember that the Premier told me the other day that I would not be long in Opposition. He surely must have meant that I would be on the other side of the House and he would be in the Senate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On no side of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely you would not turn a man out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The people will.



MR. SPEAKER: I must break up this private conversation, interesting as it might be. I fail to see how it could amuse the constituents of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: I will give the Government something to laugh about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will be a change.

MR. HOLLETT: I apologize if I break the Rules of the House; but I am quick on the trigger.

Before I go on, I want to refer to—(you have to have a line of thought, marking posts along the way)—I was going to say that this Government came into power in 1949. They slipped in accidentally again in 1951.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some accident!

MR. HOLLETT: They were, you will remember, heirs to a fortune. They had no National Debt. The previous Government had some one hundred and seven million dollars National Debt. They had no Post Office or Telegraph Offices, no Customs, no Railway, the Hotel was taken off their hands. They had no Gander Airport, no Defence, no services for the protection and encouragement of fisheries; no lighthouse, no fog alarms, buoys or beacons. They had none of that. What did they have? They had forty-six million dollars dry cash—cash which they could spend; up to two-thirds of it. They had the Federal Government pouring twenty million dollars a year into the Treasury. Heirs to a fortune! None of the huge expenses of previous Governments; a till full of cash, and the Federal Government pouring in the money, without any effort on the part of the Government to collect it from the people.

In years gone by it had to be collected from people who were impoverished by taxation placed upon them, not only by Liberal Governments but by Tory Governments as well. They had to do these things. But here you had a bunch of men—twenty-eight or thirty—with not one worry; a rich country, in my opinion. But, I would like to quote you from "Wayfarer" of February 16th, 1953—a year ago. I say, if you get men of that standard believing these things, then God help our country. "If the Commission of Government had possessed—"

MR. COURAGE: I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to embarrass the Leader of the Opposition, but this is the third time he has referred to newspapers by reading extracts. He is now about to give the opinions of "Wayfarer" and we may all be forced to debate the opinion of "Wayfarer." The House is not concerned with the opinion of "Wayfarer" or anyone else concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except when a newspaper deals with the proceedings of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may speak to the Point of Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A newspaper may be quoted in this House, very properly, when in its columns it deals with proceedings of the House. Then it is proper.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member wish to speak by way of explanation?

MR. HOLLETT: If I am able to table the newspaper, it is all right. But I am reminded that no later than yesterday afternoon the Honourable the Premier quoted from a newspaper.

MR. BROWNE: May I remind the honourable member who raised the point of order, the right to quote from newspapers is contained in Pages 39 and 40 of the Rules of Procedure.

There are several exceptions which I think would be proper to quote:

"Quoting from Newspapers, Documents, etc.

It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they:

(a) Refer to other debates during the same session or to any question not before the House.

(b) Reflect upon any proceedings or any determination of the House.

(c) Contain unparliamentary words, as no language can be heard in quotation if it would be disorderly if spoken.

(d) Refer to, comment on, or deny anything said by a member.

(e) Contain treasonable or seditious words or use the Queen's name irreverently.

(f) Refer to matters pending a judicial decision.

(g) Reflect upon the conduct of persons in authority.

(h) Contain personal allusions derogatory to members.

A member may read extracts from books, etc. provided in so doing he does not infringe upon any point of order."

It would seem therefore, that unless he offends against some of these provisions, he is in order in quoting from a newspaper.

MR. SPEAKER: The Point of

Order is rather a fine one. While in ordinary debate no person can be heard in the House other than elected members thereof; this is not a debate in the ordinary strict Parliamentary sense. As the honourable member has just read from the Rules, great latitude is allowed in the Speech in Reply.

All I can say is that the honourable member may quote extracts from newspapers or books, as long as he does not infringe upon the Rules. He can only be guided by his good taste. He must, as I say, be guided by his sense of taste—is the matter apropos to the occasion?

The honourable member may continue.

MR. HOLLETT: I shall try not to hurt the feelings of the members on the other side too much. I suggest they hear them first before they begin to fear whether their feelings are to be hurt.

I was speaking of the richness, the prosperity and the happy position this Government found itself in in 1949 following Confederation. If I may go over that, I may refresh the memories on the opposite side: Instead of a National Debt of one hundred and seven millions, they had no Post Offices, Customs, Railway, Gander Airport, no Defence, no Hotel, no lighthouses, fog alarms, etc. They had Education, (and of course that is enough) they had Health and Welfare, Public Works and one or two incidentals—and forty-six million dollars in cash.

I was about to say, if esteemed and honourable people outside get opinions such as have been expressed here, it is my duty to correct them.

"If the Commission of Government had possessed a very small part of the vision and drive of Joe Smallwood—" I suppose that is unparliamentary. "Newfoundland would have been a wealthy country in 1949 when the last surviving members of the Commission either folded their tents and slunk silently back to their English refuges or accepted the new offices which Confederation had bestowed upon them."

**MR. SPEAKER:** For the honourable member's guidance, no words may be heard in quotation which would be improper for the honourable member to say in the course of his speech.

**MR. HOLLETT:** These are complimentary remarks to the Premier.

These men were honourable men; they were honest, responsible men. We have one of them on the opposite side of the House, whose honesty and integrity cannot be impugned by anybody inside or outside the House. They did no such thing as is intimated in this article. None of these members slunk away.

The point I wanted to make there was that there was some doubt in the minds of people outside the House, particularly in the mind of the man who wrote it, that Newfoundland was not prosperous; that it was poverty-stricken in 1949; no money in the till; no anything, according to this fellow. He says if the Government which got out of here in 1949 had had half the drive, things would have been hunkydory for this little country of ours.

I want to refer, if I may, to what I shall call "the Great Expectations of 1949." If we are to speak to this, we must first set the background, dig up the soil and prepare for what may come later on, and I suspect great

things will. On Page 49 of the Hansard of 1949—to give some idea of what the intentions of that administration were when they came into power—Honourable the Premier was speaking on the Act respecting Economic Development: "—we are faced with the basic problem of all, the doctrine of development of the natural resources of this Province—"

Quoting again from the Speech from the Throne:

"In conformity with my Government's policy of encouraging the development of the natural resources of the Province—"

And in Hansard, page 49, the Honourable the Premier continued:

"... to yield the basic conditions of a higher standard of living for our people. Newfoundland in the next few years is going either to find herself trying ever more and more to subsist on family allowances, old age pensions, pensions for the blind, unemployment insurance and these other benefits, or else she is going to stand on her own feet, and by development of her own resources create a standard of living out of which the Province and the Government of the Province can develop still further extensions of the social security pattern already introduced. We are going to be either a glorified poorhouse, or else a self-supporting Province, independent and proud, with every reason for our pride, willing and able to look the rest of Canada square in the face." I hope we will always be able to do that.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Whose quotation is that?

**MR. HOLLETT:** Surely the Premier recognizes such a momentous statement. That statement has been repeated year after year from 1949.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I want everyone to know who said it.

MR. HOLLETT: We on the Opposition side do not attach all the blame or all the praise for what has happened since 1949 to any individual member. The Government must take the responsibility. I put it to every member of Cabinet and every member of the Government, and I would include back benchers; they share equal responsibility with the Premier for anything that happened, for good or ill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the honorable member say "good" as well?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, we will give you the praise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is going to be good.

MR. HOLLETT: On page 51 of the same Hansard, the Premier goes on "... if within two years of Union, Newfoundland should institute an economic survey of the Province, which includes Labrador, for the purpose of determining what new industries could be established, and what existing industries extended, then, Newfoundland having initiated such a survey, the Government of Canada will back it with its resources of men and machines, with its technicians, its various survey departments, and other resources of that type, and these are amongst the best in the world. And further, that the Government of Canada, will make a special effort, and I think these are the exact words, "special effort," to bring up to the level existing throughout the other Provinces the knowledge of the natural resources of Newfoundland that such a survey would produce. Now, I am in hopes that that survey will involve an expenditure by the Government of

Canada of many millions of dollars. Nothing will satisfy Newfoundland less than a thorough-going combing or scouring of the Island and of Labrador in a search for natural resources, and the measuring of them and the photographing and blue-printing of them, so that Newfoundland will be put in a position, a position incidentally, in which she has never yet been, after all our four and a half centuries, put in the position of being able to go to potential investors, capitalists, bankers, investment houses, promoters, with actual detailed blue-printed data of the actual natural resources which we desire to develop and into the development of which we desire positively many millions of dollars to come from the Mainland of Canada."

He goes on to speak of a Report supposed to be submitted by a Dr. Boyle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That Report has been tabled.

MR. HOLLETT: That must have been before my time. I am only a youngster here.

It goes on: "Some of us in Newfoundland have great faith in the possibility of developing a tourist traffic in Newfoundland. So far as I know, no Government in the past in Newfoundland has had very much faith in the possibilities of a tourist trade. Here in this chamber when we were members of the National Convention, we were confronted, and quite angered, by the resignation en masse of the whole Tourist Board. We feel that there are genuine possibilities in that, for I know, Mr. Speaker, I know how possible it is for gentlemen in an Opposition to seize on that, poke fun at it, ridicule it, and hold it up

for a laugh, and say to the fishermen, "Here's your wonderful Government, there's what they are doing for your fisheries"—I know what I could do if I were in an Opposition when the Government began to talk about tourists."

And so, I trust, if we start to poke fun, he will remember he is the author of that particular procedure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Try your hand at poking fun.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. HOLLETT: We will start.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go ahead, it is getting dull.

MR. HOLLETT: That same speech continues:

"Then again, we have a big programme of hydro-electric development. We are in hopes of bringing here to manage that, a man who is perhaps, in North America, today the greatest authority of all, Dr. Thomas Hogg . . ."

He goes on to describe him and his work in Manitoba. So far as I know, that man has not landed in this country. If he did, he left before he got well acquainted with the Province.

Later he refers to a great Economist who he says he is going to bring in here. Whether that was Valdmanis or whether it was someone else prior to him, I have not been able to find out. I have an idea that the Premier at that time had heard of the wonders of Dr. Valdmanis; about whom I shall have a few remarks to make in a moment or two.

It was all mapped out. On page 449 of the same Hansard, the Honourable the Premier says:

"Mr. Chairman," (The House, apparently, was in Committee), "we have been in our thinking in the Cabinet deadly afraid that the months and years would pass by, and that in the absence of a plan, in the absence of a blue-print, the money in the two-thirds portion of the surplus would be going for this and that and the other; that in a year or two or three the legislature here and the public outside might wake up to discover that six, eight, ten, twenty millions of it had gone without having made any basic change, any fundamental change, in the Province's overall economy. And so, to avoid that very danger, our thinking is running along the line of budgeting for the two-thirds of the surplus which are under the Terms of Union to be devoted to development purposes; that is to say, to take the whole of it, divide it up in certain proportions for certain purposes. Let us say for the sake of argument that the total is twenty-five million dollars; two-thirds of the whole would amount to twenty-five million dollars available for developmental purposes."

The Honourable the Premier then goes on to allocate twenty-five millions which at that time he believed was part that could be spent for development—" . . . of the twenty-five millions we have earmarked so much for schools, for improvement in existing schools, so much for hospitals, so much in all for construction and extension of hospitals and then again so much for fishery development and so much for agricultural development and so much for development along other lines. That twenty-five millions was to be earmarked and set aside to be spent year by year so much in each of these five sections, seven or eight years. In other words we were going

to have twenty-five million dollars and not spend it all in the first years and find it all gone. In other words, the money then in the treasury, twenty-five or thirty million dollars was to be spent for economic development already blue-printed, drawn up, so much for hospitals, so much for fisheries, so much for roads, so much for other things, so much each year for five or eight years."

Well, Sir, if we look back over the past five years we see that the honourable the Premier and his Government had reason—You will notice he said there that they were frightfully afraid they would do a certain thing, and certainly they went right ahead and did that very same thing. I am reminded here—I don't know whether I will be allowed to quote this or not Sir, but the Premier is such an interesting man that it is the duty of the Leader of the Opposition to find out just what manner of man we have and what he was thinking many, many years ago. I came across an interesting letter written by the Honourable the Premier in 1925, in June 29, 1925. It was in reply—I am sure the Premier himself will be interested in hearing that and it will carry him back many years. He has now reached the age where retirement is in the back of his mind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable the Premier asks the honourable member if he hopes that, it is the only hope he has left that I retire.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a hope—That was in 1925, Sir, and he was replying to some man who had advocated the bringing into this country skilled men from England, Ireland and Europe anyway. The Honourable the Premier, Mr. Speaker, was at that time in Grand Falls where the

letter was dated, and he signed himself as J. R. Smallwood, President, Newfoundland Federation of Labour. "And this man had the audacity to write to the paper and advocate bringing people in from outside the country," he said. I left the letter at home where I keep it in a secure place with all such documents to be handed down to posterity. The Honourable the Premier ended up "I maintain that Newfoundland is for Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders are for Newfoundland." Follow up that thought, Sir.

What happened since 1949? Icelanders to teach us how to fish; Seig him to teach us how to farm on Labrador and grow cabbages down there. I think a member who is not here in the House at the present time said that, IBEC (Rockefellers) to make an economic survey which the Government did not publish, why I do not know—Not in the interest of the country—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will gladly tell the honourable member right now.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know whether we want it now. We wanted it two or three years ago and could not get it. The Industrial Basic Economy Corporation was a corporation noted for the thoroughness of their inquiries into the resources of a country, and they were noted for the excellent reports which they made on surveys in other countries prior to coming to Newfoundland. Anyway they made a report and they studied the natural resources of this country, or so they said—They made a report and the Government, Sir, refused to table it although they were requested to do so by the then Opposition on many, many occasions. I know, of course, the reason why the Govern-



ment did not publish it. Then there was Dr. Valdmanis ("Newfoundland for Newfoundlanders"), Sir William Stephenson and I need not go into all the names, I have them here about twenty, twenty-five or thirty of them—Newfoundland for Newfoundlanders.—Every one of the foreigners, Sir, cost the country on the average of a million dollars. Max Braun Wogan—I thought that would make the Honourable the Premier chuckle. It is something to chuckle about.—Here is this man—Somebody raised the point yesterday, Sir, about my remarks about foreigners and Europeans, and he hoped the European Question would never be raised in the House again. But I am telling the honourable member, who is not here today, it is going to be raised. Not that we have anything against them, Latvians, Germans, Slovaks, whoever they are they are human beings and we have a certain respect for human beings, Sir, in the Opposition at least we have some.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You recognize them?

MR. HOLLETT: I recognize them. But we shall raise this question of Europeans. The Government, Sir, hates for us to raise the matter, it is a very sore point. How some of the honourable gentlemen on the other side can sit here and hear these things talked about amazes me. No wonder the honourable gentleman a day or two ago got up and said he hoped it would never be mentioned again. I checked up last night to see exactly how much money went into these names—\$19,450,000. If ever I want to find out anything about these Latvians and Germans I shall go to the firm here which probably knows more about them than anybody else—I made some remark about that before

and I don't intend to do it at this moment, but I want the House, Sir, to remember that in 1925 the Honourable the Premier's slogan was "Newfoundland for Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders for Newfoundland." I maintain today, Sir, it is Newfoundland for Foreigners and Foreigners take over Newfoundland, they got the surplus of twenty-five millions. Why the Honourable the Premier should have changed his tune I know not.

Now, Sir, after all that, in this the fifth year of Confederation—that reminds me there is a move on by the Liberal Party to try and tell us that we went into Confederation on March 31. We did no such thing, Sir, up to 12:00 o'clock in the night, March, 31, 1949 we were a Dominion, but the next minute, I grant you, we were into Confederation. The Honourable the Premier, I believe, on two occasions said we went in on March 31, why, of course, is obvious. But we went in on April 1, Sir, there is no question about that. Now, Sir, in these five years of union we can, after all the talk about natural resources, about the inquiries which were to be set up, we now are told in this document which should be framed and hung over there—no not on that side but hung here where the honourable gentlemen whose faces are portrayed could look at five years after Confederation, we have here an organization set up to study agriculture and another for forestry and a fishery authority of three men which I am going to comment on, Sir, in a moment. I don't know whether I am going to be allowed to say very much as I believe there is some legislation coming up in relation to it. I believe these three men are to be given fabulous salaries. In conformity with this Government's

policy to encourage the natural resources of this country, after five years, Sir, here we are with not a cent to bless ourselves, not a copper to bless ourselves, and since November 11, 1952, had to borrow two and a half million dollars from the Bank of Montreal and from the Fisheries Loan Board and the Co-operative Loan Board to carry on after we, five years ago, having forty-six million dollars. We are in the hole now up to our necks. I know we got some money coming in from Canada—"God Bless Us! We are in Confederation now;" and you might make a note of that, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have known it all along.

MR. HOLLETT: I fought, Sir, against Confederation, I fought it hard, and I still think I was right. I think we should have gone into Confederation on an agreement brought about between two Governments, the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. If they had arrived at an agreement where we would have gone into Confederation in that manner there would have been no need of asking for a Royal Commission which the Premier has set up to study Newfoundland's case.

With regard to the fisheries there is a slight error, I think. The Honourable the Premier is very impartial I should say—does not like mistakes, does not like to be misquoted—here it says: "In the view of my Ministers the most important business to be laid before you in this session is the Bill to authorize the creation of a fisheries authority. Almost one half of our people are more or less directly dependent upon the fisheries for their livelihood," I doubt that very much at the moment. According

to figures released by the General Secretary of the Fishermen's Association there are ten thousand. Give them five in family, making only fifty thousand people and this country has about three hundred and forty or three hundred and sixty thousand people. Then it goes on—"Due to a number of causes the fisheries are languishing—" Why is our fishery languishing? I think everybody in this House is well aware of why it is languishing. We have not yet developed our fresh fish industry to the point where we can count on the markets, and the salt fishery markets to which we have to send out salt fish, there they are living under a different setup, have a different economy of different values for their money and the exchange is against us. They cannot, therefore, pay us the prices which our people need in order to live in this country today where the cost of living has gone skyward.

I have something now, Sir, to say which is rather unpleasant. I don't like saying unpleasant things as a rule, I have to reply to too many of them and therefore know what it feels like to have unpleasant things said. But one of the reasons, Sir, I maintain, why our fisheries are languishing is because of, shall I call it, an inept Department of Fisheries. I say that with all due respect to the Minister of Fisheries for whom I have great respect. But as for the Department of Fisheries, in my opinion, the Department of Fisheries have fallen down in their job on nearly everything they touched since 1949. If they had not a hand-out to give fishermen they had no plan. They brought in an expert from the Mainland and paid him \$15,000, I believe, a year and made him Deputy Minis-

ter of Fisheries. I don't wish to say anything to hurt even the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, but I referred to that gentleman last year, and I thought in deference to the civil service of this country, Sir, that the man would probably have returned to his native home. Instead of that, Sir, I find the gentleman still the big-wig in the Fisheries Department. Something is wrong, Sir, with this Fisheries Department. I have only to refer to a question which I directed to the Department of Fisheries some days ago. We have been told, Sir, that we are inexperienced, and that we are not very hot on this side of the House, and on account of that, Sir, I would say, if we directed a question to any honourable member in charge of a department on the Government side of the House, if we did make any error in directing that question or any slight mistake, I should think the Honourable Minister in charge would be honourable enough to direct us properly and not answer, Sir, with such a manner as these particular questions were answered. This is one of the questions: "Give a detailed account of (a), (b) and (c) relative to the full utilization of known Fishery resources?" And the answer given: "Opportunity for reply will arise during consideration of the 1954-55 Estimates and to No. 3 the answer: "Question improperly directed." I submit that is an answer which is absolutely ridiculous on the face of it.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the honourable member here there is no debate on Answers to Questions. Certainly it must follow there can be no debate otherwise the rule is null and void—this is merely for the Honourable Minister's guidance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would my

honourable friend allow me to ask him a question on that point?

MR. HOLLETT: Oh yes, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would my honourable friend seriously expect the Minister of Fisheries merely by way of answering a question, to give the information that question asked for? Would he seriously expect the Government's fishery policy to be described merely in answer to a parliamentary question—would he seriously expect that? Or would he not expect it in the budget speech or when the estimates are brought in here or when the Bill is brought forward? Would he seriously expect it in this form?

MR. HOLLETT: We remember a Fishery Development Committee set up two years ago which made certain recommendations a year ago now. The question is on the recommendations of that committee, is there anything wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? The report of that committee came into the House here last year, and I have merely asked the question as to what steps were taken to implement the recommendations. Now, I am asked by the Premier—would you really expect? No, I would not expect to get an answer from them, that is true. I said the department was inept and not carrying out the recommendations which I think they should do—and I say this with all due respect to the Minister who cannot be expected to pay attention to every little detail or every big detail. But he has fifteen thousand a year men; fishery engineers, boat builders and everything there. I see no reason why I should not get a decent or a better reply to that question which I asked—"Opportunity for reply will arise during consideration of the 1954-55 Estimates." We want the information

now, Sir, so that we will be able to properly debate it when the estimates come up.

I asked—on the North East Coast what, if any, steps have been taken towards the salt cod fishing industry—This is the answer: "Steps have been taken towards centralization." I asked what steps? And the answer given was: "Steps have been taken." If any negotiations thus far have been taking place in the establishment of small meal plants as recommended in the Committee's report? The answer: "Investigations have been under way for some time to ascertain the practicability of small fish meal operations but not exclusively for the North East Coast." Has the Provincial or the Federal Governments taken any steps to implement the recommendations in the memorandum dated November 20th, 1952 by the Walsh Committee relative to (a), (b) and (c)—Give details of any such implementations. The answer: "Yes, by the Government of Newfoundland"—I thought our Government and the Federal Government were together on these things, Mr. Speaker, but apparently they are not—our Fisheries Department know nothing of what is going on in Canada. I can cite more of these, Sir, but I was so sick for the welfare of our fishermen and our fisheries when I read these replies that I made up my mind I would ask no more questions of that department because I am afraid, Sir, I have not much faith in the help of the Honourable Minister, the paid help.

Give a detailed account of any Housing Scheme envisaged for fishermen—that is from the fishermen's point of view—the answer given was that it was under consideration—that is all I get.

Who is Newfoundland's represent-

ative on the Fisheries Research Board of Canada? The answer given: "Question improperly directed." Why is it improperly directed? The Chairman of the Committee recommended that Fishery Research Board of Canada—at least we have somebody on the Research Board of Canada, and when I ask who he is I am told the question is improperly directed. Why? I don't know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that not obvious?

MR. HOLLETT: No, not to me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the honourable gentleman like to know?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course not—he does not want to know.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no standing committee on fishery matters that could give some information on that. But I do remember on reading over the Report of the Walsh Committee that a standing joint committee be set up in which there would be members of the Federal and Provincial Governments, and they would meet every once in a while to advise the authority carrying out the recommendations of the Walsh Report. Now, I am told, after a whole twelve months, there is no standing joint committee. In other words this Government is not working in coherence with the Federal Government. That is pretty obvious—you have only to look at recent events. On the basis of answers I have received to these questions, I must say I have not too much faith in the work which will be done by this particular scheme.

I am reminded of another editorial in the "Evening Telegram" relative to the fisheries—"English Fish to Can-

adian Market—Two thousand tons—Shipped to Toronto from England”—There is some comment on that, but I won't go into it now.

I raised the matter last year, Sir, and I say it is distasteful for me to touch on it again. This has to do with fishery administration, it has to do with honesty and fair dealings of civil servants. I was in the civil service myself for a period of twenty-five years. I have some idea of civil service, and do believe generally it is a body demanding respect—they have to work under considerable difficulties and bring down on themselves the opprobrium of the general public and powers that be and everybody else generally. The civil service is a body who command the greatest respect—I referred last year, Sir, and refer now again to it, because to me it is something this Government will have to do something about in the civil service, and I refer to that man now Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and I refer to him in conjunction with certain loans which have been granted by the Government for fishery purposes on which loans it would have been expected that the recommendation or otherwise of this Fishery Department secretary would have been sought, and I suspect why this is so, because in answer to some inquiries I found last year, Sir, and repeat now, that four firms to whom this Government had granted loans of some considerable amounts, hundreds of thousands of dollars, totalling over two million dollars, these very firms, Sir, during the negotiations for some of these loans, either prior to or just after, loaned to this secretary amounts in the sum of \$1,750.00; \$2,865.00; and \$2,625.00. I do not wish to comment any more on that, but I do think the Government ought to take

cognizance of that, out of respect for the civil servants of Newfoundland and the civil servants of Canada. I think something should be done; they should be told “we expect you to be strictly above-board in all your dealings with the public,” if you are to get the right men in your Government, in the civil service of the country. Otherwise the whole structure of Government in Newfoundland goes by the board, it falls. If the civil servants are not protected, if their honesty is not protected, then, Sir, I pity the Ministers who have to carry on Government under them.

Now, with regard to NAFEL. You all heard of that. Page 13 of the Terms of Union—(a document which some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House were foremost in drawing up)—“Any of the Fisheries Laws may be repealed or altered at any time within the period of five years from the date of Union by the Parliament of Canada with the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the Province of Newfoundland and all orders, rules and regulations made under the authority of any Fisheries Laws may be revoked or altered by the body or person that made them . . .”

We have heard much comment about NAFEL ever since Union. They were going to be fired out; going to get their teeth kicked in; going to be banished, practically, from this country. Why were they not banished? Why was not their prerogative seized, lifted, taken away from them? There was the authority—Section 22 of the Terms of Union. I must only come to the conclusion that the Government, even though kicking in the teeth of NAFEL, even though calling them all sorts of things, the Government was only too happy to associate with them

in dealing with the fisheries. The Government had no intention of destroying or getting rid of NAFEL. If they wanted to get rid of them, they would have done it or they could get the Federal Government to do it. You let them do as they please, let them go on and do the things for which you blamed them and called them all sorts of things.

Considerable talk has been made with regard to long-liners. I do not wish to say anything detrimental to any efforts for the long-liners or Danish seiners. I will tell you a little story to indicate to you how great was the lack of supervision over the efforts which were made. I was in a certain district, towards the latter part of the fishing season, about two years ago or one and a half years ago, probably. As a matter of fact, it was during the time when the honourable member for Ferryland District was seeking election at the hands of the people in that area—September, 1952—near the end of the fishing season. While waiting to go into a political meeting, I met a man, or he met me; and I asked him what he was doing. "Long-lining," he said. I said "Where?" He told me. I asked him if he was making a living for himself and his crew. "Oh yes, definitely," he said. He was soon going to give it up; the weather was bad. He was quite happy. I thought I had better make some inquiries. I did and I found that up to that time they had landed twenty quintals of fish—maybe one or two quintals over and above. I found also that the Captain and crew were receiving salaries from the Department of Fisheries. That was not giving it a fair trial. I blame it not on the fishermen, nor do I blame the bad fishing on the long-liners.

MR. MURRAY: Would you know

the name of the boat and the crew? I never heard of it.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable member must be like what the member for Fogo said of us "you do not travel." Of course the roads are bad and the honourable gentleman is not able to get up there. I do not wish to name the men. I do not blame them; I am laying the blame at the door of the Fisheries Department. Of course, the Honourable Minister of Fisheries cannot be expected to look into everything, every detail. But something will have to be done. For a Captain and two or three men to go on board a boat, get paid salaries, and for the season land twenty odd quintals of fish, it is poor inducement to the men living in that area where they are operating.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I say that there never was such a case in this Government's experience. There is no long-liner with a crew consisting of a Captain and two or three men. Not a long-liner.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be a Danish seiner.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not table a question?

MR. HOLLETT: It probably would not be answered. However, it was a vessel on which there was a skipper and two or three men and they were paid salaries by the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By this Government?

MR. HOLLETT: I have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member was interrupted. A member has the floor only when he is addressing the Chair.



MR. HOLLETT: I am sure that applies to the Leader of the Government equally as well.

MR. SPEAKER: I said the honourable member has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: I object to interruptions of that kind. I told that, with the belief that it is true. If I was misinformed by the fishermen or my informants, then of course there is a remedy; but the remedy is certainly not jumping to one's feet and denying it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman has to take my word. He is forced to.

MR. BROWNE: It is not your Department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When the Leader of the Government speaks for the Government; he speaks for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable members must ask permission to make comments.

MR. HOLLETT: As a matter of fact there is a question to be answered. I am quite sure I asked the question, asking the Honourable Minister to give details which would include that.

But whether the vessel was a boat, a long-liner or a Danish seiner—

MR. MURRAY: I think it was the Flying Dutchman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a figment of the imagination.

MR. HOLLETT: I might point out that the man to whom I referred did not reside in the honourable member for Ferryland's District, so he need not be unduly worried. But the facts are true.

Not only do I lay the blame at the door of the Department of Fisheries, I lay blame for all the fisheries fiasco at the door of the Government, the Ministry. In my opinion, very little of a constructive nature has been done for the fisheries since it took office in 1949. We have been told all sorts of things. Even the fishermen from Iceland were going to tell our fishermen how to fish. The idea of bringing in Icelanders to teach our fellows how to fish!

I come now to the setting up of this fisheries authority. Here we had the Honourable the Chief Justice, Sir Albert Walsh, head of a Committee of investigation; after two years they brought in a Report. That Report contained certain recommendations. One of these was that a Joint Development Committee be set up and taking part in it would be the Provincial Government, the Federal Government and private enterprise. What did the Government do? They jumped the gun and set up a local authority, a local fisheries authority. Then we suddenly heard over the radio and read in the newspapers that this fisheries authority had been set up and which would save the country; they would advise the Government; they would implement the plans laid down in the Walsh Report. It was rumoured that salaries of \$25,000 a year for ten years and a pension of \$5,000 were to be paid. How true that is I do not know; but that story was rife in Newfoundland and the Government has not taken steps to deny it. The Government did not take us into their confidence with regard to it.

You all heard of Mr. Sinclair. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to know just exactly where Newfoundland stands with regard to the fish-

eries. As you know, Sir, a short time ago a Government release was issued by the two Governments—the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland. That release told us that from now on, the marketing end of the fisheries would be taken over by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. This great Mr. Howe—the man who opened up the Machinery Plant; the man who was going to supply it with all sorts of orders; put it on its feet; 5,000 men were to be employed there—this man now has absolute control (or his Department has) over the marketing of our fish, in conjunction with NAFEL. I had better not say too much, because conversations are under way in Ottawa at the present time between Mr. Howe, Mr. Sinclair and the fish merchants of the trade and the fish merchants who make up NAFEL. Why somebody from the Fisheries Department is not there, I do not know. Surely Mr. Planta should be there. Surely the fishermen's representative, Mr. Lane, should be there. I wonder if the Premier could tell us why they are not there? Is it that there is a feeling in Ottawa that they should not be there? I wonder if they were told they should not come? That is a question which the Government can answer. It is strange to me that the fishermen of this country are not represented at these talks at Ottawa. It is strange that Mr. Lane, the General Secretary of the Fishermen's organization, was not even invited to come up. Our own Department of Fisheries was not allowed, apparently, to send up Mr. Planta.

I know that when I am talking about Fisheries it is a subject which is worrying everybody. It would worry me if I was in the Premier's and the Minister of Fisheries' place. I know

it has been a problem all down through the years. I do not believe that Mr. Howe or Mr. Sinclair or the Premier or Mr. Keough or anybody else, on his own, can settle it or bring about a solution. The biggest solution has to come from the fishermen themselves or probably from their organization. I know the member from St. John's West here is a great believer in the Co-operative movement, and he would suggest probably, that that was the only cure. We have had some experience in Co-operative movements; and I say now, if the Co-operative movement is going to be carried out for the fisheries in the same manner as it was in other cases, then for goodness sake do not touch it. I do recognize the fact that when the Government started the Co-operative movement, they went about it in the wrong way. They started Co-operatives by giving grants; which was absolutely fatal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did not start the Co-operative movement, the Commission of Government did. One Government started, the other gave grants.

MR. HOLLETT: You gave them loans. What about the sordid story of Lourdes? Do you want me to go into that? They were not "grants" they were "Loans." The Premier thinks that by pushing in his spear he is going to knock us out.

I am afraid that for the next few years the Federal Government will have to grant a floor price to the fishermen, otherwise we shall have no fishermen.

Now, I do not think that our Government can very well congratulate themselves on their efforts in the fisheries. We have here a fresh fish in-

dustry that in scientific and technological development is second to none on the North American Continent.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** We have what?

**MR. HOLLETT:** I said that we have here a fresh fish industry, in scientific and technological development, second to none on the North American Continent. If that meets with the approval of the Premier, he could let it pass. Therefore, we should expect that the men engaged in the fresh frozen fish industry would be receiving sufficient wages on which to survive. I have here some price quotations for fresh fish taken from a Department of External Trade magazine, a magazine put out by themselves. As I look at this, I can only come to the conclusion that our Government have fallen down on their jobs again. Let me quote: "Prices received by fishermen as of January 15, 1954:

**Inshore Cod:**

North Sydney .....	3½c.
Halifax .....	4¼c.
St. John's, Nfld. ....	2¼c.

Did our Government know that was going on? Did the Government know that Halifax and North Sydney were getting so much more? It was their duty to find out why our fishermen were not getting more.

**Offshore Cod:**

North Sydney .....	3½c.
Halifax .....	3¼c.
St. John's, Nfld. ....	2¼c.
Ramea .....	2¼c.

**Halibut:**

North Sydney, 28c. lb.—top price.

**Chicken Halibut:**

St. John's Nfld., 15c. lb.

Our fishermen had to put up with 15c. while North Sydney and Halifax

got as high as 28c., and chicken halibut in Ramea was 10c. They will tell you that transportation was more; they are nearer the trade. So they are, but not to that extent.

**Haddock:**

Halifax .....	5½c.
St. John's .....	3 c.
Ramea .....	3 c.

**Haddock (large):**

Halifax .....	6¼c.
Yarmouth .....	6½c.
Sydney .....	6 c.
St. John's .....	2¼c.
Ramea .....	2¼c.

How can they live, if they are not given a chance? The Government is doing nothing. All they said is "we are going to kick NAFEL's teeth in." I have heard the saying that it is no use knocking on wood; neither is it any use kicking in teeth. Oh yes, they gave the fishermen \$1.50 last Fall, without any investigation they paid out the \$1.50. They forced the Federal Government to do it. And there is one thing for which I congratulate the Premier. He expected, and rightly so, that the Federal Government would come across with a floor price, or some implementation of the fishery price. He went to Ottawa. They told him to go home. I will say this for the Premier; and I hope he will remember it, he came home; he dipped down—not into the chest—that was empty. He may have had to go to the bank; but anyway he paid the \$1.50. The Federal Government got so ashamed of themselves, they said. "We will pay you back one cent a pound, but do not do it any more. And we are going to see that you do not do it any more. We are going to hand it over to Mr. Howe." He forced the Federal Government to come across.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I say that the honourable gentleman is completely wrong. I do not deserve his congratulations. Before the Government paid the \$1.50, I telephoned the Government at Ottawa, from St. John's. What we did was done with their knowledge beforehand, with the understanding that if they made a deficiency payment, it would come back to the Treasury of Newfoundland. So, the credit for that is not really mine.

MR. HOLLETT: The modesty of the Premier is unexcelled at times. If I erred, the blame is the Premier's. He never told the public that before. He let the people think it was all his doing. I was naive enough to give him credit for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman not realize that in highly delicate matters of this sort, one has to do what one does and keep one's mouth shut? Because of the situation in the markets, the Government of Canada could not, under any conditions, be involved in suspicion that they were subsidizing fish, some of which might enter the United States.

The honourable gentleman can have all the fun he likes here now, but one must do what one does and keep one's mouth shut in delicate matters of this sort.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that people of this country, the fishermen of this country, were under the false impression that the Honourable the Premier was wholly and completely responsible for this advance of \$1.50 a quintal. I still say, Sir, as much as I am opposed to the Premier on various other policies, I say now, I give him the credit, if he had not done what he did do there

would not have been one five cents come across from the Federal Government for our fishery. We had to force it out of them, Sir, and whoever gets over there in the next hundred years will have to force everything out of them. It is the history of Nova Scotia and of Prince Edward Island, and perhaps it is good for them that they have to fight. But they are not going to hand it to us, don't worry.

Yes, Sir, this development authority I was speaking about, the authority which has been set up—I believe they have been named, but as there is some legislation to come in relative to that I will keep my remarks, Sir, for that occasion.

Now we hear, and we heard last year, the Government was ready to develop water powers, minerals and soil. They are also ready to develop the fishery—ready to develop the fishery, forests and agriculture and they have not one red cent to do it with, which means they must be going to try and look for a loan—I see no other way out of that.

Then also, I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier would like to know, Sir, that on February 18, 1954, cod fillets sold in Toronto for 33c. a pound. Our fishermen got 2¼c. a pound. So I take it these fishermen in England are in for a grand time when they get that order to send a lot of their fish to Toronto. I put it to the Government, if the people of Toronto have to pay 33c. a pound, surely our fishermen here out of St. John's, Ramea, Burin and other places should expect more than 2¼c. and I assume, Sir, the Government will be glad to assist them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The people there are lucky. We pay more than that here in St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: I was going to speak about that. The Honourable Premier has reminded us of that when he came back from Jamaica. That was the time he was going to kick the teeth out of NAFEL, and he quoted the prices the people had to pay for salt fish. At that very time, Sir, I believe, our people here were paying about two cents less than they were in Kingston. Here is the place to start on that, not start a row in Jamaica, not come back and tell NAFEL what to do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the honourable gentleman want to kick their teeth in too?

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know why he has not kicked their teeth in long ago. He has the authority, I quoted it a moment ago. He could have changed the legislation relative to NAFEL and made it impossible for a half dozen men to put in ten thousand dollars and be the exporting authority for all the fish caught in Newfoundland. Everybody knows that is wrong, the Premier knows it is wrong, the Government knew it was wrong five years ago, but they have done nothing about it except threaten to kick in their teeth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Supposing that is all we could do. The honourable gentleman just read the paragraph but does not understand, the honourable gentleman never does understand anything legal or a constitutional document, he never has yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—it seems to me the discussion is wandering somewhat afield. I suggest the honourable member hold the floor and address the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I

could have raised a point of order there—I think the remarks the Honourable Premier made were unworthy of the Leader of the Government, even of the Opposition, us ignoramuses—I don't think it is right of the Government to say so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say so, except in respect to legal documents and constitutional—

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I must again interrupt—please proceed.

MR. HOLLETT: Interruptions are all right but put me off the track a little—I will get back after a while. Last year they appointed a commission and from that on they were going to prosecute or shall I say implement agriculture with energy and resolution. I well remember the words "Energy and resolution." What is wrong with our division of agriculture anyway? Why the need for a Royal Commission? Why do we have to pay these three or four men and their departments thousands of dollars to find out just what can be done for agriculture? Have we not got a division of agriculture in the Department of Mines and Resources? I don't pretend to lay the same blame to the Department of Mines and Resources as to the Department of Fisheries, I am not sufficiently well acquainted with that department. But I do think in this country of ours we ought to be able, Sir, as a Government and a Department to handle our little agriculture, and big, shall I say, agricultural problems without having to set up a Royal Commission. We have had nothing but commissions all down through the years since 1949. I say, what is wrong with our agricultural division? What is wrong with our forestry division, and where are our forests? That reminds me, Sir,

and I think that will bring me to the next thing to talk about—where are our forests? It is my impression that the AND Company and Bowaters control and have the right to cut every stick on their concessions. Of the remaining eighty-five thousand square miles NALCO and BRINCO have the lot. I take it NALCO—

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order? Will the honourable gentleman give me an opportunity to correct that erroneous statement? BRINCO nor NALCO doesn't control the rest of the timber resources of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing like it.

MR. HOLLETT: I say, Sir, NALCO and BRINCO, in certain instances at any rate, have control over certain forest lands—they have the right to make concessions on these properties to other bodies. They can grant concessions to the AND Company if they want to, over all their timber areas. Is not that correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: And BRINCO can do the same. Therefore, I am not very far afield when I say BRINCO and NALCO control the forest destinies of eighty-five thousand square miles.

DR. ROWE: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I may not be exactly correct, but pretty nearly. We were told the other day that NALCO granted concessions for minerals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are now talking about timber.

MR. HOLLETT: We have little forest left, Sir, we have a little—we

have some birch stands, I believe, how limited they are I don't know, but I do know there is something wrong with the methods of awarding contracts to cut birch on crown lands. I do know that last fall there was some interference with regard to the granting of licenses to cut birch with the result, the end result, that very little birch was cut until too late in the year to get very much in to the birch plant. Whether that is one of the reasons why the birch plant is closed down is something I could not say. I don't mean closed down but it has laid off some of its employees, no work being apparently the trouble. But I do say NALCO and BRINCO, Sir, have control of at least—they can do quite a lot with a lot of the forests we have. For instance, if they see a territory say two hundred thousand or rather two thousand square miles of forest land, will the Honourable Minister deny that NALCO has the right or BRINCO has the right to grant a concession to cut timber on that, will he deny it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Timber where?

MR. HOLLETT: On the area which they have been granted under the Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Obviously.

MR. HOLLETT: That is exactly what I have been saying—that is what I mean—I hope you understand that now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, now.

MR. HOLLETT: Which brings me, Sir, to NALCO—because you cannot say NALCO without thinking of that man, Valdmanis. Yes here is something, a question that I was referring to which has to do with minerals—I won't quote that sub-



concession by NALCO to Canadian Javelin and American Zinc, and Newmont Corporation of Canada. These were three concessions granted by NALCO—and I believe they have been re-leased—so that everybody can know all about them—the American Zinc—the completion of the formal agreement is approved but I find the document is not signed. I give 745 square miles of Newfoundland—Canadian Javelin—I am not sure about that—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are these timber or mineral?

MR. HOLLETT: These are mineral, I hope. Newmont Mining Corporation of Canada—they got their option and have dropped their option, perhaps they found nothing but timber on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They had no rights to look for timber.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to read now, if I may, some extracts from NALCO's last year's report, just to refresh the memory of members of the Government. I am sure they will know very little about it.

"The Government of Newfoundland in late 1949, approved a plan which, with modifications and after several compromises, was embodied in Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited. Established by an Act of the Legislature of Newfoundland (June 22, 1951), the Corporation represented a rather unique marriage, for a certain period of exploration and adaptation, between Government and private capital, with the Government of Newfoundland controlling 90% of voting power, and 10% private capital being conceded some specific rights on major issues.

"Through the Corporation, the Government of Newfoundland attempted:

1. To attract interest of strong financial groups.
2. To provide a means towards the rapid exploration of Newfoundland's natural resources.
3. To assure the Government of Newfoundland of a higher-than-usual return from the proceeds of the exploration of Newfoundland's resources (mining tax plus extra dividend): (a) by making a \$900,000 contribution toward the risk capital of the Corporation, and (b) by taking over leadership during the first year of operations.

"An ambitious attempt to charge the Corporation also with the task of general manager of economics of Newfoundland (the Government's "economic arm") failed and was aborted.

"During the mining season of 1952, inspired by Sir William Stephenson, the following mining companies showed an active interest in the mineral-rich areas of the Corporation."

He stayed with us months, I believe, and gave us all this inspiration.

"Mr. Lytleton B. P. Gould introduced American Zinc, Lead and Smelting Co. and Freeport Sulphur Co., and Mr. Claude S. Richardson made the contacts with some other firms.

"In addition, the following companies made brief surveys of the area controlled by our Corporation: The John Fox Interests (Oil), Kennecott Copper Corp., Oliver Iron Mining Company, Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Powell Duffryn Technical Services Ltd.

"These contacts are proving very valuable, and, indeed, we expect some kind of association of interests with quite a number of them.

"We have signed a contract (sub-concession) with Newmont Mining Corp., and have reached agreements with American Zinc, Lead and Smelting Co., and the John Fox Interests."

Sir, I need not go on—they go on to tell about earlier accomplishments. Then they go on to recommend the new status of the Corporation. They are going to take control away from the Government up to a point and get private people to invest and run the corporation on a business-like basis. To that end they came across this Javelin Corporation of Canada, and they let them down. In that connection, Sir, I would like to offer the House the opinion of what I believe to be the "Bible" of Canadian Mining, that is how it is described anyway—I refer to the Northern Miner, which has the interest of mining and mineral resources of Canada at heart. This is what they have to say: (This is in reference to Newfoundland's venture into private enterprise and is dated March 18th, 1954):

#### NEWFOUNDLAND'S VENTURE INTO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Premier Joseph Smallwood's efforts to cut the people of Newfoundland in on some of the mining "gravy" seems to have run aground in shoal water. The result is not altogether unexpected. The doughty Premier's intentions were undoubtedly of the best but his methods of execution were entirely unsound from any practical viewpoint.

We are thinking of the Nalco fiasco which has now been dumped back in the lap of the Government

after a pathetic trial in the field of public promotion. Its sponsor on that ill-starred voyage was a company which at that time was barely known to the mining public and which shortly thereafter for reasons never fully explained, was removed from trading on the Canadian Stock Exchange. No public accounting has yet been made of the relations between the two companies and up to the present the people have merely been told that control of Nalco has been returned to the Government.

Nalco, formally known as Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, was launched with great fanfare back in 1951 as one of Mr. Smallwood's ambitious projects to revive Newfoundland's economy. Its corporation bill described it as expedient for the "development of the natural resources and the improvement of the standard of living of the people of the province." And, behind the move was the feeling that in the past Newfoundland had profligately dispensed its resources with a lavish hand to various outside interests who reaped huge profits with the risk of little capital. Nalco was handed a big slice of the unclaimed portion of the province, the idea being that blocks would be turned over to private companies with an interest being retained by Nalco so that the people of the province would thus share in any dividends that resulted. But there was not much incentive for private capital to assume all the risk and give the province a free ride. The proposal languished under its own dead weight and last year a change of policy was adopted with the province taking a back seat. That, also, it would appear, did not work.

Between Nalco, Brinco and various other concession holders there is not

a square inch of Newfoundland left where the private individual can carry out exploration. A table published in these columns two weeks ago showed that of all the provinces, Newfoundland was the only one in which not a single claim was staked last year. We think that is a great pity for it is generally recognized that the province has a promising mineral potential. Actually, its great producing mines have been a great source of wealth to the province, providing steady jobs for large numbers of people and pumping sizable amounts of money into the provincial economy for the purchase of equipment and supplies. That is the most satisfactory and satisfying type of reward that the people of Newfoundland can hope to get through the development of their natural resources. Much better, we think than to saddle the investors with free-riding shareholders which serve to stifle development and delay the finding of mines which await only the intelligent employment of risk capital.

This, Sir, is the opinion of a paper which is recognized by the Canadian Mining Interests as the "Bible" of Canadian Mining.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is pure nonsense, they publish anything they are paid to publish. If you pay them "God in Heaven" knows what they will publish there—the most venial paper in Canada, the "Northern Miner" a venial rag.

MR. HOLLETT: Like the Telegram?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not like the "Telegram." The "Telegram" is not venial.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain, Sir,

whatever you call the paper, it is a just and honest appraisal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is utterly false and untrue—False factually.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain NALCO and BRINCO have absolute authority over these large areas, and that will stifle the production of any resources in that huge area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend's predecessors said the same thing about the AND Company and the original company at Corner Brook. They were the great octopus.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not responsible for what my predecessors said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the "Tory Attitude."

MR. HOLLETT: The "Tory Attitude."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is it—Well said.

MR. HOLLETT: Again I repeat, Sir, talk about Newfoundland all you like; kick the teeth of NAFEL all you like, I think the Government better start to kick the teeth in NALCO and BRINCO—There you have a bunch of companies, and I refer to one or two of them, and the AND Company in our own country and Bowaters, they with a dozen others or more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are both in BRINCO.

MR. HOLLETT: They control the forest interest of sixty thousand square miles, and BRINCO if it so desires tomorrow may grant to the AND Company a concession or to Bowaters a concession or to anybody else a concession on the Labrador to hold and develop certain wooded areas. They can also withhold that concession from

that area. They can withhold the concessions from the AND Company. Just the same, I say they are the NAFEL of mining and of forest development and any other development including hydro-electric power in that huge area of eighty thousand square miles. The ordinary prospector, the man who always finds mines, not companies like these, but the ordinary Jack who goes out as a prospector, goes out and finds mines. Not one of these companies discovered mines in this country, it was done by private individuals who went out with whatever they used and located certain minerals and went to a company, and the company went to the Government, etc. But there you cannot go in where BRINCO and NALCO have concessions and discover minerals and have somebody to produce. You have to go back to NALCO and say: "I have found some iron ore, what do you do about it?" NALCO can then do what it likes or do nothing about it. Of course, I know that I cannot do anything about it but I want the public to know and the Government to know just what they have done. They have stifled the development in this area, Sir, and I tell you, Sir, these companies they have on these corporations, BRINCO and NALCO, they will stifle the development of any industry when it is going to interfere with industries which they have already established. They have absolute control, a monopoly. I have heard the Honourable the Premier go into hysterics over the great concessions which were given out by the Governments of the past. They should be hung up to the lamp post. Everything should be done to these Governments because they gave five or six thousand square miles to the AND Company or ten thousand square

miles to Bowaters, etc. They should have been tarred and feathered, Sir. Yet here, Sir, the Government, I say, gave away too, to do as they pleased with, eighty thousand square miles of Newfoundland territory, and as this respectable paper, the "Northern Miner," looked up to by the mining interests of Canada as a bible of mining, says, there is not one inch of territory into which a man can go and locate a mine without getting in touch with these people.

DR. ROWE: I say it is not true, the statement is wrong.

MR. HOLLETT: I have been told I am a liar.

DR. ROWE: I say the statement is not true.

MR. HOLLETT: He has no right to say it. He has to abide by the rules of this House as much as I have. Nobody can shout across the House and call me a liar.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody did that.

MR. SPEAKER: No, the Honourable Minister did not do that. He said that is not true. It is not unparliamentary to say a thing is untrue. If the honourable member intended any other interpretation it would certainly infringe—

MR. HOLLETT: I hope he will correct the statement, and give me the truth if that is not the truth. We are told somewhere "The truth will set you free." I do repeat there is not one square inch of territory in the eighty five thousand square miles controlled by NALCO and BRINCO where the Honourable Minister nor myself as an individual can go in and stake out a claim and go to any com-

pany he pleases to develop. We have to go to NALCO and have to go to BRINCO—Mr. Speaker, I went to the Department of Mines and Resources. And I can tell the honourable member now where there is the biggest deposit of Fluorspar, I suppose, in the world, and I went and found out where it was. It was in NALCO's area, so I said, you better find it yourselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is patriotic.

MR. HOLLETT: Would it be patriotic to give it to NALCO? I maintain that the time is when the money the Government has put into this Corporation will be spent, and I would like to know where they are to get any more. Are they going to get it from this company taken off the stock market in Canada. I say, Sir, this Government will not profit five cents from any concessions which they granted. A few of our Newfoundlanders may get a day's work here and there, or a year's work or may even get continuous work, but the Government will get no revenue whatsoever, from NALCO, and nope surely from BRINCO, because you have a lot smarter men in BRINCO than you have in NALCO. You have men in BRINCO who are shortly going to ask you for further concessions with regard to your Act, and I advise the Government they had better watch out for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman will eat these words.

MR. HOLLETT: Nothing will give me greater pleasure. I see the Honourable the Premier waxing fat on words we have made him eat—words which he has said since 1949. In 1925 it was "Newfoundland for

Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders for Newfoundland." He has waxed fat, Sir.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may adjourn the debate until tomorrow—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I second the motion, Mr. Speaker, not with a view to following the honourable member, but with a view to making a motion that the debate be adjourned.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, Mr. Speaker, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, April 5, 1954 at 3:00 of the clock.

---

MONDAY, April 5, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have to get a correction made, and I see there are no press reporters present. For that reason I will wait until the reporters are present, and with the indulgence of the House make the statement, as it is a matter of grave importance.

#### Presenting Petitions

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): I beg leave Sir, to present a petition from the residents of Burgoyne's Cove and Clifton, Trinity Bay North, pray-

ing that the road may be completed from Waterville, a short distance below Monroe to their particular district, a matter of four or five miles. Unfortunately the road construction in that particular locality would require the use of machinery and hence there has been some delay in giving heed to petitions of the residents during the past two or three years. This petition is signed by 190 people and has the support not only of the residents of Burgoyne's Cove and Clifton but also of Little Harbour some few miles up the bay, also the residents of Ireland's Eye. I heartily support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and beg leave to have it laid on the Table of the House and have it referred to the department concerned.

I beg leave also, Mr. Speaker, to introduce a petition from the residents of Kerley's Harbour, and Bonaventure praying that the road may be extended from New Bonaventure to Kerley's Harbour. In this connection I have also been approached by the residents of British Harbour saying that some three years ago they did make an effort to try and extend the road a distance of four miles in order to connect up Bonaventure with Little Harbour and British Harbour, but there is a difference of opinion amongst the residents and the difficulty of the terrain made it difficult for us to decide what route was to be taken, and consequently after some work was done the matter was held up. This petition has recently been supported by the medical doctor of the place who has pointed out to me the advantage of extending the road to avoid the hazards of sea travel along that particular part of the coast.

I heartily support this petition also, Mr. Speaker, and beg leave to

have it laid on the Table of the House so that it may be referred to the department concerned.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a copy of the pension plans which were originally put in effect by the Town Council of Corner Brook East and also the Town Council of Deer Lake. I table these, as called for under the provisions of Local Government Act.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House report on the matters transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1953, under provision of the Act, also all reports of the Minimum Wage Board established under the Minimum Wage Act, 1950.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before you call the questions I would like to have the indulgence of the House for a few moments only, to draw attention to the very serious misquotation that appeared in one of the papers on Saturday. It reads as follows: "The Premier said he did not deserve congratulations and reveals that the whole deal had been worked out with Ottawa in advance. Mr. Hollett wanted to know why he had not said so at the time. The Premier replied that the Government of Canada could not let it be known it was subsidizing fish, some of which might go to the U.S. Market."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not only a misquotation of what I said, but in the form in which it appears could be a vitally damaging statement to



Newfoundland and Canada as a whole. It is obvious, I take it, the statement affects U.S. Trade, appearing locally, would be clipped by the U.S. Consul and forwarded to Washington. I take it that it would be the duty of the American Authorities in St. John's to clip this account of a statement, reported to be a statement by the Premier in the Legislature, and send it to the State Department in Washington. Furthermore, I can well imagine this very statement allegedly made by me, and appearing in the press might be sent to U.S. Fishing Interests and the U.S. Fishing Lobbyists who for years have been endeavouring to have the quota of fish at a low rate of duty reduced and the general tariff on the fish from Canada increased. It would well be, if allowed to stand on the record, a very damaging piece of information in the hands of those interests in the United States who are endeavouring, and have for years been endeavouring to put more and much greater restrictions on the importation of Canadian Fish into the United States.

Now, I think everybody in this House knows that I said no such thing as that. If the House is in any doubt of it we could ask to have Hansard produced by the reporter. It must be very clearly understood that I did not say anything of that nature nor anything approaching it, and that what appeared is as completely a misrepresentation of what I had said as it would be possible to imagine.

Now what I said is this: What I am quoted as saying let me repeat—

"Mr. Hollett wanted to know why he had not said so at the time." Here is where the inaccuracy began. "The Premier implied that the Government

of Canada could not let be known" (had to hide the fact) "it was subsidizing fish, some of which might go to U.S. Markets." What I actually said was this: "I had telephoned to Ottawa and ascertained whether or not in the event of the Government of Canada making a deficiency payment, they would agree that the deficiency payment would come to the Newfoundland Government if the Newfoundland Government made an advance payment to the fishermen. I made that, I think, amply clear in my remarks here, and I don't see how anybody could have misunderstood, I frankly confess I don't know how any person with ears hearing what I said could translate it into what appears here in the "Daily News."

Now, I ask the press gallery, in a matter of vital importance, not to me personally, it does not matter a tinker's damn to me personally but it matters a great deal to Newfoundland, it matters a great deal to the fishermen of Newfoundland, to the fisheries of Newfoundland, and it matters to the fisheries of Canada as a whole—so for the sake of the fishery and the fishermen of Canada and Newfoundland as a whole I do ask the press to make it thoroughly clear that this has been a complete misstatement of what I said. Now, if anyone is in any doubt, because I fear that in some quarters I have a very, very low reputation, a very bad reputation in some quarters, there is a chance of suspicion that I am not capable, that it is not in me ever to speak the truth. If I say it is a fine day they probably say it is a foul day with bad weather. I know that suspicion exists in some quarters. Now, if there is in any quarter any doubt of what I have just said is true, then the solution is easy—ask Hansard to be

produced and get the exact words I said—

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, until the Honourable the Premier made that last statement I had no intention of rising at all. But since he has made that statement I would like to have the Hansard produced so that we would all be quite clear, even the Premier himself as to what words were used at the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk will take note of that request and present it on tomorrow.

### Giving Notice of Motions and Questions

#### Notice of Motions:

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

HON. MYLES MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriage Act."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

#### Notice of Questions:

Notice of questions given by Mr. Browne and Mr. Hollett.

(45) MR. W. J. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. How much has been spent on advertising by each Department of the Government during the fiscal year 1953-54? Give the name of the publishers and the publications concerned with the amount paid to each.

2. Have any pamphlets, books, maps or other material for advertising purposes been published by or on behalf of the Government? If so, what was the cost in each case?

(46) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. How many licenses have been granted by the Board of Liquor Control to Clubs during the past twelve months? Give the names of the Clubs and the names of the persons who made application on behalf of each Club.

2. Has any reference been made to the Department of the Attorney General for advice as to whether such Clubs are bona fide Clubs within the meaning of the Alcoholic Liquors Act?

(47) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development or other appropriate Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What was the total amount of cash loans and guaranteed loans made by the Government to the North-eastern Co-operative Fisheries Society Ltd? Have any payments been made by this Company to the Government on any of these loans?

2. Is this Company now in voluntary liquidation, and if so, who are the Trustees?

3. What are the assets and what

are the liabilities of this Co-operative Society, and when will the liquidation be complete?

4. If the Government has taken possession of the property assets of the Company, what are these properties, and what is to be their final disposition?

(48) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. The names of those firms supplying the commodities listed in Question 28 (2) to the institutions referred to in Question 28.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 44 : Stand.

Question No. 34 : Still being prepared.

Question No. 35 : Being prepared.

Question No. 36 Answer tabled by Honourable Minister of Finance.

Establishment	Location	Date of Suspension or Cancellation	Date Reopened	Reasons For Suspension or Cancellation	Licensee
Furey's Tavern	Holyrood	April 10, 1952	April 13, 1952	Breach Section 53 (b) A.L. Act.	Mr. A. Furey
Bradbury's Hotel	Bay Roberts	April 12, 1952	May 23, 1952	Breach Section 62 (1) and Section 52 (2) A. L. Act.	E. J. Bradbury
Hamilton Inn	St. John's	Oct. 31, 1952	Nov. 1, 1952	Breach Section 26 (b) A.L. Regulations.	Mrs. Susie Joy
Hillview Inn	St. John's	Oct. 31, 1952	Nov. 1, 1952	Breach Section 53 (b) A.L. Act.	Messrs. Cook, Greene
Cochrane Hotel Lounge	St. John's	Nov. 6, 1952	Nov. 17, 1952	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act, and Section 29 (a) A.L. Regulations.	R. T. Ryan
Sport's Tavern	St. John's	Nov. 6, 1952	Nov. 10, 1952	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	A. Connors
Sport's Tavern	St. John's	Nov. 13, 1952	Nov. 19, 1952	Breach Section 78 (c) A.L. Act.	A. Connors
Corner Tavern	St. John's	Dec. 29, 1952	Jan. 2, 1953	Breach Section 72 (3) A.L. Act and Section 29 (b) A.L. Regulations.	Georgetown Reality Co.
Cochrane Hotel Lounge	St. John's	Dec. 30, 1952	Mar. 23, 1953	Breach Section 72 (3) 53 (d) A.L. Act and Sections 10, 29 (a) (b) and 26 (b) A.L. Regulations.	R. T. Ryan
Ritz Tavern	St. John's	Jan. 6, 1953	Jan. 10, 1953	Breach Section 72 (3) A.L. Act and Section 26 (b) A.L. Regulations.	Derek Kearney
Avalon Club	Manuels	Feb. 28, 1953 April 21, 1953	Mar. 12, 1953 April 22, 1953	Breach Section 26 (b) and (e) A.L. Regulations. Breach Section 19 and 41 (1) A.L. Regulations (R.C.M.P.)	C. Hall, Pres.
Application for renewal Avalon Club License rejected for 1954.					
Murrin's Tavern	Spaniard's Bay	Mar. 16, 1953	Mar. 20, 1953	Breach Section 56 (b) A.L. Act, and Section 29 (a) A.L. Regulations.	L. Murrin
Kelly's Tavern	Avondale	Mar. 16, 1953	Mar. 21, 1953	Breach Section 16 (b) and (c) A.L. Regulations.	Mrs. Teresa Kelly

Establishment	Location	Date of Suspension or Cancellation	Date Reopened	Reasons For Suspension or Cancellation	Licensee
Harbour Inn Tavern	St. John's	Mar. 27, 1953	April 1, 1953	Breach Section 72 (2) and (3) Section 53 (d) A.L. Act and Section 25 (c) A.L. Regulations.	Kevin Darcy
Hamilton Inn	St. John's	April 15, 1953	April 20, 1953	Breach Section 72 (2) A.L. Act.	Mrs. Susie Joy
H. S. Yetman (Hotel-Lounge)	Salmonier Line	April 10, 1953	Cancelled	Breach Section 229 (2) Criminal Code of Canada.	H. S. Yetman
Piccadilly Club	St. John's	May 16, 1953	May 18, 1953	Breach Section 58 (2) A.L. Act.	E. Pelly, Pres.
Park Inn Tavern	St. John's	May 15, 1953	May 19, 1953	Breach Section 72 (2) A.L. Act.	Park Inn Co.
Riviera Tavern	St. John's	May 16, 1953	May 20, 1953	Breach Section 72 (3) A.L. Act and Section 29 (a) A.L. Regulations.	D. A. Mercer, Trustee
Elks Club	St. John's	June 17, 1953	June 18, 1953	Breach Section 58 (1) A.L. Act.	B. P. O. Elks
Didham's Tavern	Colinet	Aug. 28, 1953	Oct. 29, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	Mrs. M. Didham
Kumbi Club	Seawards	Aug. 22, 1953	Aug. 24, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	G. B. Hefferton
Park Inn Tavern	St. John's	Sept. 11, 1953	Sept. 14, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	Park Inn Co.
Harbour Inn Tavern	St. John's	Sept. 18, 1953	Sept. 19, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) and (b) A.L. Act.	K. Darcy
Crawley's Tavern	Holyrood	Sept. 21, 1953	Sept. 23, 1953	Breach Section 62 (2) A.L. Act.	W. Crawley
Hickey's Tavern	Holyrood	Sept. 21, 1953	Sept. 23, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	J. J. Hickey
Nfld. Flying Club	Torbay	Sept. 24, 1953	Sept. 30, 1953	Breach Section 58 (1) (a) A.L. Act.	Paul Murphy, Pres.
Albert's Tavern	Harbour Main	Oct. 26, 1953	Nov. 5, 1953	Breach Section 53 (d) and (b) A.L. Act and Section 27 (b) A.L. Regulations.	Mrs. Albert Furey
Green Lantern Tavern	St. John's	Nov. 14, 1953	Nov. 16, 1953	Breach Section 53 (b) A.L. Act.	C. Doyle
Club Commodore	St. John's	Jan. 2, 1953	Jan. 12, 1954	Breach Section 65 (2) A.L. Act and Sections 14 and 25 (a) A.L. Regulations.	C. Martin (Mrs. Stella Divine, Guardian)

Establishment	Location	Date of Suspension or Cancellation	Date Reopened	Reasons For Suspension or Cancellation	Licensee
Queen Tavern	St. John's	Dec. 11, 1953	Dec. 15, 1953	Breach Section 53 (b) A.L. Act.	C. Truscott
Mrs. Mary Fewer	Avondale	Jan. 21, 1954		Breach Section 52 (2) 58 (1) and 52 (a) and (4) A.L. Act. Court Conviction.	Mrs. Mary Fewer
Brown Derby Tavern	Stephenville	Feb. 9, 1954	Feb. 15, 1954	Breach Section 53 d) A.L. Act.	M. J. Boland & Com.
Crosbie Tavern	St. John's	Feb. 2, 1954	Feb. 6, 1954	Breach Section 26 (b) A.L. Regula- tions.	W. Spurrell
McCarthy's Tavern	Corner Brook	Feb. 11, 1954	Feb. 15, 1954	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	Estate of Mrs. McCarthy
Dunphy Tavern	Corner Brook	Feb. 11, 1954	Feb. 15, 1954	Breach Section 53 (d) A.L. Act.	P. J. Dunphy
Kelly's Tavern	Avondale	Feb. 26, 1954		Breach Section 16 (b) and (c) A.L. Regulations, Section 53 (b) A.L. Act.	Mrs. T. Kelly
Ringside Tavern	St. John's	Mar. 4, 1954	Mar. 6, 1954	Breach Section 16 (b) A.L. Regula- tions.	T. Dunne Ltd.
Donovan's Country Club	Donovans	Mar. 8, 1954	Mar. 18, 1954	Breach Section 58 (2) A.L. Act and Section 285 (4) (A) Criminal Code of Canada.	G. Byrne, Pres.
Joint Services Offs' Mess	Buckmaster's Field	Nov. 10, 1953	Nov. 12, 1953	Breach Section 58 (4) A.L. Act.	Commanding Off. Joint Services
Joint Services Sgts' Mess	Buckmaster's Field	Nov. 10, 1953	Nov. 12, 1953	Breach Section 58 (4) A.L. Act.	Commanding Off. Joint Services
Joint Services Men's Canteen	Buckmaster's Field	Nov. 10, 1953	Nov. 12, 1953	Breach Section 58 (4) A.L. Act.	Commanding Off. Joint Services



Question No. 37:

MR. BROWNE: I asked Section 4 of that question again today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that question was referred to the Honourable Minister of Supply who has just informed me the question is in course of preparation.

Question No. 38: Answer being prepared.

Question No. 39: Referred to Honourable Minister of Fisheries.

Question No. 40: In course of preparation.

Question No. 41: Referred to Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I shall take measures to secure the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. This is the first information I have had of it except being told it was referred to some other department.

Question No. 12:

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question No. 12 appearing on the Order Paper of March 30th. There is one part of one section I find has not the whole of the answer. This deficiency will be corrected. There are several copies, for all members of the House, Mr. Speaker.

Question (12), asked by the Honourable, the Leader of the Opposition, March 30th, 1954.

I:

**NUMBER OF FAMILIES RECEIVING ABLE BODIED ASSISTANCE FOR EACH MONTH FROM MARCH 31ST, 1953, TO JANUARY 31ST, 1954.**

Months	Families
April 1953	697
May	515
June	262
July	161
August	146
September	141
October	260
November	504
December	869
January 1954	1,515

**QUESTION NO. 12 (2):**

**ABLE BODIED ASSISTANCE**

No. in Family	Minimum	Maximum
	Per Month	Per Month
1.	\$ 5	\$15
2.	10	19
3.	15	23
4.	20	27
5.	25	31
6.	30	35
7.	35	39
8.	40	43
9.	45	47
10 or more	50	51

## QUESTION NO. 12 (1):

STATEMENT SHOWING NUMBER OF ABLE BODIED FAMILIES BY ELECTORAL DISTRICTS MARCH 31ST, 1953  
TO JANUARY 31ST, 1954

DISTRICTS	April 1953	May 1953	June 1953	July 1953	Aug. 1953	Sept. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1953	Dec. 1953	Jan. 1954
St. John's City	135	95	58	70	68	74	81	128	213	339
St. John's Extern	3	5	3	1	4	7	4	9	9	14
Harbour Main-Bell Island	29	31	18	15	11	7	12	19	29	36
Port de Grave	20	19	13	6	5	0	1	2	7	13
Harbour Grace	50	67	56	35	10	8	14	3	17	44
Carbonear-Bay de Verde	44	42	28	6	9	2	8	26	57	63
Trinity South	18	12	4	3	1	2	5	8	20	35
Trinity North	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	7	25	56
Bonavista South	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	22
Bonavista North	9	4	5	0	4	0	4	3	11	18
Fogo	17	3	1	0	1	0	1	6	35	85
Twillingate	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	28
Grand Falls	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
Green Bay	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	22
White Bay	112	91	6	5	7	3	3	52	78	164
St. Barbe	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	39
Humber	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	11	12
St. George's-Port au Port	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burgeo La Poile	37	7	36	13	22	15	73	67	74	128
Fortune & Hermitage	35	11	5	0	0	0	29	79	161	212
Burin	46	35	10	1	0	1	13	33	26	54
Placentia West	86	57	0	0	0	17	4	39	58	86
Placentia & St. Mary's	22	16	8	4	4	3	4	5	10	31
Ferryland	10	8	4	0	0	1	2	6	7	6
TOTALS	697	515	262	161	146	141	260	504	869	1,471

QUESTION NO. 12 (2):

**COST OF ABLE BODIED ASSISTANCE MONTHLY BY ELECTORAL DISTRICT FROM MARCH 31ST, 1953 TO  
JANUARY 31ST, 1954**

DISTRICTS	April 1953	May 1953	June 1953	July 1953	Aug. 1953	Sept. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1953	Dec. 1953	Jan. 1954
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
St. John's City .....	2,867	1,968	1,079	1,454	1,644	2,014	2,242	4,380	6,311	9,110
St. John's Extern .....	65	93	60	5	75	150	95	215	214	334
Harbour Main-Bell Island .....	952	995	501	456	371	236	352	650	958	1,187
Port de Grave .....	535	457	233	130	65	0	15	60	130	340
Harbour Grace .....	1,477	1,760	1,530	876	185	150	305	110	406	1,278
Carbonear-Bay de Verde .....	1,261	1,098	532	110	228	65	215	605	1,557	1,882
Trinity South .....	347	197	54	55	15	30	114	193	554	1,111
Trinity North .....	181	126	20	0	0	0	0	174	885	1,903
Bonavista South .....	133	68	65	0	0	0	0	82	169	660
Bonavista North .....	250	105	100	0	140	0	145	90	305	604
Fogo .....	515	95	25	0	15	0	25	145	1,060	2,685
Twillingate .....	0	0	0	25	0	0	40	99	134	953
Grand Falls .....	90	35	25	0	0	0	0	35	40	198
Green Bay .....	80	50	0	20	0	0	0	75	235	770
White Bay .....	3,516	2,379	172	170	195	53	48	1,632	2,309	4,769
St. Barbe .....	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	119	1,395
Humber .....	85	35	25	0	0	25	30	0	270	295
St. George's-Port au Port .....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burgeo La Poile .....	1,085	180	954	375	660	385	1,535	1,945	2,020	3,555
Fortune & Hermitage .....	1,120	370	75	0	0	0	815	2,228	4,700	5,575
Burin .....	1,755	1,090	240	30	485	30	315	1,140	918	1,840
Placentia West .....	2,579	1,792	0	0	0	563	120	1,630	2,207	3,157
Placentia and St. Mary's .....	667	332	144	72	72	57	87	112	317	1,030
Ferryland .....	354	271	85	0	0	40	70	180	220	495
<b>TOTALS .....</b>	<b>20,054</b>	<b>13,499</b>	<b>5,919</b>	<b>3,778</b>	<b>4,150</b>	<b>3,798</b>	<b>6,568</b>	<b>15,914</b>	<b>26,038</b>	<b>45,126</b>

## QUESTION NO. 12 (3):

**NUMBER OF FAMILIES IN RECEIPT OF SICK RELIEF MONTHLY BY ELECTORAL DISTRICTS FROM MARCH  
31ST, 1953, TO JANUARY 31ST, 1954**

DISTRICTS	April 1953	May 1953	June 1953	July 1953	Aug. 1953	Sept. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1953	Dec. 1953	Jan. 1954
St. John's City .....	126	128	133	120	117	112	113	111	108	142
St. John's Extern .....	7	7	7	4	1	4	4	0	0	1
Harbour Main-Bell Island .....	40	39	36	37	39	34	36	29	30	25
Port de Grave .....	23	20	23	19	22	22	24	23	16	22
Harbour Grace .....	35	32	37	31	32	22	21	29	29	31
Carbonear-Bay de Verde .....	87	93	82	57	61	70	91	93	81	91
Trinity South .....	41	47	40	38	49	42	43	39	49	51
Trinity North .....	43	35	33	25	32	34	31	32	35	39
Bonavista South .....	50	40	32	22	26	30	30	30	34	36
Bonavista North .....	27	26	21	16	15	15	17	21	15	19
Fogo .....	73	60	43	54	55	56	51	44	40	39
Twillingate .....	32	29	27	24	25	24	33	32	32	31
Grand Falls .....	48	45	43	38	39	42	42	42	52	47
Green Bay .....	44	42	38	61	32	33	35	30	37	33
White Bay .....	50	61	49	47	42	45	50	54	49	46
St. Barbe .....	41	38	36	33	31	33	35	33	36	39
Humber .....	30	31	33	26	26	27	30	24	28	23
St. George's-Port au Port .....	64	52	43	41	39	41	44	42	44	69
Burgeo La Poile .....	26	29	23	24	27	27	32	35	28	27
Fortune and Hermitage .....	56	68	68	66	73	62	64	59	71	74
Burin .....	35	36	34	28	28	38	42	38	31	40
Placentia West .....	56	58	46	37	35	63	37	58	58	55
Placentia and St. Mary's .....	39	30	21	21	23	25	27	29	26	21
Ferryland .....	28	29	24	24	23	23	25	25	24	29
<b>TOTALS</b> .....	<b>1,101</b>	<b>1,075</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>893</b>	<b>892</b>	<b>924</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>952</b>	<b>953</b>	<b>1,030</b>

	Mothers' Allowance	Dependents' Allowance	Old Age Assistance
1. Bonavista North .....	43,050	47,010	103,820
2. Bonavista South .....	33,820	57,670	117,280
3. Burgeo & La Poile .....	48,270	35,240	39,900
4. Burin .....	58,270	37,760	54,920
5. Carbonear-Bay de Verde .....	58,620	62,200	111,180
6. Ferryland .....	27,500	29,760	60,550
7. Fogo .....	34,730	37,590	91,540
8. Fortune Bay & Hermitage .....	68,560	63,870	91,620
9. Grand Falls .....	50,200	40,360	59,910
10. Green Bay .....	40,150	29,900	54,690
11. Harbour Grace .....	30,570	37,350	47,640
12. Harbour Main-Bell Island .....	75,540	61,860	78,530
13. Humber .....	72,140	41,170	48,510
14. Labrador .....	22,230	24,790	31,230
15. Placentia West .....	60,050	50,460	74,230
16. Placentia & St. Mary's .....	39,310	38,590	67,640
17. Port de Grave .....	29,780	33,130	67,400
18. St. Barbe .....	35,960	25,150	48,500
19. St. George's-Port au Port .....	58,510	34,460	37,330
20. St. John's East .....	66,030	80,410	87,710
21. St. John's West .....	109,530	113,590	110,780
22. Trinity North .....	43,550	51,250	96,890
23. Trinity South .....	45,820	41,820	88,360
24. Twillingate .....	32,680	30,360	65,120
25. White Bay .....	43,170	36,940	64,080
26. Other Districts .....	1,110	4,160	4,050
	1,229,150	1,146,850	1,803,410

Expenditure is not recorded by electoral districts. The above figures are based on an analysis of expenditure for February, 1954, as supplied by International Business Machines.

April 2, 1954.

## QUESTION NO. 12 (5):

**NORTHERN LABRADOR AFFAIRS****1953-54 Account as at April 1st, 1954**

<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Subhead</b>	<b>\$</b>
Salaries (including Headquarters, Staff) .....	111901	56,101
Expenses—Travelling .....	11190201	1,238
Office .....	02	1,079
Miscellaneous :		
General, including rental and repairs .....	11190301	3,799
Steamship Service .....	02	15,000
Radio Services .....	03	4,580
Deficits on Operations .....	04	1,481
Trading Supplies, including freight .....	05	349,655
Cultural & Educational Services :		
Films, Radio & Library .....	11190401	
Education of Children .....	02	903
Sundry .....	03	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</b> .....		<b>\$433,836</b>

**Revenue :**

General Revenue .....	1155	268,471
Recoveries re Board & Lodgings .....	115605	5,316
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b> .....		<b>\$273,787</b>

Note : When the records for the year are received from the depots certain adjustments will have to be made in the above expenditure subheads, e.g., items transferred from stocks for use on the depots will be transferred from 11190305 to 11190301.

April 2, 1954.



Question No. 32:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have the answer to Question No. 32: The Directors of Atlantic Gypsum Ltd. are, Hon. L. R. Curtis, Hon. E. S. Spencer, Hon. C. H. Ballam, Ernest Leja, Hon J. R. Smallwood.

2. The Managing Director of the plant is Ernest Leja.

3. 183 persons, and in shipping season that goes to 350. \$600,000 a year being paid in salaries and wages.

4. The cost to date to the Treasury of this plant \$2,825,113.

5. Newfoundlanders 165 and others 18 making the total of 183, not the total of 350 in which it is still 18 non-Newfoundlanders. I have not the amount of wages paid to each classification, but will have them in a day or two and will table them then.

In reply to (6) and (7) I regret to say that the only part of that question I noticed to this moment when I read it aloud—I thought it referred to an Auditor's Report. That is not yet available but as it refers to a period of which I should think the audit is available, if so, I will certainly table it. With regard to the second part the report is not yet available

and I will present it in the House as soon as it is available to me. With regard to the next section I am afraid it is not in the public interest to say anything whatsoever, and I do not propose to do so. I think my Honourable friend will agree, if we are negotiating the sale of the plant the least said the better.

Question No. 30: Answer tabled by Mr. Hefferton.

Question (30) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to table the following information:

1. A statement showing the number of machines, bulldozers, graders, tractors, etc., purchased during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954. From whom were they purchased and what prices were paid for same?

2. List the number of motor vehicles of all kinds purchased during the same period. For which Departments were they purchased and from what firms and at what prices? Give type of vehicle.

3. What used vehicles and road building machinery were sold during the period. To whom were they sold and at what prices?

QUESTION NO. 30 (1):

**LIST OF MACHINES, BULLDOZERS, GRADERS, TRACTORS, ETC., PURCHASED FROM APRIL 1ST, 1953  
TO MARCH 31ST, 1954.**

Department	Type of Machine	From Whom Purchased	Price
Public Works	1 Air Compressor	H. A. Walsh & Co. ....	\$ 215.12
	1 V Type Snow Plow	Whelan's Garage Ltd. ....	3,605.00
	4 Sicard Snow Blowers	Basil Fearn Ltd. ....	15,450.00
	1 Bit Detacher	Riley Engineering Co., Ltd., Halifax, N.S. ....	99.27
	1 Rock Drill Compressor	Canadian Copco Ltd., Truro, N.S. ....	3,900.77
	1 Esco Dozer	Industrial Engineering Co., Halifax, N.S. ....	1,612.00
	1 Auto Patrol	Nfld. Tractor & Equipment Co. ....	20,117.92
	1 Tractor	" " " " " " .....	20,143.71
	1 Snow Plow Wing	" " " " " " .....	6,746.60
	1 Snow Plow Wing & Tractor	" " " " " " .....	22,701.20
	1 Snow Plow Wing	" " " " " " .....	3,404.15
	1 Snow Plow Wing	" " " " " " .....	2,008.50
	2 Shovels	" " " " " " .....	57,504.90
	1 Tractor	" " " " " " .....	19,255.85
	2 Snow Plow Arrangements	" " " " " " .....	6,849.50
	1 Gravel Plant	" " " " " " .....	49,830.37
	1 Concrete Mixer	" " " " " " .....	2,219.65
	1 Tractor	" " " " " " .....	10,784.60
	1 Tractor	" " " " " " .....	19,106.70

QUESTION NO. 30 (2):

LIST OF MOTOR VEHICLES PURCHASED FROM APRIL 1ST, 1953 TO MARCH 31ST, 1954.

Departments	Type of Vehicle	From Whom Purchased	Price
Public Works	1—Plymouth Station Wagon	Marshall Motors, Ltd.	\$ 2,199.93
Municipal Affairs & Supply	1—1½ ton Chevrolet Truck	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	3,029.14
Mines & Resources	1—Plymouth Sedan	Marshall Motors, Ltd.	1,942.07
Labour	1—Plymouth Station Wagon	Marshall Motors, Ltd.	2,194.41
Public Works	1—¾ ton Chevrolet Truck	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,693.85
" "	1—3 ton Chevrolet Truck	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	3,323.47
Attorney General	1—Chevrolet Sedan	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,681.41
Public Works	2—Pontiac Sedan Delivery Vans	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	3,736.14
" "	1—Chevrolet Stake Body Truck	Corner Brook Garage, Co.	3,038.89
" "	2—Chevrolet Delivery Vans	Corner Brook Garage Co.	3,247.01
" "	1—¾ ton Chevrolet Truck	Corner Brook Garage Co.	1,671.63
Health	1—1 ton Chevrolet Delivery Van	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,987.85
"	1—Plymouth Sedan	Marshall Motors, Ltd.	4,292.79
"	1—Chevrolet Sedan, 210 Series	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,849.56
"	2—Chevrolet Sedans, 150 Series	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	3,534.32
"	1—½ ton Chevrolet Panel Delivery	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	3,671.93
"	1—1 ton Chevrolet Panel Delivery	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,987.85
"	1—½ ton Fargo Truck	Wiseman Motors, Ltd., Corner Brook	1,663.24
"	2—G.M.C. Suburbans	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	5,154.00
Public Works	1—Pontiac Sedan	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	1,984.00
" "	2—Pontiac Sedan Deliveries	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	3,914.40
Health	1—Station Wagon	Wiseman Motors, Ltd., Corner Brook	2,192.92

Departments	Type of Vehicle	From Whom Purchased	Price
Public Works	3—International Dump Trucks	Whelan's Garage, Ltd.	13,905.00
" "	1—3 ton Chevrolet Truck	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	3,073.47
" "	2—Pontiac Sedans	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	2,612.22
" "	1—Chevrolet Pick-up Truck	Hickman Motors, Ltd.	1,693.85
" "	2—Pontiac Sedans	Terra Nova Motors, Ltd.	2,900.69
" "	2—Chevrolet Sedan Deliveries	Corner Brook Garage, Corner Brook	3,248.01
" "	1— $\frac{3}{4}$ ton Chevrolet Truck	Corner Brook Garage, Corner Brook	1,670.70

QUESTION NO 30 (3):

LIST OF USED VEHICLES AND ROAD BUILDING MACHINERY SOLD FROM APRIL 1ST, 1953,  
TO MARCH 31ST, 1954.

Vehicles	To Whom Sold	Price
1—1947 Model Studebaker Pick-up Truck	Elim Ellis, Bishop's Falls	\$206.00
1—1948 Chevrolet Sedan	Joseph Hynes, Kelligrews	222.48
1—1943 Model $1\frac{1}{2}$ ton Chevrolet Truck	Bert Guzzwell, St. John's	386.25
1—1947 Model G.M.C. Truck	Jerome Crawley, Holyrood	128.75
1—1941 Model G.M.C. Van	H. Vardy, St. John's	262.65
<b>Road Building Machinery</b>		
1 Crusher Plant	Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd., Corner Brook	360.50
1 Broke Drum Turning Machine	Canadian Diesel & Marine Eng., Co., St. John's	41.20

## Question No. 28:

MR. HEFFERTON: I can give the answer to that question in part. Tenders are called normally for all institutions in Town, contracts are awarded on the basis of prices consistent with quality and the lowest tender receives the contract. The West Coast San. after some inquiries made at the time when the institution was about to open, on the basis of prices that were given, arrangements were made with a local firm to supply the hospital with day by day requirements. The Gander Hospital and the cottage hospitals and nursing stations, day by day requirements are met by arrangements made locally. But when there are furniture requisitions, surgical supplies etc., these invariably go to the Department of Health and come to the Department of Supply for tender.

The second part of the question is under preparation. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one part of that particular question, the matter of drugs and dressings is so involved it is going to take considerable time trying to get it before the House closes.

## Question No. 27:

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): The answer is being prepared.

## Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply:

MR. HOLLETT: I shall try to get through as quickly as possible. It comes down to the fact that some of us have to be long-winded to cover some points which are of special interest to us all.

I believe when I left off, I had come to the important issue of NALCO—

the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation Limited. If one were to devote the whole afternoon to NALCO, one would not be amiss, because we all know that this Corporation, set up by the Government, has control over a large extent of the territory of this Province. Some twenty-three to twenty-five thousand square miles have been placed, almost unreservedly, in the hands of a number of people both inside and outside the country. It would be well, therefore, to look before we go further and see how it came about that this particular NALCO was set up, and to do that, as it comes under the Department of Economic Development, we shall have to go and see what were the duties of the Department of Economic Development as laid out in the Act.

Page 178—Volume 1—Revised Statutes.

"The duties, powers and functions of the Minister shall extend to and include all matters relating to the encouragement generally of economic development in Newfoundland and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, particularly the following matters:

"(a) The encouragement of the development of established industries," If as in our opinion "established industries" mean all the industries that at that time existed, it was the duty of the Economic Development to look into the encouragement of the development of these industries, "the diversification of products and the application of modern methods for the production and marketing of the products of Newfoundland and products manufactured in Newfoundland.

"(b) The encouragement and assistance for the establishment in New-

foundland of new industries suited to the needs of Newfoundland and especially industries based on the natural resources and products of Newfoundland."

You will note that it says encouragement and assistance to industries suited to the needs of Newfoundland.

"(c) Guidance of small industries, and encouragement of expansion in groups inadequately represented."

If we cast back over the period, to what extent did the Economic Development guide the small industries in this country? We must remember that quite a number of small industries in this country have disappeared entirely, and as it was the duty of the Economic Development Department to look into and guide them, it is also the duty of the Department to tell us just why these industries are defunct and to show us wherein the Department failed in its duty. Many small industries have disappeared and there is no explanation from the Department whose duty it was to see that they were properly guided and assisted.

"(d) The promotion and utilization of the resources of Newfoundland."

What resources did we have? Certainly we had the fish, all sorts of fish. I do not need to ask what has been done. I do admit that the Department and the Government did assist some merchants to acquire druggers and I do know they spent some \$214,000, I believe, in assisting fishermen with smaller boats and so on. I shall come to that later. There seems to be some discrepancy in the way the Development Board granted these loans. Out of \$214,000 I find \$88,000 went to one of the Northern Districts and I believe the Minister

will be quite familiar with that particular district.

The duties of the Economic Development Department are well defined and there should have been no mistake as to what their duties were.

If we go over to sections 9 and 10 we find:

"The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations to give effect to and carry out the objects of this Act, and may prescribe penalties upon summary conviction for violation of any such regulation by way of imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars or both such fine and imprisonment, and in default of such fine additional imprisonment for a term not exceeding two months.

"Regulations made under this Act shall forthwith after approval by the Lieutenant Governor in Council be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and laid before the Legislature within fifteen days after they are made, if the Legislature is then sitting, and, if not, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session thereof."

We have seen no Regulations. They have never been tabled. Since I came here, I have never seen Regulations with regard to the duties by the Department of Economic Development. In my opinion the Minister did not get to read this properly. I do not believe he got further than Section 4. I will read the whole section.

"4. (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint an officer, who shall be called the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, who shall be the deputy head of the Department and who shall hold office during pleasure.



"(2) Such officers, clerks and employees as are necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the Department may be appointed or employed in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act, but the Minister may, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, temporarily employ such technical or other assistants as he deems necessary and, with such approval, fix the remuneration of and prescribe such expenses as may be incurred by such assistants in carrying out their official duties."

That is as far as the Government and the Minister got in relation to this particular Act. They did not get any further than that. When the Minister saw he had the authority to appoint somebody else; he brought in Valdmanis, made him Director and said "go to it; the sky is the limit. Bring in the industries wherever you can get them." And that is what Valdmanis did. He was given unlimited power by this House. He was installed as Director General at a salary of \$25,000 a year.

There is also something in accordance with the rules in connection with Civil Servants which apparently never applied to Valdmanis. He was given the job as Director General, and the Minister promptly forgot about him as soon as they appointed him. He promptly forgot about Valdmanis, who had come in here from the mainland of Canada, where he touched down on his way from Central Europe—Latvia. He spent a while in some Town or in Ottawa, getting \$100 a month in a small job with one of the Departments. He was pounced on by the Minister of Economic Development, brought here and promptly forgotten, but told to go straight ahead. Valdmanis was a lonely man, I take

it, amongst a bunch of foreigners, so he decided "here is a chance; I have a job; I will bring in some of my friends." He brought in his friends from all over the world and he advised this Government to spread some twenty million dollars amongst them.

One other thing the Director did (and I take it the department is somewhat responsible), was to set up this NALCO.

One thing I forgot to mention when speaking of Valdmanis—I do not know whether the Honourable Minister of Economic Development knew it at the time—but it is a fact that during the period Alfred Valdmanis was Director of Economic Development here, he was also a Director of a large Fish Company in New York—the Douay Export Company of New York. It is also a known fact to anybody who takes the trouble to find out, that this Douay Export Company had an interest in a fish plant in New Brunswick, very close to St. Andrews in New Brunswick. It can be proven that this Director made certain large investments in this fish plant in New Brunswick. It can be proven that not only Alfred Valdmanis but other people in this country invested largely in this particular fish plant in New Brunswick. I do not know whether the Government knew anything about that or whether it did not. It does seem rather a strange thing when we here in Newfoundland were trying to develop our fisheries, trying to set up plants, establish plants in order to give fishermen a chance to live, the Director of Economic Development and other people took large sums of money and invested it in fish plants in New Brunswick. I say it in passing. I shall probably have to refer to it later in more and in fuller detail.

Another thing the Doctor did—he had a large hand, I take it, in setting up the Newfoundland-Labrador Corporation Ltd. It is interesting to look at that particular Act and the peculiar manner in which it starts out:

“An Act to Incorporate  
The Newfoundland and Labrador  
Corporation Limited.”

WHEREAS it is expedient for the promotion of the industrial and economic development of the Province of Newfoundland and for the development of its natural resources and the improvement of the standard of living of the people of the Province that a corporation be formed with the powers and be granted the concessions and rights hereinafter described and set forth.”

That Act set up the Newfoundland-Labrador Corporation and Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General and Dr. Alfred Valdmanis were Directors; as also were C. A. Pippy, E. A. Bowring, H. M. S. Lewin, Claude Richardson, Lyttleton B. P. Gould, George M. MacKintosh and Harold S. Griffin.

Later on, Sir William Stephenson was a Director. He was with this Company about two months and then disappeared. We told the public last year about the manner of his going and the facts are well known to everybody.

Mr. Bowring has resigned, as has also Mr. Lewin. And now the great Valdmanis also has taken his suitcase and travelled off with his loot. I call it nothing else but loot. This man came in here and was given \$25,000 a year for a number of years and then he was made Chairman of NALCO and given \$30,000 a year.

For what? I have yet to see for what and I hope that the Government will be in a position sooner or later to explain to us why they increased his salary from \$25,000 to \$30,000.

This Act was amended in order that they might deprivatize this Company. They brought in Sir William Stephenson. He was put in charge of NALCO. He said “we are going to sell the Gypsum Plant, the Cement Plant, and the Birch Plant. Raise ten million dollars and we will give you these three plants.” NALCO could not raise ten million dollars. We still have the three plants—we have two anyway. We had to go back to the financial world and borrow money as a government. Sir William Stephenson got out after that.

I was referring to the Amendment. NALCO has the right to grant concessions to whom it pleases. Over 25,000 square miles of territory they have absolute control of practically all mineral rights, all wood rights, all timber rights and all water rights. I believe, since 1950 they have had the sole control of this huge territory and during that period they granted three concessions, one to the American Zinc of Tennessee; one to the Canadian Javelin (these are the people who took the “private” out of the Corporation; they deprivatized it. They were supposed to raise a lot of money. We know what happened to Javelin. They succeeded in getting 2300 square miles. The are to be given a Mining Lease any time between now and 1959 over a mileage of 50 square miles). Another to the Newmont Mining Corporation of Canada. I am getting sick of it. We heard so much about Newmont; going to do this and that. What have they done? Anyway, this rings down the curtain—they dropped their option on December 31, 1953.

We have these three sub-concessions which unfortunately have come to nought.

Nine hundred thousand dollars, good hard cash, has gone into NALCO, and to date not one cent has come back. Nine hundred thousand dollars gone out on a gamble; given to Valdmanis to go out and spread his wings.

I was going to say something about BRINCO—that may look a little more respectable largely because it has on its directorate large Companies such as A.N.D. Company, Bowaters and Rothchilds. BRINCO has a concession to ten thousand miles in Newfoundland and fifty thousand miles on Labrador. They have been given absolute control over sixty thousand square miles—85,000 between BRINCO and NALCO, and if you were a Prospector and discovered a mine in that territory—or anything that looked like a mine—you would be naïve if you came to the Department of Mines and Resources and said to Mr. Rowe “I have a mine; I want to file a claim.” He would have to tell you—our own Minister would have to tell you—“I have nothing to do with it; you have to go and see NALCO or you have to go and see BRINCO.” I defy anybody on the opposite side to refute that. We have a country, but we have not got it. We do not own it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Point of order. Unless he is raising new points, is it in order for an honourable gentleman, in the wide latitude given in the Address in Reply, to go over legislation passed in former sessions—legislation which has been thoroughly ventilated and adopted by the House? If he chooses to take every piece of legislation, is he at liberty to review

it all; give the pros and cons on it; give his views on it; is that in order? Or is he doing it just to bring his colleagues up to date?

MR. SPEAKER: I was about to remind the honourable member of a pitfall. Members may refer to past Acts, but they may not criticize past Acts. So far, and I have been listening carefully, I have not heard him commit a breach of that. He must be careful when commenting on legislation not to criticize it, and so long as he does not infringe on that, I cannot rule him out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not noticed particularly a note of adulation or praise of the legislation up to now and if it is not condemning it, it sounds suspiciously like it.

MR. HOLLETT: Do I have to start praising the legislation? I have here an Act with regard to Dr. Arthur Seigheim. But I am not going to say anything more.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be equally out of order to praise it, as much as it would be to condemn it.

MR. HOLLETT: I can neither praise nor condemn an Act.

MR. SPEAKER: It does not prevent the honourable member from criticizing the policy of the Government emanating from an Act.

MR. HOLLETT: The hand out to Braun-Wogan—everybody knows him, the man who went to Gander and put the mythical gun to the head of Dr. Sennewald and said: “Look you come to St. John’s and say what we tell you”—that is the man who got a million dollars for the rubber plant and is in on two or three others as well. The Canadian Machinery Company cost the country two and a

half million dollars. If my memory serves me right the Public Accounts say there is an extra \$25,000, I believe—why I don't know? Then there is the cotton mill—if you want a pocket handkerchief made it is a good spot to get it, but you won't get anything else—you might get a pair of overalls—that has taken the place of the reputable firm, and casting no reflection on United Cotton Mills, but a reputable firm which was formerly here in Newfoundland—but Valdmanis, Sir, is responsible for all that—Dr. Alfred Valdmanis who got \$25,000 to \$30,000 a year here for three or four years and while he was the agent for the Government, the Government was responsible, the Government cannot escape responsibility—I am laying the blame on Valdmanis but do so with a purpose—the Government has to take the responsibility for paying out twenty million dollars which with all other incidentals brings it nearly up to thirty millions, which has caused a little heartache or pain.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, is that remark in order? That sounds suspiciously close to an allegation of graft. If the honourable gentleman wishes to suggest graft, embezzlement, thieving, robbery, I wish he would do so, so that we could deal with it, instead of hinting and using innuendo.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That remark was certainly coming very close to and could lend itself to misinterpretation. Consequently I don't think the honourable gentleman should make ambiguous remarks like that.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I take it, it is something similar to the remarks of the Premier on the last sitting day that the paper misrepresented him—when any of us, Mr. Speaker, open our mouths to say any-

thing we lay ourselves open to possible charges. If I have said anything suggesting a breach of the rules I beg Your Honour's pardon, and I ask the House's forgiveness in the matter. I wish to, as much as I can, keep within the rules of the House.

There is one question I should like to ask, Sir, I shall not get an answer about this Valdmanis—I am wondering who fired him? Who fired Dr. Alfred Valdmanis? Or is it possible that Dr. Valdmanis fired somebody else? Fired NALCO—fired the Government? It seems to me rather strange that a man getting \$30,000 to slip out without any explanation, whatsoever, except he finds he has to live in Montreal, the nature of his business will render it necessary he live in Montreal so much, he feels he will have to resign and give up \$30,000 a year, because he finds the climate Sir, of Montreal, much more amenable to his delicate disposition, or shall I say indisposition.

We might also inquire who fired Sir William Stephenson. Or did Sir William Stephenson fire somebody? I don't know. I wish the Government would tell us, and not give us the opportunity to make innuendo or talk like this.

Now, Sir, I leave Valdmanis for the time being and let it rest. Now, I come to the delicate matter of finance. I am not too good a judge, I admit that, but I do know that last year we voted on current account some thirty-two million dollars (round figures). Then there was a vote for capital account, which I believe brought the entire vote up to some forty-four million dollars. That was allocated to the various departments which they were to spend between the 31st, March 1953 and the last of April 1954. One would have thought, Sir, that was

ample. But when we look at the information which has been handed to us so far we find that was not in any way ample for this Government, who claims that it is the only Government that we have had, that did anything for certain branches of our industries such as the fishery etc. I want to draw, Sir, to your attention the Orders in Council which were passed relative to financial matters during the past year. As we know, each department is allocated so much and each department has that so much, divided up into little lots for this, and big lots for that. During the course of the year it is reasonable to expect some department might run short and others have a little too much etc. But, Sir, I never did think that it was possible for any one Government to require over and above the estimates passed at the beginning of the year, to underestimate an amount of \$3,168,000. For instance they had to get an Order in Council for \$50,000 for a commission of inquiry into agriculture. Was not that taken care of last year in the estimates? I am quite sure we had something about a commission of inquiry into agriculture last year. Still the Government had to get fifty thousand dollars to pay some of the cost on that. They had to get an Order in Council, to find an amount I take it, of \$125,000 to lend the Co-operative Housing. They had to get an Order in Council for \$20,900 as the cost of printing and illustrating a booklet descriptive of the progress of the province since the date of union with Canada. Well, Sir, I don't know what booklet that is—I don't know if any member on the opposite side could enlighten me as to what booklet that was. Was it "Newfoundland is on the March"? I could not say.

We have not been told, but they had to spend \$20,900 over and above what was allocated to this department on this booklet showing the progress of the province since union with Canada.

The honourable member for White Bay, a few days ago asked a question relative to the amount of money granted to the Grenfell Association this year. I believe in the estimate last year there was an amount for this year—in any case they had to have an Order in Council to give them another \$178,000. They had to get an Order in Council for \$150,000 to defray the cost of administration of fishery development authority. That is something we have to go into later, and I don't intend to take up too much time of the House at the present time on it other than to say that this \$150,000 goes towards the paying of the fabulous salaries, on a par with Valdmanis—that is to help defray some of the salaries, I take it.

Then we had \$46,000 to cover cost of motion pictures required for the use of the Government. Now are we, as a Government, going into the motion picture business, and if we are who are the stars? Who are the Roy Rogerses—who are they? Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I saw a picture of somebody in the "Evening Telegram" recently resembling very strongly "Roy Rogers" with a gun. That was \$46,000 Sir which went for motion picture shows for the Government. Possibly the Government members amuse themselves in their spare time when not travelling, or perhaps they take them along when travelling all over the world, Pakistan, New York, London and Brussels and God knows where they are going to go—Jamaica—I suppose it is possible they did take along those motion pic-

ture shows to remind themselves they were Newfoundlanders at any rate.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable member for a moment. Officers are supposed to remove from the building any person who makes any comment by way of laughter or other comment—the disturbance came from the upper gallery—

MR. HOLLETT: We know we should not laugh, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The honourable member is offering a satirical comment on Your Honour's Ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member knows full well that only elected members to this House may speak or make any comment whatsoever; also that Mr. Speaker has the right to clear the galleries of visitors—as that would work a hardship on certain innocent members of the public, I ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to send an Officer to the gallery. I don't want the honourable member who is speaking interrupted.

MR. HOLLETT: I find here next, Sir, \$25,000 for a wardens' building for the prison camp in Salmonier; \$100,000 advanced to the Newfoundland Knitting Mills, Limited (that is by way of squaring up a loan of \$387,000 for the Newfoundland Knitting Mills, Limited). Some of these things are very interesting, Mr. Speaker. There is \$900,000 there to cover expenditures required to be made in the event of payment made for salt cod for 1953 production. I can quite see the necessity for an Order in Council for such a purpose as assistance to the fishery. I do not criticize that at all. But I do question whether this Government of this small province, or an other province

for that matter, has the right without calling the House together to vote amounts totalling \$3,168,000 without the House's approval. I doubt, Sir, very much whether that is proper and correct. If I were to read section 3 of the Revenue and Audit Act I believe I would find that each Minister must give the reason why he makes a request for an Order in Council and it must be proven before the Lieutenant Governor in Council that dire hardship will result to our people if such a grant is not forthcoming. Where was the dire hardship in the matter of motion pictures? Where was the dire hardship with regard to various other things I have mentioned here. There may have been dire hardship in this particular case, therefore I am not casting any reflection on that if it took five millions, if the fishery were in such condition as this would indicate. The honourable the Premier told us some facts about that and has, according to the honourable Premier been misquoted on that—we shall hear more about that later, therefore I am not saying anything about it at the moment.

That was on Nov. 26, 1953, Sir. And I notice (that may be a resolution or may not) that a million and a half dollars had to be borrowed from the Bank of Montreal. Later on, February 1954, \$225,000 were borrowed from Fisheries Development Loan Fund, and \$45,000 from the Industrial Loan Fund and \$35,000 from the Co-operative Loan Fund, and another \$750,000 from the Bank of Montreal on which we had to pay  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ . So that we had to borrow from the bank and from the loan boards \$2,550,000 over and above the amount of revenue which was collected for the eleven months of over



thirty millions. That, Sir, in my opinion is unheard of in the history of this province, the amount of borrowing. Does the honourable the Premier wish to make any comment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has left the Premier speechless for once, speechless as he has anyone else who has any brains or knowledge.

MR. HOLLETT: I do hope, Mr. Speaker, there are several persons in this House with some brains and knowledge who will understand the purport of what I said and the purport of the Honourable Premier's words.

Altogether, then Sir, \$3,168,000 had to be voted to the Government by orders in council. In my opinion, Sir, to take care of a good bit of overspending by the Government, a good bit of travelling which need not have been done. I venture to bet the travelling expenditure of the Government for the last twelve months is close to or in the vicinity of four hundred thousand dollars—we voted them over three hundred thousand dollars or even ten per cent of the vote for current account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ten per cent?

MR. HOLLETT: One per cent—I beg your pardon. I have the floor. If you want me to sit down Mr. Speaker, I shall do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no.

MR. HOLLETT: When I look back over the financial record, Sir, of the Government for the past five years, and particularly over the past three years, I wonder why our credit is good, I wonder why we have any money at all. I am warning the

people of this country now that if this present Government is allowed to proceed in the manner of financial waste that they have been carrying on then I am quite sure, Sir, this country will not be in the position that she should be following Confederation. How are we going to have the money for roads and bridges and everything else? Incidentally, Sir, I come to roads now.

Last year on roads, I believe, we were supposed to spend some five million dollars approximately. I quite realize that roads of this country, Mr. Speaker, are in a deplorable condition in every part of the country particularly at this time of the year. The very nature of the roads must indicate that they are not going to be in good condition—but I have only to go up in my honourable friend's district here in St. John's West to see the deplorable state of the roads up there, not fit to walk over not to talk about taking a vehicle over. I wonder how much was spent in the last year on Blackhead Road, the Petty Harbour Road and how much on St. Phillip's Road. I remember last year, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Public Works informed me there was a vote of sixty thousand dollars to be spent in St. John's, or something similar to that amount. And the Honourable Minister informed me that he would get in touch with me before they spent any of that money on any of our roads in St. John's West. I have to say, Sir, since that time the Honourable Minister has never even bothered to phone me about it. I did phone him once or twice to try and get a few dollars for here and there in the district. Now, as to how that money has been spent I am not questioning, but I do say a little more co-operation between the Honourable Minister and

the representatives of the district would be appreciated, I should think, by every member in this House. It is all very well to shake your head and look and smile askant—

MR. SPENCER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition obviously refers to me—I shook my head—I made the statement to him that sixty thousand was voted for St. John's West last year—I was hoping he would have recollected that the correct amount we hoped to spend in St. John's East and West last year was placed at forty thousand dollars for each district. I hoped when the honourable member made the statement of sixty thousand which is only an increase of sixty per cent—well I can easily understand anybody not understanding his figures. The honourable member referred to somebody shaking his head. I merely tried to help him. If he wishes for any information regarding the district he is entitled to it and will get it and always has gotten it since I have been the Head of the department.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt you—there was no point of order.

MR. SPENCER: I merely make the statement, Mr. Speaker. If you want to disagree with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—there will be no further interruptions. Honourable member please proceed.

MR. HOLLETT: The matter is much worse, Sir, since the exact amount was given by the honourable member—forty thousand dollars for St. John's West and East, out of five million dollars—forty thousand dollars to be spent in St. John's West

and East out of a grant of five million dollars. Then you get somebody going up to Corner Brook and endeavouring to turn the people against St. John's District on account of roads, and coming back to Grand Falls and doing the same thing there. These things, Sir, don't seem to me to be quite fair. I thought I was being very generous putting the amount at sixty thousand dollars for St. John's West, but now I am told it was forty thousand for St. John's West, and for St. John's East where the population is very considerable and there are a lot of people and a lot of vehicles, a lot of people paying revenue in that area—yet the Honourable Minister has made the admission now that forty thousand dollars was the full amount voted, and I hope, Sir, that gets across the country so that the people in Corner Brook and the people in Fogo will know the amount voted for St. John's East and West. I do hope my honourable friend the member for Fogo has not told the people of that district that St. John's East and West got it all. That is another thing, forty thousand would be all right in Fogo and the honourable member says they would be glad to get forty thousand, and we would be glad to get forty thousand in St. John's West. But we don't know what we got, nobody knows, Sir, if it goes on local roads, which I say did not get anything. Incidentally Sir, we are not so fortunate as they are in some parts of the country where I am told on very excellent authority there is a big road repairing job going on, i.e., on Roches Line near Briggs. There is a major road construction job there being carried on, and I believe there are six trucks presently working there dumping crushed stone along the muddy road between the Conception

Bay Highway and Brigus Junction. Now, we know that Roches Line is a sort of sport area where there are a lot of ponds and supposedly some trout out there. I have been out there several times but never managed to get any trout. But I take it this road, fifteen miles of it, is being repaired so that people will be able to go out and catch a few trout when the season opens up. But when I think, Sir, of the deplorable state of the roads from St. John's to St. Philips and out to Blackhead and Cape Spear and from St. John's to Petty Harbour. Where I travelled recently, Sir, and I did not see any trucks thus when I think of the condition of these roads and then think of a major repair job being carried out on Roches Line I am inclined to ask if there is another new industry out there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer to that would be yes, there is.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable the Premier inform me what it is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the right time, and very gladly and very proudly.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask, Sir, is this the reason why this major job is being done with six trucks pulling crushed stone for the muddy road? Yet we can't get five cents in St. John's East nor West, and here we have the member for Fogo crying out as to why they can't get some money up there. How can you get it when we spend it on Roches Line before the frost is out of the ground—dumping crushed stone—and we are told now that a new industry is to be started out there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No such thing—that a new industry has started.

MR. HOLLETT: It is started out there, Sir. I do hope it will be a success. I do hope any people who have a share in that industry will reap rich rewards, then we will know that the money spent on this particular piece of road will have paid off. Forty thousand dollars in St. John's East and West!

I was going to say something about education, but I think I need only refer to the report, which I think I have here, the annual report of the Department of Education. I think it has two or three pages describing it very well, and I won't detain the House any longer than to read one or two extracts from the pages of this report just issued for last year, Sir. The Problem of Teachers Shortage—"It has already been pointed out in previous reports and in public addresses that our school population increased at the rate of five thousand pupils each year and this trend will continue." I don't know how, Sir, it will continue but it says there that it will. "The fact that Newfoundland is undergoing a major social and economic transition, cannot help but affect the teacher supply problem." A major social and economic trend. I agree with the social but cannot see the economic transition yet. Here is something, Sir, of interest which we all take to heart: "The following figures gleaned from statistics in the report are of interest." Total number of pupil teachers at present time, 2,585—teachers with one or more years of professional training 1,136. Less than half, Sir, of the people who were teaching our children across Newfoundland. Teachers with less than one year total more than half. Think of these figures five years after entering Confederation, Sir, five years after the sunshine of prosperity was

to blast out all poverty in this our Island home—teachers with less than one year of professional training number 1,402 out of a total of 2,500, and classed in that are 384 without any professional training whatsoever. I know, Sir, that the educational authorities are undoubtedly doing a good job. Everybody of course realizes the wide stretch of coast around this country and how difficult it is to get teachers to go to these out of the way places—I know that the educational authorities are undoubtedly doing a good job. Everybody realizes, of course, the wide stretch of this country around the coastline, and how difficult it is to get teachers to go to these out of the way places. I hope the Economic Development plan laid down by Dr. Valdmanis will eventually bring some of them into larger centres.

Public Health and Welfare: They had fourteen million dollars spent on that. We are told it is not enough. I am quite sure it probably is not quite enough. We can see as the years go along that we are going to need more for that. I think we know—we have to know—that we have to cut down on wasteful expenditure. We have to cut out the huge travelling expenses; this \$300,000 or \$400,000 for travelling, in this small Province. Never a day goes by but some Minister or some member of some Department goes to Ottawa or goes to New York or Ontario or Europe or Halifax or somewhere.

DR. POTTLE: That is \$300,000 or \$400,000 travelling expenses of the Government as a whole.

MR. HOLLETT: I asked how much was spent by each Minister. \$400,000 spent by the Civil Service as a whole is much too much—

MR. SMALLWOOD: How do you know?

MR. HOLLETT: I am entitled to my opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How does it compare with the travelling expenses of the Commission of Government?

MR. HOLLETT: The Commission of Government had to look after Post Offices, Customs, Railway, etc.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have eighty or ninety Welfare Officers, alone, travelling incessantly. What do you suppose that cost?

MR. HOLLETT: I am telling the Government that they are extravagant. While we have a Government which carries on such extravagance, then we cannot have money for Public Health and Welfare and for hospitals. The member from White Bay asked about the Grenfell Association the other day, he was told they had paid \$830,000 to the Grenfell Association. That is good; but the honourable member for White Bay is trying to get a hospital in the district. The Government will give them \$100,000 but they must put up \$100,000 themselves. However, you could not expect anybody in White Bay to collect \$100,000. Yet the Government paid \$200,000 to house Sennewald. \$200,000 would put a hospital in White Bay. I hope the Government will give every bit of help it can to the people of White Bay. It is on that long stretch of coast—White Bay to Cape St. John—Cape Norman up to Bonne Bay, where there are hundreds and thousands of people and who are many miles from hospitals. That part of the coast has been neglected by the Government.

I was going to say something about tourism. Since I mentioned the \$200,-

000 building (which was the Aerated Water Building)—it reminds me of Mr. Vardy. He is trying to give good service in his job. But I noticed something some time ago about the leasing of salmon rivers. I do hope and trust that the Government will not see fit to lease any of our salmon rivers or fishing rivers to anyone outside or inside the country. God knows we have not too many places to go to enjoy ourselves. Rivers are limited, compared to the population and sporting activities. Once we start renting rivers, it will not be long before they will all be in the hands of private owners, particularly as the Government might get hard up for cash. I hope that they will take into consideration before they allow Mr. Vardy to persuade them to rent rivers. I could say more about that, and I shall say more later.

I come now to fisheries. We come to a tough problem. I admit that the Government—any government; be it the Government of Nova Scotia, or the Government of New Brunswick, the Government of British Columbia or the Government of Newfoundland, you have one of the toughest problems on your hands. I am not going to be too critical.

MR. SPEAKER: There is too much use of the personal pronoun. I would suggest the honourable member refer to the policy of the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now with regard to the Mental Hospital—I have other things to say, but at the present time I would just mention the wages paid student nurses. These students are getting \$660 a year—that in itself would be bad enough; but listen! "of which \$360.00 is deducted for board

and lodging, including laundry." We expect these young girls to spend three years—even in the Mental Hospital where conditions are not too pleasant—to work long hours, hard work, for \$300, clear of board and lodging. I do not think that is good enough. On the other hand, I am reminded that they say that it is understood that that is equal to the highest paid in Canada. God help us if that is all the student nurses get in Canada. It is about time the whole of Canada got busy. We know the nursing profession is one of the most important, most glorious, most sacrificial services which any individual can perform. They have to spend three years in training for a paltry \$300. Three hundred dollars today is not worth twenty-five years ago. I do hope the Minister will bring in Estimates and ask for more money, even if we have to make an Order in Council and get it later on.

Regarding Fisheries, I have here an answer to a question with regard to the loans made by the Fisheries Loan Board. I find, as I have already pointed out, that \$273,000 was loaned out by the Fisheries Loan Board. Of that amount, I find that \$88,602 went to Bonavista Bay, most of it was in Bonavista North. I find that \$11,000 went to Placentia Bay, believe it or not. It is a good bay, good fishing and good fishermen, but they got only \$11,000. That Loan Board was granted \$500,000 to loan to fishermen. I undersand it was so difficult to get a loan, you would die of starvation if you had to depend on the loan, before you got it. Only \$273,000 was paid out over the last three years. Then we find the Government had to go and borrow money from the Loan Board, money which should have been loaned to fishermen two or three

years ago, still there lying idle. The fishermen were not able to get access to it. One man in Fortune Bay got \$26,700 and a man in Trepassey got \$710. I mention that in passing. The Fisheries Loan Board, although it undoubtedly helped some people, they have not justified their existence to the extent we had hoped. Why, is anybody's guess. I am not going to make any comments with regard to that now.

I come now to the most important thing in fisheries that I have seen in a long time, that is the matter of the Walsh Report. I have here, and I want to read it, if I may, a synopsis of the recommendations of that Committee which worked two years on the oldest headache of Newfoundland, and which brought in a voluminous Report. These are notes I have taken down from the Report of the Committee, and I would like to read them to the House, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: As far as I can judge the honourable member may read them. They are not comments on Speeches made in the House.

MR. HOLLETT: "A brief synopsis of the Programme of Development envisaged and indeed recommended by the Newfoundland Fisheries Survey include the following:

The programme, they say should be based upon the utilization of all available resources capable of Economic exploitation and sustained yield. First then they recommend a period of intensified exploration in new fishing methods of fishing. They suggested at least one large Dragger equipped for deep water fishing. They suggested the exploration of waters off shore for some sixty miles by one small dragger, and other suitable vessel, equipped for multiple purpose

fishing, Danish seining and variable depth trawling. This was to begin early in 1953.

They recommended two craft equipped with ship-to-shore radio for locating and reporting mackerel, caplin and herring. They wanted a search made for Halibut grounds by long-liners and seiners.

The Committee recommended an intensification of biological and technological Research in certain areas, and suggested four suitable vessels to explore the bays and estuaries—two on the Northeast coast in summer and all four on the Southeast coast in winter. An additional vessel for the Labrador.

They recommended immediate conservation measures for salmon, and research upon cod populations to establish relationship between in-shore and off-shore populations.

They recommended an aquarium (I do not know why) and a museum for fishery displays. The Technological research would include:

- (a) continuous study of salt fish and methods of processing (a Pilot Plant);
- (b) experiments in packaging herring, and smoked fish products;
- (c) experiments in canning fish, and in processing pet foods and fish meals;
- (d) as also the possibilities with dog fish and sharks.

CATCHING: Long-liners, Danish Seiners, and multi-purpose boats recommended. Bounties recommended. And also the training of fishermen in the use of gear and engines, etc., and vocational classes at the Memorial University.

They suggest the building of Dry



Docks and Repair Shops and ample spare parts for engines, etc., at select centres, as also servicing and supply depots.

**CURING :** Until suitable mechanical driers are available, they say "stick to sun drying." The Committee state they will say nothing to halt the exodus of the men from the fisheries (salt), unless immediate and effective steps can be taken to assure to the fishermen a standard of living, regarded as normal for rural areas. Child and female labour must be eliminated, they say.

For the South West Coast the solution is, more filleting plants; plus minor centralization in small settlements or areas.

For the North East Coast, the answer is Centralization of the Salt Fish industry at suitable places in large areas of production in the in-shore fishery and near grounds on which long-lining can be carried out. Adequate stores would be placed at some winter shipping port. All by-products possible to be manufactured. They recommend an immediate survey of Development areas, where all facilities may be made available, such as better housing, electricity, good roads, good schools and water and sewerage. Also hospital and nursing facilities, and good agricultural land.

The programme is a long term one, and the first step is a Survey, followed by the erection of experimental plants. Minor centralization of curing operations is to be encouraged in small settlements or areas, along co-operative lines. The Memorial University is to be tied to the whole Programme.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** Point of order. Is it in order to go into a long

quotation, which, to this moment, we do not know what it is?

**MR. HOLLETT :** I told you.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** The Honourable member has not yet told us what he is quoting from. He said something about a summary or synopsis, but whose, has not been said. He is reading from a long document. Is that in order? It is getting to be very monotonous.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The rule of strict relevancy does not apply to this debate. So far as I can see, the report or comment which the honourable member is reading is not out of order.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** When we do not now what it is; and he does not tell us. He asked if it would be in order if he read a few words; you said, as far as you could judge, it was in order. For seven or eight minutes he has been quoting from a document. He has not told us what it is. He refers to recommendations in the Report of the Walsh Committee. Is it a summary? Whose summary? Who is the author of the summary?

**MR. SPEAKER :** I cannot rule the honourable member out of order.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** I ask you is it in order to quote at length from a document without telling us what the document is? Is that in order?

**MR. SPEAKER :** He asked if it was in order to quote from a synopsis of the Report. I can only assume it is his own.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** Should you have to assume whose summary it is? Are we not entitled to know whose summary it is so we may the better know whether it is an accurate one?

He is quoting from an anonymous document. We do not know who wrote it. We are entitled to know, before the honourable gentleman is allowed to read it.

MR. HOLLETT: May I say a word? I said at the beginning that I had here a synopsis of the recommendations made in the Walsh Report. These are recommendations of Sir Albert Walsh and his Committee. I have taken them out word for word.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The point at issue is this—whether he is giving in his own words a summary of the Walsh Report, or whether he is giving it in the words of somebody else.

MR. HOLLETT: It is none of your business.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is our business. Furthermore, we demand to know, we demand to know whether this document is in his own words or whether he is picking out sentences and merely reading them aloud.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member, at the beginning, asked the Chair if he could read a synopsis of the Report. He has quoted no other, and automatically we must infer it is his own synopsis. If, at this stage the House wants to be sure whose synopsis it is, I think the honourable member will explain it.

MR. HOLLETT: As I said a moment ago, I asked permission from your Honour to read a synopsis of the Recommendations made by Sir A. Walsh and his Committee, and I received it. I had prepared these recommendations; I had taken them word for word from the Report. If the Premier doubts their accuracy, and I can see he does, then he is not

familiar with the Report, otherwise he would recognize that it is word for word from the Report.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I accept the honourable gentleman's explanation. It is his own summary. Now we know.

MR. HOLLETT: It is my own summary of the recommendations of the Walsh Report. I can read and I can write. I took them down, word for word, briefly, because I did not want to bore the House. I am going to take the time the honourable the Speaker will give me and I am not going to be bullied as long as I keep within the rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The question of boredom does not enter into it. The Chair has to listen to all the speeches. Continue your speech.

MR. HOLLETT: To continue with my own synopsis of the recommendations of the Chief Justice, Chairman of the Fisheries Development Board: The Memorial University is to be tied in to the whole programme.

Increased production of heavy salted codfish is to be examined. And four salt depots are to be set up. A Housing scheme for fishermen is to be a part of the plan. They recommend division of the responsibility for implementation of the scheme as follows: Federal—Exploration, Demonstration and Scientific Research as also Biological Research.

Provincial: Training in Navigation and Diesel Engines.

Fishermen: Servicing Depots.

Private Enterprise: Docks and other shore facilities. Building large plants, small curing stations, servicing large establishments.

Small curing stations should be the responsibility of the fishermen they say. Education is for the Provincial Government and the University.

Financing the programme is largely for the two Governments and private enterprise. The Committee recommended that if private enterprise can make an investment of 51% in the capital of a Company, then the Governments should advance the balance. But if private enterprise refuses or is unable to bear this share, then Governments go fifty-fifty.

They recommend a Standing Joint Committee to be set up at once with a full-time executive Secretary. The Committee to have two joint Chairmen representing the two Governments. The function of the Committee is to advise the Governments, who will jointly bear the cost."

That is the end of the Summary I made of the Walsh Report and for which accuracy I can vouch. As I pointed out, if anybody does not recognize it, I am not at all the least bit surprised. It is quite a lengthy document. The scheme can be carried out; it can be implemented, but it is going to take a long time to do so. And while they are going about that, we have at least ten thousand fishermen, if not more, and something else will have to be done for the fishermen in order to keep them in the fishery. It is no use to launch boats and catch fish, when the dollar is not worth 50c. of the value it was a few years back. The Government will have to spend large sums by way of implementation if they expect the fishermen to remain in the fishing boats.

Fishing is one of the most honourable occupations a man can go at; like the farmer who tills the soil, the

fisherman goes out on the mighty deep and he puts out his net and fishing gear and comes in day by day or week by week, hoping to keep from starving both his wife and children. The fishery has fallen on hard times. The fisherman looks to somebody for help and hope. They have looked in vain to this Government for five years.

DR. POTTLE: More "hope."

MR. HOLLETT: Your Department will have to pour out help if this scheme is not implemented. Unfortunately this scheme has not come into production to any great extent. I say therefore, Sir, and I repeat again; we cannot afford to waste money on motion film by the Government, there are private individuals who are supposed to do that. I am afraid, Sir, that you can scarcely call the Government that we have today a responsible government, you can scarcely call them a government at all because every department practically has a commission or committee set up to look after things; all sorts of commissions ever since 1949—we have been setting up commissions of all kinds and the heads of the departments have been gallivanting all across the world and leaving the business of their departments and of the country in the hands of commissions. We had a fish price commission, cost of living commission, forestry commission, agricultural commission, fisheries development committee and then this very, very special one they set up, of experts, to go into the terms of union and to make recommendations to the Government. Everything is being done by commissions. Then they have boards, development boards, fishery loan boards, boards of inquiry, boards of this and boards of that, and the Government, Sir, are not paying

very much attention to the duties which they as a Government should carry out, they get somebody else to do the work. You take this implementation of the terms, this committee which has been set up of high-class high-sounding names, but is not that the Government's job to prepare their own brief to put before the Royal Commission? Have they not brains enough over on that side of the House to prepare that claim properly? Is there any reason why they have to get men along Water Street to prepare a brief? Then they in turn go and hire a high salaried man somewhere across Canada to do the work. In the first place we should not have to implement the terms, they should have been properly drawn up in the first instance but were not. Now the Government is starting to drag a red herring across the track of the terms, and they are going to get some men, and I have great respect for these men. They are good men, the whole lot of them on that committee including the chairman to have one onus of insufficient terms laid at their door, which I fear certain members on the opposite side of the House will do if the Canadian Government does not come across, as it should, when the recommendations of these gentlemen are presented to the Royal Commission. I have great respect for every one of the men on this particular Committee.

Now, Sir, I come to the final thing I shall speak on in this present speech on the address in reply. I come now to something on which perhaps I am not the best one to speak, the alcoholic liquor question. This question, Sir, is one which we in this country have to take very seriously, and not only in this country but in all countries because, as I look across the

world today, and as I look across forty years, I find that this evil of intoxicating liquor is one of the most devastating evils of democracy. It is doing more to destroy the democracies which we knew and which we have read of in times past than any other that I know of. Why this is so I don't know because they have had alcoholic liquor down through the ages right from perhaps three thousand years ago. Every country has had alcoholic liquor as far as I know. But I don't think there is anybody in this House, Sir, who won't agree with me when I say that the impact of alcoholic liquors and the sale of alcoholic liquors upon the modes and morals of our people today is much greater and is having dire results across this province and right across the Dominion of Canada as well as the whole North American Continent. It is something therefore, which we, in this little province and in this House should approach with a certain amount of coolness and cool-headedness. I will say right here, Sir now, that I have no desire whatsoever to make politics out of this. I know the proposition which the Government was up against when they proposed it. There, I think was a place where they might very well have set up a commission to make some inquiries, a commission who knew something about the proper way for us to draw up legislation with regard to alcoholic liquors. They did not do that at all, and now, as I have said, I may make some harsh remarks, Sir, and I do so and want it publicly known that I don't want any politics made out of this. We should not make politics out of this evil which, Sir, is bringing degradation and disgrace to so many of the people of this province. I know of the evil of this alcoholic liquor problem, I don't

suppose there is anybody any better able to speak on the matter than I am myself, with regards to the evils of alcoholic liquor. So, if I do get hot, Mr. Speaker, I trust that you, Sir, and the members on the opposite side will overlook it. It is difficult to know just exactly where to start. But there is one thing I have to say, Sir, and I will say that quite early—I do not think that any member of this House should in any way be dabbling with the liquor situation. I want to quote, Sir, section 11, I believe, of the Alcoholic Liquor Act. If I am a little slow in finding it, Sir, I trust that you will overlook it. I am going to quote that, Sir, supposing I am going to hang up the House for the next hour. I have to find it because it is important—The Alcoholic Liquors Act. I have it. Page 1156 of the Statutes. I want to quote this just to show how the Government of the day has made this liquor act. It was made before this Government came into power, and they have administered it since they came in—but how much weight have they put into the idea of not having anybody mixed up in the sale of it who has anything to do with the Government—"No member or employee of the Board of Liquor Control shall directly or indirectly, individually or as a member of a partnership or corporation have any interest whatsoever in dealing in or in the manufacture of alcoholic liquor or in any enterprise or industry in which alcoholic liquor is required, or receive any commission or profit whatsoever from or have any interest whatsoever in the purchases or sales made by the Board or by the persons authorized by this Act to purchase or sell alcoholic liquor."

Now, Sir, if it is so important that members of the Board and their em-

ployees have nothing to do with the sale or purchase or with the profits that come therefrom of alcoholic liquors, how much more important, Sir, is it that the legislators, the Government, the members of which each of them has to frame the rules and regulations which are made for the sale and purchase of alcoholic liquors, or how much more important is it that no member of this House would have anything to do in any way in any shape or form with the sale and purchase or what-not of alcoholic liquors? I think, Sir, that the hands of every person in this House should be washed clean of alcoholic liquors as to the sale and as to the profit therefrom. I say that with all due respect to any member on the opposite side who may have shares in this business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I heard my honourable friend say: it was therefore all the more important that the Government, that no member of the Government should have anything to do with the sale of liquor, is he suggesting that any member of the Government has, or that he has any reason to think that he has—would he make a charge?

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that could be a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sorry—but then perhaps my honourable friend would answer that question.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't have to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know. But perhaps my honourable friend would.

MR. HOLLETT: I will come to that later. Now that the honourable premier has mentioned that—I did

not intend to use this thing at all. But Mr. Speaker will remember that sub-section five or section five of Question No. 5 a few days ago reads; List all taverns, hotels and clubs licensed in Newfoundland with names and addresses —

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is not allowed to refer to that. Surely he remembers a ruling from this Chair which ruled the entire question out of order. He cannot refer to that question.

MR. HOLLETT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, if I cannot refer to it I must if necessity refer to a list which was presented to this House on the request of the Opposition last year, a list of licensed establishments 1953. I also have here, Sir, a similar list for 1952. These have been tabled in the House and are documents which I may refer to. I know that at that time there was given us the name of every licensee, of every tavern and every club in Newfoundland, and their address is here. Whether it was a tavern, hotel, club or a vendor it was all listed as was also the fee which each licensee paid for his license to sell alcoholic liquor is there set down as is also the registered owner of every tavern-keeper, club-keeper and every other sort of building which sold alcoholic liquors. That, Sir, was listed last year and was tabled here in reply to a question. Also in the previous year the same thing was done. I find, Sir, that in 1952 there were seventy-two taverns and clubs selling alcoholic liquors. In 1953, Sir, there was one hundred and forty-two, practically double. When I see that, Sir, I am mindful to remind this House how quickly this thing has grown from nought to a hundred and forty-two clubs and taverns last year, 1953. It has increased by seventy, first we had seventy-two

taverns and clubs all across the country, but today there probably are many more than that. So that we can see how it has spread.

A good many of us, sir, were born in places in this country where there were no clubs, no taverns, where it was almost impossible to get a drink if you wanted it. Now that in itself was wrong, I admit, but when I see the tremendous increase of places set up for the sale of alcoholic beverages in this country I am alarmed for what it may do for us. I am of the opinion that a good many Newfoundlanders—I won't say this—You will remember, sir, and we all remember, I hope, and I hope the honourable member for Labrador, there seems to be a law that no alcoholic liquors, though he seems to be grinning.

DR. ROWE: To a point of order. Mr. Speaker: Is an honourable member in this House allowed to smile or grin. I would like a ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: When an honourable member rises to a point of order the speaking member will be seated. What is the point of order?

DR. ROWE: The point of order, sir, is this: Is not an honourable member of this House allowed to smile or grin or grimace without having the intervention of the House and the attention of any visitors here drawn to the fact? Or, to put it another way, is that to be considered as a reflection. I happened not to be referring to anything the honourable member was saying.

MR. SPEAKER: I remember quite clearly the context of the honourable members' speech and his use of the word "grinning", therefore the point is in order. The honourable member



has no right to make gratuitous reference to any other member who might be smiling, "grinning" or in any other way contorting his face. Resume your speech.

MR. HOLLETT: If I have no right to refer to it I shall not do it. If I get many more interruptions I shall have to go into the next day.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member created that point himself.

MR. HOLLETT: I must say in this particular instance I agree, that perhaps I have.

MR. SPEAKER: I do think the House is wasting time on a matter of the utmost triviality. In fact it is beginning to appear to the Chair as utterly ridiculous. Will the honourable member continue his speech?

MR. HOLLETT: The waste of time, if I may comment, Mr. Speaker, originated on the other side of the House.

Yes, we have the names of all the taverns and we have reason to believe certain members in this House have interests in these taverns and clubs. We have not only reason to believe, sir, but we know it to be a fact, and I bring it to the House's attention that it is not correct, it is not right, that any member of this House should have any monetary interest in the sale of alcoholic liquor, causing so much devastation to the lives of our children and parents, if you like, or the whole of the country. It is not correct that members in this House should have any interest in it whatsoever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will allow me. I ask the honourable gentleman again to state—apart from the fact that most

of us on this side of the House are members of the well known political club known as the "Laurier" Club—I ask the honourable member again, will he say that he thinks that members of the government, not members of the House of Assembly, but members of the House of Assembly who are also members of the government are shareholders in liquor establishments other than the "Laurier" Club, which happens as everyone knows, to have a license. Will the honourable member say that—man fashion—because I have no interest, never did and never will, and I am the Head of the Government. Stop skimming it, going around the edge of it.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know why the honourable the premier should make a speech or demand that members of the opposite side should be named. I know the names, and I may be tempted to do so. Perhaps the honourable leader of the House thinks that by challenging me I may refuse to do it. If I do it, Mr. Speaker, I will tell something which will cause too much discomfort to too many people. I have the names of all the clubs here and of others that were here last year. And there is no reason why I should not read the lot of them. I could, there is no reason why I should not read the lot of them. I could read some which would probably make some of the members on the opposite side wonder if perhaps they did not have some little monetary interest in these. I am only going to refer to one particular one recently opened, Sir, in our own district, I refer to the Old Mill Properties. Now, that, Sir, opened a short time ago over and above the request of seven or eight hundred people, I am given to understand, who petitioned through the clergymen in St. John's West, the

Board of Liquor Control of the government, because when you petition the Board of Liquor Control it comes under a department of the government; petition them, Sir, not to allow any Club, tavern or place for selling alcoholic liquor to be opened there. I submit, Sir, there is something in this Act, which would indicate that when a sufficient number of electors in any area petitioned not to have this thing opened then it is not supposed to be opened. Some eight hundred people, Sir, I understand, asked that this be not opened. Here we are on page 1199, section 124. (1) If a petition is presented to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council signed by not less than one-third of the electors resident in any settlement or in any area containing two or more settlements in one electoral district (hereinafter in this section called an "area") requesting that a vote be taken in the area praying that alcoholic liquor be permitted to be sold or be prohibited from being sold in any store or premises licensed under this Act in the area the following provisions shall have effect:

(a) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, after first being satisfied that the persons whose names are signed to the petition or a sufficient number of them are electors, by proclamation order a plebiscite to be held in the area;

If the majority of the valid votes cast in any plebiscite is against the sale of alcoholic liquor in that area, the Board shall

(I) close any store conducted in the area;

(II) cancel licenses for the sale of alcoholic liquor at premises in the area; and

(III) not issue licenses for the sale

of alcoholic liquor in respect of premises situated in the area.

It goes on to point out what shall be done by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Then the Government was completely lacking in its duty when it refused to listen to the petition of some seven or eight hundred voters in St. John's West. When my colleague here, Mr. Browne—

MR. SPEAKER: Order. That makes four times this afternoon that honourable members have referred to surnames of members. There is no "Mr. Browne" in this House.

MR. HOLLETT: I beg your pardon, sir, the honourable member for St. John's West. I think I was referred to as Mr. Hollett.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly. And the honourable member referred to a member on the other side by his surname.

MR. HOLLETT: I think I stated that in my opinion the government and the department concerned did not do their duty when they did not take the proper cognizance of the petition which had been presented to them, and which I understand, was presented to them long before the license to sell alcoholic liquor was granted. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Premier can challenge me all he likes but I am setting this up, Sir, as a principle, that we ought all to observe, that no man who comes here to this House to assist in making laws and rules and regulations for anything, particularly alcoholic liquor has any right whatsoever to dabble in profits therefrom.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has not Your Honour already ruled on that point, when Your Honour said it was not

the business of the House how a member of the House makes his living and invests his money? Now the honourable leader of the Opposition is promulgating an entirely different view from Your Honour's, who ruled on it.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say, a good deal of this continued oblique reference seems to be an attempt to bring the Chair into contempt and to embarrass it. I thought I made it clear, with my limited knowledge of Her Majesty's English, that I am not concerned with who sells alcoholic liquors or who drinks them. I have not the slightest interest in it. But, as I will not permit a question in the House to list who is selling groceries or who is peddling safety-pins, neither will I allow improper questions as to who is doing this or that with alcoholic liquors. The main reason is that this information is accessible to any member of the public on the payment of twenty-five cents at the office of the Registrar of Companies. Further if any honourable member has reason to think some law of the Province has been broken by an honourable member and an infringement of the Act created thereby, this is not the place to charge it. The courts of the land are set up and have ample authority to deal with it. This is not a court. No honourable member may be impeached nor brought into contempt nor charged with actions in this House other than for actions with which the courts are not competent to deal.

I cannot permit remarks to be made containing innuendo nor improper information to be ferreted out in a circuitous manner. The honourable member is within his rights to denounce the sale of alcoholic liquors but not to make the suggestion that any member of the House is breaking

the law of the land. We are not concerned with who sells liquor or who drinks it, any more than we are with who sells or eats onions. We are only concerned with principles. The honourable member may deplore what he believes to be breaches of this Act or any Act, but must not impute or insinuate that any member of this House is so infringing the Law of the Province.

The honourable member may resume his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do deplore that any member of this House whether on the Government side or on the Opposition side is making a profit out of the sale of men's and women's souls in this country. I do deplore it if they are doing it, and if there is any member in this House, Mr. Speaker, who is doing it, he knows it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order. The honourable gentleman is now quite boldly defying Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I was about to call attention to that myself. There again is the innuendo to which I just referred—"If any honourable member of this House is doing that." The fact is it is not innuendo but insinuation. One must read from that—that honourable members are. Therefore the remark is not in order. The honourable member might just as well say "if certain members are committing petty larceny" with the inference that he has information to the effect that some honourable members are doing such things. You will refrain from any innuendo. So continue the speech.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case Mr. Speaker, I have said sufficient. I

have said sufficient. I do deplore the fact that the petition presented by more than a third of the electors in an area as described in the Act was ignored by this Government. The prayer of that petition was that no alcoholic liquors be sold in that particular area. That petition was presented long before the permit to sell was granted. The Act lays down that where a petition of that nature is presented then the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall do this and that to procure the decision of the voters in that particular area. That was not done, Sir, and I deplore it very much, and I want to know why. I think I am entitled, Sir, to ask that in this House. Why?

I take it the people who presented that petition are regular authorized voters, they have rights, and their demand was: "Don't you put a beer parlor or club, as the case might be, in that area and give them a license." The law will back them up, Sir, but the law has been flouted. On behalf of the voters who put me here, I am entitled to raise the point, surely I am entitled, Sir, to give a few more facts that may be incidental, I hope, than I have given this afternoon.

I reserve the right to prove my case and I shall keep on; and I would admonish every man in this House, whether on the Government side or on this side; if you are coming here to make rules or laws about alcoholic liquor, you better wash your hands of it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DROVER: First of all, I wish to join with other honourable members of this House in their expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen; and I wish also to congratulate the mover and seconder of

the motion that a Committee be appointed to draft the Address in Reply.

I think it is a pleasure to see the junior member for St. John's West as a member of this House and I believe his stay here will be an asset to democratic form of government.

I am not going to keep this House very long. I think we have listened to quite a few speeches and everybody is getting tired. There are a few things I would like to mention in connection with the Speech from the Throne. One, fisheries; (2) forests.

I believe the Report brought into this House of the findings of Sir Albert Walsh and his Committee, was the finest piece of investigation conducted since our Government took office in 1949.

The people in the district which I represent are mostly fishermen. As a matter of fact, we have more fishermen in White Bay than in any other district in the Province. Apart from logging, that is their only means of livelihood. Some people will criticize the Government and say we have been too long in the development of the fisheries. I do not think that is so. I do not think any Government could jump into the development of the industry without first giving it careful thought and consideration.

In 1949 we asked that in LaScie a cold storage plant be built in order to give the people there continuous fishing up until late in the year and also to bring the people together in centralization. It was turned down and I was disappointed. But today we find that, after careful planning, we are to have a modern fish plant in that area and I believe it will be the means of bringing hundreds of families from isolated places and will improve their lot.

St. Anthony is an area which this Government has helped considerably, and I believe if a few roads were extended in the North and South to St. Anthony, it would save a lot of trouble because fishermen would be able to supply the plants at St. Anthony and it would bring these people together. I hope this Government will take that into consideration when they make plans for development in that area.

There is a stretch of territory in White Bay to which very little attention has been given since this Government took office; not that they would not do it or cannot do it—they will do it, but it takes time. It consists of 220 miles of coastline and the people are scattered in sixty settlements. The land there is suitable for agriculture. They have forests, it is true; but it is mostly taken up by private companies and it is impossible to build roads. The only hope is for the Government to develop it and bring the people together; then I believe the problem of central White Bay will be solved.

Speaking of forests, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the three mile limit of White Bay. The Government is aware that there is very little, if any, of the three mile limit left in White Bay. Past Governments or former Governments have either given it away, sold it or leased it to individuals or Companies. The last remaining stretch was leased in 1953—a year ago—it was given to Bowater's or leased to Bowater's by the International Grenfell Association. If I understand it correctly (and I would like the Ministers concerned to take notice) I believe the stretch of territory which went over to Bowater's a year ago was done surreptitiously. I am blaming the Government just as

much as myself. I presented a Petition to the department concerned and asked that it be taken over. The original Petition was underhandedly done and eventually a Petition will come to the House and ask that the land come back to the people. It is the little saw mill owners who are hardest hit. The same thing applies on the South and Southeast part of the Bay.

The ticklish problem of White Bay is Health—hospital facilities. It is true we have one of the finest hospitals in Newfoundland at St. Anthony, on the Northern tip of the great Northern Peninsula. They have a fine staff and Doctors, and they have to care for not only White Bay, but also St. Barbe and Labrador as well. It is true that within the past four or five years some \$830,000 was granted by this Government and the Federal Government towards the Grenfell Association. Some people will say that White Bay is receiving quite a sum of money. That is not so. That \$830,000 must go for the care of St. Barbe and also Labrador, and I believe that they have a couple more Nursing Stations in the Quebec Province which is also operated by the Grenfell Mission. South of Harbour Deep for about 150 miles, there is one Doctor, and a Doctor stationed at Baie Verte. Apart from that there is not a Nurse or Doctor from LaScie near Cape St. John to Englee and Roddickton. I believe this House will realize the predicament in which the people find themselves. We have not too many roads; communication is by sea, and it is difficult especially during winter time for people to get their sick to St. Anthony hospital. Corner Brook, too, is out of the way and Twillingate is impossible. I do not know how to get around it to get

better medical services for White Bay. I know the Government cannot do everything. I realize they have not got the money and the cost would be enormous. One thing I would like to ask is this: Those who do not know the district of White Bay, I would like for them to get a map and compare the Northern Peninsula, including St. Barbe; compare that with the Burin Peninsula. Our coastline is from Fortune Bay to Port aux Basques. On the Burin Peninsula what do we find? There is a hospital at Burin. The Americans are building one at St. Lawrence. (We cannot blame the people of White Bay if we had no wreck). They also have a couple of Nursing Stations. It is only a little strip of land. They have more people, it is true and they have roads. Up to a point, they have transportation by boat summer and winter alike. They have two or three hospital boats on that coast.

I am not asking for medical services for the district I represent for myself; I do not want praise or honour. The people of that district are doing their part and I hope the Government will realize that. I ask for very little and I believe this Government will reconsider their stand with regard to the people of the Northern Newfoundland and perhaps give us a Nursing Station or Cottage Hospital sooner than we expect.

There is one thing I want the Leader of the Opposition to know and that is that I am not affiliated with any of the beer taverns and neither do I derive any income from them.

Speaking of Industrial Development, I will say what I said in this House when I sat here as an Independent Member three years ago—it

is better to try and fail than not to try at all. Supposing some of the industries will fail, it is far better for us to prove to the country that economically it is impossible to make it pay. If we went back without trying, they would only shout out "you did not try the programme." Therefore, I believe there is much credit due the Government for their effort in trying to make our Province better and economically sound; and I believe the Honourable the Premier deserves the backing and support of all the members of this party.

DR. POTTLE: I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: No. 10 "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

Read first time. Moved and seconded that it be read a second time tomorrow.

Carried.

11. "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act."

Read first time. Moved and seconded that it be read a second time tomorrow.

Carried

No. 3. Second Reading: "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. As I explained to the House when this matter was last before us, this is a Bill which provides for the imposition of a tax on Corporations. It is a tax which this Government does not collect, but rather it is a tax, the collection of which has been dedicated to Ottawa



under the Tax Rental Agreement. Consequently, we are not particularly interested as Legislators in the details because the effect of the amendment is simply to facilitate those who pay the tax, by making our tax similar in all respects with the Federal Tax, so the taxpayer will have to file only one Return based on particulars which are identical with particulars with which he has to file other returns.

This really is an Amendment just to make our Income Tax Act agree in all respects with the Federal Tax Act and so facilitate the taxpayer in filling out Returns for the Assessor. The Bill consists of seven sections and they are not very important, but I will run through them for the sake of those members of the House who may be particularly interested. We are all interested in a way, but a few members are actually taxpayers under this category.

Clause 2. This repeals paragraph (f) of Section 5 of the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949.

"Amounts received by the Corporation in the year as premiums paid by a Corporation on the redemption before April 30, 1953 of any of its shares."

If shares have become devalued by reason of the fact that the dividend is reduced, the Company need not pay income tax on that amount. Suppose the amount is \$10, and \$11 is paid; that extra dollar represented the premium accrued. When the dollar is collected, it is repayment of \$11. It is not income. It is an advantage in favour of the taxpayer.

Amendment to Clause 3 is a minor one.

The words on the 7th line "officer or director becomes eligible to retire or retires from the employment or office, an amount paid by the corporation in the year or within sixty days from the end of the year pursuant thereto as the lump sum in respect of an employee, officer or director who so became eligible to retire or retired in the year (except to the extent that it is deductible under paragraph (f))." The original Law read without these words. The effect of this Amendment is to provide for the circumstances where the employer is required by contract to make provision for superannuation on the date the employee became eligible to retire.

Clause 4. A new section 18A is added.

"Where, by virtue of an assignment or other transfer of a bond, debenture or similar security (other than an income bond or an income debenture), the transferee has become entitled to interest in respect of a period commencing before the time of transfer and ending after that time that is not payable after the time of transfer, an amount equal to that proportion of the interest that the number of days in the portion of the period that preceded the day of transfer is of the number of days in the whole period."

I think in explaining Clause 2, I got mixed up with Clause 4. I am not particularly well versed in the Income Tax Act.

Clause 4 is very clear and is in favour of the taxpayer.

Clause 5, "Where, by a decision of the Minister of Finance under Section 40 or by a decision of a judge of the Supreme Court it is finally determined that the tax payable by a corporation

for a taxation year under this Act is less than the amount assessed by the assessment under Section 32 to which the objection was made or from which the appeal was taken and the decision makes it appear that there has been an overpayment for the taxation year, the interest payable under subsection (3) on that overpayment shall be computed at 6 per centum instead of at 2 per centum."

That is instead of the 2% as formerly.

Section 6, sub-section (5) is added. This section is applicable to 1952 taxation year.

Section 7. Sub-section (1) of Section 58 is repealed and another substituted therefor.

These are unimportant amendments, but they bring it into conformity with the Federal legislation.

I have pleasure in moving that it be read a second time.

MR. BROWNE: I have only one observation to make. I think the members will agree that these amendments are not easy to follow. The member has to get the Act and the other amendments, and they are numerous, in connection with income tax—there have been scores of amendments brought in; it is a highly technical subject.

I noticed recently that the Board of Trade are proposing to the government that a Committee be appointed having thereon representatives from those affected by legislation, especially trade and commerce. It is a pity there is not a Committee from Trade and Commerce to which representations might suitably and profitably be made. In other places they have a Committee which deals with law amendments and

I think it would be advisable if we would consider having a Committee of that kind to deal with matters like this. We ought to have a Committee to consider Bills of this kind so that those outside who are affected might make proper representation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have only this to say, in reply to my honourable friend: that while we may not see the necessity to set up a permanent Committee of the type he suggests, I see no reason in the world in any given issue, why a select Committee of the House would not be set up to deal with that one issue. We have done that. We have done it since Confederation. We have done it on a number of occasions. I know it was done in connection with some private Bills; and there might have been public Bills too. Certainly there is nothing to prevent the setting up of a Committee. I do not know if it is important enough; it is only to enable the government of Canada to do certain things.

At any time in the future when legislation comes up that is of special interest to the public, it could be set up.

MR. HOLLETT: What would happen if we did not pass the Bill? I think we are forced to pass it.

MR. HIGGINS: I think that is beyond the realm of possibility.

MR. SPEAKER: The question will be answered, no doubt, in Committee of the Whole.

Moved and seconded that the Bill be read a second time. Carried.

Committee of the Whole tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that the standing orders be deferred. Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock. Carried.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 6, 1954.

The House met at 3.00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Tabled regulations under the authority of the Fisheries Loan Board Act.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Tabled certain statistics relating to the Vital Statistics of Newfoundland.

There are sufficient copies for the House and for the Press.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I give notice that I will on

tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

MR. BROWNE: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask the Minister of Economic Development to lay on voices, Receipts, Vouchers and Pay-rolls concerning:

(a) the construction

(b) the equipment of the plant for the manufacture of hardwood products at Donovan's (Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.)

#### Answers to Questions

MR. SPEAKER: No. 45 addressed to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): The Honourable Minister is not in the Chamber.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): The answer to (46) is being prepared.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (47) stand.

MR. POWER: Tabled answer to No. (44).

#### QUESTION NO. 44:

(i) \$3,660.32.

			Cost of
(ii)	Dates of Trips	Destination	Each
	17. 6.53-28. 6.53	St. John, N.B., Boston, New York and Montreal	\$632.13
	15. 9.53-15.10.53	Sydney and Amherst, N.S., Moncton, N.B., Montreal, P.Q., Toronto and Hamilton, Ont., Winnipeg, Man., Edmonton, Alta., Vancouver and Victoria, B.C., New York, U.S.A.	1,433.61
	25.11.53- 8.12.53	Montreal, Ottawa	581.46
	7. 2.54- 3. 3.54	Montreal, New York, Halifax	1,013.12

DR. POTTLE: Tabled part of answer to No. (12) March 30th.

## COST OF SICK RELIEF MONTHLY BY ELECTORAL DISTRICTS FROM MARCH 31st, 1953 TO JANUARY 31st, 1954

DISTRICTS	Apr. 1953	May 1953	June 1953	July 1953	Aug. 1953	Sept. 1953	Oct. 1953	Nov. 1953	Dec. 1953	Jan. 1953	Total 1954
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
St. John's City .....	3,217	3,369	3,318	2,511	2,582	3,447	3,519	3,620	3,696	3,628	33,307
St. John's Extern .....	213	242	110	115	95	180	150	60	50	30	1,245
Harbour Main-Bell Island .....	1,386	1,291	1,064	1,147	1,125	1,040	1,022	809	936	795	10,615
Port de Grave .....	721	641	685	663	779	845	792	729	623	715	7,193
Harbour Grace .....	1,046	900	977	738	793	771	572	820	809	943	8,369
Carbonear-Bay de Varde .....	2,309	2,307	1,783	1,429	1,416	1,630	2,147	2,148	1,854	2,118	19,141
Trinity South .....	1,300	1,400	1,189	1,134	1,405	1,194	1,153	1,107	1,483	1,393	12,758
Trinity North .....	1,103	982	837	668	807	953	759	787	911	1,042	8,829
Bonavista South .....	1,259	1,008	724	479	533	661	709	742	898	941	7,954
Bonavista North .....	737	671	475	415	431	464	435	500	330	451	4,909
Fogo .....	2,112	1,677	1,190	1,190	1,363	1,316	1,176	1,223	1,098	1,058	13,403
Twillingate .....	783	698	599	587	635	615	813	854	869	770	7,223
Grand Falls .....	1,249	1,114	1,018	895	934	983	1,010	956	1,198	1,206	10,563
Green Bay .....	1,193	1,189	1,060	1,558	882	900	959	906	1,053	916	10,616
White Bay .....	1,208	1,421	1,093	1,086	1,029	1,112	957	1,301	1,233	1,189	11,629
St. Barbe .....	1,002	886	806	746	758	876	904	836	962	1,002	8,778
Humber .....	756	1,003	1,023	838	738	721	739	660	751	565	7,794
St. George's-Port au Port .....	2,085	1,693	1,266	1,136	1,087	1,231	1,169	1,126	1,260	1,440	13,493
Burgeo-La Poile .....	510	591	542	612	714	702	771	824	645	660	6,571
Fortune and Hermitage .....	1,345	1,480	1,659	1,605	1,707	1,519	1,724	1,619	1,610	1,743	16,011
Burin .....	803	941	1,002	911	983	993	996	982	838	998	9,447
Placentia West .....	1,825	1,821	1,853	1,269	1,327	1,938	1,407	1,839	1,991	1,937	17,207
Placentia and St. Mary's .....	463	545	424	488	482	496	601	663	507	326	4,995
Ferryland .....	706	776	611	591	596	562	617	553	549	599	6,160
<b>TOTALS</b> .....	<b>29,331</b>	<b>28,626</b>	<b>25,308</b>	<b>22,811</b>	<b>23,601</b>	<b>25,149</b>	<b>25,101</b>	<b>25,664</b>	<b>26,154</b>	<b>26,465</b>	<b>258,210</b>

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tabled answer to 37 (3) of April 27th, asked by Mr. W. J. Browne, Member for St. John's West.

NAME	Principal Paid	Interest Paid	Interest Refunded
Atlantic Gloves	—	172.60	172.60
Atlantic Films & Electronics	—	—	—
Atlantic Hardboard	—	12,550.65	12,550.65
Atlantic Optical	105,000	2,027.63	—
Atlantic Gypsum	—	—	—
Canadian Leathergoods	—	—	—
C.M.I.C.	—	68,951.67	—
Eckhardt Mills	—	—	—
Hanning Electric	—	3,231.20	3,231.20
Kock Shoes	—	—	—
Nfld. Tanneries	—	18,072.96	18,072.96
Nfld. Hardwoods	—	—	—
North Star Cement	—	225,150.00	225,150.00
Superior Rubber	—	10,810.70	10,810.70
United Cotton	—	9,418.79	9,418.79

MR. KEOUGH: Tabled reply to Question No. 26 on the Order Paper of March 31st., asked by the honourable member for St. John's West (Mr. Hollett).

Question (1): Total number of Newfoundland long-liners and Danish seiners operating in Newfoundland waters during the year 1953.

Answer: Question incorrectly directed.

Question (2): The total number of men employed fishing on these boats.

Answer: Same as (1).

Question (3): The total quantity of fish caught by those vessels and the total landed value of same.

Answer: Same as (1) and (2).

Question (4): How many such vessels were operated under Government sponsorship? Give names of skippers of said vessels, the number of the crew and the ports from

which each such vessel operated, together with total quantities of fish caught by each boat and value of fish caught by each boat. Give also the total expenditure by the Government or any of its Departments upon each such boat, together with amounts spent in wages for each boat's skipper and crew, during the calendar year 1953. Give tonnage of each such boat.

Answer: The question improperly asked.

The Government have facilitated the construction, conversion and equipping of a number of vessels for long-lining and Danish seining operations through the Fisheries Loan Board and under the policy of demonstrating in commercial practice the use of new types of fishing gear, equipment and navigation instruments and fish detecting apparatus and to afford an opportunity for Newfoundland skippers and crew members gaining experience in the use of the gear and equipment in commercial

practice. This is public knowledge as is the activity of the Government of Canada in respect of long-lining operations carried out during the past two years. It is not in the public interest that the details sought in Question 4 pertaining to demonstration and training be made public. Such information could be construed as the actual cost of such vessels in full scale commercial fishing operations which would convey an entirely wrong impression in respect of the practicability of commercial operations with such vessels and methods of fishing.

Question (5): Is it the intention of the Government to continue with its experimental fishing from such boats in future?

Answer: The Government of Newfoundland is not operating any vessels in experimental fishing.

Question (As amended by Mr. Speaker): What is the correct tonnage of such fishing boats, the correct crew number; and what is the approximate cost of construction of such a boat, and total cost including engines when boat is ready for sea?

Answer: There is no such thing as a correct tonnage of a vessel for use in long-lining or Danish seining, the tonnage and number of crew and the cost of construction and engine and equipment depend upon a wide range of technical and practical considerations and, most important is the acceptance by fisherman-skippers of a vessel which they believe will best serve their needs and in which they have confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Before taking up the Orders of the Day, yesterday, Honourable the Premier complained that a statement of his made in this

House had been misquoted or misrepresented in the Press. Whereupon, a transcription of the Hansard containing those remarks was asked for and ordered for today. Is it the wish of the House to hear the transcription?

Read by Mr. Clerk:  
“(Quote)

Friday, April 2, 1954.

MR. HOLLETT: How can they live, if they are not given a chance? The Government is doing nothing. All they said is “We are going to kick NAFEL’s teeth in.” I have heard the song that “it is no use knocking on wood,” neither is it any use kicking in teeth. Oh yes, they gave the fishermen \$1.50 last Fall; without any investigation, they paid out the \$1.50. They forced the Federal Government to do it. And there is one thing for which I congratulate the Premier. He expected, and rightly so, that the Federal Government would come across with a floor price or some implementation of the fishery price. He went to Ottawa. They told him to go home. I will say this for the Premier; and I hope he will remember it: He came home, he dipped down—not into the chest—that was empty. He may have had to go to the bank; but anyway he paid the \$1.50. And the Federal Government got so ashamed of themselves, they said “we will pay you back one cent a pound—but, do not do it any more. And we are going to see that you do not do it any more. We are going to hand it over to Mr. Howe.” He forced the Federal Government to come across.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I say that the honourable gentleman is completely wrong? I do not deserve his congratulations. Before the Gov-



ernment paid the \$1.50, I telephoned the Government at Ottawa, from St. John's. What we did was done with their knowledge beforehand; with the understanding that if they made a deficiency payment, it would come back to the Treasury of Newfoundland. So, the credit for that is not really mine.

MR. HOLLETT: The modesty of the Premier is unexcelled at times. If I erred, the blame is the Premier's. He never told the public that before. He let the people think it was all his doing. I was naive enough to give him credit for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman not realize that in highly delicate matters of this sort, one has to do what one does and keep one's mouth shut? Because of the situation in the markets, the Government of Canada could not, under any conditions, be involved in suspicion that they were subsidizing fish, some of which might enter the United States.

The honourable gentleman can have all the fun he likes here now; but one must do what one does and keep one's mouth shut in delicate matters of this sort.

(Unquote)."

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have only one comment to offer on that—and that is that it supports completely the complaint I made yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day—Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply.

#### Orders of the Day

DR. POTTLE: In rising to take part in this debate, my first duty is to offer, along with other honourable

members, my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Motion. They have performed their duties with dignity and earnestness.

I reaffirm my loyalty to Her Majesty, the Queen, and wish Her continued health and happiness and a prosperous reign.

Furthermore, I should like to extend my compliments and welcome, along with other honourable members, to the entry into this House of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. While in his first speech, in my humble opinion, he did not live up to the expectations we had of this honourable gentleman, nevertheless, I feel quite sure that in his coming, the House has acquired a member who will be attentive to his duty, and the Leader of the Opposition, a most solicitous solicitor.

Since this House closed, we have been very glad to know that the Prime Minister of Canada has made a remarkable journey around the world, not, I might say, as a Politician but rather as a Canadian Statesman and, in fact, a World Statesman. Having visited some of the places which he himself has visited, I, in my humble way, am gratified that he has been able to represent Canada in these parts of the world. Canada, as the present Governor-General has pointed out, is one of the few nations of the earth which can emphasize her nationality without intimidating or giving offence to other nations; and I am quite sure that the Prime Minister's visits in those foreign parts will help in some way—some substantial way—to align Canada with all the forces of the world which are concerned with peace—that peace which although at present is elusive—which

will inherit the earth, if not tomorrow, then the day after tomorrow.

We cannot debate this motion before the House without making some reference to Canada and its help and influence on this land of ours because of the fact that Union with Canada has changed the course of our history. I was therefore sorry when a few evenings ago I listened to a speaker over a radio station speak on "Five Years of Confederation in Newfoundland." This gentleman took occasion to make his speech from beginning to end a Political address, in which he made it quite plain that he was against Confederation even more now than he had been from the beginning. Those who argue thus and believe we should have gone our own way were not altogether aware, as indeed not one per cent were aware at that time in Newfoundland, how near we were to the brink of collapse in 1949 even with forty million dollars in the till.

At the time of Confederation there were nearly eight thousand families on relief; the figures from the Unemployment Assistance, which was a measure extended to Newfoundland in 1949 as soon as we became a Province, the number of people applying for Unemployment Assistance was 42,000. The number who actually claimed receipt of this assistance was 28,000 and the cost in that year 1949-50 to the Canadian Treasury was \$3,212,000; along with the four million dollars which we as a Government spent as a gallant gesture in 1949 for relief. I say now, Sir, that if it were not for the Social Services which were applied to Newfoundland in 1949 immediately after Confederation, we might have been prostrated today or close to prostration, five years after Confederation. And yet this honourable gentleman as he con-

tinued the doleful dirge and unloaded concentrated bilge upon the air waves, intimated we could have taken family allowances in our stride—eleven and a half million dollars last year—fifty-three millions paid out since Confederation—we could have taken that in our stride, said Mr. J. G. Higgins, Q.C. We could have taken the Old Age Security in our stride, costing many millions more. I refer again to this Unemployment Assistance because most of the people who qualified for Unemployment Assistance would have had to get relief if they had not received that assistance—the vast portion of those would today be receiving relief, that viper that can suck the blood from any economy and not the last of which would be the economy of Newfoundland. And so on this dyspeptic gentleman continued until he had discharged the acidic content of his system on an unsuspecting people. I repeat that if it were not for the advantages of Confederation we receive now, a very serious situation would presently exist as far as the position of our economy and the destiny of this land is concerned.

Now, the non-legal member for St. John's East takes up the stand and by-passes the speech by being critical of Confederation in general and of the railway. It is rather ironical that the member of the Opposition should have kept up complaining about that, because if there is one public service, one facility which seems to justify Confederation, it is the railway. It in itself is almost sufficient justification for our being a Province of Canada. Go up to the Railway Station and take a look around you at eleven o'clock in the morning or four o'clock in the evening on any week-day and see the numbers of cars

which are parked there. They are the cars of the working classes—thank God for that. Nobody will deny them what is their proper due; but the situation might have been mighty different but for Confederation. The Gander; the marine works; the social services—the most civilizing influence tending to a much more equitable distribution of income than was ever distributed before. We must not, however, find ourselves leaning upon Canada as upon a crutch. As I see it, there is a failure on the part of the Opposition to distinguish between the factors within Newfoundland's control and those without, and it is only the first we should be criticized for. The fact that we are a Province of Canada involves us in Canada.

I come now, Sir, to raise certain specific points, in answer to other specific points raised earlier by the Opposition. I refer in the first place to the "Ghost Speech" by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. This Honourable House will recall the tragedy of "Hamlet" where the Ghost of Hamlet's father appears after Hamlet's uncle has killed his father, crudely speaking, to possess Hamlet's father's wife. The ghost says to Hamlet: "I am thy father's spirit doomed for a certain time to walk the night and for the day confined to fast in fires. But that I am forbid to tell the secrets of my prison house, I could a tale unfold whose lightest word would harrow up thy soul." There were certain things which prevented the ghost from telling all the story. But the honourable and learned gentleman in the Opposition had no such inhibitions. He leads us back and forth past the graveyard, and when he thinks he has flayed our spirits until they are prostrate and can bear no

more, then he administers the "Coup de grace" by showing to our bewildered and misty gaze a mound of cadaverous and accusing skulls.

Learned members at least will recall the churchyard scene in "Hamlet" wherein the skulls are kicked about, and Hamlet picks up one he recognizes and says: "Alas! Poor Yorick, I knew him, Horatio." Then in symbolic fashion, Mr. Speaker, the learned member for St. John's West holds these skulls symbolically above us all: Alas! Poor Icelandic Trawlers; Alas! Poor railway of the narrow gauge; Alas! Poor Judges and their salaries; Alas! Poor Fishermen's Federation, that child of my brain which like Lycidas died ere his prime; Alas! Poor Socialistic Premier—this thing has a remarkable degree of life in it. We are still handling skulls, Sir, Alas! Poor Sennewald, the eyeglasses still intact; Alas! Poor Industries; Alas! Poor cost of living; Alas! Poor freight rates; Alas! Poor Government—the numbskull.

And having judged, stamped and catalogued all the sundry skulls, flings them all in our direction and, his "Ghost Speech" nearly over, he has only one thing to say, but, Sir, this other thing that the learned gentleman has to say, in my view, condemns the whole speech because, having criticized the Government of producing all these skulls, he then goes on to say: "Now we have produced the fisheries report, and their whole programme of fishery development is now brought before us," he says; "as a red herring." To me, Sir, and I want to make it clear, it is my feeling that this was a mischievous and irresponsible statement. For the fishery plan as outlined in the report and as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, for it to have been a red

herring is to visualize that away back in 1951, over three years ago, the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada conspired to concoct something which, one of these days, when it was most convenient to us—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The honourable member is imputing motives to me never expressed. I don't think he is entitled to figure out in that fashion what I said, and I think it was plain to the honourable member. I said "We are now told we are going to concentrate on the fisheries, fish, fish, fish, that is the reason why it was a red herring, to cover all the misdeeds of the past."

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member might agree an inference may be drawn, but I must say it ought not to be inferred here that the considered remarks of the member who spoke first in the debate were "mischievous."

DR. POTTLE: "To me it seemed," I said, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member should have drawn that inference.

DR. POTTLE: Thank you, Sir.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that a plan which now, if it comes into being, in the fisheries development report and which was fore-shadowed in the Speech from the Throne, was developed long, long ago, and we could not have done any more than we had done on this particular point while the committee's report was in the making, else it would have prejudiced all the findings of the committee before the committee had time to work. So, Sir, it seemed to me that the "Big Gun" of the Opposi-

tion, while it might have sounded like good firing from their side, backfired as far as we are concerned, and I would say, backfired as far as the feelings and attitude of the fishermen of Newfoundland are concerned.

Now, I come to the honourable member for St. John's East, the honourable and learned member—He likewise took an abject look at the fisheries and with forensic inexactitude he says; "They are not prepared to launch out into the deep." What the honourable and learned member means, I have not the faintest idea. If this is not launching out into the deep, Sir, I do not know what is. There was probably never a plan possessed of such magnitude worked out so systematically as this plan for the fisheries of Newfoundland. Yet he says we are not prepared to launch out into the deep. Now, I can quite understand why the members on the opposite side would not launch out into the deep, because they might, any one of them, become seasick in Murray's Pond or Quidi Vidi Lake. There is not any one of them perhaps who could distinguish a sinker from a sunken. Yet, the member for St. John's East says the Government are now taking a new interest in the fisheries. We have been in the fisheries and in it pretty deep since 1949. Since then over twenty Newfoundland firms have been assisted in one way or another to carry on the fishing industry. In actual cash loans for buying vessels we have committed out of the Treasury seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and for actual cash guarantees for buying vessels one and three-quarter million dollars; for actual cash loans for the construction of fish plants nearly two million dollars, and actual guarantees for the construction of fish plants

again nearly two million dollars; a grand total of approximately six and one half million dollars for fisheries, for Newfoundland firms to carry on the fisheries since 1949. In addition, as my honourable colleague representing Trinity North reminded us, this is all in addition to cash assistance to the fishermen, all in addition to the marine works on an increasing scale, which though carried out by the Government of Canada in the main has been initiated by the Province of Newfoundland. Yet the Leader of the Opposition says very little has been done by this Government for the fisheries of Newfoundland.

This House will know, Sir, that for years now the fishermen of the North East Coast have been the subject of concern. I have pleaded that the Bay de Verde Area be included in any consideration of the rehabilitation of the North East Coast. I am delighted to know, Sir, that the Bay de Verde Area has, in fact, been included in the overall Fisheries Development Committee's Report and planning, and that it will share in the major developments that will take place as a result of the implementation of that plan, and that, if things go as we expect and hope they will, the work concerning the development of the fisheries, in keeping with that report, will go ahead in Bay de Verde Area this summer.

In that area of Bay de Verde itself, there are 172 families, and 150 of these are directly getting their livelihood from the fisheries. It is easy to make comparisons, but I doubt whether there is anything in all Canada quite so typical—there is certainly nothing in Newfoundland quite so typical of the fishing industry—as there is inside the breakwater of Bay de Verde. These Bay de Verde

people, along with other fishermen of Newfoundland, are amongst the backbone of this little Island, and they are amongst the people of whom we like to think when we say "God Guard Thee Newfoundland." I hope that the people of Bay de Verde will support in every way the carrying into effect of any scheme that might be initiated there on behalf of the fisheries. I shall say this, Sir: Although this Government foreshadows the expenditure of many, many millions of dollars, and although the Government of Canada foreshadows the expenditure of many millions more, yet, great and worthy as these plans are, fundamentally necessary as these plans are for the people and for our fishing people, yet they can be frustrated, they can be hampered, they can be soured if our people do not give all these plans all the support they can. That support will be necessary in many, many ways, very practical ways, some of them physical, economic and social ways. It may be a matter of removing their fences, or some interference with property, the matter of building up local organizations through which the Government can function and develop any organization and plan. There is the matter of moving from one place to another in order to enable these large-scale plans to come into effect. All these are very human considerations and all within the power of the people. None of these, no matter how fundamental they are, Sir, none of these is so important or should bulk so large as but what they ought to be made possible in order that this massive venture might have some real, ultimate hope of success.

I come now, Sir, to the non-legal member for St. John's East: he has discussed the industries at some

length, to which remarks I know the Premier will reply. I have only one comment to make—

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman to ask in what way the honourable member is a non-legal member of this House?

DR. POTTLE: I meant that as a technical phrase. I could not say unlearned, and I could not say illiterate, nor could I say the honourable and junior member which possibly is no more complimentary.

He referred to one other industry—I suppose he would call it a major industry, the liquor business. He did so last year and I then made a statement which did not get an appropriate headline. I too was in a way misquoted, but I said then: "In administering the Liquor Act, as in all other such matters, the Government tries to keep in touch with public opinion," I said this last year and I am repeating it now. So far the Government has reason to believe that by and large its liquor policy is upheld by the people. At least we know of no concerted opinion against the liquor policy. This Government, like any other Government, will keep its ears close to the ground, it will not willingly for very long run contrary to the great body of public opinion, and for reasons which the Opposition will appreciate. I only reaffirm what I said then, Sir: If the people want the liquor policy changed, as any other Government policy, they largely have the remedy in their own hands, whether permanent or better is another matter. But when the great majority of the people make clear to this Government, through the recognized channels, that

they want a different liquor policy the Government will, as it is bound to do, take due notice of their wishes. The Government cannot be expected to lead the public in this matter but is more likely to follow the public in a matter of this kind.

Now, Sir, I wish to make one or two comments with regard to the speech of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The first point is that in all he said there was an underlying theme. It was a theme if not of dislikes of at least a really critical look at, those people whom he calls foreigners. As far as I know, the people whom he dubs as foreigners are as law-abiding and industrious as many of our people, probably most of our people. I think they have not added any disgrace since they came here, at least that is not the experience of the people of Carbonear. I don't think it is the experience of our school children. I think they have given us a far better lesson in this matter of integrating with our friends from across the water than the people of the Opposition. I have no brief for these people as against other people, I know that they are amongst the most industrious and law-abiding citizens of all Canada, and who knows, we may need them one of these days against our enemies. I hope that event never arises. The scars of my honourable friend's war experience are still burning deeply, and when he comes to discussing the industries and introducing the names of these German people he does not even give them the courtesy of pronouncing their names properly as I know he can.

MR. HOLLETT: I try it.

DR. POTTLE: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows as



well as I do, Sir, that these people speak a language which is the language of Goethe and Beethoven, or Kant and Einstein, names to be reckoned with. He knows too that German literature and German thoughts are amongst the most precious of the Western World. He knows, for example, that the passage I am about to quote contains one of the crucial passages in "Faust" Part I.

"Werd'ich zum Augenblicke sagen  
'Verweile doch, du bist so schon'  
Dann magst du mich in Fesseln  
schlagen  
Dann will ich gern zu Grunde gehen.

Dann mag die Totenglocke schallen,  
Dann bist du dienes Dienstes frei,  
Die Uhr mag stehen, die Zeiger  
fallen,  
Es sei die Zeit für mich vorbei."

Now, that is the language of Faust I have quoted, the language of these people who came amongst us, whose conscious thoughts, compare with Shakespeare's, yet they are "foreigners" who have come to take over Newfoundland.

Let me say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, through the Chair, Sir, that we have assisted Newfoundland industries too, on land and on sea, and not all of these have succeeded, but we have taken the intelligent gamble just the same. That is the first point I take. And they are unduly critical and unsympathetic toward people who have come to share destiny with us. I do say they are not reaching their greatest heights when condemning the "hope" speeches of this Government. I am sure, Sir, that he must appreciate that the foundation of the life which we live these days is as much hope as anything else, not only solid achieve-

ment but the faith that enables us to go on when we don't see clearly all the way ahead. When Lincoln spoke of democratic governments—"Government of the people by the people for the people" he was not speaking of an achievement that was either then or at any time since fully realized. He was speaking of a hope. Because it is a hope we should not spurn it for that reason alone. Is it not a hope that has inspired democratic life everywhere and has created institutions such as this House? I could cite from the sayings of a real Conservative leader to show how liberal he is—Churchill, who as far back as 1908 made a statement to the workers of Aberdeen which reflects his sound sense of social security of Britain which is one of the solid structures of civilized man today, which will not be changed fundamentally whatever Government there comes into power—it is part and parcel of the people; and Churchill away back in the dark days of 1908—when I say "dark" I mean by way of not having so much understanding about social security as we have today—in 1908 he was saying to the workers of Aberdeen—"Where there is no hope, believe me, there will be no thrift."

Mr. Speaker, how will you confront the fishermen of Bay de Verde without hope? I had some occasion to go over to the North shore of Conception Bay in 1949. I thought I knew that district well. I was born there, and of very ordinary people. I have known what it is to have my breakfast come out to me in a boat on an endless rope, because we were not able to get ashore. I have known something of the hard, comfortless existence of many fishermen, and yet I was not prepared for what I saw in 1949. I made it my business to see our older people par-

ticularly because they seemed to be the most desolate. I am sure the people of Lower Island Cove and Job's Cove and Daniel's Cove and Red Head Cove and all the other places around about would not mind, if they were here this afternoon listening to what I am saying; they can remember what even five years ago happened. Hope—If I had any hope, Sir, when I went down in that district I would not have gone at all, I would have had no justification unless I had gone with hope. When I turned over Saddle Hill I thought about my predecessors since 1855 going over Saddle Hill to represent Carbonear and Bay de Verde, and I wondered what hope in the world they had. I was well aware it was not anything I had of myself to give, but being part of Canada there was something now to hope for. I can see these old veterans, people with their short stubby, salty beards under the blankets shivering, the blankets shivering over them as they thought—"We must not take this \$30 or \$40 a month because if we do we will lose our picket fence, we will lose the trap out there in the barn loft." My wife and I went down there together because I thought she could get nearer and see things more clearly than I could. I can see now an old lady in Job's Cove looking over the fence weeping, not any tears of drama or of just sheer made-up drama, but the real thing. Sir—"I have owned this little cabbage garden you see here and my father and his before him for generations. Do you tell me I am going to have to give it up just for getting \$30 a month?" They had been inured to despair for generations, Sir. That was the lot they knew and that is all they knew. And for anybody to come and say "Somebody cares—it is going to be different"—They looked in our faces

and said, some with tears and some with a hard face, depending on their dispositions, "This is not for us." How could we face the people of Job's Cove without hope? Look at them now—All their problems are not solved by any means, but what has happened for them and for their children since 1949 is something the like of which has not happened on this side of the water in our age.

I think of the old gentleman in Grate's Cove looking at me one day in the meadow as he came ashore from the fishing boat, mowing his hay in the spare time between one haul and another and saying to me: "Sir, there is more to social security than dollars and cents," and took off his cap when he said it. But yet, Sir, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition criticized us for expressing hope. I don't want to be unduly critical, I want to see the business of this House done as capably and as businesslike, and at the same time as realistically, as any man, I believe, and yet I cannot forbear saying that the speeches of the Opposition Leaders since I have known them have not been messages of hope but of hopelessness, and I have sat in this House as consistently, I believe, Sir, as most members. The present Leader of the Opposition says, "All you say or the most you do over there is express hope." He says that to this Government when this Government can be marked not only by hope but by solid achievement based on its hope. This Government which is accused of expressing only hopes has spent more on teachers' salaries, more on school buildings and maintaining them, on public works, has done more for hospitals, has done incomparably more for social service generally, set up labour relations with labour people through Newfoundland such as have

never been set up before, and in addition has done more for the fisheries, believe it or not, than any other Government in the same length of time and even not comparing the same length of time. These are solid achievements, I say, Sir, which are written into the history of this land, and ought not, I say, to be derided because we have expressed some hope.

I feel first of all it is proper to extend at the very beginning my compliments, my thanks to the Leader of the Opposition and to his colleague from St. John's West for making complimentary references to the Public Welfare in Newfoundland. I should like, just for a minute, to do some stocktaking ourselves, now, after five years of Confederation. I referred just now to what has been done for the older people; but I come back to them because they have been amongst the most neglected of our race. When we came into being in 1949, the Old Age Pension was then on the books (and you had to be 75 to qualify at all)—you then received \$18.00 per quarter—or \$6.00 a month. Two people, 75 and over, received \$30.00 a quarter or \$10.00 a month. During the days of Commission of Government, it had been less than that.

MR. BROWNE: You were one of the Commission.

DR. POTTLE: A widow could get her husband's allowance on his death, but she would have to be sixty-five to get it.

Now, I think Newfoundland knows fairly generally—certainly at first-hand, what has happened in the field of Public Welfare since 1949, and because I have had some little part to play in it, I shall be as modest as I can and associate myself mainly with

my staff and the people in the field who ultimately are the people who make any Welfare system a success. And to them I wish to pay my tribute now as I have paid it before.

For the first time in the history of Newfoundland, all our people in need, wherever they are, are being given substantial assistance and that, in itself, is a remarkable achievement. But more than that, they have been enabled to get their assistance according to need and that assistance is the same for all persons everywhere in the same circumstances. That is to say, for a Public Welfare system to be successful, it needs to pass three tests:

It must cover the ground—everybody in need. People from Cartwright to Cappahayden, from King's Cove to Lark Harbour—all people coming within the test receive assistance and the assistance is equitable, it varies according to need and only according to need. And, it is consistent—it is the same for all persons everywhere in the same circumstances.

To be able to say that that is being done for the first time, not on any political grounds, on no other grounds but on sheer basis of need—that is remarkable.

During the past year I have had to represent Newfoundland at conferences called by the Government of Canada to consider the possibility of bringing a Disability Allowance to permanently disabled people over 21. We are now caring for these people in a kind of way, through Dependents' Allowances Act, and there are only three systems in Canada who are providing a comprehensive coverage for permanently disabled people. The allowance is not as much as we should like them to be—they are part and parcel of the

whole Social Security system of Newfoundland. It is possible that legislation may be introduced into the House of Commons at this session to enable the Provinces to enter into an agreement ultimately with the Federal Government regarding them. I understand the Regulations which will be based on that legislation will be framed sometime this session, probably in June. We advised Parliament that our policy would be that we will look at the proposals as they come forward in the Legislature, see if we shall benefit financially if we enter into it or if we shall be better off with some welfare from our own people or if we shall get better service under contract with the Government than we are getting now—financial grants and welfare grants—and we can say now the Government is closely watching how this scheme might work out for Newfoundland and take the best steps accordingly. At the present time we have about an expenditure in benefits of five and a half million dollars. I think it is fair to say that that 5½ million dollars is being distributed at the same time more equitably, more comprehensively, more consistently, all three together, than any other 5½ million dollars spent in Newfoundland. It is all very well to talk in terms of billions of dollars, we can bandy the figures about as much as we like, there is more to it than dollars and cents. The success depends not only on the records kept, the amount in dollars expended, the number of staff you have in the field; it depends on the quality of service—whether we are in fact meeting the public in a friendly and understanding way. The people who do that by and large, along with our administrative men at headquarters, are our Welfare Officers in the field. I think now there is a high de-

gree of morale among these Officers; but unless we give attention to human things first and not our own self-aggrandisement; not our own wishes, but the needs of the people, that happy situation will not last indefinitely. What we must say to any Public Welfare is that we put people first, not any other thing, but people; for welfare is always public welfare; and the State, in all these matters, can only do so much; it has to do so much because of the faulty beginnings of days ago or years ago when one could not meet the demands. They are not consistent. Something has to cover it across the board. And only the State can do that. That does not mean that the traditional springs of welfare should dry up. The Government provides the minimum—sometimes a bare minimum—but that should not prevent all social organizations of a charitable or social kind from going on doing all they have been doing and they may be expected to do more.

I think we have developed a system of public welfare in Newfoundland. I know it developed suddenly and probably the system meets the needs of all our people. It is being looked at carefully and sympathetically by the other Provinces of Canada and in areas far afield. I am glad to say the emphasis we have been giving to welfare, first, is self-help; and this will be the theme of the National Conference and International Conference on Public Welfare in June at Toronto.

But, there is one worm in the rosy apple. On the outside the fruit looks very attractive, but even half a million dollars in Unemployment Insurance, better Veterans' Allowances, Old Age Security, Family Allowances, all that would cost tens of millions of dollars. On the outside the apple looks rosy and most assuring, but there might be

a worm at the heart of the apple, if we do not watch out. At any time the whole fabric could be wrecked if we had large-scale unemployment and consequent able-bodied relief, that viper that can suck the very life-blood out of any system of social welfare in Newfoundland. We have had two competent surveys of Public Welfare within the last few years and both have pointed out the vulnerability of Newfoundland in this matter of unemployment, because you see in Newfoundland we have a Law on our Statute Books which obligates us to meet their problem of relief of unemployed wherever and whenever it arises. In the other Provinces of Canada they can push it on to the Municipalities. We cannot push it on to the Municipalities in Newfoundland. We have no Municipality-sharing of this hazard of unemployment in Newfoundland. We are unique; so when it comes to the question of the Royal Commission on the Terms of Union facing up to the Newfoundland needs, I hope we shall give every attention to the vulnerability of Newfoundland to unemployment. Back in 1949 the Federal Government thought it should accept in principle this responsibility and a separate scheme to turn our Provincial Budgets and our Municipal Budgets over to the Federal Government. After that year, with the full amount of prosperity, the Province did not need the Federal Government to back up the span, they revised the scheme. With us there is always the risk that if large-scale unemployment should come upon us, then Newfoundland will be the most sorely affected, and among these will be the fishermen who are among the most vulnerable of the lot.

The Leader of the Opposition asked for figures on relief and other mat-

ters. Today he has his full answer. He has the figures in abstract form. If he takes these figures and goes to the census figures and compares the three poorest districts with the three best districts, he will find a disparity of 30 or 40 between the two. That is to say, in the three districts I can mention, there were thirty or forty times as many on relief as in the best districts. The best districts are those where there are industries—continuous industries. The poorest districts are mostly always wholly fishing districts. That is the picture from year to year. How can we make these poorer districts more comparable to the others? Some will say "give unemployment insurance to the fishermen."

On March 16th last, Mr. Carter in the House of Commons asked the Minister of Labour whether the Government of Canada was considering unemployment insurance for the fishermen of Newfoundland and the answer was "yes we are." Unemployment Insurance for fishermen, even if it could be worked out; even if some plan was devised to bring these self-employed within the unemployment insurance scheme, even then the unemployment insurance would be a palliative. For there can be no treatment for a malignant disease such as the fishery business has in Newfoundland except by some such radical remedy as is here proposed and this question of the fisheries having a malignant disease is no figure of speech. Earlier in the session this afternoon I had certain figures distributed to the House and all leisure honourable members will be able to analyse these tables which have been prepared by my able Deputy in the Department, Mr. Ralph Andrews.

Table 1, which gives the information on the population of 65-69 age group as a percentage of the total population

of each Province based on estimated population of the Province as at June 1st, 1952. This Table tells you what proportion there are in Newfoundland and other Provinces of people 65-69 as compared to the whole population. Apart from Quebec, there are less in the 65-69 group in Newfoundland than anywhere else in Canada. What happened? In that case, many in the 65-69 group are not here, they are not under the sod; they left long ago. Those who did stay, many of them were cut down by the ravages of disease, malnutrition and exposure. They are with us not in the flesh. But Newfoundland is down below the other Provinces except Quebec.

MR. HOLLETT: What about New Brunswick?

DR. POTTLE: It runs close. Newfoundland is the poorest.

Table 2. Percentage of Population 65-69 years of age receiving assistance. It tells us how many people out of 100 are getting assistance here. In Newfoundland 56 out of 100 are getting old age assistance. That is not a crime, but it means their income is way down as compared with Saskatchewan and those other socialized Provinces of Canada where the recipients are 14½%—Newfoundland is four times worse off than these and practically five times worse off than Ontario.

Table 3. Tells us the number of people (male) in Newfoundland and elsewhere permanently unable to work expressed as a percentage of all, Newfoundland tops the list. This table says that 5 out of every 100 male people in Newfoundland, 14 years of age and over are unable to work. Newfoundland tops the list.

Table 4. Gives some information with regard to the women adults un-

able to work. Again Newfoundland is worst off.

MR. BROWNE: Could I ask a question on that? In this country they are not allowed to work until they are 17. Is there not a rule where they must have passed their 16th year? Therefore your figures are not accurate on the last two tables.

DR. POTTLE: True some Provinces have the 18 age law and others the 16; but this gives us the "Permanently" unable to work—it has to do with incapacity.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask a question? Could the honourable gentleman tell us if he has arrived at a conclusion as to why we have so many permanently disabled persons?

DR. POTTLE: These tables were prepared recently without our having had the time to go behind the scenes to find reasons. We are giving them to you as straight out of the census. We presume the same question would apply in getting them in Manitoba as in getting them in Newfoundland.

The Leader of the Opposition has raised a very good question. Tables 1 to 4, they represent to us part of what I shall call now "the unfinished business of public welfare in Newfoundland."

MR. HOLLETT: After five years of Confederation?

DR. POTTLE: "Unfinished business of Public Welfare in Newfoundland." The unfinished business represents a long agenda, but I shall content myself with describing the details of two or more towns in Newfoundland.

I think of one town which has always had a great struggle to survive



and has been impaired by many setbacks in its long history. Today it is beset with labour troubles and any major industry presently there or that may be established there, may possibly be threatened because of these labour dislocations and unrests. The very grave danger from the point of view of Public Health—the very grave danger is that the demands of labour may become so pressing that although labour may now, today or tomorrow, achieve its ends and get higher wages, yet it may do so at the expense of starving the children of the next generation.

I am not taking sides, because there may be other factors in the situation which I have not covered. I am singling out one, in such a situation as this, there is a clarion demand for statesmanship among labour leaders to see to it that the welfare of the Newfoundland people is properly safeguarded. That is what I call part of the unfinished business of Public Welfare.

I think of another town—this one is one of the wealthiest and one of the largest. Last year the wage bill from the over-riding, the Central Company, the big company was \$9,000,000.00. This year it will go beyond nine million dollars. But some of the living conditions in that town, especially for our young people are frightful. This town, I say, is one of the most prosperous in Newfoundland, so prosperous that although it contains eight or nine thousand people there are presently three families only on relief, yet the housing conditions are amongst the very worst in Canada. So far for sixty years—in fact I have not known the company to raise one finger to draw attention to those conditions. So far I have not known the company to involve itself in any public way in the

social conditions which surround that company's operations in that prosperous town. So far the hundreds of miners have had to climb or crawl along on their bellies to scratch out rock from under the water. We have produced untold wealth, Sir, for Newfoundland in that area, and the living conditions of some of the people there are unspeakably appalling.

But I am glad to say there are more signs of improvement in these conditions there today than there have ever been in my remembrance, both from the company where I believe there are signs for the better, and from the people themselves as we have seen indicated lately. Things are on the move, and I believe we have seen the worst for that prosperous town.

My remarks in this respect, Sir, are designed to involve industry generally as having a moral responsibility for people; that people are not merely something out of which wealth must be squeezed, and then when they become 45 and have asthma, throw them out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Socialism—Careful that is not liked over there —

DR. POTTLE: I am involving industry, Sir, industry as having a moral responsibility for the people, and that is part of the unfinished business of Public Welfare.

So we go on—I met five or six welfare officers a few weeks ago. I asked them, because they belong to certain areas which are to some extent contiguous and their districts in some cases join one another, "How about your unemployment situation?" I was told: "We have not any in the whole area, no unemployment, no great amount of relief." And yet, if I say that social conditions are appalling in

any place, there are no words to describe the social conditions in parts of one or more of these districts—I can't find a word to describe it.

One of the welfare officers told me that, although there is no unemployment around his community nor in most of his district, ninety-five per cent of the children in a section of his district should not be living with their parents, but, I say: "Should be decontaminated by being taken away from the bad example of their elders." That may sound like 'Plato's Republic' but there it is.

Right in Newfoundland today social conditions, I say, are unspeakably bad; wives are exchanged like common chattels—and it does not happen all on one side of the track either, it is not just an indisposition of some poor people, one of their luxuries.

I shall say something, Sir, which is bound to be misunderstood. Where there is most prosperity in Newfoundland there is most social disorganization. Now when that is said, that is not to say that prosperity is a bad thing. But it does mean to say that prosperity abounds (and I am speaking Public Welfare now, Sir) where prosperity abounds there is, to that extent, a greater need for us to be on our guard that, when we think of money, when we are getting and spending, we do not at the same time lay waste our powers. The advent and habits of prosperity ought not to dull us to the fact, dull our perceptions to the fact that people, people above all, are important, and that we cannot go on singing the national ode as if it were just some wonderful dream—It means people. We have more here than just pine-clad hills. We have people—and when we speak of people as being our ultimate resources we

are speaking of something which is more than poetry.

Now, Sir, as a member of this House, I think it is an abiding responsibility, not only for this Government, but for the House as a whole, the Opposition and all of us together, to see to it that in our debates we put first things first, and that in an issue of this kind, of putting people first, we cannot afford to dissipate our resources by bickering nor by drawing attention to "Red Herrings." This is the real thing, Sir—The People of Newfoundland! That is the unfinished business of Public Welfare. It seems to me that in all out getting and spending we should put our people, our fundamental resources, where they properly belong, in the forefront. It is a responsibility, I think, Sir, for both the Government and the Opposition, all of us together, to see to it, in collaboration with every agency of good-will, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, that; "While we accumulate wealth men shall not decay."

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments in connection with the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor on the 24th instant, I wish to join with all honourable members of this House in extending my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply.

I may say, Sir, that there is not much left for me to stress in the Speech from the Throne as all the honourable members on this side who have spoken have outlined the benefits that can be derived from the very important address. Yes, in the Speech from the Throne we have four main objects, which I feel, Sir, are very

important and essential to this country of ours. As we look forward, Sir, we will find in that address, which was delivered by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, there are four very important factors whereas the Opposition on the opposite side stated that there is not very much to it. Yet when we realize, taking first the No. 1 point—A Royal Commission on Forestry. This I feel, Sir, is very important to this country. No. 2, Sir, the appointment of a Royal Commission to revise the Terms of Union, which was considered by the Opposition as a not very important factor, and No. 3 the new Election Act which will be brought forth in this House in this coming term of ours together with the Redistribution Bill will be a big factor, I feel sure, to all of us who are here, and No. 4 the creation of a fishery development authority which to my mind is probably the greatest of all. That alone, I feel, is sufficient to keep this House in session for months alone in a general debate. Yet the honourable members on the opposite side of the House in delivering all their speeches claimed that the Speech from the Throne is null and void.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side can take that attitude. I know that the honourable members probably have more learning than I have, they have great minds. But I think their minds are very small when they say that there is nothing in this speech.

MR. HOLLETT: How can they be great and small at the same time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: However, it is true.

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, all I have heard is "There is nothing in

this speech to comment on." Mr. Speaker, all I have heard so far is Dr. Valdmanis, Sennewald, Seigheim and the beer taverns. That, Mr. Speaker, seems to be their theme.

But, Mr. Speaker, why did they bring up Dr. Valdmanis?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, why?

MR. BUTTON: And the beer taverns etc.?

MR. HOLLETT: Why?

MR. BUTTON: They referred to the past—in the Commission of Government days—they were angels and we are demons, although it is true, as the Honourable the Premier has said, we brought peace and comfort to the people of Newfoundland, which they regret. Mr. Speaker, I can understand that they feel sore over it. They feel sore because they are not on this side of the House. They feel sore that they are not running our country. That is why, I feel confident, they say the Speech from the Throne is null and void.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order: That is the second time that has been repeated. I do not remember anybody on the Opposition side saying it is null and void. If he is going to quote I suggest he quote correctly.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order, but possibly could be a misquotation.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a misquotation then, Sir.

MR. BUTTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, null and void as I understand it—From the Leader of the Opposition's speech it is not worth anything, which in other words means it is null and

void. As I have already said: I do see these four great factors, not factories. We have factories in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will in future be proud of. As time goes on he will get up in this House and say: I regret that I have condemned them.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the Fisheries Development Committee, I sincerely trust that (however I am not criticizing the Government by any means) whoever is in charge of the committee whether it is Federal or Provincial that they will in the near future, Sir, give considerable thought to the District of Trinity South which I represent, because we have quite a number of fishermen in that district at the present time. As I see it the situation is now very serious especially when so many plans have already been announced over the radio and in the press as to other districts especially on the North East Coast and on the South West Coast. I understand, Sir, that the fishermen on the North East Coast and on the South West Coast require all the fishing plants they can get. I believe it is essential in order that these good people can earn a living for themselves and for their families. Yet, Sir, in my speech last year I mentioned the 'Walsh Report' because I read it from the very first day it was brought down in this House, and I am doubtful many members in this House have read it, as I have, from cover to cover, but I read it, and I was in great hopes that the "Walsh Report" would mean a lot to my district. But unfortunately, as at the present time, it does not mean anything. Yet it means a lot to the North East Coast, which I feel, Sir, is something worth while. Yet I hope that before many months have passed

that it will mean a lot to the District of Trinity South. But, Sir, to date it is very disappointing to me—The honourable member for Fogo said he was disappointed in the whole fishery project last year but this year he was proud of it. Yet a few years ago in this very House he told the fishermen to pull up their boats. Since the "Walsh Report" has been brought down he has assumed a different attitude.

The "Walsh Report" is going to benefit the people in his area and I hope, as he has already said, that before many months have gone that I may have the same attitude towards my district. The reason I say that, Sir, is that a few years ago the Federal Department put a small fish drying plant in my district, at Winterton; or an experimental plant to see if it was economical or not—But as to the present time I cannot say because I have no report on what has happened. But when the Federal Department put this fish drying plant there I was hoping that it would be of some great benefit to the people of Winterton, New Perlican and Hant's Harbour and all up and down the shore. But according to the present circumstances I am in doubt. Yet I feel that if it is economical, the Federal Government will increase this plant and it will be of much benefit to the people concerned.

Last year, Sir, in this House I asked for electricity for the people of Heart's Desire, Whiteway and Hant's Harbour. But today, Sir, it is the same old story, no lights. On Friday, April 2, I again presented a petition from the people of Whiteway asking for electricity. I don't know what that will bring. I sincerely hope it will mean lights. I feel, Sir, that the people have been

dealt with unkindly especially the residents of Whiteway, Heart's Desire, Hant's Harbour where they were promised in 1949 by the President of United Towns Electric Company that they would have the lights. I cannot understand it especially when the President of the said company guaranteed me and three others. But, Sir, if the company, as I understand it, is broke at the present time, then maybe they were broke in 1949. It was the duty of the President at that time to come forward and say we cannot give you the lights in Whiteway, Heart's Desire, Hant's Harbour and Lead Cove because financially we cannot do it. But instead of that they telephoned me and said: we will give you the lights. That, to my mind, was nothing only a bluff, and Sir, this I cannot take. But as my honourable friend the Minister for Provincial Affairs brought forth the same question here in a Petition asking for the same thing I can't quite understand the situation. The answer was delivered here in this House by the Honourable the Premier to affect us all. But, Sir, if that was really the case I would suggest, Sir, that the Government, this Government would take over this said company the same as is done in other Provinces of Canada and give the people —

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): That would be socialism.

MR. BUTTON: Socialism or not, I think that it would be only right that the Government should nationalize the company and see that the people, especially where they were promised the lights in 1949, would be given electricity. Sir, in Heart's Desire all that is needed is a transformer. The poles are running through the place!

If poles were running through St. John's and a transformer were needed I am afraid there would be more to it than what is happening in Trinity Bay, because the people there are very quiet, and that is why they have no lights.

As for Petitions, to my mind, Sir, it is useless to present any Petitions not only to this Government but to any Government.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTTON: Because they are not regarded, as I see it. I presented a Petition in 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 and 1954 yet the people in Heart's Desire, Whiteway, Hant's Harbour, and Lead Cove are still without lights. Why should the people of Trinity South in this day and age have candle light while the people in other places in Newfoundland are receiving the benefits of electricity. At Whiteway, Sir, we need one-tenth of a mile (1/10) yet the President of this Company cannot give us electricity. If the United Towns in the first place had stated we cannot give you the lights because we are financially broke, the people in the district which I represent would not mind. But to make a statement and say that before 1952 the lights will be connected from Heart's Desire to Old Perlican—Sir, that is something that they cannot do. I am going to ask this Government of which I am a representative, I am going to ask the cabinet to take it into consideration, and to make a special effort for me, the same as they have promised the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs in his area. Because I feel that our people in the area that I represent are just as important as the people in Ferryland.

MR. MURRAY: That is the boy.

MR. BUTTON: Again, Sir, last year I asked for some consideration to be given to the people of Winterton, New Perlican and Heart's Content in order that they might come under a hospital scheme the same as practically all the other settlements of the community of Newfoundland, that Petition was null and void. Well I can understand that. I have found out since that due to some reason beyond control, other settlements in the country needed hospitals, isolated places whose need was greater than that of the District of Trinity South. Yet I feel that the people have been neglected somewhat as compared to some other districts in the Island, but I will not mention these districts now. Yet I am going to ask the Honourable Minister of Health this year, as I asked him last year, to include in his estimates, in order to bring it before the Cabinet, that the people of Winterton, New Perlican and Heart's Content be given consideration this year, and that a wing be built on the Old Perlican Hospital. By building this wing on the Old Perlican Hospital and with additional doctors, we could eliminate and solve the problem for the whole district concerned.

Sir, we have a great Liberal District in Trinity South and I feel that this Government cannot do too much for them, because they are behind the Premier 100 %. He knows that. And I know if there was an election today, it would be useless for a Tory member to go over in Trinity South.

MR. HOLLETT: Thanks! We will not waste the money.

MR. BUTTON: It would be useless for them to spend their money. Coming back again to the fisheries—we have at the present time, in the

District, a small plant which is operated by the Atlantic Fisheries at Dildo. This plant is doing a remarkable job. It is a great thing for the people, but it is too small and I am going to ask now in this Honourable House if it is not possible for this Government in co-operation with the Federal Government, to have this plant extended to a fish filleting plant in order to take the fish from the people in that particular area? At the present time this plant, as I mentioned a minute ago, is doing a good job; it is buying up potheads, salmon, squid and every thing possible, even berries. It is doing a remarkable job. They also take mackerel and herring. But the plant is too small and I make a special appeal to the Government to try and have this plant enlarged, the same as they have in mind for the North East Coast and South West Coast, because it will eliminate a lot of unemployment.

I see here something of which I am very proud—according to this statement received from the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, in the District of Trinity South in January 1921, we have only thirty-five able-bodied families receiving relief. I would like to see "0" there instead of "35 families" and this would happen if we had this plant at Dildo enlarged to an extent which will take all the fish from Lead Cove right up to Dildo. It would not take very much. We have no other plants there. Our greatest industry was destroyed a few years ago when the Commission Government removed the railway; when the A.N.D. Company took up the tracks from Heart's Content and removed their shipping plant to St. John's to relieve the unemployment situation in here. Trinity South really lost its little industry,



and since that time we had the other small industry which I have already quoted—this plant at Dildo operated by the Atlantic Fisheries.

Getting back to the Atlantic Fisheries, there is a lot to be said. They do take the fat and the meat of the whales, but on the seashore from Chapel Arm to Dildo, there is one thing that might be brought before the Health Authorities in the future, and which I trust can be avoided by my stating this today—and that is the rotting of the carcasses and the bones on the beach. I understand the Honourable the Premier tried to interest some whaling interest to start a Meal Plant there, but due to the small amount of carcasses and bones and so on, it was not economical. But, Sir, I feel that something should be done, even if the Federal Government sent a bulldozer over there at this particular time in the Fall, to cover up the bones and the guts of these potheads because it is a terrible stink, which is not pleasant to the people who live in that area. But I would much rather see some kind of a plant to utilize these carcasses from time to time.

Now, Sir, as I have already stated, I do not plan to take up too much time because all the previous speakers have outlined the Speech from the Throne. They have really given the Opposition something to dwell on for the rest of the Session.

MR. HOLLETT: You have given us nothing to think about but the stink.

MR. BUTTON: They have given them something to think over until the House opens again. The Opposition speeches said there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne, yet

there is a lot. As I have already said, there are four great things.

We have this Government behind us which will prove to the people whom I represent, in the near future, they will have something to confirm their faith in this great Liberal Government and I feel, as I close, that the Honourable the Premier will never let down these our people.

MR. CLYDE BROWN: In rising briefly to speak to the debate before the House, first, I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Motion to draft the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. These gentlemen acquitted themselves very ably and discharged their duties well.

I would also like to congratulate the honourable, the recent member for St. John's West who having spent some five years as a member in the House of Commons at Ottawa, has decided to represent his constituency in this Provincial Legislature. I feel, Sir, that the presence of the honourable gentleman will add strength and experience to the provincial party he represents.

I also endorse, Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed in the Speech from the Throne in respect to Her Gracious Majesty, the Queen, and trust that her present tour of Britain's far-flung Empire will not prove to be too strenuous and exhausting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items set forth in the Speech from the Throne to which I do not propose to make reference. However, the most important item is that of fisheries. During the present Session, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Government proposes the introduction of legislation

designed for the purpose of modernizing the fisheries of Newfoundland. This will be an undertaking of gigantic proportions. The work and energy required to complete this enormous task will involve the complete and absolute attention of all who participate in the modernizing scheme.

As a representative of one of the largest fishing districts in Newfoundland and as one who was born and bred in the midst of a great generation of fishermen, believe me, I know whereof I speak when I say that if we are to revitalize and inject new blood into the fishery, we must first ask ourselves—do we properly understand and can we appreciate the problems which confront the industry as it operates today? And, furthermore, are we sufficiently familiar with the difficult assignment to which we will shortly commit ourselves? We must not only be prepared but must be ready to solve any unforeseen problems that may crop up here and there.

Mr. Speaker, as the son of one who has always been an advocate of a better deal for the fishermen of Newfoundland, I feel sure that this legislation will be of the highest importance and I think we should give the question very serious consideration.

There was a day, Mr. Speaker, when the income derived from this great industry was such as to place it at the top of the list as a source of livelihood for the men whose lot it was to depend upon it. Today the industry remains but a shadow of its former greatness. The motive to catch fish has all but disappeared and the incentive to follow the industry has vanished. I, like my friend and colleague the honourable member for

Fogo District, was very much concerned over the status of the fishing industry, especially the marketing of salt codfish; but I am now convinced that the Government, in its wisdom, decided that until such time as the desired information could be gathered and completed to draw up a well-developed programme, the Government was aware that a period of at least four years would be required before all would be in readiness and the machinery set in motion for this very important move; and upon their decision depends the success or the failure of the fishing industry in Newfoundland. I am looking forward with a great deal of enthusiasm to the forthcoming legislation with respect to the modernizing programme. I feel sure that the fishermen throughout the Province will know us by our actions with respect to fisheries development.

Many Governments of the past have grappled with the fishery problem. They set about to do something about it with sincerity, wisdom and understanding, but I believe that the Government of today has far more information on which to work and a better comprehension of the problems involved than was ever made available to their predecessors.

As I look back over the years, I am inclined to think that the Premier and his Cabinet were so mindful of the tremendous task involved in fisheries modernization that they explored and examined every possible angle involved before proceeding with any constructive policy designed to change or modernize our fishery methods.

Mr. Speaker, I am keenly interested in seeing that everything possible is done for our fishermen and their

families, for without them, Newfoundland would not be Newfoundland. The fishing industry was once referred to as the backbone of Newfoundland's economy, but its importance today is greatly minimized to the extent that it now represents less than 25% of Newfoundland's total exports. In spite of this, however, the fishery today is still, socially, the most important industry of Newfoundland and the distribution of population in the main, depends upon it. I am happy and proud, Mr. Speaker, to be associated with any legislation that will, in my opinion, benefit the fishing industry and in the years to come, I hope to be able to recall the year 1954 as a year in which the fisheries assumed a new role in the economy of Newfoundland.

It is also encouraging to note that a Royal Commission has been appointed for the purpose of investigating agricultural problems in this Province. I personally feel that this particular branch of our natural wealth has wide and varied possibilities. Agriculture in Newfoundland today is going on on a very limited scale. Although we grow sufficient ordinary vegetables to take care of our personal needs—(and I see no reason whatever why we should have to import such easy-to-grow vegetables as potatoes and turnips)—however, it could be argued that because of our diversified economy of fishing and farming and owing to its geographical position, bordering as it does one of the great agricultural areas of the Dominion, Prince Edward Island will prove to be our keenest competitor. I think the Province would be self-sufficient in agricultural produce, enhanced by the many successful farms operated on the West Coast of New-

foundland particularly, and on the Avalon Peninsula as well. I see a future for agricultural produce. I trust that it will develop into a great industry in the future.

One other subject, not mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, but it is something on which I would like to dwell for a moment—it is that of roads. The Province has, I think, somewhere in the vicinity of 2,500 miles of motorable roads, of which less than 200 miles are paved. The honourable and recently-elected member for St. John's West, in the course of his opening speech to this House, deplored the condition of roads in certain sections of his district. I was very interested in what the honourable gentleman had to say, because the roads in my district today are in a far worse state than they will ever be in the district of St. John's West. But I was interested particularly when he compared the state of our Newfoundland roads with the boulevards of the Maritime Provinces. It is indeed unfortunate that we are not blessed with this type of road, but I can assure the honourable gentleman that the fault does not lie at the feet of this Government. The Department of Public Works has done and is still doing a very remarkable job with respect to road-building and road-maintenance. For that reason alone, I would like to have the figures showing the number of roads constructed in Newfoundland since Confederation, and the total amount spent; and I do think the figures will be amazing. Again, Sir, I say it is regrettable that we do not possess sufficient roads to take care of our industrial and business requirements, but I think the whole House agrees, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Public Works and his

able staff are to be highly commended on the great work that they have done in their efforts to remove the people of Newfoundland from isolation. Last year, I believe, an amount in excess of five million dollars was spent on road construction in Newfoundland. This year we hope a similar, if not greater sum will be voted by this House for that purpose. The country itself, Mr. Speaker, cannot possibly enjoy a successful, flourishing tourist trade, nor can the wheels of industry properly function without the benefit of more and better roads. I am therefore hoping, Sir, that sufficient money can be made available in future years to provide a system of paved highways and ordinary road links that will compare favourably with anything our neighbouring Province has to offer.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that I do not propose to go into now. I presume my honourable friends will cover them quite fully after I have resumed my seat, or at another date. But I consider a Commission on Forestry to be something long overdue, and certainly a step in the right direction. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our forests need all the protection that we can afford them. The study to be conducted of our forest development will prove of extreme value as a source of knowledge to enable future forest developments.

In closing, Sir, I will say this: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has labelled the Speech from the Throne as a "Hope Speech," I trust the honourable gentleman will forgive me if I add just three simple letters to this word "Hope" thus proclaiming His Honour's Most Gracious

Speech from the Throne to be one of the most hopeful and encouraging messages ever to be delivered to this House.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate on the Speech in Reply.

Committee of the Whole:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretations Act."

Deferred.

Second Reading:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this amendment to the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act. The changes which we recommend here are purely nominal. The Undeveloped Mineral Act, when it was brought into force here in 1952 for some reason the names of the companies were not then given correctly in all cases. I am at some loss to know why this occurred. Apparently some clerk made an error along the way, somebody who was supposed to change it and did not. However, the changes are very simple. In the original Act we have "Falconbridge Limited," which should have been "Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Limited." The next one is listed as Newfoundland Labrador Mining Exploration Company, Limited whereas it should have been the Newfoundland Mining and Exploration Company, Limited. The third one should have been Newfoundland Fluorspar Limited and the last one should have been Industrial Company, Limited.

These changes are very nominal, and I move the second reading.

On motion Bill was read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

First Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act," and "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, committee on two Bills at the same time?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: We are streamlined.

MR. BROWNE: Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I suggest, with deference, that is a very unusual situation. That is not correct procedure. We should deal with one Act at a time. If you take two at a time, you can take the whole lot.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, any number of Bills. I can assure the honourable member that is quite in order, by

parliamentary procedure and certainly by practice of this House.

MR. BROWNE: It is a new custom since 1949.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair cannot enter into a petty debate on the matter. The motion is "I do now leave the Chair."

Committee of the Whole:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to say is this: I made a request the other day to see if we could get a copy of the Revised Statutes for the Opposition Room. I understand that request was passed on to the Office of the Attorney General but so far we have not received a copy. I don't think it is fair to the Opposition members to be sending to the Library. I wonder if the Attorney General will make a note of that and have a copy sent to us?

MR. CURTIS: I will. In the meantime, I have two copies of the Interpretation Act here, if the honourable member would like to have them. Unfortunately we do not give them out. They are distributed through Supply, and it takes a little time. There was a copy down there, I think.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not down there now.

MR. CURTIS: You each have one at home?

"An Act to Amend the Interpretations Act:"

MR. BROWNE: When the Attorney General told us the other day there was a committee on the uniformity of legislation, Mr. Chairman, I looked up two of the Interpretation Acts, Ontario and Alberta, but I don't see anything corresponding to any of

these provisions and I am wondering why. They are necessary, I assume.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me a rather strange procedure to say an Act of this Legislature has been deemed to have been repealed. I am thinking of a good many Acts, for instance, the Seigheim Act—that might be one which the Government has in mind, but I would like to be sure that the Seigheim Act is repealed. How are the general public to know when it has just expired, how is the world going to know. To all intents and purposes, it is still an Act, and may still be implemented by Dr. Seigheim. It is not sufficient for us to say here that Act has lapsed or expired. Before the clause is carried, I would like to have some explanation on that point.

MR. CURTIS: I am not able to answer completely, Mr. Chairman, without having the Seigheim Act in front of me. But if the Seigheim Act gave Dr. Seigheim the right within a certain period to ask for a lease, and if, within that period he did not ask for a lease then obviously the Act would just lapse as the time is up and no action has been taken, and therefore, there is nothing now can be done under it. So then the Act would be held to have lapsed. It is the same with a number of old Acts that have been passed in this House from time to time, hundreds of Acts which gave companies certain rights. They just passed into disuse that is all. They just ceased to exist.

MR. HOLLETT: They were not repealed by the House?

MR. CURTIS: No. We don't repeal Acts like that. We only repeal Acts if there were a direct grant in an Act, but not if there is only power to give a grant because the power is

limited to a certain time. If in a certain time the power has not been exercised it cannot subsequently be exercised. Therefore, there is really no need to repeal it. I think my honourable friends will find that there are hundreds of Acts on our books which have just fallen into disuse.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is to be the judge of that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The courts.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not say so here. As a member of the Opposition how am I going to know when that Act has been repealed? Who is to say so? All it says here is "when it lapsed or expires." What does that mean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member during the period during which he has been a member of this House has demonstrated to the House and to the committees, his possession of a number of qualities, but not numbered amongst them is the quality of understanding legislation. Now that he has a new colleague sitting at his immediate right who is a lawyer and who takes an interest in affairs in this House, I suggest that the honourable gentleman be seen and not heard in these matters, and that he leave it to his colleague on his immediate right, from his own district, because the honourable gentleman has not yet, in my hearing in committee, ever attempted to deal with any piece of legislation without hopelessly and rather ludicrously misunderstanding it. So I do suggest, seriously, leave it to his colleague on his immediate right, and he will be well guided if he does so.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Honourable the Premier I will not leave anything to



any honourable member of the Opposition. I will tell the Honourable the Premier it would be a lot better for this country if he had been seen and not heard—I think it would have been much better, Sir. I am asking a simple question but the Honourable the Attorney General says he is not properly able to explain it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There—my honourable friend does not even understand what is said here, not alone an Act.

MR. HOLLETT: If the Honourable the Premier would be seen and not heard I would get on much faster. If the honourable gentleman's idea is to get up on every occasion I get to my feet and ridicule me, I will find myself in the position of offering similar ridicule—fighting the devil with his own tools, and I am quite capable of doing so. Any time the Honourable the Premier wants to get up and ridicule me I shall reply, Sir. I am asking here a question—who is to say—for instance will the Honourable the Attorney General tell me whether the NALCO Act is repealed? Have they carried out everything they have been asked or ordered or agreed to do. I say, no. BRINCO has not done any such thing either. As for many other companies, who is to say when the Act is to be repealed? Is it the Attorney General, the Premier or somebody? I would like to have some proper explanation, and I am not staying here to take ridicule from any member on the opposite side of the House without answering it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am astonished at the indignation at the perfectly natural suggestion that the honourable gentleman's learned friend on his right should be left to guide him on these matters of law. I think

my honourable friend is smarting privately over something—merely because I mentioned his honourable colleague on his right hand who is a learned gentleman and a lawyer.

MR. HOLLETT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We are discussing this particular section and I refuse to let the Honourable the Premier interfere with my remarks.

Clauses 2, 3, 4 carried.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Attorney General—the original sections are entirely the same as the amendment?

MR. CURTIS: No, I will read the original section—"No provision in any Act passed after the 11th day of May, 1952 affects the Right of Her Majesty"—nevertheless it is explicitly stated in the Act that Her Majesty is bound by the Act.

MR. HIGGINS: Yes.

MR. CURTIS: It is just a little more amplified.

MR. BROWNE: But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Attorney General, where does that come from. There is no provision in the Ontario Act.

MR. CURTIS: I might say in reply; it is quite likely that Ontario has not yet enacted these recommendations of the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation. You must remember this committee held a meeting this winter, and they met last summer in Quebec and they had a further meeting this spring. In fact, Mr. Puddister went and visited them in January. This committee is meeting all the time and making recommendations to the various provinces. All the pro-

vinces are members of the committee. Our Legislature happens to be open first. In any event even if Ontario or any other province were adopting these changes, they would not appear in the written records yet. In that case we are perhaps in some cases before them and in other cases are passing legislation at the same time.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Honourable the Attorney General tell us what is the implication there?

MR. CURTIS: I might say my understanding of the amendment is that Her Majesty in the past was only bound if the Act said so or an Act was so constituted as to imply that She was bound. Now since 1951 She is not bound unless the Act specifically says so. In other words we are incorporating into the Act now the effect of the judicial interpretation of the original decision, common law prescribes that even if the Act says so and so, if it could be necessarily implied She was bound, but now we are specifically stating.

MR. BROWNE: Could you in popular language give an illustration of the effect of this change?

MR. CURTIS: The only thing I can think of on the spur of the moment is the Statute of Limitations.

MR. BROWNE: But how would it affect, say, the Department of Public Works? Does that envisage the Crown taking land under the Local Government Act and things like that?

MR. CURTIS: I would think the Government would not be bound by any statutory limitations.

MR. BROWNE: If the Government goes in and expropriates land in any particular area, is the right of

the citizen protected there or does this exempt the Government from liability?

MR. CURTIS: Definitely not, Mr. Chairman, there is no suggestion that this Act will in any way exempt the Crown from any liability. It just means that unless the legislation in existence expressly says Her Majesty is bound by the legislation, Her Majesty is not bound. I don't know anything further than that. We could let that clause stand if you wish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 5 stand.

Clause 6 carried.

Clause 7 read.

"Section 24 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"24. A citation of or reference to an Act of Newfoundland or to a regulation made thereunder or of any other province or territory of Canada or of Canada shall be deemed to be a citation of or reference to the Act or regulation as amended whether the amendment was made before or after the passing of the Act or regulation in which the citation or reference is made."

MR. BROWNE: There is considerable enlargement of the original section. What is new in it is the reference to any other province of Canada. Now, is there some reason why we introduce references to the Acts of other provinces. I can't conceive why we should be bringing into our legislation references to Acts in other provinces. The original section is very short, but now we are dealing with other provinces and the Canadian Regulations which go very, very much further.

MR. CURTIS: The real object of this section, Mr. Chairman, was really to apply rather to Acts of the Federal Government than to Acts of any of the provinces. But it was worded to include provinces in case there should be any such Acts. Now, the position is this, Sir, under the Criminal Code, for instance dealing with drunken driving, we in our Highway Act provide that the license of a person found guilty of Section 285 (40) but in the meantime the Parliament of Canada changes the Act and adds a fourth sub-section to No. 285, and subsequently our Act where it referred to No. 285 only applied to No. 285 as it was worded at that time. The effect of this section is to have it apply to No. 285 as amended. In other words, if the Parliament of Canada added section (4) it came within the scope of our Act.

MR. BROWNE: That is very good, but what about bringing in other provinces?

MR. CURTIS: It is purely a matter of conformity. I frankly don't see any objection to doing it. I don't see any harm in doing it. I move the committee rise, otherwise we will have to sit here all night.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, have made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

Report received. Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 7, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): I beg leave to present a Petition from the town of Carbonear, generally, and in particular from that part of the town which is known as Adelaide Street, from 951 residents of that area which petition is also endorsed by the Town Council of Carbonear. The petition begs for an extension of the pavement of Water Street West from the main highway, a distance of some 1,800 ft. more or less to bring the paved surface to the crossroads which is the end of Adelaide Street. It was thought at such time as the road is being paved or surfaced that this work might be done at the same time.

Due to the fact that Carbonear is a prosperous and growing town, and its citizens believe they are entitled to these facilities, I endorse the petition, and ask leave to have it placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

Petition received, to be referred to the department concerned.

MR. B. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by 153 residents of Green Bay to the Honourable House of Assembly, Legislative convened: We the undersigned inhabitants of Green Bay hereby respectfully request the House to grant us a law that no horse outside

the settlement be allowed to enter on Pilley's Island to run at large. We have on the island now thirty horses of our own and it is more than we can do to keep them out of gardens. There is a lot of damage done by horses landed from other settlements, no one knowing who the owners are or who should look after them. This had been going on for years. It is very dangerous for our children.

I support this petition which is signed by 153 residents of Pilley's Island, Mr. Speaker, and ask that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

Petition received.

MR. G. JANES: I beg leave, Sir, to present a petition from the Gander Bay area signed by 1,346 people from the Mainland Section of Fogo District requesting the Government to construct a road from Gander to Carmanville and so connect Gander Bay and that section of the area from Horwood to South Side of Carmanville with Gander. Now, Sir, we are only thirty-five miles from the cross-roads of the world at Gander, and our people are living in the same isolation down there in Gander Bay and Carmanville where there are something over three thousand people, as the Indians who fished on the Gander. They were undoubtedly a little more fleet-footed than our people today and were able to get from the interior a bit quicker. But, by having a road connection in this district with Gander, we would have railway and road connections with the rest of the Province of Newfoundland. We have insufficient people down there to employ a doctor, and we have found it very difficult to employ a doctor over the years, and we have been

using Twillingate Hospital. But, Sir, to come from Carmanville across Gander Bay and across the Dildo Run to New World Island in the middle of February is not a very good treatment for anybody especially sick people. The result is that we have been trying to use the Gander Hospital in the last few years, and have been moving our people out by plane. While that is better probably, than going across the Dildo Run to Twillingate it is not satisfactory, and we hoped that when a road came through to Gander we would have the use of the Gander Hospital. We also, have, Sir, some five thousand people living on Fogo Island. In order to get to the railroad and highway, people must go all the way to Lewisporte whereas, if we had the road from Gander to Carmanville we would then be able to use that road, and so would be within two hours reach of the railroad. It would also be useful, Sir, in disposing of some of our fishery products. It would also be useful for people going to Gander, the cross-roads of the world which is less than one hour's run from the great scenic beauty of that section of Notre Dame Bay.

I support this petition, Sir, and respectfully request it be passed to the department concerned, and hope we will have immediate action on it in the near future.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the petition so ably presented by my honourable colleague the honourable member for Fogo District, I would like to say that I am in complete accord with the prayer of the petition. But that is a very small matter. My primary reason for rising to support the petition is that

included in the programme outlined in the Government's policy for road connection from the main highway through the island to the outlying districts is a proposal to extend a road from Gander Airport to the North Side of Bonavista Bay and on to the Strait Shore.

More than a year ago the department caused a survey to be made from Gander extending out towards Lumsden or just the North Side of Cape Freels on the North Side of Bonavista Bay, and with a proposed spur running north to Carmanville, the community to which my friend and colleague referred, and from which this petition comes; and the other branch of which is to extend to the South to Wesleyville. I am not sure if the direction "South" is the correct one there. In any event to Wesleyville a prosperous community on the north side of Bonavista Bay.

I can merely say to my colleague that I am not in a position of course, to commit the Government as to when that road may be constructed. But I think it should be encouraging for people of that district to know that in addition to the progress made on the north side of Bonavista Bay up to the present time, there are definite plans in an effort to include the Strait Shore between Cape Freels and Carmanville, and on the North Side of the Bay at Wesleyville. I support the petition.

On motion petition received, laid on the Table of the House to be referred to the department concerned.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Tabled Report of Workmen's Compensation Board.

#### Notice of Motion

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speak-

er, I wonder if I may ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development is there a report to be submitted from that department, or has it already been submitted?

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Economic Development makes no report. It is not required to do so, and it does not do so any more than does any of the departments of Government. The only departments I know of at the moment that make reports are the Department of Education, the Department of Mines and Resources and the Department of Health, and Public Welfare—four Departments, I believe—

MR. BROWNE: Then is there any report to be expected from the Division of Tourist Development on the work it is doing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am speaking now from memory—I don't recall any annual report by the director of tourist development. I don't recall any Act requiring one—I only speak from memory on that.

#### Notice of Question

Mr. Browne gives notice of questions on tomorrow.

Mr. Hollett gives notice of questions on tomorrow.

(50) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

(a) Copies of all advertisements for tenders for road construction during the past fiscal year.

(b) Copies of all tenders received.

(c) The name of the successful bidder in each case.

(d) The amount paid for the work in each case.

(e) What changes, if any, were made in the specifications after the tenders were received.

(51) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance or other appropriate Minister to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. Give a list of all loans under headings of "Fisheries" and "Economic Development," as also those under heading "Guaranteed Bank Loans" showing the amount of insurance required to be carried under the Agreement for said Loans or Guarantees on the assets of the Companies concerned. Show also the actual amounts of insurance carried in each case.

2. Have any mortgages been secured to the Government by the North Eastern Fish Industries Ltd. on the druggers or on any other assets of said Company? If so in what amount?

(52) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. What amount of money was realized on the sale of each of the four Icelandic vessels owned by Richard Ltd.?

2. Which of these vessels was sold on terms, what were the terms of the sale of this ship, and how much money has thus far been received by the Government on the sale of this particular ship? To whom was the ship sold?

3. Give an itemized statement showing the disposition of moneys received by the sale of these ships. To whom were the moneys paid and on what accounts?

4. Does the Government hold a mortgage on the vessel which was sold on terms, and for what amount?

(53) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. Has the plant for the Superior Rubber Company been completed and if so has production or manufacture of rubber goods begun?

2. How many men and/or women are presently employed in this plant. How many are Newfoundlanders?

3. Who is the Managing Director of this plant?

4. Has the Minister any knowledge as to the present whereabouts of Mr. Max Braun Wogan and Mr. L. Grube and if not is the Government prepared to start an investigation as to their present whereabouts?

5. What was the landed cost of plant machinery, tools, equipment, furniture, fittings and raw materials by this Superior Rubber Company, including invoice, cost, freight, insurance, duty and cartage? And who certified as to this landed cost?

6. Has the Superior Rubber Company thus far succeeded in negotiating any commercial bank loan, or sold any of its bonds? If so to what extent or amount?

7. What amount of insurance against loss or damage by fire is presently being carried on the fixed assets of the Company and is said insurance made payable to the Government?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 49: In course of preparation.

Question Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48 :

Question No. 45: Answer tabled by Mr. Hefferton.



Question: How much has been spent on advertising by each Department of the Government during the fiscal year 1953-54? Give the names of the publishers and the publications concerned with the amount paid to each.

Answer: The following is a list showing the cost of advertising from the 1st April, 1953, to the 31st March, 1954, of the Newfoundland Provincial Government, together with the names of the publishers:

PUBLISHER	COST
Nova Scotia Agricultural College	\$ 25.00
Forestry and Outdoors—Montreal	90.00
Canadian Institute of Forestry	10.00
Kiwanis Musical Festival	70.00
The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada	165.00
Canadian Fishermen	200.00
Pulp and Paper Magazine of Canada	33.00
The Financial Post	2,440.60
The Newfoundland Quarterly	115.00
The Financial Times	550.00
The Modern Hospital Publishing Co.	4.60
The Halifax Herald	771.52
The Sydney Post Record	137.24
The Newfoundland Fisherman	440.00
The Canadian Medical Association Journal	140.00
The Times Globe and Telegraph	217.60
The Bay Roberts Speaker	59.50
Roads and Engineering Construction	60.00
Dun and Bradstreet Canada Ltd.	230.00
Canada Review	178.00
The Canadian Mining and Metallurgical Bulletin	210.00
MacLean-Hunter Publishing Co.	395.00
The Monetary Times	156.00
The Official Labour Journal	60.00
Canadian Nature	160.00
Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees	95.00
The Postal Tribune	75.00
The New York Herald Tribune	659.40
Winnipeg Free Press Co. Ltd.	25.50
The Montreal Gazette	25.20
The Newfoundlanders	93.75
Nfld. Federation of Labour	50.00
Canadian Dietetic Journal	20.00
The Ottawa Journal	92.00
The New York Times	945.00
Guardian Ltd.—Year Book and Business Directory	165.00
Nfld. Federation of Fishermen	45.00
The Toronto Star	118.00
The Canadian Nurse	27.00

PUBLISHER	COST
Nursing Outlook	15.00
American Journal of Nursing	25.50
The Modern Hospital Publishing Co.	58.90
The Maritime Advocate	288.00
The Daily News, Ltd.	5,802.56
The Evening Telegram Ltd.	5,995.44
The Sunday Herald	1,681.52
The Newfoundland Gazette	5,009.60
Radio Station C.J.O.N.	667.50
Radio Station V.O.C.M.	498.00
The Western Star	2,454.75
The Grand Falls Advertiser	1,143.70
The Fisherman's Advocate	363.30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$33,291.90</b>

Question: Have any pamphlets, books, maps or other material for advertising purposes been published by or on behalf of the Government? If so, what was the cost in each case?

Answer: The following is a list of pamphlets, books and other material for advertising purposes, published for the Provincial Government during the year 1953-54, together with the cost in each case:

25,000 copies	— "Province of Newfoundland Geographical Aspects"	\$3,750.00
91 "	— "Photographs"	45.50
30,000 "	— "Newfoundland Britain's Oldest Colony Canada's Newest Province"	3,750.00
30,000 "	— "Hunting and Fishing Guide to Newfoundland"	2,800.00
10 "	— "Photographs of St. John's from the Air"	5.00
203 "	— "St. John's Book"	50.75
1,673 "	— "Album of Avalon"	418.25
130 "	— "Corner Brook Book"	32.50
9,000 "	— Plans for:	
	Overnight Cabins — 6,000 copies	
	Motels — 2,000 "	
	Cabin Cottages — 1,000 "	162.00
20,000 "	— Address Labels and Post Cards	120.00
10,000 "	— Decalomania Transfers	492.28

Question No. 46: Section I. answer tabled; section 2. referred to Attorney General.

Names of Applicants Applying  
on Behalf of Clubs

## Clubs

Grand Falls Golf Club .....	O. J. Mallalieu, Secretary
Canadian Legion, Botwood .....	F. W. Barrett, Secretary
Canadian Legion, Fortune .....	James Wicks, President
B.P.O. Elks, Grand Falls .....	H. Roy Hansen, Rec. Secretary
Notre Dame Club, Grand Falls .....	Ronald J. Fewer, Secretary
Laurentian Cabins Limited, St. Lawrence .....	Fabian F. Alyward, President
Old Mill Properties Limited, St. John's .....	Thomas Collier, President

Re: Second Paragraph. This question should be referred to the Honourable Attorney General.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the honourable the Attorney General has given consideration to it yet, if not would he be in a position to answer now?

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, answers relayed to my office might be referred to any one of five officials. I will make inquiries.

Question No. 47:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have a note here from the Treasury Department saying the answer to that question was included in the answer to Question No. 10 asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPENCER: Question No. 41, Order Paper of April 2, was referred to my Department. I believe the House will be generally aware that the building has been passed over, as it were, by the Department of Public Works to the management of the Board of Regents of the Memorial University. Hence we in Public Works do not administer its affairs at all

with the exception of supplying the charring and cleaning services, and the engineering and heating and plumbing services. Hence we are not in a position to give the information requested here. But I think my answer gives generally the reply to Section 3 of that question. It is a matter for the Board of Regents of the University to reply, as I am not in a position to have the information.

MR. HOLLETT: By way of a supplementary request, may I ask the Honourable Minister to what Honourable Minister we may submit the question. It has been directed to the Honourable Minister of Finance who turned it over to the Minister of Public Works, and neither is competent to answer the question. I would like to ask somebody on the Government side to inform us as to whom we should direct the question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, if to any Minister of the Crown, it would be to the Honourable Minister of Education.

Question No. 5: Answers to Sections, 1, 2, and 3 tabled by Mr. Power.

# BOARD OF LIQUOR CONTROL

Part 1:

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases
			Jan. 1, 1953 to Feb. 28, 1954
Lemon Hart Rum	United Rum Merchants	J. McGrath	3,000 c/s
MacKinlay's Whisky	Chas MacKinlay & Co. Ltd.	J. McGrath	300 "
Lamb's Old Navy Rum	J. M. Douglas & Co. Ltd.	J. McGrath	2,263 "
Park Lane Whisky	H. Corby Distillery Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	50 "
Special Selected Whisky	H. Corby Distillery Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	75 "
Royal Reserve Whisky	H. Corby Distillery Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	100 "
Wiser's DeLuxe	H. Corby Distillery Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	50 "
Johnnie Walker Whisky	John Walker & Sons Ltd.	C. R. Bell	2,841 "
Black and White Whisky	Jas. Buchanan & Co.	C. R. Bell	2,200 "
Haig & Haig Whisky	Haig & Haig Ltd.	C. R. Bell	1,150 "
Dewar's Special	John Dewar & Sons Ltd.	C. R. Bell	500 "
White Horse Cellar	White Horse Distillers Ltd.	C. R. Bell	475 "
Gordon's London Gin	T. Gordon & Co.	C. R. Bell	1,900 "
Havana Club Rum	Josie Archabala	Baine Johnston & Co.	900 "
Captain Morgan Rum	Capt. Morgan Rum Distillers	Baine Johnston & Co.	3,100 "
Vat 69 Whisky	Wm. Sanderson & Son Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	450 "
Crown Royal Whisky	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	100 "
Kings Plate Whisky	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	50 "
Seagram's V. O. Whisky	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	2,300 "
London Dry Gin	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	100 "
Hudson's Bay Rum	Hudson's Bay Co.	Job Brothers & Co.	1,750 "
Hudson's Bay Whisky	Hudson's Bay Co.	Job Brothers & Co.	300 "
Seigerts Rum & Bitters	Dr. J. G. B. Seigert & Sons	Geo. Chalker	320 "

Black Diamond Rum	McGuinness Maritimes Ltd.	Geo. Chalker	300 "
Fernandez Vat 69 Rum	Fernandez & Co. Ltd.	C. Granger	200 "
Old Sam Rum	Edward Young & Co. Ltd.	M. D. Shears	5,520 "
Bacardi, Carta Amber	Bacardi Corp. of America	J. Walker Agencies	700 "
Old Grog Rum	S. Davson & Co.	C. Strong	100 "
Cluny McPherson Whisky	John E. McPherson & Sons	Direct	300 "
Bells Special Reserve Whisky	Arthur Bell & Sons Ltd.	P. J. Dobbin	500 "
Bookers Fruit Cured Rum	Booker Rum Co.	J. McGrath	700 "
King of Hearts Whisky	Jas. Burrough & Co. Ltd.	J. O'Driscoll	50 "
Lemon Gin	Jas. Burrough & Co. Ltd.	J. O'Driscoll	50 "
Claverts Grand Reserve Whisky	Calvert Distillers Ltd.	M. D. Shears	75 "
Lord Calvert Whisky	Calvert Distillers Ltd.	M. D. Shears	200 "
Schenley's Reserve Whisky	Canadian Schenley Ltd.	W. A. Reid	25 "
Schenley's London Gin	Canadian Schenley Ltd.	W. A. Reid	25 "
Coronation Whisky	Gooderham & Worts Ltd.	C. Strong	25 "
Prince Regent Whisky	Gooderham & Worts Ltd.	C. Strong	25 "
Bonded Stock Whisky	Gooderham & Worts Ltd.	C. Strong	25 "
John Collins Gin	Gooderham & Worts Ltd.	C. Strong	100 "
Italian Vermouth	Martini & Rossi S/A	C. Strong	175 "
Four Roses Whisky	Frankfort Distillers (Can). Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	50 "
Harwoods Whisky	Doncan Harwood Distillers Ltd.	Gordon Squires	250 "
Silver Fizz Gin	Doncan Harwood Distillers Ltd.	Gordon Squires	800 "
Old Inspector Rum	Doncan Harwood Distillers Ltd.	Gordon Squires	650 "
U.D.L. Special Whisky	Doncan Harwood Distillers Ltd.	Gordon Squires	50 "
Dominion Ten Whisky	Montromency Distillery Ltd.	C. R. Bell	350 "
Lemon Gin	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	100 "
Geneva Gin	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	20 "
Liqueurs "Twins"	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	5 "
Creme de Menthe	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	25 "

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases	
			Jan. 1, 1953 to	Feb. 28, 1954
Silver Top Gin	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	225	"
Asst. Cordials	Erven, Lucas Bols	Baine Johnston & Co.	245	"
House of Lords Gin	Booths Distilleries Ltd.	G. Carnell	250	"
Plymouth Dry Gin	Coats & Co. (Plymouth)	J. McGrath	125	"
Fleischman's Dry Gin	Fleischman's Distillery Ltd.	T. & M. Winter	50	"
London Club Gin	Melcher's Distillery Ltd.	M. T. Jones	50	"
Hennessey's Brandy	James Hennessey & Co.	W. A. Reid	50	"
Martell's Brandy	Martell & Co.	Baine Johnston & Co.	25	"
Doppel Korn Brandy (German)	Gerb. Schmitmann	Direct	18	"
Edel Korn Brandy (German)	Gerb. Schmitmann	Direct	18	"
Bond No. 5 Whisky	W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.	S. Lake (P. J. Dobbin 1954)	50	"
Gilbey's Dry Gin	W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.	S. Lake (P. J. Dobbin 1954)	600	"
Gilbey's Orange Gin	W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.	S. Lake (P. J. Dobbin 1954)	200	"
Gilbey's Collins Gin	W. & A. Gilbey Ltd.	S. Lake (P. J. Dobbin 1954)	950	"
Canadian Club Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	2,750	"
Imperial Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	50	"
Royal Scott	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	25	"
London Dry Gin	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	850	"
Old Plaid Whisky	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	150	"
Manhattan Cocktail	Hiram Walker & Sons	J. Everard	10	"
Captain's Choice Rum	Unital (Trinidad) Ltd.	J. Canning	200	"
Bacardi Rum	Ron Bacardi S/A	Walker Agencies (Toronto)	1,100	"
Highland Queen Whisky	McDonald & Muir Ltd.	Walker Agencies (Toronto)	300	"
Glen Moray Whisky	McDonald & Muir Ltd.	Walker Agencies (Toronto)	75	"
Drambuie Liqueur Whisky	Drambuie Liqueur Co. Ltd.	Direct	75	"
Western Pearl Rum	Southard & Co.	W. Petten	1,300	"



London Dock Rum	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	Affiliated Offices	847	"
Votrix Vermouth	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	Affiliated Offices	50	"
Long John Whisky	Long John Distillers Ltd.	Affiliated Offices	200	"
Monnet Brandy	J. G. Monnet & Co. Ltd.	Affiliated Offices	25	"
Windmill Rum	Martin Doorly & Co. Ltd.	R. Winsor	300	"
Queen Anne Whisky	Hill, Thompson & Co. Ltd.	G. Carnell	700	"
House of Lords Whisky	Wm. Thompson & Co.	G. Carnell	550	"
Findlaters Liqueur Whisky	Findlater, Mackie & Todd	G. Carnell	200	"
Findlaters London Gin	Findlater, Mackie & Todd	G. Carnell	100	"
Highland Cream Whisky	Wm. Teacher & Sons	J. Strang	1,400	"
Loch Corrie Whisky	Marshall Taplow & Sons	Haig Scott	200	"
Old Taylor Whisky	National Dist. Products Corp.	W. McNamara	150	"
Peppers Kentucky Bourbon Whisky	Schenley International Corp.	Baine Johnston & Co.	25	"
Ballantines Whisky	Geo. Ballantine & Sons Ltd.	J. Everard	250	"
Harper's Bourbon Whisky	Schenley International Corp.	Baine Johnston & Co.	25	"
Jamieson's Whisky	John Jamieson & Sons Ltd.	H. Scott	25	"
Benedictine Liqueur	Benedictine (France)	A. J. Dunne & Co.	40	"
Combiar Creme de Cocoa	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	Affiliated Offices Ltd. (Montreal)	5	"
Combiar Triple Sec	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	Affiliated Offices Ltd. (Montreal)	5	"
Combiar Asst. Cordials	White Favell (Vintners) Ltd.	Affiliated Offices Ltd. (Montreal)	40	"
Creme de Menthe	Meagher's Brothers & Co. Ltd.	P. J. Dobbin	5	"
Asst. Cordials	Meagher's Brothers & Co. Ltd.	P. J. Dobbin	225	"
Morris Sloe Gin	Meagher's Brothers & Co. Ltd.	P. J. Dobbin	10	"
Cointreau	Cointreau S/A (France)	C. Strong	10	"
Old Niagara Port	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	11,250	"
Old London Port	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	200	"
Chateau-Gai Port	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	300	"
Old Niagara Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	2,500	"
Old London Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	700	"

BRAND	FIRM	AGENT	Purchases	
			Jan. 1, 1953 to	Feb. 28, 1954
Chateau-Gai Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	200	"
Private Stock Sherry	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	100	"
Burgundy	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	200	"
Champagne	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	250	"
Vermouth	Chateau-Gai Wines Ltd.	Wm. Petten	100	"
Four Aces Port	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	300	"
Club Port	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	75	"
Connoisseur Port	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	75	"
D.D. Port	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	50	"
Four Aces Sherry	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	75	"
Club Sherry	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	25	"
Connoisseur Sherry	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	25	"
St. Lawrence Sherry	Danforth Wines Ltd.	Gordon Squires	25	"
Red Seal Burgundy	Jordon Wine Co.	Gordon Squires	50	"
Asst. Portuguese Table Wines	Sociedade Commercial Senas Ltd.	Direct	100	"
Amontillado Sherry	Manuel Fernandez & Co.	Direct	600	"
Oud's Advocaat	Wed. G. Oud Pz. & Co.	Direct	350	"
Acadian Apple Wine	M. W. Graves & Co. Ltd.	Geo. Chalker	100	"
Bristol Cream Sherry	John Harvey & Sons Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	50	"
Petri Port and Sherry	Petri Wine Co.	H. Scott	300	"
Eagle Port	Gonzalez Byass & Co.	J. Everard	100	"
Mumm's Champagne	G. H. Mumm & Co.	E. D. Hobbs (Montreal)	60	"
French Vermouth	Noilly Prat & Co.	Terroux & Co. Montreal	100	"
Asst. Cordials	L. J. McGuinness & Co. Ltd.	Geo. Chalker	20	"
Special Old Rye Whisky Army & Navy	L. J. McGuinness & Co. Ltd.	Geo. Chalker	100	"
Bulmer's Cider	H. P. Bulmer & Co. Ltd.	Walker Agencies	50	"

Paarl Sherry	Co-op Wine Growers	J. O'Driscoll	50	"
Liebfraumilch Table Wines	Louis Guntrum	Affiliated Offices	25	"
Nierstenier	Louis Guntrum	Affiliated Offices	25	"
Heidesiech Champagne	Chas. Heidesiech	J. Everard	35	"
Chianti Rossi	M. Calissano & Co.	Affiliated Offices	25	"
Claret	Schroder & Schyler & Co.	Walker Agencies	50	"
Ast. German Wine	Herman Pabst	Direct	70	"
Neuve Clicquot Champagne	B. D. Vogue & Co.	Affiliated Offices	10	"
Taylor's Viceroy Port	Taylor, Fladgate & Yeatman	F. F. Wells	125	"
Constantine Port	Sociedade Commercial Senas Ltd.	Direct	100	"
Escador Sherry	C. N. Kope & Co. Ltd.	Affiliated Offices	25	"
Dry Sack Sherry	Williams & Humbert	Walker Agencies	50	"
Bass Ale	Export Bottlers Ltd.	J. L. O'Dea	500	"
Guinness Stout	A. Guinness & Sons Ltd.	J. L. O'Dea	1,100	"
McEwan's India Pale Ale	McEwan Younger Ltd.	O. L. Vardy	1,200	"
Younger's Double Century Ale	McEwan Younger Ltd.	O. L. Vardy	900	"
Younger's Milk Stout	McEwan Younger Ltd.	O. L. Vardy	1,550	"
Heineken's Lager Beer	Heineken's Brewery	R. Rennie	750	"
King's Beer	Dow Breweries Ltd.	S. Lake	12,900	"
Carling's Red Cap Ale	Canadian Breweries (Quebec) Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	25,108	"
O'Keefe's Ale	Canadian Breweries (Quebec) Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	38,550	"
Brading's Ale	Canadian Breweries (Quebec) Ltd.	A. B. Baird Ltd.	2,400	"
Molson's Ale	Molson's Brewery Ltd.	Baine Johnston & Co.	50,000	"
Oland's Ale	Oland & Sons Ltd.	C. Strong	2,650	"
Labatt's Ale	John Labatt Ltd.	B. Stafford	41,800	"
India Beers (Local)	Newfoundland Brewery	Direct	26,818	"
Dominion Ale (Local)	Bennett Brewing Co. Ltd.	Direct	58,440	"
Jockey Club (Local)	Bavarian Brewing Co. Ltd.	Direct	90,178	"
		<b>Bulk</b>		<b>Liquor</b>
Casks, Paarl Brandy	Co-op Wine Growers Assoc.	J. O'Driscoll	40	"
Barrels, Jamaica Rum	J. Wray & Nephew Ltd.	Direct	500	"

## PART 2

## BOARD OF LIQUOR CONTROL

Alcoholic Liquors, Wines and Beers Purchased by the Board of Liquor Control  
through the following Local Agents from 1st April, 1953,  
to 28th February, 1954

No. Cases	Class	Local Agent
4,793	Rum	J. A. McGrath
250	Whisky	J. A. McGrath
125	Gin	J. A. McGrath
275	Whisky	A. B. Baird Ltd.
55,988	Beer	A. B. Baird Ltd.
7,491	Whisky	C. R. Bell
1,900	Gin	C. R. Bell
2,650	Whisky	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
3,450	Rum	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
445	Gin	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
325	Liquors and Cordials	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
25	Brandy	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
7 pipes	Port	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
43,350	Beer	Baine Johnston & Co. Ltd.
1,800	Rum	Job Brothers & Co. Ltd.
520	Rum	Geo. Chalker
100	Whisky	Geo. Chalker
20	Asstd. Cordials	Geo. Chalker
200	Rum	C. Granger
4,500	Rum	M. D. Shears
200	Whisky	M. D. Shears
100	Rum	C. Strong
75	Whisky	C. Strong
100	Gin	C. Strong
10	Liquors	C. Strong
100	Wine	C. Strong
2,000	Beer	C. Strong
400	Whisky	P. J. Dobbin
240	Cordials and Liqueurs	P. J. Dobbin
50	Whisky	J. O'Driscoll
50	Gin	J. O'Driscoll
50	Wine	J. O'Driscoll
20 casks	Brandy	J. O'Driscoll
5 casks	Port	J. O'Driscoll
50	Brandy	W. A. Reid
300	Whisky	Gordon Squires
800	Gin	Gordon Squires
650	Rum	Gordon Squires
700	Asst. Wines	Gordon Squires
1,250	Whisky	G. Carnell
250	Gin	G. Carnell
50	Gin	T. and M. Winter Ltd.
50	Gin	M. J. Jones

**Alcoholic Liquors, Wines and Beers Purchased by the Board of Liquor Control  
through the following Local Agents from 1st April, 1953,  
to 28th February, 1954**

No. Cases	Class	Local Agent
50	Whisky	S. Lake, P. J. Dobbin 1954
1,750	Gin	S. Lake, P. J. Dobbin 1954
10,900	Beer	S. Lake, P. J. Dobbin 1954
3,225	Whisky	J. Everard
860	Gin	J. Everard
135	Wine	J. Everard
2 butts	Sherry	J. Everard
1,200	Rum	W. Petten
15,600	Asstd. Wines	W. Petten
200	Rum	R. Winsor
1,100	Whisky	J. Strang
225	Whisky	H. Scott
300	Wine	H. Scott
125	Wine	F. F. Wills
1,100	Beer	J. L. O'Dea
2,950	Beer	O. L. Vardy
750	Beer	R. Rennie
38,450	Beer	B. Stafford
150	Whisky	W. McNamara
40	Liqueurs	A. J. Dunne and Co.

Question No. 28: Answer tabled by Mr. Hefferton—one part of the question is still under consideration, that is the section dealing with drugs.

Question (28) 1. Were tenders called for the purchase of provisions since March 31st, 1953, for the following institutions: General Hospital, Fever Hospital; St. John's Sanatorium; West Coast Sanatorium; The Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases; Gander Hospital; Botwood Hospital; Cottage Hospitals and Nursing Stations? If so were the lowest tenders only accepted, and if not, why not?

2. What firms or individuals supplied the following items to the institutions named in question 1 and what were the prices paid in each instance—Eggs, Ham, Bacon, Beef, Pork, Bread, Butter, Fish (Salt and Fresh or Frozen) and Fowl? Also Drugs and Dressings?

Answer (28) 1: Monthly tenders are called for the purchase of all supplies for Government institutions in St. John's and lowest tenders, consistent with quality and delivery accepted. Preference however is given wherever possible to local products. The West Coast Sanatorium is supplied through an arrangement with Messrs. Goodyear & House, Corner Brook. Gander Hospital gets its daily supplies through arrangement with the Department of Transport Stores. Cottage Hospitals and Nursing Stations procure their supplies locally, but as far as possible distribute their purchasing among the local merchants, sometimes on a monthly basis.

Answer 2: The attached list shows the Institutions, prices and contractors for supplies that were let on a yearly contract during 1953-54.

ITEM	INSTITUTION	CONTRACT PRICE	CONTRACTOR
BREAD	General Hospital	.0850 per lb. (Sliced)	Central Bakery
	Her Majesty's Penitentiary	(increased to .0950 per lb.)	
	Girls' Home and Training School		
	Sanatorium	.08166 per lb. (Unliced)	Mammy's Bakery
	Home for Mental and Nervous Diseases	.08666 per lb. (Sliced)	
	Home for Aged and Infirm	(increased to .09166 and .09666 per lb. respectively)	
EGGS	Girls Home and Training School		Two Way Stores
	Home for Aged and Infirm	70¢ per dozen	
	Home for Infants		
	General Hospital	85¢ per dozen	Hawthorndell Poultry Farm
	Mental Hospital	85¢ per dozen	Hawthorndell Poultry Farm
	Mental Hospital	63¢ per dozen	Wilsil Ltd.
	Sanatorium	88¢ per dozen	Poultry Producers' Assoc.
	Sanatorium	92¢ per dozen	Poultry Producers' Assoc.
MEATS	All Institutions	48¢ (increased up to 60¢) per lb.	A. J. Casey
BACON	Home for Aged and Infirm		Chalker & Company
	General Hospital		
	Mental Hospital	53¢ (up to 75¢) per lb.	
	Sanatorium		



MILK	Infants' Home	\$1.28 per gallon	Sunshine Dairy
	Home for Aged and Infirm Mental Hospital	\$1.20 per gallon	Sunshine Dairy
HAM (Raw)	General Hospital	\$1.18 per gallon	J. S. Kelsey & Sons
	Sanatorium	\$1.18 per gallon	J. S. Kelsey & Sons
	Home for Aged and Infirm	64¢ (increased to 81¢) per lb.	Chalker & Company
	General Hospital	64¢ (increased to 81¢) per lb.	Chalker & Company
	Mental Hospital Sanatorium	64¢ (increased to 81¢) per lb. 64¢ (increased to 81¢) per lb.	Chalker & Company Chalker & Company
HAM (Boiled)	General Hospital Sanatorium	80¢ (increased to \$1.01) per lb.	Chalker & Company

## Fresh Fish :

Codfish                      7¢ per lb.                      Fort Amherst Sea Foods.  
(Other varieties at seasonal prices) .

Salt Fish—Purchased as required, when possible from fishermen.

Butter—Monthly supplies with other provisions.

Fowl—Local Poultrymen—prices vary but average around 50¢ per lb.

### Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. P. J. CANNING: My first duty as a loyal British subject is to join with other members in an expression of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen. Secondly, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Motion made on opening day, that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

For the next few moments I am going to take up the time of the House by stating some hard, cold facts, most of which are concerned with my own district. I shall be as brief as possible to enable the House to get on with what I consider the most important business that has ever come before the House since the Liberal Government took office in 1949. I repeat that—I say that I shall be as brief as possible to let the House get on with what I consider is the most important business ever to come before this House since the Liberal Government took office in 1949.

In the Speech from the Throne is contained proposed legislation which will mean life or death to this Province. I shall take the items according to their importance to my district; or perhaps I should say, to the Province as a whole: (1) Fisheries, (2) Mining, (3) Agriculture, (4) Forests. On the by-products of these industries, depends the whole future of this Province of ours.

Before dealing with the industries, I feel it my duty to say that during the past five years my aim has been to hold the confidence placed in me by the people of my district and

placed in me by the Liberal Party in 1949.

I realize our responsibilities as members of this Honourable House, on both sides—on both the Government side and on the Opposition side. I realize that some four hundred thousand citizens have placed in our hands the destiny of the Province; and still more important, thousands of citizens—people yet unborn—for whom we are responsible, to make this land of ours a better place to live in.

It has been our experience to witness the results of fascism and communism and at the same time we realize that members of our great democracies helped to bring about that chaos by indifference, and the injustice of greedy politicians who placed personal gains and their own desires before the welfare of mankind as a whole. I have noticed, in my own time, the greed of Capitalists who have kept the working class under their heel; I have seen them neglecting their duties and depriving them of their rights.

I did not go to Placentia West without having a sense of responsibility and a realization of my duties to the people in that little section of the world; the people who looked up to me to represent them in the Government of this little island. I made some promises to these people and one was to put the welfare of the district before any personal desire or gain. I promised the people I would be honest and just; to be loyal to the Liberal Party as long as the Liberal Party was loyal to the people. I promised them that I would at all times try and make life better for the people. I leave it to the House—the Government and the Opposition—to

judge if I have lived up to the promises which I have stated. In order to do this, I shall first give a little picture in brief of the district as I found it in 1949.

My district extends from Fox Cove near Burin down the West coastline of Placentia Bay, down the East side to Come by Chance including the Islands within the Bay. The total population of my district is 9,700; or, to be accurate, in 1949, 9,669 people. The number of settlements is approximately 50, including Marystown and the other settlements. There is an average of 28 or 30 families per settlement. Of course, some of them have as many as 70.

I will not go into details of the conditions existing in the district in 1949. I am aware that the members in this House, on both sides, are familiar with the standards of living in those isolated outports. Firstly, the total earnings of the fishermen of my district in 1949 was \$200 a man and I think I am conservative when I say it was that much. Imagine in this twentieth century, if we stop to think of it for a few moments, add up our grocery bill. Add up the taxes and what not. Many of these families had 5, 6, 7, 8 and perhaps 10 in family and the average earned in my district was \$200 per fisherman. It sounds a little fantastic when you consider these men living on that for 365 days; with five or eight children; all bills to meet. But it is a fact and if anybody in this House now, on one side or the other doubts it, I shall be glad to table figures at any time of the total quintals of fish caught; the average from Cape Race to the tip of the Peninsula and I shall prove the average wage of the fisherman was far below \$200.

This is how I found the district

when I went there. The total population between 6,000 and 7,000 people; 1,700 or 1,800 families. 97% had no sewerage or water system; 99% had no electricity; 99.5% had no heating except the kitchen stove. As far as medical services are concerned, and these are most essential; in my district in 1949 we had one Doctor and two part-time Nurses. We had neither Nursing Station. There was one Doctor at Marystown when I began my campaign in 1949. If I fell sick at Marystown I had a Doctor; the next place I could get medical attention was at Woody Island in the bottom of the district, in a straight line, it would be fifty miles; if you were zigzagging in the coves, it would be from 100 to 120 miles.

The next item is Schools—Education. When I went to the district, I found several schools overcrowded; school rooms were without adequate lighting or ventilation; in some cases I found the schools were old, had been there for years and they were leaky.

As far as the local roads were concerned, I would say without fear of contradiction, that 75% of the settlements had dangerous foot paths. In some places where the two sides of the harbour were separated by water, they were without bridges; people had to go to Church and children had to go to school by crossing over in dories and other boats.

Next, I shall take the highroads and secondary roads. From Marystown to Terrenceville the highway was under construction for two years. The situation in 1949 in my district was, there were two settlements connected with the Cabot Highway; one was Terrenceville and the other was Come by Chance. One section of the road, from Marystown West, up to

Burin, you could drive over it, provided you did not have heart trouble or high blood pressure. I remember, during the campaign, going to Fox Cove—I was in the Navy in World War II and there were times when I was pretty well scared, scared stiff; but I think I can safely say I was never more scared during World War II than I was when I drove to Fox Cove in 1949 to look for votes to get to this House of Assembly. I remember going around one turn in a truck or pick-up, and I looked out through the glass and saw the sea lashing up on the shore three hundred feet below. At that moment I was more scared than I ever was in World War II.

This is in general or in brief the situation in my district in 1949. I have not gone into detail. If I did, it would take me a long time; probably another hour; if I was to go into detail as it existed.

One thing I have to mention is the plight of the aged, the widows, the children of large families and the sick. I feel sure that whatever our political philosophy may be, whatever we think of Confederation, the Liberal Party, the Government or the backbenchers; I think that everybody in Newfoundland must surely realize the blessings and happiness that our social service have brought to our people, especially those who could not help themselves. If I were to tell of some cases I met in 1949—cases of old people finished work, some cases living with in-laws; if I were to explain their feelings; their position; how poor they were; how miserable they were; and if I were to compare it with today and what happened to them, I think all of us would laud, would praise Confederation.

We remember that the Honourable

Minister of Welfare told us in his speech that the improvements in the railway alone would justify Confederation. I agree with him, but I would say now emphatically, and I do not think anybody here will put up an argument against it, that Old Age Pensions alone would justify Confederation. Before 1949, we can realize how those old people felt. How unhappy they felt. How unhappy the atmosphere of the home was. I know some cases where old people have been separated from their families; old men or old women separated from their daughter or son, perhaps within the district or some part of the Province or even on the mainland; they were separated for years and during the past five years the average man has managed to get along on the Pension and perhaps save enough to take a trip and unite with his son and daughter again. I know of several cases where the coming of Confederation enabled them to be united again.

Now I shall describe briefly the changes that have taken place in my district in the short history of the Liberal Administration. I have lived in my district since coming into this party and I have done everything I possibly could in the interest of the people. First—Medical Services: In 1949 we had one Doctor and two part-time Nurses. In 1954, today, we have four Nurses, plus one vacancy (temporary); three nursing stations and two Doctors, one of whom is on the "Lady Anderson" which visits every part of the district once a month. Every case of TB which came to my attention, I did my best to get them hospitalization, in spite of the fact that we have a shortage of beds at the hospital. Again, Sir, I say I do not think—and I emphatically state—

there has not been one emergency case in my district which has not gotten immediate attention either from the department or from me. I used to bring them to hospital by boat myself. I do not think there was one case in the last five years which has not been attended to.

With regard to schools; as I said previously, I found several schools with inadequate lighting, overcrowded and in some cases old and leaky. The following, Sir, are the list of new schools and school rooms that have been built in the last five years. At Creston two new schools; Barhaven a new school, Beau Bois a new school, St. Ann's a new school, Tacks Beach one room extension, Swift Current two room extension, North Harbour a new school, Garden Cove a new school, Monkstown one room extension. In all, Sir, possibly these have cost about thirty-five thousand dollars. So that is thirty-five thousand of our forty million which has not gone down the drain.

Next, Sir, I shall compare the local roads, secondary roads and highways: I stated, Sir, at the beginning that when I toured the district in 1949 I found 75% of the settlements without roads, or with just paths, in some cases dangerous paths. In at least three or four places I found the two sides of the harbour divided by water and children crossing to school by dory. Today, Sir, I can state, Sir, the highway to Marystown is completed and there were three places in my district which were connected with the Cabot Highway. Today, Sir, in 1954 this is the situation: The road to the Burin Peninsula was completed in 1950 at a cost to the Government of over half a million dollars. That is another half million we have spent for the benefit of the people. In my

district, Sir, we have had the following branch roads connecting the settlements to the main highway. In other words, we have let some of these isolated people out into the world, about 2,000 people.

MR. HOLLETT: May I be permitted to ask the honourable member. What time the road to the Burin Peninsula was started, what Government started it?

MR. CANNING: The Commission of Government started it—and I remember, Sir, during the National Convention a certain gentleman from Burin, or belonging to Burin, could not understand why we were asking for the road, and he said he had lived in Burin and he could get out by water and they did not want the road. I said the road was finished in 1950.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who was the man?

MR. CANNING: Mr. Malcolm Hollett of Burin.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to help out the honourable member.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You opened your mouth and walked into it that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CANNING: I could not understand it. During the National Convention, Mr. Speaker, I was attending the Memorial University. By the way, I came back from overseas and finished my high school under my colleague here and then went to the Memorial. I did not have much time to follow speeches although every now and then I tuned in. I remember particularly the night after the honourable member had spoken, and

stated he could not understand why the people of the Burin Peninsula wanted the highroad. When he was up there he always got out by sea—he is a Tory and the sea was good enough for him. He did not want to run down to the city by car in a few hours.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was within a couple of days of when he said they were too lazy to work.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted to rise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: Who has the floor?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know who had it in the National Convention that day.

MR. CANNING: I wonder where I was?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair thinks the honourable member is quite capable of making his own speech in this debate. Will other honourable members please listen. Please resume your speech.

MR. CANNING: It is human nature, Mr. Speaker—I was dealing with branch roads. After I got to North Harbour, I don't know whether I mentioned it or not. Anyway, since 1950, Mr. Speaker, we have had the following branch roads from settlements which were, before our time, isolated: North Harbour, Garden Cove, Boat Harbour, Bakers Cove, Baine Harbour, Rushoon.

MR. HOLLETT: Is the honourable member addressing his remarks to the Chair or to the Leader of the Government? Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order: I think it is the

duty of a speaker to address the Chair not to any member on the opposite side.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I am addressing the Chair. I have not addressed the honourable Premier—he is taking a list.

MR. SPEAKER: If while the honourable member is speaking some other member wishes to be sure of his exact words, I think of no precedence that can prevent his taking it down, nor of any way I can accelerate or retard the speed of the speech of any honourable member, I will ask honourable members to kindly remember the honourable member for Placentia West has the floor. He is speaking in this debate and it seems to the Chair he is quite capable of handling any interruptions from the other side. Will you deny the honourable member the right to speak in this debate? The honourable member will resume his speech.

MR. CANNING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I understand the attitude of the honourable member across the House when we talk of the highway there, because he was not in favour of it during the National Convention. He could not understand how the people could not carry on by boat in these places. I guess he is a bit sorry now that they arrive by car. In those places I have mentioned there are several cars now and trucks. I wish I had time to go into it and tell the number that are there—I wonder where was I?

MR. HOLLETT: Is the honourable gentleman quoting from a speech which may or may not have occurred during the National Convention? If so I demand a transcript of that speech! I think I am entitled to that.



MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MR. CANNING: The following settlements have been connected to the main highway: North Harbour, Garden Cove, Boat Harbour, Parkers Cove, Baine Harbour, Rushoon, Jean de Bay, Mooring Cove, Rock Harbour, and Spanish Room. By the way the road to Rock Harbour which is some four miles from the highway is not yet completed. There is about a three-quarter mile strip to be completed which I hope to see finished this year. The total cost of these roads, Mr. Speaker, not counting the maintenance in the last five years is \$180,000 out of that forty million dollars which has gone down the drain. What is more important, Mr. Speaker, there are roughly two thousand people relieved of their isolation. I say here that these other settlements, with the exception of Baine Harbour and North Harbour did not even have the coastal boat call in with mail and freight.

I am sure, therefore, the House will realize or appreciate what it means to those people who have been shut-ins, cut-off from hospitals and highroads, mail and freight. I assure, you, Sir, they certainly appreciate the fact that these roads have been built. It gives me great pleasure that I have had some part in building these roads. I went to the Minister once and said; I want the branch road built to Garden Cove. He asked me, how many people are there? I told him there were about thirteen families. Then he asked, how far it was. I told him it was about two miles. "Twenty-eight thousand dollars for thirteen families," he said. I put the argument up to him that across the water there was an island called Sound Island, and I felt that if this road was

built that the people from Sound Island would move over to Garden Cove. However there was nothing in Garden Cove to justify moving at the time except the fact that they could be connected to the highway. We had rings around anyway. Finally I persuaded him that if this road were built these people would move and we would have one problem off our hands. So at last he came across, and the road was built. Since then, Mr. Speaker, approximately fourteen or fifteen families from Sound Island have moved, and Sound Island is no more. It is one problem off our hands. Nobody is living there. And I contend it was the one sum that was justified out of the exchequer that I have had in my district. The honourable Premier may not agree with me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do agree.

MR. CANNING: One time during the year, Mr. Speaker, the Premier spoke at some meeting, and wondered why in the world they had moved from Sound Island over to Garden Cove. I believe he said they should not have moved there. Anyway, that was one time, Mr. Speaker, I did not agree with the Premier because first of all the people of Sound Island lived on an island, and it was costing the C.N.R. something to have a boat go there. They had a post office there, schools there and a phone there. But when they moved into Garden Cove the boat did not have to call there any more; one phone did the two places, and we built a new school there—I believe I mentioned it earlier. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, these people could have moved to some other place near the railway or a hospital or something.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, apart from the highroads in general and the branch

roads we have had during the past five years, connecting places within the district, we have many good roads, Clattice Harbour, St. Lawrence, to St. Leonard's and the road from St. Lawrence to St. Anne's all in one section, which is now under construction. I believe that the road from Clattice Harbour—St. Leonards is at least usable. To the House, Mr. Speaker, this may seem a small thing, to have a couple of settlements joined. But to the people of these lonely settlements it means a lot to have a connection with mails and being able to meet with one another. It is nice for a place where they have thirty families this afternoon, for the people to be able to walk over the road to another settlement where another thirty-five or forty families live, to shop in each place etc. Since I am still on roads, Mr. Speaker, I may remind the House that during the last four years we have spent in my district alone some \$120,000 on maintenance and improvements, widening roads etc. The Department of Public Works, under Local Roads Division, have never yet during the past five years, not in one instance, refused a grant that has been requested by an organized local roads committee. I have no record of one instance where they have refused a grant provided, of course, it was within reason. Today, I may say, the local roads in my district are in pretty good shape, and I think the people feel pretty happy over the results.

Mr. Speaker, I know I could spend much more time in relating improvements in my district, probably some things of perhaps even more importance. But I feel, Sir that my district is only typical of what is happening elsewhere in the Province. In the last five years what has happened in my district is really typical of what is

happening to Newfoundland, and is something the people hoped for, waited for and asked for, and which we have given to them. Of course the Opposition never gives us credit for what we have done. But we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have the satisfaction of knowing that the people appreciate it.

I said previously that I spend most of my time in my district, and I passed through my colleague's district here, Fortune Bay, through Trinity Bay and Conception Bay going back and forth to St. John's. I know the feeling of the people, and how much they appreciate what we have done for them. I feel, Sir, that should we go before them tomorrow in an election we would have a landslide as we had in 1949 and 1951. I feel, Mr. Speaker, as long as we carry on and improve conditions and look after the people as we have looked after them they will be solidly behind us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the beginning I gave the context of the Speech from the Throne in order of importance to my district and the province as a whole. I shall not, Sir, go into farming, agriculture or mines to any extent because my district is a fishing district, but I should like now, Sir, to come to the fisheries: I will be as brief as I possibly can,

First of all we will talk fish, something the Leader of the Opposition complained about at the opening of this session when he said it was "Fish," "Fish," "Fish," nothing but "Fish." He thought very hard of the fact that this Government should take up fish. Yet he comes from Placentia Bay—and he is worried because we start talking fish.

MR. HOLLETT: Who said so?

MR. CANNING : I say, Mr. Speaker, he was worried because we started talking about fish. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the other day when the honourable member was making his speech he spent more time, a lot more time, talking about the roads in St. John's, and spent only a few minutes talking about fish, eleven minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD : I counted and thought it was ten.

MR. CANNING : He spent eleven minutes talking about fish—a great defender of the people. Mr. Speaker, the people in Placentia West are not worried much about the roads in St. John's West, they want to hear fish and more of it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, fish has been one of the main foods since man inhabited the earth. I remember in one of the lessons of the Bible in the time of Our Lord, during a sermon Our Lord was giving, some boy turned up with a few fish. And, Mr. Speaker, I feel that fish will be one of the principal foods while man exists, providing, of course, some lunatic does not contaminate our waters with hydrogen or atomic bombs. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland is geographically placed in the midst of the greatest fishing grounds in the world. There is no argument against that. We know that we are definitely in the midst of the greatest fishing grounds in the world. We have had, and still have, some of the finest seamen, again I say, in the world, and the finest fishermen. I think our glorious history of the past shows our seamen and fishermen cannot be equalled anywhere else in the world. For the past four hundred years they have braved the storms of the Atlantic, fogs, storms and ice to gain a

living. For them it has been a rugged life with few joys and unfortunately much sorrow. But Sir, what has happened in the last fifty years is that we have lagged behind the changing times. We have not kept pace with the modernizing of boats, equipment and processing, procuring or even marketing the products of the sea. So, Sir, in 1949 this Government was faced with, I think I could say, Sir, the greatest problem ever to face any province of the Dominion from an industrial and economic standpoint. Our first problem, Sir, was that we had very little knowledge of our fishing grounds, of the species of fish or the amount of fish which swam in our waters. Secondly, Sir, as times advanced things had gotten ahead of us and this Government nor the fishermen did not know the type of boats or equipment most suitable for securing catches of inshore and offshore fisheries. There was one thing we did not know. Now, Sir, there is a statement I am going to make, Sir, which would be or might be detrimental to the marketing of our fish in the next two years, and I would ask the press and gallery to note that—and I am going to ask the press, Sir, should they comment on anything I have said that they confine themselves to saying that I said we should modernize our fisheries. On anything I say I shall ask the Premier when I am finished to give his opinion if he would ask the press not to make too much of it.

There is one thing we did know, and the Department of Fisheries knew, that our fishermen needed training in the know-how of using modern machinery and other equipment essential today to keep up with the pace and hold the markets, to gain new ones and to make our fishing industry lucrative and economi-

cally sound. Now, Sir, I am going to give an example: First of all, Sir, this Government advanced loans to fresh fish plants—in my district they advanced loans to fresh fish plants, and I am going to compare, Sir, the old method with the modern method and in comparing this, I am going to ask the Press not to comment on it; as it may injure our markets.

At Burin there is a modern fish plant. Draggars come in and land fish, everything is very attractive, very clean. Down the Bay, some twenty miles, we have something quite opposite. We have people fishing, using the same methods, same boats, same equipment as was used, I would say, one hundred and fifty years ago; with the exception of the engine to take them to the grounds a little faster. This is the picture of the old methods: A man with a motor boat and dory, goes out today; goes to the cove and gets his bait; gets his lines; goes out and catches his codfish. At ten o'clock he has his fish caught; he comes in; goes to his dinner. Fish is left under the boiling sun. He comes back at one o'clock, takes the fish out of the boat and throws it upon the wharf with a pitchfork. It is there at least half an hour before it goes into the shed. It is split; not washed. Sometimes they may throw some water on it and a bit of salt; sometimes it is salted in the stage. Sometimes it is there in the shed for six weeks; then it is washed, put on the flake and made—sun dried. I believe the average number of days to make fish in Newfoundland is less than four per month. And, Mr. Speaker, that fish is made, and they hope to sell it for food product. In that very stage where the fish is stored, there is also gasoline stored. If we had carried on this way, I would say that within a very few years

there would be no market for that fishery, as I have outlined.

In 1949 the Department of Fisheries was faced with this problem. What were they going to do? Were we going to advance loans to carry on this way or were we going to start at rock-bottom and try and modernize our fishery.

The other day the Leader of the Opposition was speaking of the loans advanced to fishermen. I believe he said the figure was \$16,000 in Placentia Bay. Now, Mr. Speaker, that \$16,000 should not have been loaned at all. I believe that is one mistake this Government made. Previous to that, I believe the senior member for St. John's West was speaking of loans—at the time, I happened to be absent from the House for a few moments—but I gathered he said they had gotten one million dollars in Placentia Bay. If this Government had put one million dollars in Placentia Bay, I would not be here today.

MR. HOLLETT: How much did Fishery Products get?

MR. CANNING: What Fishery Products got was spent to improve the fishery and put it on modern lines.

MR. HOLLETT: How much?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Over two million.

MR. CANNING: Burin, today, is a different place than when my honourable friend left it. Burin ten years ago was a miserable place to go into; but go there today and you will see the results of the million dollars or whatever it was, was loaned to Fishery Products. This Party started at rock-bottom. They gave loans to Fishery Products, they gave loans to

other fish plants, they started surveys, and so on. I will give you an example of the results of this experiment. This Government introduced Danish Seiners and long liners for the first time in this country. Last year, Mr. Speaker, there was a man from my district who was a Captain or Skipper of one Danish Seiner in Fortune Bay. The average wage made in 1949 was \$200; last year a man from Marystown was in charge of one of those Danish Seiners and for ten months fishing in Fortune Bay his wages were over \$5,000; his crew members shared \$4,200. That is quite a difference in the wages earned by something this Government recommended, compared with the old way.

The Department also set up a Commission to study the fisheries. On that Committee were well qualified men and they produced their recommendations in their Report. In my opinion, therein lies the salvation of the fishery of Newfoundland. To be brief, the Report recommends centralization and modernization of the fisheries. In my district, today, I realize centralization is very important. In three or four places there are 72 children not in school. There are no teachers. The places are small. The teachers will not go there. The only solution is to draw the people from the smaller places. I hope the time is not too far off when perhaps the Provincial Government and the Federal Government will give some grant or some help towards moving these people. Today we are now on the move to modernize the fisheries and I hope things will move faster. Newfoundland is on the march! Referring to my district, I feel certain that the Port of Marystown has great possibilities as a fishing centre and as a shipping centre. There, Sir, we have everything required for fish

plants or a fishing port, docks, or anything else pertaining to the sea. It is an ideal area for settlers. I see also in that district the possibility or probability of cattle raising and crop farming.

I feel too that this Party will leave no stone unturned in the possibility of making Mortier Bay a National Port.

In conclusion, I renew my pledge to make my district one of the most prosperous places in the Western World.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address myself to the Motion before the House, I wish, first of all, to associate myself with the sentiments of loyalty that have been expressed by those who have spoken before me and arising out of the note in the Speech from the Throne regarding the crowning of the new monarch as Queen and Head of the British Empire. In this Island the tradition of loyalty to the British Crown is as long as the length of our days in this Island. Not more than several stones' throw from this place, down on the King's Beach, our forefathers landed during the reign of the first Elizabeth; and of all British subjects, none have been more loyal than those who came to live in this land. If there is another England in the Western World, this is it. As far as we are concerned, two and two make four and first of all with us is loyalty to the British Crown and the Queen, and of all the shouts of "God Save The Queen" none were more sincere than those which echoed from our coves and bays and harbours. That man more than any other fashioned England's finest hour and expressed the hope that this second

Elizabethan age will be full of great accomplishments for England and mankind. I am quite certain that it is the wish of all of us that history will so record it.

The Speech from the Throne lays emphasis upon the appointment of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and the hope that its recommendations will form the basis for a full and practical policy for the more rapid up-build of agriculture in all its branches. It so happens that the appointment of that Commission has special significance for the district I have to represent in this House. On the land at Robinsons, Crabbes and Codroy River live many of my constituents—sober, industrious, good people, as good as you will find anywhere in this Province—or, for that matter, anywhere on this earth. I can tell you this—none of them is going to starve to death this winter—they are much too provident for that. I know additional services and technique could be made available to them, and will be made available to them according to their needs; but I crave the indulgence of the House now and state that their great need is for rural electrification. Today, West of St. George's and until you arrive at Port aux Basques, the only lights that shine in the night are those of kerosene lamps; the only form of power is that which is derived from the individual's diesel. In the twentieth century half of the Western World is assisted by the ready availability of electric power at the push of a switch. If farmers cannot be so assisted, they must lose out in the battle of competitive prices and so pass from the Newfoundland scene. So I would note in passing for the attention of those who should take note, that rural electrification for the district of St. George's, including the Codroy Valley

is absolutely essential to the farmers of that area. As far as they are concerned "let there be light; or the end of their way of life."

Before I address myself to the subject of the fisheries arising out of the note taken of it on the Speech from the Throne; there are one or two matters which were raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to refer to rather briefly. I was alarmed to a certain extent when I learned from the Leader of the Opposition that I presided over an inept Department, because the Leader of the Opposition is such an authority on fishery matters, particularly fishery administration that much attention should be given his opinion! So I hasten to assure him that I attach as much significance to his opinion as I am sure does the general public of Newfoundland, and I am sure that is the significance it merits. In listening to the honourable gentleman, I came to the conclusion that one of the reasons—perhaps the principal reason—why he came to that conclusion that my Department was inept was because he had received what he considered to be an inadequate reply to questions he had addressed to me. I was sorry to have him come to that conclusion for on the very day that the honourable gentleman charged my department was inept, I had supplied him with more information than he had asked for. If I may refer to that matter—the honourable Leader of the Opposition asked me for certain information concerning the "Matt." The obvious reply I should have made was that my department had no information about the "Matt." other than the ship of that name is historically alleged to have sailed from the Port of Bristol in 1497 under command of a person called "John Cabot." How-



ever, after long and careful consideration of the honourable gentleman's question, I came to the conclusion that the information he wanted was about the Matthew 2, and so I gave him the information he was entitled to about the Matthew 2, although I strongly suspect it was the information he thought he was asking for. I would like to suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that if he would frame his questions more precisely, he would get more precise information. When a question is slapped over hell's half acre, it is difficult to deal with it. In any case, I have to say this; I will answer questions exactly which call for statements of fact. As for questions regarding policy, I will not answer them. It would be improper for me to do so and where policy has been decided, it will be made known when the Government sees fit. Above all, I will not answer any questions that ask what the Government of Canada has done or intends to do about this or that. For me to undertake to do so would be a piece of gross impertinence, and all such questions are improperly directed. However, since I am anxious to be as helpful as I can, I am going to suggest to the honourable gentleman a method whereby he can get all the information he wants about the exact intentions of the Government of Canada. If he will direct his questions to the Leader of his Party at the national level, I am quite certain Mr. Drew will be only too happy to ask those questions in the House of Commons. In other words, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, since I will not do it, he could "let George do it."

I was intrigued by the idea of the Leader of the Opposition that this Government brought about fundamental changes in Nafel during the

past five years. I have been wondering ever since, by what course of imagination he adduced that. He appears to have derived that from the Terms of Union. To begin with, he will find no mention of Nafel.

MR. HOLLETT: That is exactly what I said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. KEOUGH: It did not lie with the Government of Newfoundland. The Government of Newfoundland could not have insisted in its own right upon a change in Nafel. Nafel is a private corporation. True it has sat astride the salt cod fish trade of Newfoundland for the last five years because it enjoyed an exclusive right to export salt cod fish, conferred upon it by the Newfoundland Fisheries Board, which in turn owed its existence to the continuance of the fishery laws as they were at the date of union. But the Government of Newfoundland in its own right has no grounds for insisting on a change in that arrangement. The initiative to bring about a change does not lie with us. It is not correct to say that the Government of Newfoundland could have put an end to Nafel, or bring about changes in Nafel in the last five years in its own right, as it could not. But I agree, from the point of view of the Opposition, it is good politics to say that. The honourable Leader of the Opposition was perturbed over the fact that no standing joint committee had been appointed arising out of the recommendations of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee. It is a matter of public knowledge that that committee made such a recommendation. But it does not follow that because the committee

made such a recommendation that, without question, the recommendation had to be accepted by both Governments. In fact an alternative arrangement was determined upon. As far as the Province of Newfoundland was concerned it meant our setting up a fishery development authority. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does not know what the Government of Canada determined upon, then I am quite certain that the Honourable Mr. Drew will be only too pleased to find out for him.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Sinclair.

MR. KEOUGH: It could be. I must admit to one point of agreement with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I share his concern over the disparity in prices received for fresh fish by fishermen fishing locally and those fishing at Mainland points. But the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that the prices paid for fresh fish are such as are determined by private fish companies. And because this Government may have loaned money to some of these companies for fishery purposes, that fact does not impose the obligation to compel these companies to pay higher prices any more than does such an obligation fall upon a bank that may loan money to such companies; any more than does such an obligation fall upon the general public when it loans money to such companies by subscribing to its shares. Nevertheless blame must attach to this Government because higher prices were not paid for fresh fish, indeed it is one of the arguments offered in support of the ineptitude of my department, for which I take it, that is something presumably I should have done something about. The only conclusion to be drawn is that the Leader of the

Opposition thinks that this Government should have compelled private fish companies to pay higher prices than they did pay. That, mind you, is an interesting thought put forward by the Leader of the Tory Party which has been the historic guardian of the rights of private companies to go their unfettered way. I must say that the idea is most unorthodox, but because it is unorthodox it is not necessary it be denied on that account. Actually I would like to hear further from him on the matter another day. But after he has had an opportunity to consult with his party I would like to know whether it is the considered opinion of the Tory Party in Newfoundland that it thinks the Liberal Government should compel private fishing companies to pay higher prices for fresh fish. Of course any responsible government in considering such a move would have to be moved by considerations rather than those of practicality. Frankly I know of no government in the Western World which has as yet legislated itself into the position where it is responsible for the prices paid to fishermen, or any other kind of men. So that I can say in this case we are in good company even if some of it is Tory Company.

Finally we had another instance from the Leader of the Opposition: It seemed that in the course of his travels he came upon a skipper of a long liner who had but twenty quintals before the season ended, but who nevertheless felt he was doing all right because the Government paid him and his crew. So that the conclusion was drawn that there was a general lack of supervision in the long lining experimental programme. Now first let me say that I have been unable to unearth the record of my department having financed any such

venture as the Leader of the Opposition indicated. His long liner would appear to be the myth that the honourable and learned member for Ferryland immediately suggested that it was. The only long liner training program that can be called such, and it would be generous to call it such, was undertaken by this Government two years ago and only for a few months. Actually there is no need for specialized training of Newfoundland fishermen in long lining. Most Newfoundland fishermen are already familiar with long lining techniques in the operation of their ordinary trawl gear. Further it must be noted that the development of long lining was not inaugurated by this Government. It grew out of the experimental fishing undertaken out of Bonavista Bay by the Government of Canada, and facilitated by the payment of a subsidy by the Department of Fisheries of Canada. For our part we have cautioned—as the honourable gentleman will recall, two years ago I openly resisted in this House a suggestion by a former member of the Government of Canada a suggestion to speed up the long lining building programme—but, as I have said, we have cautioned fishermen against going too rapidly into long lining. Some fishermen have heeded our advice but others who have not heeded it have found they have bitten off more than they sought, but others, guided by us, have done all right in long lining. At the moment we are watching the operation of every long liner made available under loan and subsidy plan, and we are making assistance available to fishermen by way of training in navigation and operation of diesel engines and the new kinds of fishing gear. We go beyond that even. We have taken occasion to place fishermen in the

berths on other ships where they could get some training in long lining before they took over their own vessels. Generally we have cautioned fishermen against getting too hastily into long lining where they are not certain of themselves nor of their ability to pay out their vessels, but where they have shown aptitude we have encouraged them with good results. The same is true of Danish Seining.

I could go on taking issue with some other matters raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, but to what useful purpose? I will concede that he has proven to my satisfaction, and I imagine to the satisfaction of the House that he is a master of the fine art of nonsensical reasoning. When he adds two and two the answer is likely to be 3.99 or 4.11 or Nafel should have its stomach kicked. So that we on this side of the House if we are to keep pace with all the nonsensical reasoning of which the honourable gentleman is capable we might well go on to Christmas and then make only a beginning. So for my part I am going to dispose of the Leader of the Opposition for the moment at any rate with this quotation. I would suggest it as required reading for the honourable gentleman whenever again he contemplates a further performance in this House. It is a quotation from a favourite classic of mine—"Alice in Wonderland"—with a change of one word. It goes this way: "You are old Father Malcolm," the young man said, "and your hair is becoming white, and why you consistently stand on your head do you think at your age that is right?"

Mr. Speaker, addressing myself seriously to the matter of the fisheries, in accordance with note taken of it

in the Speech from the Throne, I think I should begin by saying that I think the time has come when I should have a word of my own about the report of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee. One year ago on April 15, I tabled that report in this Chamber without comment. In the meantime there has been some comment though superficial, not understanding what it was all about, not seeing the implications of the recommendations, and not finding it spelled out in the report in a formula whereby the income of fishermen could be raised to ten thousand dollars a year, forthwith the superficial have brushed it aside. Some others have read the document. Their views have been more balanced. Some losing sight of the objects set before the committee have taken it as setting forth something it was not supposed to do. Thus I have seen the committee criticized for not attempting to resolve our marketing difficulties. The reason why the committee did not is obvious, to put it in the language of the nursery—"Nobody asked me, Sir, she said." It is just as well judging the work of any committee to do so in the light of the terms of reference. The terms of reference of the Newfoundland Fishery Development Committee were these: 1. To examine into fishery resources available to the Province of Newfoundland with a view to the full utilization of known resources and the discovery and development of others. 2. To examine into the economics of existing methods of fishing and other methods which may be applicable. 3. Examine into the existing methods of processing and other methods which may be applicable.

These undertakings were for the purpose of recommending increased exploitation of fishery resources through

methods of fishing and processing based upon sound, scientific, economic and social considerations and the purpose of recommending a programme capable of implementation by both Federal and Provincial Governments and those engaged in the fishing industry, and outlining the respective responsibility of each, and their agreed share in carrying out a programme. It will be seen from these terms of reference why this committee did not particularly concern itself with what we should do to sell more quintals of salt cod in Brazil. The committee concerned itself with the problems of marketing only to the extent it bore on the problem which was confined within the terms of reference. The committee defined the problems of the Newfoundland fishery in these terms. The traditional equilibrium of the resources of the industry including the population dependent or involved in the market has broken down as a result of pressure from several directions. The objects of a development programme should be to establish a new equilibrium on the basis of a new, modernized fishing industry utilizing the resources to the best advantage and meeting market requirements to the full extent providing the fishing population with a living conforming to national standards.

The committee then did the next obvious thing and studied the fishery resources available to Newfoundland, including in that phase of its work:

- (1) Naming certain species probably incapable of much greater exploitation.
- (2) On which information was inadequate to determine whether increased exploitation is possible or economically feasible.

(3) Species capable of expanded exploitation.

Convinced that the decision is to the effect, an expansion and development of the fisheries must be based on the expandibility or otherwise of the outlets for the sale of its products, the committee next reviewed the facts. It then turned to a discussion of the methods and facilities necessary for the most efficient utilization of our resources to meet market requirements. The committee then recommended a programme of development.

The committee's report is a formidable document. The only way to appreciate its significance is to read it with discernment. I am convinced that not too many have taken that trouble. All in all it is a remarkable synthesis of the best things that have been done by our fishing industry across the years, with some new things contributed by the committee. I am convinced that its implementation in the spirit, taking it for granted that the letter will have to be drawn as changing circumstances warrant, will go a long way towards the committee bringing about and realizing its object of providing our fishermen with a livelihood conforming to the national standard. The report points to something that is all too often lost sight of in this Province, i.e. that the price of fish is not everything. It is stated that an increase in fishing income to make an appreciable difference in family living can hardly be brought about by a rise in the price that fishermen obtain for their product, because the scope for price rising, although it may be primarily based on market conditions, is too limited. What is required is that increased production per man, which means in turn an adequate marketing

structure to sell the increased production; it means better fishing instruments in the fishermen's hands in the way of improved boats and fishing gear, and it means fishing out of centralized ports, and landing at processing plants capable of handling the increased yield. So that then the key-note and the dominant note of the committee's report is centralization.

The committee recommends centralization of three types. First of all major area developments are recommended here. The development of fishing ports wherein there would be provided all the conveniences of a modern community, out of which fishermen would fish with modern fishing instruments on prolific grounds near such ports, and make their landings to plants therein geared to process their total catch into such products as the varying demands of the market require. It is suggested the areas where such major developments can take place are limited.

There is also recommended by the committee secondary community developments. The committee recognized that there are in this Province some well established ports which are unsuited for modernization along the lines suggested for major development, but where, nevertheless, the fish come in to eat the rocks, and where a considerable number of fishermen live and are going to continue to live long after you and I are dead, development programme or no development programme. The committee suggests for such places medium sized plants to be owned in common by fishermen and operated by an organization of those willing to abandon their own premises and centralize their operation in the new plants. Finally the committee recommends

regional centralization by way of small community developments. The committee recognized that there were many smaller settlements unsuited for large scale development, yet nevertheless likely to retain their fishing population for some time to come. In time it is hoped these will be attracted to areas of larger development. But they are going to cling to their coves next year and the year after and maybe for the next decade. It is suggested that fishermen in such places should be encouraged to centralize their curing on a co-operative basis and acquire premises and equipment as the scale of their enterprise permits. This last is a policy of Mohammed going to the mountain instead of a policy of root, dig, or die. Such a policy no government in Newfoundland with its roots in the people could in justice and charity contemplate.

There are many other recommendations and suggestions in the committee's report, but they all are auxiliary to or in support of achieving the three major ones of concentration just quoted. In the year since this report was tabled in this House the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland have agreed upon certain steps to be taken to provide for the report's implementation. In order not to anticipate a debate which is pending in this Chamber I prefer to leave any discussion of these agreed projects up until such time as the bill to incorporate the fisheries development authority is before us. There is this, however that can be said at this time. It is common knowledge the fisheries development programme for the total rehabilitation of our fishing industry, boiled down to its essentials, is a programme for the production of an increased and increasing volume of fish of higher quality. If a New

Jerusalem in fishery is based upon a greater production per man, all of which means that unless the fishery development programme is underpinned by an adequate marketing system, then it must fail. There is no need for me to add that the marketing system in salt cod that we have had to put up with during the first five years of union was not adequate although that marketing system demonstrated an increasing incapacity to market successfully a production yield that has been diminishing all the years of its existence. Before I have anything further to say about the inadequate marketing structure let me give a special reason why such a structure is necessary. The reason has to do with the pace at which a programme of fishery development can be implemented. There are some eight hundred fishing communities in Newfoundland, but five hundred of them are concentrated on the North East Coast, the area pointed out by the fisheries development committee as the crux of the salt fish problem. Development must necessarily be limited by two things at least, the money and the qualified personnel available. So this year the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland, will undertake development by expansion of their present operations and the building of new plants in a few other places. But by the most optimistic estimate there can be during the next ten years, say, two large scale centralized developments in each year or, it may be twenty in fourteen years. There may be a hundred communities, subsidiary communities to these larger places where development should take place within the next ten or fifteen years. That makes one hundred and twenty places in all.

But what of the people who live



in the other places? It is true that in a number of these smaller places no permanent fishery development can be justified. It is hoped that the people living in these places will in time be attracted to the centres of concentration. I have no doubt that many of them will move in after these communities have been made ready for them. But in the next year and year after and for fifteen years many of those who fish to live, are going to have to live in anticipation of change. The only thing that we can do is to make some minor assistance available to them, but the principal thing we must rely on to tide them over the transition years is the benefits that they may derive from an adequate marketing structure. Now I have my own ideas about what should go into the making of an adequate marketing structure, and I am going to keep them to myself for the time being, at any rate. But there is much that can be said, and it is common knowledge for the modern council of marketing and that is that marketing should begin at the point of operation and follow through to the point of ultimate consumption. Translated into terms of salt codfish, which is our principal concern, the marketing of salt codfish should begin when the fish comes off the boat and should follow the product through until it reaches the table of the person who eats it.

Now there is encouragement for the future in the decision taken at Ottawa recently—that is, the responsibility at government level for the marketing of salt codfish, would be that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That decision means, that the marketing of our salt codfish becomes a problem for the Hon. C. D. Howe which he has to cope with. Now, it is no small matter even for a man of

Mr. Howe's dimensions to have to shoulder the responsibility for the success of Newfoundland's fisheries, the development of the trade and the general welfare of the thousands of our people who are dependent upon salt cod. However, Mr. Howe is not a man to be turned aside by the mere magnitude of a problem. Long before now he has mastered multiple difficulties in marketing in Canada—pulp and paper; minerals; live stock products, etc. Mr. Howe is without doubt the most able man in trade matters in Canada, and possibly in North America, and there are few people who could match his prowess in his own field in any country in the world. I have no doubt that Mr. Howe will do a thoroughly top-level job that must be done and will give our fisheries development programme an adequate marketing system. So I feel that we can with assurance proceed to implement this programme which is geared to greater production per man and inevitably greater total production. As far as the coming season is concerned, I would say that there is no reason why every fisherman everywhere in the Province should not make up his mind to take every last cod out of the water he can take out and make it into a good product. For the coming season, I repeat, I would say there is absolutely no reason in the world why every fisherman everywhere in the Province should not make up his mind to take out of the water every last cod he can take out and he feels he can make into a good product. Even if it means our production goes to a million quintals, what of it? One million quintals of salt cod would only be a drop in the bucket in the total production of Canada and the Honourable Minister of Trade and Commerce

will be able to take our million quintals of cod.

MR. HOLLETT: And throw it away.

MR. KEOUGH: There has always been a sense of impending doom and dire consequences in our fisheries, that year after year will bring its own particular crisis. At long last we are starting upon a broad programme of improvement that will bring new life to the industry and it is our hope that our fishermen may enter into their inheritance of the good and abundant life.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Item No. 5: Moved and seconded that it be read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Section 14 (1) "The Minister may attach to any certificate of greater hardship issued by him under Section 13 a condition that the person in whose favour the certificate is issued shall not sell, lease or otherwise dispose of the dwelling in respect of which the certificate is issued or any part of such dwelling within a period of one year from the date of the issue of the certificate."

I take it that, that takes care of cases where the landlord has difficulty in moving the tenant, but finds when he comes before the Rent Restrictions Board that the Board rules this greater hardship decision and awards the landlord the dwelling for himself and orders the tenant to get out. And that section debars the landlord from disposing of the property for a period of a year even after the tenant is moved. I know this will be discussed in Committee of the Whole, but if that is the intention, it seems

rather odd, that having gotten rid of the troublesome tenant, he should not be allowed to sell for a period of one year.

MR. CURTIS: Even though he gets possession under false pretenses?

MR. HOLLETT: That is another matter. Here is a case of an ordinary citizen. We take John Jones, an honest landlord—he has had a tenant there for years, unable to get him out. Finally, the Rent Restrictions Board decided he should get possession of his property. It seems unfair, if their judgment is correct that greater hardship would be borne by the landlord if not given his property—if the Board is correct; then this Bill says this man has property which he cannot dispose of for a whole year. I may be wrong, but I raise that point now.

MR. CURTIS: I do not wish to enter into the debate, but I think section 13 envisages the landlord getting the tenant out because his own need is greater than that of the tenant. In giving him a certificate of greater hardship, they would be doing it on the basis of his family's condition. The object of this legislation is to be able to say "yes," you can have your house; you are getting it because of your own need; and you have to live in the house a whole year; not to use it as an excuse to get a tenant out and let somebody else go in it." I am presuming the tenant is satisfactory, paying his rent and keeping the property in good condition. It is not a case of getting rid of an undesirable tenant. We have found that there have been conditions where this has been abused; where landlords have gotten the property on the pretext of using it themselves and then let it to someone else.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Speaking from memory—perhaps the Minister of Supply can confirm this—Section 14 (1) has been in effect for the past several months, if not for the past year. Section (2) I have seen certificates issued to which that condition has been attached.

MR. CURTIS: It may not have been legal.

MR. HIGGINS: It has been attached to every certificate issued for some months past.

MR. HEFFERTON: There is not much I can add to the explanation given by the Honourable the Attorney General. There is something in what the member for St. John's East said. A certificate of greater hardship is given a person if he is able to prove to the Rent Control Board that he, as owner, is under greater hardship by not having possession of his house. After the case has been heard and decided upon, a certificate is given whereby the owner can gain possession. To do that there is one condition—during one year the property shall not be rented; it shall be used by the person who gets possession. In the original Act it says the house itself; consequently we have instances during the last year where the owner has gone in and used one or two rooms and sub-let the other part of the house and this Amendment is designed to overcome that.

I move that the Bill be read a second time and be referred to a Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Carried.

12. Second reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): There is just one change to be made which requires this Amendment—6th—"on" to be substituted for "for." The reason for this is obvious. If we think of a licensed area as a checker board, each square representing 40 acres. A strict interpretation of the original would require the license holder to put in 25 days work on every square of the checker board and this might lead to a ridiculous situation. While this does not lessen the financial obligation of the licensee, it does permit him to use time and money in a common sense way.

Carried.

13. Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriage Act."

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): This amendment is designed to permit the issue of a temporary license by Preachers and Teachers of religion.

Moved and seconded that it be read second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House tomorrow.

Carried.

HON. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

Read a first time.

HON. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act."

Read a first time.

HON. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL asked leave to introduce a

Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

Read a first time.

Item No. 7: "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): It has been considered desirable to have Legislation which would enable the Lieutenant Governor in Council to prescribe the amounts of scholarships. I recommend second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like, if possible, to move that it be adjourned.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was part of a question I asked to be deferred. It had regard to Newfoundlanders and Non-Newfoundlanders: what wages did they get—at Brigus—from April 1st. to December 31st. \$373,623.12 was paid of which there was paid to Non-Newfoundlanders \$67,204.38. The Non-Newfoundlanders in question are of course General Manager, Technical staff in the Mill.

I move the House at its rising do stand adjourned until Thursday, April 8th at 3 o'clock.

Moved and seconded that the remaining orders be deferred, and the House stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3 p.m.

Carried.

THURSDAY, April 8, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Communication from the Lieutenant Governor read by the Honourable the Speaker. Dated April 6, 1954.

Government House,  
St. John's,  
Newfoundland.

The Honourable the Speaker  
of the House of Assembly:

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of The Honourable the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable the Attorney General, and the Honourable Minister of Finance as the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland (1952), entitled "An Act Respecting the Internal Economy of the Legislature," as set forth in the Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council dated 6th, day of April, 1954.

(Sgd.) J. CRAWFORD,

Private Secretary to the  
Lieutenant Governor.

April 7, 1954.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motions

None.

#### Notice of Questions

(54). MR. W. J. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Does the agreement with the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. contain any provision for representation

from the Government on the Board of Directors of the said Company?

2. Does the agreement with the said Company give the Government any control over salaries paid to the Managing Director or any others of the staff?

3. What salary is payable to the said Managing Director?

4. Does the said agreement protect the Government investment from liabilities incurred by the Company?

5. Who are the Directors of the said Company?

6. Has the Government received a copy of the Annual Report of the said Company, and if so table a copy of same?

7. What was the value of sales for 1953, and what was the actual cost of goods sold by the Company?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 50 :

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): The answer to that question is being prepared.

Question No. 51 :

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): My Department has directed that question to the Department of Fisheries.

Question No. 52 :

Stand.

Question No. 53 :

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): That is in the course of preparation.

Question No. 49 :

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I said here yesterday when this was called that on the previous night I had been in the office of the Treasury and had asked the comptroller of the

Treasury, Mr. Marshall, to prepare the answer to that question, and he informed me he would do so immediately. I informed the House then that as soon as I received the vouchers and invoices I would table them. When I got back to the Office yesterday, after the House closed, I found the answer to the question.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Premier tell me whether it has been the practice to destroy vouchers and substitute microfilms?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the foggiest idea. If the honourable gentleman will table a question, I will gladly find out. I have an idea that for several years past, the Department has been microfilming documents including vouchers, bills and cancelled cheques and all things of that sort; but whether they have made a practice of destroying cancelled cheques or such documents when they are microfilmed, I have not the foggiest idea. If he likes to give notice of a question, I would be glad to answer it.

I have one or two answers. I table a report of the NALCO Corporation. They had their annual meeting this morning, the Report was submitted and adopted by the directors and shareholders and I have pleasure in tabling it.

Secondly, the Balance Sheet of the Corporation tabled and adopted by the directors and shareholders and I have pleasure in tabling a copy of it as well.

Finally the Report of the Corporation of NALCO. I think that clears up the question about Newfoundland-Labrador Corporation. I forget which honourable gentleman asked the question. I believe it was the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): I beg leave to table reply to No. 27, March 31. And question No. 39 on the Order Paper of April 2.

Question No. 27:

Question: Table a detailed statement showing all Capital Account expenditure made under Subhead 1422 since April 1st, 1953, to date, this statement to include the names of all individuals, firms and companies to whom moneys were paid and the amount paid to each, together with an explanation with some detail as to whom these expenditures were made.

Answer: The following amounts were paid under Subhead 1422 for the period April 1, 1953-54, to the persons or firms indicated:

1. Miss Audry Ralph	\$ 586.67
2. Professor Noel, M.Sc.	1,750.00
3. 369 Job Brothers & Co. Ltd.	877.50
4. 500 Horwood Lumber Co. Ltd.	42.95
5. 394 Crane Limited	422.97
6. 498 Crane Limited	59.95
7. 516 Burry's Shipyard	1,874.04
8. 520 Fishery Products Ltd.	681.15
9. 551 Browns Service Station	433.80
10. 584 Sundry Payments	55.80
11. 557 J. Clouston Ltd.	18.54
12. 558 Job Brothers & Co. Ltd.	166.35
13. 563 E. & S. Barbour	292.06
14. 586 Atlantic Films & Electronics	267.23
15. 421 Mrs. E. Lear	12.88
16. 619 J. Spurrell	36.40
17. 640 Atlantic Films and Electronics	267.23
18. 431 M. Dwyer	4.00
19. 645 Atlantic Films and Electronics	1,235.19
20. 7 Department of Supply	3.00
21. 405 Canadian National Telegraphs	14.04
22. 471 Department of Supply	2.90
23. Transfer from K Account	36.12
24. Department of Supply	8.62
25. Department of Supply	1.20
26. North Eastern Co-operative Fisheries Society Ltd.	22,733.32
27. H. E. Petite Ltd.	2,000.00
28. Fishery Products Ltd.	300,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	350,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	100,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	287,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00



Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00
Fishery Products Ltd.	50,000.00
29. H. E. Petite Limited	13,000.00

The Expenditures, Items 1 and 2, are salaries paid in carrying out research work on salt fish at the Newfoundland Memorial University.

The Expenditures, Items 3 to 25, were made to assist improved shore facilities to fishermen and the acquisition of improved fishing gear and equipment including cost of installation.

The expenditure, Item 26, to be answered in reply to Question 47 on the Order Paper of April 6.

Expenditures 27 and 29 enable a consolidation and improvement of the facilities to more adequately serve the fishermen of the area.

Expenditure, Item 28, payment under loan covered by agreements for fisheries development.

Question No. 39:

Question (1): What is the exact financial relationship now existing between the Government and the Bonavista Cold Storage Company, Limited?

Answer: This information will be provided when an amendment to the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1951 is presented to the House during this session.

Question (2): Is Mr. Dunstan still an associate of Mr. H. A. Russell on the Board of Directors of the said Bonavista Cold Storage Company Ltd.?

Answer: No.

Question (3): How much money has been loaned by the Government to the Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd. and/or to H. A. Russell and Associates of Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.?

Answer: The information regarding Bonavista Cold Storage Company, Ltd. will be provided when an amendment to the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1951, is presented to the House during this session.

An advance by Government of \$40,500 to Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils

Limited was made under authority of the Loan and Guarantee Statutes (Amendment) Act, 1953, the Act No. 60 of 1953. This is the Company of which H. A. Russell and Associates were incorporators.

Question (4): Is Mr. Dunstan still an Associate of Mr. H. A. Russell and the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd. in connection with the Government's Agreement with the said Company under date June 2, 1952?

Answer: No.

Question (5): What is the exact financial relationship now existing between the Government and the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Limited?

Answer: An advance of \$40,500 was made to Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Limited under authority of the Loan and Guarantee Statutes (Amendment) Act, 1953, the Act No. 60 of 1953.

Question (6): Table copy of Mortgages securing repayment of loans made by the Government to both these two Companies.

Answer: Mortgages on all property in course of preparation. Covenants

of the agreement establishes protection pending execution of mortgage.

Question (7): Who is the Government nominated Director on the Board of Directors of (a) Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd.? (b) Bonavista Cold Storage Ltd.?

Answer: (a) Hon. W. J. Keough. (b) Under an agreement entered into August 1, 1953, provision is made for the appointment of a Government representative on the Board. This will be done at the Company's annual meeting.

Question (8) What amounts have been paid out in Directors' Fees to each Director on the Board of Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils Ltd. in each and every year since June 2, 1952?

Answer: Question is not properly directed. But, in fact, no Directors' fees have been paid.

Question (9): What is the relationship between Mr. H. Dunstan of Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils and Bonavista Cold Storage, and Mr. Dunstan of the recently established Fishery Authority?

Answer: Mr. Dunstan has severed his connection with these Companies.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is, I think, something with which every informed member of the House and the public will agree, if I say that the greatness of the British system of Government, that the people in the nation or state or province where that system remains are confronted with at least two different policies or programmes to choose between. These policies or programmes are, of course, advocated by the two political parties, if there

are more than two political parties, there are more programmes or philosophies—one for each party. And so when you have two political parties, you have or you should have, two different programmes or philosophies between which the people can make their choice. The parties, of course, seize upon every chance to explain their policy or programme or philosophy and to advocate it and to ask the people to put them in power, in office, so that they can carry out their policy. Now, each party not only advocates its own policy, but condemns the other party's policy and argues against it, and tries to show that its own policy is better for the country, the State or the Province. That is the policy or programme or philosophy of the other party or parties; and the people choose the party with the policy and the men they think will do most for the country, State or Province. That, I say, is the greatness of the British system of government—that the people shall have a choice of political parties advocating different programmes or philosophies. Now, I have listened carefully to hear from the Leader of the Opposition in this debate some hint, some suggestion, some inkling of what his Party stands for; of what he would do if he had the Government. Now, we in this party have a policy on Fisheries Development. What policy have they? We have a policy in this party on Mineral Development. What policy have they? I have listened in vain, I think this House has listened in vain; I think Newfoundland has listened in vain for the slightest sign or hint of what the Opposition stands for. I have heard them condemn our policies right, left and centre. They are against the Government. Of that there is no doubt whatsoever. They have made

that very clear. They do not like us and they do not like our policy. But what do they stand for themselves? What do they advocate? What would they do if they had the administration of the government? They would like to have our jobs. They would like to have the government. But up to this very minute, they have given the people not the slightest idea of what they stand for. All that they have told the people is what they stand against. They stand against the present Government.

Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in constitutional usage, and in common sense, it is the Opposition's duty to make its policies known—if it has policies. What is the Opposition's policy on the development of fisheries? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of our agriculture? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of mines? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of Water Power? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of Industrial Plants or establishments? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of Education? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of Public Health? What is the Opposition's policy on Public Housing? What is the Opposition's policy on the development of Municipal or other local government? What is the Opposition's policy on the Liquor problem? What is the Opposition's policy on Provincial taxation? They have not told us. They have not told the people. They have given us no hint whatsoever of their policy in these matters. They have not told this House. They have not told the people. Even in the last General Election they failed to tell us. They have no Manifesto or declaration of policy.

Now, they must be careful not to drive us to the conclusion that they are just a little gang of disgruntled fellows who are "agin the Government." They do not sound like a political party. Really they should try and grow up. They must try and reach political adolescence, if not full manhood. Up to now, since Confederation, the people have had no choices—there have not been two political programmes or policies to choose between—there have been only one—the Liberal. The Tories tell us they are against the Liberal Programme; but they do not tell anybody what their own programme is.

I remember when the Referendum Campaign was on, the same people, the same Tories kept telling us that they were not against Confederation with Canada, but only against the way it was being done. Now, today, they tell us they are not against Economic Development, but only against the way it is being done. They are not against the development of minerals, or forests, or fisheries; but only against the way this Government is doing it. And all this time, never as much as a hint of what they would do or how they would do it. Now, how long, Mr. Speaker, is it practically possible for a little group of men to stay in this House with no policy of their own beyond that of criticizing the elected Government of this Province and criticizing everything we do, everything we say, everything we advocate. How long will they get away with that, politically speaking, in this Province? Are they a Political Party? Who is their Leader? We know who their Leader was yesterday. That is about as far as we can go. They have had a long succession of leaders in the last five years.

Now, during those last five years the Opposition have been criticizing the Liberal Government. If you can believe the Opposition, this Government has done nothing right, nothing good, nothing. If you believe them, this Government has accomplished nothing that is any good for the people. This Government has had no successes but only a long and dismal succession of failures. That is their story. If the Opposition are right then the only progress this Government has made is progress towards disaster and ruin. Their five years on that side of the House have been five years of endless criticism, of picking holes in the Government, and of complete failure to put forward any constructive ideas or proposals of their own. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition Party now has five members with seats in this House. In addition to these five one of their elected members passed to his eternal reward, two others retired from this House and one dropped out to contest a federal seat. That means the Tory Party has had nine different members elected to this House since Confederation. Nine members elected in the two general elections and two by-elections. All the Tories elected to this House since Confederation have been anti-confederates without exception, all nine of them. When you remember that without a single exception they have all uttered their sneers against Confederation you may be justified in concluding that the only policy they have, the only thing they have in common beyond being men, beyond being Newfoundlanders, beyond being Christians and all these ordinary things that all humanity has in common, the only thing they have in common is that they all fought against Confederation, that they are all still against Confederation, that they all will be forever against

Confederation. That is all they have in common. That is what makes them a political party.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier how he knows that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In exactly the same way as everyone in the House and everybody in Newfoundland knows it, and the same way as the honourable gentlemen know it themselves. They can't hide the bitterness. It seeps out even when they don't want it to. They can't hide it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat amused to see the birth and growth of two pieces of mythology in those past five years. Now I am old enough to remember the myth that was believed by Sir Ralph Williams just after he retired as Governor of Newfoundland. I believe that just before he left Newfoundland I, as a small boy was honorary ADC to that Governor for a day when he visited the CLB of which I was a member at that time. The myth that grew up about Sir Ralph Williams was that he had said on going through the Narrows on his way back to England, having served his term as Governor, that the Newfoundlanders are dirtier than the Boers. The Boers and we had been fighting just a few years before, so around that time the word "Boer" meant about the same thing as "Russian," "Reds," or "Communists" means today. It was pure myth—pure myth. Now there are two new myths concerning the present Government. One is that we have used our big majority in this House to crush and throttle the little Opposition, sitting on them, gagging them, slugging them and silencing them. That is one myth. There is not a single bit of truth in this story, not a scrap

of justification for it. If we have beaten them we have beaten them in fair debate on the hustings and on the floors of this House. If we are better than they it is because we are better debaters, we know more, we are better informed, we work harder, and if we are the majority it is because we deserve to be the majority. We did not get our majority by coup d'etat, by violence. For the past five years we on this side of the House have gone far out of our way to give the Opposition every conceivable opportunity in this House, when they were not ready to proceed with a debate we postponed the debate; when a debate had started and they were not ready to carry on we fell in line. For five years we have virtually let them call the tune in these matters. It is common knowledge, everybody knows that inside this House. The thanks we get is to have this myth grow up of the brutal Government throttling and sitting on and stifling and choking almost of the gallant little band of the opposition.

The other myth is that we have refused information to the Opposition. Not that we have refused it once or twice but frequently, consistently, not information that should not be tabled, but information that we had in our custody. That is the second myth. Now, Mr. Speaker, from the time this Government came into power up until yesterday and including yesterday the Opposition have asked in this House 1,567 questions, including those on yesterday's order paper and from the first day this House opened after Confederation. They could have asked more if they had wanted to. That of course, is understood, but that they do not ask twice as many is their business not ours. But the number they did ask was 1,567, and we

have refused to answer less than twenty of them. Less than twenty out of 1,567. This Government, this high-handed, this tyrannical Government, this Government that flouts democracy, this Government that has defied this gallant little band of patriots who are defending the people from this band of dictators—my honourable friend should do some night work. Is that an unusual proportion of refusals, is it many? But why did we refuse to answer even these few questions? We had good reasons, good parliamentary reasons, reasons that were good in equity. Well about one-third of these questions we refused to answer were questions that never should have been addressed to us at all in the first place but should have been addressed to the Government of Canada, and we are not the Government of Canada. About another third of these questions we refused to answer were questions that asked us to give certain records that we felt we could not give, one of these was the IBEC Report, which however we offered to allow the Opposition to have privately. We were not willing to make the report public, and the Opposition knows why. They know why just as well as I do, but they have never told it. Well I give them credit for that, for not telling the reason why we could not and would not table the IBEC Report. Now, I can give the reason. There is no danger in giving it: Up until some months back this Government was actively canvassing the possibilities of getting built another paper mill in this province. One of the principal motives we had when we brought Mr. Nelson Rockefeller's organization in here was to have a survey made on the practical possibility, the financial practicability of a third paper mill for this province. The report, as

those members of the Opposition who have read it know was adverse to the possibility, to the practicability of a third paper mill at this time or around this time but not forever. I said it was not in the public interest to publish this document. Now, when I said that I took the responsibility for it, I had no choice, I had to take the responsibility for that statement. I took that responsibility. The responsibility I took was that we refused information to the Opposition and through the Opposition to the people. We refused it, and I took the responsibility of doing that in the interest of the people of Newfoundland to whom I was refusing the information. There must come times, obviously—is there anything more obvious than the fact that there must come times when a Government, if it has any regard at all for the public interest, in the interest of the public must refuse information when the revelation of it would injure the public interest? So that a Government on occasions must take the responsibility to refuse to give the information. I say, about a third of the questions we refused to answer were questions that asked us to table that kind of information, the tabling of which would have resulted in definite damage to the public interest. Should we release it when we knew that to do so would damage the public interest, just because the Opposition wanted it? Should we?

Now, the remaining third were questions that asked us to release information about the private business of companies for no better reason than that we had loaned some public money to them. It appears to be the belief of the Opposition that once the Government lends money to a private company then the Opposition has the right to ask and to expect that we will

answer questions bearing on the private affairs of such a private company. Extraordinary as it is there appears to be that belief. I doubt that it exists in the mind of the latest member of that party. He has, after all, just come from Ottawa where he spent four or five years in that great parliament. He must have learned something. No doubt he is busily passing on what he has learned to his new colleagues, who doubtlessly are delighted to be taught by him and be guided by him and led by him normally. They desire, it appears, to be led less by the honourable gentleman who sits to the immediate left of that honourable gentleman to whom I have just referred. I doubt if he holds to the view that because a government has lent funds to a private company to enable them to expand that they have a right then to all kinds of private information which would be openly tabled in the House. I doubt that he shares that view.

Now, this Government has lent many millions of dollars, public money, to business concerns in Newfoundland. The Commission of Government before us lent other millions also to companies in Newfoundland. Public moneys have been lent to Andrews Labrador Fisheries, Olsens Whaling and Sealing, Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils, Northeastern Fisheries, Arctic Fisheries, Northlantic Fisheries, Bonavista Cold Storage, Hollett & Sons, Gaultois Fisheries, Fishery Products Limited, Dunphy Limited, and at least twenty other companies. There are about fifty private companies in Newfoundland at this moment to whom public moneys have been lent from the Treasury by this Government to enable them to expand their operations, to enable them greatly to expand their operations,



Just because public moneys have been lent to those companies the Opposition demands any information they may happen to want about these companies, their balance sheets, what their raw materials cost—for instance, I think my honourable friend the recently elected member for St. John's West gave notice today of a question to be asked on tomorrow concerning some private company, what this cost and what that cost, and what were their expenses in this and what were their expenses in that. Does he seriously expect me to answer that question?

MR. BROWNE: Are we dealing with questions now, Mr. Speaker, or is this the Speech from the Throne?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not expect my honourable and learned friend to answer me at the moment as it was rather a rhetorical question not demanding an answer.

Are we supposed to table in this House those companies' cost of production, their profits and all the other secret and confidential private details of their affairs merely because we have lent them public moneys? Is that the policy, the philosophy of the Tory Party, the party of private enterprise, as we see it in this Province? I say, no. We have refused to table this information about private companies, and shall continue to refuse it. We are right to refuse it and the Opposition are wrong to ask for it—we are right and they are wrong. Now, that is our job. That is the way we feel about it. All the members of this Government and our sponsors on this side of the House feel that way about it. We take that responsibility although nobody else may like it. The test will come when the next election is held. We are prepared to stand or fall on that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I draw the Premier's attention to the fact that he is a director of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited and Premier of this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so, and has no connection whatever, not the slightest—I am also a man five feet four, weight 145, but what has that got to do with it?

MR. BROWNE: I am not interested in your weight.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has just as much bearing.

MR. BROWNE: How much money have you got in the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a fair question that has been asked and answered. If you want to know private details—but the answer to that question is that we have nothing, never had a cent. If my honourable friend is asking about the building and machinery on the land, a piece of physical property, we own it all there, that is the public of Newfoundland owns it all. But it has been leased for fifteen years to a private company in which I represent the Government, but I own no shares, not one. I am merely there as a representative of the Treasury. That is all. I am not part of the company. I don't own a share in it. It is a purely private company.

Mr. Speaker, we as a Government are most anxious for individual fishermen, for private fishermen companies, for groups of fishermen or for groups of private fishing companies to come to us to ask for loans to enable them to establish or expand projects for fishery development. And when money is lent them we shall continue to refuse to disclose the

private and confidential details of their business on the floor or the table of this House.

One final word about the Opposition's questions: Members of the Opposition are expected to know how to word their own questions. It is not the Government's fault if questions are wrongly worded. Surely we are not expected to teach the Opposition how to perform their duties.

Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in his speech of four or more than four hours and taking part of each of two days in this House dealt with a very considerable variety of subjects of which this one was somewhat typical; He said that this Government during the financial year just past, the financial year that came to an end at midnight on the 31st of March, a few days ago, in that twelve months that this Government had borrowed an amount of over two million dollars. Some of this, as he pointed out, was borrowed from the bank and some was borrowed from the Fisheries Loan Board, our own Fisheries Loan Board, and some from other sources, totalling something over two million dollars. Now, I am speaking figuratively when I say the Leader of the Opposition said that with his eyes round with astonishment, and I detected a note of genuine shock in his voice.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this stuff is meant to impress yokels, well and good, it was good enough for that, otherwise it was pretty poor stuff. Now, if I had been a newspaper reporter representing a newspaper or a radio station when my honourable friend drew attention to that couple of million dollars this Government borrowed in this past financial year, if my instructions were specifically to

report everything that was said in the afternoon, for my paper next day or my radio station that night, I would obey such specific instructions, but not if I had freedom of selectivity of reporting in this House. A quarter of a century ago or longer than I like to think of when my honourable friend the present newly elected member for St. John's West occupied a seat in this House, I happened to be a reporter myself, and knowing at least a little about public affairs my reaction when the honourable gentleman talked about that would have been: "Good Heavens! what is next? What is he going to talk about next? Does he think we are ignor-amuses? Does he think we are fools?" Now, on the other hand, if he had said, well that is smart, that is clever stuff, that is going to impress the yokel, that reference to a couple of millions borrowed during the year and, I would either conclude he did not know what he was talking about himself or that he now was just trying to fool the yokel. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little difficult to believe that the honourable gentleman does not know that every year since this Government has been in power without exception, whether we had a surplus running between five or six million dollars by the time the year was over, even in such a year we borrowed one, two or three million dollars during the year, every year since we have been in power. Every year the Commission of Government were in power they did the same thing. Every year the Government of the United States or of the United Kingdom have done the same thing, and do the same thing, and will continue to do the same thing. Every year the Government of Canada has been in power, for at least a century, or at least a half

century, they have done and will continue to do the same thing. It is a perfectly normal thing, a perfectly normal thing, a perfectly conservative, perfectly natural thing, perfectly traditional thing to do. It is not worth mentioning. Why? I will tell you why: This House of Assembly passes and passed last year that certain basic taxation shall be imposed on the people and the Government says, all right, if that is the law we will try to collect the taxes. In the course of the year they run to some many millions of dollars. This House of Assembly also orders that during the year coming so much money shall be spent. The Government says, okay we will spend it. So that we have two jobs for the twelve months, (1) to spend the money that the House has authorized us to spend; and (2) to collect the Taxes that this House authorizes us to collect. But, does the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition seriously think that the Government takes in the same amount of revenue which it spends? Or that it takes in as much as it spends? He knows it is not so. Why? Because over half the revenue of this Government comes from Ottawa (it has gone as high as 65%); and that comes into us in four amounts—every quarter, a quarter comes in and it comes in in arrears not in advance. So that we always spend, every year, inevitably we will have spent more than we have taken in that year. It is coming in a little later. We have our Payroll coming in every fortnight—3,400 civil servants. The Government does not go to them and say "We know we owe you wages; but you have to wait. The revenue is slow coming in." We give them their cheques. Same thing with the School Teachers. Same thing with the Tradesmen's Accounts. How much do we

buy? Several million dollars worth from every shop in St. John's; from every factory. We say, "Ship to the General Hospital; the Mental Hospital; the Sanatorium; the Cottage Hospitals; send in your bill and you get your money." We do not say to the businessmen or the factory owners or jobbers "sorry, but the money is slow coming in; we are a little short of cash; you have to wait a couple of weeks until the revenue comes in." My honourable friend thought I spoke figuratively when I said we were short of cash. They thought we were broke, on the verge of bankruptcy. He spoke as if he were trying to get that inference through. What does the Government do? What would anybody do? It makes temporary borrowing from various sources—loans or treasury notes or an overdraft. When drawing to their attention that the Government of Newfoundland does this, does he imagine the yokels might be surprised and even imagine that the end is close at hand? Of course I do not suggest that the Leader of the Opposition dwell on this simple and ordinary matter in an effort to create the impression of insolvency on the part of the Government. I do not suggest anything of the sort. But I am curious to know just why he did it. One thing he has done is he has forced me to explain things that did not need to be explained. He forced me to do that. That may be smart, deep and subtle. I am not subtle. I do not understand politics. He has some deep, diabolical plot. I am stupid. It passes over my head. I can imagine the consternation down in the bottom of White Bay when it is broadcast that the Leader of the Opposition said, "The Government borrowed two million dollars this past year." I can imagine the Leader of

the Opposition saying "Ha, ha, that is good for another dozen votes for you."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Government felt very proud and I certainly felt very proud that in the British Newfoundland Corporation we had brought great and famous corporations and banks of Great Britain together. We had brought them together. They had not been brought together until we brought them together in the new Company known as the British Newfoundland Corporation; a new Company formed at our suggestion in Great Britain—twenty of the greatest and mightiest of all the great Corporations of the United Kingdom—the mother country—at our instigation—twenty of these vast concerns banded themselves together to form the new entity—BRINCO—brought together for the purpose of making a great effort to survey and explore the natural resources of this Province—we felt proud of that—I personally was deeply proud of that—we had felt that this was one of our great accomplishments as a Government since Confederation—one of our greatest accomplishments—but the Leader of the Opposition has managed to make "BRINCO" sound like a dirty word, spoken in toilets—a word scrawled by small boys in coloured chalk on the back fence—a dirty word—BRINCO. "Bunko" one of the honourable gentlemen called it. That is shrewd politics—that is clever. That is smart. The Leader of the Opposition manages somehow to make this great BRINCO project sound like a piece of shameful treachery to Newfoundland. Twenty of the mightiest and most reputable concerns of the Mother Country accepted my challenge to explore any riches they might find and the Leader of the Opposition

makes it sound like a pack of vultures descending upon us. I succeeded in interesting Sir Winston Churchill himself in this plan to band together some of Britain's industrial and financial giants and giving them the task of the vast exploring programme in this Province—the Attorney General was with me when Mr. Churchill described it as "a great Imperial concept" and which one of the Leader's colleagues calls "bunko." The Leader of the Opposition himself makes it sound like a dirty word. "You pay your money and you take your choice."

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Might I interrupt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sure. Put your foot in further. I am glad.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the honourable gentleman tell us how I make it sound like a dirty word or how I make them sound like a pack of vultures? Personally, I have never seen a vulture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He never knows when to leave well enough alone. His colleague from St. John's West is shivering at his leader's naïvete and lack of subtlety. The Chairman of the Board of the Bank of Montreal; the Chairman of the Board of Directors is the President of BRINCO. The great A.N.D. Co. and the great firm of Bowaters and the old House of Bowrings have joined together with the House of Rothschilds and they have revived the century-old practice of daily setting the price of gold. Did you read where that was restored a week ago? BRINCO! Dirty word! The Prudential Insurance Companies, the English Electric Company and a dozen other firms whose names are known around the world—these have joined

together to give parts of Newfoundland and Labrador the greatest scouring for natural resources that we have ever witnessed in Newfoundland. This does not cost the Newfoundland Treasury one single cent. In addition to the taxes which the Treasury will get from any development that takes place, we shall also get a share of the profits on such development. There is not another Province in Canada that can say that. That is a new pattern established by this simple, stupid Government. We have set a new pattern for all the other Provinces of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the whole of the day. I should like to speak a while and continue my remarks tomorrow, so that we can get through some of the business on the Order Paper today; but I do want to deal with a point made by the Leader of the Opposition and my honourable friend will notice the great courtesy I showed him in referring to the points or alleged points which he made. I can do no greater courtesy to him than that. Virtually all my remarks dealt with his momentous speech. One neophyte writer, who incidentally describes himself as a veteran parliamentary reporter with  $1\frac{1}{2}$  years experience—the same veteran reporter described the speech of the Leader of the Opposition—I do not remember the exact terms, but the impression I got was that a milestone had been established in this House—a great new record, or something close to it. That was funny to me who sat here and heard men speak for five days—I heard one man speak for six hours—but this literary giant, the great journalistic effort, a towering effort of a great orator. The Opposition members all spoke in this debate—one spoke on the Amend-

ment. I am so happy to see my friend from Bell Island back, by the way; he is no more a Tory than I am. He is a Liberal. The honourable gentleman is mismated. I am so happy to see him back in this Chamber. He would not hurt a fly.

MR. D. I. JACKMAN: How do you know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know. He sat here beside me in the National Convention. He would not hurt a fly and if there is a fly he would hurt, I am not that fly. They spoke altogether for six hours—work it out yourself, the proportion. The Leader of the Opposition spoke in all for eleven minutes—and half of that was about a Flying Dutchman that did not exist.

MR. BROWNE: You yourself have not talked much about the fisheries so far.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are going to hear lots about it. I am just introducing myself to the subject. In the course of the eleven minutes which he talked and dismissed the subject of the fisheries, he made some remark that this Government had done nothing for the fisheries. Something to that effect. I did not take down what he said, but that is what he meant. That this Government had done nothing for the fisheries—or virtually nothing.

MR. HOLLETT: You helped them haul up their boats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend will do me the honour to listen, I shall proceed to educate him in this matter. This Government in its five years have made loans to fishery concerns numbering thirteen. And before my honourable friend hastens to call that an unlucky

number, let me hasten to tell him that we loaned some six million dollars to these thirteen concerns. I have made extensive notes on this. I have seven or eight copies which I will distribute afterwards. I shall not attempt to give the House an outline of what has been accomplished from the time we took office—I shall not deal with any part beyond the year 1953. I will take just one year. In 1953, these thirteen plants to whom we loaned the six million dollars, employed ashore 3,178 people—some all the year; the rest throughout the fishing season. These 3,178 workers were paid in wages—\$3,575,666.00 —  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million dollars. These thirteen plants, in addition to that, bought fish from 2,900 inshore fishermen and paid them \$1,374,600.00. In addition to that, they bought fish from 439 dragger fishermen; to whom they paid \$1,253,738.00 or  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million dollars. All of this, as I said, was over and above the large quantities of blueberries, salmon, lobster and smelt which a number of these plants bought. In addition to those thirteen plants to whom we made loans or financial guarantees, other new fish plants will be brought into production this year or early next year—one or two will not get into production. These plants will be located at Grand Bank, Long Harbour, Trepassey, Holyrood, Bay de Verde, Greenspond, Change Islands, Joe Batts Arm and Twillingate. These loans will amount to well over a million dollars and these new plants are expected to employ 750 more plant workers who will receive at least another million dollars a year. These new plants will serve 1,200 inshore fishermen who will receive at least a million dollars a year. That is not all. This year, under the Fisheries Development Programme, there will be constructed

new fish plants at Quirpon, LaScie, Seldom Come By, Valleyfield and Merasheen. These plants will employ 200 plant workers who will receive another \$200,000 a year in wages. These new plants being devoted to salt fish products, will serve another 1,900 inshore fishermen who will receive  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million dollars for their fish. Recapitulating, that means 4,128 inshore workers were employed.

Here, the Government in casual debate mentions Government plans in effect and about to go into effect which will have the effect of giving employment to 4,128 workers, but there will be no great headlines on that. So we grow. So Newfoundland advances. Modern streamlined fishing plants—4,128 workers receiving in wages annually \$4,775,666, and the inshore fishermen serving in these plants—6,000 in number, receiving for their fish at least \$3,624,000; and dragger fishermen—500—receiving for their fish \$1,436,000. Total people 10,128; total dollars \$9,837,000.00. Is there any need to say that it has required, and will require, far more than our loans and financial guarantees to produce these very encouraging results? It is really the toil of the fishermen both inshore and deep sea and that of the shore workers that has made these results possible. It is their toil and the progress and drive of the progressive fish firms that borrowed the money from us. Our loans and financial guarantees have been the lubricant, the cement, the generator that made the toil and skill bear fruit. But let it not be forgotten that in these past five years, quite apart from the vast amount of basic work we have done by way of experimental fishing, by way of exploratory fishing, by way of research and investigations, over and above all



that—and that has run into many hundreds of thousands of dollars—over and above all that, but with very little being said, and little by the Opposition and that to condemn, quite above and apart from all that, this Government have laid out six millions and are about to lay out five millions more, all you might say within the first five years, producing or helping to produce the results I have named, yet this Government has done nothing for the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, if we had a great brass plaque the height of Your Honour's Chair, that beautiful chair that was presented to this House by one of our sister provinces in that great family of provinces, the great Province of Ontario, were placed on one of these walls and on it were carved the names of the fishing places in Newfoundland in which fishery development has taken place thanks to the support of this Government, it would make a role of honour: Quirpon, St. Anthony, Englee, LaScie, Nippers Harbour, Twillingate, Change Islands, Joe Batts Arm, Seldom Come By, Greenspond, Badgers Quay, Valleyfield, Bonavista, Dildo, Bay de Verde, Bay Roberts, Fermeuse, Trepassy, Long Harbour, Merasheen, Burin, Grand Bank, Gaultois, Ramea, Fortune. No, I don't think I can claim that until they get their druggers out, but for what we lent them then we can claim a little credit from Fortune.

I notice in the Chamber at this moment a gentleman who has just arrived from New York. That gentleman has been kind enough, that gentleman has instigated and launched it, but is kind enough to say he received his inspiration from his association with me. I disown that, I don't deserve the credit. I will take

the credit due me, every last ounce of it, but not the credit not due me.

Mr. Speaker, I must now turn away for a moment from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and give a little attention to his new, can I say, supporter, dare I say, follower, I will compromise and say, colleague, because I frankly don't know who is leader and who is follower, who follows and who leads. But that will straighten itself out, I have no doubt. My honourable friends opposite will sometime make up their minds as to who is leader and who is follower. The only thing is, I think, they will probably have to compromise in that matter and decide who is leader—I don't think any of them is willing to be leader—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would show a little discretion. This is highly provocative and highly unnecessary and it seems to be for the purpose of amusing the spectators.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is speaking of provocative remarks. Were I not a man of monumental patience some of the remarks emanating from the other side during this debate would be regarded as somewhat tending in the direction of provocation. I know actually my honourable and learned friend is purring inside at these references to the leadership of the party—well I will say no more—he loves it really—now we looked forward eagerly to his speech in this House. It seemed to most of us that he certainly missed the chance to be big and magnanimous. It seemed that he had waited a full five years for the chance to make that speech so that he could tell Smallwood what he thought of him, and all the cold hash of Confederation he raked

over and over. With the opportunity to be big he talked about the Icelandic Boats. We had hoped that he would be constructive and forward looking, and he rehashed the IBEC Report and other dull topics that had been worn threadbare by the Opposition for the past five years.

He told the House that I had appointed some of my friends to be members of the Board of Liquor Control. That is the way he put it: "The Premier appointed some of his friends to be members of the Board of Liquor Control." And he went on to make out this was just a waste of money. What was the good of it? What was wrong with the way the old Board of Liquor Control was run under the Commission of Government? Does not the honourable gentleman know the answer to that question? He was on the Bench and he ought to have known, he had lots of opportunity to know. Let me remind him, if he does not remember, let me refresh his memory as to what was wrong with it, with the way things were run under the old board and under the Commission of Government: Here is what was wrong—you did not have a place in the City of St. John's, not one, with no exception to that statement, where any civilized, decent, self-respecting human could go in for a bottle of beer or a glass of whisky or whatever he liked to drink, not one. The places you had were the worst dives, not of St. John's, not of Newfoundland, no not of Canada, but the worst dives of North America. They were the worst dives where the most disreputable characters only went. And if a decent man wanted to have a drink disrepute might attach to him if he went in or were seen going in. He had to sneak in through the back

door and out the same way. Wretched, disreputable dives—everybody knows that. Am I inventing that? It is as well to say I invented dives. There they were, filthy, unfit for habitation, for human use. That is what we had under the system my honourable friend seems to admire so much. He does not appear to remember that because he asked what was wrong with the way the Board was run under the Commission of Government. That is what was wrong. We have cleaned up that mess, and today—oh I am not going to say it is perfect—far from it, we have our inspectors—

MR. BROWNE: You made another mess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. We have our inspectors, and they go about. If they catch them, but they don't always catch them, but when they do they close them up. There is no favouritism whatsoever shown. I hope in so far as my words may now reach the public of Newfoundland that the public will understand this: I would ask nothing better than that any member of the public would complain instantly to any member of the Government especially to me, drawing attention to any breach of the rules we have in force. We have these inspectors and these places today are decent, respectable, civilized, clean. Now of course there are two ways to look at this thing.

You can bring to it this approach: You can say, there is nothing unlawful about drinking beer, you don't break the law when you drink beer unless it is below certain averages. It is lawful to drink beer. The Legislature of Newfoundland has not passed any legislation making it unlawful to drink beer unless it is below a certain average. The Parliament of Canada

has not enacted any legislation making it unlawful to drink beer. So that it is lawful, and if it is lawful to drink beer, and if it is lawful to make it, and if it is lawful to sell it, if these things are lawful and not unlawful, then surely it is common sense, just plain common sense to have the Government insist in its regulations on having the beer made under decent, clean conditions, of having been sold under decent, clean conditions, surely that is common sense.

Now, the other way to look at it is this—incidentally there is a third thing I might have said; that is, it is common sense for the Government to make all it can out of the sale of it—now the other way to look at it is this, to make it unlawful to make beer, to pass laws against it—thou shalt not make beer. To make laws against the sale of it—thou shalt not sell beer. To make laws against the consumption of it. Thou shalt not consume beer. We can do one or the other. We can make it lawful or unlawful. What we have done is to make it lawful, perfectly lawful. Now, I know that there is a certain school of thought which goes a little foggy, a little woolly, a little lacking in perspective, a little out of focus like a snap shot taken by a camera not in the right focus, foggy, a type of thinking that will say to you: "Well I know it is lawful, it is a pity, I know." But when you ask, "would you make it unlawful?" would answer; "Well no, you could not very well make it unlawful because if you made it a law you must not make, sell or consume liquor that law would be broken, it would be disregarded, so I suppose you cannot make it unlawful." But they hate to see it made lawful and somehow they see it dis-

reputable, like to think the places where it is sold are dives, hate to see it become respectable. There is that viewpoint—I hate to see it become respectable—there are people who have that reaction. Now, that is not logical. They won't say, make it unlawful, have prohibition and at the expense of the Treasury enforce that law. Let us appoint half the people to watch the other half and more from another country to watch the half watching the first half—let us enforce that though the Heavens fall—outright and absolute prohibition. Very few people take that stand. So that the only other stand you can take is to make it lawful, and having made it lawful regulate it.

As I see it there are two possibilities, two policies for the liquor question—make it unlawful, do away with it, prohibition. In other words it is not allowed to be made, not allowed to be sold, not allowed to be consumed. The other policy is to throw it wide open, let anyone who wants to make it, when he wants to make it, where he wants to make it with no restrictions on him, no regulations on him. Let anyone who wants to sell it, where he wants to, when he wants to and at any price he wants to, under any conditions that please him, and let anyone who likes drink it, any age, any sex, under any conditions. Throw the whole thing wide open. That is the other solution. The Opposition has not told us which of these they favour. Do they favour shutting right down on it, having prohibition? They don't tell us. Do they favour throwing it wide open, the sky the limit? They don't tell us. Those are the two possibilities, either accept or reject them.

But our policy in this Government is to reject both these two extremes

for there is one in the middle—allow it to be sold, allow it to be made, allow it to be consumed, but under regulated conditions, and we will make the regulations. We have done so. We are proud of that policy. When my honourable and learned friend exclaimed with horror, I asked myself, did he really express genuine indignation and shock? In my honourable friend's comments he referred to Mr. Al Vardy as having taken part in the last Federal General Election, and my honourable friend nods and agrees I was right in inferring that my honourable and learned friend did so with indignation and shock.

MR. BROWNE: An official of the House of Assembly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the moment he referred to Mr. Vardy, my honourable friend nods and agrees my inference was right when I say he was shocked and indignant by the fact that Mr. Vardy took part in the Federal Election. Well, I can understand the honourable gentleman's shock, I can understand his indignation, whether I agree or not I can understand his shock and indignation. Perhaps my honourable and learned friend will now a little more readily understand the shock that I felt and others with me felt when we saw a man step down off the Bench in the Courts of Justice, when we saw a man here in St. John's step down off the Bench in a Court of Justice, lay his gown temporarily aside in a great political campaign that was going on at the time, and actively and personally and aggressively campaign on that occasion. Perhaps now my honourable friend may appreciate, may have some little understanding of the shock some of us felt when that civil servant, that established and pensionable civil servant, that very high

civil servant, a judge on the bench, stepped down off the bench, not having resigned, but still holding his position, with his gown flapping between his knees as he engaged aggressively and energetically in a campaign. Perhaps now, in his experience of last fall, he may appreciate just a little the shock of what we felt when we saw that judge do that very thing, and saw that judge describe Confederation as Communism, and said to many—

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is stating something that is not true. The only aggressive thing that I can be credited with having done in that campaign was—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman is not now stating a point of order but debating with me.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I am telling you that what is said now is untrue. I did not compare that campaign with Communism.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman at least, I will be conservative (with a small "c")—on at least one hundred occasions the honourable gentleman said that Confederation was nothing but Communism; that it meant Communism would be taught in all our schools.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman is telling a deliberate falsehood when he says that. I never used that expression, not once.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I was going to say these are allegations of facts and cannot be proven. The remarks may be true or untrue—will the honourable member please proceed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must ask that the Premier withdraw that statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will not. I will have a commission and prove my statement.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman gets up here and makes a slanderous speech about me—am I entitled to have him withdraw it? I say I never made such statements.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say I can prove it—if the honourable gentleman wants a select committee to investigate it we can have that and bring the witnesses, who on oath will say he did.

MR. BROWNE: I don't care. You can bring all the witnesses in the world and they can't prove that I said it—I never said it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—as I pointed out previously on another occasion; this is not a court to hear evidence for or against words which may or may not have been said. It is alleged that a certain honourable member said a certain thing, and the honourable member denies he said it. This House cannot entertain a charge, and can't very well hear evidence on the matter. If the honourable members are not inclined to give way on either side—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a ruling on a point of order. I have denied the allegation, and it is up to my honourable friend, who is so fond of tradition, to withdraw it. I have often heard him say that when a member denies something it must be accepted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I fear my honourable friend is right. When he challenges me to uphold the

rules and traditions of the House I must do so. I regret we have not the Committee to hammer it out.

MR. BROWNE: Hammer it out somewhere else. I am prepared any time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to another incident: In the course of the campaign we had a very decent young man Gerald Healey who went on the radio for us, and advocated Confederation. He broadcast on VOCM one night a speech in favour of Confederation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order again: Is my honourable friend entitled to go over the whole Confederation campaign. He knows the position he is in. We have all finished speaking and can't answer, yet he brings up this long story about Confederation?

MR. SPEAKER: It is admitted the story of Confederation is again being brought up. However, I cannot deny the honourable members on my left the same privileges granted to honourable members on my right. I have not ruled Confederation out of order for any of the previous speakers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have seen Your Honour listen with great patience.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may say so, with feelings other than pleasure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly with very great patience, Sir, you listened by the hour and by the day to speeches from that side of the House reviewing the whole Confederation issue; in great detail by my honourable friend now objecting to my mentioning one or two incidents from it. So Gerald Healey delivered a political

speech in which he advocated Confederation. Now, Gerald Healey at that time was working in Argentina on the American Base. He came to St. John's and recorded his speech for the night and went back again so he would not miss work on the following morning. His speech was broadcast on VOCM. You can imagine, Sir, or can you, the fright of the mother of Gerald Healey as there came a knock at her door—

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Speaker (the honourable gentleman may laugh) I rise to a point of order: What my honourable friend is going to say now is heresay. It is not public knowledge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May be you know?

MR. BROWNE: No, I don't know. But it is something not of his own knowledge, something that has come to him—is it in order, Mr. Speaker, for him to relate stories of this kind?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can say; I was not the one who knocked. Any knowledge I had of it came from the lady in question, the mother of Gerald Healey. But I was not there.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, somebody has told him the story which he gives now as being correct, is he entitled to do that? I don't see how it concerns the business of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I have been asked to rule on what is almost a hypothetical case. I do not know what the honourable the member is about to say. I can only gather that some honourable members are of the opinion it will be objectionable, that it is heresay. I can only say I can't make a firm ruling on something which has not yet happened.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After I tell it Your Honour will be able to rule on whether I could say it or not.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is debatable. But in order to facilitate the debate I would refer you to Page 99 of Beauchesne, "It is doubly disorderly for any member in speaking to digress from the question before the House and to attack any other member."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order: Who says I am going to say anything derogatory, against any member. To say he was anti-confederate and took an active part in the campaign, is that derogatory?

MR. HIGGINS: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend who is a good anti-confederate would never admit it was derogatory, so that I am not making an attack.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member who quoted from "Beauchesne" might go on further to where it says: "Provided that a member shall say nothing personally opprobrious to another member." But who, including Dr. Beauchesne, is to decide if a thing which has not been said, or is about to be said, can be personally opprobrious? Now I might say further—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I only got as far as a knock on the door.

MR. SPEAKER: I have another comment to make—I will try to be fair to both sides—in order to do that I would like to say—I tried to anticipate before the honourable member began to speak, and with that in view I had Hansard prepared in part of the speech of the honourable mem-



ber who has spoken, so that I shall not err in refusing to members on this side of the House privileges I allowed those members on that side. However, I do try to give the breaks to the Opposition as does every Mr. Speaker. Will the honourable member continue his speech. I will ask him to make a strong effort to restrain himself from making any personal remarks that would be opprobrious to any member on the other side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will make a determined effort not to say anything to hurt the feelings of the Opposition. Merely accusing him of being an anti-confederate who campaigned energetically against Confederation will not hurt his feelings in the least.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman remarked that I campaigned "energetically" against Confederation. I deny that I campaigned energetically.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might look up the dictionary, look up the word "energetically." There was an energetic knock at Mrs. Healey's door. Mrs. Healey went to the door and you can imagine her fright to see a Judge on the Bench. He did not have his gown on, but she recognized him as a Judge on the Bench. He came in and said "Is it not terrible about poor Gerald?" He said "I suppose it is too late to do anything. I suppose he is gone."

MR. BROWNE: Let me tell the honourable gentleman that I never used words like that. I would not be able to speak like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am quoting the words, not the tone.

MR. BROWNE: He can quote my words, but not my tone.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member who objected says he did not use those words, then the House must take his word.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Speaking of tone, I remember the night—was it the same night? If it was not that night, it was the day he resigned from the Bench. He spoke at a political meeting in the C.L.B. Armoury and his Speech was broadcast on the radio and I listened in to it. Now, when we recall the circumstances leading up to that speech in the C.L.B. Armoury, we can, of course, make allowances for the fact that a gentleman who has just resigned his seat on the Bench under the impression—the mistaken impression—he was entirely mistaken as he ever was or ever will be—I had no more intention of removing the honourable gentleman or causing it as I had of flying—however, it is immaterial.

MR. BROWNE: It is very material.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was under the impression that I had virtually pulled him off the Bench.

MR. BROWNE: You said so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: After the campaign started. Under that impression, my honourable friend delivered a Speech. It was quite a speech.

MR. BROWNE: You did not hear it all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It must have been very good, because what I heard suggested nothing so much as someone in the Old Testament commanding Providence to hurl one of His thunderbolts at that man Smallwood. I could picture him with his hand up commanding that a thunderbolt be thrown at this animal, this beast

Smallwood. The honourable member, the Minister of Finance, has particular reason to remember that. He remembers an encounter he had with him on the highroad in his District. The Minister of Provincial Affairs has an acute and vivid recollection of the same occasion. Talking of partisanship, talking of Civil Servants, established Civil Servants, high-ranking Civil Servants—

MR. BROWNE: I was not an established Civil Servant. I was not a pensionable Civil Servant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was an established Civil Servant. If he had remained on the Bench, he would have been pensionable, in accordance with the Pensions Act.

MR. BROWNE: I was not an established Civil Servant. I was President of the Civil Service Association because I was not recognized as a Civil Servant. I might say this: I was fifteen years working for the Government. I organized the Civil Service. I was the only person who never got one cent increase in salary while on the Bench.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank you for reminding me you were President of the Civil Service Association. Not only were you on the Bench; not only were you a Civil Servant; but you were President of the Association of Civil Servants. Talking of taking an aggressive part! A man who just went to his waist in politics; a man who took action against the Government of Newfoundland and the Governor of Newfoundland!

MR. BROWNE: Did I have the right to take action in the Civil Courts of Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. A judge has no business in partisanship of

that type. Let me quote the opinion of Viscount Simon, perhaps the greatest Lawyer of the last quarter century: Now if I may be permitted to quote that in other word, a Judge on the Bench, flings his gown to one side and wades to his waist in politics. He comes down off the Bench and he wonders why we lost faith in him. How could any Confederate go before him and look for justice? How could he?

MR. BROWNE: I wish the Premier would not get completely out of his mind. Surely he cannot accuse me of injustice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The gentleman showed undying hatred for Confederation. A man who leaves the Bench and sues the Government in the Supreme Court—

MR. BROWNE: It is a serious accusation.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has no right to say that no one could expect justice from the honourable gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said no Confederate could expect justice.

MR. SPEAKER: The expression is unparliamentary. It must not be used.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Remember this; when I say, "So help me God, I believe in Confederation," I do sincerely believe in it. And the honourable gentleman had just as much right to disbelieve sincerely in it; but as a Judge, he did not have as much right to argue against it and campaign against it.

MR. BROWNE: I did not campaign against it. Can he produce

evidence to show I campaigned against it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I cannot produce it at the moment. I will withdraw that, to be in conformity with parliamentary procedure. I have, in any case said enough to show that my honourable friend—even if he did nothing; if the only occasion on which he expressed himself was the one on which he sued the Governor and the Government—if that was the only occasion, it was an example of partisanship which was shocking when it came from a Judge on the Bench.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if he would return to the question of Mr. Vardy's campaigning.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe I interrupted the gentleman on the other side; the effect of which is usually to prolong the Speech of the man who is speaking and sometimes arouses hard feelings in the House. Perhaps there is nothing wrong with that—with hard feelings being aroused. I do not want a "hang-er-down" session, but I do hope we see things livened up. It was one of the secret hopes that the member for St. John's West would liven things up by his cultured and cool way of livening up things and would teach his colleagues to do likewise, and I know they must be grateful for having him with them, knowing all the rules, knowing the way they do things in Ottawa—how delighted and grateful they must be, especially the Leader. The Leader was beginning to feel secure, and I wonder if he feels that this new member with greater knowledge and background would constitute a danger to his leadership? Let me assure my friend that he has very little to fear from his colleague. I predict, unless, I miss my guess, that the honourable

and learned gentleman, having tasted the greatness of the House of Commons, will never be content until he returns there. As a matter of fact, I, having read every word he uttered in the House of Commons—

MR. BROWNE: You heard most of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From that I would say, the honourable and learned gentleman must have been an exceedingly unhappy man because at heart he is a Liberal. At heart he believes in the Co-operative movement just as much as the Minister for Co-operatives. He believes in Public Housing just as much as any of us. He believes in Public Welfare. He believes in Public Relations just as much as the Minister of Labour. He believes in all these things, yet due to the unfortunate circumstances of his having been an anti-Confederate, he prefers to nurse this anti-Confederate hatred. He prefers his hatred of Confederation to anything else. He is a man of fine intellect. He is a student. He is a worker.

MR. BROWNE: You say so many contradictory things, it is hard to believe you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My learned friend has never begun to understand me. The only thing he sees in me is a couple of horns of a demon. I am afraid to turn around, he will see the tail. He thinks if I am not the devil, then I am one of the devil's imps. What else could I have been to advocate Confederation, which he regards as sin personified, sin incarnate?

MR. BROWNE: Where does he get the impression I regard it as "sin incarnate; sin personified"?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am charmed and delighted to know he has had a change of heart and so it goes once again to prove that "While the light holds out to burn; the vilest sinner may return."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we were on the second reading of item No. 10—A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The adjournment of the debate on second reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act" was requested by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have no great objection to the principle involved here except in so far as it is the intention of the Act to remove from the Act the names which were given to the various scholarships which were known before some of the honourable members were born. You will note, Sir, in Section 28 of the said Act is given amounts paid by the Minister of Education out of moneys voted for the Department of Education. Those scholarships, Senior Jubilee, University Scholarships and the King George V, and such others as may from time to time be payable. Now, these are paid out by the Minister, and now in the amended section these names are taken out of the Act. I am only looking at it from a historical point of view. After twenty or twenty-five years, people will have forgotten these scholarships first established to make historic events. The Senior Jubilee, we know, was set up many years ago, and that would also apply to many of the others. Now, you are taking these names from out of the Act. I think it is quite possible to carry out the same prin-

ciple and still leave these historic names in there.

There is another point. The authority to pay the money is taken out of the hands of the Minister and given to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The same thing applies where it is stated, "The Minister can no longer make regulations." Now, that puts the regulations in the hands of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, I don't know why that is done. Probably the Minister when he gets up to reply will be able to answer that. But my main objection to the Bill is the fact that we are dropping out these names. My honourable friend here, with all his reputation he has found in recent times, was himself the winner of the Jubilee Scholarship.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You too?

MR. HOLLETT: No, I was not, unfortunately. Perhaps I would have gone further if I had been. I might not be here then, at any rate I did not win it. But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am getting at is this—I do believe the honourable minister could possibly arrange to leave these names there in the Act, and not have them taken out, for the sake of posterity, if nothing else for the record.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, if no other honourable gentleman wishes to speak to the principle I will close the debate.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is found necessary by the Government in as much as there has been so many changes in scholarships in the last five years, in as much as amounts awarded. And as the amounts awarded have to be legislated for in this House we thought it advisable to

have that legislation changed so that the amounts and the scholarships themselves can be awarded by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The reasons for the change are, Sir, is that the real concern of the department is that the cost of living, or the cost of board and everything else which could be maintained ten years ago for two hundred dollars now require \$350 or \$400. This year the Senior Jubilee University Scholarship has been increased from one thousand to fifteen hundred dollars. That has been done on the request of people receiving it. We have had some scholarship winners turn down the scholarships because the amounts awarded were not sufficient for them to come in here to St. John's to attend the University. Now, that may go up again, and probably may happen in September when the House is closed, and I may probably have to go to the Cabinet and ask for that to be upped.

The Junior Jubilee Scholarship is not now awarded but has been taken over by the electoral scholarships. I don't see there is any reason why the word "Jubilee" could not be attached to that. That point is not serious. The idea is just so that we can have the privilege of changing the amounts if we want to do so.

**MR. BROWNE:** Is there any intention of making any change in the number of scholarships?

**MR. CHALKER:** None whatsoever.

Bill read a second time, ordered referred to Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowance Act."

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, that is the Bill which I referred to the other day when I said this seemed to be the sort of Bill which should be introduced by way of regulations as it involves a further charge upon the revenue. The Bill, as I have read it, increases the age from 16 years to 17 years and from 17 years to 20 years in certain cases, and will certainly involve an increased expenditure.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member did give notice of his intention to make that objection to the second reading of this Bill. He has, however advanced no argument to show his reason for suggesting that the Bill ought not to be considered other than on resolutions.

**MR. BROWNE:** No, Mr. Speaker, I am raising I suppose a question of privilege of the House to consider a Bill of this kind first of all in the resolution stage in committee, and recommend it to the Chair afterwards. Also there is supposed to be a request from the Crown for such expenditure. I think these are well-known principles which have been carried out.

**MR. SPEAKER:** To answer the question properly would require some time. Let me, as briefly as I can, state the position for the benefit of certain other honourable members who might have doubts about it.

Over the past thirty years it has been the custom in the House of Commons of Canada to rule out of order all motions which purport to give the Government orders or authority to do a thing which could not be done without the expenditure of money. That practice has grown directly out of Section 54 of the British North American Act which clearly lays down what it shall be legal for the House of Commons to

do with regard to public funds. But on the other hand the Canadian Journals also make it clear that, as stated in "Beauchesne" Paragraph 449, "a Bill which does not involve a direct expenditure but merely confers upon the Government, a power for the exercise of which money will have to be voted at some future date by the Parliament is not a money Bill." That seems to me exactly to describe this Bill, for here the parent Act empowers the Government of Newfoundland to do a certain thing through one of its departments which obviously cannot be done without the expenditure of money, and the money necessary for the implementation of the parent Act is voted by this House on resolutions brought in from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. This Bill we have before us now merely seeks to enlarge the scope of the parent Act, and it is impossible to say if the passing of this Bill will cause a greater expenditure of money under the parent Act or a lesser amount. Therefore, we do not know if we are going to spend more money or less money. Even if the Minister could tell us the exact amount to be spent we still would not be justified in considering it a money Bill.

"Beauchesne" paragraph 450 says: "A Bill which is designed to furnish machinery for the spending of certain sums of public money to be voted subsequently may be introduced in the House without the recommendation of the Crown and without a resolution being first considered in Committee."

I could go on and show the difference between the House of Commons of Canada and a provincial legislature, but I shall only refer honourable members to Section 91 and 92 of the British North America Act which

clearly defines the legislative powers of both "parliaments," (I use the word loosely there).

There is one other thing I must mention. That is under Term 14 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, the constitution of Newfoundland as touching the Legislative Assembly of Newfoundland is not changed only in so far as the Legislative Council is concerned. Appropos of that, this House may re-establish the Legislative Council or establish a new one. Therefore since the constitution of Newfoundland touching this House is still in existence, the customs, rules and usages of the old Newfoundland Parliament, for it sat as a Dominion Parliament prior to Confederation, are also still in existence. That must be taken into account when reading Standing Order No. 1 of our rules which state: "The powers of a full fledged Parliament are not applicable in toto to a Legislative Assembly, neither are the customs and usages of the Parliament of Newfoundland easily applied in their entirety to this Provincial House." But we may carry on such of these customs, usages and rules of the Newfoundland Parliament as are applicable, and we may adopt, I say we may adopt such customs and usages of the House of Commons of Canada or Westminster as we see fit. A Committee sat on these rules and regulations in 1949 and we did agree that we may draw our procedure from the three sources, and that we may set up rules of our own. I could name the members of the original committee, one sits on my right at the moment, another was the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. John Gilbert Higgins, K.C. We felt that these rules, customs and usages might quite properly be employed in this House.



The report was discussed at the table in Committee of the Whole and adopted by the House. Therefore the rules, customs and usages of the Parliament of Newfoundland may, must and is to be used here. I may quote precedents—and hope I am not tiring the House. In May, 1925, two Bills were brought in here, read a first time, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole and passed without any resolutions, although they demanded an expenditure of public money. Two Bills were brought in in July, 1925. The honourable member then sat in the House but cannot, of course, be expected to remember the incident now. There are many such precedents.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps if you gave me the name of the Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. "An Act Respecting Certain Retirement Allowances in which sums exceeding \$20,000 were noted to be spent on retirement allowances for certain people."

Another was "An Old Age Pensions Act" whereby the pensions of a male pensioner, after his death, would be paid to his widow. These moneys come from the public purse, but the Bills were not brought in on resolutions.

Therefore I rule such Bills as these, and mind you I rule because the House has given me authority to do so, are not properly regarded as money Bills and need not be brought in on resolution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I can only say "A Daniel come to Judgment."

MR. SPEAKER: I have tried to make this question clear because there are many new members here since the time of that Committee.

MR. CURTIS: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I am not questioning your ruling. But I have here the 1924 Journal of the Assembly which refers to the first entry of my honourable friend into this House. That journal seemingly abounds with cases where Bills of that nature were introduced without such a committee. For instance on page 38 here on July 10, the Minister of Justice asked leave to introduce a Bill to Amend the War Pensions Act. If you follow it through you will see that on the next day this Bill was introduced, read a first time etc., and so went right through all stages. There are several other Bills, Mr. Speaker, in this very journal of the year when my honourable and learned friend came into this House.

MR. BROWNE: That would depend upon the provisions of the Bill. It could be the War Pensions Act—the Minister for Dominion Affairs might have introduced a Bill by way of resolutions first to amend the War Pensions Act.

MR. SPEAKER: For the purpose of clarification, honourable members must bear in mind the difference between a Parliament and a Legislative Assembly. I might give one other illustration. In 1936, motion was made in Ottawa to pay pensions to people over a certain given age, and was disallowed because it involved expenditure of public moneys.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Introduced but not by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, not by the Government. The reason why it was ruled out without resolutions is because Parliament just cannot do that. But we hold here we can introduce such Bills as this without resolutions because you cannot have any money to spend until the Minister of Finance

brings in the resolutions for the Crown, and we are following well-established custom in that.

Does the honourable minister wish to move the second reading of this Bill?

DR. POTTLE: I move the second reading be deferred, Mr. Speaker.

On motion second reading deferred.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders be deferred.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock, I should like to say for the information of my honourable friends on the Opposition, that we are hoping tomorrow when we adjourn, to adjourn for Holy Week, and to re-assemble on Tuesday, April 20th, i.e. all next week and Easter Monday, and meet here on Tuesday, April 20th. That will give us all on next week and the following Monday away from the House. I hope that will be satisfactory.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 9, at 3:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, April 9, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, a few days

ago I tabled a report in which I mentioned there was an error. I now have the correct copies and ask leave to table them.

#### Notice of Question

(55) MR. FOGWILL—To ask the Honourable the Premier to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

What is the number of trips made by the Premier since April 1st, 1952?

When were these trips made and how long did they last? Give the names of the places visited, the purpose for which each such trip was undertaken, and the cost of each trip.

(56) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Supply to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. In connection with the supply of eggs to the several institutions account for the difference in prices charged by Wilsils Ltd. of 63 cents and by the Two Way Stores of 70 cents.

2. With regard to the accepted tender price of Chalker & Co. for 80 cents per pound for boiled ham supplied to the General Hospital and the Sanatorium, why was this price later raised to \$1.01 per pound? Why was the accepted offer of 64 cents per pound for raw ham raised by Chalker & Co. to 81 cents, and why was the price of bacon raised from 53 cents up to 75 cents? Were further tenders called for before allowing these increases?

3. What arrangement has been set up by the Department with Messrs. Goodyear and House with regard to the supply of commodities listed in Question 28, to the West Coast Sanatorium? What prices were charged for these commodities?

4. Explain the cause for a difference in price of 8 cents per gallon for milk supplied to the Home for Aged and Infirm and the Mental Hospital.

(57) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. How many paid officials are or have been employed by Nalco during the past fiscal year? Give their names, dates of employment and the salaries they receive or received at the yearly rate. Where is the Head Office of Nalco at the present time?

2. What officials supervised the value of plant and machinery imported for the equipment of the new industrial premises whose construction was undertaken by the Government? Give the cost of construction and the value of machinery and equipment for each plant.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 54:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to No. 1 is, yes. The answer to No. 2 is, no. The answer to No. 3 is that the question would be much more properly directed to the company concerned. The answer to No. 4 is, no. The answer to No. 5 is that the directors are Mr. Chester Dawe, and R. C. B. Mercer, apart from the Government. The answer to No. 6 is, no. The answer to No. 7 is that that is a question which would much more

properly be directed to the company concerned.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Premier a supplementary question? I believe he is the present representative of the Government on the board of directors. If so, is he not in a position to say what salary is paid to the managing director?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course I am in a position to say anything with regard to any of the private business of the company insofar as knowing the facts is concerned. But I do not choose to do so for the reason that I stated in my remarks here yesterday as to the private details of the business concerns of a private company.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask one more question? Does the Premier think that a company is a private company that receives from the Government over two million dollars to run its affairs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. If it received over two hundred million dollars it might still be a private company. Why not direct the question to them?

MR. BROWNE: How much did the others put into it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not giving any private information about a private company, for the reasons which I have explained at some length in this House.

Question No. 50—Answer stand.

Question No. 51 :

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to that question.

Question No. 51 (1) :

Name of Borrower	Class of Loan	Insurance Required Under Agreement	Max. in Force 1953-54
Alberto Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	\$75,000	\$ 85,000
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	Property to be insured against loss or damage by fire in such sum as will equal the amount for the time being owed by the Company to the Government.	315,000
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan		
Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan		
Atlantic Films & Electronics Limited	Industries—Cash Loan	\$100,000	299,000
Atlantic Gloves	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	230,000
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	890,000
Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited	Industries—Guaranteed Loan		
Atlantic Optical Co. Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	Nil

Arctic Fishery Products	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	<p>The Company shall at all times keep all the buildings, plant, machinery and equipment and all future buildings, plant, machinery and equipment insured against loss or damage by fire, in a sum equivalent to the value at which the said buildings, plant, machinery and equipment are carried in the current Balance Sheet of the Company and will insure and keep insured the two whale catchers referred to in the Agreement in the sum of \$15,000 each under an "All risk" policy and will insure and keep insured under a similar Marine Policy in an amount or amounts to be approved by the Minister any other Whale Catchers or other floating property subsequently acquired by the Company.</p>	120,000
Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	<p>At all times during the currency of the Agreement the Company will keep all of the buildings, wharves, plant, machinery and equipment situated on the lands and premises referred to in Clause 7 of the Agreement and all of the vessels referred to in Clause 6 fully insured against loss or damage by fire and will keep all of the said vessels fully insured against damage through any marine risk under an "all risk" policy.</p>	1,415,000

Name of Borrower	Class of Loan	Insurance Required Under Agreement	Max. in Force 1953-54
Bonavista Fish Meals & Oils Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	Nil	Nil
Canadian Leathergoods Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	70,000
Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Co. Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	1,250,000
George T. Dixon Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to keep all buildings, plant and machinery comprised in the mortgage fully insured against loss or damage by fire.	25,000
Dunphy's Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company agrees that while any portion of the loan is owing, the vessels will be covered against loss.	78,000
Eckhardt Mills Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	72,000
Fishery Products Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	The Company will insure and keep insured in an amount to be approved by the Minister.	2,254,350
Fishery Products Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan		
Fishery Products Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan		



Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	The Company will keep all of the buildings, erections, fixtures, plant, machinery and equipment mortgaged fully insured against loss or damage by fire and keep all the vessels and draggers to be mortgaged fully insured against damage through any marine risk under an "all risk" policy.	Nil
Hanning Electric Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	415,000
Hollett Sons & Co. Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	Borrower agrees to insure and keep insured the mortgaged vessels under an "all risk" policy.	155,000
Koch Shoes Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	Nil
Lake & Lake Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$50,000	40,000
Lourdes Co-operative Society Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	The Company will insure and keep insured in an amount to be approved by the Minister.	17,500
Newfoundland Asbestos Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company is required to keep lands or premises mortgaged fully insured against loss or damage by fire.	89,000
Newfoundland Asbestos Ltd.	Industries—Guaranteed Loan		
Nfld. Dehydrating Process Co. Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$200,000	420,000

Name of Borrower	Class of Loan	Insurance Required Under Agreement	Max. in Force 1953-54
Nfld. Tanneries (Wm. Dorn) Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and to keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	290,000
Northeastern Fish Industries Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company agrees to keep insured all draggers purchased under the loan	480,000
Northeastern Fish Industries Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$260,000	260,000
Northeastern Co-op Fisheries Society Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	The Company will insure and keep insured in the amount to be approved by the Minister.	41,150
Northlantic Trawling Co. Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$200,000	540,000
Olsen Whaling & Sealing Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	\$560,000	560,000
Penney & Sons Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company agrees to keep the dragger fully insured against loss or damage through any marine risk.	246,600
Penney & Sons Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$50,000	50,000
St. Lawrence Corporation of Nfld.	Industries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company will at all times during the currency of the Agreement keep the "Mercator" and the value of the freight charges to be earned by her fully insured against loss or damage by fire and loss or damage through any marine risk under an "all risk" policy.	320,000

Springdale Fur Farmers Co-op Society Ltd.	Fisheries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company will insure and keep insured in an amount to be approved by the Minister.	8,000
Superior Rubber Co. Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland. *Note: additional policies totalling \$1,995,000 to be submitted shortly.	*105,000
Terra Nova Textiles Ltd.	Industries—Guaranteed Loan	The Company agrees to insure and keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	38,000
Trepassey Fisheries Ltd.	Fisheries—Cash Loan	\$29,000—Vessels presently tied up and insurance cancelled. Immediately that they go into operation again, the boats will be insured as required under the Agreement.	
United Cotton Mills Ltd.	Industries—Cash Loan	The Company agrees to insure and keep insured against loss or damage by fire all its fixed assets in Newfoundland.	335,000
United Engineers & Contractors	Industries—Guaranteed Loan	Nil	Nil

Question No. 51 (2) :

Yes, on Draggers "Nordelite" and "Nordepic." Mortgages in amounts sufficient to cover amount of Guaranteed Bank Loan.

Question No. 52 : In course of preparation.

Question No. 53 : In course of preparation.

Question No. 51 : Answer tabled by Mr. Hefferton.

Question No. 31 : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply to lay on the table of the House the following information :

1. A complete statement of amounts due the Government by the St. John's Housing Corporation, as also of amounts due the Government by any other Housing Projects throughout the country.

2. A statement showing the original amounts advanced the various Housing Projects, and showing whether or not said Corporations are carrying out their financial obligations with the Government.

3. Who are the personnel of the St. John's Housing Authority?

4. In computing the amount payable for rent-purchase per month by the occupier of a home is it a fact that family allowances and war pension cheques are treated as income?

Answer 31 (1) and (2) :

Project	Address	Principal on Loan as of March 31, 1954	Interest Due March 31, 1954	Principal Advanced by the Province	
St. John's Housing Corp., St. John's :					
(i) Interest Bearing		\$4,000,000.00	\$ Nil	\$4,330,438.00	Obligations fulfilled. The interest free advance includes an amount of \$741,263.28 which was the balance remaining payable to the City of St. John's of an interest free advance made by the City to the Corporation. The Province has acquired from the City the Corporation's indebtedness on this account.
(ii) Interest Free		1,384,013.28	Nil	1,402,763.28	
(iii) Free Grants		Nil	Nil	347,000.00	
Total		5,384,013.28	Nil	6,080,201.28	
Railway Employees' Welfare Assoc.,					
Bishop's Falls		55,000.00	Nil	75,000.00	Obligations fulfilled.
Westmount War Veterans' Housing					
Assoc., Ltd., Corner Brook		100,000.00	1,000.00	100,000.00	This Assoc., at the beginning of 1953, owed \$4,774.00 in interest. Besides paying interest of \$3,500 due on 1953 account, arrears of interest were reduced to \$1,000. Principal repayments due in 1953 were not made.
Grand Falls Ex-Servicemen's Housing					
Assoc., Ltd., Grand Falls		66,150.53	Nil	75,000.00	Payments in 1953 exceeded yearly capital obligations by \$261.00. At this rate the Assoc. will meet its obligations.
Corner Brook Townsite War Veterans'					
Housing Assoc., Ltd., Corner Brook		72,625.16	Nil	75,000.00	Capital repayment in 1953 less than obligation by \$625. It is fully expected that larger capital repayments, in later years when annual interest charges are lower, will enable the Assoc. to discharge its obligations within the loan term period.

Project	Address	Principal on Loan as of March 31, 1954	Interest Due March 31, 1954	Principal Advanced by the Province	
Humber Housing Co-operative Society Ltd., Corner Brook .....		108,152.90	4.35	150,797.00	Obligations fulfilled
Nfld. Building & Loan Assoc., Ltd., St. John's .....		46,000.00	Nil	50,000.00	Obligations fulfilled. Repayment of Principal not due until 1964.
Bloomfield Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		37,800.00	Nil	37,800.00	None of these Societies has yet received total loan, nor has one completed building operations. Pay- ment of interest outstanding as of March 31, 1954, is expected shortly. On completion of houses full capital amount will be recovered when individual mortgage loans are granted to Society Members by Central Mortgage & Housing Corporation.
Bonaventure Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		18,000.00	427.50	18,000.00	
Colonial Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		15,000.00	356.25	15,000.00	
Coronation Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		49,500.00	Nil	49,500.00	
Eastmount Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., Corner Brook .....		25,000.00	593.75	25,000.00	
Edinburgh Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		63,740.00	Nil	63,740.00	
Newland Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		22,000.00	2.08	22,000.00	
Newtown Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		32,000.00	Nil	32,000.00	
Northdale Housing Co-operative Soc., Ltd., St. John's .....		25,000.00	593.75	25,000.00	



Name of Project	Principal Invested as of March 31, 1954	Interest	Total Value of Invest- ment by Province	
140 Subsidized Rental Units—St. John's	\$ 279,337.14	Nil	\$ 282,897.84	Obligations fulfilled.
152 Subsidized Rental Units—St. John's	343,163.23	Nil	343,163.23	Projects not yet complete. Further expenditures
100 Economic Rental Units—St. John's	316,874.63	Nil	316,874.63	will be made which will increase Province's invest- ment. The first instalments of principal are not due until the projects have been capitalized.

Answer 31 (3) : The St. John's Housing Authority consists of the following :

H. M. Powell (Chairman)  
 I. Mercer, Q.C., M.H.A. (Vice Chairman)  
 C. G. Eaton (Member)  
 Wm. J. Ashley (Member)  
 G. C. Carnell (Member)  
 L. A. Earle (Member)

The Secretarial duties for the Authority are performed by Mr. L. G. Crumney, Deputy Minister of Supply.

Answer 31 (4) : No.

### Orders of the Day

Adjourned Debate on the Address  
in Reply :

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, if you go back a hundred years or so in the history of this Island you will find a tremendous difference of things, particularly in the social and economic conditions of the people. Now, I say a hundred years or so for the purpose I have in mind at the moment. It would be difficult to pick on an exact number of years or to pick on an exact year in our history, therefore, as it is desirable for the purpose of this argument to be a little arbitrary I would pick the year 1825, which is actually a bit more than one hundred years or one and a quarter centuries ago. Around that year, with some leeway now before and after the year in question, if you travelled to every settlement in Trinity Bay it would number very small. There were only ten or twelve places in all of Trinity Bay; Grate's Cove, Old Perlican, Hant's Harbour, Winterton, Heart's Content, New Harbour, Old Bonaventure, Trinity, Catalina, Elliston—ten, or call it twelve because I have probably left out one or two places. There were then only ten or twelve places in all of Trinity Bay around one hundred years ago. If you move around the Cape, going north into Bonavista Bay, the great Bonavista Bay, you will find that around that time the settlements of Bonavista itself, King's Cove, Keels, Salvage, Greenspond and Wesleyville, six settlements, or call it eight, because no doubt I have forgotten the names of one or two. Then in that vast Notre Dame Bay you would have found Fogo, Change Islands, Twillingate, Exploits, Nipper's Harbour, Indian Burying Place, six or call it eight

settlements in that vast bay known as Notre Dame Bay, i.e. all the way from Cape Freels to Cape St. John. Then as you moved around Cape St. John, going north you ran into a stretch of coast which was rather more numerous populated, at least from the standpoint of the number of settlements. You would have found LaScie and Pacquet, Conche and St. Julians, St. Anthony, ten or twelve settlements, or I think it would probably be more realistic to call it fourteen because the French Shore was frequented quite considerably by the French fishing interests. Now taking the outside figures : Trinity Bay 12; Bonavista Bay 8; Notre Dame Bay 8; White Bay 12, you get a grand total of 40 settlements on the North East Coast leaving out Conception Bay, the St. John's Shore and the Southern Shore to Ferryland. There were from Baccalieu Tickle to the Straits of Belle Isle, there were forty places a hundred odd years ago. So it was also two hundred years ago and three hundred years ago and four hundred years ago. For over three hundred years the number of places where people lived on the North East Coast was practically static, scarcely changed. Now, if you went back to the very beginning of our history you would find that the people first came to the headlands, the great headlands that separated the bays, the Baccalieu Tickle Headland, the Cape Bonavista Headland etc. You could, without much difficulty, trace the movements of the people from those settlements on the headlands northward and southward of them. Now, I do not desire to draw that too tightly because what I have not said is not one hundred per cent accurate because in addition to settlements going on headlands they also settled in places such

as Heart's Content and up the bay and they settled at Old Perlican and Hants Harbour and New Harbour around the same time that they settled at Carbonear and Harbour Grace in Conception Bay. But speaking generally, I think, it is fair to say that they settled first on the headlands and they got as near as they could get to the salt water, as near as they could to the occupation that brought them to Newfoundland, fishing for cod. Then as men settled and married and had children, and they had large families in those days, twelve, fourteen, eighteen and twenty children per family, some of whom survived and a good many of them died under the conditions of those times.

Then the fishing grounds began to be a bit crowded, and the foreshore, the landwash, the places from which they operated and on which they landed their fish, putting it away, dressing it, drying it, became overcrowded, also on the land the tendency was for overcrowding to occur, so that there was a tremendous force at work to drive people away to that empty cove up the shore a mile or two or five or eight, where a man could take the whole of the foreshore if he wanted to occupy it, an entire cove all to himself. So people spread out further and further and they over spread the shores of all these bays. It began roughly a hundred years ago. For three hundred years there was virtually no change. Then, early in the last century, a great new movement, a great new internal migration of our population began to take place. I think it was propelled and impelled to a very large extent by the sudden new growth of the seal hunt which is a thing of relatively recent origin in Newfoundland. It,

of course, was caused by a combination of factors all working suddenly together for the first time to produce that result. The result was that where a hundred odd years ago there were forty places where people lived from Baccalieu Tickle to the Straits of Belle Isle, that vast coast, today there are five hundred places, all in about a century. I have been in virtually every one personally. I have been in literally dozens of places in Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay, Notre Dame Bay and White Bay. I talked either with the first man that ever set foot there to live or his son or his grandson. I have done that in literally dozens of settlements along our North East Coast. I remember for example a place called Bellville (I am just speaking now of one out of many Bellvilles) I remember the whole population of Bellville joining in to help me determine exactly what year it was in which the settlement was founded. The whole population turned to and helped me. We got aboard a boat and rowed across the harbour to the oldest house in the place, occupied by two old brothers, one over eighty and the other well over seventy. I went into the kitchen. The whole population went in with me, as was the custom. Every man's house was open to everyone in the harbour. We sat down for an hour on the chairs and on the floor, because there were too many people to seat. Then we worked out how old the settlement was.

"How old are you, sir?"

"Eighty-three on my next birthday."

"When will that be?"

"Such a date."

"Were you born here?"

"Yes, right here on this point."

"In this house?"

"No, sir, this house was built when

I was ten years old."

"Where is the house you were born in?"

"It was torn down."

"Who built the house you were born in?"

"My father built it."

"When did he build it?"

"As soon as he landed here."

"Where did he come from?"

He told me it was some arm or another, I just forget where he said.

"Were you the first child?"

"I was the first child."

"Did he bring his wife here with him?"

"No. He came here and went off a year after to get his wife and brought her back."

"And you were born here?"

"Yes."

"About two years then after he first came here?"

"Yes."

"You were born 83 years ago. So that makes it 85 years since he first came here?"

"Yes."

That is ten years ago, which makes it ninety-five years ago. So that Bellville is roughly 95 years old. I have traced the history of dozens of such places in the same way. It is a strange fact that you can go into four hundred places on the North East Coast and find now living the first settler or his son or grandson, in over four hundred of our five hundred settlements along that French Coast.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House can visualize, a good many here have enough knowledge of that coast to be able to visualize three long, sleepy centuries with virtually nothing happening, sleepy settlements where people lived simple and primitive lives and nothing much ever happened. Then for a variety of

reasons, all of a sudden, in twenty or thirty years, four hundred and more brand new settlements sprang up throughout these Bays, where these people previously had nothing to do on earth beyond catching codfish, eating, sleeping, going to Church when and if there was a Church; going to school, if, as and when there was a school. An extremely simple and primitive life—a terribly easy way to live, because the demands the people made of life were extremely simple in those days.

I knew a fisherman—Bill Hicks—in the Town of Bonavista. I knew him well. I was often in his home. He was in my home. He never wore a collar in his life, just a blue guernsey. The day he got married in the Methodist Church in Bonavista, his chums made up a trick—they were going to put a collar on Bill and that was that. They put the collar on him—he was sweating under the collar—it was like putting handcuffs on him. But when he got to the door, he ripped off the collar and so he was married that way. For most of his life he wore canvas pants made of sail cloth, a canvas jacket and a blue guernsey. Any Newfoundlander who has not heard Bill Hicks' "Marshes of Bonavista" has not lived. God rest his soul! He was a great man.

Up to the outbreak of the first world war, the people of these five hundred places, and I might say, some hundreds of other places in Newfoundland as well—but, I am addressing myself for the moment to the North East Coast; the people in these five hundred places, up to the outbreak of the first world war, lived on hard tack, laggies, codfish and herring, which was good eating; still is good eating, and molasses—I am

old enough to remember the great reform brought into Newfoundland by Sir E. Morris when he took the duty off sugar and for the first time in Newfoundland history, fishermen began to put sugar in their tea. Even now, you find old fishermen who do not like sugar—he prefers “lassie” tea to sugar. The food was very simple, very crude and very primitive. I would think that there was lots of it, for the most part, except in a time when there was some catastrophe of nature, such as the year when the North East Coast was frozen in up to the middle of the summer; such as the year when some terrible failure in fisheries stripped them of the meagre food they were used to; when some disaster of nature made it impossible to get food down there.

**MR. JACKMAN:** Are we the only ones who went through these hard times? I think that applied to Canada and the United States as well.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** He thinks I am attacking Newfoundland. I am merely describing how our ancestors lived.

**MR. JACKMAN:** You are going a nice way about it.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I can give blood-curdling details as well, but it is not my purpose to defame Newfoundland or Newfoundlanders.

The clothing they wore was extremely simple and quite cheap. Throughout their entire lives, a man, as a rule, had one suit of clothes. He saved up to get that and get married in. He wore it a bit sparingly, going to Church or to Mass on Sunday. He was buried in it and when the various fraternal societies sprang up in 1860 and 1870, he would wear it on the Annual Parade. One suit of clothes

throughout his entire life! I am old enough to remember these suits. They were something like the modern zoot suits at the ankles. Down to the outbreak of the first world war, life amongst the fishermen was exceedingly simple and somewhat primitive. Their occupation was exclusively the catching of salt cod; some worked in the woods, some for the A.N.D., a few in Corner Brook; some in Bell Island, taking iron ore out of the ground. Occasionally men went in the woods and cut saw logs. Except for these things, up to the outbreak of the first world war, the main occupation was the catching of cod. They lived simply. If they earned very little, they needed very little. They were fairly happy; reasonably content; the world had passed them by. They were in the backwoods of North America. There was no radio. They never saw a newspaper. A vast number could not read one, if they saw one. Life was exceedingly simple; things were quite cheap. A man wanted but little here below. That was Newfoundland — that was the North East Coast up to the outbreak of the first world war. Now what has happened since then? Part of the Newfoundland Revolution to which I have alluded many times in this House. My honourable and learned friend from St. John's West need not start shivering. I am not alluding to turmoil or friction; I am referring to a sociological and economic revolution, dating from the time of the outbreak of the first world war. From that day, the history of Newfoundland—especially the history of that Coast is a history of increasing discontent with what they had.

**MR. BROWNE:** You left our Pilley's Island and Beck's Cove and the building of the railway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I developed that theme in the National Convention, in which Green Bay mines and the building of the railway played a part. That is quite true.

Now, if you were able to live on thirty quintals of codfish a year; the price you got for thirty quintals; the way you lived and the way you were satisfied to live up to the outbreak of the first world war, there has not been a moment since when you were willing to live on the proceeds of thirty quintals of codfish—there has not been a moment since then. The time has gone when a man in Newfoundland can rear a family, give their families the things they demand, in this day and age when there are so many nice things to buy—dresses, silk stockings, shoes, lovely hats, radios, and so on. No longer can it be said "Man wants but little here below." Now, he wants many things. And so the proceeds of thirty quintals of fish will no longer support a family along the North East Coast as it did in the old days now almost beyond recall. So, I suggest to the House that what confronts this House and this Government now is this: either that something shall be done, something will be done, to enable people to live according to the standard that they have now been educated or propagandized to want, or they will inevitably and inexorably reverse the process that went on for the first half of the last century—instead of building up settlements, they will tear them down; I do not mean physically—I mean they will abandon them. The choice, it seems to me, is crystal clear. I do not believe—I cannot believe—that the average person on the North East Coast is going to be content to live the simple, rather primitive, peasant life existence that

went on for four hundred years, ending with the outbreak of the first world war. I do not believe it. I cannot believe it. They are going to have decent living or they are going to get out. We are going to lose them. Newfoundland is going to lose them. That is the situation.

Now, another thing, going along side by side with this development—here in the City of St. John's the vast majority of four thousand Federal Civil Servants live and work; the vast majority of the 3,400 Provincial Civil Servants live and work; the vast majority of the 4,000 railway men live and work—over half of them—2,000 roughly—

MR. FOGWILL: 3,500.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here in St. John's are 3,000 Shop and Office workers and with them, teamsters, packers and labourers associated, not only with serving the public who live in St. John's, in a retail way, but serving tens of thousands outside, in a wholesale way. Bell Island, a couple of gunshots away has vast industrial activity, with a population there now, I believe, of between eleven and twelve thousand people. And thanks to my honourable friend here, they earn about ten million dollars a year—over \$800,000 a month.

Again you have a Town that did not exist ten or fifteen years ago, with a population of 6,000 souls—all well paid, relatively speaking, some of them exceptionally well paid at Gander.

At Grand Falls you have a Town equivalent of two such towns as the Grand Falls of twenty-five years ago. Grand Falls of today is nearly twice as big as it was then.



At Buchans you have a Town of four thousand or so souls, with the Company employing one thousand people.

When I spoke of Grand Falls, I included all other Towns lying around it—Botwood, Windsor, Bishop's Falls, Norris Arm, Lewisporte, Millertown and Badger.

At Corner Brook which includes many places, you have a vast industrial empire with relatively highly paid people.

Then at Stephenville you have an entirely new Town that has sprung up since the war began, with a population of four or five thousand people.

At Argentia you have a great new Town there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what you have, side by side, going on almost simultaneously, hand in hand; this vast North East Coast, the home of the greater part of our basic industry, the codfishery, going steadily down grade; and on the other hand the upsurging and the birth of entirely new areas of hard cash market. And with what result? With this result: That the great firms of Water Street—some of them great and historic—the great firms of Water Street have been devoting the greater part of their energy, time and enthusiasm—by far the greater part of it, not to carrying on the great fisheries of Newfoundland, not to improving these fisheries, but rather to catering to these great new cash markets that have been brought into existence. Now, nobody can blame them for that. I am not blaming or praising them. I am trying merely to describe what I have seen. Nobody would be silly enough to blame the merchants for going after cash trade; if they do not do it, somebody else will.

The refrigerators, washing machines, the radios and other conveniences are all symbols of the new prosperity of Newfoundland. But you have only so much energy; you have only so much ability; you have only so much time and if the greater part of that is used up in this competitive business of selling waffle irons and tinned goods, you have no time for anything else. If I were a Water Street merchant and I were buying tinned goods—tinned beans, spaghetti, meat balls and other canned goods produced by firms in Canada—Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and elsewhere—I would know this; that I would get a much better price in buying these goods if I could buy a railway carload at a time than if I were buying only a few cases. I would get a better price and would therefore make more profit. Everyone in the world knows that. By the same token, if I could buy half a dozen carloads, each tin would be one-eighth or one-quarter cent less. I would get every tin so much cheaper if I could buy six carloads. If I could buy one hundred and fifty carloads a year of tinned beans and all the other things that come in by the trainload and shipload, I would get it cheaper and make more profit. All right. So what do I do if I were a Water Street merchant? I would advertise in the Telegram and Daily News; I would advertise on C.B.N., C.J.O.N. and V.O.C.M. and all radio stations and I would engage a smart salesman and I would go out and grab my share of this cash trade in St. John's, Argentia, Gander, Grand Falls, Buchans, Humber Area, Grand Bank, Fortune, Burin, St. Lawrence, Bell Island and wherever there is a bit of hard cash. I would be out grabbing my share. Then having got all I could get out of it, I would say; "Now what about these fishermen. God knows they

have not much but they have got something. If between them all, they would take say two hundred car loads for the year between the whole lot of them, and I can get twenty or forty carloads of tin beans and the rest to sell to the fishermen, then I will get my two hundred carloads for the year or whatever it is, if I buy for the year I will get all my goods a shade cheaper, and I will make that much more profit on all the goods, not only what I sell to the fishermen but also what I sell to the big cash market." That is all the fishermen have come to mean to me if I am a typical, average Water Street Merchant. They have only come to mean shading the price of a tin of beans so I can make a bit more on every tin of beans I market in Argentia, Stephenville, Gander, Grand Falls and Buchans and all the other commercial markets.

Now, then I ask, how low has Newfoundland fallen. Now again I am not blaming, I am merely describing what has happened and is happening. Because I think if we are going to do anything about the fishery matters, and I hope by now the House recognizes that since I have stood on my feet it is fishery I have been talking.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Tin beans, was it not

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am tempted to use once again on my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition the observation—I can explain a thing to you but only the Almighty God can give you the brains to understand it when I do explain it—

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be the last in this House, I think, to depreciate the importance and value of industrialism. To me there is some-

thing very attractive and appealing, just as attractive and appealing as it is unattractive, I believe, to my honourable friend from St. John's West, the newly elected member, although he is a civil engineer, I believe that his ideal is not shining industrialism at all. I believe his ideal is a more pastoral type of economy. God knows I am with him in some things. As Shelly said: I too realize the great stabilizing forces in an economy of a staple agriculture, a sound, a healthy and wholesome fishery. Not a small and slummy economy transplanted into the fisheries, but a solid, wholesome fishery and a wholesome agriculture. Oh yes, especially a live-stock agriculture. I know what that can do for the economy of any land. I know too that the land is the mother of all wealth, and I include the sea. At the same time I confess to you frankly that when I go to Grand Falls and to Corner Brook and see there many men who began life in the fishing boat, and there are many in those towns who did that, and fished for eight, ten, twelve or fifteen years before ever they saw the sky over Corner Brook or Grand Falls. And when I see them today living in their splendid homes, beautifully and tastefully and comfortably furnished, and their children going to beautiful schools and with their beautiful clothes. They are even now building a beautiful cathedral. They have all kinds of athletics and sports, I like that too. I like it, I must confess. But Newfoundland will cease to be Newfoundland if our fisheries perish, and will cease to be Newfoundland even if our fisheries change so that they are conducted by large companies employing proletarians, less and less workers having nothing but the wages they carry home on Saturday night.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: So I say that for Newfoundland's sake this great North East Coast must be saved. Now I hope no one will be so cheap—my honourable friends in this House from other districts, other parts of the Island other than the North East Coast, for instance my honourable friend from Fortune Bay, I am sure he does not misunderstand nor my honourable friend from Burgeo and LaPoile when I am not including all the rest of Newfoundland. I am dealing at this particular moment with the North East Coast, because the North East Coast is the fishery. If you start at Cape Race, to include that great fishing district of Ferryland and really take in all the North and East Coast of this Island, then what you have done is to take in the overwhelming bulk of the fishery of this Province, because from Port aux Basques to Cape Norman, the entire western side of the triangle there is hardly enough fish produced to—I don't exactly fear they will be hurt on that coast when I say they are not big producers, or they have ceased to be. The whole district of St. Barbe represented by His Honour the Speaker, most of the people of St. Barbe to get a meal of fish would have to travel fifty miles in that great district which was once a great fishing area but which is no longer.

No, it is on the North East Coast that the great heart of the problem is, and if it disappears or even if it goes the way I suggested, just the haunts of great capitalistic companies or combinations of companies, it will be bad. Now, Sir, there is the dilemma: The North East Coast is going down, that is number one. You cannot change the weather. You cannot establish on that North East Coast the

great fish plants that you can put in places such as Fermeuse, Trepassay, Burin, Marystown, Grand Bank, Fortune, Gaultois, etc., because they could not operate more than so many months a year and would have to be closed about four or five months a year, and that would make them extremely uneconomical—you cannot do it. Yet, if we think for one moment that men are going to go out in trap skiffs for the rest of the time and just carry on the codfishery by means of codtraps, by means of trawls or by means of hand lines or by means of jiggers, then we are crazy if we think that. That is another horn of the dilemma—how many horns can there be on a dilemma. On this North East Coast there are an awful lot of horns, the place bristles with them. So you can't get the great industrial fish plants on the North East Coast, no economically, they won't pay. Yet you cannot go on with your old fashioned cod fishing, that also does not pay. You cannot live on thirty quintals today. You could do it fifty years ago, with one suit of clothes in a life time, a pair of long boots, probably "Smallwood's Boots" for half a lifetime, two pairs of them in a lifetime, and the hardest and roughest kind of food. You might then live on thirty quintals of fish. I believe they did reasonably well for hundreds of years, but not now. It will start another kind of revolution, the one with barricades and that kind of thing, if we try to force our people to live on thirty quintals of fish a year—they can't do it—they won't do it. That is another horn of the dilemma. So what are you going to do about it?

Incidentally, to bring a little politics into it, I would remind the House that the Opposition never said a word as to what they would do about it.

They don't seem to have the foggiest notion. They have no policy. That is okay, we have a policy, and we are going to carry it out and begin to carry it out in this session.

MR. HOLLETT: It is about time you had a policy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I got off a bit of politics there. So my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, is trying to get off a little, and he did, but a little bit cheap. Don't forget we have only been in office five years, and the fishery has been here nearly five hundred. The fisheries have been going almost one century for every year we have been in office. We did not create the problem, but we are trying to fix it.

MR. HOLLETT: But will you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend the Minister of Public Welfare remarked that if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition got as far as Windsor Lake or Quidi Vidi he would be so seasick he would not want to talk fish or hear of fish.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Or Murray's Pond. We would like to see him in there.

MR. HOLLETT: I think I spent more time on the sea than the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes — more time at sea—my honourable friend, in fact, is still at sea.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member continue his speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. These disconcerting interruptions I get from the other side put me off the track. I have such a

shallow mind, you see, I can't retain anything; easily put off the track.

MR. HOLLETT: Narrow gauge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Narrow gauge?

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest you bear in mind the suggestion from the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now, later in this session the Government will ask the House, all members in the House to support us, to back us, to vote for us in a big effort we propose to make, a very expensive effort. We are going to ask the House to authorize us to borrow some money to spend on that great effort, because we desire to spend millions of dollars on it, and we desire to spend more millions next year and we desire to spend more millions the year after on the fisheries. How? By carrying out the great fisheries programme that has been devised by Sir Albert Walsh and the four or five or six other members of the Fisheries Development Committee, who sat for two full years delving deeply into the problems and coming up at last with a series of practical proposals and suggestions. Now, that was last year, and that was no sooner done than the Parliament of Canada dissolved and a general election was called and held. Then just around that time, either before or after we had this dispute over the price of fish last year. It was not until the election was over and things settled down that it became practical for the two Governments to get together to hammer out the actual details of the question of an agreement between them; to what extent could they agree in detail, in practice, and what should be the functions of the Government of Newfoundland and what the functions of the Government of Canada, who would do

what, who would pay for which? These details have been worked out and the two Governments now, I am happy to say, are seeing eye to eye. Now I will admit this very frankly, if the Government of Canada would say, whatever the bill is send it to us, just go ahead and whatever it costs just go ahead and do it and just send us the bill. That would be pleasant. If we did not have to vote any money in this House for fishery development, if this Government had not to rack its brains to find money in many, many millions to do it, but if Ottawa agreed to pay all that, it would be pleasant. That would be nice. I suppose it would. I am not sure. I think perhaps it is good exercise for us Newfoundlanders to grapple with our own problems and solve them if not entirely then largely and mostly by our own efforts. I don't know but that it is the better thing for us to do. I don't think that we became a Province of Canada just to lean on the rest of Canada. I don't believe it of proud Newfoundlanders, proud as Lucifer, the proudest people of all Canada bar none. God in Heaven, I sometimes wonder what we have to be proud of. But we are proud, we are sinfully proud, we Newfoundlanders. We think we are the "Cat's Pajamas." There is nothing in North America our equal, we little handful of people. We think we have more guts and more brains and more courage and more skill than any other people in this continent. I don't think we have. I think we can hold our own. But we are very proud. I think we are too proud to join up with nine other provinces and say; now you have us, you dirty brutes, now you got us, thanks to a few traitors and Judas Iscariots and Quisslings like Smallwood. You got us, now support us for the rest of your natural life. I

don't think we Newfoundlanders are willing to do that. I don't think that is the feeling of the Newfoundland people. We must do our part, and Canada must do hers. Between us it will take a hundred million dollars—as our American friends would say—if I am not passe' by now—I must admit as I grow older I get out of touch with the latest slang, but as I believe our American friends would say: "That is not hay." That is a lot of money, a hundred million dollars.

This year we are going to start. And I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that next year when this House meets, a year from now, the Opposition will be able to denounce us because we are going to make a lot of mistakes. I can tell the House now that we are going to make a lot of mistakes. You see, Mr. Speaker, the members of this Government were not born with a hundred or a couple of hundred years of experience in running a country, and we are still only young, with five years of practical experience, and in the launching out of a vast fishery development programme we have had precisely no experience at all, none, because it has never been done before in Newfoundland.

**MR. HOLLETT :** The Minister of Public Welfare has a lot.

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** In the launching of a great, new fishery development programme, I say, no one in Newfoundland has had any experience in doing that. In the session two years from now my honourable friends in the Opposition will be able to point their finger at us again and again. They will be able to point to some pretty bad mistakes because we will make them in our second year and in our third year and up to the nineteenth year we have yet to go be-

fore there is a Tory Government elected in Newfoundland. For the remaining nineteen years of this Liberal Government, in each one of these years we will make mistakes. With all the experience in making mistakes I will leave it to the House to decide the kind of mistakes my honourable friends will make in their first year in power twenty years from now.

MR. HOLLETT: It is no laughing matter, these mistakes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we will make them. So that, Mr. Speaker, this is the fateful year that we are going to launch in to the deep for fishery development.

There are one or two other points, then I think I will finish. I am sorry the honourable member for St. John's, who is not a lawyer, has gone out. He talked about these new industries, these new industrial plants. He said that CMIC was gone. That reminds me, about a year ago, the present Leader of the Opposition, I don't remember if he was the Leader then, frankly I cannot keep track of the Leaders—

MR. BROWNE: Where has the other gone?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know.

MR. BROWNE: You got him a job.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there is one working now for the Government, and doing a good job, I must say, as Minister of Self-Defence. Excuse me, it is Director of Civil Defence. He is doing an excellent job, I may say, whatever he does he does thoroughly anyway. I can say that for him anyway. I cannot deny it.

But my honourable friend who has just come back into the Chamber took a very dim view, and his present Leader, nominally, the one sitting on his immediate right, not on his remote right, that Leader said last year about the —

MR. HOLLETT: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Whilst I am not greatly perturbed over the remarks made by the Honourable the Premier as to the leadership of this party, I do think whoever is sitting in this Chair should get the recognition which he deserves, and I would like to see that done.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable the Premier should not have said that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have a sweep-stake running on this side of the House as to who will be the next leader. Anyway that Leader took a very dim view last year of the textile plant, and he thought it a most significant fact that there beside it was a graveyard. Now I am sure he will be happy to hear that plant is flourishing, and instead of being appropriately near a graveyard, actually the plant has really done exceedingly well. That remark may have been made by another leader, it was one of the leaders of the party anyway.

Nine of the new plants are actually in operation now at the moment, three of them at capacity, and six of them at part capacity but now in actual operation. Five of them have not yet begun production—that is fourteen in all. Now these fourteen new plants in this year, 1954, will employ full time, 2,100 workers and part time 750 additional workers. These workers will receive this year



in wages over four and a quarter million dollars. It will be considerably more under both headings next year. There will be more workers next year than this year and they will receive more in pay next year than this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, the sum laid out is approximately twenty million dollars. I ask the House to do a little table in arithmetic. I wonder if we could clear up the point which is the senior and which the junior member for St. John's East?

MR. HIGGINS: It was never agreed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are both so young it is hard to say which is the junior and which the senior. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, for the record we could clear up that point.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that particular point: As far as I can find out, I believe the senior member of any district is the member with the greater number of votes in any general election. As far as I can find out, I think that is a rule which was made by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt, Mr. Speaker, you or any speaker could give a ruling on that immediate question as to which of these two gentlemen is senior and which junior. However, as I said, about twenty million dollars has been laid out on all these plants. In this year with nine of them in operation, three at capacity and six part capacity and five of them not yet in production, they employ twenty one hundred workers full time and six hundred and fifty part time, who will receive in wages this year over four and a quarter million dollars. I ask the House whether it is good business for Newfoundland to spend twenty million dollars of its

own hard earned money to create these plants. Let us say that next year, 1955, the total in wages paid is five millions. But why put it at five millions and not ten millions or seven millions or six millions, but five millions as an average, typical wage bill annually from these plants. Let us say that—I am trying to be conservative (with a small "c")—the Government lends out twenty million dollars. It does not give it away but lends the money at interest. At the present time we are trying to collect back neither the principal nor the interest. We have loaned twenty million dollars. That has created fourteen new industrial plants. Let us assume that these three thousand workers are to be given employment the year around at five million dollars in wages a year. The question I have to ask is this: Was that a good thing for the Government to do? If the Government had its time all over again, and had not laid out a dollar of that twenty millions, would the Government be right to do what it did on that basis—on the basis of fourteen plants? On the assumption of employing 3,000 people, getting five million dollars, would the Government be right in taking that decision—the decision we did, in fact, take? I will go a step further—suppose we have twenty millions cash in the till (we have only a little more than half that—we have eleven millions in the till at the moment)—suppose we had twenty millions lying loose and free and not needed, would it be good business to use it to create another fourteen plants that would employ another three thousand people, receiving five million a year? Would that be good business? Or further, if we have forty millions and could produce twenty-eight new plants employing six thousand people,

receiving wages of ten million dollars a year, would the Government be wise to do it? I think the House ought to consider that. We were not a pack of jackasses, nincompoops and fools in spending twenty millions to create the fourteen plants we have created.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if my honourable friend would indicate the plants where these people are employed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Cement Mill and the Gypsum Mill on the West Coast; the United Cotton Mills, the Atlantic Hardboards, the Terra Nova Textiles, here in St. John's—that is five. The Newfoundland Hardwoods, the CMIC, Hanning Electric, the Rubber Plant, the Wool Mill at Brigus, the Carbonear Tanneries; the Glove Factory; the Shoe and Leather Goods Plant. Of these plants, three are working at full capacity.

MR. HOLLETT: How many employees?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is wasting his time as usual. He will not get me to do what I have refused many times to do. I am not that simple.

MR. HOLLETT: Almost.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is optimistic.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is still here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I want to say a word about liquor. By the way, I do hope that the point I made yesterday is thought about by somebody. I have a fairly considerable library. If I never collected money, I collected some books. I managed to amass quite a number of books. I have a library

that deals with the history of Parliament; deals with parliamentary procedure; deals with parliamentary rules, proceedings and practice, generally. On that topic, all these books—Todd, May, etc.—dozens of them all agree on one thing—all of them; I made the point here yesterday; no one took the slightest notice of it; they all agreed that it is as much the duty, the plain duty of the Opposition (and "duty" is a strong word), to tell the people what they stand for, what their philosophy is, what their programme is, as it is the duty of the Government to govern. In fact it is more the duty of the Opposition to inform the people what is their policy, orally and in writing, than it is the Government's duty to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Hon. the Premier indicate the sections where it says that is the policy?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I will not. You have read them. It is more the Opposition's duty by speeches and writings to tell the people what their policies are than it is for the Government to do it. The Opposition cannot act; they can only talk and by the nature of things, there is all the greater obligation on them to tell the people by word of mouth and by writing, what they stand for; and they have failed utterly to do it. They have failed—the Tory party has failed lamentably to make known to even their own clan, what they stand for. I say this as a brief, preliminary reference, a brief introduction to the liquor problem. In the matter of the liquor question, the Opposition have been content merely to ask questions which they hope will be embarrassing to the members of the House who sit on this side. That is their contribution to this social problem of liquor—

as politicians, as members of this House, merely to try and embarrass members on this side—not a suggestion, not an idea, not a proposal—nothing. It could not be much less than nothing. I cannot say they have no policy—how do I know whether or not they have a policy. I am not a member of their party; I am not admitted to their caucuses. If I ask them they will not tell me. If they have a policy, they are keeping it a deadly secret from me and from the people of Newfoundland, and from this House. It is the most precious-guarded secret in this Island today—jealously guarded. I am told that you can protect people from uranium by putting it in a depth of mountain that had lead walls a foot thick so that rays could not get out. I imagine they have their policy guarded in such a box as that. It is like one of these boxes where another box fits exactly inside; inside of that there is another box; inside that another one smaller than a match box; out of that comes one smaller than a thimble and out of that comes one as big as a pea. Similarly, out of such a one comes the Tory policy.

MR. BROWNE: It might be as strong as uranium and just as effective.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will never be effective if it is not told. Are they saving it up to spring on the people three nights before Polling Day? Maybe it cannot be released—like Gordon Higgins' policy. He had a piece of Tory policy. He saved it up. It cost \$1,000 by the way. He saved up Sennewald as a part of Tory propaganda for the last night—the last night anyone was permitted to broadcast. He saved him up for the last minute; but the only thing was, I was to follow

him on the air. We had tossed for it weeks before and it so happened I won the toss. According to that, I had the last moment on the air.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to hear you give some quotations from that now.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you gave it extemporaneously.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have the ability to write fast and think fast.

MR. HOLLETT: You thought fast that night.

MR. SMALLWOOD: While Mr. Higgins was lambasting me, I was there in the studio with my pencil—my trusty pencil; like a nice trusty sword—getting notes, so that I could reply. Then the announcer said "You heard Mr. Higgins speak for the—" what is the name of the party? Progressive Party." He then announced it was the Canadian Broadcasting Station at St. John's and then he said "We now introduce the speaker for the Liberal Party." And this was Joe—an antidote to Mr. Higgins. Is it not funny, a party calling itself "Progressive" offering itself to the people and saying, "Elect us to be the Government. We have no manifesto; we have no programme; we have no policy. Just elect us."

MR. HOLLETT: We ask them to elect us for the Opposition. When we want to be the Government, we will be the Government.

MR. FOGWILL: Clean up your own mess first.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems a pity to break up this interesting private conversation. Would the Premier go on with his speech?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I deprecate these interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair deprecates them from either side.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As the Press points out, Newfoundland has the lowest rate of alcoholism in all Canada. I think this is worth knowing. Newfoundland has, of all Canada, the lowest alcoholism rate. In British Columbia they have the highest. This table was prepared by the Alcoholism Research Board of the Government of Ontario. British Columbia, per one hundred thousand of the population has 2,532 alcoholics; Quebec has 1,813; Ontario 1,687; Nova Scotia 1,286; New Brunswick 1,278; Manitoba 1,173; Saskatchewan 1,167; Alberta 918; Prince Edward Island 675 and Newfoundland 501. That is not a bad tribute to this Government's liquor policy, that we have, of all Canada, by far the lowest rate of alcoholism—that we have one-fifth of the Province of British Columbia—they have 2,500; we have 500. Take the consumption of beer—the people of the United Kingdom consume 18 gallons of beer a year—that is, each person of the whole population of Great Britain; in the United States, 14 gallons a year; in Canada (all Canada, including Newfoundland),  $13\frac{1}{2}$  gallons— $\frac{1}{2}$  gallon less than the United States; Newfoundland  $4\frac{1}{2}$  gallons. That is not too bad a tribute to this Government's record or policy.

Take all kinds of beverages, beer, wine and hard liquor, in Nova Scotia (just across the Gulf) the people consumed, last year, an average of \$36.27 worth.

MR. BROWNE: May I remind the honourable member that Nova Scotia has a big tourist industry, and a lot

of that would be consumed by tourists.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not quite so. That is definitely not the case. I will come to that. I have the broken-down figures of every province of Canada. I can tell my honourable friend this—there is an organization in Canada consisting of the Chairman of each Province's Board of Liquor Control, and I can tell my honourable friend the daily, weekly consumption of liquor is known—it is known by days, weeks, months. If the tourist trade in Nova Scotia made any appreciable difference in the consumption, then, obviously, in the tourist season the jump would be seen and the drop after that. But that is not so. What makes the difference is the number of outlets. Wherever you go in Nova Scotia you see a government liquor store—48 of them. We have five. Last year in Nova Scotia, the average person of the population—men, women and children—the average was \$36.27 worth of liquor of all kinds; Alberta \$48.41; Saskatchewan \$38.90; Newfoundland \$18.50—the lowest in all Canada. As a matter of fact, the people of Newfoundland are very moderate drinkers compared with any other Province of Canada or with the United States, or with the United Kingdom. Our people are very moderate drinkers. They are not heavy drinkers.

The other point is this: Is the trend up? Yes! Why is it up? More liquor will be consumed in 1954 than in 1953. There was more consumed in 1953 than in 1952.

MR. BROWNE: How much?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount is not startling. The increase is slowing down, but it is still an increase.

The reason is obvious. People consume more beer for the same reason they buy more shoes, silk stockings, motor cars and new houses. They have more money, more prosperity (The Deputy Speaker reminds me there are fewer extracts of essence to get drunk on).

MR. HIGGINS: Who has the figures on essences?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are licensed and when you license an activity, you are apt to know the size.

MR. HIGGINS: Are they definitely going down?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Another thing that might interest the House is that the consumption of hard liquor relative to the consumption of beer and wine is going down.

MR. HIGGINS: Is not the consumption of wine up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The consumption of hard liquor relative to beer and wine is going down. I know what my honourable friend would allude to should he ask if the consumption of wine is going up. Not being a drinker myself, I take an occasional glass of wine, but I have yet since I was born to touch or taste rum, whisky, brandy or gin. As a matter of fact I don't even know the names of most of these liquors.

MR. HIGGINS: Pinky?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was coming to pinky in a moment.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable member? I want to give directions to the officers on duty to remove from the building the next stranger, that is persons in the gallery who laugh aloud. The members of

the press are here to make comments on speeches with their pencils.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have been told, Mr. Speaker, that some people buy wine for the purpose of mixing it with some other drink.

MR. HIGGINS: Aftershave, some of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But principally they mix it with beer or liquor.

MR. HIGGINS: Beer, as a rule. That will bring out the real pinky, beer and wine. It has to be a particular brand to produce the best brand of pinky—Old Niagara Port, and beer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, that does not sound to me like a very attractive drink. I have heard it said by connoisseurs in these matters that beer and wine don't mix. Drink beer before a meal, during the meal drink wine and follow the wine with champagne, but never beer after wine.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us not get on to recipes for various kinds of cocktails. If the honourable member has a preference he might pass it on to the honourable members on this side when the House closes.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I would like to know the effect myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The answer will not be given.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just one point more of a special character, and then one other point of a general character, then I am through.

I notice that some private companies here in Newfoundland, even private companies that the Government has not assisted financially, are now beginning to bring foreigners into this Province. I am not referring to companies that this Government has been instrumental in bringing into Newfoundland or assisting to come to Newfoundland, nor am I referring even to companies in Newfoundland which have been helped by us in a financial way. But I am referring to old companies here in Newfoundland who are beginning to bring foreigners in here to this Province. I am wondering why the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has not registered any objections in this House to that fact. I know there are several persons here now working in the Newfoundland fisheries from the Faroe Islands, without any complaint whatsoever from the Opposition. There has been no question asked here about these foreigners. I notice there is a man here from Denmark, a couple of Germans as well as an Estonian. There are several Norwegians engaged also in the Newfoundland fishing industry—yet there is not a word of objection voiced by the Opposition, no question directed at us about the matter. I notice also that a number of our more up-to-date fish plants have brought in German machinery, with German Technicians to operate that machinery and to train Newfoundlanders in its operation. I notice that Bowaters, by far the biggest company in Newfoundland, has brought in a number of Europeans, technicians, scientists and chemists to work for them, without a single word of objection from any of the honourable gentlemen opposite, even my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition.

What is happening to him? Is the spirit going out of him? Is he losing his grip? I was quite startled the other day to read that the great President of the United States, President Eisenhower, is of German extraction. But don't let us bring that fact out in the open. We know there are no people of German origin or German decent in the United States. We only find them here. Yet President Eisenhower's family Bible came into prominence lately, and horror of horrors, his Family Bible was printed in German. Yet there was not a word of protest from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, no questions tabled for us, not a protest. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition must truly be wondering what the world is coming to—the President of the United States!—

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have lived in the United States, parts of it at least. I have noticed a number of things about it. But there was one thing in particular I noticed. You don't have to go to the United States for that either, here in St. John's the same thing applies. Listen to the radio broadcasts of ball games in which Americans from Fort Pepperrell take part, or read about it in the newspapers. If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does that I am quite sure he will end up with the suspicion that these people here on the American Bases have names that sound suspiciously Germanic, and I am wondering what he is going to do about it. Is he going to let the Yanks get away with that? Let them get away with bringing Germans in here, into our very midst, and God in Heaven knows what other strange people, with strange-sounding names, foreigners? My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, spoke the other day



about the people who worked in the Gypsum Plant at Corner Brook, and attempted, not as successfully as he could have done so, to reel off the names of some of these people because they sounded strange. That is nothing! He should read the names of some of these people, the American ball players, right here at Fort Pepperell. My honourable friend, his new follower, who spent four years in the House of Commons will recall members of the House of Commons, in the very heart of the nation, with strange-sounding names, members coming from the west.

MR. HOLLETT: What has that got to do with the liquor question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have passed on from the liquor question. My honourable friend may be preoccupied with this question of liquor to an extent that I have never been.

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have never been.

Mr. Speaker, would it be good for Newfoundland, if assuming there was the work for them, if we could bring five thousand Danes in here, five thousand Dutch, five thousand Swedes, five thousand Norwegians, five thousand Germans, five thousand Swiss, five thousand Belgians, five thousand Spaniards, five thousand Portuguese—would that be good for Newfoundland? It was good for the United States. It was good for Ontario. It was good for the Prairie Provinces of Canada. Would it be good for Newfoundland? Would it be good to bring these national strains in that we have not got. We are the English, Irish and Scotch race. There is nothing wrong with that. But I have never yet heard it suggested that all the

assets of humanity were confined to the English, Irish and Scotch. And if it is suggested here in this House it will be an entirely new anthropological theory. Those racial strains with the characteristics and attributes of those people brought in here, their children mixing with our children, going to school side by side with our children, where you don't have racial prejudices, and grow up with them as friends. I say economically speaking if we could absorb, if we could find employment for them if they would make a living here, to bring in these new qualities to add to the solid sense, experience and character we have already, if we could enliven it by adding them it would be a great thing for Newfoundland, a magnificent thing. I find it very difficult to believe that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, who is a Master of Arts from Oxford University, a Rhodes Scholar, and therefore a learned man, a scholarly man, I find it difficult to believe that he could have so lost his old love of learning that he must have had at one time, that he could have separated himself so far from the great traditions of culture and learning as to believe, as to be sincere when he sneers at the Germans and Latvians who have come into this Province—I find it difficult to believe. Therefore I am driven to an inescapable conclusion that when he makes these references he makes them not out of a sincere belief that they are right, but in the hope that they will arouse a responsive cord in the breasts of the yokels, to whom I referred yesterday.

MR. HOLLETT: If the honourable gentleman will permit me? He has quoted me as sneering at Germans. I have never done such a thing. I

have only sneered at a Government who has brought them in at a million dollars apiece. So I would like to have that corrected, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the correction would be a valid one if it were true. There is just no truth in it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair cannot be asked to decide what tone of voice constitutes a sneer.

MR. HOLLETT: I will admit this—I am politician enough to admit if my honourable friend could make that stick—

MR. SMALLWOOD: We brought in twenty Germans and gave a million each to them—twenty millions. Now the surplus is all gone. We gave it to twenty Germans. If we could make that stick. I am politician enough to know it would mean some votes. But where would I be in the meantime—deaf, dumb and speechless—does he think he alone can talk to the people of Newfoundland? Now I admit it is smart. It would be smart if there were no answer, if that is all they would hear. We had a big surplus and gave it all away to twenty Germans, a million dollars each, that is the kind of Premier you have. If that is all they would hear, over and over, dinned in their ears often enough, they could win some votes with it. I know that is true. But that is not the case. To begin with it is not true, and propaganda today is all the more effective when it is true. It is highly dangerous when it is not true, it can have the kick of a mule, but it can turn around and kick in the face of the man who has uttered it, it can knock him out. There is nothing so bad as propaganda that misfires—it is always safe to be truthful,

MR. HOLLETT: Fourteen companies got twenty million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were not all Germans to begin with. If my honourable friend implies that he will never extricate himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are many things about which I could talk, there are many things I could say. The fact is that this Government has been in office for five years and these five years have been the most revolutionary in all the history of Newfoundland. The only time in little more than half a century in North America that one part of North America joined another part was when we became a Province of Canada. That was the first great continental change in this continent for fifty years or more.

MR. BROWNE: Alaska.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said fifty years.

MR. BROWNE: When was Alaska purchased?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was a change of boundaries. Just the same some of my honourable friends would say that was a purchase too. That was the first time in half a century that any boundaries in North America changed. That is something to think about. We became a Province of Canada, and a country does not cease to be a country and become part of another country without great dislocation, not only a dislocation of spirit and mind and heart but a dislocation physically, economically, statistically, commercially, industrially. We have, as a Government, tided Newfoundland over these five years, and I hope that we have done a good job.

MR. BROWNE: You had upward of fifty millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we had not fifty millions. We had nothing like fifty millions. But we had four times fifty millions if my honourable friend wants to take the five years and add up all the revenue we have had together with the grants from Ottawa, the pre-union surplus together with the surpluses we have earned ourselves would be more than four times fifty millions. But if he is thinking only of the actual surplus we inherited—I say we have tided Newfoundland over very well in those tumultuous years for a little place like Newfoundland. We are quite small. We must not get illusions of grandeur. We talk about resources and untapped wealth and all that and we might quite easily give ourselves illusions. We were a small country and a small handful of people so that these years were tumultuous and difficult. In the first three years the members of this Cabinet worked night and day. Never did any Cabinet, I suppose, in the history of the world, certainly in this half of the world, work so hard or for such long hours. My honourable friend, the Attorney General, has had more experience than any ten lawyers in North America in the drafting of new legislation of one country into that of another and with the integration of each country into that of the other, Canada into Newfoundland and Newfoundland into Canada; the integration of the very fabric, constitutionally speaking, of Canada into the very fabric of our life in Newfoundland, gigantic work, which we did in these last five years. Along with the slavery, hard, monotonous, drab slavery we did, on top of that, we had to spare the energy and mind and heart for our idealism, in bringing in our idealistic legislation, and at the same time had to spare some of our enthu-

siasm to launch our great drive for economic development. I claim that it is evident we have committed very few blunders. I have been the first to name our great blunder which was a little bit of an anticlimax for my honourable friends. I am really sorry about that. My honourable friend, the newly elected member, when he talked of the Icelandic Boats the other day really was terribly out of date. I am the one who accused this Government of making a horrible blunder. On the radio, I think, I said; "If I had been the Opposition I would make the Government's life too miserable to live." So that several years later when my honourable friend returns here from Ottawa and rakes up the Icelandic Boats here he is horribly out of date.

MR. BROWNE: Is the matter finished up yet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I see it is a sort of serial—to be continued. Well the Opposition ought to think up something more original, and something more applicable than that, twenty millions to twenty Germans would be something they could do a little more with than the Icelandic Boats.

Now in the five years—just think of the Alderdice Government. They were not there quite four years. Think of the Monroe Government a little less than four years. The Squires Government before that, and go right back to Bond and try to think of a Government in office for four years that made so few mistakes as this Government, try to think of one. It would be a little difficult. And I know the history of the Governments of Newfoundland from 1900 on almost like the palm of my own hand. I have just been going through two

tons of documents affecting two Governments, sometimes up until two and three o'clock in the morning with all their secret and confidential documents. We have not done too badly, if I do say it myself. We have not committed very many mistakes, and we have accomplished a lot. We are still fresh. We are not tired. We have not grown weary. We are full of ambition, full of life and energy and enthusiasm to tackle the biggest job of all, the reorganization of our fisheries here in Newfoundland. While it is true I would like a somewhat bigger Opposition, because it is a little pathetic to have six hours talk only from all the members of the Opposition put together, that is a little pathetic, that is hardly good enough.

MR. BROWNE: You have almost equalled that yourself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly. I would like to see a better Opposition. By better I mean only stronger, as they are all excellent gentlemen, all nice gentlemen, all of them without exception, with Rhodes Scholars, one lawyer, one labour leader.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder—if the honourable gentleman would not be so personal in his remarks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can't I pay a compliment.

MR. BROWNE: I know that is nice, but is it not a waste of the time of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been waiting for such an objection. Certainly the Chair cannot stop an honourable gentleman from paying a compliment. On the other hand compliments are personal, and the objection taken by the honourable member is in order. He can object if he pleases.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. So I say in conclusion that the five years have made us better than we were five years ago. We are better equipped now to go on to build Newfoundland nearer to our heart's desire.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20th, at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 20th, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

TUESDAY, April 20, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and very happy to announce that the British Newfoundland Corporation generally known as BRINCO, have decided to conduct a great survey, commencing this year, of the watershed of the Hamilton River and the Grand Falls on the Labrador.

The company at a meeting of its directors recently approved an expenditure from its funds of up to one million dollars in 1954, this current calendar year for the purpose of commencing what is to be an absolutely thorough survey of the hydro-electric

potentialities of that great watershed. BRINCO has entered into contract with a Montreal Engineering Company and also an engineering company of the Province of Quebec under which those two great hydro-engineering concerns will carry out the survey commencing this year, on behalf of BRINCO, of course.

Aircraft will be employed in the work as well as approximately two hundred persons in the present year. The survey has already begun, and the company are quite pleased to learn from the initial work already performed in 1954 that it may not take anything like as long to complete the work as they thought at first it would require.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the Grand Falls alone, on the Hamilton River, various estimates have been made, running as high as four million horse power of hydro-electricity, that can be developed from the Hamilton watershed and up to ten million horse power from the whole of the Hamilton River watershed if connected with another watershed lying immediately beside it. That is more hydro-electricity than is presently developed throughout the length and breadth of Canada. That would be a great development that would dwarf Niagara Falls, that would dwarf the great Kitterman, this could be a development that is the largest in the world, the largest single hydro-electric development in the world.

Certainly, Sir, the fact that BRINCO has voted out of its funds an amount of upwards of one million dollars to be spent in this present year on that survey indicates the deadly seriousness with which BRINCO are taking this huge and expensive job.

I won't say any more at this time about it. I will certainly say nothing to indicate any possible use to which the power in question might be put. That is something which must await another occasion. But it seems to me that the decision of BRINCO to make this great survey is one of the biggest pieces of news that ever came to Newfoundland.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege:

On Tuesday the 6th, instant on the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I addressed the House, and in the latter part of my remarks I elaborated on what I called "The Unfinished Business of Public Welfare." Throughout these remarks I was anxious to convey to the House a point of view I have been pressing within the House and outside for years, namely, that welfare is always in some measure public welfare. I had just finished saying that although government had to take such a large responsibility for welfare, I still hoped the springs of voluntary charity would not thereby dry up. And to illustrate further, I gave instances by which I intended to draw labour, management and indeed the whole community into a total partnership with government for improving the public welfare. If I recall correctly the mood of the House at the time I was speaking, I believe I can assume now that the House understood that such was my principal purpose.

In the course of these remarks I said, among other things, that there were indescribably serious social conditions prevailing in Newfoundland affecting the welfare of families and their children.

At this stage I should like to quote an excerpt from that section of my address. I was speaking on industry and I concluded that section of my remarks by saying: "My remarks in this respect, Sir, are designed to involve industry generally as having a moral responsibility for people, that people are not merely something out of which wealth must be squeezed and then when they become 45 and have asthma, throw them out."

Mr. Smallwood here said: "Socialism—careful that is not liked over there."

Then I continued: "I am involving industry, Sir industry as having a moral responsibility for the people, and that is part of the unfinished business of Public Welfare."

"So we go on—I met five or six welfare officers a few weeks ago. I asked them, because they belong to certain areas which are to some extent contiguous and their districts in some cases join one another, "How about your unemployment situation?" I was told: "We have not any in the whole area, no unemployment, no great amount of relief." And yet, if I say that social conditions are appalling in any place, there are no words to describe the social conditions in parts of one or more of these district—I can't find a word to describe it.

One of the welfare officers told me that, although there is no unemployment around his community nor in most of his district, ninety-five per cent of the children in a section of his district should not be living with their parents, but I say; should be decontaminated by being taken away from the bad example of their elders. That may sound like "Plato's Republic" but there it is.

Right in Newfoundland today social conditions, I say, are unspeakably bad; wives are exchanged like common chattels—and it does not happen all on one side of the track either; it is not just an indisposition of some poor people, one of their luxuries.

I shall say something, Sir, which is bound to be misunderstood: Where there is most prosperity in Newfoundland there is most social disorganization. Now then that is said, that is not to say that prosperity is a bad thing. But it does mean to say that where prosperity abounds (and I am speaking Public Welfare now, Sir) where prosperity abounds there is, to that extent, a greater need for us to be on our guard that, when we think of money, when we are getting and spending, we do not at the same time lay waste our powers. The advent and habits of prosperity ought not to dull us to the fact, dull our perceptions to the fact that people, people above all, are important, and that we cannot go on singing the national ode as if it were just some wonderful dream—it means people. We have more here than just pine-clad hills—we have people—and when we speak of people as being our ultimate resources we are speaking of something which is more than poetry.

Now, Sir, as a member of this House, I think it is an abiding responsibility, not only for this Government, but for the House as a whole, the Opposition and all of us together, to see to it that in our debates we put first things first, and that in an issue of this kind, of putting people first, we cannot afford to dissipate our resources by bickering nor by drawing attention to "Red Herring." This is a real thing, Sir—The People of Newfoundland! That is the unfinished business of Public



Welfare. It seems to me that in all our getting and spending we should put our people, our fundamental resources, where they properly belong, in the forefront. It is a responsibility, I think, Sir, for both the Government and the Opposition, all of us together, to see to it, in collaboration with every agency of goodwill, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, that; "While we accumulate wealth men shall not decay."

Now, Sir, that was the concluding section of my address, and it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that I did not mention any place by name nor give any such indication as to what part or parts of the province I had in mind. I said it was an area of no unemployment. But at the time there were numerous areas, large and small, where there was no unemployment.

For the larger purpose I had in mind it was neither necessary nor certainly desirable to single out any community or district.

However, the "Evening Telegram" reporting this part of my address the following day, while admitting I did not mention any place, stated nevertheless that the community I had in mind was Stephenville. To quote from the "Evening Telegram" of April 7: "And there was one area where there was no unemployment, said Dr. Pottle. (Again he did not name the centre, but he referred to Stephenville). Here in spite of prosperity, the Welfare Officer reported that 95 per cent of the children should not be allowed to live with their parents—they should be "decontaminated." Here, he declared, wives were exchanged like chattels."

The same paper in reporting my earlier remarks on labour and on

management saw fit to guess at the names of the places I was supposed to have in mind, and then continued its guessing when it came to reporting my remarks on social conditions.

I met the "Evening Telegram" reporter outside the chamber shortly after my address, and we had only a very brief conversation. As I recall, he mentioned some place or places I might have had in mind when making my references to labour, management and social conditions. I gave no indication whatever about the place or places I had in mind as far as my address was concerned. Because I did not deny that his guesses were right it should not have been taken as any form of admission that his guesses were right. For if I had denied I would then have been manoeuvred into a guessing game, and by elimination the correct community or area would be finally pinned down.

Once Stephenville was singled out in print the damage was done, and whether I denied that it was the place I had in mind the next day in the House or at any time thereafter, a serious reflection had been cast on that community, which as we might have expected, has caused the residents great embarrassment and deeply disturbed feelings.

"Why," the Evening Telegram asked in its edition of Thursday the 15th, did I "wait so long before denying that Stephenville was the place I had in mind?" It was not for me to prejudice any charge that might be brought against it; and a serious charge may arise from the Telegram's own reporting: "He did not name the centre, but he referred to Stephenville." That is to say, the reporter added something of his own in his

report of my speech. Why the Telegram should have been so anxious to fix my reference to bad social conditions upon Stephenville I am at a loss to understand. And even when that paper published my denial about Stephenville on Thursday past it was still asking—"If it is not Stephenville, where is the place?"

I can only ask the House to imagine what it must be like for anyone three hundred miles away from this House to take up a newspaper and be confronted with capital italic and bold face headlines featuring out of context that his community has been indicated by a Minister of the Crown as morally unregenerate and socially outcast.

May I digress one moment to say that there were several errors in the reporting of my address in the Evening Telegram, some of commission, others of omission. One of the omissions referring to the company, I considered serious. My critical comments were reported, but the paper failed to report my saying, in so many words, that I had reason to believe the company was now seeking to help improve conditions and that in that community on the whole there were hopeful signs of increasing social responsibility. But the paper failed to report my saying so in so many words, and I quote:

"But I am glad to say there are more signs of improvement in these conditions there today than there have ever been in my remembrance, both from the company where I believe there are signs for the better, and from the people themselves as we have seen indicated lately. Things are on the move, and I believe we have seen the worst for that prosperous town."

I was, in fact, most anxious to have those positive items recorded.

I believed then, and I do so even more now, that my remarks could have been lifted to such a level in the public press that they would have done a great public service outside the narrow confines of this House. As it is, I believe my remarks have stirred the public conscious. And it is a great pity they were soured and perverted to cause in some quarters grievous human anxiety.

On Wednesday the 14th, I sent to the Evening Telegram a copy of a telegraphed protest from Reverend Father Bromley on behalf of the Community of Stephenville and a copy of my reply. The full text of the two telegrams: This message came from Rev. Fr. P. J. Bromley of Stephenville:

"Whole community of Stephenville indignant your remarks as published in the Evening Telegram seventh inst. Charges of such a base nature are fantastic and will do irreparable harm to a good people. Steps are being taken to deal with the matter."

This afternoon I replied in the following words:

"I can quite appreciate your anxiety and the anxiety of the people of Stephenville over the Evening Telegram's report on the seventh of my remarks in the House on the sixth. The Telegram quite erroneously attributed certain of my remarks as applying to Stephenville. At no time in the course of my ninety minute address did I mention Stephenville or in any way imply that I was referring to Stephenville. In actual fact I was not referring to Stephenville and did not have Stephenville in mind at any time at this point in my speech and the

welfare officer I quoted was certainly not one from Stephenville. As I have known Stephenville over the years I have always thought of it as a respectable God-fearing community. The welfare problems that Stephenville has had to meet within recent years are similar to those of other rapidly growing communities similarly situated and I can assure you and the people of Stephenville that your welfare officers' reports have always been fair and sympathetic. I can further say that we have been thinking of ways and means of improving our welfare services in your area and shall continue to do so. I am communicating a copy of this message to the Evening Telegram which in its issue today wrongly and without any justification whatever persists in construing my statement as referring to Stephenville. I regret exceedingly that my remarks are being so construed and I am considering making a statement to the House on Tuesday to this effect. Will you please convey immediately to the people of Stephenville on my behalf the contents of this message."

Yours truly,

HERBERT L. POTTLE,  
Minister."

These two telegrams, Sir, were published in the "Evening Telegram" on the following day, Thursday the 15th.

On the same day, Thursday the 15th, I gave the following statement on the radio stations.

"Please give full publicity to following statement: On Wednesday past I sent a signed statement to the Evening Telegram in which I said that I was definitely not referring to Stephenville in my recent speech in the House of Assembly. My denial

was published in the Telegram the next day, Thursday the 15th.

"However, in spite of the fact that a written denial had come from me and was made public by press and radio; in spite of the fact that a telegraphed request had come from Stephenville to the Telegram for that paper to retract its statement; in spite of the fact that on Thursday the 15th the Telegram was still asking "If it is not Stephenville, where is the place?"—in spite of all these facts the Evening Telegram in today's issue, Saturday the 17th, again publishes its earlier article where it positively identifies Stephenville as the place to which my remarks were applied, and fails to take any notice whatever of my emphatic denial.

"I know that a serious state of affairs has been created at Stephenville, and in view of the unwillingness of the Evening Telegram to retract its statement about Stephenville I feel I must in fairness to the people of that community and myself consider what further steps should now be taken to remedy this situation."

HERBERT L. POTTLE,  
Minister of Public Welfare.

April 17th, 1954."

Now, Sir, in spite of the fact that my denial was made public; in spite of the fact that a request had come to the Evening Telegram from the community of Stephenville for that paper to retract its statement about Stephenville; in spite of the fact that the Evening Telegram was asking on the 15th, "If it is not Stephenville. . . where is the place?"—nevertheless on the 17th, the Evening Telegram had reprinted its earlier article of the 14th, in which it positively identified

Stephenville as the community to which my remarks pointed. But the paper did not reprint my emphatic denial. That is a weekend paper, Mr. Speaker, and has an unusually large circulation.

I had a statement broadcast that evening pointing out these facts and saying that in view of the serious state of affairs existing at Stephenville and because of the unwillingness of the "Evening Telegram" to make any retraction whatever, I was obliged, in fairness to the people of that community and myself, to consider what further steps should now be taken to remedy this situation.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least four aspects of this issue that I wish to draw to the attention of the House.

In the first place, Sir, serious reflections have been cast upon one of our Newfoundland communities and named in the public press, and it has been thus unnecessarily disturbed and embarrassed.

Secondly; I can say, that the public welfare services in that area, as a result, have received a most serious setback.

Thirdly; The Evening Telegram's report has brought no little inconvenience and embarrassment both to the elected representative of the District concerned and to myself.

Fourthly; this matter is one which involves the privilege of the press in this House, of which the House should, I believe, take due notice.

I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Privileges be asked to investigate this matter and report in due course to the House. I table the papers from which I have quoted.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion proposed by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare.

The House will understand that I have a particular interest in the matter that the Minister has called to the attention of the House. Stephenville is located in the district which I represent here, and so it must be through me that the views of the people of Stephenville are heard in this House. Because of the report of the proceedings of this House on April 6th, as reported in the "Evening Telegram" on April 7th, the good reputation of the citizens of Stephenville has been besmirched, to my mind with malice. Consequently I cannot do less, Mr. Speaker, than demand on behalf of the people of Stephenville the full measure of satisfaction that this House may be able to order. The breach of privilege of this House of which the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare complains, and in which I support him, involves the putting of words into the mouth of a Minister of the Crown which he did not say. The consequence of that action is that the character of the people of Stephenville has been called into question, indeed called into decided disrepute.

Let us look once again at what the Evening Telegram said that the Minister of Public Welfare said: I quote, Sir, from the issue of the Evening Telegram, April 7, reporting the proceeds of the House on April 6 and in particular the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare. The Evening Telegram says (quote):

"And there was one area where there was no unemployment, said Dr.

Pottle (again he did not name the centre but he referred to Stephenville). Here in spite of prosperity, the welfare officer reported that 95% of the children should not be allowed to live with their parents, they should be decontaminated. Here, he declared wives are exchanged like chattels."

It can be proven from the report, Mr. Speaker, Hansard can be produced to prove it, and the Minister of Public Welfare in any case just produced the record to prove he at no time during the course of his remarks mentioned Stephenville.

I have to add that I sat in this House during the course of the Minister's remarks, and at no time did it appear to me that he meant Stephenville, nor that his remarks were directed at Stephenville. Let me go further and say that, had it appeared to me that his remarks were directed at Stephenville I should certainly have taken him to task for it when I spoke the following day, although I would have been decidedly out of order in doing so because it is beyond the competence of any member of the House to impute motives or inferences from the remarks of another. Although, Mr. Speaker, it is beyond the prerogative the Evening Telegram has taken it unto itself.

I will quote again from its report of April 6th: "Again I do not know the centre but he referred to Stephenville." I submit, Mr. Speaker, no member of this House could make that remark and have it stand on the record, yet that is just exactly what the "Evening Telegram" presumed to do. Now, as it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a case of a reporter having gotten out of line and possibly getting his paper in trouble.

The "Evening Telegram" subsequently and in its editorial of April 10th obviously accepted the report of its reporter at its full face value and commented accordingly. Not only that but on two subsequent occasions the Evening Telegram persisted in its position in an article appearing on page 3 of the April 14th issue of the Evening Telegram in which it stated: "The inference was plain to Dr. Pottle's listeners, that he referred to Stephenville Area though he did not say so in so many words."

Again in the issue of the "Evening Telegram," April 17th, although in the meantime the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare had issued a categorical denial that he had meant Stephenville, the "Evening Telegram" had this to say: "The inference was plain to Dr. Pottle's listeners that he referred to Stephenville Area though he did not say so in so many words."

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order: I believe it is the purpose of the motion to have this referred to the attention of the Committee on Privileges. I suggest that the recommendations presently being made would tend to prejudice a committee in its deliberations. May I ask further if there has been any Committee on Privileges appointed thus far in this session?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that point, I do not think it is a good point of order. The member who spoke first has the right to state his reasons, and the honourable gentleman speaking has exactly the same right, and that is the right he exercises, and he is not out of order in so doing. As to whether or not there is a committee—

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has a point of privilege himself which just happens to coincide with the one just raised by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare. A Committee of Privileges—yes, it was appointed on opening of this present parliament, to last for the life of the parliament. The names of the members of that Committee are on the notice board in the hall. The honourable member may continue his complaint.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, referring to this item which appears in the issue of April 16th, the weekend edition of the "Evening Telegram." I was quite prepared at first sight to give the "Evening Telegram" the benefit of the doubt, and to think that perhaps whoever was responsible for the news-of-the-week page happened to pull this particular item that referred to Stephenville out of the stack published previously during the week, and that it just happened to get in there through an oversight. But that is not so, Mr. Speaker. In the April 14th issue of the "Evening Telegram" the first paragraph reads: "The first repercussions from Welfare Minister, Dr. H. L. Pottle's speech in the Legislature on 'Unfinished Business' was heard in the Capital today."

In the end-of-the-week edition published April 17th the first paragraph read: "The first repercussions from Welfare Minister Dr. H. L. Pottle's speech in the Legislature on 'Unfinished Business' was heard in the Capital Wednesday." So that a word was changed in the end-of-the-week edition to bring the matter up to date. Therefore, I say, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Public Welfare had in the meantime made a categorical denial of the statement

that he had meant Stephenville, the "Evening Telegram" persisted, and did so with premeditation, in its stand.

Now, let us look at the charge that has been made, as far as I am concerned, by the "Evening Telegram." In accepting the inferences of its reporter and repeating them the "Evening Telegram" charged that 95% of the children of Stephenville should not be permitted to live with their parents but should be taken from them and decontaminated. By accepting the inferences of its reporter, and persisting in them the "Evening Telegram" charged that in Stephenville wives were exchanged like chattels. That means, Mr. Speaker, that the "Evening Telegram" has charged that a great number of the population of Stephenville are living in adultery, and their children should be taken from them. That, Sir, I class as a deliberate, infamous, dispicable and monstrous lie. There is this I should add, in fairness and justice to the proprietors of the "Evening Telegram" thoroughly reputable members of the community across the years who have conducted the operations of a newspaper with skill, and their journal is highly respected in this province by all classes. It is indeed regrettable that in this instance the columns of that journal should have fallen into the hands of an irresponsible who, in my opinion, was guided by motives of political malice.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I know the people of Stephenville probably better than any other member of this House, and certainly know them better than any members of the press gallery who may suddenly have taken it upon themselves to play God. I can vouch to this House and this province for the people of Stephen-



ville as law-abiding, hard-working and God-fearing. It may well be true that during the last dozen years there has been an influx into the community of Stephenville of certain undesirables, just as there may have been an influx of such undesirables to St. John's and Gander and Grand Falls and any other place in the Island where ready employment is offered for remuneration. So Stephenville is no worse off or more unfortunate in that respect than these other large centres I have named. In any other case I know the people of Stephenville at first hand. I know many of them by their first names, and I can vouch to this House and to this province for them as people who are very concerned with the Christian concept, very much concerned to live a Christian life. Therefore, on their behalf I repudiate the charge leveled against them, and on their behalf I demand the full measure of satisfaction that this House may be able to order.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the motion made by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, and to speak very briefly to this topic which has been dealt with by two of my colleagues. I shall not at all attempt to go into the details of the specific references and quotations which have appeared from time to time to cause pain and embarrassment to a fine people in any section of Newfoundland. These details and specific references have been dealt with sufficiently by my colleagues, and I merely rise to say that I do regret, deeply regret, that a great journal which I have had the privilege to review, as many another citizen of my age has for upwards of forty years, and which has

from time to time built up a reputation for its fair minded, faithful, honest and good writing. I recall, in making that comment, a comment made by the Honourable the Premier in this House very recently wherein he said it was regrettable indeed that the editor of that paper was unfortunately ill and unable to fulfill his normal daily task. I recall the Premier said on that occasion that he felt, had that gentleman been at his desk, no such ridiculous statement would have appeared in its editorial column.

Mr. Speaker, the proprietors of that journal, as my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives has said, are a very reputable people. They are personally known to me, and I question too, as a great many others present in this House, and I again express my regret that the names of these people must be brought into disrepute by the present methods of reporting in Her Majesty's House of Assembly in this province. I have been reminded that these things may have been caused due to the inexperience on the part of reporters. I am well aware that there are several youthful reporters here, but all, as far as I know, young men and young women of great integrity and good education. Whether or not they have had the necessary experience to report correctly and to decide as to what should be said and what should not be said is not within my province to say. I do not propose to say. Nevertheless it remains that this unfortunate incident has occurred, and words, as my honourable colleague has pointed out, have been imputed to the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare which he at no time allowed to pass his lips.

Then it has been made clear that it is the duty of this House to the public of Newfoundland and to the people of Stephenville in particular, and possibly other communities that inferences have been made regarding—to see that as far as this House is concerned these imputed references are perfectly clarified. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied to leave the matter entirely to the Committee, which will in due time and in accordance with this motion take care of it. I cannot but help being reminded of one or two quotations that I recently got hold of in reading with regard to writers and I give them, if I may be permitted, for what they are worth. To either youthful, inexperienced or other writers, as the case may be, I say, I do not impute any motives to them other than the motive of good reporting which is their duty to do. Whether they do so or not is not for me to say. I do not sit in judgment. But I do contend and know that there are many, many cases of reporting which, even in my own department, could very readily be picked up and be referred to me as head of the department. These are things we do not allow to bother us very much. But when it comes to a reporter causing great pain and anxiety to people of this province, as a Minister of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty to rise in support of the idea of doing away with such a possibility. Let us try to get honest and faithful reporting. I now quote for the benefit of the House generally these one or two little quotations I recently picked up by two great writers. Emerson says as follows: "Talent alone cannot make a writer, there must be a man behind the book." And No. 2: A quotation by a great writer, who said: "Bad writers are those who

try to express their own feeble ideas in the language of good ones." I give one other quotation before I close, Mr. Speaker: It is in the words of the great Thomas Paine, one of the greatest men who fought on behalf of labour in the great North American Continent who said: "A man may write himself out of a reputation when nobody else can do it."

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my support to the motion made by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare. In doing so, I would make just three comments. First of all I think I should in justice to my colleague making the motion say that he, as far as I know, had no idea that I intended to support his motion. I say that because, as this House knows, I worked with and under the direction of that honourable gentleman for some three years. It is in part because I did work for three years and under him had a hand in setting up the welfare organization in Newfoundland that I support his motion. I know something of the contribution that gentleman has made to Public Welfare, not only in Newfoundland, but all across Canada. As a matter of fact I don't think this has been said before; when the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare of this Province speaks on welfare matters all Canada listens. In fact, insofar as social welfare is concerned the whole world listens. I know something of the contribution, the self-sacrifice and labour of that gentleman to the cause of Public Welfare. I also know something of the West Coast. I have lived on the West Coast for many years. As the House probably knows I brought my wife with me from the West Coast.

I have a very deep personal interest, but I would like to say that this is a matter which transcends mere personal interest. It is a very important matter involving the whole integrity not only of this House but of a great community in this province.

I listened to the honourable gentleman speak, every word. When he finished I did not have the faintest idea as to whether he had any specific locality in mind. No. 2: I did not know whether he referred to my own district of Labrador or the District of Ferryland. I too have in my own district very serious welfare problems in certain communities. I had no idea whether the Honourable Minister meant my district or any other. In fact I was left with the impression that the honourable gentleman was trying to get across a principle not as a reference to some specific little spot in Newfoundland, but a great principle of unfinished welfare in Newfoundland.

I have great pleasure, sir, in adding my support to that motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition, I rise to support the motion of the Honourable Minister of Welfare. The mere fact of any journal or newspaper having misquoted a Minister of the Crown seems to me demands an apology or some other remedy. That apparently has not been undertaken by the paper in question.

I do deplore the fact that the Honourable Minister, after five years of intense social effort in this, the Tenth Province, should have found it necessary or obligatory upon himself to make the statement which he did make in this House in reference to this one of the Ten Provinces of Can-

ada. It is unfortunate, I say, that any man in this House, much more so any Minister, should be able to rise in his place to state that wives were exchanged like chattels and 95% of the children should be taken from the custody of their parents. It is something we all ought to take very seriously to heart. Not only must the Committee on Privilege go into the matter of a statement by a daily paper, but I think the House should go into the matter of the statement made by the Honourable Minister, and if it is correct, then we as a Province ought to be jolly well ashamed of ourselves.

I rise to support the motion, sir, but I would like to point out in the matter of the Committee, as I read it, standing order 88, "A committee of five to be named by the mover shall be appointed on motion of the Leader or other member of the Government as early as possible in each session whose duty it shall be to prepare a list of members to compose the following standing committees of the House."

Amongst these is a committee on Privileges and Elections. So I submit, sir, that the committee has still to be appointed, although I may be wrong on that perhaps.

MR. SPEAKER: Before putting the motion to the House, it remains for me to say whether in my opinion a *prima facie* case exists or not. In doing so I feel I ought to point out to honourable members one or two things regarding the principle involved here especially as it is the question of the privilege of freedom of speech without which there could be no parliamentary assembly anywhere.

At the beginning of every parliament since 1541 the properly appointed Speaker of that parliament presented a petition in which the ancient rights and privileges are requested. That has been done in this House, and has been done for the Legislative Assembly. The petition is always granted. In an Act of Henry VIII the privileges of freedom of speech and the protection of members in their speeches in the House was granted statutory recognition. Again after the revolution of 1688 statutory recognition was given and the privilege of freedom of speech, one may say, clearly defined in the Bill of Rights. That has not been changed, and any person who violates the privilege of the freedom of speech does so at his own peril.

In the words of "May," and before I quote him let me point out that this principle of freedom of speech is not something merely for Ministers of the Crown nor for this side of the House nor that side of the House but it is for the parliament itself, the whole body of members, because the Bill of Rights said that the freedom of speech on debates or proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place outside of parliament. Only the House itself has the right and that is laid down in the same section—only the House has the right to take to task or punish a member for unparliamentary words and speeches in the House. As Sir Erskine May says then: Subject then to the rules of debate a member may state whatever he thinks fit in debate however offensive it may be to the feelings of character of individuals, and he is protected by his privilege from any occasion for libel as well as from any

other queries or molestation. You cannot, however, accept May's word without reference to ancient speeches and ancient acts in parliament which may thus be said to be unquestionable and free. But this freedom from external interferences does not involve unrestrained license of speech within the walls of the House.

Since 1771, I believe, newspapers have been reporting and commenting upon speeches made in both Houses. Strictly speaking it is still illegal to report speeches. However, since that time all Houses of Parliament have realized the necessity and the value of having their speeches reported for the information of the general public. But, and this is a very important "but" the House will have to consider this, especially the committee to whom the motion is referred: False reporting and misrepresentation of speeches made in the House are breaches of privilege, and they have often been dealt with severely and sometimes moderately. Publishing scandalous misrepresentations (I am quoting) of what has been said in debate, publishing gross or wilful misrepresentations of particular members' speeches; these are two instances of breach of privilege of the freedom of speech. So when the evidence is produced here today and goes to the Committee, and when the Committee makes its report, both the Committee and the House must examine it without fear or favour in the one hand and without any vindictiveness on the other. The paper in question must be given a fair show, produce its own written word and the Hansard of the House must be made available to the Committee so that the spoken words of the Minister in question may be compared therewith. The Committee will report to the

House, and the House will decide itself, not I, but the House.

On the strength of what has been said here today I must declare a prime facie case does exist. Now the motion is that the complaint of the Honourable Minister of Welfare and of the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives too referred to a Committee on Privileges.

Motion carried.

There is the point brought up now by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition: It is my recollection, subject to correction, that at the beginning of this Legislative Assembly, the committees were appointed for this Parliament. However, if the House wishes to appoint a Committee of Privileges and elects to do so now it would be quite agreeable to Mr. Speaker. I might say, the present committee as it stands consists of the Honourable the Attorney General, the Honourable Member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, the Honourable Member for St. John's East, and the Honourable Member for Green Bay, and the Honourable Member for Placentia West. What is the will of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, so that there may be no doubt whatsoever, and just in case there is some technical obstacle, I move that the Committee on Privileges the members of which Your Honour just gave be confirmed and reappointed or reelect for this present session.

MR. HOLLET: I will second that, Mr. Speaker.

Motion carried.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to present relating to Northern Labrador in which this Province as a whole will be especially interested. This will concern not least of all the member for Labrador who has worked in the past very considerably in making possible the reports to the House that I wish to make now. The first relates to the steamship service to Northern Labrador:

Following negotiations between the Newfoundland Government and the Government of Canada, it has been decided that the Canadian National Railways will in future operate the Northern Labrador Steamship service as an extension of its Newfoundland Coastal Steamship services.

The Northern Labrador Steamship service has been operated by the Government of Newfoundland since 1942, when it accepted responsibility for the administration of the depots on Northern Labrador formerly under the management of the Hudson's Bay Company.

This service which was originally introduced for the benefit of Labrador fishermen (floaters) in the area north of Hopedale also served the trading depots at Davis Inlet, Nain, Nutak and Hebron. The costs of operating the passenger and transportation service in that area have been borne until now entirely by the Government of Newfoundland.

It is hoped that the new arrangement will result in an improved service to the northern outposts of the province. The details of the arrangement will be worked out shortly.

The second statement I wish to make refers likewise to Northern Labrador, and in this instance too relates to rehabilitation of the people of that area :

#### NORTHERN LABRADOR

During recent months the Government of Newfoundland has been interceding with the Government of Canada in the interests of the long-term rehabilitation of the Eskimos and Indians of Northern Labrador.

It has been considered by both Governments that the most single effective means toward this end would be to begin by improving the general health services in that area.

Agreement has now been reached on a number of proposals. These are as follows :

- (1) The Government of Canada will assume 66⅔ per cent of agreed capital expenditures on Eskimo account and 100 per cent of agreed capital expenditures on Indian account in the fields of welfare, health and education, the aggregate cost to the Government of Canada not to exceed \$200,000.
- (2) The Government of Canada further undertakes to conduct a ten-year general health programme in Northern Labrador. This programme will include not only a vigorous anti-tuberculosis campaign, but also full Federal responsibility for the transportation, rehabilitation and treatment of Indians and Eskimos during the ten-year period, regardless of the nature of the illness. It is estimated that the cost to the Government of Canada for such a programme over the next ten years will lie in the neighbourhood of \$1,500,000.

- (3) The Government of Newfoundland will resume its responsibility for the payment of relief to Indians and Eskimos which had been refunded by the Government of Canada to Newfoundland since 1949.

The Government of Newfoundland feels that this plan when carried into effect will represent a programme of basic rehabilitation for the Eskimo and Indian populations of Northern Labrador. The plan came into effect on April 1st, 1954.

I believe, Sir, there are sufficient copies for the House and for the press.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. What experiments were made in each year since 1949 with various types of fishing vessels, owned or leased by the Newfoundland Government or jointly with the Federal Government?
2. Give the cost of purchase or hire of each boat with the value of the returns if any.
3. How many long liners have been used and what was the cost of each and what was the value of the returns of each?

MR. FOGWILL—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information :

What is the extent of the work presently being carried out on the



Mount Pearl Road, how much grading and resurfacing is being done, what is the estimated cost. Is the work being done by the Department of Public Works or by contract, if by contract, who is the contractor?

#### Answers to Questions

Answer to Question No. 56 tabled by Mr. Hefferton.

Question No. 56 :

1. In connection with the supply of eggs to the several institutions account for the difference in prices charged by Wilsils Ltd. of 63c. and by the Two Way Stores of 70c.

2. With regard to the accepted tender price of Chalker & Co. for 80c. per pound for Boiled Ham supplied to the General Hospital and the Sanatorium, why was this price later raised to \$1.01 per pound? Why was the accepted offer of 64c. per pound for Raw Ham raised by Chalker & Co. to 81c. and why was the price for Bacon raised from 53c. up to 75c.?

3. What arrangement has been set up by the Department with Messrs. Goodyear and House with regard to the supply of commodities listed in Question (28), to the West Coast Sanatorium? What prices were charged for these commodities.

4. Explain the cause for a difference in price of 8c. per gallon for milk supplied to the Home for Aged and Infirm and the Mental Hospital.

Answer No. 56 :

1. The price of 63c. per dozen is price quoted in case lot deliveries—the price of 70c. per dozen is due to delivery in dozen lots to small institutions.

2. All tenders include a clause allowing price changes subject to market fluctuations. Contracts are for a

twelve month period and adjustments in contracts are made only after Departmental survey of current quotations.

3. Where possible, supplies — e.g. eggs—are bought locally; otherwise goods bought on monthly requisition at competitive prices and subject to the normal fluctuations of market conditions.

4. We were unable to obtain all our requirements at \$1.20 per gallon and were therefore obliged to buy elsewhere at the higher figure.

Question No. 55—Stand.

Question No. 67—Stand.

#### Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. At the same time I would like to say that, in my opinion, all the speeches made in the House this year have been of an extremely high order. That I think particularly applies to those made by private members. I should like not to congratulate only the mover and seconder but in particular the other private members who have spoken in this debate.

In my remarks this afternoon, which I must of necessity make somewhat brief, I shall confine myself to two major approaches in the debate. I am sure the House will bear with me for a few moments if I make some references to the district of Labrador.

I make no apology for referring to this district because it is the one that this House and the people generally know the least about. It is at the same time by far the largest, larger in

fact by two and a half times that of the whole Island of Newfoundland. Some of us have not yet gotten used to the idea that it is anything but a territory. I still see it referred to as Newfoundland's Northern Territory as though it were some colonial possession. It is of course nothing of the kind, but is an integral part of the province where the people, four out of five of whom are white people like ourselves, and the other fifth is made up of Esquimaux and Indians who all have the same rights, Mr. Speaker, you and I enjoy here.

It is to me a very gratifying coincidence that the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare who is interested not only on behalf of his department but has been Chairman of a Committee set up by the Executive Government to consider Northern Labrador, it is a gratifying coincidence to me that he is able to make a double announcement today, which I fear with the commotion which was going on in the galleries when he made it, may not have been fully apparent to all of us here. This Government has been working for four or five years on such an arrangement with the Federal Government whereby that Government would assume what we have always considered to be the proper responsibility in the administration of Northern Labrador affairs where the majority of the people are Esquimaux and Indians. Not only will this arrangement which the Honourable Minister has spoken about relieve this province of the expenditure of what would appear must be several millions of dollars, but it marks the beginning of an intensified campaign to rehabilitate the whole of that area.

Also because of the taking over of the responsibility for transportation in

Northern Labrador, a responsibility which in my view should have been taken over by the C.N.R. at the time of Union, but which in some way did not occur, but because the Federal Government now, through the C.N.R. have taken over that responsibility it will make possible a far better transportation system for the whole of Labrador including the Straits of Belle Isle, that great coast running from Battle Harbour right on north and the great inland sea of Lake Melville, two hundred miles from Goose in the heart of Canada, and in addition that great stretch from Cape Harrison north, usually referred to as "Northern Labrador." Of that system, I have reason to believe, within the next day or two the management of the C.N.R. here will be making a detailed announcement on the ways envisaged for this new C.N.R. Transportation Programme. Indeed the C.N.R. has in some measure taken me into their confidence knowing I was to make a statement here today, and I have some knowledge as to what their arrangements may contain. I understand that for the first time certain communities on the Labrador will have a regular steamship service. I don't know if that is fully appreciated by all of us. If we were to think of some fairly large settlement on the South Coast of Newfoundland which never in history had a steamship call can you imagine what it would mean for them to know for the first time in their lives that they were to have a regular steamship service? Let me cite just one example, Mr. Speaker; the most thickly populated part of Labrador is the upper end of Lake Melville, the area of Goose Airport, the great military airforce base of Goose and the very large and growing community of Happy Valley and North West River. Until two years

ago the people of North West River, since Goose Airport came into being, is the largest settlement in Labrador, and, Sir, I don't mind saying it is, in the opinion of everybody who ever visited it, probably the most civilized community of the whole Province of Newfoundland. That large and continually growing community of North West River until two years ago never had any steamship service of any kind. Last year I am glad to say, as a result of representation made in Ottawa by me and also here, North West River did receive a one-way steamship service. But because it was only one-way it meant that if any resident of Happy Valley, Goose Airport or North West River or any smaller community in that area wished to come south on Labrador, say Battle Harbour or Cartwright, or south to Newfoundland as many of them did during the summer season, he had to get aboard the Kyle at North West River after perhaps going twenty-five miles in a very rough sea from Happy Valley and go out the great expanse of Lake Melville and go between two and three hundred miles to the north in order to come south. That will be eliminated in the new service, I understand. There is at St. Mary's River a hospital. George's Cove, Port Hope Simpson, Postville (a new settlement), and Goose Airport, will now be regular posts of call as a result of this new transportation system. That is only one part of the arrangement.

The problem of Labrador, Mr. Speaker, is the problem of Newfoundland many times magnified. It is no different, in essence from the problem of Newfoundland, the only difference is it is many times magnified. On Labrador, for example we have (I heard some gentleman speak here and refer to, and I believe he represented

one of the largest districts in the Island of Newfoundland and he referred to something like fifty communities in his district) we have a very large number of communities on Labrador. We have, according to the last census one hundred and eight communities ranging from a few families to great centres like Goose Airport. One hundred and eight communities stretched over a coastline from L'Anse au Clair at the border of Quebec and the Province of Newfoundland right on to the Straits of Belle Isle to Cape Chidley, a coastline, Mr. Speaker, whose length is not yet known by any living person. That will give us some idea of the tremendous problem when I make that statement that the length of the coastline is unknown. It is true, for two hundred years our people have been familiar with the headlands everywhere from the Straits right on north to Cape Chidley, but there are indentations in Labrador which have never been chartered up to this time. Just one example will serve to show what I mean. Nain, the headquarters of the Moravian Missions on the Labrador, is a highly civilized community with boarding schools and now, I believe, a hospital or at least a nursing station. But the nearest living person to Nain is sixty miles away either way north or south. L'Anse au Clair which I try to visit every summer and Nain which I try to visit every summer are further apart, Mr. Speaker, than St. John's and Halifax. Why do I refer to that now? For this reason. While I regard it as a very great honour to represent a district so vast as Labrador, I don't know this, but I am told it is the largest provincial constituency in all Canada, I don't know but it certainly must be one of the largest. I regard it as a great honour to represent that and to be able to say

that I represent in our provincial parliament a great district, but my conscience will not allow me to say that any one person can represent that vast area and all these scattered communities in this House of Assembly. I don't know what will happen in this new Redistribution Bill in the future. But I certainly feel that the time has come when we have to recognize not only the population of Labrador but the vast potentialities of that area. I feel that one matter which we as a Government have to give some consideration to in the near future on Labrador is a roads programme. I hope the Honourable Minister of Public Works will not mind my referring to this, when I say I have recommended to him this year, to his department this year that if at all possible two major pieces of construction be commenced immediately, one is the linking up in the Straits of Belle Isle of the fifteen settlements lying from L'Anse au Clair to Red Bay a distance of only thirty-five miles. There are fifteen settlements in that area yet for weeks at a time even in the summer, as I know personally, for days and sometimes weeks, particularly in the fall and in the spring the times in the year when the Arctic ice is moving the people of Red Bay are further away from their nearest neighbour than we ourselves are from Gander Airport. There are no roads of any kind, apart from the little that has been done in the past three or four years. I am hoping it will be found possible to make a beginning on a highway to link up these fifteen settlements. The other thing I have recommended to the Department is that we should endeavour to link up North West River, the most important settlement in central Labrador, with Goose Airport which is only about twenty miles

away; actually there the only need is for about fourteen miles of road.

Popular knowledge of Labrador is based for the most part on what our fathers and forefathers brought back from their contact with the headlands, the outside coast. But there are two worlds in Labrador, as I have learned personally, one of which we know very little about. One is the world of the headlands, the outside coastline, bleak, barren, forbidding at times, beautiful nevertheless; nothing seems to grow, nothing seems to live but seabirds; the places which our forefathers frequented in the Labrador fishery. The other world is the great inland bays, the inlets, an entirely different world, different climatically, different vegetation, and entirely different potentialities. The two hottest days (I don't intend to spend too much time on this, Mr. Speaker) the two hottest days I ever spent in my life were at two places in Labrador, about five hundred miles apart. One is St. Mary's River and the other at Goose Airport in July. These were the two hottest days I ever spent. We have to revamp our entire thinking about Labrador. Here the other day, a few weeks ago, we had evidence of what is being done not in southern Labrador but in one of the more northerly parts, Kiglapait Bay where one man, the Pentecostal Missionary there grew his year's supply of potatoes, a milestone in the history of Labrador. It is the first time a man grew his potatoes and with the encouragement of my department this year, I understand every one in the community intends to follow suit. I saw grass near Kiglapait Bay which is roughly two hundred miles north of Goose Airport, I saw grass there standing up shoulder high. We sent some sheep down there, un-

fortunately the ram died on the way. However, the sheep have thrived and we are now sending more down.

I want to make reference also, Sir, to something, and this may sound strange, something in Labrador which has been underestimated, in my opinion is the timber reserves of Labrador. I believe the timber reserves of Labrador, in spite of all that is said about them, have been underestimated. I am not going into detail, but I will say this, Sir, I have never had any money unfortunately at any time in my life to invest in anything apart from my home and a bit of life insurance and I never expect to have very much. But if I did have any money to invest, Mr. Speaker, if I were looking for ways and means of investing money, I would certainly invest it in the timber potentialities of Labrador.

MR. HOLLET: You would have to see BRINCO first.

DR. ROWE: I am coming to that, Mr. Speaker, and I think the honourable gentleman who just made that interjection is going to appreciate what I have to say on it—I will come to that in a moment—

Last year we were able to encourage two very small operations in Alexis Bay and in St. Michael's Bay in Labrador, and there were small local operations done, not under the supervision of but in connection with the operation of the two great paper companies, mind you, but they undertook to sponsor them. These two operations while they met with much difficulty and have been carried on with inadequate equipment have nevertheless shown us beyond any doubt whatsoever that such operations in Southern

Labrador are an economic feasibility. As this House will recall, we made an agreement with a company for the Sandwich Bay area. That company has until the end of this year, I believe it is, at least until late this year, in order to pick up its option. The company did not pick up its option last fall, however, I think I understand the circumstances. I think I owe it to the House to say why: Last fall along with other things the bottom fell out of the pulpwood markets so much so, I understand from Bowaters, it was a drug on the market to the extent that they could buy it in the Mainland of Canada and land it in the mill in Corner Brook cheaper than they could produce it anywhere in Newfoundland. Because of that situation the company with whom we had the Sandwich Bay agreement decided to hold off a few months to see what would happen. That is quite natural. A lot of people in the United States and elsewhere thought we were on the verge of a serious recession. I think opinions on that are beginning to change very quickly. I had word the other day from the Sandwich Bay Company that they hoped to be going into Labrador as soon as the Labrador navigation opens. That is as far as I can go on that.

I would like to say this: in Southern Labrador, now mind you, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the great timber resources of Lake Melville, but those in there we have heard of at the time of the Seigheim agreement and which we have heard about since in connection with BRINCO and NALCO, in Southern Labrador we have Green River flowing out into the Straits, we have St. Louis Bay River, a great river where incidentally we landed the moose last

year, we have the Alexis River, the Gilbert River, the Hawke River going north and we then have the great rivers flowing into Sandwich Bay, the Eagle River, the second but one largest river in all Labrador and the Paradise and North River and the Back Bay River. Any one of these rivers, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and I hope the House will appreciate I don't say that without having given the matter some thought, having been in a position to get some information on it, in my opinion any one of these rivers, not all put together but any one is capable of supporting a large economic pulpwood and lumbering organization. That has nothing to do with Lake Melville nor the Hamilton River itself and its great watersheds, the Naskaupi River and the Grand River emptying out into North West River, so vast, Mr. Speaker, that when I crossed it by canoe last year I thought it almost incredible that we should have such a tremendous body of water, that is internally, that is the Hamilton River. I shall have a little further to say on that in a moment.

Our potentialities in timber down there are the greatest in fir and spruce in North America today, and I would say with the exception of Russia today the greatest in the world. Our reserves, unsubscribed, unused reserves of timber in Labrador are with the exception of those in Russia the greatest fir and spruce stands in the world today.

There must be further mineral development in Labrador. It is against the law of averages, the law of common sense to think that only in that one hundred and twelve thousand square miles that the only workable deposit is that great iron deposit that

we have heard so much about in the last few years, especially in the last year or two. That is against the law of common sense. Labrador potentially is far richer than the Island of Newfoundland where already we have four or five mines, far richer than this island; I am told it is so geologically formed beyond any shadow of a doubt, by the law of averages, there must be in the course of time dozens of new mines coming into being. It is the purpose of this Government to bring these potentialities to reality.

I would like to make one further reference to an illusion that has existed regarding Labrador, and I have come across it a great deal when talking with potential investors when they are asked why don't they invest in Labrador. Well, it has a very short navigation season down there—Another old-wives tale—I don't know why this idea came into existence, but people in the southern areas say that Newfoundland is somewhere near the North Pole so we in Newfoundland think of Labrador as being away up there in the far north. But the fact that our forefathers went down there and usually got down there around the end of June and came home in September—we think the navigation season on Labrador was three months at the most. The actual fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that for the whole southern half of Labrador, including Lake Melville there is practically no difference between the navigation season for that whole southern half and the navigation season for the north and northeast and east coast of Newfoundland. I think the quicker we get that into our heads the better for Labrador, because far too many of us in Newfoundland still feel—I speak with some heat on this matter, I have



spoken to a lot of people in the last few years, and stated that it was feasible to have a steamship go to Lake Melville in November. They told me it was out of the question, you cannot send a steamer to Cartwright in November; yet the air force sends down steamships in December last year and this year will continue to do so.

Before I leave this matter of Labrador I would like to make one passing reference to something which very few people, for obvious reasons, know very little about and that is the extreme activity that there has been in Labrador in recent years in the operations of the bases. I am not revealing any military classified information when I say this: all I say is that no one here perhaps knows just how much has been going on down there. I mention it now to show that no matter what action is taken by this Government, no matter what interest is taken by the people of Newfoundland, the fact is Labrador is now willy-nilly in the world. I saw a reference the other day, a statement in "Time", I believe, to the effect that this year a statement was made in the House of Commons, if I may refer to it, I believe by the Honourable Minister of National Defense to the effect that it was proposed to establish what is called the McGill Fence right across Canada slightly to the north, I believe, his words were, of what is now the uninhabited part of Canada. That will obviously, Mr. Speaker, affect the Labrador. In fact I know it will affect Labrador. Goose Airport has affected Labrador just as the other great bases we have heard something about affected Labrador; amongst other things it has caused a tremendous increase in the population down there. There are now settlements on the Lab-

rador that two years ago did not exist, large settlements.

One final word about Labrador before I summarize what I have to say on this point: It is that the world does not know enough about what the religious leaders have done down in that great area. I had this brought home to me very vividly this past year when I went down on Labrador, not this past year but the year before, when I was very gratified to see the great work which is being done amongst the Indians of Davis Inlet by Father Sears, a French Canadian Priest of the Roman Catholic Church, a member of the Oblate Order. His work there, of course, is fairly well known, as he has been down there many years. Then I went to North West River and saw an Indian settlement there on the other side and saw the difference between them and the Indians at Davis Inlet, and I could not help wishing that it would be found possible to have some religious leader go there too. I am very glad to say that the Bishop who is concerned with Labrador, Bishop Scheffer of Quebec, last fall sent at some sacrifice, I am sure, one of his priests this time a Belgian priest, Father Pearson, and when I went back the difference, Mr. Speaker, you could not believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did no one object to him?

DR. ROWE: No, I did not hear one protest from one single resident of that community of North West River about the fact that he was a Belgian. There were no objections. When I went back after an absence, and the priest had been there only about a month, I was amazed at the transformation which had taken place. It was, believe me, absolutely incredible, what had happened under the leader

ship of that one man. I say the world does not know enough about what these religious leaders are doing, so I want to put my own appreciation on record. I am just coming to a point Mr. Speaker, of which my honourable colleague reminded me: First of all I would like to make reference to the Church of England Missions on Labrador, the one at Flower's Cove embracing the Straits of Belle Isle and the one at Battle Harbour taking in central Labrador going north and the one at Cartwright which takes in Sandwich Bay. Then there is the United Church Missions of which the best known is the one at North West River under Dr. Burry, and another one at Red Bay in the Straits of Belle Isle. Then there is the Pentecostal Mission at Port Hope Simpson and Happy Valley, particularly the one under Pastor Gillett, in my opinion one of the pioneer pastors of this province. I have already paid tribute to the Apostolic Bishop for Labrador. The Roman Catholic population now comes under the Right Rev. Bishop Scheffer domiciled at Blanc Sablon which is actually right by our border. He is able to give a service which probably would be impossible if the population came under one of the other Roman Catholic centres in the Island of Newfoundland. Finally, I would like to say a word about the Moravian Missions operating amongst the Esquimaux, often misunderstood, often amidst great difficulties, for it was I believe, 1779 they first went down there, and the first missionaries who went down there were killed by the Esquimaux, but that did not scare them anymore than it scared the Jesuit Missionaries of Quebec. Lastly I should make this reference to the work of the International Grenfell Association. I have heard the rumour, Mr.

Speaker, within the near future, and I have no official knowledge of this, I have heard it rumored that within the near future the Superintendent of the Grenfell Association, Dr. Curtis, plans to retire. If that is so, and I am sure the time must be approaching when he must retire—it will be remembered that Dr. Curtis succeeded Dr. Grenfell himself as the Superintendent—when he retires this Province will be losing one of the greatest supporters in it. We down here, living in a vacuum half the time, have no idea, I had no idea until two years ago of the contributions that this great man, that great friend of kings and princes, a friend of President Roosevelt, and associate of some of the world's greatest men, we have no idea of the contribution of that man, the stature of that man, one of the greatest men, I would say, ever to work in this Province and in this country, and his contribution and the contribution of the International Grenfell Association to Labrador is something which we should have on record.

So for Labrador let me enumerate: It has the greatest reserve of spruce and fir in North America and one of the greatest in the world, with the greatest untapped source of hydro-electric power in North America, the Hamilton River, with its fabulously rich mineral belt, and without any doubt whatever still more fabulously rich unknown mineral wealth; with one of the best summer climates in North America; with tourist attractions infinitely greater than anything we have here in Newfoundland. I have always been one of the greatest exponents of the tourist attractions of this Island of ours, yet I say infinitely greater attractions than anything

we have here; with a hard-working, brave and courageous people, people who have survived centuries of neglect and I might say of injustice. The true story has not been told yet and perhaps it never will be of all the injustices suffered by our people on the Labrador, at the hands of what? Of the British Government? No, at the hands of Newfoundland. With all of these things I will end my remarks on Labrador by saying that, in my opinion, the future of that great area is brighter by far than that of any comparable area in the whole world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to a more mundane, political aspect—I don't use the word political in a derogatory respect but as an aspect of this debate. First of all I would like to congratulate the honourable member for St. John's who has taken a seat in this House. Because of what I have to say later I want now before I begin to pay my respects to that honourable gentleman and I have sufficient good reason for doing so, sir. He was one of the few men, when I was a young man starting out, who took any interest in my personal welfare. I dare say this has probably slipped his memory but I recall on the occasion of my graduation from the Memorial College when I gave the valedictory, and it was just another valedictory, but the honourable gentleman who was then a judge sought me out. He had never seen me before, yet he sought me out, inquired about my prospects and even offered, and did in fact go further in endeavouring to secure some employment for me. I did not have to take advantage of his generosity, but I have always remembered it. For that reason, I say, I was rather happy when it had become known that the hon-

ourable gentleman was to sit in this House.

I am aware too of the contributions that he has made throughout the years to the co-operative movement, to the public library, and to the welfare of the civil service. For all of these things I was looking forward, and still do I might say, to the fact that this gentleman, although on the opposite side, would still be in the House and would make some contribution to it.

Having said that, sir, I will now say this: What I have heard from the honourable gentleman so far has been a great disappointment to me. I expected that after his experience in the House of Commons and after the rich experiences he has had in various public matters throughout the years he would have been able to bring some fresh approach in attacking this side of the House. I regret to say that this did not materialize. I know that although he might be highly critical of some of the things we have done, he might, after being absent for four years or so, show some recognition perhaps of some of the improvements this Government has brought about. Apart from a casual reference, a passing reference to the Public Welfare programme, I don't think he had anything good to say about this Government's programme in any way whatsoever, in the course of his maiden speech here. As to his references to the Premier, I understand perhaps his feelings of resentment—he has suffered some very heavy defeats, as have most of the honourable gentlemen on the other side, at the hands of the Premier, but I did expect him to show some appreciation, make some passing reference to the energy, courage and imagination which the Leader of

the Government has shown during the past five years, whether he agrees or disagrees with his programme (and I don't suppose anybody on the other side agrees one hundred per cent with all the Premier advocated) I did expect this gentleman who had come to us from Ottawa and experienced in public matters would show some appreciation of the fact that the Premier displayed tremendous imagination, tremendous grasp of what is wrong with this Province and our needs, and that he has shown at least some humanitarianism in his dealings with the people of this Province. But when the honourable gentleman was finished I felt as if there was not even a "C," a passing grade for the Premier or any member on this side of the House, a passing "C" for effort. I hope it will not be said of the honourable gentleman, as it was said in the history of the Bourbons of France that they had "Learned nothing and forgotten nothing;" in this case after four years—having learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Let me be a little more specific on that matter: The honourable gentleman referred to politics in the civil service. I must confess, and don't want to elaborate, the last person in the world I had expected to bring the matter up was the honourable gentleman who did so. I sometimes have felt a little sympathy for the opponents of the Premier when he was gone aboard them in debate. The Premier is recognized, I think, by most of us as being a very great debater, perhaps the greatest Newfoundland has known, but I must confess that the other day, if I may refer to it, when the Premier, to use a vulgarity, had the honourable gentleman over the barrel, I did not feel any great sympathy; he had asked for it, in my opinion. I want to make

this general comment about politics and the civil service. It is this: I have studied the political history of Newfoundland, have given it a sizable amount of study, reading and research, looking up old records available, reading, I think, every record of this House since 1833 I could lay my hand on in any public or private library anywhere, and I will say this: It is my considered opinion that there is less politics in the civil service today than ever before in our history. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when with every change of government every person in the civil service who was known to have any political connection with the party going out of power was automatically kicked out. In fact a great many of those who had no affiliation were kicked out to make way for friends of the incoming government. There is a certain amount of that, I suppose, in every government in the world under the democratic system, every government trying to look after some of its friends. But I will say there is less politics in the civil service in Newfoundland today than at any time in our history. I mention this because I know that it actually happened in our past that the sons and daughters of politicians lost their jobs, when absolutely innocent, lost their jobs because of the political connections of their father. That could not happen today. I don't know whether the honourable gentleman who spoke—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend said he was asking a question—We are not complaining about people losing their jobs but people who were strong supporters on the side of the Government being promoted and given better jobs.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I understood what the honourable gentleman said but did not understand it was a point of order.

DR. ROWE: I don't know if the honourable gentleman has any child, son or daughter, in the civil service today or connected with any government services, but I can say that I know his son or daughter would not lose a job today because their father happened to be on the other side.

MR. BROWNE: I doubt that.

DR. ROWE: I don't doubt it.

The honourable gentleman made some reference here directly concerning my department, i.e., the supply of birch, the birch mills and the supply of birch which he said was so small—I am paraphrasing again now and am subject to correction—at least I understood him to say that the supply of birch had seriously interfered with the operations of the mills, and he went on to say he understood that there had been some political interference—I am rather vague on this, Mr. Speaker—but there had been some political interference with the procurement of birch.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—I did not say that nor anything like that at all.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will say, someone on the opposite side of the House said or I understood, there had been some political interference with the procurement of birch for the birch mill — birch mills — established with the help of the Government. I must confess I heard that with surprise, because this year I have had the honour to serve as one of Her Majesty's Ministers, in the Department of Mines and Resources, and a

number of things naturally have given me great concern, and I have lost a lot of time and sleep on some of these problems that concern us. The future of the mining industry is one of the problems which comes to my mind now, the difficulty of farmers marketing their produce is another one, and the supply of agricultural livestock happens to be another. To my mind I have spent a lot of time with my staff in the department on these problems, but the one problem I have spent most time on in my two years was endeavouring to assist in every possible way in the procurement, the production of birch for that birch mill in there. Now, I have no idea what the honourable gentleman was referring to. I believe he mentioned Green Bay or somewhere in Notre Dame Bay or some part of the north east coast. I checked with the honourable member here who represents Green Bay to see whether he had any inkling as to what the honourable gentleman was getting at. He was as much in the dark as I. I have gone into our records, checked with our officials in every way, and gone over all the bills, and I state now, Sir, that the honourable gentleman was misinformed. I state categorically that never at any time in the past two years has there been any political interference with the production of birch in this Province. I ask him to give us details in this House or outside, I don't care which, and I will answer—there has been no political interference with the production of birch. I have lost too much time and sleep trying to work out with the paper companies and other people for the production of birch to take that. I ask him to give us information at any place or any time, and I say now, while he did make the statement in

good faith he was misinformed, the information reaching him was false.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that we have a five minutes recess.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that at the time that you moved a recess I was speaking of the supply of birch and of the complaint of some political interference with it. I was under the impression the remark was made by the recently elected member for St. John's West but I understand since it was made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I do want to say this in connection with that: Whoever made it should be guided by the advice perhaps which the honourable and newly elected member for St. John's West tried to give to the Premier the other day, i.e., no one should be guided by heresay—objections too have been made to heresay being admitted here. It seems like a case of the pot calling the kettle black. It appears that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was going on heresay when he made that statement and consequently he has not given us any evidence to prove the validity of what he was told.

Now I should like to go on with some comments on some of the statements made by the honourable junior member, I presume for St. John's West. I was intrigued by one almost incidental, nevertheless, I think significant statement emanating from that honourable gentleman. As I recall it in his remarks, he stated that the Premier was a socialist, and he followed that up, as a result of prodding from this side of the House, that socialism was bad or evil. I am not quite sure what the word was. At any rate it was a word, I think, with that connotation. There is one per-

son in this House at least, the Leader of the Government who is well able, better I am sure than anybody else in this House to defend himself, so that I don't refer to this because of the implied accusation against the Premier, but because I feel there are principles involved there.

I, Mr. Speaker, am not, I hope, a socialist any more than I am a fascist or a communist. I would not be able to say if anybody asked me, I don't know if any honourable member in this House could say that he or anyone of us belongs to any "Ism" other than that we pride ourselves, I suppose, as far as it is possible to be Christians with all that that implies. I do feel that when words are banged around like "Socialism" and "Communism" that there is an important principle involved and a potential danger as well. I am not going to talk about the socialists of the world or people who call themselves socialists. There are some great socialists of our time like Bevan and Sir Stafford Cripps who gave their lives in the defence of our way of life though they called themselves socialists. The highly respected former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Clement Attlee calls himself a socialist, as do some of our friends in other provinces of Canada. I happen to know personally the Premier of Saskatchewan, and have talked and had discussions with him. I would not like to tell him that socialism is an evil thing. I certainly think he would react rather violently if he were told that. Why I refer to it now is this: I think, particularly in view of what is happening outside our shores and more particularly in view of what is happening in the United States of America, and I am not going into detail, I feel that in view of what is happen-



ing elsewhere, and the possible implications on our way of life here, it is very dangerous for us to be bandying words of that kind. I think there are too many issues involving the survival of our way of life, and which can involve our very physical survival on this planet; I think it is wrong for us to be placing such labels. Sir, it is a dangerous practice to start and can boomerang sometimes in most unexpected ways. We know that is the practice of totalitarian groups both communist and fascist who are none the less active today, Mr. Speaker, than they were ten years ago, don't let us forget that. I would oppose communism with every bone and muscle in my body. But let us not forget in doing that that the fascists are not less active today than when your kith and kin and mine and of all of us here were out fighting for their lives, and they are not all confined to Europe. I feel that the time is too serious for us to be labeling and adopting tactics of communism and fascism; whenever somebody disagrees with us to label him and his cause.

I am wondering—this is purely a rhetorical question—I wonder if the honourable gentlemen who have made use of that have ever considered where the presumption ranks in the catalogue of human failings.

Now, I want to refer to the fisheries. What I have to say, Sir, will not, I hope be a bare repetition of what has already been said here in the House. I will not presume any specialized knowledge of the fisheries. All I have is somewhat shall I say a sense of what is meant by the fisheries. That is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, because, and I hope the House will pardon the personal angle—when the population of Newfoundland was six thousand

fishermen, and only six thousand fishermen, one of the six thousand was my ancestor. When the 31 remaining men from the men in Newfoundland defended Carbonear Island, one was my ancestor. I say that with a definite reason in mind. I never saw until I was fourteen or fifteen a quintal of fish salted or fresh fish or anything else. Nevertheless if any man in the Province is a product of the fisheries I am one of them because for three hundred years my ancestors here have lived and died by the fishery, and I mean that literally.

I am asking again a rhetorical question—are we to assume from what our friends on the other side of the House have said that there was once a golden age in the history of the fisheries in Newfoundland? Are we to assume that? After I heard one of the speeches the other day dealing with the fisheries and by inference blaming the Government for everything that happened in the fishery, I went home and read up several of the old Newfoundland Histories, including Prowse, to refresh my mind and I found that between 1815 and 1925 one-third of the people in Newfoundland, all of whom at that time were fishermen, apart from those connected with it, were living on public charity, one out of every three, men, women and children, and incidentally most of it came from England and from the Mainland of Canada. That was the period 1816 to 1925—no golden age there—then again in 1860—and I have reason to be deeply, personally interested in this period of the 1860's as it was the period in which my father was born. That is why I am personally interested in it and know something about it first hand. In 1860 one-third of the revenue, every dollar and cent, or I think it was called

£s.d. in these days, but one-third of the total revenue collected by the Government went to provide relief. And when you consider that the relief at that day was corn meal and molasses you have some idea of the state of destitution of our fishermen. That was not for one year but over a period of nine or ten years. Now I know, and I am fully aware, that at the time and in fact at any time a very small minority of our people enjoyed a comparatively good income from the fisheries either directly or indirectly. I know that a small proportion, maybe one or two per cent had what we may call a gracious way of life. I can think of names, some of the names I know personally, some with whom my own people were associated. Thinking of our own bay—we had the Strongs of Little Bay Islands, wonderful people, one of whom married a former Premier of this Island. I mention these as illustrations—not in any blameworthy manner whatever—the Manuels of Exploits Bay—my father told me that Josiah Manuel personally owned 21 Labrador schooners. The Manuels of Exploits enjoyed their gracious way of living—the Ashbournes of Twillingate and Fogo, Winsors of Bonavista North; Ryans and Templemans of Bonavista, the Rourkes and Moores of Carbonear and other Conception Bay towns. Then on the South Coast, chiefly because of the nature of the fishery down there we had still more of these great families enjoying a prosperous way of life, a gracious way of life, the Warehams, Buffetts, Tibbos, Forseys and the Footes, and over on the Corner Brook part, the Baggs of Curling and there were others too up and down that coast. These were fine people. They were a necessary part of our way of life. The bank fisheries could not be carried on as it was without them—

and there were also the Holletts—I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I left out one well known family, the Holletts of Burin from which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is directly descended. These were in their time and in their day great people, great families who made their contributions and nobody blames them because they had at their disposal money and capital that enabled them to send their children to college and to enable them to enjoy amenities in their homes, anymore than anyone blames any businessman today. For that reason I don't refer to them in any derogatory or blameworthy way. Many of us are related by blood and by marriage to these very families, but here is my point: They constituted only one per cent and in some cases less than that. What was the dismal tale for the other 99% of the people in the fishery? It was poverty and destitution spread over the years. At no time did they have any security. I will tell this House this, Mr. Speaker, my father for thirty-five years prosecuted the Labrador fishery and for three years during this period his earnings were absolutely nothing, through no fault of his own it was a blank in 1910, 1911 and 1912, but his family had to live. I say this now, Sir, that he left it in utter disgust in 1912, and I never regretted the fact that he did. Perhaps if he had left it earlier the three children he buried during his years in the fishery would still be alive. That is true of hundreds of families, people became disgusted. Our fishermen were living in destitution with no security, people died, suffered from malnutrition. The reason why for years and years that we had the highest T.B. rate in the world is a sheer physical reason and was not all ignorance and the reason why our infant mortality was on a

par with the jungles of Africa for years. I say now there never was a golden age in the fisheries. At no time did our fishermen ever have security. But if I knew nothing about it and listened merely to the Opposition telling us what we have done and what we have not done and who were to blame for things I would assume that the fisheries had a golden age, the millenium in 1949, at which time the decline started.

Mr. Speaker, I spent three years on the West Coast in the 1930's in a fishing settlement. People there had for the most part forsaken the fisheries and had gone to the lumber woods. I spent two years on the South Coast. In Grand Bank fifteen years ago most of the people had forsaken the bank fishery then. I spent several years in Wesleyville and most of the people had forsaken the Labrador fishery in 1930, and not when this Government was in power. My point is that the fishery for years and years has been declining. Just as soon as anything offering greater security or greater remuneration came along our people left the fishery.

I enumerate another statement, far from chastising this Government for neglecting the fishery this Government over a five year period has done more for the fishery of Newfoundland than any other government for any five year period in history. Had it not been for the help this Government gave the fishing industry, the fresh fish industry, and in one way or another the salt fish industry today both would be gone. There would be no fresh fish nor salt fish industry worth talking about in Newfoundland today. The steps taken by this Government kept the fishery going.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition made some reference in

his speech to the Royal Commissions which we are setting up. Now simultaneously in his criticisms of these Royal Commissions he referred to the Ministers galavanting around the world—that is the exact expression I heard—galavanting around—and I noticed in the report carried in the "Daily News" that is given in quotations as well—"Galavanting around the world" is in quotations. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said—there are too many commissions. He thought these two, fishery and agriculture and the one on forestry would have been unnecessary if the divisions concerned had done their work properly and were doing their work properly. Now, there seems to be some confusion in the honourable gentleman's mind at this point, at that time—in the first place all but one are in connection with my Department of Mines and Resources. We have a Royal Commission on Forestry and a Royal Commission on Agriculture and one also, a commission, not a Royal Commission but a commission of inquiry in connection with wild life conducted by the world's greatest authority on wild life. So that as to the reference to Ministers galavanting around the world I don't see the connection. Frankly if anyone is to be blamed for neglect it is myself, the Minister of Mines and Resources. It is certainly not the Minister of Public Welfare as he is certainly not responsible for agriculture, it is certainly not the Premier who has been to spend two weeks on a holiday in Jamaica at his own expense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Please repeat that—own expense—

DR. ROWE: He happened to spend two weeks at Jamaica at his own expense this year which fact, by the way, served as a target for every

Tory who could taken pen in hand and write a nasty letter to the press on it. Why on earth they can sit down and watch with equanimity when any businessman, every contractor, every lawyer takes a month or six weeks or two months off, as they do, and go to Jamaica, then when the Premier of Newfoundland who occupies the highest position possible for the people in Newfoundland, takes two weeks off he becomes a target for ridicule and insinuating remarks not only outside but in this House too, Sir.

If anybody is to blame for any neglect necessitating these Royal Commissions it is the Minister of Mines and Resources. Unfortunately the honourable gentleman got a little confused at this point. The Minister of Mines and Resources not through any lack of desire, has done, since he has been in the Government, no galavanting around the world, he has been tied down by other things and should have done a good deal more travelling in the interest of the public affairs than he has been able to do. I want to make that clear, as I am the person concerned, I have not had in three years, Mr. Speaker, one week away from my work—not in three years—

Now, the second point is this: The inference to be drawn from what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said is that there has been some neglect, some lack of effort in these two divisions, forestry and agriculture. I repudiate that, Sir, I repudiate that inference with all the emphasis at my command. I am familiar, Mr. Speaker, with a great many divisions of government. I have had three years in Public Welfare, I think there are seven divisions there. I have worked with education and know something

of the divisions in that department, and in my own now. I know how hard these men work, in the past two years how many nights and nights the Director of Agriculture spent working on agricultural problems as did others in the division. There is no division in the whole Government of Newfoundland that worked harder than those divisions in the past two years. I cannot speak for before that as I was not there, but I do know what happened since that. It is precisely because these divisions are on their feet and because other responsible departments are on their feet and because we have taken the responsibilities imposed on us by the Government and the people so seriously that we have the Royal Commission and not because of any neglect. I was astounded, Mr. Speaker, when he said; "Why do we need a Royal Commission? Why can't the division concerned look after it?" I was utterly astounded. The implication is that when the British Government set up a Royal Commission on Education during the last war it was because the Department of Education had neglected its work; when Ontario set up a Royal Commission on Forestry the department concerned had neglected its work. We have been setting up Royal Commissions for precisely and exactly the same reason as every government in the civilized world, because there are big jobs to be done beyond the scope and comprehension of the ordinary departments of government. How on earth, Mr. Speaker, could we ever hope to have a man like General Kennedy, one of the foremost men in the forestry field in the whole world, a man who is able to command a salary of a hundred thousand dollars a year if he said so—how on earth could we ever hope to have him or attach people like that

to our Division of Forestry—it is out of the question. Not only that but any division of the government is set up to carry on a routine work, and not to tackle some of the major questions that from time to time come up, problems such as the state of the fisheries or the state of our forest reserves, etc. I am reminded by the Honourable the Premier that we have as head of the Agricultural Commission a man who has for years been the right-hand man of the greatest Minister of Agriculture that Canada has ever had, Mr. Gardiner, who is recognized as such all over the world, and his right-hand man, Dean Shaw, is now here as head of our Agricultural Commission. I say, if they had been purely and completely political gestures—and I take the responsibility as the Minister recommending them to the Government—if they had been merely political gestures how can you explain the fact that we waited for six months for the right personnel. In the case of the Forestry Commission that matter had been agreed on by the Government at the last session of the House and mentioned in the Speech from the Throne last year, but the appointments were not made until two months ago or so. It took all that time to find the personnel. I was determined as was the Premier and the whole Government that if we were to have the commission it would be composed of the very best men procurable on the face of the earth. There has been no neglect on the part of the Division of Agriculture nor the Division of Forestry nor any Minister who was galavanting around. I take the responsibility if anything is wrong up there in that department.

Now, I am leading up to something else, Sir, and it is this: If I had time I would like to say something about

the importance of agriculture to our people. Mr. Speaker, there are fifteen hundred full-time farmers in Newfoundland. I would like that fact to sink in—fifteen hundred people live by growing crops—there are seven or eight thousand people in Newfoundland deriving a substantial, I might say a major part of their income from farming. Speaking of agriculture there are so many things we want to know which no minister and no person can know. We spend one hundred thousand dollars clearing land because farmers wanted the land cleared. Now frankly and honestly I recommended it to the Government and the Government agreed, and in fact recommended the policy to the Minister of Agriculture in Canada, Mr. Gardiner, personally and he agreed to contribute forty thousand dollars to that cause. But I don't know if that is what is needed in agriculture. It might be a lot better to forget clearing land and take that hundred thousand dollars each year and buy sheep or pigs. I don't know and these are things that require men who are experts in the field, men who have spent their lifetime specializing in administrative matters pertaining to agriculture.

Now, there is just one other point which is this: I have been concerned in those past two years with two problems of what I may call local concern, one the saw mill industry. We have thirteen hundred saw mills in Newfoundland. Should we have two hundred or twenty-five hundred? A lot of these thirteen hundred are closing down because of local conditions, with so many men out of employment and so many families on relief—that has happened this year, and that is one concern. These closed down, mind you, not because of any

insufficiency of lumber but because there happened to be none in their area while five miles away there may be or it may be a case of going twenty miles.

The other concern is the problem of so many thousand people in Newfoundland depending on the timber for firewood. So many thousands have cut out all the available firewood in their area and so many thousands now are cutting out any available timber reserves. We have a great problem there. But the real reason I think—it is in the back of my mind but I have never stated this publicly at all to any person, and I have only discussed it privately with one person, and that is the obvious one: It is this: It is my profound conviction that a third paper mill is feasible on this Island of Newfoundland, and I believe—I cannot anticipate the Royal Commission, Sir—but I believe it is not only feasible but practical. Part of it is based on faith and part of it is based on good sound common sense. I believe the report of the Royal Commission will reveal here that there is every reason to look forward to the establishment of a third paper mill on the Island of Newfoundland. If that ever comes it would justify the creation of fifty Royal Commissions on Forestry.

Now, a word about the liquor problem, Mr. Speaker. I am fed up—I am concerned about the liquor problem in Newfoundland—but I am fed up to the gills—I am concerned partly because I was brought up, it is just as well to be frank, in a Methodist environment, or then Methodist. I am concerned with the liquor problem in Newfoundland, as I believe is every honourable member on both sides of the House, but I cannot say that I like the sneers brought to bear on this

problem. This problem deserves more than sneers and jeers and insinuations and innuendo. If people are breaking the law, then let us make use of the courts. That is what they are there for. Surely we can bring something a little more valuable to bear on this matter than sneers and taunts. This is a problem that concerns the whole world and nobody is satisfied with it. I never saw anybody on the outside nor in the House, Government or otherwise who is satisfied. Even if it meant consumption of more beer there has been progress. I say people have been dissuaded from drinking mentholated spirits. I saw my father in his little store in Lewisporte refuse the sale of boot polish and Florida Water, I think it was called, to people then in the "horrors" from liquor. God knows I don't want to see anybody lose his soul, as is the inference, from trafficking in souls of men—I don't want to see that. I have also seen people die in agony from drinking wood alcohol or some drink they have manufactured. If it comes to a choice between selling six, seven or eight million bottles of beer or of making moonshine and drinking all sorts of dirt and filth and killing themselves in the process I would take the beer. If the Opposition knows the answer to the liquor problem they should give it to us and offer more than innuendoes and sneers. They should give the answer to us and give it to the world. Humanity is waiting for the answer not just the people of Newfoundland. I say now these sneers and taunts are admissions of either weakness or irresponsibility.

On the matter of films, Mr. Speaker, I have just one thing to say. We have been taunted, that is what it amounts to, about the film making industry carried on under auspices of



the Government. Our department made a film last year through Atlantic Films. I only regret we could not have made more. I wish we had a film of wild life. We never had one on the fauna and wild life of Newfoundland. We had one or two dealing with moose, incidentally and caribou but have never had one made on wild life. We have thirteen distinct species here in Newfoundland, and we should have a film on them. Speaking on that I was intrigued the other day to see in cold print that last year the Department of Mines and the technical services in Nova Scotia had nine films made on mining alone—it looks as if the Government is not alone.

I wish I could say a word about travelling, Sir. Every Minister and I perhaps more than anyone have often looked at the amount of money we are spending on travelling, and have often been concerned, not so much that I supposed it was a waste but rather inevitable, but wondering if some of the money might not be applied in other ways. I had been highly critical at the time as to the justifications for spending in travelling of money which could have been applied somewhere else. Now, on that I want to say this. Last year there was a conference, and every year there is a conference of the Mines Ministers. I did not go as I had other commitments, but there was a meeting of the Mines Ministers, also a meeting of prospectors of Canada attended by all the Ministers of Mines across Canada. I have regretted that ever since. Had I been there I am sure I would have been able to disabuse their minds of some of the erroneous ideas some of the prospectors across Canada hold and some directed to us by the Honourable Leader of the Op-

position a few days ago. Now, on this point I would say that at the Mines Ministers conference, British Columbia had two persons from the Government, Alberta had seven, Saskatchewan had six, Manitoba three, Ontario thirteen, Nova Scotia five, New Brunswick four, Quebec seven and Newfoundland had none. Now, I take the blame for that, and it is wrong. Another point; this past winter there was a meeting in the Maritimes, a salmon conference dealing with the Atlantic salmon fishery. Again I was too busy and the department concerned at the time was too busy to go to the conference. I have regretted it ever since. The four Atlantic Provinces concerned made recommendations to the Federal Government regarding the salmon fishery which if implemented would have virtually destroyed the salmon fishery on the West Coast of Newfoundland. I am sorry we were not there and should have been there. What I am leading up to Sir, is this: It is impossible for us to know when a conference is called concerning public welfare in Regina or Winnipeg, it is impossible for us to know beforehand whether anything will take place there which will effect the destinies of the people of Newfoundland. That is not far fetched, Sir. I went to represent Newfoundland at Regina and the result of that conference and partly as a result of my participation there, expressing the views of the Minister and the Government, representations are being made to the Federal Government which will, if effective, affect the destinies of Newfoundland for centuries to come.

Mr. Speaker, I have not utilized all my time nor have I dealt with all my points. I am wondering if it would

be in order for me to move the adjournment of this debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes it would, but the honourable member has just two minutes more.

DR. ROWE: Thank you Sir, I will utilize them with one point which deals with prospectors. In 1948 there was not one Mainland prospector in Newfoundland and in 1949 there was none nor in 1950, 1951 nor 1952. Now, we have given out concessions to BRINCO and NALCO and we are told that all the prospectors in Canada are up there weeping and deploring the fact that they are unable to come down and prospect. We should have held out one hundred and fifty thousand square miles until some prospector in Ontario hitches up his britches, gets on his burrow or whatever he has to saunter down to Newfoundland to look at the minerals. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say I have no time to deal with other things I have here. But I will say this one thing here, Sir—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Speaker, the House would be agreeable if the honourable gentleman went on another five or six minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

DR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding BRINCO and NALCO let me say that NALCO, I understand, has a timber concession in Labrador near the new railway or the part of it which is being built in our territory, that is in Newfoundland Labrador. BRINCO has a concession down in Lake Melville. But the greater part of the timber concessions

of Labrador are held by the Crown and by nobody else—held by the Government of Newfoundland! I want to repeat, Sir, the greater part of the timber resources of the Labrador are held by the Government of Newfoundland! Furthermore neither NALCO nor BRINCO has any right whatsoever of any kind to one single tree on the Island of Newfoundland—not one tree in the Island of Newfoundland—let us not forget that. I can only assume, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman concerned had not read the BRINCO Agreement.

In our time there has been much great development in our history, our long, varied and sometimes dismal and always checkered history. We have had many milestones, some of them as we look back, particularly when we look at these paintings on the wall—think of the establishment of the first courts of law which, incidentally, preceded these gentlemen; think of the efforts of the Carsons and Morris in bringing about Representative and later Responsible Government in Newfoundland, one of the great milestones in our four hundred years of history. Think of the building of the railway, another great milestone and the settlement of the French Shore question achieved partly by Sir Robert Bond, another great milestone in our history, and there are others. But I will say this, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the greatest achievement of the present Leader of the Government—let us remember he has already two major achievements to his credit to rank with anything any of these men have done—one is the restoration of Responsible Government in Newfoundland and the other is bringing about the Union of Newfoundland with Canada, but in my opinion history will record his greatest

achievement, greatest feat of imagination and daring as the fact that he was able to go to the Old Country and talk to these who now after hundreds of years of history must be case-hardened people, and inspire and enthuse the Prime Minister of Great Britain as well as the heads of the greatest banking firms in the world, and as a result bring about the creation of the British and Newfoundland Corporation. Let us not forget the million dollars to be invested and what will be more than a million dollars on the Grand Falls on the Labrador and other millions just as well because the Premier brought them here, and it was largely his own creation—I know that.

Mr. Speaker, our Tory friends I believe both inside and outside the House would do well to take a piece of advice I gave last year outside the House. The time has come when they have to get a policy. I say in all sincerity they have not had a policy either here nor on the national level. I said this on the network last year—until such time as they formulate a policy they will never form a government in Ottawa and the same thing applies here. Until such time as the Tories begin getting a policy of their own they will never be re-elected, I can assure them of that. Criticizing some of the new industries will never cause the people of my constituency of the Labrador to vote against the present Leader of the Government—they will have to get their own policy.

Our Tory friends have never admitted we were ever any better off because of Confederation. No. Everything that has happened here would have happened—old age pensions we could have had without Confederation. They have never admitted at any time that the Premier made any con-

tribution to the welfare of the Province in any way whatever. They have damned the new industries on every occasion, time and place possible and always ended up by saying—Of course I hope these new industries succeed—in my opinion they have never been able to overcome the bitterness and detestation they have had—I don't want to impute motives, Sir, these are my opinions; I think they are obsessed by their detestation of the Leader of the Government and have suffered so many defeats at his hand that I think their view is distorted. No matter what it is if it anyway relates to the Premier and his policy they are against it. An argument, Sir, presupposes a minimum of logic, and if that is so, I charge the Opposition with not having offered one single argument in this debate. I charge they have failed utterly to discharge their primary obligation to the people of Newfoundland. I recommended before to our honourable friends on the other side that they would read again the trial of John Bunyan's book, the trial where the jury comes in and says; I see nothing, I know nothing, I hear nothing good. It may be paraphrased—I want no good—the Opposition have not offered one scrap of praise for any action of the Government and because of their purely negative approach have refrained from offering a constructive policy of their own. They have failed to discharge their duties as an Opposition, and in consequence, until such time as they change their tactics, they will be an opposition.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

On motion the House then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 21, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Sunnyside and Chance Cove that the road be reconditioned and that a quarter of a mile of new road be built which will eliminate a lot of hardship, hazards and dangers out there going around a certain pinnacle called Adam's Bend. Sir, this road, the people here are asking for is essential. For a number of years both the Commission of Government and since our own present Government, nothing has been done for this road out there, and I have often wondered about it, Sir. While we were in session I made a visit out to Sunnyside, and I began to wonder if we have a Department of Public Works at all because the road is not fit for any person to call a road.

I have already stated one time before about the cow paths, now I am beginning to think that—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order. He may not make criticism of a Government department when presenting a petition.

MR. BUTTON: Thank you, Sir. Well, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the road in question is necessary for these people, and I am going to ask the department concerned to really consider this road, as these people out there really need some kind of as-

sistance at this time from this Government who is in power.

Sir, I beg leave to lay this petition on the Table of the House and have it referred to the department concerned.

Petition tabled.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House a petition from the residents of Georgetown in the District of Humbermouth. The petitioners numbering something over a hundred are petitioning that Georgetown would be connected with the new road which would be something less than a half mile but would serve the purpose of that town greatly insofar that at present they have to come out via Petries to the old main road which means a distance of three or four extra miles whereas a quarter of a mile would link up their community with this main road which also goes through to Corner Brook, and will in the course of time, link with the Trans Canada Highway. The road at present linking Georgetown is a narrow road and one which would require a lot of money and a lot of work to widen it because of the nature of the soil there. It is built on the side of a hill with rock on one side and quite an embankment on the other.

Personally I give this petition my full support as I think the people are very deserving of this. The community of Georgetown is quite a good size community and one of the oldest residential sections of the upper reaches of Petries Valley near Petries Crossing. I ask on behalf of the petitioners, Mr. Speaker, that this petition be laid on the Table of the House and that it be referred to the department

concerned. I give it my utmost support.

### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

### **Giving Notice of Motion**

None.

### **Notice of Question**

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. On what date did the Board of Liquor Control purchase the five hundred barrels of Jamaica rum listed in the answer to Question 5? Who is the local agent of J. Wray & Nephew Ltd.?

2. What was the total amount of duties paid by the Board of Liquor Control on account of all alcoholic liquors purchased between April 1st, 1953 and February 28th, 1954?

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

Give the names, addresses and dates of appointment of all agents of the Board of Liquor Control and/or of the manufacturers of beer who have been given authority to sell beer by the case. How much beer has been sold by each such agent during the past fiscal year, giving the value in each case, and the rate and amount of commission paid to each agent.

### **Answers to Questions**

Question No. 58—Stand.

Question No. 59—Being prepared.

Question No. 55.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no answers to questions today. I ask that all questions addressed to me and not answered be allowed to stand.

Question No. 47—Answer tabled by Mr. Keough.

Answer, Question No. 47 asked by Mr. Browne:

The original vouchers relating to the period prior to 1 April, 1951, are no longer available; they have been micro-filmed and after such processing have been destroyed.

Vouchers relating to the period commencing 1 April, 1951, have been microfilmed but not yet destroyed pending cross-check of micro films.

In the circumstances, it is suggested that the Honourable Member attend, having given notice of intention, at the Department of Finance where facilities to view will be made available to him.

Question No. 52—Answer tabled by Mr. Keough.

Answer to Question No. 52 asked by Mr. Hollett:

Question—What amount of money was realized on the sale of each of the four Icelandic vessels owned by Richard Limited?

Answer — The "Come-by-Chance," "Pushthrough" and "Hugginn II" were sold for the amount of \$29,000. The "Grotta" was sold for \$25,000.

Question—Which of the Vessels was sold on terms, what were the terms of the sale and how much money has thus far been received by Government on this particular sale? To whom was the ship sold?

Answer—The "Grotta" was sold to Mr. Alexander Duffett of Clarendville. The conditions of sale were a down payment of \$5,000 upon the execution of the Bill of Sale and the balance is payable in annual instalments each in the amount of \$5,000, together with interest at 4½% per annum on the balance outstanding. The "Grotta" was sold by Richard Limited and moneys received therefor were received by, and deposited to the credit of, that Company.

Question—Give an itemized statement showing the disposition of moneys received by the sale of these ships. To whom were the moneys paid out and on what accounts.

Answer—The receipts from the sale of these ships were received by and deposited to the credit of Richard Limited. The disclosure of the manner in which that Company disposed of these moneys other than these disclosed in the Audited Financial Statements of the Company is a personal matter between that Company and the firms and individuals to whom it was paid for goods or services rendered in the normal course of business.

Question—Does the Government hold a Mortgage on the vessel sold on terms and for what amount.

Answer—Richard Limited has transferred to Government the Mortgage held in respect of the "Grotta" in the amount of \$20,000.

#### Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to follow the usual custom of this House and extend congratulations to the mover and

secondor of the debate. With regard to the mover, while he is not here in this chair, I would like to say that knowing him as I do, not only as a personal friend but as an old campaigner in the past, realizing he is a very clever lawyer and a succesful lawyer, I want to congratulate him again on the manner in which he used his legal ability to avoid and confuse certain matters which were contained in the Speech from the Throne. I wish particularly to congratulate the secondor of the motion because, I imagine, he is a man something like myself, one from the toiling masses, an ordinary worker. I would particularly like to congratulate him on the warning that he gave this Government, when I come to it, where the fishermen of this country are neglected, fishermen who are the backbone of this country—when they are neglected the Government won't last long.

I would particularly like also at this time, on this very auspicious occasion to offer my sincere loyalty, personally and on behalf of my constituents to our most Gracious Majesty on today, which I believe is her birthday. May Her reign be long and prosperous and happy, and may God bless Her.

I would also like to express my welcome to the benches of the Opposition, our latest addition, a very worthy gentleman, a gentleman well known in this country. I am delighted to be associated with him. I am certain he will add strength to our position and that he will add dignity to the House.

With regard to the Speech from the Throne, there are only two items in it, or one item I should say, which I would like to deal with this afternoon, and the other one which is left out



I will deal with that also. However, Sir, before we begin to discuss these matters I would like to refer to a remark made by our worthy Premier, that is, insofar as we on this side are concerned we are anti and bitter anti-confederates. I want to say personally and on behalf of those I represent that we are not bitter, anti-confederates, but I will say this, we are Newfoundlanders. We are not against Canada. We like Canada. Personally I have a good reason to like Canadians as I represent an organization on Bell Island which while it is chartered by the United Steel Workers of America at the same time it is affiliated with one of the largest organizations in the whole of Canada, that is the Canadian Federation of Labour. I have occasion at least twice a year to visit the Mainland and associate with these men, working men like myself, and I certainly want to say here now that I never met better people in my life, and they appreciate me too. When I say I will shake your hand as a Canadian, as a brother worker, as a brother member you will have to recognize me as a Newfoundlander. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker.

Again the Premier said: Look over at them, five bitter anti-confederates. That again I repudiate. I repudiate it for this reason that while there are only five of us here there are seventy-five thousand outside, that was proven in the first referendum. Now, I will add another fifty thousand to that number, good well-meaning Newfoundlanders who are disillusioned over the agreement that was made with Canada. So that when you look across at us don't think we are just five nincompoops over here. Don't think because we come here to debate we look upon this Chamber

as a debating chamber much less a place where you can have a burlesque show, Mr. Speaker, you have had that in the past, and I pitied you at times, but I think that is over. We are here, I imagine, at least I am here, and I think we are all here with the same purpose to legislate justice on behalf of the people of this country.

At the risk of being called an anti-confederate, at the risk of hearing something from the other side about how this is the "Old Hash" I will have to refer back, Sir, in order to make my point clear I will have to refer back to the convention days, I will have to refer back to 1933, or I could go back to 1914. I don't want to go back to 1914 when I lost the only brother I had in this world, that is one who could associate with me—I have another but he is wearing a round collar and I can't associate with him. For example he can't go into a beer tavern and have a good drink of beer as I heard the Honourable Minister say yesterday. He can't do that because he wears a round collar, but my other brother, yes, he could, but his guts—pardon me for using the expression—were blown completely out of him on July 1, 1914 in the Battle of Hamel. I believe there are some veterans here now who were with him then. So I refer back, though I say I don't want to, to 1914, to 1918, but, no it hurts my feelings. I will go back to 1932, I will go back to the time when not only Newfoundland, not only Canada but the great United States of America itself went broke or practically broke, with eight thousand bank failures. We were caught in that financial maelstrom, I would call it. We were up against it. We could not pay the interest on what we owed. I will say right now, Mr. Speaker, we

should not have had to pay it because it was the war debt that crippled us and not our own debt. We were not even allowed to declare moratorium not alone default. We were sold out. Three hundred thousand Newfoundlanders were sacrificed to the golden calf, and you know what the golden calf is, the modern god of idolatry. One out of every three people in Newfoundland were put on a dole existence of six cents a day. Why? Because we were not allowed to declare a moratorium and not allowed to default. I know people in this country who were taken before court—I know a widow in particular, and this might be one for the Minister of Public Welfare, who applied for her six cents a day dole but because she still had a pig left and when the authorities found out that she had a pig, she was taken to court and soaked, and the pig was sold and she had to pay the fine. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to dwell on this situation because after all none of us want to resurrect unpleasant memories. I am only bringing it up in order to show just exactly how this little country was treated. And while we were on six cents a day dole, the very people who killed my brother, the very people who were eulogized here the other day by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, (and I am sorry to criticize him because I like him. In fact I like every man on that side of the House, and I am hesitant to criticize but I must do it) the very people whom he eulogized, and he almost did the Goose Step. I am certain he recited German here—

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): I appreciate my honourable friend's understanding.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I say the very people who did create a blood-bath and did it twice, the very people who at that time received money from England, the same people who loaned it to the Russians—if you want my thoughts on that I will give them: Lord Beaverbrook—take a note of it anybody who wishes—these very people at that time were receiving money while we Newfoundland people had to live on flour and molasses and wear flour sacks for clothing. I know people who could not go to church because they did not have clothing. I know of others who went in turn, one had to go to one service and come back, take the clothes off and let the other go. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago that sort of stuff is not nice to dwell on. None of us wish to hear it, but nevertheless it must be brought out. The time has come when we must talk plain, and I will say that time is right at hand.

In 1939 Herr Hitler got busy, not Herr Valdmanis but Herr Hitler got busy and he said, I will conquer the world. Again if my information is correct or if I can believe what I read from the military experts of the whole world, he would have succeeded if it were not for the bridgehead which was established right here in Newfoundland. There is not any doubt whatsoever about it, there is no man can question it. Professor McKay, a man who was freely quoted in the convention, in his book which I have here, but won't worry you with reading it, said that Newfoundland was a nonentity until the last war started, then the great United States and the great Dominion alongside us all of a sudden got interested in Newfoundland. So they started bases. But in the meantime Newfoundland could

not say a word in her own defence, Newfoundland was not free, Newfoundland was under what I would call a Beneficial Dictatorship. They would not let us starve, they would give us a few cents a day—so she could not speak, but in 1946—personally I wrote a letter to the paper on this—they set up a National Convention. I have that paper home on file. I said in that letter, which was written to the Daily News, that this convention is nothing more than a total board of confusion set up on Hitler lines to confuse us all, and that is exactly what happened. I heard the late and great, and I might say I am a disciple of his, and I don't care who knows it—I heard the late Sir Stafford Cripps quoted here yesterday. A great man, a great leader, a great lawyer, a great citizen, Sir Stafford Cripps, sat in the House of Commons when the Newfoundland Bill was first up for discussion and said, if this goes through it will be the first step in the crash of the British Empire.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): It is a funny place for a disciple of Cripps to be—in the Tory Party.

MR. JACKMAN: Beverley Baxter said as well, it is one of the blackest chapters—that Bill would have never gone through in the House of Commons in England only for one rider attached to it. That Bill definitely and squarely stated, once Newfoundland became self-supporting automatically her constitutional rights would be restored. Were they restored?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It did not say that. Will the honourable gentleman allow me to say what it did say?

MR. JACKMAN: Sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What it did say is that Responsible Government

would be restored as soon as Newfoundland was self-supporting, and upon the request of the Newfoundland people.

MR. JACKMAN: Is that all you have to say?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is enough.

MR. JACKMAN: Very well. Probably it is enough. I have here a letter from one of the first commissioners who came out to Newfoundland—are you going out? I have to refer to you and don't want to do it behind your back.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member; if he wishes to address a remark to another gentleman he must do it through the Chair. For example: "May I ask the honourable gentleman not to leave?"—don't speak directly to any honourable member.

MR. JACKMAN: I am sorry, Sir. "An Unholy Deal" Sir Thomas Lodge—to the Editor of the Manchester Guardian in England: "No Englishman can feel happy about the way in which the constitutional problems of Newfoundland had been handled by this Government . . . There is not a shadow of doubt in my mind, when we went out in 1934 to try a new experiment in administration, the Government in London had expressly committed itself to restore political independence as soon as the Island was once more self-supporting."

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is wrong.

MR. JACKMAN: I won't read it all. I don't want to take the time. I will just read his closing paragraph: "I have no doubt whatsoever that at some stage an unholy deal had been made between London and Ottawa

under which London undertook to do something like using their best endeavours to secure the entry of Newfoundland into Confederation. The deal was doubtlessly never embodied in any formal document and its existence could always be denied, but the fact remains two members of the present commission openly advocated entry, and would hardly have expressed such views on a matter of the free decision of the islanders without being certain of the approval of the Secretary of State."

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I may say it is a matter of record the statement I made as one of the commissioners to whom the honourable member just made reference. The statement had no such approval, and sought no such approval from the home office at the time.

MR. JACKMAN: I think Mr. Lodge said there was nothing there to prove it, but nevertheless it was done—and you went on the air—the Premier got up the other day and lambasted the latest addition to the Opposition, and said he went out campaigning as a judge. I don't know if he did or not. But I say, if he did, he was justified. I will go further and say he was going out for justice sake and a just cause. If the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare who was a commissioner at the time had a right to go out why should not a judge. If we are going to have equal privileges let us have them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is good logic.

MR. JACKMAN: I will go a little further — if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker, I am going to quote something here—is it in order?

MR. SPEAKER: I presume so.

MR. JACKMAN: I will give you what an Englishman thinks of Newfoundlanders:

"The Newfoundlanders fled across the sea,

And all they cried, let our land be free.

You lavish freedom on the Black Guiana

But we the white subjects of the Crown

Must still be bossed and bullied by that four

And told that we should not exist at all . . ."

MR. MURRAY: Who wrote that?

MR. JACKMAN: You are a lawyer and I am only a common workman, but I don't worry about you. Mr. Speaker, as I said before I had to bring this matter up, and for this reason; we have in this Throne Speech a reference to a revision of the Terms of Union. I want to say in this respect, and I will try to be modest, but I want to say in that respect that the people of Newfoundland can thank—there are three of us left here, our worthy and solid Leader, the Leader of the Opposition—I would go to Hell and back for him—the worthy member for St. John's East, not the legal member, you won't have any trouble distinguishing him as he is a working man just like myself; and myself. We are the only three left of the dictators in this House, twenty-nine of us who said; "No." "These terms are not satisfactory, they are not nearly satisfactory." I know at least three Cabinet Ministers who at that particular time on these first terms advocating Confederation fought like Hades with us to get it across. Yet we said—No—and because we said no, and because sixty-nine thousand more followed us the people in Ottawa be-

gan to realize that we were not all White Indians in Newfoundland, and they revised the terms, and they brought these terms up by sixteen or twenty-four million dollars. One man on that delegation, Ches Crosbie, at that time even said he would not sign these terms as they meant financial suicide for Newfoundland. I will prove it to you, Mr. Speaker, or at least I hope to do so to you and to this House before I sit down, that Ches Crosbie's words were right.

Now, let the people realize this: If it were not for three of us who are left on this side of the House, if it were not for us, they would not even have the terms they got now, which are so far short. If things were as rosy as they were painted, why at this time should we have to get a commission and have them take a year to prepare a case? I would say this, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to give credit to the Premier. I tell you frankly, and I believe I say it also on behalf of a number of my supporters, I have the deepest respect and the highest regard for him. I am going to call him "Joe" he calls me "Nish"—but I will say this, these terms were hasty, and we could have taken our time. Nevertheless we went into it, and now things are not so good. However, this is the position. I am not speaking for the party now, I am speaking as an individual when I say; our position could be improved if we had the determination and the energy to do so. I have not the least doubt but that the whole nasty, unholy deal which was put over on us could be re-opened. If it can't be I would say that the Atlantic Charter is a mere screen of hypocrisy and all the talk about the United Nations and the rights of small nations is the light of hypocrisy. I would even go further

and at the risk of being called a "Red"—

MR. MURRAY: You are not, you are being called a "Tory."

MR. JACKMAN: I am a better "Liberal" than you are. I am one of the best "Liberals" in this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. JACKMAN: Don't anticipate anything. I am one of the best Liberals but I am a Newfoundland Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anti-Confederate?

MR. JACKMAN: There is my father over there. He was a Liberal, as was Sir Robert Bond. In this country the Jackman name always followed him. His right-hand man was my uncle, his Minister of Finance. He lost his business, he lost everything following a good Liberal Leader, and he died happy, and I am sure when he went to Heaven, St. Peter welcomed him with "Well done thou good and faithful servant." Good Liberals. Good Newfoundland Liberals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you will allow me—All the "Liberals" who were Anti-Confederates had to go "Tory."

MR. FOGWILL: Don't talk nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. If the honourable member wishes to make a remark he may do so on his feet. I would suggest that the honourable member who is speaking not allow himself to be drawn into any side arguments.

MR. HOLLETT: I submit he was forced into it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JACKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Confederation I would

think that the majority of our people, and I would say the majority of our people are very intelligent. They may not be educated but they are logical and realistic. I imagine at the present time they will accept this condition, and in that respect I will go along with them. I am only expressing a personal opinion here.

In that respect I would like to make a little further reference to this grand little country of ours, and it is a country as far as I am concerned, a country not a province. This grand old country, Britain's Oldest Colony, the foundation of the British Empire, and as far as I am concerned, still Britain's Youngest Dominion, although we were robbed of it. What does she mean today? What does she mean to the free nations of the world? What does she mean to the greatest nation on earth, the United States of America. She is the greatest insofar as money is concerned, don't get me wrong. Insofar as character is concerned, really down, deep, virtue and spirit, it is still the Old Country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. JACKMAN: Don't take me wrong on that. Personally I am very proud in my heart that on my father's side I am an Englishman, and on my mother's side I am Irish.

MR. HOLLETT: A bad mixture.

MR. JACKMAN: I don't know if there is any Scotch in me, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I do have once in a while some Scotch in me. I can tell you that when you get that combination it is hard to beat. With regard to our little country, and with regard to the present serious situation in this world, I find that last year NATO spent sixty billion dollars, that is sixty thousand

million dollars. They gave the French money, they gave the Spaniards money, they gave them all money, but what did they give us? I don't want to say it but I could say it, but here it is again: Newfoundland is the key to North Atlantic Defence, the key to the whole situation—Sixty billion dollars spent last year on NATO. Let us take a look to our good friend to the South, to America, and I say they are good friends of ours. What did the Americans do last year? America's household cat and dog population has reached an all time high, forty and one third millions. Our great American friends to the south of us, and I don't begrudge them that, spent a million and a half dollars last year alone in feeding their dogs and cats.

MR. MURRAY: I hope they gave them fish.

MR. JACKMAN: They don't get the fish to give them anymore, Sir, unfortunately. I still hear a voice in my ear, the fishermen down north saying: "No fish unless you guarantee me a price." I don't blame them, and God love them, and God help them! But what I am trying to say is that the Americans last year spent a million and a half dollars on their cats and their dogs.

Now to bring up fish: I will say this again: If the Honourable R. B. Job's proposition had been accepted in this House the man down in Bonavista today would not be shouting for a price for fish. I don't want to go back to the Bond Treaty, but I will say this: We as the bastion, we as the people who were defending the whole North American Continent, what did we receive? The cats and dogs of America received a million and a half dollars a year. Eisenhower



said the other day that NATO is an entity of a united people for a free world. I will ask any fisherman to come in here today and say he is free, and yet we can support the dogs and cats, and if the war started tomorrow the first to get the blast would be ourselves, the first crack. If it ever happens we are the ones who are going to receive it. Now, what do we get? We get nothing. Only last fall our teachers had their pay cut down in order to subsidize the poor fishermen—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so.

MR. JACKMAN: As far as I can understand that is how it was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. JACKMAN: Very well, probably I am wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were not cut—but they were not increased.

MR. JACKMAN: They did not get their increase because of the fact you had to subsidize the fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not subsidize—we had to advance them.

MR. JACKMAN: That is good enough, Sir. We will take that as a fact—the teachers did not get their increase voted for them because of that situation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was not voted.

MR. JACKMAN: I don't know if it were voted or not. You intended to give it to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the money were available.

MR. JACKMAN: The money would be available—but the fishermen did not get a price for their fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is exactly right.

MR. JACKMAN: That is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Speaker, I may say I find it difficult to say a word against any man on that side of the House. I know some of them personally, in fact that man who continues to interrupt me, we were fellow boarders at one time, and slept in the same dormitory. I know another good man over there, I won't mention his name, and I am going to give him a belated thank you for what he did for us in our recent dispute, that is the Honourable Minister of Labour. We requested from the Honourable Minister of Labour the facilities of his Conciliation Board to settle a dispute between ourselves and our employers on Bell Island. He did that. On behalf of our organization and myself as well I would say a belated thank you, Sir, but it is genuine just the same. I am very happy to say that matter was resolved in a very dignified manner.

But the position regarding our country at the present time, as I see it, is very serious, and I am not looking at it through the eyes of these twenty-three millionaires we heard so much about during the convention, nor am I looking at it through the eyes of a lawyer or any sort of professional man. I am looking at it through the eyes of a workman. I have a very definite stake myself in this country. I am responsible for the bringing up a family of seven children, and I want to see these children well fed, well clothed, well housed, and at the same time I don't want to see them well fed and well clothed and well sheltered unless the little children living next door are

well fed, well clothed and well sheltered. So that when I look over the horizon today, insofar as Newfoundland is concerned, I feel sorry about it, the picture is not by any means bright. I would almost say that the picture is dark, particularly. It is not very far off, Sir, when we had the day in our country when nineteen thousand men received unemployment assistance.

DR. POTTLE: Insurance.

MR. JACKMAN: When we have ten thousand, roughly, fishermen who are at the present time saying: For God's sake give us bread! And all they receive is a stone. When we see the cost of living higher than it was ever before confederation—well, we almost have to throw our hands up. That, Mr. Speaker, is actually the position in Newfoundland today, as I see it as a labour man. I maintain these are the facts that cannot be disputed, they cannot be denied. They are authentic because they are published by the Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa. I am not referring now to the ten thousand fishermen, that is a question I will admit, I don't know how many are left. At one time I think before confederation we had thirty thousand. I don't know how many are left. At one time I think before confederation we had thirty thousand. I don't know if we have ten thousand left. But insofar as the nineteen thousand are concerned, yes, Sir, that is what we have today unemployed. Our school teachers and a lot of our civil servants—it is almost as well in some cases they were not employed. They would get more in unemployment insurance in some cases than they get in salary.

So, after five years of confederation,

and don't forget I am not against confederation—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No?

MR. JACKMAN: No. I said I was against the terms of confederation. But after five years this is what we got. Now here is the worst of the whole situation: In 1949 following confederation we had an election in Newfoundland. The Liberal party at that time practically cleaned the whole works. I don't know how we got in here, you know. However, I think there were five of us. The Premier asked the other day where all the leaders were. Well I was talking to one of them yesterday. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, he is hale and hearty, his wishes are for our people and our country. I believe he goes down on his knees every night and prays for it. I believe he is all right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not anti-confederate?

MR. JACKMAN: He is John G. Higgins, if you want his name. As to the last Leader of the Opposition, I thought he was gone. I did not know what happened to him. But just a short while ago I happened to be listening to CJon one night and I heard the gallant gentleman was appointed to civil defence, as director in Newfoundland. The day before that I was reading my paper and I saw where Malenkov was putting out peace feelers. And I said to myself: "How in the world could that happen?" But he must have heard about the gallant gentleman, and he shivered and shook and sued for peace.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is easy to say when he is not here.

MR. JACKMAN: I would say it anyhow, and I am not finished with regard to that gallant gentleman. I will tell you frankly, as far as I am concerned, he has been consigned to a political grave of oblivion, unwept, unhonoured and unsung. Let him alone!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mind he does not go over to Bell Island as a candidate—it would be interesting.

MR. JACKMAN: I know what happened the last time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying. In 1949 we had an election in this country, and the Liberal party almost made a clean sweep. Yes, Sir—here he comes now, he was outside there—almost made a clean sweep but there was some remnants of democracy left anyhow, four or five of us. Again in 1951 they thought they should go before the country again. I want to say something before I forget it, and now that the Premier is in his seat, he is the gentleman who did say, a few days ago that if the Liberal party went before the country today it would be a landslide. He did not qualify that statement, and I don't exactly know what he meant by it. But I will qualify it insofar as I can see it, it would be a landslide, Sir, it would be an avalanche, an avalanche of votes against the Liberal party that would burst it for the next twenty-five years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A "Tory" avalanche, what a miracle.

MR. JACKMAN: A miracle, no, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources closed his address yesterday—I would almost call it a treatise. I think he was told three or four times he should sit down, but got a minute or two extra. But

he closed this way: "You got no policies Tories." No policy? I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatsoever about it, we have got a policy, and if the Liberals want to test it, dissolve this Parliament and spring another election, and you will see.

MR. MURRAY: Let us hear about it.

MR. JACKMAN: Not here, my friend—You are a lawyer.

MR. MURRAY: Keep it secret.

MR. JACKMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have a policy, and I hope to Heavens that our policy will produce slightly more results anyway, if not much more than your present Liberal policy. Here is the Liberal policy, and this is the snap election of 1951—Help for those who cannot work—jobs for those who can. That is the policy. Before I go on to that I would just like to mention in passing, just in case I should forget, the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources yesterday had this to say: I am convinced that a third paper mill is feasible in Newfoundland, and I believe that the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry will include the establishment of a third mill in their recommendations to the Government. Last week the Premier said in his statement, his speech, giving as his reason for not tabling the IBEC Report, that the IBEC Report did state that a third mill in Newfoundland was not feasible. Policy—Liberal Government Policy—The Minister of Mines and Resources says it is feasible, and the Premier says, through the IBEC Report which cost the taxpayers of this country two hundred thousand dollars, it is not feasible—who are we going to believe? I don't

know, frankly. Are we going to believe the Minister of Mines and Resources or are we going to believe Rockefeller, the man with a hundred million dollars. The Government is very good on pulling tricks, pulled another one yesterday, the Hamilton Inlet, a million bucks. Well I hope that something will come out of it in order to help our people and give them a chance to live.

Mr. Speaker, here are the issues of this last general election. This is a point I made at the beginning of my remarks, when I said there were two points I would deal with—I would deal first of all with the terms—Well that will be left to a Conservative Government to get good terms—Now I will deal with the part which has been left out. The part that brought on a snap election in 1951. Here are the issues in this general election, and these are not my words:

In industry: "I have made arrangements with many European companies, good reliable companies to start new industries in Newfoundland. These new industries will employ about fifteen thousand Newfoundlanders at good wages running into about thirty million dollars a year." I don't know if you would call that good wages, Mr. Speaker, but we don't call it that. That is not an average of \$35 a week. Those are only scab wages. "As a result of these new industries about five thousand other people will get other jobs at about ten million dollars in wages a year. That will mean twenty thousand new jobs, and bring forty million dollars a year in wages." That was the issue in this general election. There was no other issue worth talking about—Twenty thousand jobs in new industries, not mentioning Dr. Valdmanis who is

gone. I think though the Herr Doctor left, and I heard a Doctor here the other day do everything but goose step. Twenty thousand jobs—Yet today we have nineteen thousand receiving unemployment insurance, not employed, and ten thousand fishermen out of work, school teachers working for scab wages, half the civil servants working for scab wages. Here are the issues. If the Liberal party goes back to the people, we have a strong united party, we have a policy, a strong policy. I will support a policy, Mr. Speaker, in any Government. I am not concerned about Liberal or Tory or be it anything. I will support any party which will help the producers of this country. But as I see it the producers of this country have been let down terrifically by this Government. I will challenge this Government—In 1951 this Government dissolved the House here and went before the people to receive a mandate for their policy—there is their policy—I will challenge this Government to dissolve this House again and go before the people and ask for the support of the people again. I doubt if they will do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are you afraid that we will do it? Doubt it or are you afraid of it?

MR. JACKMAN: Not for the honourable gentleman's sake but for his colleagues' sake. He would welcome it, Mr. Speaker, but would his colleagues? I don't see why you should be afraid, will you do it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Wait and see

MR. HOLLETT: Issue the challenge. Issue it again.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to say one more thing before I conclude. I have been a subscriber to

the "Financial Post" for over twenty years. In fact I subscribed to the "Financial Post" when I came back from the United States in 1931. I place great reliance in that Post. I might say it is a very educational paper, any man can learn a lot out of it. The editor is not always right but—I want to be charitable and won't say anything about him, but will just read it: "In 1949 only one Newfoundland family in ten owned a car, now the ratio is one in four. Electrical consumption has doubled, telephone subscribers are up by one third, freight volumes throughout and from the Island is almost doubled." Yes we know something about the freight rates.

MR. MURRAY: A sign of poor times, all that.

MR. JACKMAN: "Union has been good for Newfoundland." Sure it has been good and for the rest of Canada. "Geographically, historically, politically and commercially Newfoundland has always been . . ."

In other words, Sir, the Canadians are admitting now that Newfoundlanders are defending them. In conclusion, Sir, I will have to repeat myself—I am not an anti-Confederate. I have very good friends in Canada. In fact I like the Canadian people. There is not, after all, a great deal of difference between us, most of us—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Most of us are "Liberals anyway all across Canada."

MR. JACKMAN: I wonder.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From St. John's to Vancouver.

MR. JACKMAN: I don't want to indulge in a discussion of Canadian politics, but I can say this much, there

is not much left of real Canadian politics, and I don't want to be drawn out on that. But I will go this far and say. The Union Nationale, Duplessis, what was it he said to you about Labrador? You do not own it.

I want to say in conclusion, Sir, I am a Newfoundlander for a number of reasons. I am a Newfoundlander first of all because I believe in Newfoundland, I believe in Newfoundlanders. I am a Newfoundlander secondly because we have a heritage that made our western civilization what it is. I am a Newfoundlander because I feel proud of the fact that it was our great little country that turned the tide of battle in the last war, won the battle of the Atlantic and saved the necks of the Englishman and the American and the Canadian. Last, but not least, I am a Newfoundlander just because I am a Newfoundlander.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like first of all to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion. Both these gentlemen did credit to themselves and to the districts which they represent.

On my own behalf and on behalf of the district which I represent I should also like to express my loyalty to the person of Her Majesty, and to wish that her reign may be prosperous and happy.

I should also like to welcome to this House the newly elected member for St. John's West. I am not too well acquainted with the honourable gentleman, but I have been in some ways associated with him through the co-operative movement and the Avalon Co-operative Council of which he was, I believe, honorary president for a number of years.

I was glad to hear a few nights ago on the radio that he still maintains his contact with the co-operative movement. I think he took part in the programme where the co-operative housing group were being interviewed by that gentleman. I do hope that his stay here will be a benefit to the House and enjoyable for himself.

Mr. Speaker, in going over the notes that I have made on the speeches from the opposition side of the House, I find very little on which to comment. Actually I am not quite sure what their purpose was in making these speeches. In the Liberal party we have an institution known as the party caucus. In that caucus members, particularly new members are brought up to date on what has happened over the years. They are also given some insight into what probably will come up in the future. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that there is no such organization across the floor, and that they have taken up the time of this House in bringing their new member up-to-date on what has happened in the past five years. I have heard of caretaker governments, and I thought at first of describing the present Opposition as a caretaker Opposition, but after hearing the speeches I am more inclined to refer to them as the "Undertaker Opposition," because they have been so anxious to bury the new industries, so anxious to bury everything that has been done by this Government in the past five years. As a matter of fact, although I may be uncharitable in saying so, it seems to me that they would be only too happy to bury the Premier.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I think I will have to ask the honourable gentleman to retract these words—do I have the

floor, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order? The statement made by the honourable member for Green Bay, that we are desirous of burying the Premier, in my opinion is not in good taste, and personally we object to such a statement. I would like to have him retract that statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was just an expression of opinion which may or may not be correct. If it is unparliamentary I will take it back.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be unparliamentary if the honourable gentleman meant it.

MR. MORGAN: During the past few days in this session, on this side of the House at any rate, we have been waiting for some indication of a policy on the part of the Opposition—they have been hinting that possibly there would be an election. I know that they have kept their policy a deep secret in the past up to within a few weeks of an election and combining the mention of an election with that policy. I have been wondering if in this session we would be treated to some of the secrets of their policy. But I have waited in vain. Not one word of their policy has been mentioned by the Opposition in this session, or indeed in any previous session since 1949. Although I am not absolutely correct in that, because I do recall, I think it was the first Leader of the Opposition, at the beginning of the discussion on economic development, proclaimed that it would be much better to keep the forty million dollar surplus on deposit so that it could be used for the payment of relief should a depression come.

Mr. Speaker, I have been more than disappointed in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I expected



more from him than we have received to date. I should like to take this opportunity to warn the new member for St. John's West to examine anything which they say very, very carefully, or what the leader says very, very carefully. For instance, there is the story of the Flying Dutchman down in Ferryland District. I contacted the fresh fish people on Water Street a few days ago in connection with the prices of fresh fish and the difference in prices of fresh fish between Halifax and St. John's. Now, I may state one thing I think to be a fact. The Leader of the Opposition may state what he thinks to be a fact, but I was informed by one of the managers of one of the large firms on Water Street, the difference ran somewhere in the vicinity of one half to one and a half cents a pound rather than the five or six cents difference as quoted by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think the most serious and the most fantastic thing the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mentioned was that there had been political interference in connection with the cutting of birch in the Springdale area. Nothing could be further from the truth. My conviction is that I could not have quite understood what the honourable gentleman said. Perhaps he said there was a lack of political interference—I think it was in the winter of 1950, the person who ran against me as a P.C. candidate in 1949 had a contract to cut birch. I don't know if that would have happened if the tables had been reversed—the allegation is, to say the least, fantastic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition or any of the members of the Opposition being ignorant of things that are happening in the outports—all they

know is what they hear from people, or what they read in the papers about these people. St. John's has the reputation of being one of the friendliest, indeed if not the friendliest city of North America and possibly in the world. I am sure that even if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition does represent them politically he does not represent their attitude toward strangers, which has always been warm and friendly.

Not only did the Honourable Leader of the Opposition cast reflections upon these people from abroad but even our Newfoundlanders came in for—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, will the honourable gentleman quote wherein I cast reflections upon these people from abroad. I don't remember doing so. Will he quote the reference which I made? I can't allow him to say that I cast reflections on these people from abroad.

MR. SPEAKER: I hardly think that is a point of order. The honourable member speaking is merely stating what he gathered from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's speech, and he is not out of order in saying the honourable member did cast reflections.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I hardly know how the honourable gentleman got that impression of it. Anyhow the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not too well inclined towards these foreigners, as he calls them, in Newfoundland. There are also some Swedes out there and some Dutchmen and some Frenchmen. There is one Swede as far as I know, there may be others.

MR. HOLLETT: One Swede is not Swedes.

MR. MORGAN: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted, Newfoundlanders also got a dishonourable mention by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Dishonourable mention?

MR. MORGAN: I mean the opposite of honourable. Mr. Chester Dawe, I think, was referred to in person. I also noticed there was no bouquet for the Premier, nor indeed for any of us on this side of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have to have this thing clear. If I may rise to a point of order. The honourable gentleman's hearing may be is on the defective side. He said I spoke dishonourably of Newfoundlanders. If that is so I must have him retract that statement. I don't intend to have any man on that side, nor in this country say I spoke dishonourably of Newfoundlanders.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we will have to get Hansard to get exactly what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to that point of order, I have exactly the same recollection as my honourable friend from Green Bay.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, has he a right to address the Chair?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On this point of order I certainly have. What the Honourable Leader of the Opposition did say was that Mr. Chester Dawe had the birch plant built close beside his own business so that a little later he might remove the fence separating the two. If that is not imputing to Mr. Dawe the most dishon-

est possible motive and the most dishonourable one I don't understand either. And what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said is a most shameful statement about a citizen of this province.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I repudiate the statement. I said no such thing. I did hear somebody say that all was necessary was to take down the fence. I did not say any such thing, and even if I did it is not excuse enough to say I spoke dishonourably of any Newfoundlander. If they want to get involved—I rose to a point of order. I see no reason why any honourable member has any right to infer that. I have stated a point of order and ask Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On that point, Mr. Speaker, may I inform the honourable gentleman, through you, I have identically the same right as he or any member of the House to participate in any discussion on a point of order—I have exactly the same right, and a point of order may well be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—this is a point of order which cannot at this time be settled by the Chair because it would be necessary for me to have before me a transcript of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's actual words, which I have not at this time, and I cannot get it at short notice. I cannot give a ruling at this moment.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. speaker, may I demand the statement be retracted until Hansard is produced here? I am not going to sit here and have any member say I spoke dishonourably about another Newfoundlander—it is not filth like saying

people are going around with other people's wives and children have to be decontaminated.

MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with this point under consideration. Perhaps the honourable member would proceed with his speech, and perhaps he would withdraw that remark. I might say that when any honourable member rises to a point of order he should not drag into the debate anything outside of what we are discussing as a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well if it will make the Honourable Leader of the Opposition feel any better I will be glad to take back that word, but I clearly recollect he did not speak in any glowing terms of the work of Mr. Chester Dawe, which he has put in on the birch plant.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly not.

MR. MORGAN: No, certainly not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He would not speak dishonourably of any Newfoundland—Oh no—not he.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Honourable member please proceed.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition must have a grudge against the world, particularly against these people who happen to live in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, when this Government came into office one of the biggest problems which they had facing them was the lack of scientific data, arrived information whether it was on minerals, waterpower, forests, agriculture or anything else, as soon as they went to look for information, any definite information, they were up against a stone wall. Governments in the past

were in the same position, but the difference between this Government and Governments of the past was that most of our previous Governments knew that they were in office for, I think it was three years only, and they made plans for the three or four year period. Consequently they had to rush into developing, developing this, that and something else, so that they would have something to show for their three or four years in office. This Government, with twenty-five years facing them, knew that they could take their time to really go into the problems, have these problems thoroughly investigated and the best possible solution offered, hence the Royal Commission. Part of that lack of knowledge has already been made up through the magnetometer surveys for minerals.

MR. BROWNE: The IBEC Report.

MR. MORGAN: Waterpower surveys, and the IBEC Report, which was next on my list, which although unpublished I feel sure has been of some benefit to the Government. This work of surveying and measuring is still going on, as is evidenced in the Speech from the Throne where a Royal Commission on Forestry and on Agriculture are mentioned.

In the district which I have the honour to represent both these industries play a more or less important role, agriculture not so much although around Jackson's Cove and King's Point seventy or eighty per cent of the people make their living as full-time farmers. However, in general I would say some sixty per cent of the people in the district make their living either through small saw mill operations or through cutting pulp wood for Bowaters and the

A.N.D. Company. I know the area fairly well, having spent four years in the district as a co-operative field worker. I have worked over most parts of it where there were trails or roads, and I know that our forestry reserves down there are getting pretty low, particularly on the three mile limit. I also know that there are large tracts of timber in the hinterland that have not been touched for years, and that are in need of being cut. I am looking forward to the report of the Royal Commission on Forestry to give us some indication of what can be done, and what should be done in these areas. But the most important of the commissions and the report which affects a very large number of the people in my district is the Fisheries Development Committee's report. Unfortunately, unlike the honourable member for Fogo (he is not here) I am sorry I cannot give a list of names of places where development will take place. Up to the present time three areas have been surveyed, that is, Fortune Harbour, Robert's Arm and Nippers Harbour. I trust that some development will take place at Nippers Harbour during the coming season. As a matter of fact, if development does not take place there this season I may feel like trying to become a member of the Opposition and a contender for the leadership of that party, the eighth contender. I say this because we still have three members on the Opposition who have not been leaders as yet, and I am sure they would not give me the position prior to them.

The people on the north side of Green Bay are some of the best fishermen in Newfoundland. They fish from May, or as soon as the ice goes out in May, for salmon and for lobster and continue on into November

and December and some years go on into January. They have a great variety of fish. Besides salmon and lobster which I have already mentioned they have turbot and halibut, herring, caplin and a particularly large run of codfish. I may say that all through the construction period on the bases I doubt if there were ten people who left the north side of Green Bay and gave up the fishery during that period to go on a construction job. They stayed home fishing and keeping their fishing gear in order. As I stated, they are amongst the best fishermen in Newfoundland. They also have been waiting patiently for this development programme and also for some development to take place. As a matter of fact there is a group presently in Nipper's Harbour who are prepared not only to give up their fishing stages and their land but also willing to invest something like twenty-five thousand dollars in a plant or in some type of improvement for their fishery in Nipper's Harbour. I feel sure that with people like that the Government will, as soon as it is feasible, do something for them. I know that we cannot get on the north side of Green Bay development such as is planned for LaScie, although the development at LaScie will be of some benefit to the Shoe Cove area, the eastern end of the north side of the bay. But under the primary development or immediate development programme there is room for great improvement in such places as Nipper's Harbour, Indian Burying Place, etc. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Government working in connection with the fisheries of Newfoundland not only the salt cod but the fresh fish as well will go further and have a greater effect on the future of the

industry than all that has been done for the fishery in the past.

Leaving the matter of fisheries I should like to turn to a subject that is dear to the heart of my honourable friend, the Honourable Minister of Public Works—I refer to roads:

Up to 1949 we had in the whole district of Green Bay something like fifteen to twenty miles of highroads. There were only two settlements in the districts connected to the railway, Point Leamington in the eastern section and South Brook in the centre. As you know, Mr. Speaker, most of the people, or a lot of the people live on islands which are quite near to the shore, near to the headlands. But a great many of these people could not get to the roads and their only means of transportation was small boats in the summer time and a dog team, or lately a snowmobile in the wintertime. Since this Government came into office we have made a beginning, and I might remind the Honourable Minister it is only a beginning, I hope, in the building of roads in Green Bay.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Now, more than double what you had before.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, I agree we have, since this Government came in office, exactly doubled. There was a road built from Springdale to King's Point. They have done some work towards Bay Verte—Jackson's Cove—King's Point—Point Leamington towards Leading Tickle—Cockles Cove to Fortune Harbour—Phillip's Head out towards Point au Bay. I must say the Department of Public Works has done fairly well, but I should like to point out that most of these roads which I have mentioned, only a beginning has been made on them. Some

of them have been roughly built out, some of them have been bulldozed and graded for a few miles, but the beginning is made and I should like to urge upon the Government the importance of continuing with that programme.

Now very few people, I think, realize the number of people involved. For instance the road from South Brook to Robert's Arm would connect no less than five thousand people to the highroad. We had five thousand, I think, in the last census, or something like 4,988 people who at the present time are completely isolated but who will be able to make connection with the highroad just as soon as the connecting four or five miles of road is completed. I know, Mr. Speaker, what it means to the people and to the community in general. People sort of get a different attitude on life when the road is open. I happened to be in Springdale the Sunday the road was opened—or the road was opened on Thursday and I happened to be there on the following Sunday. I am sure that fifty per cent of the population had taken their cars out. They were used to running back and forth for four or five miles in the town. The road opened on Thursday and on Sunday everybody took advantage of it going out to Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander, Botwood, wherever they felt inclined to go. As I said, I know it does make a tremendous difference to the people. Now these roads which have been started, particularly this road to Robert's Arm, which I will say liberated five thousand people, was started last Fall and I hope the work will be continued this year.

Mr. Speaker, this Speech from the Throne portrays more activity in fish-

ery matters, in forestry and in mining than has taken place in the history of Newfoundland. For that one thing alone it will go down in history as one of the greatest speeches that has been made in this House. If any additional endorsement of what the Government has done in the past five years is needed I think it appears in the "Evening Telegram" of April 3, in an item headed "Camp Change—Sunshine" for Province's Crippled." Mr. Herb Wyatt, President of the Sunshine Camp, stated that all in all they found it hard going getting really underprivileged children to aid. I think that is the greatest tribute that could be paid to this Government, that what is known as the "Sunshine Camp" had to change its sphere of operations. I think it now plans to look after some polio victims. They had to change from one operation to another because they just could not find enough underprivileged children in St. John's to operate their camp. Now if that is true of St. John's how much more true is it in the outports. I don't know what the St. John's people will say to me for saying this, I am a bay-man myself, but St. John's had more poverty, abject, absolute poverty than any part of the outport areas. The reason for this is quite logical. In the outports most people grew their own vegetables, caught their own fish, got their own firewood, some had sheep from which they could get wool for mittens, socks, sweaters etc. for the children. But in St. John's, or in any town, or any industrial town or city, when a person loses his job, a great many people don't own their own houses, and we get poverty in its worst form. When such a fine person as Mr. Wyatt makes a statement like that I am sure that we all feel very proud of it, and of the accomplish-

ments of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, during the past five years the people of Newfoundland have taken a new lease on life. I spent six years travelling around this country from Port aux Basques around the north west coast, the east coast and back to Conception Bay and in Placentia Bay. I knew the conditions very well. I will say I knew them more than the average person who travelled Newfoundland, because working with the co-operative movement I really got to know the toiling masses, I really got to know their problems, to know their problems and their difficulties. I must say that when travelling around Newfoundland at the present time when I meet the same people the improvement amazes me, it is unbelievable. For instance I have seen children, who, as the member for Bell Island mentioned this afternoon, did not have enough clothes to wear, I have seen them having to stay home from school because of lack of clothing. Today in no part of Newfoundland would you ever find such poverty. As a matter of fact, I am again quoting from the "Evening Telegram" of April 3rd: "So called underprivileged children turned up at the Sunshine Camp last year wearing perms, dressed in fine clothing and having as much as five dollars in their pockets. Their underprivileged parents brought them to the camp and came back for them in taxis."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Good enough. It was worth fighting for was it not?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if for nothing else alone but for the social benefits we have obtained through Confederation with Canada and for the industrial development programme, and for the fishery development programme, which I feel



sure we will get, this Government will go down as the greatest Government which Newfoundland ever had.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House now go into Committee on sundry items Nos. 2-9, or as many of them as we could get through in forty minutes.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the permission of the House to withdraw item No. 7. The reason for that request is that we have another additional amendment, somewhat minor, to make to the Crown Lands Mines and Quarries Act, and the Department of the Attorney General felt, I think rightly, that rather than have two Bills it would be better to have the two amendments in the one Bill. So that, with the approval of the House, Sir, I would like to request to have that Bill withdrawn. You understand that a new Bill will be submitted incorporating the amendment which has already had second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave?

Leave of the House given. Item No. 7 withdrawn.

As to items No. 2 and 3, leave has already been granted for the Committee to sit again. So that we have new items No. 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. Motion is I do now leave the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills:

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think at this stage, I might remind the Committee we were discussing Section 7 of the Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretations Act." Section 7 had come up

for some discussion but had not been passed, and Section 5 had been left to stand. So that we will now begin with Section No. 7, which has already been read and partly discussed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, since the last sitting the Attorney General was kind enough to send over to me a copy of the report of the Committee on all such legislation, and this contains representative clauses which they deem advisable for insertion into the Interpretations Act in the different provinces. I believe one of the sections is also one we have under Section 5. So far as that is concerned, therefore, I have no objections.

MR. CURTIS: Just to clarify, Mr. Chairman, if any member would like to see the report of the proceedings of the 31st annual meeting of the Conference on Uniformity of Legislation in Canada, held September 1st to 5th, 1953. Since my honourable friend referred to that matter in debate, I took the liberty yesterday to send it over to him to see for himself. It will be remembered that earlier in the debate, my honourable and learned friend suggested I could not find these amendments in any other provincial Act. That is explainable because the various houses are now meeting and at this moment, probably, re-enacting the same Acts as we are enacting here today. This Committee on Uniformity of Legislation which meets every year is a particularly valuable committee consisting of some of the outstanding lawyers of Canada. I might say I had the privilege of meeting some of them last year in Quebec. We are represented on the Committee by Mr. Puddester, Mr. Carter and Mr. Greene, all of the Attorney General's Department. These gentlemen don't always manage to get

away. Last year actually we were not represented, but we have been represented at previous meetings, and we hope to be represented at the meeting to be held this year in Winnipeg. From the names appearing on the list of the commissioners any member will see this is an outstanding one, and for that reason I do not examine too closely the amendments they suggest, because they are an outstanding group, and I felt quite happy if the amendments in question had their endorsement they would undoubtedly be good ones. On the other hand if there is any particular point that honourable members would like to discuss I would be happy.

Clause 7, 8 carried; clause 9 read, carried.

Clause 5:

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable the Attorney General, if there is machinery to acquaint this House of any appeal or amendment to some Act in some other province, as indicated there.

MR. CURTIS: There is certainly no machinery to acquaint the House. Any lawyer or any court interpreting this would obviously have reverence to any amendment in effect.

MR. HOLLETT: In any province?

MR. CURTIS: I think so.

This is the date the Interpretation Act came into force, Mr. Speaker, so this amendment is retroactive to the date of the original legislation.

Clause 5 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949." Passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

Clause 1 carried, clause 2 read:

"2. Paragraph (b) of Section 13 of the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act, chapter 185 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by striking out subparagraphs (iii), (v), (ix) and (xi) and substituted therefor the following:

"(iii) Falconbridge Nickel Mines Limited.

(v) Labrador Mining and Exploration Company Limited.

(ix) Newfoundland Fluorspar Ltd.

(xi) Independent Mining Corporation Limited."

MR. BROWNE: Before you put that, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources would tell us who this corporation is, and is it actively engaged in mining or prospecting at this time?

DR. ROWE: In answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe this company is actually doing any work at this present time. I believe that sometime last year they suspended, but I don't think they have ruled out altogether the possibility of operating, but I think they did suspend operations in York Harbour, Bay of Islands. The honourable member for Humber would be more familiar with the case. It came into existence before this Government came into office.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have spent several hundred thousand dollars, a couple of hundred thousand,

and then the promoter of the company persuaded his directors to risk another hundred thousand which brought it to three hundred thousand. Before that was all spent he persuaded them to risk, I think another fifty thousand. So that they spent in all a figure of approximately three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now, the Government helped them in this way; it gave them a sole, exclusive right to search for minerals immediately beside the area they already had. They acquired the area they already had by purchase from Harvey and Company the original, or late owners. This was done so that they might test their theory that the additional ore body they needed, and which did not exist in their own area might be found immediately beside it. It was on a search of that area immediately beside theirs that they spent the large sum of money, but with no result, they did not increase their tonnage sufficiently to have a mine, so they dropped it.

MR. BROWNE: What mineral?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The York Harbour Mine was originally a copper mine. Unfortunately at the time it was first operated, worked as a mine, they discovered that the ore contained a very high proportion of a nuisance mineral for which there was no use at the time. This mineral is known as zinc. It is very rich in zinc, I think from eight to ten per cent. This was a nuisance at the time. But it was that high proportion of zinc which made it so attractive right now to go in again in the last few years and try to work up sufficient tonnage to justify a mine. It contained a very high proportion of zinc, which in fact actually caused them to quit mining. For the amount of copper it did not

pay to have to separate the useless ore known as zinc.

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill  
"An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act."

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill  
"An Act to Amend the Local Areas Planning Act."

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if we might know what Act that sub-section 2 is amending? I have not the original Bill here.

MR. CURTIS: Sub-section 2—Under the present new regulation made under sub-section 1, it may provide for the issuing of orders within the scope of that sub-section. What we have done is to take that out and put in that clause which provides for a penalty for breaches of the regulations.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Is there any special reason this elaborate and very stringent clause is being inserted here? Has anything arisen in the past to justify the enactment of this provision? I would also like to ask if the Minister would be good enough to inform me as to what sort of areas this applies to?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): These are areas really not incorporated but for some reason or other, at the request of the people or the public at large, may have been incorporated into the rural area planning development.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any one in existence at this moment?

MR. HEFFERTON: Topsail Road; some part of the St. John's Municipal Department is definitely under the Department of Municipal Affairs. We have had a request from several other areas for the same thing. No penalty is provided under the section. During the last year or so we have had occasions where at different times people have asked for certain regulations, they come back to us and ask what happens if the regulations are not enforced. Consequently there is an amendment being put in.

MR. BROWNE: Is Topsail Road the only planning area at the present time that has been announced?

MR. HEFFERTON: As far as I know that is the only one active at the present time. Although on the West Coast there is an area to come in shortly, and in central Newfoundland there is an area which will probably be under the same, and on the North East Coast probably another.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is very good to make regulations along the highway like that, provided they are reasonable. It seems to me some of the regulations I have seen seem to be a little unreasonable. It says, within a mile of the highway, I believe, nothing shall be done without the permission of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it should be a mile—I can show why: Suppose a factory is built beside the highway, with a few hundred yards, or several factories, and it becomes desirable or even necessary to build a town for the workers whom they have employed in these factories. It follows that these people would like to live nearby the plant. The minute that situation arises it becomes very imperative to take control so that you won't have another slum. I can think of a case

right now, Atlantic Hardboards Limited, and Newfoundland Hardwoods, two plants quite close to each other. If you had people building there within half a mile or a mile of these two plants, you would have immediately the problem of sanitation, the problem of water, the problem of fire hazards and forest fire hazards which in turn might destroy the factories and the homes that have been built. You would have all kinds of problems arising from an unco-ordinated and unregulated building scheme. So that it is desirable that the Minister have authority to step in where municipalities don't exist or where no form of local Government exists, and acting as a sort of mayor for that area prevent the springing up of what would be virtually another slum. I hope I am now speaking to the right Bill—yes I am told that I am. I think this is very sound and very sensible. I think of a beautiful highroad leading from Corner Brook to Deer Lake, and going for some miles of its distance along the bank of the very beautiful, very majestic Humber River. I think what a tragedy it would be if that kind of thing happened along that road. Then again take the Trans-Canada Highway as it leaves Port aux Basques and comes eastward coming through that beautiful valley of Codroy, and all out through that district, then down through St. George's and Corner Brook again passing through magnificent scenery—take the new highway that has been begun from Bonne Bay down, and on which magnificent progress was made last year, and on which even more progress may be made this year—it would be criminal to allow slums to spring up along these highways.

DR. ROWE: I can add to what the Honourable the Premier has al-

ready said. An example we had of some negotiations with the Government of Canada in Happy Valley, a community of Newfoundland citizens in Air Force Territory held by the Government of Canada, and being very rigidly controlled, and the people are only squatters there. We had some negotiations and the Government of Canada felt it should transfer that area back to the Government of Newfoundland, the area that would include the Community of Happy Valley. If that were done, unless we had some means of stepping in there the thing would be wide open, and within two or three weeks, I should say, you would have hundreds of shacks going up all around there as soon as that area became open territory. So that apparently there should be some control until such time as the community itself can set up its own municipal body.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if that is the sort of thing this Act deals with?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, the point my honourable colleague has brought to the attention of the Committee is one of the reasons that brought that to the fore.

MR. BROWNE: I understand from the remarks of the Premier that the Topsail Road is designated as an area a mile outside the limits of St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From Cowan Avenue, I believe.

MR. BROWNE: The City of St. John's, I believe, has jurisdiction to a distance of one mile outside its boundary—you begin there?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the only area around St. John's controlled by

this Act at the present time?

MR. HEFFERTON: There has been a request from the whole perimeter around St. John's to be placed under control in a similar manner but no decision has been made on it yet.

Bill passed without amendment.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Chairman, the Committee rise and report having passed these four Bills and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bills "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act" without amendment. Report received. Ordered read a third time tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949," passed without amendment. Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act," passed without amendment. Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Areas Planning Act," passed without amendment. Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act," passed without amendment. Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

The Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have made progress on the following Bills:

"An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act."

"An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

Report received—Ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might crave the indulgence of the House to give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, might I also crave the indulgence of the House to give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pets and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation," and "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave to introduce a Bill on tomorrow, "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act," and a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to ask on tomorrow to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carriers Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour adjourns the House, may I say for the benefit of the House that we don't propose to meet on St. George's Day which is, I believe on Friday. It is

not customary in the early stages of a session to meet on Saturday. Therefore in rising tomorrow, Thursday, we would propose to rise until the Monday following. It is a little inconvenient to have only a short week, but St. George's Day is St. George's Day and it is the Queen's Birthday, I think, under our law.

Moved and seconded the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 22, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. S. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Westport, Pumbly Cove and Bear Cove requesting that the three mile limit be restored to the province. The petition reads in part: "We the undersigned consider that the rights of the people of White Bay are too much restricted as far as the three mile limit is concerned. During the past years timber bordering the coastal waters have been given away to private companies. We have often been told we are not to cut any of Bowater's timber, yet before that, any person living within the three miles limit would be permitted to cut logs for firewood and for building houses."

The petition, Sir, is signed by 244 persons in the area concerned. Not only in the area concerned but in other parts of White Bay, too, the people have been deprived of their rights on the three mile limit.



I have much pleasure in supporting this petition, and ask that it be tabled in the House and presented to the Department concerned.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak to a point of privilege: I missed my opportunity in the first place, but would like to speak now with the consent of the House?

Permission granted.

MR. HOLLETT: I just want to draw attention of the House to the "Daily News," April 21, which states: "Opposition Leader Hollett added the support of his side of the House to the motion that the "Evening Telegram" should apologize for its quotations."

Now, we have no Hansard here, Sir, and I am quite sure these are not the words I used. I did say the "Telegram" should apologize if it misquoted any honourable member. I draw the attention of the House to that so that it might be corrected.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to that same point, I would like to say, my recollection agrees thoroughly with that of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. In my recollection that is exactly what he said, what he has now repeated.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Honourable the Premier for supporting me.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wish any further action?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

#### Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Civil Servants' Commission of Newfoundland from July 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable Minister of Finance if that is to be printed or if he has copies here?

MR. POWER: I think there are sufficient copies to go around, at least there are sufficient copies for the members of the Opposition.

#### Notice of Questions

Notice of questions on tomorrow given by Mr. Browne.

(62) MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

The names, positions and salaries of all employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

(63) MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

The names, positions and salaries of all employees of the Public Utilities Commission.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 60: Being prepared.

Question No. 59: Stand.

Question No. 58: In course of preparation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions the answers to which I have not received. I am sure honourable members who directed these questions to me will appreciate the fact that it is very rarely indeed that I prepare the answers handed to

me. At this moment I have no answers, and will take the replies as soon as they are handed to me. I may say in that connection that the past fortnight or so has been for me personally a period of very unusual business, and until the answer is handed to me I frankly don't know there is such a question directed to me. I don't know whether I am on my head or on my heels, but I have been extremely busy in the past two weeks, and it is not with any disrespect to the House that I have failed to answer any one, two or three questions still on the order paper for me.

**MR. POWER :** I believe there are a couple of questions addressed to the Department of Finance which are outstanding. I believe the answers are ready, but I have not been to my office for the past two days.

**MR. SPENCER :** Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 35 asked by the honourable member for St. John's West. I find that I had already, in fact, discussed this answer with the honourable gentleman who had asked the question, and he indicated to me there was a point there he would like to have answered. I promised I would endeavour to get it for him. Unfortunately that particular bit of the answer is not included in the written answer, so that I propose to give it verbally, which I think will serve the purpose.

The question is : What amount of money has been paid for architects by the Government since April 1, 1949? Give the amounts paid to each architect or firm of architects and state the work for which the amount or amounts were paid.

I shall not read the details of this but merely give the summary :

#### A. J. C. Paine

West Coast Sanatorium	\$90,949.84
Mental Hospital South Wing	78,473.08
Mental Hospital Nurse's	
Home	8,252.36
Memorial University	881.24
	<hr/>
	\$178,556.52

In connection with that I think it would be only fair to inform the House that all of it except nine thousand was contracted expenditure prior to the advent of this administration.

#### Rennie & Horwood

Boys' Home, Whitbourne	\$5,330.00
Museum	1,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$6,330.00

#### W. J. Ryan

Memorial University	\$50,000.00
---------------------	-------------

We will I hope be able to report in due time having paid this firm a very much larger sum. My reason for saying that is that it is anticipated that the Memorial University, as presently visualized, will probably cost somewhere in the vicinity of five million dollars.

#### J. A. Hoskins

Colonial Building	\$ 1,300.00
Mental Hospital	
New South Wings	28,679.94
Ellis Wing Extension	6,317.37
Nurses' Home	6,003.87
Central Laundry	1,228.20
Centre Block	197.22
Boiler House	77.73
Kennedy Wing	882.42
	<hr/>
	\$44,686.75

Practically all of that was contracted for prior to our coming into office, and paid to Mr. Hoskins since 1949.

#### W. J. Roue

Placentia Ferry .....\$3,500.00

#### Fetherstonhaugh, Dunford

Bolton and Chadwick

Memorial University .....\$5,463.82

This was for a set of plans in connection with the original idea held in connection with the extension to the present Memorial University. That was prior to the thought of building a new University.

#### Question No. 35 (2):

Question: How much money was spent on roads in the District of St. John's West in the years 1952 and 1953? Give the amount spent on each road together with the name of the foreman in each case.

#### Answer:

1952-53

Maintenance .....	\$66,808.21
Improvement and	
Reconstruction .....	Nil
Construction of New Roads	Nil
Local Roads .....	950.00
	<hr/>
	\$67,758.21

1953-54

Maintenance .....	\$76,063.00
Improvement and	
Reconstruction:	
Brookfield Road towards	
Mount Pearl, foreman	
Eldred Smith .....	24,097.64
Thorburn Road towards	
St. Phillips, foreman	
Fred W Bennett .....	11,872.92
Blackhead to Cape	
Spear, foreman Eldred	
Smith .....	4,903.06

Construction of new roads .. Nil  
Local Roads ..... 3,070.00

---

\$120,006.62

---

#### Question No. 35 (3):

Question: Were tenders called for the construction of the ferry boat to operate on Placentia Gut, or for the construction of terminals on each side? Give the names, if any, of those who tendered, with the amount of each tender. What is the estimated cost of this project, and how much has been expended to date thereon?

Answer: Tenders were invited by advertisement in the press. Three tenders were received for the construction of the Ferry Boat. Two of these were from Mainland firms. The contract was awarded to Newfoundland Shipyards Limited at Clarenville, it being decided to give preference to the local company.

Three tenders were received for construction of the terminals. One of these was withdrawn. Of the remaining two, the tender of Tidewater Construction Co., Ltd. was the lower and the contract was awarded to this firm in the sum of \$223,755.

Speaking from memory—I have not the exact figures of these tenders—I believe that is the part my honourable friend is particularly interested in, and I can get the details for him. But speaking from memory, I believe the bid of the Newfoundland Shipyards Limited of Clarenville for the ferry boat which is to go on the Gut at Placentia was of the order of \$115,000. That may vary a few cents one way or the other, I will get the actual figures.

MR. BROWNE: What were the other two?

MR. SPENCER: The other two were slightly less, as indicated, but preference was given to the local shipping yard. There was a slight difference, but I don't remember the exact figures, I believe it amounted to 8% or 10%. I repeat that the justification appeared to be on the basis that when we first entered union with Canada the Federal Government authorized the purchase in here for any work they undertook of a differential of some 15% in favour of the local suppliers, not necessarily merchants. That was to take care of the difference anticipated in freight rates and charges. They were allowed that difference so that if we bought a piece of machinery from a firm here in Newfoundland we would be entitled to pay them about 15% more than they would pay on the Mainland of Canada for it. On that basis, I believe, it was considered and the advantage given to the local firm, at an additional cost of less than the 15%. Three tenders were received for the construction etc.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby table these answers, and I believe there are sufficient copies for all members.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would be gracious enough to give me the remainder of the information, the names of the companies who tendered in each case and the amount of their tender.

MR. SPENCER: I know of no reason why it cannot be provided.

#### Orders of the Day

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention this afternoon to discuss at any

great length the Address in Reply, but there are some remarks which I think should be made, and which I hope to be able to make, which may be of interest to the House and possibly to the country.

First of all, sir, I would like to join those who have preceded me in congratulating the mover and seconder of the motion. They have spoken, as we would have expected, with their usual skill, and they have been a credit to themselves and to the districts they represent.

I would also like to congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the many speakers who have spoken before me. The speeches this year have all been of a very high order, and some have been outstanding. I don't think I will discriminate lest I be asked to name the settlements from which the members came, who made the speeches referred to.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with what previous speakers have said with respect to the visit of Her Majesty to other parts of her domain. We all wish our young Queen well. We have all followed with great interest her tour, rejoice with the rest of the empire that she is about to rejoin her family and that she will shortly be returning to her home.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the words of welcome which have been extended to our new member, the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West. I have known the honourable member for many, many years. In fact our names are quite close together, if not immediately adjoined on the roll of the Law Society. For the many years that he served this country on the bench of the central court I was

also a member of the bar, and on many occasions I had the pleasure and the privilege of appearing before him. Indeed I might say, Mr. Speaker, quite sincerely that it was always a pleasure to appear before my honourable friend. I always felt personally very happy and that I would receive at his hands, and that my clients would receive fair treatment, which they invariably did. I went before the Central District Court and also the Magistrate's Court presided over by my honourable friend with perfect confidence, in fact, much more so on occasions that I did when I went before other courts not far from his. He attended to the matters that came before him, Mr. Speaker, with great care, and I for one can find no reason at any time to criticize any treatment received by my clients or by myself when I appeared before him. If we could only make the Honourable Member for St. John's here, a J.P. those of us on this side of the bench would feel quite at home because we would be then addressing a full bench. However, we have two of them now. I don't know if we could make another of them a J.P. The Minister for Provincial Affairs might do it for the Honourable Member for St. John's East.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then we have the Honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. CURTIS: I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend still has in his mind a grudge against me, is it? or is it against the Premier, or is it this party? over his resignation from the Bench in St. John's. For I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member resigned from that position and was not removed. In fact I would go so far, Mr.

Speaker, as to say that he would not have been removed.

MR. BROWNE: You are not sure about that, but you were going to do your best, remember.

MR. CURTIS: I do, Mr. Speaker, I assured the honourable member that as far as I was concerned, I always found him eminently fair, and as far as I was concerned I would do the utmost I could to see he remained there. But he had unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, involved himself in a debate which puts me in an awkward position, because he expected me and the party I was with to recommend him as one of the first district court judges.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—May I point out that in the original terms of union in 1867 there was provision—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BROWNE: This is a point of order because the honourable and learned member is not correct in what he is saying, and is not reporting me correctly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, the honourable and learned gentleman is completely out of order, and I ask Mr. Speaker, to rule on it.

MR. BROWNE: Who is Mr. Speaker? Not the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

MR. BROWNE: I may say, I moved an amendment to the Address in Reply, and that debate is finished. Yet speaker after speaker on the other side gets up and refers to it, when it should not be at all. Actually, Mr.

Speaker, this is the point of order—I have been misquoted and the honourable and learned gentleman is not entitled to misquote me.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to misquote.

MR. BROWNE: Allow me to state what I said: The point of order is this: You are making a statement which is not what I said. What I said was that the original terms of confederation, in all provinces as well as in Newfoundland, made provision for district judges of district courts to be paid from Ottawa.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will Your Honour give a ruling? The honourable gentleman has been on his feet two minutes and has not yet stated a point of order. If he had asked the Honourable the Attorney General to yield and make the explanation he would be in order, but to rise to a point of order and then go ahead and contradict what he has said—

MR. SPEAKER: I think it would take more than a mere Mr. Speaker to decide what is happening at the moment. Let us see if my impression is correct. The Honourable Attorney General was speaking. He made a reference to a speech made by the honourable member for St. John's, the honourable member for St. John's West. Whereupon the honourable member for St. John's West rises to a point of order. I will admit that he was somewhat ambiguous at the beginning. He stated that he was going to complain that he was being misquoted.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: And that he is now stating what he actually did say.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the situation for the Attorney General, otherwise we are going to have an argument here.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable gentleman might confine himself to the complaint that he is misquoted, and not try at some length to fill in what he actually did say.

MR. BROWNE: I will make it as brief as possible. In 1867 there were provisions made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Premier is out of order. The remarks, the honourable member was about to say refers to 1867, and he does claim that is what he said in his speech.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, the Honourable the Attorney General was saying that I requested him to try and have me included as one of the first district judges of the district court.

MR. CURTIS: Not requested; no, expected.

MR. BROWNE: I expected my honourable friend to carry out the Terms of Union which he did not do.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, now I am going to rise to a point of order. The honourable member thinks because he made a motion to move an amendment on the Address in Reply that those of us who speak now cannot refer to a speech he made in this address. I don't care what he moved. He spoke on the Address in Reply, and everything he said we can refer to now.

MR. BROWNE: I am not objecting to you doing that.



MR. CURTIS: The honourable member, Mr. Speaker, said to you that the matter, in the form of an amendment was disposed of, and that every speaker who referred to it since has been out of order. In other words he put a closure on us by making a foolish amendment, which this House threw out.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, here are the Terms of Union, and if the honourable member would like to read—

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable member on a point of order? It is up to the Honourable Attorney General if he cares to accept—

MR. CURTIS: All I want to say, Mr. Speaker is this—I had no intention, and the Premier and this party had no intention of recommending to the Federal Government as one of our first acts after we came into Confederation, the promotion of a man who had deliberately tried his utmost to defeat Confederation. Now then—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Terms of Union were hardly signed, and what did my learned friend and his colleagues the Premier do—violated the Terms of Union before the ink was dry.

MR. CURTIS: Absolute nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—if the honourable and learned gentleman gets up and makes a speech without even a point of order, now I will make a little speech to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To a point of order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, at least as much as the honourable gentleman

had, at least that much, and he occupied several minutes. My point of order is this: The honourable gentleman not only fought to defeat Confederation but then afterwards volunteered himself as a "Liberal" candidate for the coming election, the first general election. He came to the "Liberal" Headquarters and offered himself as a Liberal Candidate while still on the Bench, a Liberal Party Candidate under my leadership.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: Order,

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to—this has gone far enough. If the honourable gentleman interrupts again.

MR. BROWNE: You are sitting down.

MR. SPEAKER: I merely stood so that there would be some semblance of order in the House. I shall ask the Honourable House if they consider me competent to fill the Chair or not. If they think not I will leave the Chamber. I am not sitting here to join in debates. Now, will the Honourable the Attorney General continue.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I am giving a ruling. Will the honourable gentleman still be seated.

MR. BROWNE: Whatever your ruling is—I am on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of privilege before the Chair at the moment. The Chair is trying to give a decision on what was alleged to be

a point of order. If the honourable gentleman wishes to usurp the authority of the Chair—

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I bow always to the authority of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Then show it by obeying the order to resume your seat. You will have ample opportunity.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when may I state my point of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: What is the honourable member trying to do?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, you ask me what I was trying to do. I am trying to contradict the most fantastic lie ever told by anybody, made by the Premier. That is what I am trying to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please resume his seat? My patience is nearly exhausted. The Honourable the Attorney General will resume his speech. It is out of order to have interruptions during any honourable member's speech. But I am not going to rule every interruption out of order unless the speaking member objects. I have done that for both. If the honourable gentleman wishes to make a point of order let him make it, but not make another speech to bolster his argument already made. If the honourable member wishes to rise to a point of privilege he may do so. If the honourable gentleman wishes to correct something which the speaking member says, he must follow the formula by asking the permission of the member who has the floor. Now will the Honourable the Attorney General resume his speech.

MR. CURTIS: I shall not refer any more, Mr. Speaker, to the subject on which the honourable member is so warm as this one. There are much more important things to be discussed. However I do welcome him in the House.

When we came into office, Mr. Speaker, we found things in this country in a most unsatisfactory condition. We found that large areas of the country had been given away; large natural resources had been alienated, and we found that these national resources were just lying dormant. Amongst the natural resources that had been alienated were many, many water powers. Indeed it was only the other day when the Government was considering a question as to the development of certain water powers that we found that these water powers were not owned by the Government but they were owned by the Reid Newfoundland Company. We found that before we could develop these water powers we had to buy them back from the owners. These natural resources, Mr. Speaker, given by God to this country alienated by former governments and held, sat upon, thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars worth of power flowing into the sea every day. And when we tried to utilize these powers we were told we would have to buy them back. That is a situation that will have to be considered by this House sooner or later. We found that the Muskrat Falls on the Hamilton River had been given away, for what? For thirty dollars a year, forever. For the last fifty years somebody has been paying \$30 a year and is holding these water powers, powerful, potential assets just running away, running to waste. And if we tried tomorrow to develop that water

power we have to buy it back. That, I say, is one of the things this House will have to consider very shortly. We found that huge timber areas had been alienated, and were being held by speculators, not for development, Mr. Speaker, but to sell at a profit.

The Government asked the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and the Legislature did give relief in this case by passing a Bill which brought back to the country such of these water powers as were not being operated, or such of these timber areas as would not be operated, in accordance with the terms of the licenses. They were to be returned within six months.

We found that there was a great, large industry at Corner Brook that had in its reserves about eighteen million cords of timber. These eighteen million cords of timber, Mr. Speaker, cost that company about eighteen million dollars, but who got that eighteen million dollars? Not the Government, Mr. Speaker, but private capitalists and gamblers who had gotten their timber limits from the government of the day.

We found that the A.N.D. Company had large timber limits which must have cost them an enormous amount of money. But that money too, Mr. Speaker, did not go to the Government of Newfoundland. We found that there was at Buchans a huge deposit of mineral which was bringing in millions and millions of dollars every year. True, Mr. Speaker, the Government did get some return from that mine because that mine was liable to income tax, but a huge portion of the proceeds from that mine were going to a private company.

**MR. HOLLETT:** How much are you getting from it now?

**MR. CURTIS:** I have not got the figures. We found, Mr. Speaker, that there were how many prospectors here since 1949? We found that there were no prospectors over a huge area of Newfoundland. What did we do? What was the Government to do? The Premier had just brought Newfoundland into Confederation. The country had received an impetus such as it had never received before. This Government tried to follow up this great exhilaration, this great boost the country had received as a result of coming into Confederation, by giving it a little further push so as to keep things going, keep things moving by taking advantage of the momentum, and keeping her on the move. So, what did the Government do, under the capable leadership of the Premier? We started to industrialize the country. I don't know how many new industries, Mr. Speaker, were introduced. There are three entirely Government owned, and sixteen or seventeen, I think, were Government assisted. But the point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that these industries were started for one purpose only, and that purpose was to give employment to our people, to reduce the number of our population dependent on the fishery, to keep in Newfoundland many of our people who were leaving the country. That, Sir, was the purpose of our entering into this industrial programme. You have heard the figures quoted the other day by the Honourable the Premier as to the number of men already employed, and the amount of wages already being paid. These we hope, Mr. Speaker, represent purely the beginning, and we hope that these figures will increase annually.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is this: The people of this

country must realize, and particularly the people employed in these industries, must realize that these industries were produced for their benefit, and for their benefit almost entirely. Local industries have an up-hill fight. We have been asked by the Opposition why there has been no talk about the new industries—why we have made no reference to the new industries. There was no reference, Mr. Speaker, purely because we want the new industries to settle down and to get established. Every new industry, Mr. Speaker, has to go through its growing pains. I think I can say with truth that it was many years before the Grand Falls Industry began to pay dividends. I know, Mr. Speaker, it was many years before Corner Brook paid dividends. And I know that before they did pay dividends they had to make a call upon the Government of Newfoundland to implement its guarantee. Whether the Government actually did implement its guarantees or whether the sale of the International made that unnecessary, I cannot say. But I do know that the company had to be reorganized and some huge block of its capital had to be written off so that the company could get a start. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, all new companies, all new industries have to go through their growing pains. Even those industries that are today at the very top of the ladder had to go through their reverses, and had to have their bad times. Therefore it must be expected that one or other of our new industries will have to go through the same period, and for that reason I want now, today, to draw the attention of the House to the handicaps under which these industries have to progress.

In the first place we are, as you know, Sir, at the extreme eastern point of Canada, consequently we have to pay the highest freight rates on our imports and exports. This means that the industries that have to export material have to pay the highest rates of import freight and those that are going to send their processed products in the Canadian market must pay high freight rates out.

This question of freight rates has been disturbing us for quite a long time, and the situation is even more disturbing today vis-a-vis the new industries than at any other time, because how they work it out I do not know any more than anybody else. Actually under the Terms of Confederation Newfoundland is supposed to benefit from an Act called "The Maritime Freight Act" which is supposed to give the Maritimes, and for that purpose Newfoundland is included, a 20% reduction on freight rates. That sounded all right. But what do we have today? Mr. Speaker, the freight rates from St. John's to Toronto are \$3.21 a hundred lbs. but freight rates on the same class goods from Toronto to St. John's \$2.72 by C.N.R. but they ship it by boat; but they ship it from Toronto by C.N.R. and we get a rate of \$2.72 coming through with a rate of \$3.21 going the other way, a difference of 18%—49c. of every hundred lbs. Look at the effect of that on local industries. On third class freight the difference is not so great. It is \$2.42 from here to Toronto, but from Toronto to St. John's \$2.14, a difference of 28c. or 13%. On fifth class goods, St. John's to Toronto \$1.59, Toronto to St. John's \$1.39 a difference of 20c. or 15%. That, Mr. Speaker, when Newfoundland is supposed to enjoy, with the rest of the

Maritimes, a freight rate which carries with it a 20% preference. So, Mr. Speaker, it must be realized just why at the moment these new industries have to carry an extra burden, and I would now appeal to labour, to the people who are working, not to be too demanding in their charges against these companies. This Government will never see labour oppressed by capital—we will not have it. I want to make that clear. But we would ask labour to co-operate and not price these new industries right out of the market by making excessive demands. One case in point: In one of the new industries in the first year there was a loss by the industry which this Government will have to pay. In that year employees asked for an increase, and the Board of Arbitration set up an increase, with the result that in the second year there was a further deficit. Now, Mr. Speaker, that cannot go on. If labour is not going to co-operate with the Government in keeping and creating jobs for labour, well then we will have no alternative than to just close the door. But to make it perfectly clear let me repeat again: This Government will not see labour oppressed. But we do ask labour to assist us to keep these new industries going, and not to be too harsh, and not to be too demanding in their requests. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the general manager of one of these organizations told me himself that he expected during the present twelve months to spend four months of that period, one-third of his time, negotiating with unions.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have these industries created, as I have said, to give employment. All I am asking is that those who have employment and those who get employment help us to keep that employment there, and not

price themselves out of the market. So much for the new industries—they will be all right in time. One or two may have a hard time, one or two may actually have to be reorganized. If our new industries all succeeded, if they succeeded, one hundred per cent we would not be a Government, we would be a bunch of supermen, Mr. Speaker. One does not get one hundred per cent these days from any scheme.

Now, then what next did we do? We had a magnetometer survey of that belt of Newfoundland just south of Notre Dame Bay, and we were able to induce some large mainland mining firms to come in and take out prospecting licenses. Still there were large areas left, and it was then that my colleague the Premier developed the idea and organized the idea of NALCO. My dear Sir, you would think, Mr. Speaker, that NALCO was a name that should not be mentioned in this House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition did at least speak half respectfully of BRINCO. He was impressed as were we all by the greatness of the men constituting BRINCO. But NALCO is still and will still be, Mr. Speaker, a corporation which will have a large part in the future of Newfoundland. I was with the Honourable the Premier when we went together to New York and discussed the origin of NALCO. We were fortunate in having met scores of the leading bankers and financiers of the United States, and I was with him when the deal was closed with Harriman and Ripley representing a group, which group was prepared, Mr. Speaker, to invest not ten per cent or one hundred thousand dollars in NALCO but 49% with the Government to keep the other 51% and controlling interest. That group, Mr.

Speaker, was very unhappy when it was thought advisable and agreed to by them, that in the interest of all the Newfoundland Government should retain 90% of NALCO and only allow outsiders to hold 10%. The only way we could win that point, Mr. Speaker, was by persuading them that 10% of a tax-free corporation was as good as 20% in a non-tax-free corporation. So, much against their will and grudgingly Harriman, Ripley and their associates were content with one hundred thousand dollars out of the one million dollars capital. Well, NALCO was capitalized, and during the first year negotiated at great length and did interest several large mining groups in the United States and on the mainland of Canada to take concessions. All these concessions were designed to give NALCO a cut-in on the profits. All these concessions gave NALCO 10% of the net profit, in addition to the mining tax, of course, which would be payable in any event to the Government of Newfoundland. And all these concessions provided that in the event of an operating company coming into the picture NALCO would be permitted to invest up to thirty per cent in the capital of any such company. That was the first year.

Then last year, Mr. Speaker, NALCO was approached by Javelin. Javelin wanted an area to prospect on the Labrador, 2,300 sq. miles. We discussed the matter at length, and it was ultimately agreed that, provided they invested two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in purchasing fifty thousand shares of NALCO, we would give them the concession. So, Mr. Speaker, they subscribed for and paid two hundred and fifty thousand dollars into the Treasury of NALCO for fifty thousand shares at \$5 each.

These were the shares, Mr. Speaker, that matched equally the shares that the Newfoundland Government had bought for one dollar each. They undertook in addition to spend one million dollars over a three year period. They undertook further to reimburse NALCO any money they had already spent on that area during this period and up to the last day of December last. They also undertook to repay any money spent by NALCO over that period because it was not felt desirable at that time of the year to change over, to withdraw from the area the NALCO Crew and have another crew go in. So for the purpose of having continuous work it was arranged that the work should be continued under the auspices of NALCO.

Having gotten that far, Mr. Speaker, Javelin got a little more ambitious. They realized that there was a great future for NALCO and therefore they offered to buy a controlling interest in NALCO. After some thinking and talking and negotiating the Honourable Minister of Finance and I went to Montreal and at some length discussed the pros and cons of this request. We were slightly worried, Mr. Speaker, one million five hundred shares at \$5 a share would have involved a payment to come into the Treasury of the Company of seven and a half million dollars, and seven and a half million dollars is not hay. But we knew that Javelin did not have seven and a half million dollars, but presumably that was their business, and they presumably knew how they could raise the money. However they did have two-thirds of a million dollars \$666,000 to be exact which they paid into the Treasury of NALCO. On the basis of that very, very substantial payment it was agreed



by the three Newfoundland representatives that we should at least give them an opportunity to carry out their plans. Well, we drafted an agreement—that is where the rest of them got off easy because I happened to be a lawyer and got into the work on the agreement, and we whipped into shape an agreement which I felt would satisfy myself, and which I was able to recommend to my colleagues. They agreed with it, and we did pass over to Javelin a million and a half shares roughly, partially paid shares, and we gave them temporary control of the directorate. But we had a clause in that agreement, the shares were to be cancelled, the directors were to resign, and the company would have—Javelin would have paid up shares on the basis of one share for every five dollars subscribed.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we all know what happened—Javelin became delisted—not a terrible thing to happen to a company, but most unfortunate at that particular time. I understand some of the largest companies on the stock market have from time to time been delisted. Javelin was delisted, and in accordance with the agreement the partly paid shares were cancelled, and new shares were issued at five dollars each to represent the money they paid in. Javelin, we agreed, could continue to hold the concession, and they are still liable today for that concession. They have three years in which to apply for a mining license. During that three years they must expend the balance of one million dollars on prospecting. After that they can have a mining license for three years, which will bring it up to January 1, 1959. Then in 1959 they are entitled under certain sections to a mining license for 99 years, which in turn will provide

that they must have a mine operating at that time. So you see, Mr. Speaker, the obligations undertaken by Javelin are very, very serious, are very heavy. They will have to spend at least seven hundred thousand dollars over the next three years, then they have to produce a mine. In order to produce a mine, Mr. Speaker, they of necessity will have to produce a railway because these big deposits which exist at Lake Wabush are almost fifty miles from the nearest point of the Labrador Railway. That line will have to be built. So, Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that Javelin will have to find about fifty million dollars to bring this mine into production. And when they do, Mr. Speaker, remember we are entitled to ten per cent of their net profits before taxation. We are also entitled, Mr. Speaker, to thirty per cent, or to be allowed to participate to the extent of 30% in the operating company. I emphasize the fact that this mine is a proven mine, I don't think there is any doubt whatsoever about this—this is one of the greatest deposits of iron ore known. In fact, I think it can be safely said that it is just as good if not indeed better, because of the fact it is nearer to Seven Islands than the other deposits which will be coming into production during the present summer—so I say, Mr. Speaker, if NALCO has done nothing else, and if NALCO does nothing else from now on, the money we have invested in NALCO is a tip-top investment. Frankly, if I had my way—the Newfoundland Government now owns nine hundred thousand shares out of one million, forty thousand shares, because Javelin owns about forty thousand shares, 39,000 to be exact—

**MR. HOLLETT:** I understood it was 160,000 paid.

MR. CURTIS: I will be glad to make the point clear on that: They paid in six hundred odd thousand dollars. But some of that amount went to repay NALCO what it had spent on that area, the balance being represented by shares—no, it is about 75,000 shares they have. We have nine hundred thousand shares and they have seventy-five thousand shares. If I had my way, Mr. Speaker, I would have the Government of Newfoundland subscribe sufficient capital to make a Crown Company still owned as to 90% by the Government of Newfoundland.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, did we abandon the 90%? Because we were given to understand by the Federal Government that they would be recommending to Parliament a change in the clauses of the Income Tax Act which provided that corporations 90% owned by the Government would be Crown Corporation and if we had 90% that company would nevertheless be liable for taxation. I am watching very closely to see if that is being implemented. If it is not being implemented the Newfoundland Government might very well be advised to match the present investment so as to bring it up to 90% investment which in turn would make it tax free and so much more valuable to the Government. Now so much for NALCO. NALCO has discovered, Mr. Speaker, many, many potential areas which will well justify further drilling, and further exploration. And when that exploration has proceeded further let us hope that a similar deal to the deal made with Javelin may be made in these other areas. I am not going to enumerate them here. The list was published the other day in the "Evening Telegram" and I think, perhaps, in the "Daily News"

when they were tabled in the NALCO Report.

NALCO, Mr. Speaker, need not be mentioned in a whisper. It can be shouted from the house-tops, and I myself am proud to be associated with a company which has been so most unusually fortunate in having within such a short period discovered such potential areas which will, if luck holds out, in time become a very powerful factor in the history, in the economic history of Newfoundland.

NALCO last year spent, in addition to all other money, five hundred and thirty thousand dollars on exploration. This year NALCO will spend another four hundred and fifty thousand, and will still have in the till, Mr. Speaker, enough money to spend a similar amount next year.

My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, may know a lone prospector who would like to go searching for minerals, and one whom he says has come across a vein of fluorspar. I can assure him, Mr. Speaker, if that lone prospector would get in touch with NALCO, if it is on NALCO's Area, or BRINCO if it is on BRINCO's Area, and either one would be glad to make it well worth his while. But when he goes so far as to suggest that NALCO is all wrong and that BRINCO is all wrong, because that lone prospector has had his style cramped, I am afraid we cannot agree with him.

As to BRINCO, Mr. Speaker, I was also fortunate in being with the Premier when in London we called on the Honourable the Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, and the Premier sold him the idea of BRINCO. And I am glad as I said before, that the Honourable Leader of the Op-

position realized that BRINCO has associated with it some wonderful names. However, I had the honour of being with the Premier that morning when he saw Sir Winston Churchill. It was the morning Anthony Eden was married. Mrs. Eden was Sir Winston's niece, and I think he came straight from the wedding to meet the Premier. The Premier put the proposition up to him, and I heard him myself say: "It is a great Imperial Concept." He used some other words which I will not quote, but he did repeat "It is a Great Imperial Concept." Mr. Speaker, we were hardly back at the hotel before we received a phone call from one of his most eminent colleagues, Lord Leathers, who Sir Winston had already briefed on the interview. Lord Leathers sent for us, and we had the pleasure of meeting him. This time we had a third colleague with us, the Honourable Minister of Finance. We met in the rooms near Downing Street which had been occupied by Sir Winston and his family during the war, very historic rooms. We there discussed with Lord Leathers the proposition. I was astonished, Mr. Speaker, to hear the detail with which Lord Leathers was able to discuss with us the conversation the Premier had had with Sir Winston. Sir Winston had apparently a wonderful memory as he had apparently told Lord Leathers almost everything we had said, and what he had said. From there on until we met in the famous House of Rothschild, where the matter was finalized—not actually, it was not finalized there, but was finalized during a subsequent trip of the Premier's. But BRINCO was then born, and it was a great privilege for this House a year ago to put through the BRINCO Act.

Now what has come out of the BRINCO Agreement?

We have two agreements, Mr. Speaker, we have the agreement with BRINCO and the agreement with NALCO. With NALCO we were a 90% owner, now perhaps that 90% is down to 80%, but we were a 90% owner of NALCO in the beginning. In BRINCO we are not an owner. We have no investment in BRINCO. But we have the same conditions in BRINCO as we have or as NALCO has in its concessions. We have a provision, Mr. Speaker, that we will receive 80% of the gross profits which is as near as we actually could make it to the 20% of the net income of BRINCO. Now that is a very satisfactory position. BRINCO last year spent three hundred thousand dollars exploring in Newfoundland. BRINCO this year will spend another three hundred thousand dollars exploring in Newfoundland. BRINCO as the Premier told us a few days ago, is going to spend a million dollars this year investigating the Hamilton River. I think it can be assumed, Mr. Speaker, that still more will be spent next year on the Hamilton River, and ultimately, many, many, millions will be spent developing that area. Because you could not imagine that any company would spend as high as a million dollars looking into the possibilities of a water power without having some idea in their mind as to the uses for it.

This is the organization, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable and learned member for St. John's East called "Bunko." If the expenditure of three hundred thousand dollars last year, and the expenditure of a million, three hundred thousand this year is bunko, then by all means, let us

have more of it. I would be ashamed, to have it said against me, that in this House I voted against BRINCO or NALCO. The time will come when this country will be a happier country, a richer country, and a better country to live in because of BRINCO and because of NALCO. Do you realize that under the agreement with BRINCO we get a share of the profits on the mining developments, but in the case of the water power development we get fifty cents a horse power. But of course then in addition we get the normal mineral tax, which at the present time is 5%. So I see where these companies are real companies, these companies are companies of which we may well be proud, and I for one am proud to be associated with a Government that was influential in bringing into existence these two great companies.

All these programmes are simply a part of our programme for making Newfoundland a better place for Newfoundlanders to live. We want a prosperous Newfoundland, and in our minds this is the way to get it.

It has been a sore point with those of us representing the North Eastern Districts to feel that so far so little has been done for the fisheries, and I was quite relieved the other day to learn that in spite of the fact that we have not felt we were doing much for the fishery, we nevertheless had during the last five years assisted them to the extent of six and a half million dollars, or one million, three hundred thousand dollars a year.

MR. HOLLETT: The Northern Districts?

MR. CURTIS: In all the districts, not only the northern districts. Nobody is more sorry about that than I. Unfortunately we had to do one of

two things; turn socialistic and organize fish plants ourselves or else we have got to get somebody to whom to give or lend the money. It is most unfortunate that we are dependent therefore upon those at the present time in the fishery for the extension of our fishing policy. But we are here. We are waiting and we now have the Walsh Report, and we all anticipate that from now on the fisheries of Newfoundland will get the consideration which they deserve.

Now, we also pride ourselves, Mr. Speaker, on the progress we have made in other avenues. Let us consider for just a few seconds hospitalization in Newfoundland: At St. John's in the General Hospital in 1949 they had 431 beds, today it is 463, an increase of 32. In the Mental Hospital in 1949 they had six hundred beds, today there are 730. In the Sanatorium in 1949 they had 365 beds, today they have 460 beds. The West Coast Sanatorium did not exist in 1949, but it was planned by the Commission of Government, therefore we will not claim any credit, but we did finish this institution which can now house 277 patients.

Cottage Hospitals: In 1949 these hospitals could look after 347 patients. Now they can look after 467 patients. My honourable friend, the Minister of Health tells me that this Government has had more lines of water and sewerage installed in the past five years than all the previous governments including the Commission of Government put together. So you see just that is the policy of the present Government.

As against that I would ask you to consider what is the policy of the Opposition? I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was very

fair a day or so ago when he said, or when I understood him to say, that they had no policy, they had gone to the country to be elected as an Opposition. (I think I am quoting him correctly).

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I correct the honourable gentleman—I did not say we had gone—I did say the policy of the 1951 election was to elect an opposition—

MR. CURTIS: Yes, in 1951 they had a policy. It was a deep, dark secret. I can almost see the gallant Major over there.

MR. HOLLETT: You have him now. Ask him about it.

MR. CURTIS: If he knew your policy I dare say he would tell us. It would not take us long to hear it. It was a deep, dark secret. They went to the country in 1951 as an Opposition, to be elected as an Opposition. Well now what can their policy be? They have not told us this deep, dark secret, and I am not a reader of Sherlock Holmes, but I think the people would like to know just what the policy of the Opposition is. They are against the industries—that cannot be their policy, that is a negative policy. They are against NALCO. That is not a policy, Sir. They are against NALCO but we got NALCO in spite of them. They are against BRINCO, called it BUNKO. Well what is their policy?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order. Nobody on this side of the House ever said we were against BRINCO.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that is a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Voted against it.

MR. CURTIS: I understood, Mr. Speaker, they voted against BRINCO. Yes, they have suggested in the course of the past five years three items which as far as I can see must constitute three planks in their platform—two years ago: Reduce the price of mouth wipes. That might be a good policy, reducing the price of mouth wipes.

MR. HOLLETT: At this point may I ask the honourable Minister a question—if the ten thousand dollars overcharge has been returned or repaid? The ten thousand dollars overcharge on the mouth wipes.

MR. CURTIS: Platform No. 2. (Mr. Speaker, I am judging from the debates). Allow that lone ranger, that lone prospector to go where he likes and prospect. Then there was one more point—oh yes—The Central District Court—appoint the honourable member judge of the Central District Court. The Premier has suggested now that there was a fourth point which I missed—have all the roads leading out of St. John's paved.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I rise here to a point of order or to a point of correction. It was not said to pave all roads leading out of St. John's. May I point out to the honourable member that I pointed out there were very important roads leading out of St. John's which should have been paved, and at certain other places in the country.

MR. CURTIS: I stand corrected. Mr. Speaker, I was not here at the time and did not hear the honourable member. But I can quite imagine these four planks in the P.C. Platform would be awfully popular in my district, wonderfully popular. I might get in by acclamation again if they

followed that policy. However, Mr. Speaker, that is the policy as far as we know it. We are still here waiting to find out what their policy is.

As to our own policy, it is no secret, we are doing the best we can to bring it into effect, and the results are being apparent in the living conditions of the people. That is our policy, let us wait with baited breath while they tell us the additional plans which they have.

Now, Sir, there are other things I might have discussed, but I think there will probably be other opportunities to do so, and I had no intention of speaking so long. I want to repeat what I have said: I am glad we have our honourable friend with us, and I trust he will co-operate with us in seeing that any legislation which we do put through is in the interest of the people. For I assure you, it is the people of Newfoundland only that we as a Government are interested in.

HON MYLES MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

### Third Readings:

Third Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act."

On motion read a third time. Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949," On motion read a third time. Ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

On motion read a third time. Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act," On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

### First Readings:

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act." On motion read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation." On motion read a first time. Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Labour ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act." On motion read a first time. Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Labour aske leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Public Works asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Motor



Carrier Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if copies of those Bills would be available to us over the week-end?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In fact I thought they were distributed. No they cannot be until they are read the first time.

MR. CURTIS: I will see if I can get them now.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Mothers' Allowance Act."

HON H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been observed to remedy certain deficiencies which have been observed in the course of administration of the Mothers' Allowances Act insofar as it is related to the Dependents' Allowances Act. In the administration of these two acts it will be obvious to the House that they cover in some respects many of the same cases of need. Our purpose in asking for these amounts, is to make the provisions of the Mothers' Allowances Act more nearly comparable to the provisions of the Dependents' Allowances Act. At the present time there is some gap in the provisions for dependent persons between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one. Typically the Mothers' Allowances Act provides for families where there are dependent children under seventeen and the Dependents' Allowances Act provided for the cases of needy people 21 years and over. But between the limits of 17 years and 21 years there are still certain gaps to be filled in, in respect of certain classes of children.

The first amendment is designed to extend the benefits with regard to

that particular class. At the present time provision is made for children residing with their parents, with a mother, over the age of 17 but under 21 with mothers who have not adequate means to provide for such children without the assistance of an allowance. The amendment here proposes that the provision for such children be extended to include other classes, namely, where such children are incapacitated, or in need of financial assistance because of attendance at college or school, or for any other general category of need—that is to say in need of financial assistance for other reasons.

The second amendment is designed to accommodate another group by setting right the present provision of the Mothers' Allowances Act relating to an incapacitated husband. At the present time a dependent husband receives no more under the Mothers' Allowances Act than a child, i.e., \$5.00 a month. That is to say: where there is a Mothers' Allowance going to the family because of the incapacity of the husband, rendering the family a widowed family, the incapacitated father counts only as a child even though it is on his account there is an allowance going in there at all. But under the Dependents' Allowances Act he may receive a basic \$25 and sometime receive in addition an amount to the extent of \$20, making it a total of \$45. So that we have this anomaly: he receives on an incapacity allowance of \$5 under this Act when he might receive up to \$45. The proposed amendment is meant to deal with and provide assistance which may be needed under such particular cases as occur in cases of sundry diseases such as tuberculosis, heart condition, pernicious anemia, and other ailments requiring special treatment.

The third amendment is designed to do for the foster children exactly what I have suggested in the first amendment as applied to normal children living with their mothers, i.e., to give the benefits to foster children that apply to children living with their own families, as already indicated in my remarks on the proposed amendment to Section No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not rise to oppose the principle involved here. On the other hand I think we should like to have some information as to what the actual number of persons involved would be, and the possible cost per year, etc., which information possibly can be given in committee.

It is a great stride forward for this government or any government if they can do the things which the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare has envisaged. We do remember our own childhood, all of us. We do remember that none of us at seventeen even could receive anything from the government because of a lost parent, and certainly nobody in this House remembers when a child under 21 would be receiving an allowance simply because he wanted to go to school or college. I think most of us had to go in the fishing boat or in the woods or some place else, even if we had not any parents at all, at that age. So I say, if the present economy of this country, and the financial stability of this Government is such that it can do this, then certainly we on the Opposition side could hardly do anything other than endorse the motion on this particular amendment.

There are, however, certain things we would like to ask in the Committee

of the Whole. It is something which I think the people ought to know, and we on the Opposition side can help to let the people know, that the children of widowed mothers may receive up to the age of 21, circumstances warranting it of course, an allowance to go to school or to college or what not. I think the people ought to be told that. With all due respect then from the Opposition we do congratulate the honourable minister for bringing in this particular thing, but as I say, I think the government, or the House rather should be told of its possible impact upon the revenue and expenditure. We have no objections whatsoever. There are certain things which could be said, of course, with regard to self-help, with regard to assistance and on the other hand there are dangers inherent therein, and I strongly suspect the honourable minister discovered some of them in the course of the last five years. There are a good many dangers inherent in certain allowances. But I have sufficient faith in the department under which this Act will be administered, to believe that they will administer it according to the strict, or not exactly strict interpretation, but with need behind it. If there is a reason why a child, who is a child of a widowed mother, should attend college or a university I am quite sure the minister and his associates will seek out that need, and certainly will not make it possible for all of our children until they are 21 years of age to receive an allowance under the guise of the University Training. I have faith enough, as I say, to believe that will not be abused.

We do not oppose in any way, and indeed support the amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker this is the latest in a rather long line

of Bills brought before this House of Assembly by this Liberal Government of a humanitarian character. I think it is simple truth that in the long history of Newfoundland all the governments combined, before the present one, failed to bring before the Legislature social and humanitarian legislation equal to what this government had done in merely five years of its tenure of office.

For that reason this government, who are introducing this Bill, using the good office of the Minister of Welfare to do the piloting, as this Bill is a government measure, this government, which will administer the Act through the Department of Welfare, are very proud that once again it has shown the heart of Liberalism to the people of Newfoundland. I am very proud of it.

Now I hasten to allay the fears of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of correction—I have expressed no fears.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member could correct me. I said I hastened to allay the fears, that I understood the honourable gentleman who leads the Opposition to have expressed that the economy of the country might not bear the expense involved in the legislation. I assure him that the wealth of this country is something about which the whole world wonders, and views with admiration, because it is one of the great wealthy countries of the earth. And if he has any fears, about which he has said nothing as to the ability of this province to support this legislation, let me without anticipating the budget that my honourable colleague,

the Minister of Finance will one day bring down in this session, let me assure him that this government has found not even the slightest difficulty since it came into office in implementing the social welfare and humanitarian legislation it has been successful in getting this Legislature to adopt, and subsequently His Honour the Lieutenant Governor to sign. And we anticipate no difficulty whatsoever in implementing or financing the legislation which this government now has the honour to introduce and in which I personally have great pride and satisfaction in supporting, as I know every Minister of the Crown constituting this Administration also shares.

I want to make it thoroughly clear that the Honourable gentleman, the Minister of Public Welfare, were he even a greater humanitarian than he is, were he even a more exceptional authority across Canada and in the whole world of social welfare than he is, this Act would not pass this House unless this government, of which he is a member, had adopted it. This government it is who introduces it, and this government asks its supporters to pass this amendment to that Act in the name of humanity.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make one comment or possibly two in concluding the debate. I do appreciate the generous and realistic approach which the Opposition has brought to bear upon this Bill, and I am human enough to respond warmly to their comments of competence within the department. I might, within the atmosphere of this House, say that we are quite aware of the point which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition made regarding how easy it is to undermine people's

toughness and independence by an over-patronage. That has been our emphasis all along, to try and show amongst other things that we can only produce these benefits according as we earn the revenue.

Now I can say further, sir, that it has been in the mind of the government for some time, that instead of having these various forms of assistance, such as Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances and Sick Relief, we might look upon them all as basically the same need. We began the way we did with Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances and Sick Relief and we built up the system stone upon stone because that was the simplest way for us to start. Yet what we find is that when these different cases rise we find ourselves, or welfare officers going to the same homes where these Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances and Sick Relief are to be distributed. It does not make too much sense from the point of view of good welfare. Our point of view is that some day, not too far away, we may be able to merge the thing into more comprehensive and tightly knit assistance payments, whereby when a social welfare worker goes to a home he will embrace the needs of the home as a whole. What we are hoping to do is, to try and wipe out as far as we can, the anomalies now existing in our present legislation as we see it.

Moved and seconded this Bill now read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act." and "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

The Solemnization of Marriages Act:

Clause 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he has in mind any person to whom these licenses are likely to be issued?

MR. MURRAY: The number, Mr. Chairman, is actually not very great. The reason behind the amendment is that a certain number of interpreters come into the Province and bring to the American Bases, teachers, etc. Under the Old Act licenses were given with no provision for revoking them. The present amendment merely gives a temporary license. Another reason why the Act is brought in is that people have left teaching and have gone to other occupations with unrevoked licenses.

MR. BROWNE: The temporary license is for a given time.

MR. MURRAY: For a given time or a particular event, one or the other.

Moved the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

Section 1, 2, 3, carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable Minister has given any consideration to the point I raised with regard to the names of the Senior Jubilee and the Junior Jubilee etc.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, as you know the King George V Jubilee Scholarships are still in being, and they have been raised from \$600 to \$800 this year and from \$200 to \$400

this year when the new budget is brought down. The only changes this year in scholarships are in the Electoral District Scholarships of which we have 28.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may, Mr. Chairman, Section 28 set up, if I remember, these various scholarships. Now, you are repealing it, which means you are wiping them out completely. Now, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may establish scholarships. If you repeal that section you repeal this \$1,000 Senior Jubilee Scholarship and the \$500 Junior Jubilee Scholarship. Under this new section you also have the power to set up scholarships as may from time to time be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. That is the authority you are giving yourselves now, but you are taking away the legislation which set up these various scholarships. I am wondering if you could amend it in some way whereby you could keep these names.

MR. CHALKER: The explanation is, Mr. Chairman, this is considered necessary because some scholarships provided by the Education Act 1927, are not now awarded or have been replaced. The Jubilee Collegiate Scholarship now replaced by the Grade X Electoral Scholarships—that is one of those you referred to, I think.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, that is the one which you are appealing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must ask honourable members to address the Chair and not to use the word "you" in referring either to the Opposition or to the Government, as that could very easily develop into a conversation back and forth from one side to the other. I may say the Chair is not going to permit that.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Chairman, there was no idea of dropping the names associated with the scholarships. The only reason we asked for the legislation is that the amounts vary from year to year, increased from one thousand in some cases to fifteen hundred. Instead of coming back and asking the House to give us this specific change each year, we are asking now that the Lieutenant Governor in Council have those powers. It is not our intention to change any of the names of the scholarships.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I don't believe that was the intention. I am just pointing it out—it is up to the Government of course.

MR. CHALKER: I presumed that the Department of Education would be adopting a certain nomenclature for these scholarships, and there is nothing in the world, as I see it, if section 2 of the parent Act is repealed, to prevent the Department of Education from retaining that old nomenclature for a certain number of scholarships, as it is certainly our desire to maintain some link with the past.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I maintain the Department of Education has nothing to do with it. It is the Lieutenant Governor in Council. And it is this House which votes these scholarships—it is not the Department of Education—it is the Lieutenant Governor in Council who may set up such scholarships as are desirable, although it may consult the Department. I submit if you pass this section here now there will be no Senior Jubilee Scholarship and no Junior Jubilee Scholarship because they are set up by the section you are here repealing—however if you want to—

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education if there is to be any change with regard to the scholarships or the method of selection?

MR. CHALKER: At the present time no.

Moved the Committee rise and report having passed this Bill without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act" without amendment.

Report received—ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, and have passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act," without amendment.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is a very simple one and is done purely for the purpose of practical convenience. In the section as it stands, the section has to do with governing the hours of opening and closing of shops in the Exploits Valley and as the section stands when such an order is made it must be for a specific period. That means when the period expires the same thing has to be gone through again, and published in the Gazette. Under the proposed amendment an order may remain and apply generally and stay in existence whereas under the section as it stands an order when issued must be for a

given period and when it expires the same procedure must be gone through again and the order gazetted. Under the amendment no period is set down, and the Act stays in existence until revoked.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, which is a Bill, as the honourable members will see, to authorize the appointment of a fire commissioner. It provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint an officer to be known as fire commissioner and also a deputy fire commissioner. Actually it is not the intention of the Government at the moment to appoint an assistant deputy, but provision is made for his appointment. I might say at the outset; when we came into Confederation we found all the other provinces had fire commissioners, and we have been under considerable pressure from everyone to adopt a fire prevention act in Newfoundland. Actually we do not need an act here as much as in other places because we have in St. John's a government-owned and controlled fire department. But the scope of this Act is province wide, and the fire prevention authority will have jurisdiction over the whole country, and it will be the duty of the fire commissioner to investigate all fires over the whole province. He will have local advisers. In clause 4 his duties are set forth, and in clause 5 he has to keep a record of every fire. Now, at the moment that is undertaken in St. John's by the Chief of Police who submits them to the Fire Department.



As I have said at the moment we have no provision for a deputy at all, although while I am standing here it occurs to me that perhaps the Superintendent of the Fire Department of St. John's might well become his deputy.

The Act provides that the assistant should be in St. John's, the Chief of the Fire Department, or anywhere else where there is a fire department; The mayor of any municipality, where a fire station has been established, and such local assistants shall serve without pay.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a consolidation and an improvement on all the existing fire commissioners acts effective in the other provinces.

I move the second reading of the Bill. If there are any points that would call for discussion I would be very glad to try to give any information when we are in committee.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I regret to say I have not had the opportunity to study this Bill or to make any comparisons with similar Bills of any of the other provinces.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend will allow me—perhaps we had better drop this matter now and come back to it—

MR. BROWNE: I was going to ask the Honourable the Attorney General before we adjourned if there was any specific Bill in Nova Scotia or any other place of which we could have a copy so that we could refer to it.

MR. CURTIS: I don't want to speak now, but to answer the question. This Bill is not exactly the same as that in the other provinces but it is very largely drafted by the office of

the Fire Commissioners, an office in Ottawa presided over by a man whose name is C. A. Thompson, and this has come from his department. But, Mr. Speaker, I will communicate with the honourable member and tell him just where we did get it. In the meantime we will ask for an adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded this debate now adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

---

MONDAY, April 26, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement about certain somewhat sensational events that have transpired within the past few days. In so doing I shall most carefully avoid saying anything that would be contempt of court if uttered outside this House. I shall be equally careful to say nothing that would prejudice the interests of the man whom I have charged with a very serious crime, and for whose arrest I personally made application, and for which I swore out a warrant. I am the man who came to have certain suspicions

concerning Dr. Valdmanis. I am the man who started certain quiet, and even secret investigations and inquiries about him. I am the man who called the Royal Canadian Mounted Police about the matter. I am the man who gave the Royal Canadian Mounted Police the first practical facts concerning my suspicions. I am the man who requested the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to start a through investigation into these suspicions that I had formed. I am the man to whom the Royal Canadian Mounted Police reported after they had made their own investigations. I am the man who swore out the warrant for the arrest of Dr. Valdmanis. The only charges made against Dr. Valdmanis up to this very moment are the charges made by me. The only warrant sworn out for his arrest is a warrant sworn out by me. I think that these facts should be clearly understood by this House and by the people of Newfoundland.

I did not seek the advice of my colleagues in the Government. I did not even tell them of my suspicions. I did not tell them of my inquiries. I did not tell them of my having called in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. It was only when I had received the report from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police that I called in the Attorney General and laid the situation before him.

He agreed with my belief that I should swear out a warrant for the arrest of Dr. Valdmanis, and he was present when I swore it out. Up to that moment I had not communicated with the Cabinet, and up to this moment I have not done so. Virtually all the members of the Cabinet are now, for the first time, hearing these statements of mine. Through-

out this whole affair I acted as one person, quite alone in my decisions, and quite alone in my actions.

I and I alone am responsible for the fact that Dr. Valdmanis lies in jail awaiting a hearing of the charges I have made against him.

One of my reasons for making this situation so clear at this time is that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has issued a public statement on behalf of the party that he leads. I am not disposed to pay much attention to this statement, but the statement contains one assertion that could not be ignored. It is as follows, and I quote the words exactly:

"The charges being made by the RCMP are very serious, in fact so serious are they that the resignation of the whole Smallwood Liberal Cabinet must automatically follow if the charges are substantiated."

False, malicious and dishonest are the only words I can find to describe this formal statement by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order: "False," "Malicious" and "Dishonest": I must have these words retracted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I shall not retract them under any conditions, and I will go on and ask the Leader to make the same statement here, and then I will deal with the words and with him, if he will record, repeat here the words he gave in that statement. I ask him to repeat these words here and now, and I will deal with him. I challenge him to do that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order: These words follow a statement which I have

made, and according to the Honourable the Premier, have been described by him as "False, Malicious and Dishonest." I wish to point out, Sir, that according to "May" at any rate, and according to any rule of any House, I have ever read, these words are unparliamentary and should be retracted. I ask you, Sir, for your decision on the matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order: These words I have quoted are words made by the honourable gentleman in his capacity as Leader of the Opposition on behalf of himself and his party, and made outside this House, and delivered to the world at large. And I say further it is quite clear they were clearly used to convey to the world the impression that somehow or other the Government have had charges made against them by the RCMP. If the Leader of the Opposition will repeat these words of his in the House I shall know what action to take with regard to them. I ask through you, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman will make the statement here that the RCMP made charges, that if sustained the Smallwood Liberal Government must resign. Make the statement here in the House so that I can deal with them here. In the meantime I can only call them, malicious, false and dishonest words by the Leader of the Opposition as the Leader of his party.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point of order I am still waiting for a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: First, honourable members should not throw challenges at each other across the House. The statement to which the Honourable the Premier takes objection has been made in the public press outside the House, and the Premier is replying

thereto stating categorical facts which he seemed to be prepared to prove, or ask otherwise to be disproved. I fail to see how the Chair can ask for a retraction of a statement concerning something made outside the House. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has, of course, a means of defending himself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I continue—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask you this: Is it parliamentary usage to call any statement by any honourable member dishonest? Is it correct for me to say the Honourable Premier is a dishonest man.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I will say yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I am on my feet. If you don't mind, sit down a little longer. Mr. Speaker, I made a statement to the press, the words I don't remember now, and the Honourable Premier has risen in this House to describe these words as "False, malicious, and dishonest." In other words the Honourable the Premier has described me as a dishonest man. 2556 Rules and Forms, May, Third Edition, 1943—

MR. SPEAKER: That would be "Beauchesne."

MR. HOLLETT: "The imputation of bad motives or motives knowingly misrepresenting the language of another or accusing him of in his turn misrepresenting, challenging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference."

Mr. Speaker, my words have been described as false, malicious and dishonest, and are unparliamentary and

call for prompt interference. Mr. Speaker, I have interfered, and I crave your protection.

MR. SPEAKER: A little more than one slight paragraph would need to be read to clarify a point like that. If words were used here in the House, the statement made by one honourable member, and another classed it as false, then it would definitely be unparliamentary. The case here is not the same at all. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has, according to the press—I have no evidence only what I have seen in the press and the Premier's explanation—has made a charge or suggestion against the Government. Surely it is the right of the Leader of the Government to deny this charge.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Sir, I have no objections to that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point, the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition is so unutterably false, so unutterably indecent, such a scandalously dishonest and unfair statement that words fail me to describe the viciousness of it. He knew the RCMP had made no charges. He knew the only man who had made charges was the Premier. He knew I called in the RCMP. Yet he made a public statement on behalf of his colleagues and himself that the RCMP are making serious charges, and he followed the words with a comma and a dash. Then "The Smallwood Liberal Government must automatically resign if these charges are substantiated." If that is not meant to convey to the world that somehow the Government is under accusation by the RCMP I cannot then understand the English language.

I have charged Dr. Valdmanis with having defrauded the Government of

Newfoundland of \$150,000. This sum of money, so I allege, was secretly collected by Dr. Valdmanis from a company in Europe. This company had a contract with the Newfoundland Government to build the machinery for the gypsum plant now at Humbermouth, and to install and erect that machinery. Dr. Valdmanis negotiated the contract in question. My charge is that he selected this large sum of money for himself, and that he succeeded in getting it only by convincing the European company in question that they would never receive the contract unless they paid him this large sum of money.

I shall make another charge against Dr. Valdmanis, that he secretly collected another large sum of money from another European company with whom the Government had a contract. This was a contract to build, install and erect the machinery for the cement mill at Humbermouth. Dr. Valdmanis negotiated that contract too, and I shall charge him with having extorted large sums of money from that company by convincing them that they would never get the contract unless they agreed to pay him secretly a large sum in question. I shall make this additional charge against Dr. Valdmanis. In short, all the charges I have made or shall make against Dr. Valdmanis concern the two contracts let by the Government for the building, installing and erecting of the machinery that went into the gypsum plant and the cement plant. And when I use the word "Extortion" or "Extort" I intended to mention that "Extort" is more genuinely understood than when the words "Kickback" are used.

I am glad to take this present opportunity to state that I have not the

slightest scrap of evidence to give me the slightest suspicion that Dr Valdmánis collected one single cent from those new industries, or industrial plants established in Newfoundland these past two years or so by means of Government loans. That too is apart from the two I have already mentioned, the gypsum plant and the cement mill; and nobody else has any evidence, to the best of my knowledge and belief.

May I say a word about these new industries. The big factor about them is that they are new. That means that they must run into all kinds of difficulties and obstacles for the first few years of their existence. Their very owners are strangers in our midst, as are most of their key technicians. These new industries have been kicked and cuffed by unfriendly propaganda from the first day they were proposed to this very day, and the bitterest enemies of this Government will, of course, use the charges I have made against Dr. Valdmánis as still another excuse to blacken still more the prospects of these new industries.

The choice lay with me as to whether I should make the charges or drop the matter. I could have buried the whole matter. I could have smothered my suspicions, shrugged them off or drugged my conscience. Had I done so nothing would have been heard of this whole business, nothing. Nobody else would have made charges because there was nobody else to do so. I knew that if I made the charges, if I called in the RCMP, if I swore out the warrant for his arrest, I would cause very great pain, and probably very great damage to others. I knew, of course that I would lay myself open to the taunts of the bitterest of my opponents. This was the choice

I had to make—To drop the whole matter, to bury it or, to force it out into the light of truth.

If there is any member of this House who thinks I did wrong I challenge him now to move a vote of want of confidence in me personally or in the Government as a whole. If such a vote is proposed I challenge any member of this House who believes that I have done wrong to vote for that motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to reply to a statement of this nature. Before I proceed may I have your assurance that I have?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to that point: It is my impression that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the right of offering brief comment only on a statement made by the Leader of the Government or any ministerial statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman may make comment, ask questions for clarification of some point of which he wishes to be more certain—Or does he wish to make a motion of non confidence in the Government? He does not necessarily have to pick up the challenge at the end of the Premier's statement. It is quite within his province to move a motion of want of confidence in the Government without being considered to be picking up the challenge laid down in the latter part of the Premier's statement.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My remarks shall be brief. You yourself have ruled on the matter which ruling I shall not question. But I wish to quote again the words

which I used in a statement on Friday or Saturday, I don't know which day, the 23rd or 24th I believe, and a part of it to which the Honourable the Premier takes exception containing these words—"The charges being made by the RCMP are quite serious in fact so serious are they that resignation of the whole Smallwood Liberal Cabinet must automatically follow if the charges are substantiated for before the bar of public opinion, the real defendant must undoubtedly be the Premier and his entire Cabinet." Sir, I have been described as knowing that the Honourable the Premier alone knew of that Valdmánis affair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I will not be misquoted a few minutes after I have spoken in the House, I said no such thing. I said the honourable gentleman knew that I, and I alone, had made the charges. I did not say that the honourable gentleman said I was the only one who knew. I said the honourable gentleman knew I was the one who made the charges.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I said, and I repeat, that the Honourable Premier just stated he and he alone knew anything about this affair, he had not even confided in the Attorney General.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: Is it permissible for the honourable gentleman to stand in this House and deliberately or otherwise misquote what the Premier just said,—That was in the statement issued by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition a few days ago and not a comment on what I just said in the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I comment on the whole statement made by the Honourable the Premier in

which statement is included this particular sentence which I myself made. I am responsible for that which appears in the press and on the news and I shall stand by it. Of course I am trying to state my reason for referring to the charges made by the RCMP.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, what charges—will the honourable member tell what charges they made?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have been a magistrate for twenty-five years and have never yet known a man to be arrested and brought to trial in Newfoundland without somebody reading a charge to him, and all the press news from the Mainland assures us the RCMP did appear in St. Andrews and arrested that man.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Made" or "read" charges?

MR. HOLLETT: Reading a charge is making it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He said "made."

MR. HOLLETT: Well "made."

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is so dishonest he is as crooked as a corkscrew.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I retract that statement.

MR. FOGWILL: I am not crooked and I am associated with the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: I want, Mr. Speaker, to assure this House and the world at large that we on this side of the House do not intend to allow the Honourable the Premier to take away from public notice that thing which has happened. He is not going to turn the table on us in that particular



way by saying—we are the ones who did this and are responsible for that and so on. If the Honourable the Premier alone knew about this, alone made the investigation on his own, and then had the RCMP make an investigation, if he alone did this and then gave instructions for this Director of Economic Development, Sir, to be arrested, who, Sir, for the past three and a half years has been Director of Economic Development—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the honourable gentleman permitted to debate my statement, take it up point by point and debate it in absolute defiance of all parliamentary rules? Is he going to debate it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HOLLETT: No, I am not debating it. There is nothing there to be debated—nothing there to debate, Mr. Speaker—but I must make comment. I believe the Honourable the Premier has stated here in this House today that none of the members of the Cabinet except possibly the Attorney General knew anything about this until it was a fact accomplished—they knew nothing about it—the Cabinet knew nothing about this which is one of the most important things, I say, from the point of view of this country, which has happened in many a decade. We are a small province, Sir, and we have such a thing as a credit, we have credit in this world, and this thing, Sir, raises an issue, yet the Honourable the Premier did not consult, did not take into his confidence his Cabinet in this matter. That is all the comment I wish to make.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Move a vote of confidence.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't have to, I still have want of confidence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are afraid to move it.

MR. HOLLETT: I would not have to anyway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I challenge you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I did say, Sir, and I repeat it again—the charges being made by the RCMP, and I submit, Sir, a charge was made by them, read to this man, Valdmanis, at 2:00 o'clock in the morning in a little place called Chamcook two or three miles outside St. Andrews where his brother Oswald Valdmanis for the past two years more or less has been in charge of a defunct and delapidated—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I draw the honourable the Speaker's attention to the fact the honourable gentleman is out of order in debating the Honourable the Premier's statement. He has the right, if he wishes, to take action—the course is open to him to move a vote of want of confidence—that is the course, if he lacks confidence, if this House does, and if the people do, let him move it now—if we are crooked and dishonest, prove it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, did I say the honourable gentleman or any of his Cabinet are dishonest? I do not remember saying that, Sir, at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You have not the guts to say it.

MR. HOLLETT: I was describing the place where this man was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I will remind the honourable member he must not make a speech, and must bear in mind that certain things may

not be said here because the matter is sub judice and it may prejudice the case.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in view of what has already been said by the Honourable the Premier about it when making his statements—some of them were sub judice.

MR. SPEAKER: No the Premier's statement merely said what is being done and why.

MR. HOLLETT: I remind the House, Sir, he did refer to other things as well. I submit the main thing I am interested in, Sir—I have been asked, and I must make comment on this—I have been challenged, I have been scorned because I won't do it, to move a vote of want of confidence. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what would the point be? When the Premier arose to his feet to make a statement this evening he was applauded to the rafters by the members on the opposite side. Yet, Sir, none of them knew anything about this thing that had happened, they had not been taken into his confidence, but knew all about it enough to clap. I say, Sir, that it would be useless to move a vote of want of confidence, it would be useless to move it, and I am not altogether a fool although described so by the Honourable the Premier. I do take exception to the words used to refer to a statement I made, but if the House is agreed that these things may be said about an honourable gentleman then I have to bow to the House's ruling. I don't wish to say anything further in this matter, as it is undoubtedly sub judice—something which happened in 1951 has been brought up. I myself, Sir, in connection with the statement which has been made by the Premier remind this House that on Monday,

April 13, 1953—that is over one year ago—I tabled a question on the Order Paper of April 12 or on Friday two or three days before—I have here, Sir, the proceedings of the House of Assembly, the Order Paper of the House of Assembly for April 13, 1953—and I would remind the House that on that date a question was on the Order Paper, No. 63—"Mr. Hollett to ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. A description of the Hildur I Manufactured Cement transaction.
2. What was the cost of same?
3. What is the total expenditure to date on the Cement Plant and the total working capital advanced?
4. Explain the ex gratia award of \$150,000 to Benno Schilde Atlantic Gypsum Ltd."

That was over one year ago, Sir, to which I received no reply and have not yet received a reply. In view of the remarks which the Honourable the Premier has made in his statement I submit it would have been wiser to have replied to that particular question at that particular time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I won't be permitted after the honourable gentleman sits down to reply to that question. The answer to that question was tabled in this House and secondly I say they have no bearing whatsoever on the charges made against Dr. Valdmanis, none in the wide world. There is nothing improper about that—it is a perfectly ordinary business transaction. Mr. Speaker, it is a mere coincidence that the amount happens to be the same. They are completely different matters. One is honest and

the other is accused of being dishonest. The one now referred to is a completely ordinary business transaction, but the amount happens to be the same as the other amount—there is no connection.

MR. HOLLETT: It is just a mere coincidence?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all—the coincidence being that both amounts are the same size, \$150,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the Premier does not think that this side of the House is entirely without some idea of what we are talking about, and some idea of questions raised in this House. We have certain information, Sir, and we have certain ideas on that information, but I don't wish to comment on that at this particular time. I do object strongly, Sir, to the fact, even though the Honourable the Premier has been allowed to repeat them, I do deplore the fact that he had to include such a cruel, unkind statement against the Leader of the Opposition—I am the Leader of the Opposition whether they like it or anybody likes it or not I am that—I am, as Leader of the Opposition, however many we have in Opposition, entitled to a certain degree of respect just as the Honourable the Premier as Leader of the Government is, and it is unkind, it is cruel, in my opinion, and in my opinion unparliamentary for any man, much less the Premier of this country, to rise to his feet and declare that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition was false, malicious and dishonest.

I have no more to say on this statement, Mr. Speaker.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of presenting from 663 electors in the District of St. John's West. "To His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in Council the petition—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: Is the honourable member permitted to present to this assembly a petition to the Lieutenant Governor in Council or only those to the House of Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: More properly to the House of Assembly. However, we may allow the honourable member to correct it in reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the petition is either addressed to the House of Assembly or to the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Is a member permitted to take a petition to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, stand on this floor and change the address on the petition. The petition must have a prayer—in duty bound—and to the House of Assembly. Is he permitted to stand here—I heard a man broadcasting on the radio pretending to be somebody else, his brother to be exact, but I don't think that a member of the House of Assembly handing a petition—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have very often seen petitions, presented from people here, not as formal as they might be. I have seen several presented in this session. I have another one to present here this afternoon. Many of the people presenting petitions are not quite sure to whom they must go. This one is addressed to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and perhaps has been—I beg the petition be presently laid on the Table of the House and referred—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only when the petition itself is presented to the House of Assembly.

MR. BROWNE: I have seen the Honourable Minister of Public Works present a petition to come back to himself. If my honourable friend persists I will have to go back and get the people to sign it all over again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or just hand it to the people to whom it is addressed, apparently the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): To a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out—the honourable member for St. John's West stated I presented a petition which had to return to me. Unless my memory is completely false, and fails me, which I don't think it does, I have not presented a petition to this House this year, and the honourable member has only been here this year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am probably in error as regard this year, but last year according to the "Daily News" he did present a petition, and I think it will be admitted he has done so before now. Mr. Speaker, do you wish me to withdraw the petition?

MR. SPEAKER: I say the petition must of course be addressed to the House. As far as the Chair is concerned, if the honourable member has authority to make himself responsible for the petition—I don't see what objection there would be. The House certainly could not accept a petition for some other body.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is for another body.

MR. SPEAKER: It would not be necessary to go back to the signatories to the petition—surely they had some one draw up the petition for them.

MR. BROWNE: I must accept responsibility for drafting it to be presented to the House of Assembly for reference to the Lieutenant Governor in Council—may I then, Sir, have permission?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point: I must again repeat my objection as Leader of the House. I must, at least on some occasions, as far as within me lies make these objections and the petition as now read does seem to be debarred as one that is not meant for the House but is meant for the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The honourable member knows it is not addressed to this House, Mr. Speaker, and I doubt that any one in this House can speak for six hundred persons to say; I have their authority to change it from a petition to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to a petition to the House of Assembly. I doubt that even the honourable member has that right.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a petition addressed to this House?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have another here, but I did not examine it carefully. Yes, I see it now—I don't know what my honourable friend will do about this one: It is a petition from the people of Fairhaven for the road to Tickle Harbour station to the Government of Newfoundland and Honourable Members of the House of Assembly—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a bit nearer although not quite proper.

MR. BROWNE: These people prepared it themselves, and did not

have assistance of any legal adviser, nor the assistance of their representative, the Honourable Minister of Finance, I presume since it refers to the House of Assembly, it was the intention of the people sending it that it would be presented here.

Fairhaven is a little fishing village in Placentia Bay with 150 residents, and with no road to Tickle Harbour station four miles away. For five years, I know, they have asked their representative to get them a road. They inform me they have been promised a road. I think the members in this House will easily understand the difficulty they have there. There is one cited here of a woman coming home from the hospital in Come-by-Chance after having given birth to a child, and when taken off the train at Tickle Harbour had to be put on a stretcher and brought by four men, herself and the baby, and it began to rain, and one of the men there had a roll of felt, he had to cut the felt and make a covering for the woman and baby, and carry her on their backs the four miles from Tickle Harbour.

These people are honest, hard-working people. It seems to me that the Minister should be very sympathetic in his consideration of a petition of this kind. I therefore ask it be laid on the Table and that it be referred to the Department of Public Works.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on commenting on that petition I would like to say—if my memory serves me correctly—the road in question is included in this year's road-building programme. I know that I have a very great regard for the people of Fairhaven, because on the occasions that

I have gone there on political campaigns, I have received their support, I think, one hundred per cent. I think in the 1949 election the honourable member opposite got no votes in Fairhaven, and I think I got 44 votes. So that no one could be more anxious to give the people of Fairhaven a road than I. The only reason why the thing has been delayed so far is that we felt that building a road to the railway station was not sufficient, as it was building a road from nowhere to nowhere. We were waiting to inaugurate our big road-building programme to build a road from Fairhaven to connect with the Cabot Highway. I think the Honourable Minister of Public Works will bear me out that that is included in this year's programme.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say just a word in connection with this petition, I am very glad it has been presented to the House. I might say that for three years we have been endeavouring to get this little question straightened out with regard to Fairhaven. The Honourable Minister of Finance has just clarified it to a certain extent. Whether or not the public will get it in that way I do not know. The request, as he has just said, was originally for a road, as the honourable member has just stated in presenting the petition, from Fairhaven on the North Side of Placentia Bay to the Railway, a distance of approximately four miles. That request was scarcely in our hands before it was added to requesting that the road would continue on to the highway, a distance of five miles I believe (speaking from memory) or a total of nine miles in all. The department wherein I work has, for the past two years, been endeavouring to get the survey made all

the way through for that nine miles. It is very sincerely hoped that something may soon develop. I am very glad to say that I know exactly where it is, as I looked it up on the map. It has been under consideration in the department for the past two years at least, but the extension of the additional five miles unfortunately held up the whole thing longer than we would otherwise have wished.

Petition received—ordered referred to the department concerned.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Motion**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Questions**

MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. Table copies of the two separate Agreements made with the North-eastern Co-operative Fisheries Society Ltd. in 1950 relative to the guarantee of a Bank Loan of \$35,000.

2. On what grounds or on what accounts were further expenditures totalling \$27,648.24 made by the Government on behalf of said Society since March 31st, 1953? Was this amount a guaranteed loan, or did it consist of cash advances, and if so, for what purposes? Itemize the various payments making up this amount of \$27,648.24.

MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. What is the rate of license fee for three ton trucks?

2. Is it correct that such trucks in the Bloomfield, Bonavista area have been licensed annually at a rate of \$100.00 or \$72.00 below the regular rate?

3. How many vehicles have been licensed below the regular rates and give the areas where such reduced rates have been applied.

4. How long has the practice of granting reduced rates been in force?

5. By what authority have such reduced rates been made?

#### **Answers to Questions**

Question No. 62 : In course of preparation.

Question No. 63 : Tabled.

#### *Appointed by Cabinet :*

Grant R. Jack, P. Eng.,

Chairman .....	\$6,000
W. J. Frampton, Commissioner .....	5,000
L. J. Delahunty, Clerk .....	3,100

#### *Appointed by Commission :*

Mrs. E. Seymour .....	2,100
S. C. Scammell .....	3,744
W. B. Taylor .....	3,120

#### *Appointed by Attorney General :*

D. W. K. Dawe, Solicitor .....	4,800
--------------------------------	-------

Question No. 60 : Question No. 61, Addressed to Honourable the Minister of Finance.

MR. POWER : Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have answers to all questions on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, I know there are some questions addressed to me that I have not as yet answered. As I explained here in the House one day last week, I have for some time past been unusually busy. The House knows now that



what I said then was probably very true. I have been very busy and pre-occupied, and up to this moment, if it were to save my life, I could not say what are the questions I have not answered as at this moment. When I receive the answers from the Treasury or whoever prepares the answers, I will gladly hand them over to the honourable gentleman who directed them at me.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking leave to move the adjournment of this House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. Naturally, in view of the arrest of Dr. Valdimanis, former Director General of Economic Development, charged with fraudulently obtaining from the Government of Newfoundland between January 20, 1951 and October 25, 1951 the sum of \$150,000, and in view of the further grave accusations made public by the Premier against the said Director General, it is possibly both desirable and essential in the public interest that a Royal Commission presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland should be immediately set up to make a thorough investigation into the methods used to establish new industries including the negotiations of contracts for the purpose of building such as the erection of factories or plants, the purchase and importation of supplies, and the evaluation of machinery, building material and equipment, needed for the erection and operation of said plants or factories, and generally an examination into the financial procedures followed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave? I shall now put the motion which will be carried without debate. The House does not give leave.

MR. HOLLETT: May we have a division on that, Mr. Speaker?

Division:

Favour of the Motion: Mr. Hollett, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill.

Opposing the Motion: Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. Minister of Public Welfare, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Education, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Button, Mr. Brown, Mr. Norman, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer.

MR. SPEAKER: The nays have it—19 to 3.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I would like to rise on a question of privilege and for the purpose of making an explanation: The "Daily News" of April 24, in an article dealing with the Throne Speech Debate refers to the Attorney General—Reviews Government's Work—and in the first column it says, quoting Mr. Curtis: "Mr. Browne, the speaker continued, had expected to be recommended as a district judge after Newfoundland entered Confederation, and it was this statement that started the excitement. The P.C. Member rose to a point of order and said the original Confederation terms had provided for the appointment of district judges and this was the point he had made in a previous speech, without reference to himself as a possible judge." I think Mr. Speaker will agree with me that the position was this. The Terms of Union provided the Federal Government would pay the salary of

the Lieutenant Governor, Supreme Court Judges and District Court Judges. That was the position I took. There had to be interfering to prevent my receiving the salary of a district court judge because that was provided by the Terms of Union, and I know from correspondence with the Department of the Minister of Justice at Ottawa that interference took place. Now, Sir, I have another question of privilege:

In the House during that debate the Premier, for what reason I don't know, made a statement that I had gone to the Liberal Headquarters and offered myself to him as a Liberal candidate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say to me.

MR. BROWNE: Then I would like to know to whom. And a heading came out here in the "Evening Telegram" "Browne was willing to be Liberal Candidate." Premier makes the statement. "'It is a ridiculous lie,' said Browne."

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is ridiculous, but not a lie.

MR. BROWNE: Now, the Premier ought to be satisfied with the amount of publicity he has had during the last few days, and certainly what he has had today, and certainly ought now to grant me the right to make this correction. "It all came about when Mr. Curtis speaking on the Address in Reply charged that Mr. Browne following Confederation expected to receive an appointment as a Judge of the District Court."

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to receive any appointment. I had that and had had it for fifteen years. "Which Mr. Curtis considered

to be ridiculous in view of Mr. Browne's open and violent campaign against Confederation."

I don't remember the Attorney General using such an expression. If he did it is absolutely incorrect. I conducted no open and violent campaign. I did not conduct any "open" and certainly no "violent" one. "It was then things broke loose. The Premier declared there was no point of order, it was all done to make a speech. The debate reached such a state of confusion etc." Then it goes on: "W. J. Browne, P.C. St. John's West, came to the Liberal Headquarters and volunteered himself as a Liberal candidate under my leadership, Premier J. R. Smallwood told the House Thursday."

"Mr. Browne branded this statement as the most fantastic lie ever told by anybody."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that was unparliamentary, but when a provocative statement like that without any foundation is made, I think the Premier will agree it is very hard to keep from saying such things at the time. Now, Sir, that statement is untrue, and I expect the Premier to withdraw it. There is no foundation in fact for it whatsoever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member, I made the statement he just quoted me as having made, namely, that he had come to the Liberal Party Headquarters on Water Street and offered himself as a candidate, as a Liberal Party Candidate, under my leadership, that is to say as Provincial Party Leader. He now asks me to withdraw the statement. Instead I would be quite happy to have a Select Committee of the House hear evidence of

witnesses, because I would endeavour to prove the truth of my statement and produce witnesses that the honourable gentleman did offer himself as a candidate of the Liberal Party under my leadership, that is to say, the Provincial Liberal Party.

MR. BROWNE: When?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On an occasion when he visited it, and it was to Mr. Garland, the Liberal agent, he made the offer, and there was present when he entered a present member of this House of Assembly on this side of the House who was there in the office of the Liberal Association, or Liberal Party, when the honourable gentleman opposite entered and on the same occasion as when he made the offer of being a candidate for the Liberal Party. Possibly we made a serious error in not accepting the honourable gentleman's offer.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is no time for joking, as the Premier said. I have stated that that is absolutely incorrect, and I expect the Premier to withdraw it. It has been given in evidence here, just this minute I read it myself, the Attorney General said I conducted an open and violent campaign against Confederation, and certainly they were doing what harm they could by preventing me getting the salary due me from Ottawa—then the Premier said I went over and begged the dear Premier, would he be good enough to take me as a candidate. Mr. Speaker, the thing is patently absurd, incorrect and untrue, and I expect the Premier to take it back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I will be sporty about it. As the honourable gentleman did not come to me personally, and as I don't know

of my own knowledge that he offered himself as a Liberal Candidate, I will take it back, or, if he likes, we could have a Select Committee and produce the evidence and see who is right. Otherwise I am prepared to retract and say, of my own knowledge I don't know that he did make that offer.

MR. BROWNE: I accept the retraction, Mr. Speaker.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I would like to say that one thing in reply to the honourable member. My honourable friend says I interfered with the payment by the Federal Government of the salary of the Judge of the Central District Court. I might say that what we did do was intimate to Ottawa that it was the intention of this Government to abolish that position, and that it would be foolish, therefore, for any salary vote to be made for a position that we had determined to abolish. As the honourable member knows the judge in the Central District Court is quite a different position from the judge of a County Court or District Court as such positions are found on the Mainland.

MR. BROWNE: I know nothing of the kind, neither do you.

MR. CURTIS: All I say is, if the honourable member was judge of that court for fifteen years, that was a very, very inferior court with a jurisdiction only up to \$200 and with no criminal jurisdiction whatsoever, it was simply a small central district court confined to hearing civil cases only of a very small amount. Every magistrate in the country had greater jurisdiction, every magistrate in the country had more power, whereas the judges now of the district court, and

the court that we envisaged have a lot of power and can hear criminal cases.

MR. BROWNE: Where are they?

MR. CURTIS: We have appointed them for St. John's and Corner Brook.

MR. BROWNE: Where is the one for St. John's?

MR. CURTIS: He will appear in due season. Mr. Speaker, when the honourable gentleman brings up a point does he think he can discuss everything under the sun. Where is he? Why is he? And this and that. Tell him to put a notice on the Order Paper. All I can say is this; any judge now operating under the District Courts Act has six or seven times the power of the Judge of the Central District Court. He has power to determine land cases.

MR. BROWNE: I know that. What has that got to do with it?

MR. CURTIS: I am trying to point out to the honourable member—but since he won't listen he might as well read the Act himself. I might say the jurisdiction that he had as Judge of the Central District Court was very limited. No one could conscientiously ask Ottawa to accept the responsibility of continuing to pay the salary for that.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder does the honourable gentleman remember, tell me, that the Premier had my successor picked?

MR. CURTIS: No, I do not remember.

MR. BROWNE: Well I do remember.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was that

the time the honourable gentleman selected his successor on a certain highroad?

MR. BROWNE: It was about two weeks before that, before I tried to have you arrested and brought before the court.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman was just about as successful in that as he has been in everything else. Now that I know the name of the person to whom my honourable friend is referring as being his successor, may I tell him his leg was being pulled all the time.

MR. BROWNE: It was the Attorney General who said he knew who the gentleman was. I did not say it.

MR. SPEAKER: How long is this private conversation to go on.

#### Orders of the Day

Adjourned Debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne:

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has said, since I moved the adjournment of this debate on Thursday, some events have transpired of a most sensational character. I am sure that all our minds are full of these events which are bound to colour our thinking, must of necessity colour whatever anyone else has to say immediately following in this debate.

I am quite well aware, Sir, of the impropriety of saying anything which would tend to prejudice a case while it is still sub-judice. Still on the other hand, Sir, I think it would be a most extraordinary position for me to take if I were to ignore altogether these sensational events that have taken place and go on with my speech

just as if nothing had happened. The position, Sir, as I see it is a difficult one, and I can quite see the impropriety of saying anything which would in the least prejudice a case before it is brought to trial. On the other hand here are events of such importance that I don't think I should ignore them. The arrest of a former Director General of Economic Development, of a man who has played a key role in Newfoundland in the past few years is an event which cannot be ignored by the first speaker who rises immediately after such an event to speak on this address.

First of all, Sir, I would like to say; my own connection with the man in question was very slight indeed. Let me make myself clear, Sir, I am not trying to avoid any responsibility in that affair if there is responsibility. If Dr. Valdmanis had done something which redounded to the Government's credit, and he had—if he had done something which brought credit to us, I, myself, would be very glad in fact to take my share of that credit and come in for whatever acclaim there is going. On the other hand if there is any responsibility attached to us, and I don't believe there is, I would not like to duck out from under it.

As the Premier has said, of the events leading up to Thursday's arrest, the members of his Cabinet knew nothing. We were just as surprised as I imagine were people all over the country. All I knew about the man was this: He was a man of great talents which brought him to a very high position in Europe at a very early age; a man who filled responsible positions in Canada before he came here at all and who came

here highly recommended by some of the most responsible and highly placed people in Canada. Now, Sir, as I have said; the same man is under arrest, and it would be most improper, altogether improper, to discuss the pros and cons of the case before it comes up for trial. But, Sir, there is one thing I want to make clear and that is the position of the members of the Government as far as this case is concerned. As has already come out today in this House, a statement was made by the Leader of the Opposition in the press on Saturday last. The arrest of this individual was referred to and immediately afterwards in the statement was a further statement that automatically—automatically—if this man who was arrested was proven guilty—automatically—the Government should resign. Now, Sir, there is only one possible construction to be put on that, as far as I see it, one possible construction. The straight innuendo is there, the straight imputation that some members of the Government were implicated with the affairs and defalcations of this man; and, Sir, the imputation is if this man who has been arrested is proven guilty, "then," said the Leader of the Opposition, "the Government ought to resign." There is no other construction to my mind, Mr. Speaker, can be put on these words than that the Government were in collusion with that man, condoned the breach or concealed it. If that is the case, Sir, the Premier was completely and absolutely right in saying such statements were false, malicious and dishonest.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—there was no such imputations—if the Honourable Minister wishes, of course, to impute that to me he can, of course do so—

I say there was no such imputation. My imputation was, and I would like to explain it—that a Government who had allowed this man for three and a half years to conduct practically alone—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman is not to make a speech.

MR. HOLLETT: To conduct the affairs, the economic affairs, up to twenty million dollars, surely must take some responsibility.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who told the honourable gentleman—where did he get the information that the Director General of Economic Development had the control of twenty million dollars, of twenty cents? That is another false statement—in the formal statement of the honourable gentleman—

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member for Ferryland had better continue his speech.

MR. MURRAY: I say, Sir, in answer to the honourable gentleman, that this statement is clearly and obviously capable of that. One would be justified in coming to the conclusions I stated here: A man is arrested and the Leader of the Opposition comes out and says: If such a man is found guilty then the Government must resign. Sir, what other construction would a logical man put on such a statement except that the members of the Government were implicated?

I say, Sir, that instead of being implicated that the members of the Cabinet knew nothing whatever about it. As far as the Premier is concerned he is highly to be complimented for the action he took. Sir, it could not have been a pleasant

thing for the Premier to set this thing in motion. No one likes to be taken in nor nobody likes to confess that he was taken in. Mark Twain said: "I can eat crow, but don't hanker after it." The Premier knew he was exposing himself to taunts and jeers and he told us so. But, Sir, it was a thing from which any man might recoil, I say, and I say it is to the eternal credit of the Premier that he saw his duty and went through with it regardless of all personal feelings—I say that, Sir, the Premier is an enthusiastic man, and it is a good thing for Newfoundland that he is an enthusiastic man. But enthusiastic men sometimes can say things that more cautious men would not—the Premier, Sir, is a loyal man. We all know he is loyal to his associates and loyal to his friends. Perhaps that loyalty has been misplaced sometimes, perhaps at times he has given more loyalty than was deserved. But I say, Sir, that it is to his eternal credit that when he saw his duty in this affair, regardless of the personal embarrassment, and he exposed himself to a great deal, he went through with his duty without fear or favour. I say, Sir, again, that is eternally to his credit.

MR. HOLLETT: He took a long time to see it.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, let us clarify our thinking on this matter. If there has been wrong doing in the matter, and it is improper for me at this stage to say there has, it would not be the first time, Sir, that people have been taken in and it will not be the last time. If we hired a man who turned out not all it was said he should be, it won't be the first time people have been taken in, not the first time, nor it won't be the last



time that unworthy instruments have been connected with good causes. Let us take an example Sir: If, unknown to the board of directors, a high official in a bank embezzles money and it comes to light, what follows? Would the directors have to resign if unknowingly an employee embezzled money? Or, to follow the argument of the Leader of the Opposition it would mean the whole system of banking is wrong.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order: I believe the statement just made by the honourable member for Ferryland is a little bit sub judice—he makes a statement that a certain man is unworthy—I think that man is to come on trial—he is insinuating the man is—

MR. MURRAY: I am stating a hypothetical case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I don't think there is a point of order there. It seems to me the honourable member who is speaking is merely giving his opinion here, and I think the honourable member who is a lawyer will be very careful not to prejudice the case of a man who is about to come up for trial. I think he was just giving a hypothetical instance. I might say while speaking, I have noticed a tendency for remarks from one side of the House to the other. Some of these might tend to generate heat in the debate and I must rule them out of order. I would like the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs to be heard in silence.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you, Sir. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of—and I hope you will stop me if I do—of trying to prejudice a case still sub judice. I am merely

trying to prove a point, if a dishonest employee is taken on by anybody it is not the first time in history it has happened. If the board of directors of a bank who are absolutely in charge set the law in motion to bring him to trial is not that proper and creditable and always done? But to give another example: Because a plant happens to employ someone in connection with it who turns out to be dishonest, must the management resign? Is that a proper conclusion to draw? If amongst the twelve apostles a Judas is found does that mean the whole idea of Christianity is wrong? I state again, Sir, a hypothetical case: If a Government nurses a viper in its bosom and the malefactor is brought to book, does it follow that the Government is responsible?

MR. HOLLETT: May I?

MR. SPEAKER: Not unless the honourable member yields.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to ask who is the viper?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I have made it quite clear to anyone that I am citing a hypothetical case—to anyone who wants to understand that, it is amply clear, perfectly obvious to anybody.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member will continue to be heard in silence, otherwise I shall take a very dim view of it. These remarks tend to generate heat, are completely out of order and are not funny.

MR. HOLLETT: If the honourable member is to be heard in silence, then why in the course of my speech was I interrupted about fifty times?

MR. SPEAKER: I know nothing about that. I am in the Chair, and will uphold its dignity, and I hope the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not casting any reflection on the Chair or the Speaker in the Chair at that time. I do not wish to interrupt again nor to have to call order.

MR. MURRAY: I don't want to be interrupted. I have only one thing to say—is all this time to be taken out of the time I have to speak? In that case I won't be able to yield any more. I have no objection whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, to exchanging pleasantries with the honourable gentleman over there, but as the Premier has pointed out, this is a most serious affair, this is one of the most serious things that any government in Newfoundland was confronted with, and I think the time is very inopportune and does not lend itself to an exchange of pleasantries across the House.

Mr. Speaker, as to the events leading up to what happened on Thursday last, to seek the causes we would have to go back a very long way. I think, Sir, it would not be out of place to review the whole situation with regard to industrial development in Newfoundland.

Sir, every government that came into power in Newfoundland, and particularly every Liberal Government, has been driven inevitably and inexorably to the conclusion that it had to go all out at whatever cost to create industries in Newfoundland. What was the alternative if we did not look for industries? What was the alternative? We would have to resign ourselves forever to a dependence on a single industry, an industry which at the very best could only

keep people at the bare level of existence, and this single industry vulnerable to every economic wind that blew, an industry which was subject always to periods of depression, which even in successful periods could not keep people at a meager level of existence. Sir, every government, particularly every Liberal Government had to go out and look for industry. They either had to develop our industries or had two alternatives before it, either to develop industry or to resign ourselves forever to a precarious, vulnerable, rickety economy. Obviously the situation which faced every government which came into power was an economy based on the work of a few thousand fishermen spread out over four or five thousand miles of coastline in over a thousand little settlements, and depending upon inadequate industry. On such a basis, Sir, no country could be built up. No country with such a basis could live in a modern world, could support the trappings of a modern government. An economy dependent solely on a couple of hundred thousand quintals of salt fish could not provide proper government, could not provide proper social services, nor proper support for young people. So, Sir, every government that came along, and particularly as I have said, every Liberal Government was driven to these conclusions:

It had to go out and bring industry in regardless of cost, and the cost, Sir, in most cases was very heavy. We had to have a railway. We had to have mines. We had to have secondary industries or we would perish. So, Sir, governments had to go out and bring these things in to entice people to come in whatever the cost, even at the cost of concessions, terrific concessions of the public domain.

The Attorney General on Thursday last got up and said in this House that when we came into office five years ago practically all of the public domain had been alienated and practically all our waterpower gone. Why? Because every government faced inevitably and had inevitably to come to this conclusion: Whatever we gave industries we had to get them in, tax exemptions, or concessions over the public domain, whatever it was, we had to give it to bring them in or depend on a few thousand little fishermen and starve and slowly dwindle away. Sir, that was the alternative facing all governments, up to the present government, that ever took office in Newfoundland. And, Sir, the baneful effects of that policy (and I am not saying it was wrong, I am saying that was no alternative) are still being left today. Our public domain had all been alienated when we came into power. Only the other day out in Corner Brook (where you can still see the effects of that policy of past governments) I was trying to collect for the Government the 3% social security taxation and what did I find? Sir, the great company of Bowaters are exempt completely from all taxation, the Avalon Telephone Company is exempted. In Grand Falls you find the same thing, Sir, huge slices of the public domain given to that company. I am not saying it was wrong to give it. The Government had to entice industries in here. The same thing applies on Avalon, there was not one industry ever set up previous to the coming into office of this Government that did not receive support in one form or another from the Government, that was not either sheltered completely tariff-wise or given concessions or exemptions in one form

or another; the rope walk, the tobacco factory, clothing factory, whatever we had in the way of industry, our mines and our mills, everything was brought in and set up by huge concessions and by exemptions from taxation. Sir, the total of these exemptions come to many, many times more than twenty million dollars, much more, hundreds of million of dollars and the effects are still being felt because rights were given away in perpetuity, and, Sir, the government of these days had to do that. There were two alternatives, as I said, either do that or resign ourselves forever to what we could do if we had no more than a couple of hundred thousand people depending on the fishery.

Sir, when this Government took over the same pressure was on it, the same inexorable pressure of events was operating for this Government, in our case perhaps with even more intensity. Why? Because after Confederation the immigration barriers were down and young men and young women could take off to the Mainland where they felt better opportunities awaited them. Unless something was done, and done quickly, Newfoundland would find itself a collection of old people waiting for old age pension cheques to come from Ottawa. The first thing that had to be done, Sir, was to persuade young people that this was a fit place to live, a good place to live, a place in which they could start housekeeping and raise families. That was the first task which faced this Government, not wishful thinking nor hair-brained enthusiasm but bold inexorable logic was brought to persuade this Government that an industrial programme had to be embarked upon and that without delay and should be done immediately.

Sir, in our case fortunately, very fortunately we were in a better position than governments that preceded us. We had money, we had the surplus, but other governments had not, other governments had to give away concessions over the public domain, had to give away exemptions from taxation which were very hard to give away, rights over taxation and give away the public domain, but they had to do it. The same cruel dilemma, Sir, did not face us. We had money and we could start to launch out on an industrial programme by orthodox financing. We had money and could lend it or guarantee it in the full hope of getting back the principal and interest. We, Sir, were in a much, much more fortunate position than any government that ever preceded us. But, Sir, we were driven just the same as any other government to the conclusion that we had to industrialize. Everything piled up on us to persuade the Government that was so. We had the demand in that our young people might go, they had the opportunity and the means at hand, etc., and there was urgency behind it. So, Sir, this Government came to the conclusion that we had to launch out on a great industrial programme. There is no question whatever, Sir, none whatsoever, in anyone's mind, that that decision was right, in fact it was inevitable. Now, Sir, when once that decision was arrived at what did we have to do? We had money but that was not enough. We could not wave a wand and see hundreds and scores of new industries springing up all around us. We had, Sir, to provide the means, to set up the system to create these industries. A new department was set up, Sir, the Department of Economic De-

velopment. That department had to be staffed, careful plans had to be made, expert advice had to be sought, expert advice, Sir. Where could a man be found—here was the problem—with the imagination and experience and energy and financial acumen and knowledge, where could such a man be found to put such a gigantic programme into effect? Obviously there were not too many men of such calibre drifting around, it was obvious to anybody that a man who had the proper qualifications to inaugurate and put into effect such a programme was not drifting around for a penny. A man of more than ordinary qualifications, Sir, had to be found to put into effect these gigantic schemes. Now, the Premier went to look for such a man, went to the Mainland and sought some business advice. A man was recommended to him who seemingly had every qualification, a man who seemed eminently suitable for the job on hand. He was recommended, as I have said, by some of the most responsible and highly placed people in Canada, people who should know, who were in the know and able to judge a man's qualifications for such a job and recommended the man to the Premier, and he took him on and, as I say, Sir, at the time the man seemed eminently suitable, a young man, still active, highly educated and more than that along the line and in the field the job required; a man who held down some of the biggest executive jobs in Europe, a man of unusual, of more than ordinary talents and knowledge. Sir, the Premier took him on and he came here and took on the job. Everyone must admit he went into it with great energy and enthusiasm, and Sir, we were delighted—everyone was delighted—be-

cause it seemed here was a man tailor-made for the job, made for the purpose. It seemed if we had combed Europe or America we could not come across a man more eminently suitable. The only angle that our friends over opposite could put up against him at that time was that he was a foreigner. That is all they could say about him. That, of course, has been the line of argument followed by the Opposition all the time. Well, Sir, here was such a man and the Premier was delighted. The very man we were looking for—the Premier praised him, he was enthusiastic perhaps it may be that he was over-enthusiastic. But, Sir, there was a great deal to be enthusiastic about. Let us not, Sir, get our thinking out of focus because of these events which happened in the past few days, sensational as they were, there was and is a great deal to be enthusiastic about—fourteen new industries were planned, Sir, as the Premier announced here in the House in his speech the other day—three are working full time, six are working at part time capacity and five have not yet started. The three working full time and the six working part time will employ twenty-one hundred full-time workers, 760 part-time workers and have a wage bill of four and a quarter million dollars a year, and in a month or two when some of those part time become full-time employees—it is very conservative to look forward to five million dollars in wages and three thousand full-time workers. Sir, that is something to be enthusiastic about, I think, and that is what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition called an escapade in the paper the other day—a programme which provided work and wages for three thousand people and bringing five mil-

lion dollars in to our workers' pockets—an escapade—I say, Sir, if ever a government did anything that is right and was inevitable and statesmanlike it was launching out on this industrial development policy, and, Sir, people, unbiased people, people whose job it is to know about this sort of thing, say the same thing. I have here, Sir, a memorandum from the Federation of Labour to the Provincial Government. I wonder what have they to say about our industries? The Federation of Labour's unbiased opinion on the industries does not call it an escapade or anything of that sort. I have here, Sir, a submission of the Newfoundland Branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, to the Premier and members of the Newfoundland Government. Both the employers and employees give full credit to the Government. They say that increased industrial development has brought additional work opportunities. Everyone, Sir, capital, labour, everyone but the Opposition had a good word to say for it and they have never had anything good to say about it from the day it was first announced, everybody but the Opposition, and since the first moment our industrial development policy was announced they have done nothing else but cry "Ruin and disaster," nothing else. Sir, if a man fires a lot of buckshot into a flock of birds and brings one down that is not much credit to his marksmanship nor reason to congratulate himself. There has been blanket condemnation of our industrial programme by the Opposition ever since the day it was announced. They have attacked every man who ever came from the other side of the water and particularly every man who ever came from the other side of the Rhine. Men have

come here with great industrial skill, with great industrial know-how, with technical education. Some other countries are very glad to have them and certainly they can do us no harm in Newfoundland, God knows we want new industrial skill and new technical knowledge. Why, Sir, from the Opposition you would think it was the second coming of Attila the Hun. Sir, before a yard of concrete was poured or a nail driven the Opposition blasted and assailed them. If there was a mechanical breakdown they thought they had won a major victory, if a seasonal layoff occurred they clapped their hands. The other day there was a seasonal layoff in a plant in there and they thought they had won a major victory. That was their approach, Sir, to industrial development programme in Newfoundland.

Sir, I say again, if ever a policy was justified this was—if an unworthy instrument has been found to bring it about, unless there was wrong doing and the Government condoned it, as I have said, or had any part in it or concealed or conceived it we are responsible, but if not, Sir, if as soon as we suspected wrong doing and that was brought to book we should be highly complimented for it, Sir.

Sir, the Leader of the Opposition in his statement to the press the other day said we are not on trial, he said—I suppose the Opposition is on trial too—the Opposition and the Government are on trial before the bar of public opinion. All right, Sir, let us take that position. Let us imagine ourselves lined up before this bar—here is the Government on this side and the Opposition on that side. In the past five years what have we done and what have they done? What

can we point to and what can they point to. Mr. Speaker, in the past five years this Government has built more hospitals, more nursing stations, more schools, more roads, more bridges, more fish plants than any other previous Government. In the past five years this Government has revamped our legislation, changed the old and obsolete thing that passed for a labour law and brought in labour legislation as modern as anything in the world today. That is what this Government has done in the past five years. This Government attacked the housing problem in a way no other government even dreamed of doing. We have gone into partnership with Central Mortgage and Housing, and set up co-operative housing, started slum clearance, put in water supplies and sanitation—things undreamed of, Sir, by any other previous government in any other five years.

MR. FOGWILL: And increased taxation.

MR. MURRAY: Will the honourable gentleman inform me how these things can be done without taxation. I have heard the honourable gentleman get up in this House the other day and made the most extraordinary statement a man ever made. He said—Old Age Pensions, Unemployment Insurance etc. are very good things. He said this, a labour man; "But there is one terrible thing about it, Mr. Speaker, taxation, they are paid for by taxation."

MR. FOGWILL: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I did not say that in this House.

MR. MURRAY: Would you mind saying what you did say.

MR. FOGWILL: I did not say that in this House—if the honourable gentleman is going to quote me—



MR. MURRAY: The honourable gentleman most definitely made reference to Old Age Pensions and Family Allowances and Unemployment Insurance. The honourable gentleman referred to them. Then he told us he was an anti-confederate, and he said the thing wrong with them was taxation. Mr. Speaker, we have had some sensational events in the last couple of days, but if the honourable gentleman would come out and tell us how these things could be had without taxation, then we would have something really sensational—they are very good, but taxation, let us cut out the taxation—very sound "Tory" thinking, Sir, I don't know if even the "Tories" believe that. That was Torism in the time of Queen Victoria.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, lower taxation.

MR. MURRAY: And less benefits, and fewer benefits. Cut out Old Age Pensions, cut out Family Allowances, Dependent's Allowances, cut out Blind Allowances?

MR. FOGWILL: Nobody said that.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, cut out all these things.

MR. FOGWILL: Is the honourable gentleman quoting me now about cutting out Old Age Pensions and Blind Pensions etc.? If he is he is not telling the truth. I hope the honourable gentleman is not quoting me now.

MR. MURRAY: I am quoting a way to cut out taxes. If we cut out these benefits we very well can cut out taxes.

MR. FOGWILL: I never said we were to get all these for free from the Mainland.

MR. MURRAY: We would never have had anything if you had your way. The gentlemen over there opposed Confederation, therefore they opposed Old Age Pensions and Family Allowances.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must intervene now: Because we opposed Confederation does not mean we opposed Old Age Pensions and Family Allowances.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No?

MR. BROWNE: We don't agree it was sufficient but we had an Old Age Law on the statutory books for twenty years.

MR. MURRAY: That was a good thing, \$5 a month.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not oppose Family Allowances but tried to introduce it through the Commission of Government in 1940. I tried to get the Commission of Government to introduce Family Allowances in 1940.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, last year in social benefits, in these things the honourable gentlemen are so much in favour of—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: Does the honourable gentleman pay any attention to a point of order? I said I did not oppose them.

MR. MURRAY: I am asking the honourable gentleman how we could bring them about. Mr. Speaker, who is speaking, am I or is the honourable gentleman? Is this taken out of my speaking time?

MR. SPEAKER: You asked me for a ruling. The honourable gentleman stated certain facts he had de-

ducted from an honourable gentleman's speech, which may or may not be true. I maintain it is impossible for anyone to say if his deductions are correct or not.

MR. BROWNE: Obviously.

MR. SPEAKER: That might very well be, but it is not out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do it all over again.

MR. MURRAY: Last year twenty-five million dollars came into this Province in social benefits. The honourable gentleman said that under Responsible Government he wanted these things. Can he show me or any member of the House any Responsible Government in Newfoundland who could ever provide twenty-five million dollars for social benefits?

MR. BROWNE: Do you want me to do that now, because I can do it if you let me, and I will do it when I get the chance.

MR. MURRAY: We are supposed to be, Sir, before the bar of public opinion. The Leader of the Opposition said we are. And they are Sir. We both are. You are the ones that called for a bar of public opinion, and you are just as much at it as we are. When it comes to accomplishments in public welfare, housing and everything else, what do you point to? You are before the bar of public opinion too.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Would the honourable member, when I ask the honourable member to be seated, do so. The honourable member is now making a direct attack on certain honourable members on the other side of the House, which is entirely out of order. Will the honourable member please address himself to the Chair.

MR. MURRAY: We are, Sir, before the bar of public opinion, as the honourable gentleman opposite said, and you are, we say.

MR. SPEAKER: That is exactly what I warned the honourable member not to do. The honourable gentleman does not have to pick up every little interruption.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, the honourable member opposite stated in the paper the other day that we are before the bar of public opinion, and so, I say, are they, the honourable members over opposite, before the bar of public opinion. Now, Sir, in the last five years we have a lot to point to, a definite record of accomplishment which I just went through. How have the honourable gentlemen contributed to this? We can say quite honestly, and any unbiased opinion will back us up, in the past five years more constructive work has been done in Newfoundland, more gigantic strides forward have been made in Newfoundland than has ever been done not alone in any five years, but from the time Newfoundland was first settled from the first year up to the last five years. That is a gigantic record of accomplishment. That is what we have done. How have the honourable gentlemen opposite contributed? I say, Sir, as their contribution we had a few jeers and a few sneers and a couple of wisecracks—that is their contribution to Newfoundland's development and advance in the past five years. That is the way they hope to win public opinion when they stand before the bar. We can point to accomplishment in every field. All they can do is make a few cracks and stay home nights figuring out a few wisecracks. Sir, we can show how we fulfilled our duties. How have they fulfilled theirs? What

is the duty of an Opposition anyway? Is it the duty of an Opposition to just hurl tirades of abuse at the Government and think up a few sneers and wisecracks? What is the duty of the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, a position which receives special remuneration from the taxpayer? Is it to make wisecracks and think up new jokes against the Government? I don't think it is, and I don't think the public thinks so. And if you appeal to the bar of public opinion, as you did two or three times, you will find out what the bar of public opinion thinks.

Sir, I have listened to the honourable gentleman over there opposite—all of you—I have listened to you all on the Address in Reply, and you spoke, I say, a total of five or six hours, and, Sir, in all that mass of verbage, five or six hours of statements, I did not hear one constructive thought emerge, not one, and I don't think anyone else did either—no wonder I was asleep. Did you hear me snoring? I was asleep when the honourable gentleman was speaking and who would blame me.

Sir, what principles do the honourable gentlemen entertain, what policy have they, what programme have they outlined? You know when you appeal to a bar of public opinion you must say what you are for at least. That is not too much to tell the public what you are for when you appeal to them. But we have never heard what the honourable gentlemen are for, Sir. We heard what they are against. Sir, there is a story about an Irishman who in time of trouble went to New York and had to fill out an entry form to get in. He was asked what form of Government he was for, and his answer was: "What, is there a Government out here too,

if there is I am against it." Now, that is exactly the policy of the honourable gentlemen—against Smallwood—that is all they have to offer—and, Sir, they appeal to the bar of public opinion.

Sir, this is a Speech from the Throne which I would say, if ever there was a Speech from the Throne that gave opportunity for such constructive thinking or some evidence of statesmanship, if there is any statesmanship in them, this Speech from the Throne was it. Here we see outlined policies in this Speech from the Throne which can affect this Province for generations to come. We see in this Speech from the Throne a commission being set up on forestry led by one of the most competent men in the world, a world authority, General Kennedy, and the gentlemen over opposite don't even deign to notice it. An agricultural commission headed by eminent men in their field.

MR. BROWNE: These were set up last year.

MR. MURRAY: These men are here this year. Dean Shaw, is there any joke about Dean Shaw the man who built up Western Canada, down here to apply himself to our problems, and I say, Sir, the honourable gentlemen over opposite did not have a word to say about it—is that statesmanship or constructive? Get off a few more wisecracks about BRINCO, call it BUNKO, and think you earn your salary. Sir, in this year we are setting up a committee to study the Terms of Union under Term 29. Under Term 29 a Royal Commission will be set up to consider the Terms of Union and this committee was set up, and we are rather proud of the personnel of that committee, Sir. We

got the best men available, and I don't think we can overrate this committee's importance to our future, yet the gentlemen over opposite did not deign to say a word about it in all that five or six days talk.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—the honourable gentleman is making very broad and sweeping statements not justified by the facts. There has been reference made to all the things I referred to—I don't think he can talk in that fashion. I don't remember making reference to things of that kind—nobody seems to pay any attention to it—but it is not true.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, as to passing references—I listened to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for exactly three and a half hours, I believe a record of endurance for the young lady in the box at any rate, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And for us.

MR. MURRAY: In the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne his reference to the fishery policy to be inaugurated this year, and no more important news could be outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and what did the honourable gentleman have to say about it? Practically nothing. I think he took eleven minutes on it out of the three and a half hours, and half of that was not worth talking about. What kind of an appeal would a Leader like that make to the bar of public opinion? I have listened to all the members over there, Sir. I listened to the member for St. John's East over there. I would say the honourable member is losing his pep. That is how it seemed to me. No more of those quotable quotes we used to have last year—The Blond Bomber on Water Street,

"Bingo" and "Bunco" which last year sent a shudder through us, but this year he refrained from comment. Sir, the honourable gentlemen over opposite remind me of a group of men that existed in the South after the Civil War, a type of men who sat down under their magnolia trees and drank gin julep and talked about the days that were gone, and were called unreconstructed confederates. To me, Sir, the honourable gentlemen opposite are unreconstructed confederates. We can see them, Sir, year after year as April 1st. rolls around hoisting black flags with their backs turned to the Gulf.

Sir, it also strikes me as amusing to see two gentlemen over there glorifying themselves as labour men. In the paper now and then you read of expeditions that go to the heart of Africa and come across a race of negroes with blue eyes or blonde hair. It is good copy because it is incongruous. Now, Sir, the incongruity of these gentlemen over there is also amusing to me, for labour leaders to sit in a "Tory" party does not fit, Sir, to me. I heard one of the honourable gentlemen over there the other day utter a statement that he was a profound disciple of Sir Stafford Cripps—Sir, it does not add up as far as I am concerned. I can tell you, Sir, something about socialism. Let me read this out: "It has been taken for granted that when workmen and employers should, as a rule, make free agreement and in particular should agree freely as to wages." What do you think of that, Sir, that seems to call for a labour conciliation, public relations act.

Sir, what I have just read is from the encyclical of Pope Leo and fore-shadows just what we have done.

Labour Relations Acts, Workmen's Compensation, good wages, those unspeakables over here, the untouchables, the communists, the socialists, have brought in a labour policy advocated in 1881 by Pope Leo XIII.

MR. BROWNE: Did he say anything about building factories?

MR. MURRAY: Sir, I heard the honourable gentleman bring up that horrible thing, the Icelandic Boats. Everyone else had forgotten about them, but the honourable gentleman tried to give it a new twist. Sir, we had a startling announcement made the other day, very startling, Sir, the herring were there all the time when the Icelandic Boats were here. Oh, they knew. How did the honourable gentleman know? A man from Ship Cove told him, Sir. A great deal might have been saved if that man from Ship Cove had only spoken up, but he stood mute. But if the honourable member knew where the herring were, when the man from Ship Cove told him, to save four hundred thousand dollars he should have announced it.

MR. BROWNE: It was spent then.

MR. MURRAY: When did the man from Ship Cove tell the honourable gentleman? Anyway it was a bomb-shell firing into this House when the honourable gentleman came in here—the H for Herring Bomb. I heard the honourable gentleman make another startling announcement. He told us he founded the Federation of Fishermen, or he was responsible for founding the Federation of Fishermen.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that.—I said it was my idea.

MR. MURRAY: He must have told Sir William Coaker in 1910.

MR. BROWNE: That is not the same thing at all.

MR. MURRAY: Of course without the honourable gentleman the idea never would have occurred to anyone. But the honourable gentleman was the one responsible for it, he originated the idea, Sir. If the honourable gentleman believes he is the only man in Newfoundland who believes it. The Fishermen's Federation has grown up now from infancy to a lusty body.

The honourable gentleman also seemed to be looking for sympathy when he came in here. I don't know, but I don't think that is the way to appeal to the bar of public opinion, to come in and air personal grievances real or imaginary. He told us he could not go to the Corporation because there was an election on. Well Sir, it is a pity the sacrifice was in vain, that is all I can say. Sir, the honourable gentleman could not understand how he could be defeated in an election—Sorcery, I say—Sorcery—How else could an electorate turn its back on such a man, so obviously qualified unless by witchcraft or black magic. That is the only way the honourable gentleman could have been defeated, that is the only possible way.

MR. BROWNE: I must, Mr. Speaker, protest against this line of argument. The honourable gentleman and his supporters are over there in great number, and it is all very well for them to smile and laugh. References of that kind have nothing to do with the business before the Chair, are offensive and likely to cause trouble.

MR. MURRAY: It is all very well for the honourable gentleman to try and interrupt me, and get in a wise-

crack, but when he gets a taste of his own medicine back, the honourable gentleman is up on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we could have five minutes recess.

Recess for five minutes.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, I now propose to go on for what time is left me, to do what I had intended originally to do, which was to discuss the speech from the Throne and its effect in respect to the district I represent. Sir, as soon as the Speech from the Throne is read all of us, I suppose, and certainly anyone who represents a fishing district like myself, would turn automatically and immediately to see what policy the Government has in view with regard to the fisheries. I am sure, Sir, this year all of us are delighted to see reference to a fishery policy by the Government, and delighted also to hear that policy further amplified in the Address by the Premier and by the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives. Sir, as the Premier said, this is the fatal year for the fishing industry, this is the year of decision. As we all know the fishery in Newfoundland has been in rather a chaotic position for years. Nobody seems to know where we are. No definite set policy seems to be outlined. Therefore, Sir, as soon as this Government got into power one of the first actions of the Government was, in conjunction with the Federal Government, to appoint a committee to investigate and report back on the fisheries of Newfoundland. That committee under the chairmanship of Sir Albert Walsh has now made its recommendations. And now, Sir, the greatest task lies before us of putting these recommendations into effect.

It seems, Sir, in all this country there is no district in which fishery development has been awaited more eagerly than it has in Ferryland. I will say this: there is no district which lends itself more readily and more easily to an enlightened fishery policy than the District of Ferryland. There is no district where the output of a few dollars in fishery development would give such immediate and telling results as the District of Ferryland. This is a district, Sir, which because of its great natural advantages has attracted fishermen to its shores from the very day Newfoundland was discovered. Newfoundland was discovered in 1497, and a year or two later Gaspar Corte-Real came from Portugal and put into harbour on the Southern Shore and that started the trade which went on with ships coming out in the spring of the year from all the ports of Brittany and Normandy to Bay Bulls and Trepassay. That traffic, Sir, started very early in the 1500's and has been going on ever since in one way or another.

There are splendid harbours in proximity to the greatest fishing grounds in the world and water supplies available. These have all acted as a magnet for the fisheries for centuries. The fishery up there has been exploited for centuries, and the supply, as we know, is still there as great as at the beginning. The supply is there, Sir, in limitless quantities, but the methods of harvesting are out of date and have to be changed. Mr. Speaker, I remember once in the month of August standing and looking out to sea off St. Shotts and seeing vessels from every part of the world, Portuguese, Spanish, Nova Scotian and American vessels fishing right off the land in sight of St. Shotts in seas teeming with fish. Yet, Sir,



the extraordinary thing about it is that the men from St. Shotts, in the middle of August, had stopped fishing. They had caught possibly 60 or 70 quintals of fish, and that was all they could make, and they had to give it up for the summer with 60 or 70 quintals although their shores teemed with fish. Unless fishery development comes to these settlements these men are just crippled, just as crippled as if they were handcuffed and had balls and chains on their legs. I remember, Mr. Speaker, the little place of Brigus South one Sunday morning after Mass when you could see the codfish rolling in on the landwash and from the stagehead could see caplin and fish eating the rocks. That phenomenon takes place only in Newfoundland. Yet, Sir, the people in Brigus that fall when they settled up had barely enough to get through the winter. I have been in Portugal Cove South, and in caplin time the fish came in there in countless millions. I have seen young fishermen there actively engaged, so busy they did not have time to talk to you, working Sunday and Monday. I know one particular young, eager, active fisherman came in with a thousand quintals of fish and the extraordinary thing he ended up in the fall, thirty dollars in the hole, all their drudgery and toil useless. It would be better if the young men sat on the bank until development comes to Portugal Cove.

Mr. Speaker, if ever there is an area that calls for development here it is. Here is food, Sir, in unlimited quantities. I remember once in the Old Colony Club there was a gentleman from Harvard University who was connected with food, Dr. Miller, and I heard him get up and say, at this very moment in the world tonight half the population of the world will go to

bed hungry. Yet, Sir, up there all along the shore good food, high protein food is to be found in countless quantities. We have active and educated fishermen up there and intelligent. They have had good schools up there for decades, a good convent school, and the people are a bright and intelligent people and are capable of absorbing new ideas. They want modern ideas and modern thinking on fisheries. and not the old traditional way. This will not do them.

Mr. Speaker, up in that area is one of the biggest per capita fishing areas in Newfoundland. Last year there were 666 fishermen and they got 66,000 quintals of fish, half light salted and half heavy-salted, a per capita catch of one hundred quintals a man, high by Newfoundland standards yet not high enough in this modern world. The fishermen know their industry will not provide them with an adequate living in the way it is carried on at the present day. It must be developed, Sir. Up in the Southern Shore, at any rate, it must be developed or it must perish. We need development up there, Sir—a small plant and a couple of breakwaters up in St. Shotts so that the fishermen will not have to stop fishing in the month of August when fishermen from all over the world carry on practically in their harbours.

At Portugal Cove, as I told you, there is simply an open beach and the fish swarm in in millions, yet when a breeze of wind comes in the middle of the trap time they have to haul up their skiffs. They need a break-water, and cold storage to hold salt fish, a storage that would hold fish in thirty or forty degrees. In Portugal Cove we need a fish plant. Bay Bulls and Witless Bay and that area is the highest per capita fish producing

area in Newfoundland. In Cape Broyle last year 125 fishermen went fishing in an area where there is a good supply of potential power for hydro-electric development. If ever there is a place waiting for development in the fisheries, it is Cape Broyle. In fact, Sir, the whole shore is waiting for fishery development to bring it to life. A beginning has been made up there at Fermeuse where a modern plant has been working, Sir, with men and women working all last winter in this fish plant, and with draggers bringing in fish, draggers financed by Government loans. Now a plant is under construction at Trepassay and it is hoped to see it in operation before the summer is out. It is one of the most modern plants in all the world, in North America at any rate, financed by Government money. We have great hopes, Sir, for this plant in Trepassay. There should not be an idle man in all that area when that plant gets into operation. It is not an exaggeration that Trepassay could very conceivably become the fishing capital of this country.

Sir, the people in my district of Ferryland are waiting for fishery development with almost bated breath. There is no area which would give such immediate returns. The man in St. Shotts, presently tied to his 60 quintals of fish a year, hopes to throw off his economic shackles. The people of Portugal Cove and Cape Broyle and all along the shore hope the day is just about to dawn when a decent day's pay can be gotten for a decent day's work, and there is one answer, Sir, development. Refrigeration and controlled marketing, these are the formulas that have worked out in Canada. Now if such formula can be worked out in Canada and can be applied to poultry and eggs and apples

and the cheese industry, if that formula can work up there why can't that formula be applied to the fishery on the Southern Shore. Refrigeration (cold storage), price control, there, Sir, is the formula wherein lies our hope of the future and I don't see any reason in the world, Sir, why it very soon should not be put into effect up there.

Sir, the Speech from the Throne also refers to an Agricultural Commission. Upon the Southern Shore side by side with the development of our fisheries we have also got to expand our natural resources if we want to have a sound, well-balanced economy in Ferryland District. We have also to bring agriculture along concurrently with the fishery. I am going to try and get Dean Shaw to come up there, Sir. It has not too much to offer us in the way of agriculture any more than the rest of Newfoundland. Broken topography, the soil is stony and of low fertility but it is a very, very important adjunct to the people living up there. There are two types of agriculture in my district, Sir. The full-time small farmers in the Goulds and they unquestionably have had a very hard road to hoe in the past few years, but we hope that the new Commissioner Dean Shaw, Professor Drummond and the rest of them will be able to bring forward a policy with regard to the full-time farmers in the Goulds as well as the rest of Newfoundland which will maintain this valuable industry and place it on a sound basis, because, Sir, the small-time farmer (and there are about 15,000 engaged in it) is of tremendous importance to our economy. Sir, apart from these full-time farmers, more important, it seems to me, to my district is what I call supplementary agriculture. It

is a great adjunct as everybody knows to a fisherman's economy when he can raise enough vegetables and have a cow and some poultry and a few sheep. That is the kind of agriculture they have been going in for and has been of the utmost importance to them in the past. In the bad times in the past it has been a most significant factor in health and well-being up on the Southern Shore as it has been in other places in Newfoundland. The pity of it is that type of agriculture has lapsed up the shore and everywhere else it has shown a sharp decline, and people are turning from their gardens to the can. This is a situation to be deplored, and I think a lot can be done for agriculture in my district. Up in St. Shotts there is as fine a sheep and beef cattle country as anywhere in the world. I have spent a winter, Sir, in the Welch Hills and Highlands of Scotland, and it seems to me the land up there is very similar to what you see in Wales and in the hills and highlands of Scotland. I don't know, but it seems to me there is a possibility for a terrific and wonderful sheep industry up there. That is one of the things specifically, when I go up with Dean Shaw, that I am going to ask his opinion on.

Sir, there is another great possibility for an industry up that shore, and I mean the blueberry industry which is assuming major importance in various parts of Newfoundland. They tell me, over around Conception Bay last year, something like eight hundred thousand dollars worth of blueberries were sent out of the country. That is a major contribution, Sir, to our economy. Up on the Southern Shore, provided we get refrigeration, the magic word for it all, if we get that, Sir, it will certainly bring along a great blueberry industry. But the

magic formula is: refrigeration, price control and controlled marketing. We must have controlled industry, and side by side must come these amenities that go with development in this modern world, transportation and communications and we must have roads, telephones and lights.

Mr. Speaker, last year I happened to be President of the Canadian Legion in this Province, and last fall I think I was on every highroad in Newfoundland. We went around to visit our branches and travelled on eighteen highroads. Our highroad is outstanding. I will tell you why. It is the worst—we in Ferryland District have the distinction of having the worst highroad in Newfoundland. I have good news and the people of the Southern Shore will be delighted to know the road is going to be fixed up. A great deal was done last year but there is more to be done this year. And when my honourable friend goes up there again next election, as they go around every election time, they will be delighted, Sir, to have a good Liberal road to go over, and they will be delighted I know, because they have been very sorry about the road. I have seen gallons of crocodile tears shed about the condition of the Ferryland Road between nomination day and polling day. However, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, when he goes up again—I know he is very interested in the fishery in the Ferryland District, I learned that from his very interesting and very informal talk. He told us, Mr. Speaker, what happened when he went up there last year. About the fishery in Ferryland I could give him a little advice for when he goes up again. Up there, Sir, they like to pull a man's leg, and when they see a fellow come in from St. John's with a tie and collar look-

ing for something against the Government, and sees a man in a boat and asks: "Who owns that boat?" "Oh the Government."

"How much do they pay you?"

"Oh a hundred dollars a month."

"How much fish have you?"

"Oh no fish at all."

They are queer hands, Sir, and like to kid people, jocos,—

MR. HOLLETT: I rise to a point of order, Sir, I object that any people in this country should be called "Queer Hands." I would like to have the honourable gentleman take that back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I can join in that point of order. The honourable gentleman when last in Renews discovered they were not "Queer Hands" up there.

MR. MURRAY: I say they are very intelligent, jovial people, Sir. They like a political practical joke. When a fellow comes up from St. John's they tell him what he wants to hear.

I will tell you one little thing about Ferryland District. When the campaign was on last year, there was a holier man than the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who went into a house and called a man into the front room, and took his black hat off and laid it on the organ, looked up to Heaven and down at the floor and said: "Mike, do you know what happened in Ferryland District. Do you know what Murray is doing?" Mike said, "No." "He is giving out rum." Mike said, "What! you come in here and say he is giving out rum and he has been in here five times and I never got a drop off him."

Mr. Speaker, I brought in a petition to this House the day it was opened.

It was signed by every adult in Trepassey, by every adult in Renews, Fermeuse, Kingman's, Brigus, asking for lights. Here, as I said, is the oldest inhabited part of North America with the people going to bed by kerosene lamp and without telephones, and, Sir, that is not all of it. Up on the Southern Shore, as I said on opening day, there are 40 or 45 thousand h.p. of electric current generated, and the people up there are without lights. Now I think something should be done about that. People have been given concessions, franchises over the public domain. For what? To provide the people with lights, and I say, Sir, if they don't live up to their obligations then their franchise should be cancelled. Call that socialism or what you like. It was given not for corporations to make hundreds of thousands of dollars nor for people to build up large personal fortunes. Exclusive rights are given to corporations so that they may provide adequate services for the people at a reasonable cost. And I say, if the people who have those concessions don't fulfill their obligations they should be taken from them. The Legislature gave it and they should take it away if they don't fulfill their obligations. If that is socialism anyone can make what they like of it. That is the way it is done in the great wealthy Province of Ontario.

Sir, during the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne there has been a great deal said about liquor in Newfoundland. The Opposition has had a great deal to say about it, nothing too constructive, but, Sir, I am going to say what I think, honestly and sincerely and based on experience. Sir, when I grew up in my father's house there was never any prohibition either. As I recall it there was a bot-

tle of spirits in the house and produced when visitors came in or on special occasions like Christmas, St. Patrick's Day or the Day of the Races or something like that. Drunkenness, I never saw. Now, Sir, I think that state of affairs which existed in my own house was the state of affairs that existed up the Shore until a year or two ago. To hear people talk about wiping out liquor, to people like that is silly, just as silly as people trying to wipe out Christmas puddings. It was a small extravagance for social festivities, and not by any means a social problem. That was the way it was in my home and in a great many in Ferryland. A man would come to town in the spring or fall and bring a bottle home, for weddings, and Christmas they bought it, but it was no social problem. It was the sort of thing the economy could stand, and certainly there was no cause for condemnation about it.

But, Sir, that has changed in the last year or two. There is too much beer sold up there now, beer dished out to young men.—And the economy, Sir, just can't stand it, just can't afford it, a fishing economy that averages in Ferryland a high of one hundred quintals a year, and can't stand beer at \$7.40 a case. It is a horrible thing to see young men drinking beer at \$7.40 a case in the trap time. I would say for the people concerned to use discretion, use moderation, or have the thing cut out altogether. It has no place, Sir, in a fishing economy.

Mr. Speaker, just as the Premier has unbounded faith and unbounded vision in this Province of ours as a whole, I have unbounded faith in my own district. As I said, Sir, I know of no place in Newfoundland where development can be of such immediate

need and have such beneficial results. And, Sir, I believe that the day of development is not too far off. I believe, Sir, I will be representing that district for a long time to come, I firmly believe it, Sir. And when I do pass on, I do hope this sincerely, that I will leave it a little better than I found it. Sir, there has been good things happen in the past five years: Old Age Pensions, Veterans' Allowances, Family Allowances. These things are very good indeed. But, Sir, if we want to have a real, well-balanced economy we have got to develop and have the amenities which civilized people are entitled to all over the world—good roads, lights, good public utilities, good schools. Sir, I look forward to a day up on the Southern Shore, and I don't think it will be in the too far distant future, when the fishing industry up there will give adequate employment to every man and woman up there who wants it. I look forward to the time in my district when every child up there will go around well fed and clothed, over good roads to good schools run by good sisters, a good sound economy, Sir. That is what I am looking forward to, and with this economy based on the natural resources, all they need is a few dollars to bring it about. I look forward to the time when everybody up there can live in frugal comfort and Christian decency, as Pope Pius said, and I don't think that is too visionary or too far off in the future.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, April 27, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

None.

### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

### Notice of Motions

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Establish The Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Provincial Parks."

### Notice of Questions

(66)—

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. As at February 9th, 1952, who were the Directors of Atlantic Gypsum Ltd.?

2. Have any changes been made in the Directorate of this Company since that date, if so, what changes were made?

3. Has the name of Dr. A. Valdmánis been removed from the Board of Atlantic Gypsum Ltd. If so, state date of said change?

4. Who were the Directors of Atlantic Hardboards Industries Ltd. as of May 27th, 1953?

5. Has the name of Dr. A. Valdmánis been removed from this Board, and if so on what date?

6. Will the Honourable Minister inform the House as to the present whereabouts of the following persons: Mr. Max Braun Wogan, Director of Hanning Electric and of the Superior Rubber Company.

Mr. Ludwig Grube, a Director of Superior Rubber Company.

Mr. Eberhard Rothe, a Director of the Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Co. and of the North Star Cement Co.

7. Who is the President of the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust and who are the Directors of said Company?

(67)—

MR. F. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. To table a statement showing the total amount expended by the Department of Labour for travelling expenses for the fiscal year 1953-1954, to whom were the amounts paid and what services were rendered in connection with such travelling.

2. Table statement showing the following information for the fiscal year 1953-1954.

A. How many labour disputes were reported to the Department during this period?

B. How many labour disputes were settled with the assistance of a Conciliation Officer?



C. How many Conciliation Boards were set up, what were the results in each case, give the location and for what reason?

3. Have any applications for Conciliation Boards been refused as from April 1st to date, if so, how many and for what reason?

(68)—

MR. W. J. BROWNE (St. John's West): To ask the Honourable the

Attorney General or other appropriate Minister to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. How many applications have been before the Public Utilities Commission during the past fiscal year?

2. What was the nature of the application in each case?

3. What was the decision or other determination of each application?

### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Question No. 64—Stand.

Question No. 65:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works has gone today to Grand Falls and will not be back until Saturday. He has asked me to table these answers—Question No. 50 and Question No. 59.

Question No. 50:

(a) Copies of all advertisements for tenders for road construction or bridge construction during the past fiscal year.

(b) Copies of all tenders received.

(c) The name of the successful bidder in each case.

(d) The amount paid for the work in each case.

(e) What changes, if any, were made in the specifications after the tenders were received?

Answer:

(a) Copies of all advertisements for Tenders for road and bridge construction during the past fiscal year.

Advertisements inviting Tenders for the following works were published:

Pymms Brook—South Brook	Grading	6.9 Miles
Middle Brook—Fishells Brook	"	6.0 "
Codroy Pond to 12 Miles East of South Branch	"	4.8 "
Steel Mountain Road—Middle Brook	"	6.2 "
South Brook—Steady Brook	"	10.5 "
Middle Brook—Soullis Brook	"	8.3 "
Highlands River—Codroy Pond	"	4.6 "
Grand Bay—Port aux Basques	"	1.0 "
Corner Brook Bridge, Badger—Buchans	Construction	15.4 "
	Right-of-way	5.0 "

A copy of the Pynns Brook—South Brook advertisement is attached. The same form of advertisement was used in all cases other than the name of the project and the mileage differ.

#### ADVERTISEMENT

#### TENDERS FOR ROAD CONSTRUCTION

1. Tenders will be received up to Monday, April 12th, for the reconstruction of 6.9 miles of highway from Pynn's Brook to South Brook on the Deer Lake to Corner Brook Highway.
2. Plans and specifications may be inspected at the Roads Draughting Office, Court House, St. John's, and copies may be obtained upon application to the Revenue Clerk of this Department upon deposit of \$25, which sum will be returned to the tenderers if the plans and specifications are returned to the Department.
3. Tenders must be made on forms provided by the Department and must be submitted in sealed envelopes addressed to the Deputy Minister of Public Works. The words "Tender for road construction Pynn's Brook to South Brook" are to be written across the face of the envelope.
4. The tender shall be accompanied by an approved accepted cheque for \$100 as a surety that the tenderer will, if successful, enter into a contract with the Department. The successful tenderer will be required to deposit further sums to bring the total deposit up to ten per cent of the amount of the accepted tender, to be held as security for the proper and satisfactory performance of the contract.
5. The Department does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender.

R. MANNING,

Deputy Minister,

Department of Public Works,

St. John's, Newfoundland.

19th March, 1954.

(b) Copies of all tender received :

PROJECT	TENDERS RECEIVED
Middle Brook—Soulis Brook	*Concrete Products Ltd. \$575,450 Trynor Const. Co. 603,214
Highlands River—Codroy Pond	Concrete Products Ltd. 229,210 *Western Const. Co. Ltd. 220,952
Steel Mountain Road—Middle Brook	*Western Const. Co. 331,095 W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. 340,080
Codroy Pond—12 Miles East of South Branch	*Western Const. Cd. 266,453 Concrete Products 276,688
Pynns Brook—South Branch	Tenders do not close until April 12th, 1954.
South Brook—Steady Brook	Chisholm Const. Co. 196,488 Rayner Const. Co. 376,564 *W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. 379,928
Grand Bay—Port aux Basques	*Western Const. Co. 129,435 Concrete Products 285,425
Middle Brook—Fishells Brook	*Western Const. Co. 277,220 Joseph & M. J. McDonald **18,000
Badger—Buchans	*J. Goodyear & Sons 365,601 C. H. Mercer 11,120
Badger—Buchans	*J. Goodyear & Sons 8,000
Badger—Buchans	Tenders call cancelled.
Corner Brook Bridge	

\*Successful tenders.

\*\*Permit.

(d) The amount paid for the work in each case :

Middle Brook—Soulis Brook	\$ Nil
Highlands River—Codroy Pond	Nil
Steel Mountain Road—Middle Brook	Nil
Codroy Pond—12 Miles East of South Branch	Nil
South Brook—Steady Brook	44,211
Grand Bay—Port aux Basques	2,503
Middle Brook—Fishells Brook	Nil
Badger—Buchans	299,429
	5,729

(e) What changes if any were made in the specifications after the tenders were received? None.

Question No. 59 :

What is the extent of the work presently being carried out on the Mount Pearl Road, how much grading and resurfacing is being done, what is the estimated cost? Is the work being done by the Department of Public Works or by contract, if by contract, who is the contractor?

Answer :

The work at present being done on the Mount Pearl Road is maintenance work only, that is, repairing the damage suffered by the road during the Winter months and during the Spring breakup. The work consists of applying road gravel which is being spread by a bulldozer. No grading or resurfacing is being done. The estimated cost of the present operation is \$1,100. The work is being done by Department of Public Works' staff.

QUESTION No. 62: The Honourable Member for St. John's West to ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour the names, positions and salaries of all employees of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

ANSWER:

STATEMENT SHOWING THE NAMES, POSITIONS AND ANNUAL  
SALARIES OF THE EMPLOYEES OF THE WORKMEN'S  
COMPENSATION BOARD AS OF APRIL 1, 1954

Name	Position	Salary
Patrick J. Whelan	Chief Med Officer	\$7,500.00
Bertha M. Gruchy	Medical Secretary	2,260.00
Paul E. Penney	Executive Assistant	3,500.00
Agnes Myers	Steno-Typist	1,900.00
Theresa Blanch	Receptionist	1,600.00
George T. Brown	Assessment Officer	4,700.00
H. A. Slade	Asst. Assessment Officer	3,900.00
Francis X. Linegar	Cashier	3,500.00
R. A. Fagan	Chief Auditor	3,500.00
Wilson Gaulton	Assessment Clerk	2,800.00
Reginald Russell	Auditor	2,930.00
Harry M. Andrews	Auditor	2,930.00
William Sheppard	Auditor	2,758.00
Thomas Powers	Experience Clerk	2,630.00
Joan Kirby	Cheque Processing Clerk	2,260.00
Vera Osmond	Steno-Typist	1,900.00
Shirley Knee	Steno-Typist	1,575.00
Audrey March	Steno-Typist	1,550.00
Florence Butler	Steno-Typist	1,525.00
Eric R. Piercey	Claims Officer	4,068.33
Samuel Brace	Asst. Claims Officer	3,458.33
Patrick Barry	Chief Pension Division	3,160.00
William Udell	Chief Med. Aid Division	2,930.00
Jonas May	Asst. Pension Clerk	2,630.00
Peter Miskell	Asst. Computing Officer	2,530.00
Jean Howell	Chief Assembly Division	2,260.00
Dulcie Parsons	Chief Filing Division	1,770.00
Joan Birmingham	Steno-Typist	1,700.00
Imelda Shaw	Steno-Typist	1,670.00
Jean Hayward	Steno-Typist	1,600.00
Jean Critch	Steno-Typist	1,585.00
Bernice O'Toole	Steno-Typist	1,575.00
Francis Walsh	Steno-Typist	1,542.00
Helen Birmingham	Steno-Typist	1,533.00
Lorraine Gosse	Steno-Typist	1,533.00

## QUESTION NO. 60:

- (1) November 14, 1952. Agent—Purchased directly by the Board.
- (2) Total amount of duties—\$1,401,357.16. This does not include duties paid at distilleries in Canada on goods shipped excise paid.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a correction to my answer to Question No. 5. That answer was in connection with the agents who sold wine and beer and spirits to the Board of Liquor Control. We had Mr. J. M. O'Dea as agent. This should have been Mr. J. V. O'Dea. And Benedictine Liquers was not purchased through A. J. Dunne as agent, it was a direct purchase.

## BOARD OF LIQUOR CONTROL

## QUESTION No. 5—Mr. Hollett. (Part 3):

Total amount paid for Alcoholic Liquors, including Wine and Beers from April 1, 1953 to Feb. 28, 1954.....	3,555,380.81
Total value of Sales for Alcoholic Liquors, including Wine and Beers from April 1, 1953 to Feb. 28, 1954.....	6,036,277.95

## QUESTION No. 5—Mr. Hollett. (Corrections):

			Purchases Jan. 1st, 1953 to Feb. 28, 1954 No. Cases
(1) Brand	Firm	Agent	
Benedictine Liquers	Benedictine (France)	Direct	40
Bass Ale	Export Bottlers Ltd.	J. V. O'Dea	500
Guinness Stout	A. Guinness & Sons Ltd.	J. V. O'Dea	1100
(2)			
Benedictine Liquers	Benedictine (France)	Direct	40
Guinness Stout	A. Guinness & Sons Ltd.	J. V. O'Dea	1100

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a question on that? When the honourable gentleman says; a direct purchase by the Board, is that made by the chairman or by some official appointed by him.

MR. POWER: Purchased by the Chairman of the Board.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet—there are a number of questions which have not been answered, and soon, I think, the

estimates will be brought down. We would like as soon as possible to have the answers to these questions.

MR. POWER: The answers to all questions that have been directed to me are in course of preparation.

## Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Economic Development has had

his attention drawn to an article appearing in the issue of May 6th of the "Sunday Herald"—"Did Europeans run off with eight thousand dollars—Rumors have been sweeping the city." Does the Honourable Minister know anything about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know that story appeared in the "Sunday Herald." Also that is all I do know about it. I don't think there is any truth in it, and certainly no public money is missing that we know of. And I have the gravest doubt, the gravest possible doubt that any public money is missing. I have the gravest possible doubt that anyone has run off with any money anywhere.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there is another question I would like to address to the Honourable Attorney General—During the course of his speech on the Address in Reply he quoted extensively from the agreement between NALCO and JAVELIN. I believe it is customary when a minister quotes from a public document to table it. Is it so intended?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I was not quoting from the report but from a memorandum given to me by the president. I really don't know where it is, but could possibly get it. It was just a memorandum given me by some official of the company. I was not quoting from the report. A full report of the NALCO has, I believe, been tabled, and I am pretty certain that the information I had given in that report—I speak subject to correction—It appeared in the daily press.

MR. BROWNE: Not the agreement. The honourable gentleman was quoting I believe, from the agreement.

MR. CURTIS: No, if I may reply, I was just quoting the effect. I don't believe I quoted the agreement. I am pretty sure I did not.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another question. On a portion of the proceedings which took place here yesterday there was a tape recording evidently—of the proceedings of the House. Was that done with the knowledge of the government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel called upon to answer the question.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I address it to you?

MR. SPEAKER: In the beginning—these questions may not be addressed to Mr. Speaker. I know of no tape recording having taken place in the Chamber yesterday.

MR. BROWNE: Well, apparently, Mr. Speaker, one was present and a recording was made. I did not hear the recording as it was broadcast, but from the report I received it was not an accurate account of all that took place during the discussion broadcast.

MR. SPEAKER: Since the Honourable gentleman has mentioned that I want to call to the attention of the House, there was a report given to me last night to the effect that some person was present in the gallery with a tape recorder, but it could not be ascertained if the machine was working or not. Such an action would certainly be contrary to the privilege of the House. But I had no knowledge that any recording was made in the House. The honourable member might have a recording made outside the House. I have no knowledge of that either.



**Third Readings :**

Third reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Education Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

**Committee of the Whole :****On Bill :**

"An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

"An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given yesterday for this Committee to sit again. I do now leave the Chair.

"An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances."

Clause 1 read, carried. Clause 2 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in the last paragraph there, what is the meaning of:

"An allowance may be paid to a woman who is resident in Newfoundland and has resident with her one or more orphan children.

(i) under the age of seventeen years; or

(ii) over the age of seventeen years but under the age of twenty-one years where such child or children are incapacitated or in need of financial assistance because of continued attendance at school

or college or in need of financial assistance for other reasons, and is the guardian or foster mother of such child or children and has not adequate means to care properly for such child or children without the assistance of an allowance."

Does that mean she is not the mother but she is the guardian or foster mother?

MR. CURTIS: If orphaned a child has no mother obviously.

MR. BROWNE: We speak of "Orphans" when one parent is dead.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): I think that is usually meant to apply to someone appointed guardian of the children by the Family Court or the Child Welfare.

MR. BROWNE: Does it apply to these foster homes where children are placed?

MR. CURTIS: I might say when I called this order the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare was here. But he had to go to the airport to meet some individuals. If the honourable member would like to have the committee just hold up that clause? In fact we might hold up the whole committee stage.

MR. BROWNE: We could leave this clause until he comes.

Clause 2 stand.

"An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

Clause 1, read, carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how many communities does that apply to?

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): In the Exploits

Valley, sir, the order applies to Borwood, Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls and Windsor.

MR. BROWNE: These are very substantial communities. Is there any amalgamation between them or any arrangement about closing time. It seems to me a very minor matter for the Legislature to have to make orders about what time the shops close. Have they not got town councils there to arrange that?

MR. MURRAY: It is the responsibility of the Department of Municipal Affairs. What usually happens is that requests come from an area for certain changes. We get in touch with the unions and it is usually by mutual consent after consulting both sides, and orders are issued. The idea of the amendment is that as the Act stands orders have to be made for specific periods. But under this amendment the order will stand until revoked.

MR. BROWNE: I would just like to repeat the question: Is it not desirable that these people should be responsible themselves?

MR. MURRAY: It could be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is it would involve the repeal of the legislation. The legislation provides it be done in this way. These people are acting under an Act directed at them to cover these cases. Now there is another Act, I believe, of a more general character. Then on top of that again there is still another Act applying each of them to one particular community. Well, if there is a particular Act inaugurated some years ago affecting these communities, surely any change must be made in this House. If the people out there preferred to cease to be under the Act

under which they now come, and would rather come under the General Act, I have no doubt that the government would be quite happy and would ask this House to repeal the present legislation and would ask the House to create an Act at the request of the people out there. But that request has not come, and we are following along in the position of the Act obtaining now for six or seven years. After all it is not as bad as the situation the honourable gentleman was familiar with, in the past four years where thousands of divorce cases were discussed in Parliament. We do not get very many requests to amend this Act.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that it seems to me that matters of this kind should be decided in the community where they apply. We are not going to make much progress in democratic government unless they can decide for themselves what time the shops should open and close. I think it is within the jurisdiction of the Act dealing with the organization of local communities—if the minister would suggest that whenever it is feasible and possible those people should assume these responsibilities for such small matters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except that what the honourable gentleman is now saying would be much better said, and more legitimately said, at second reading. He is now discussing the principle of the Bill, which I think has been agreed to by this House in recent days at second reading.

Clause 2 carried. Bill passed without amendment.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report

having passed the Bill without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act, without amendment.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have made progress on the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act," and asks leave to sit again.

Report received—Ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, in the parent Act incorporating the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook there was an omission of a definition of the word "Land." This amendment merely gives this definition. I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Public Libraries Board made representation to the Government pointing out that it would be more satisfactory if a small annual grant were made

to the Public Libraries Board somewhat as is done in the case of Jubilee Guilds. That would give the board freedom of decision on the salary scale etc.—instead of having every action of the board submitted to the Minister the library be given a fixed amount for five years subject to the annual report.

The Civil Service Act is to apply to the person holding the post of Secretary Librarian at the date of this new legislation and in addition to the pensionable service done by that person when this section comes into force the years of service done by him after this section comes into force shall be counted as pensionable service, but this sub-section shall not apply to any person occupying the post of Director of Public Library Services after the retirement of the person holding the post of Secretary-Librarian at the date of enactment of this section.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the more important Bills because it embodies a change in the way the Government is going to treat the Public Libraries Board. It is not readily apparent however, from examination of this Bill that it involved any change, as the Minister explained it. The Bill, it seems to me, deals with a good many points in regard to the administration of the Board and in particular deals with the question of the Secretary-Librarian. I would like to ask the Minister if he would show me the section in which the change he has mentioned is, I cannot see it.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, the changes made in this Bill are the powers vested presently in the De-

partment of Education and which are now to a great extent to be vested in the Public Libraries Board, in as much as they themselves would not have to be coming for every proposed change or procedure necessary in the operation of the Public Libraries Board. The other clauses regarding the civil servants. I believe the holder of the job at present, Mr. Newell, is the only civil servant on the Public Libraries Board at the present time. The other members of the Public Libraries Board do not come under the Civil Servants' Regulation, and are not so treated to any degree in respect of the increases granted by the Government. The Public Libraries Board are asking that they themselves be given the power to name salaries for these employees. Most of the sections of the Bill are taken up to explain the powers of the Lieutenant Governor in Council and pass them over to the Public Libraries Board. That is practically all the changes.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the Exchequer Court Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 98—1952 provides in section 30 as follows: (1) Where the Legislature of any Province of Canada has passed an Act agreeing that the Exchequer Court has jurisdiction in cases of controversy, (a) between Canada and such province, (b) between such Province and any other Province or Provinces that have passed a like Act, the Exchequer Court has jurisdiction to de-

termine such controversies. The section further provides that an appeal lies in such cases from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court.

Now then as at the present date Newfoundland has not passed an Act and the passage of this Act will therefore give the Exchequer Court jurisdiction in cases between Canada and the Province of Newfoundland — whereas now at this moment no such jurisdiction exists. The Supreme Court Act section 62 of the Revised Statutes of Canada 1952 ch. 259 provides simply where the legislature of any province of Canada has passed an Act agreeing and providing that the Supreme Court has jurisdiction in any of the following cases, i.e. of suits, actions or proceedings in which the parties thereto by their pleading have raised the question of the validity of an Act in the Parliament of Canada, when in the opinion of a judge of a court in which the same are pending such question is material: (b) of suits, actions or proceedings in which the parties thereto by their pleadings have raised the question of the validity of an Act of the Legislature of such province, when in the opinion of a judge of the court in which the same are pending such question is material: The judge having decided that such question is material shall at the request of the parties, and may without such request, if he thinks fit, in any suit, action or proceeding within the class or classes of cases in respect of which such Act so agreeing and providing it has been passed, order the case to be removed to the Supreme Court for the decision of such question, whatever may be the value of the matter in dispute, and the case shall be removed accordingly. The Act further provides the Supreme Court shall thereupon hear

and determine the question so raised and shall remit the case with a copy of its judgment thereon to the court or judge whence it came to be then and there dealt with as to justice appertains. (c) There shall be no further appeal to the Supreme Court on any point decided by it in any such case, nor, unless the value of the matter in dispute exceeds \$500, on any other point in such case. (4) This section applies only to cases of civil nature.

The effect of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, is to provide that the clauses in both Exchequer Court Act and the Supreme Court Act will become applicable to Newfoundland. I would move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Attorney General a question. He stated that the Exchequer Court Act gave power to a legislature to have a dispute between Canada and Newfoundland heard by the Exchequer Court. It also mentioned between provinces. Is it not the intention to have that included there in this Bill? Did the Attorney General omit that deliberately or why is it not included here?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point that I would raise. I wonder if in the Supreme Court of Canada and in the Exchequer Court are there any provisions there to take care of such a controversy as might arise between Canada and Newfoundland over the Terms of Union for instance. If there is no such provision in either of these courts in my opinion by passing this Act you delegate to the Supreme Court of Canada the right to decide any controversy over these Terms, the settlement of these Terms of Union. I just raised the point.

Certainly I don't know enough about the Supreme Court of Canada Act or the Exchequer Court Act—the Honourable Premier seems to laugh but I am quite sure he knows less about it than I do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not possible.

MR. HOLLETT: His laughing does not affect me any, but I see as it reads here, Sir, you transfer to the Supreme Court the right to settle all controversy between Canada and Newfoundland, and as long as the fact that we are to have something in the very near future I raise that point so that the Attorney General may tell the Premier and myself something about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the only contribution I wish to make to this particular debate is to make this one observation. I notice particularly that when the honourable gentleman from St. John's West who is a lawyer asks the Attorney General a question the Attorney General merely nods meaning he will answer when he closes the debate, whereupon the Leader of the Opposition debates with himself—if he were to speak now or forever hold his speech on this subject, therefore he spoke. Now it seems to me if by any chance Professor Einstein were a member of this House on this side and were piloting a Bill on a most obtruse scientific theory imaginable, the Leader of the Opposition would get up and offer his opinion on it. So in the same sense he has offered his opinion now, at least if not his opinion has posed some questions. I would like to see an experiment tried, the experiment of having an entire afternoon devoted to highly intricate and highly complicated and highly

scientific matters only and see how many times the honourable and learned Leader would take part.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, I believe second reading is given to discussion of the principle of any Bill and not personal criticisms with regard to Professor Einstein or Malcolm Hollett or Joseph R. Smallwood or anybody like that. I believe it has to do with the principle of this particular Bill and if the Honourable Premier has no better competition to offer than he has then I would say he should keep his mouth shut.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman has rather spoiled his point of order by being out of order himself in his closing remark therefore I shall make no comment. I might add however, the Honourable Premier has a perfect right to discuss relativity or any other thing.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would be most happy to answer the two questions that have been addressed to me by my honourable friends opposite. First with regard to the question as to extending the effect of this Act to enable some province to sue Newfoundland or to be sued by Newfoundland, I may say, we deliberately left out that section of the Act because at the moment the other province we might have a case against or who might have a case against Newfoundland has not passed a similar Act. In other words the only provinces in Canada that have passed this Act at the moment are the Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan and British Columbia. I could not imagine that Newfoundland would have any litigation with either of these four provinces. Therefore I was not prepared to recommend

to the Government that we extend the jurisdiction to all the provinces of Canada until the province with whom we might become involved had passed a similar legislation. So that I deliberately, Mr. Speaker, left out the provision that provided for giving either the Exchequer Court or the Supreme Court of Canada jurisdiction to adjudicate matters as between Newfoundland and the other provinces.

Now, this is really a very important Act because if it were not for this Act we could not go to the Supreme Court of Canada and ask for an interpretation of the Terms of Union nor for the determination of any point which might arise between us and Canada, such as, for instance the freight rates case, or the determination of the interpretation of the Terms of Union. The passage of this Act will enable Newfoundland on the one hand to apply to the Supreme Court of Canada for an interpretation of the Terms of Union or to take action against Canada in either of the courts, and of course vice versa, the passage of this Act will enable Canada in its turn to take action against us either civilly or to determine the interpretation of the Terms of Union.

It is legislation I think, which we should have. One thing can be said I suppose, if we don't like it we can always repeal it.

I would move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act."



MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. This is a Bill which we have been asked to pass by the Federal Government. It deals entirely or to all intents and purposes entirely with the rights of officers in the Canadian Forces situated in Newfoundland to take affidavits. At the moment we have provision only in our Act whereby officers employed in the Canadian Forces can take affidavits from their troops, but this Act is a little fuller. It was found, by the Department of National Defence that all the provinces had different legislation enacted dealing with this matter, and the Federal Government has therefore asked all the Provinces to get together and have the legislation uniform. With that same result in mind the committee on the uniformity of legislation has met and has drafted a Bill, of which the Bill before us is practically a verbatim copy. We have made one or two minor changes just to suit local conditions, but this Bill as it is before us now will bring our legislation in line with the legislation which either has been or will be passed by the other provinces. I do not think I need go into details of the Bill, Mr. Speaker. If there are any questions that arise from this reading I will be glad to answer same when we get into committee.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fires."

MR. SPEAKER: The motion on second reading of this Bill was adjourned at the request of the Honourable Member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, since the last day I have had an opportu-

ity of studying this Bill and making a comparison between this Bill and the Acts in two other Provinces—the Province of Ontario and the Province of Manitoba, I think it was, which are similar. In the Province of Ontario they call the official the "Fire Marshal" as I think the official designated here was formerly called, but I think his name is apparently going to be changed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will allow me—I think that is being done all across Canada, making a uniform title for the job.

MR. BROWNE: The Act seems to have been in force for a number of years in other places. I don't know whether the Attorney General would say we have suffered by not having it, but as one who has many times held inquiries into the cause of fires, I am very strongly of the opinion that much good could come from a Bill of this kind, and having the investigations centralized. If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to speak from my own experience—I remember having an inquiry in St. John's when I was ex officio stipendary magistrate and did the work of a magistrate as well as of a judge, and a greater amount of work I think than all the other magistrates in Newfoundland put together.

MR. CURTIS: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: At that time, I think the Attorney General knows that I am not far out in what I say, I remember holding inquiries into every fire that took place within the jurisdiction of this district and I can assure this House it had a very beneficial effect whether because of the publicity given to the cases or not, fires

for that period when I was personally taking an interest in them, diminished considerably. Now I know that with-in recent years with the introduction of the use of oil fuel in oil stoves which were probably converted and which were not of good design, a great many fires arose on that account. I do believe that an investigation into every fire of any considerable importance has a beneficial effect of making everyone careful, and it certainly would be a great deterrent to any one of those who might have any criminal intent to set fire to a building for the purpose of collecting insurance. I believe that the records of the courts show that for a good many years now there has been very few cases of arson. I also feel quite sure that careful investigation into the cause of all fires would have the effect practically of eliminating arson altogether.

Now the point that strikes me as being different from that contained in other Acts of this kind is contained in the last sentence in the last paragraph, No. 25, where there is a conflict between the authority of the fire commissioner and that of an official of any municipal area where the authority of the fire commissioner shall prevail.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that that is a good policy to follow. That means to say when all the extensive provisions of that Act are taken into consideration that the fire commissioner will have authority in St. John's in regard to granting permits for construction of buildings or alterations in buildings. Now the Municipal Council has an engineering staff and building inspectors, wiring inspectors, and therefore is well qualified from the point of view of safety for any hazard that might arise to decide whether the type of construction is

suitable or whether any danger is involved. I don't believe that in a city of the size of St. John's it should be necessary to give the fire commissioner authority over the Municipal Authority so that his opinion would prevail over the engineer and the staff that is under him. At the present time I believe the engineering department of the Municipal Council in St. John's is better equipped than ever it was to deal with such questions, and therefore, the authority of the fire commissioner should not be extended to include places of this kind. I don't know how far they are able to resolve these questions in other communities outside the City of St. John's, but I do feel, within the City of St. John's he should not have that power.

Now, before I sit down I should like to pay a tribute to the Fire Department in the City of St. John's. As most people know there is a special tax levied upon the citizens of St. John's through the fire insurance companies, collected from the people who insure their homes, for the purpose of contributing towards the expenses of the fire department. It is certainly desirable that in all the larger towns there should be a fire department. I don't know if any arrangements of that kind are possible, but if there are, I think it should be extended to them, so that they may have the advantage of an up-to-date fire department.

I would like to pay tribute to the Fire Department in the City of St. John's. I have been closely associated with them for many years. I believe that they are very brave and able in the carrying out of their duties. I have known fires here in the City of St. John's which were of such a nature that it was extremely dangerous for the firemen to go into the building

concerned. But nothing seems to deter them. They are full of spirit and dash and very eager to get at their work and stop the fires. They are a fine group of men, especially Supt. Codner now retired. He was very efficient, a very devoted man to his duty. I know his successor who is also a very intelligent man and also filled with spirit and keenly interested in the work, the difficult work which he has to perform.

In concluding I would say, I think there are several questions which I would like to ask, and some further things I would like to say. I think this Bill, whilst it is beneficial and should prove useful, also has some sections which I think might be changed from what they are at the present time. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be somewhat regrettable if this particular Bill were to pass second reading with a minimum of debate. It happens to be in some ways one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House in the present session. It was requested legislation of this type and particularly the appointment of a fire marshal, as the House is aware, by quite a number of organized bodies in the Province including notably the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and notably the Newfoundland Board of Trade, and I believe still other important bodies. The Bill, in fact creates virtually a province-wide code with regard to the prevention of fires. It creates a code and philosophy and a system for the control of fire. It is most sweeping in its jurisdiction. It does more than merely appoint a fire marshal or a fire commissioner. In section 5 of the Bill the way in which the authority is to be created and ex-

ercised is quite sweeping—the fire commissioner shall, under the direction of the Minister—that is to say, I believe under the direction of the Attorney General—keep a record of every fire reported to him with such facts and statistics and circumstances as may be required by the Minister, and he shall investigate and hold inquiries respecting the cause, origin, extent, and circumstances of fires in such areas as may be prescribed by the Minister from time to time (this is province-wide) inspect any property or community with a view to determining whether precautions against fire and the spread of fire and the means of exit in case of fire or the alarm of fire are adequate and satisfactorily maintained, with a view to directing such alterations or additions to be made and such precautions to be taken as he may deem necessary for the safeguarding of persons and property; and the fire commissioner shall review plans and specifications for the construction, alteration or repair of structures with a view to determining that proper precautions are taken against fire and the spread of fire: submit to the Minister on or before the thirty-first day of December in each year a detailed report in such form as the Minister may prescribe, setting forth particulars of all fires, fatalities or injuries by fire, investigations of fires, investigations of any precautions for arson or attempted arson, and a summary of the administration and the fire prevention and fire protection activities of the office of the Fire Commissioner, and any other information required by the Minister; render advice and make recommendations to the Minister and to Town Councils, (this means the St. John's Municipal Council, a Town Council, a Rural Council or a local government area), with respect to the

establishment of fire brigades and departments and the necessary organization and equipment for such brigades or departments; for provision of adequate water supply for fire fighting purposes; the installation and maintenance of fire alarm systems and fire extinguishing equipment; the storage use, sale or disposal of combustibles, explosives or other inflammable material—thus it goes on and on, I have read about half or hardly half of the matters with which the Act deals and which gives authority for the Fire Marshal under the Minister to deal with.

Now touching on the points mentioned by my honourable and learned friend, the newly elected member for St. John's West, as to interference with the City Council of St. John's: I think it cannot be denied the City Council has in recent years built up a quite satisfactory service in these matters, not perhaps completely adequate, but satisfactory as far as it goes but I see no necessity for confidence. I hope the Act provides for the appointment by the Minister or by the Commissioner as the case may be of an official of the City Council of St. John's or an official of the town councils or community councils or such local bodies as a deputy of the fire commissioner and assistant to the fire commissioner in much the same way as, for example, the Government of Canada frequently appoints provincial government officials to be Federal Government Officials for the carrying out of certain federal responsibilities. Similarly the government of a province frequently, or sometimes at least, appoint federal government officials to be provincial government officials for the carrying out of certain provincial government responsibilities. So likewise, I suggest, and I hope, it is provided for in

this Act that the fire commissioner or the minister, as the case may be, might well use the existing machinery in the matter of fire prevention and fire fighting and fire alarms and all the rest of such functions. We feel that if a machinery already exists, if the City Council of St. John's has officials specifically trained in these matters, why should their services become redundant?—Why should there be any overlapping or why should there be any jealousy? Why should not the two, the provincial authority which is created under this Bill, be integrated with the various local authorities in the field of fire detection and alarms and prevention and extinction.

Mr. Speaker, it may well be that this Act, if it passes into law, will save scores and possibly hundreds (who can say) over a period of time possibly thousands of lives. If this Bill had been an Act eight or ten years ago when they had the Hull fire it is extremely doubtful if the Hull fire would have occurred. If this Act had been in force at the time many such fires should not have occurred. Because surely the fire marshal or fire commissioner exercising all these tremendously wide powers, armed with the authority of this Act or through city council officials acting as his deputies would have seen to it that the terrible state of affairs that existed with regard to that building would not have existed and would have been remedied so that a fire would have been very much less likely to break out in the first place, or having broken out would not be in the terrible danger in which it was on that lamentable occasion. I could go back still further to the time of the terrible holocaust, the terrible disaster of the K. of C. fire on Harvey Road. Now I know

that no matter what laws you pass, and no matter how efficient your officials be, there will still be fires and there always will be. But surely if some decent system had existed that Knights of Columbus fire would not have been the utter disastrous thing it was when human beings were trapped. As I recall a heap of burned bodies were found underneath a window where evidently they were trapped and climbing on each other in a raging inferno, trying to get out through the window, but perished.

Mr. Frank Ryan is being appointed as fire marshal or fire commissioner. I think we are lucky to have such a man as Frank Ryan. He is a man who has taken a particularly keen interest in the matter of fire prevention and fire extinction. I believe that he actually, at his own expense, and out of sheer interest he had in the matter took a course of instructions during the war. I believe he volunteered for a considerable amount of war service in that field in the City of St. John's during the late war. I believe he has the distinction of being the only non-professional fire fighter ever in history to come in person and address the great American Fire Association, I forget their exact name. An all-American organization comprising the fire chiefs, sheriffs and fire marshals of America, of the whole United States. A very distinct honour for such a body of professional men to accord to a non-professional such as Mr. Ryan. Now I am delighted personally that again it should have been our good fortune on this side of the House to have introduced this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, when the history of this period is written, I think, looking back about fifty years from now, and there are people in this Chamber who will, please God, be living and

in good health fifty years from now. —It won't be the Leader of the Opposition and myself. Fifty years from now we may conceivably be living but I doubt that we will be in the best of health, but there are undoubtedly people in this Chamber at this moment—And as they look back over the period of the first five or eight or ten years of Confederation in this country. I think, what will stand out above everything else is the fact that it was a golden time, a rich, fruitful time for new thinking, new legislation, a revolutionary period, a period when people's minds were ripe for, were susceptible for, entirely new and fresh ideas, and I think they will be forced to admit this particular government never lagged behind the public in that field, but was in the very vanguard of reform, of progress, led the public of Newfoundland in this House, in this Legislature, and this Bill today is in this class, a distinctive piece of legislation.

I am delighted to hear that the honourable gentleman from St. John's West is giving the Bill his blessing, and I have no doubt all the members of the Opposition will do likewise. It is one Bill in the present session that will meet the undivided approval of all my honourable friends on the Opposition, and I am all the more pleased on that account.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, of course the Opposition does support all legislation which comes into this House, which in our opinion is for the public good. This is a piece of legislation which in our opinion at least is for the public good. However, Sir, this is going to cost the province considerable money, and in fact, regardless of what the Premier has just said projecting his new view

fifty years hence, I think it is quite possible it will be fifty years hence, according to all the different clauses of the Bill, before they can be all properly enforced, because the Bill is so far-reaching and has so many different things in it that it is going to take a considerable staff of people to look after and do the things required to be done. One thing in particular I want to mention is that part in connection with the installation of electricity. I, of my own knowledge, do know we have quite a capable person, Mr. Browne, who is the electrical inspector in the City of St. John's, and has been for the past nine or ten years. He is a quite capable person, Mr. Speaker, and is doing a fine job. However, he himself will be the first to admit, within his jurisdiction and authority it is impossible for him to look into and inspect electrical installations in some of the older buildings. I would like to point out that in these buildings quite a lot of the electrical installations are not up to standard and are quite a lot below it. Perhaps the fire commissioner could inspect these.

There is one further matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention in supporting this Bill: I want to bring attention to Section 24 (f) regulating the sale, installation and maintenance of electrical equipment used or intended for use in or upon any structure or property.

I don't know how the fire marshal or fire commissioner will regulate the sale of all electrical appliances coming into the Province and put on sale in the various shops throughout the Province, because although I don't travel very much—members of the Opposition don't of course—but here in St. John's you can go into any

store in the city, of any size, and buy electrical appliances of any nature which require a lot of current to operate nevertheless fitted with plugs which are so small in value that the capacity of the plugs are only half the value of the size of the appliances themselves. You can go into any shop here today and buy them. Whether they are inspected before they come in to the province or not I do not know. I have been into shops and more or less just asked the price, and asked the clerk if the plug operated the equipment successfully, and have been told, yes, which I know is wrong, because it is not in accordance with the Canadian National Electrical Code. There are many other things like that, Mr. Speaker, going on from day to day. As I have said, this is going to cost the Province quite a lot of money if it is put into effect, with the idea in mind that all clauses and regulations made under the Act are to be fulfilled within a period. They will certainly have to have quite a staff to carry out this legislation. Nevertheless, Sir, I do support the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make any world-shaking announcement in regard to this Bill at all. After all I am not the man to make such a statement. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier has referred to this Act in a very expansive manner. I hope the commissioner would not be allowed to come in here, or at least would not be able to come in here and put out the so-called fires to which he referred. I find on page 18 of the Bill that he has within his power to make the regulations apply to structures or property owned by the Crown. I strongly suspect that he would have under this Bill, the au-



thority to come in and put out the fires of doubtful origin and from doubtful (sometimes) causes.

Doubtlessly this is a good Bill, Sir. There are some things here which we shall bring up in committee. I think we should give some little attention to the point referred to by my honourable friend from St. John's West, the conflict of authority between the various councils throughout the country and the fire commissioner. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I have found down through my short life-time, and incidentally I may live that fifty years the Premier referred to, but I have always found the more commissioners and more highly paid higher-ups appointed, then the job is not done, shall I say, as good in many cases as it is done before you appoint various commissioners and higher-ups. In a good many cases when it is on the shoulders of one man the job is well done. Here you have to set up a staff to carry out the various things subscribed in this Act.

There is also another matter in regard to Section 13 "Where the Fire Commissioner deems it necessary he may direct the owner or occupant of any structure or property or both the owner and the occupant to comply with any order and may designate the person who shall bear the expense of carrying out the order or any part of the expense."

It seems to me there is no appeal there, and the Commissioner may make pretty well any order. I find there is an appeal from Section 17 under Section 18, but there is no appeal to anybody under this section, at least I have not seen it. It may be wrapped up somewhere in another section. I doubt, Sir, if that is good. As I have said here several times be-

fore—I was a magistrate for 25 years. During that time I had to hold many inquiries into fires all across the country or help others to do it. I think the Minister will still have to appoint the magistrate to do it; heretofore they have done it automatically.

We believe on this side it is a very excellent Act. With regard to the Honourable the Premier's statement to the people fifty years hence looking back upon this age of enlightenment, the golden age, that is a very apt phrase—the golden age— I heard something the other day about some man worth his weight in gold to this country. Gold is something of which the Government, Mr. Speaker, is very fond. They like the colour of gold. But this is a golden age, and all the Acts brought in here will be looked upon in the next fifty years as those which were performed in this golden age. I could recite some of these Acts, Mr. Speaker, alongside of this one here, which perhaps even those who live fifty years hence would not subscribe to an age which might be called golden. I could refer to the Seigheim Act and to various Acts with regard to the industrial programme, and there is the NALCO Act, which I believe is a heartache—

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman is wandering.

MR. HOLLETT: The golden age—and all the credit, of course, would come back to this particular day in which we are now living when this particular Government held office. Of course the Honourable the Premier expands very greatly when he refers to the Government. We don't blame him for that. There have been some achievements too in connection with welfare. Yes, there have been

some achievements, but I would point out, Sir, there were Acts which were passed in years gone by, to which we can look back, and we on this side can stand and look up at the honourable gentleman on the wall, with the belief that some Acts were passed which have been very beneficial to the people of this country. The Act to set up the Newfoundland Railway, the Act to set up the A.N.D. Company.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All Liberal Acts.

MR. HOLLETT: Very Liberal Acts in the strictest sense of the word—there was the Bowaters Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Another Liberal Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, if they were "Liberal"—I wonder if they were Liberal—I wish we had a Liberal Government today. I do wish we had a Liberal Government today, there is no question about that. We on the Opposition side would love to belong to a Liberal Government because our ancestors were Liberal. But there is such a thing as people who come in, Sir, and interlope and more or less grab up—

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I think the honourable member is wandering too far away from the Bill altogether.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. Resume your speech, please.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't wish to wander any further, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member for Fortune Bay wishes to shut me up I will shut up and sit down.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate, it is so long since

I heard the Bill discussed that I almost forget the various points that have been raised. However, I would, I think, like to say just one or two things. The first is that I do not anticipate this Bill is going to call for the organization of a large staff. The Bill itself calls for the appointment of a fire commissioner, and we have the fire commissioner, and the appointment of an assistant commissioner whom we have not named, and whom, I may say, we have no intention of naming at the moment. The Act is just permissive. We can appoint such a man as and when we feel there is need. On the other hand the Minister may appoint any chief of any fire department of any municipality where a fire department is established, or it may name any municipal area with a local assistant. Of course, Mr. Speaker, in addition to these who will not be paid there will be both the R.C.M.P. and the local police and any other assistance that would be necessary.

Now with regard to the one question which the last speaker referred to—the question of appeal—I think if he will refer to Section 17, he will find that there is an appeal from Section 13, and there is a further appeal from the Minister to the Supreme Court under Section 18. So, I think that my honourable friend may satisfy himself the Minister is the appeal first and then the Supreme Court.

MR. HOLLETT: Where?

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, or perhaps I can't read. I do know, Section 17 reads: "On application made to him by any interested party, before the expiration of fourteen days after the order was made, the Minister may re-

view any order made under this part by the Fire Commissioner or by a local or special assistant to the Fire Commissioner and may amend, revoke or confirm the order.

Any decision made by the Minister on application to him under this section may be enforced under this Act in the same manner as an order of the Fire Commissioner."

That is conclusive and it goes back to Section 10. Everything from Section 10 on, is subject to appeal, every decision made by the fire commissioner or by his deputy or by anyone else on his authority is appealable, to the Minister. The Minister's decision is in turn appealable to the Supreme Court—if my honourable friend will read Section 18.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give my honourable friend a course in interpreting Bills, I think my honourable friend to his right can do that.

MR. HOLLETT: You are perfectly right there.

MR. CURTIS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I feel relieved. The other point was raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's West with reference to Section 25. That is an interesting point, and frankly I would like to give the matter a bit of thought between now and the time we get into committee, to see whether or not decisions that have been made on the Mainland in other cases should apply here. Somebody must be in charge, and I think perhaps that somebody should be the person whose sole job it is to determine these questions. I am quite aware the Municipal Council here in St. John's has accumulated quite a staff, but I think my honourable

friend will agree that in all cases they refer their fire problems to the fire department. I think you will find that is the position, and the Superintendent of the Fire Department now will be an assistant to the commissioner we appoint under this Act. I recommend this Bill to the House, Mr. Speaker, and would ask for second reading.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill I wish to make a few comments on it. I don't know if I should explain or not that the pests and insects have no political connotation at all. I don't know whether it has ever occurred to very many people that in the isolation which Newfoundland enjoyed by virtue of her being an island there were both advantages and disadvantages. I think perhaps we have not thought too much about the advantages of our isolation. When sometime in her geological history Newfoundland got separated from the Mainland of Canada, in fact I believe it has been separated many times—the Honourable the Premier reminds me he has had some little part in joining it up again, however not geographically. For instance we have, I believe, thirteen species of animals in Newfoundland of which ten or eleven belonged here always. As you know the other two or three have been brought in, but we have many species of animals right on the Mainland (again I lay myself open)

which are not to be found here or never had been here on this Island, and it is a good thing. Just ten miles across the Straits of Belle Isle we have porcupine, for example, doing immense damage to the spruce trees, and we have no porcupines here. So I could go on. We have no squirrels, no chipmunk, no skunks here.

The background of this piece of legislation is very simple. We had some similar legislation prior to 1949 but at the time of union with Canada that legislation automatically was repealed. The Federal Government does have what might be called complementary legislation applying to all Canada, but it is customary for the various provinces to have other legislation which applies specifically to the province itself and is peculiar of the province itself and applies to the province more than does the general federal legislation.

This Act called the "Protection Act" for short is designed to prevent the bringing in, and assuming that some diseases have been brought in, as far as possible, control of the spread of the new disease affecting plants, vegetables or any form of vegetation. This is seen to be necessary when it is borne in mind that there are a number of diseases of a fungus and parasitical nature which are well known on the mainland but which have never been known here. In fact only recently has a certain disease, I believe it is ring rock, but I am not sure, during the past year or two has come into prominence in Newfoundland and could very well, if not controlled as quickly as possible, become serious. A very good example is in our moose. When the Newfoundland Government introduced moose in 1904 they broke the cycle of a serious moose parasite. The

Liberal Government did it, but purely by accident they broke a cycle, and as a result the four or five moose that were brought to Newfoundland were free of that disease, and all their descendants are free, so that today our Newfoundland moose are still free of disease that may have helped to destroy the moose in the State of Maine and to some extent in New Brunswick and other parts of Canada.

This legislation is enabling legislation, it gives us the control and the authority we need right now and in future, I might say this has been drawn up in collaboration with the Federal officials of the appropriate department. There may be some points that I think we can best deal with in Committee. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I need say anything more. I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity of studying this Bill, but I am a bit surprised at seeing a Bill like this being introduced. My honourable friend the Minister says legislation of this kind was on the statute books before 1949, because I do remember hearing Mr. H. A. Butler, who for many years had been recognized as our prominent entomologist and I think he is still engaged in work of that kind—

DR. ROWE: Yes, with the Federal Government.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, particularly with regard to preventing ravages by the spruce bug. But I notice this afternoon this is not so much for preventing diseases—when the Minister is replying at the end of the debate maybe he will say something about the spread of diseases which are here. I remember a couple of years ago,

the Minister of Agriculture, in the House of Commons in Ottawa, drawing to my attention that our potatoes were not suitable for seed potatoes because of the fact we have been suffering from canker in our potatoes in this country. Now, I remember years ago meeting agriculturists, who came to the country, at Corner Brook and on the West Coast at the time looking for seed stock, and gave the opinion the further north you go the better quality of seed you obtain. That is, better seeds can be found in the northern climates than can be found further south, certainly therefore, it is a very bad thing for our farmers if the potatoes cannot be rid of this canker. Now, there must be a great problem in this connection, it is not one with which I am expert but the Minister may know whether in his department something is being done and I would like him when he replies to tell us something about it.

As regards to the principle of the Bill, I have no objection to it. I think it is necessary and it is surprising that it has not been introduced before as it was automatically repealed after Confederation. It is desirable that there should always be on the Statute Books a Bill of this kind. As the Minister says it is principally an enabling Bill to protect against any outbreak of disease which might occur in any of the other provinces.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting piece of legislation actually, because it is a Bill, which if it becomes law will give sanction to pass Acts to protect Newfoundland from Acts passed elsewhere in the world. I will give the

House an example of that; about two years ago or maybe three years ago the farmers of Newfoundland were deeply worried about the low price they were then getting for potatoes due to the fact that potatoes could be imported at that time from the Mainland of Canada at lower prices than the lowest one they could get for the local potatoes, and these even lower prices on imported potatoes tended, of course, to bring down the already low price obtained for the local potato. Apparently something had to be done and I became quite alarmed about the situation which confronted Newfoundland at the time. So I held a conference in my office; this was made up of all the people who imported potatoes into Newfoundland. I personally telephoned to every importer of potatoes, Canada Packers, Swift Canadian, Wilsils, Steer's Limited, Frank McNamara, T. & M. Winter, George Neal Limited, etc. quite a large gathering of importers. I told them very frankly that Newfoundland was extremely lucky in many ways in that she was an island and one of the advantages was that our soil was pretty clean and healthy, that I was not so sure that the soil of the neighbouring provinces of Canada was as pure and wholesome as our own and that I was really very much afraid that diseases might be brought in to contaminate our good Newfoundland soil. Therefore I propose to have the Government of Newfoundland institute a system of close and very careful inspection of all potatoes that might be brought into this province, for the prevention of the contamination of our good Newfoundland soil.

Now, actually there was no Act on our Statute Books at that time. I told those importers we would christen

our own baby first; that we had an extremely limited number of inspectors and we just could not afford to appoint an army of inspectors; that we would have only two or three or maybe four inspectors in all and that they would have to inspect every barrel and every bag before these potatoes could be offered for sale or moved around for the purpose of being offered for sale. In other words before any traffic could be had in potatoes they would have to be inspected and a stamp of approval of the Government of Newfoundland placed on these potatoes. They wanted to know if we would not be prepared to accept the stamp of approval of the Government of Nova Scotia. I said, of course not; we would not even consider it; we insisted on inspecting them ourselves. Then they wondered, if we had only two, three, or four inspectors, how long it would take to have potatoes inspected. I told them I did not know, but guaranteed that by Christmas they would be. One man said; but I bring them in by the trainload. Well, I said, I can't help that. You can continue to import your train load of potatoes, but dare not sell one until our inspectors inspect them, and puts the certificate of health and cleanliness of the Government of Newfoundland on these potatoes. He said, "If I have to wait until Christmas to have them inspected they will go bad." I then told him it was for him to decide whether he would care to take those risks. The result was that the Government amply protected the soil of Newfoundland in that year. We protected the soil from any contaminated or diseased Mainland potatoes. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, we had not the legislative authority to do it, and it would have

been necessary, had our action been challenged, to call the House together, and invite the House to pass the legislation which is now before it today.

MR. BROWNE: This does not read that way.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the honourable gentleman will find us a resourceful government, armed with the authority of this Act and with the implacable determination to protect our good Newfoundland soil from the contamination being brought in here; insofar as it is scientifically feasible we will do so. If a bird happens to perch on a farm in New Brunswick, and gets monkeying around with diseased potatoes, and happened to fly down here and brings disease with it, we cannot legislate against that situation. Such legislation would be useless. But we can legislate against things coming in now, things other than birds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, fortunately agriculture is a matter of concern both federally and provincially. Under the constitution of our country and the British North America Act, such jurisdiction is the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada and also the jurisdiction of the legislature of the province concerned. It is unlike fish, which is entirely a federal jurisdiction. As property, fish is a provincial jurisdiction because property and civil rights are, of course, a provincial jurisdiction. But fisheries are a federal jurisdiction, as distinct from agriculture which is of concurrent jurisdiction. If agriculture were not of concurrent jurisdiction we would not have this Bill before the House today. Now there is not any doubt in the world of the constitutional validity of this Bill. We have the authority under



the Constitution of Canada, to introduce this Bill, and having introduced it, if it is passed into law, we then have the authority to carry out its provisions. If we carry them out with grim determination and with vision, particularly with vision and imagination, I am quite sure that on more than one occasion the Minister will have all the necessary authority to protect the good soil of Newfoundland repeatedly against possible contamination that might be brought in here by mainland potatoes or other crops which sometimes unfortunately are flooded in here by way of dumping. That is to say, when prices of potatoes on the Mainland fall too drastically they have a very powerful tendency to flood Newfoundland with their surplus potatoes by way of frank and admitted dumping.

If the honourable gentleman, having made his own speech, would allow his leader to make up his own speech I would be able to speak without the continual undertone of conversation now going on. I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can make his own speech. I know they have been much improved since he has his new follower to advise him, but it ought not to be so open. They ought to do it when the House is not in session, and not quite so obviously. Yes, I am happy to see the Leader improve since he now has an adviser at his elbow there, because I like to see the tone and standards of this House raised and the Honourable gentleman is doing that since his new follower and adviser has come into the Chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, who I know is itching to speak, will support the Bill, be-

cause it is an innocent Bill, and it has been brought in here, I assure him, with a sincere desire to help the farmers of Newfoundland, and he dare not oppose it, because if he does he will incur the displeasure of his colleague on his immediate left who represents good farmers and good people, and indeed the displeasure of his colleague on his right who represents farmers and, if he only knew, would incur his own displeasure because he too represents some farmers.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, after all that I deem it my duty, sir—But before I say that—It never dawned on me that I would be asked so soon after union with the great mainland of Canada to support a Bill to keep out insects and pests from the mainland. Insects and pests it is, sir, of all types we are told by the honourable minister. The Honourable Premier went so far as to say the little bird perching on the trees over on the mainland might fly here and deposit something of a germ nature. I may say it is an unexpected pleasure to me that in the new golden age of confederation I am invited by the Honourable the Premier, Father of Confederation, to stand on my hinders and support a Bill to keep out Canadian Insects and Pests.

But, sir, I think this Bill is aimed not only at Canadian Insects and Pests, I hope it is also aimed at insects and pests from all over the whole wide world, European Insects for instance. I see my honourable friend the Member for Ferryland who lives in around the Housing Area raise his head, because he knows as well as myself that people living in around there are pestered with the European insect or pest, with six or eight legs, sir—I am not referring to any pests with two legs. But we have European pests,

sir, around the Housing Area that came from the Mainland. How they got to the Mainland of Canada I don't know but they are called European Pests, sir. That brings me to the point on which I wish to speak: Ever since Confederation the Federal Government has been sending inspectors to try to control or wipe out these European Earwigs, as they call them. The place in around the Housing Corporation which I believe the government owns, is pestered to death with these European Travellers. They fill up basins, kitchens, dining-rooms and fill up your bed, and you find them on your clothing when going around town. I am doing my best to bring them in my hat and drop them on Water Street. I am sure the Honourable the Premier will be glad I am putting pests on Water Street. I am sure there must be some constructive ideas between the Federal and Provincial Governments. I believe the control of pests comes under the Federal Department. I know there are inspectors here, and I wonder how much conflict there will be between the inspectors to be set up by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa? I expect this will be one of the cases to be decided by the Supreme Court of Canada under the Bill brought in here by the Attorney General today. That there will be conflict I have no doubt whatsoever.

Yes, sir, this is a good Bill, but as I remarked on another Bill which was brought in here today, it sets up another division, almost a department. I can visualize next a Director of Pests, and I have no doubt whatsoever that the government on the opposite side will have no difficulty whatsoever in finding a director of Pests, they have so many of them lately, they are

trying to eliminate them, looking them up, turning them down, doing all sorts of things. European Earwigs, European Pests, Mainland Pests, and I am sure the Honourable the Premier will have no trouble to get a Director of Pests, and I have no doubt he will set up an army of inspectors to go all over the country watching little birds and getting specimens to be collected and put in the museum for generations to come or at least fifty years.

These pests have come in from the Mainland after our little Island was joined to the Great Dominion by the Honourable the Premier. After all, he did it. He alone is responsible for the pests and insects, he did it, and he did not tell the people about it five or six years ago, about the canker in potatoes brought in here or about the difficulty in marketing our potatoes. Incidentally there was something the Honourable the Premier did say about potatoes I don't think I had better repeat, and I think he should have said it—I think it is infringing upon the Federal rights, and the rights of all provinces to carry goods from one province to another.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not diseased goods. All we are doing—we can't prevent them coming in, but we wish to inspect them to see they are not diseased, that is all.

MR. HOLLETT: You have just brought in the Act. If he had the proper authority to do what he did there would be no need of this Bill. But May to December is a long time to inspect potatoes, and armed with that arbitrary authority which is possessed, I think wrongly by the government, the Premier or the Government took this responsibility. But I visualize a period very shortly when some-

body in the opposite side will probably be sitting in the seat occupied at the present time by the Honourable the Premier who will not delegate unto himself arbitrary powers.—So I think we are wise in passing this Act, which is a good Act, and I appreciate the honourable minister's bringing it in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two good actions in one day.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this Bill, there are just two points: The honourable member for St. John's West referred to diseases in certain potatoes. I would like to assure him that is something which has been occupying the attention of the particular division of agriculture for some time. As a matter of fact, if there is one specific reason for this Bill more than anything else, it is diseases amongst seed potatoes. We hope with the introduction of this Bill, and with the regulations that will be made almost immediately after the passing of the Bill, we will be able to control some of the diseases which are being spread around by seed potatoes. One point of interest is that it has been found recently that certain types of potatoes are almost immune or practically immune to certain diseases such as canker, and perhaps we might find it necessary to insist that only that type of potatoes will be used for seed in this Province. That is of course something which would have to come later. This whole business, as the Premier has intimated, of inspection at the point of entry or before it arrives in Newfoundland, is something to which this Province has to give more and increasing attention, even if it involves, which I do not visualize at the moment, a great army of inspectors. But nevertheless we have to give some special attention to it.

An incident came to my attention in the past week in connection with the control and inspection—I mention it now, and don't think I am out of order—it was an incident in connection with the control and elimination of bovine tuberculosis. One of our dairy farmers had his herd examined and a number were found to be infected with bovine T.B. and were destroyed. The farmer co-operated one hundred per cent. He was compensated and bought and imported new dairy stock only to find three of the animals he had imported from a supposedly T.B. free area on the mainland, after they were brought here, were found to have bovine T.B. Three of the new herd he brought in. I cite that example now to show how important this inspection is from our standpoint. We can not always depend, I am afraid, on the other provinces to be over particular on vegetables or animals to be exported to Newfoundland. I regret to have to say that, but it is the case. In any case accidents can happen, and it is our business to try and anticipate those and anticipate the possibility that our farmers will be penalized in the ways I have suggested.

MR. BROWNE: You said three. That was out of how many?

DR. ROWE: A small group of cows. I don't know the exact number.

MR. BROWNE: Was there any follow up or any action taken on that?

DR. ROWE: Oh definitely! Yes, there was a follow up. The honourable member is referring to three animals which were recently brought in in a group and were found to be infected with T.B. These animals

came from a supposedly disease free area on the Mainland. I may say that is being followed up. Not only has representation been made to the provincial Government but also very energetic representation has been made to the Federal Government, the Federal Department of Agriculture.

MR. HOLLETT: That has nothing to do with this Act.

DR. ROWE: No, I stated it as an example, and have elaborated in answer to a question asked by your honourable colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the principle of this Bill, and I move second reading.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Might we revert, Mr. Speaker, to the Committee of the Whole on Mothers' Allowances? Leave was given earlier for this committee to sit again.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I may say this Act has been read. The first and second clauses have been read and the first clause passed. The second clause was permitted to stand.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of having this section stand was on account of a question I wanted to ask the Honourable Minister. Now that he is here in the House I would like to ask him if he would intimate what the cost of this is going to be. I did compare this with similar provisions in Ontario, and I notice their age limit is

eighteen, and don't go beyond. I notice here it goes to 21 years. That is one question. The other question deals with the expression "Financial Assistance for other reasons" in sub-clause (f). It also appears in sub-paragraph 2 of paragraph 7. Then I wanted to ask if this provision of sub-section 2 applies to foster homes in which children have been recently placed?

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I shall have to ask the honourable member again to cover the points because I can't remember all the points just raised.

First with regard to cost: The whole series of amendments considered, the main difference arises out of the application of the proposed amendments having to do with incapacitated husbands—I pointed out in second reading that there is an anomaly at present, in that, within the two legislations we have Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances and under the Mothers' Allowances the incapacitated husband receives only five dollars as a child, whereas under the Dependents' Allowance actually he could receive a basic amount of \$25 and a possible additional amount of \$20 making a maximum of \$45. Now, in view of other changes we anticipate in the course of time, relating to our total legislation, we thought we should wipe out that anomaly. In other words there is a penalty in the Mothers' Allowance Act now with regard to incapacitated husbands—there are 1,384 such—and our thought is, to raise the allowance from five dollars to ten dollars a month, to provide for dressings and medical services which incapacitated husbands definitely should have. Now, if every in-

capacitated husband under the Act were eligible the total increased cost would be \$8,000 a year.

The honourable member will note that it is anticipated that sometime in the very near future there will be Federal Legislation relating to permanently incapacitated people. If that should come into effect and if we should enter into an agreement the saving would be \$60,000 a year, if we were to enter into a Dominion-Provincial Agreement.

There were four hundred and fifty children of normal parents, under the Mothers' Allowances Act that were taken off the list during the past year because they had reached the age of 17 years. I would like to make clear a point here, which the honourable member raised on second reading, or still earlier, the question of this being a money Bill. He raised that point in relation to the age being 17 years as against 16 years in earlier legislation. I presume he had only the Consolidated Statutes on hand. There has been a Bill passed since consolidation, No. 11, 1952, which raised the age from sixteen to seventeen years right across the board.

Now, to return to my point: There were 450 children last year taken off this list because they reached the age of 17 years and we anticipated maybe ten per cent of these might have to be kept on because we are expanding the cause of benefits. If ten per cent are kept on about \$2,700 a year will be spent.

With regard to foster children, there are only 314 allowances of that kind paid. With respect to that point, some ten or fifteen per cent, probably not more than ten or fifteen per cent all together of that 314

would be eligible under that amendment and the total would be less than one thousand dollars a year. Now, that leaves the matter of cost—now I wonder if the honourable member could just repeat the other questions?

MR. BROWNE: The other questions were, whether they applied to those in foster homes where children are placed, and are they kept there above the age of 17 years? Does this section apply to a woman who is regarded as a foster mother? Or as a guardian?

DR. POTTLE: That applies not to boarding homes where the Director has put them but to a family where the feminine head of the household is not the mother of the child necessarily, it may be the guardian of the child or it may be the aunt.

MR. BROWNE: Thank you.

Clause carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

First Readings:

Of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the address in reply going to be continued?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate is unfortunately absent as he was detained in court today, and was not therefore able to be present and make his speech. I believe he is the last member of the House who wishes to speak in the debate, in which case he will close the debate probably tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: If the Minister of Finance were here I was going to ask if he could give us any information as to when the estimates will be ready?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable colleague has just gone out of the Chamber for the moment. My understanding from him is that he hopes to bring down his budget, since it is our practice to bring the budget and estimates simultaneously to the House together with estimates within two or three weeks. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I am a little out of order, I fear I am, but I don't know how long the interim supply is for or how near we are to the exhaustion of that amount. Maybe we will have to ask the House for a little additional interim supply, depending on how long we have to go before the estimates and budget are ready. I have no doubt after the estimates are brought down it will be three or four weeks before they are adopted and the appropriation Bill passed for Royal Assent, and it would not be until Royal Assent was given that any further money would become available to the Government for carrying on, in which case it might become necessary in the meantime to apply to the House for some additional interim supply. But I don't know, because frankly I don't remember now the period for which it was asked and how much of that has

passed and how much time remains of that period. It seems to me at the moment to be a little doubtful that the appropriation Bill can be passed unless the members on the opposite side of the House don't intend to debate the budget. But I hope my honourable friends, in the interest of good, healthy debate on the estimates will give us a little interim supply if necessary, as the commitments of the Government must be carried out.

On motion: The House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 28th, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): I beg leave to table a petition re the Pentecostal Assembly and ask consent that this petition be referred to the Department concerned.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): I rise to give my unqualified support to the prayer of this petition. In Newfoundland, for a great many years, we have had in our school system what is generally known as the denominational idea or the denominational system. Before anyone in this building was born, that denominational system was introduced into Newfoundland—indeed, before anyone now living, I believe, in Newfoundland was born, the denominational system was introduced into the school system of this island. That is the system and inevitably, inexorably and undeniably the moment any denomination—cer-



taintly any Christian denomination (and possibly non-Christian)—but certainly any Christian denomination comes to have a considerable number of citizens adhering to it, believing in it, then that denomination, if there is any logic, if there is any democracy, is fully entitled, as of right, as of justice, fully entitled to the same rights precisely as in any other denomination.

Now in Newfoundland, I know of no priority of rights for any religious denomination. I think the principle and practice is to have equality of rights as between the religious denominations. There are people elsewhere who look askance at that principle which is exemplified here. I think that the practical experience of Newfoundland is that the best way to remove denominationalism and sectarianism from the field is to give all denominations their full rights. No more, or less—absolute equality before the law. I do not see how any Newfoundlander can argue against that. I have heard powerful arguments against the denominational system, as such, but given the system—once you have the system, you must be logical about it. You must be consistent about it. You cannot say, "We will pick and choose the denominations to whom we, as legislators, can give rights."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I come from a district where Pentecostal Assemblies are very largely represented. Indeed, in some sections they constitute the only religious denomination; and I have received from the District and neighbourhoods, many requests to support this petition

presented by the Honourable the Minister of Education.

I am sorry I did not know that this petition was coming up today, because I would have liked to have brought along the various telegrams and letters I received, asking my support; but if the facts are as alleged, then in simple justice to these people who signed the petition I have no alternative than to commend their petition to the Government, and I heartily support it.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition tabled by the Honourable Minister of Education. There are two or three comments I would make. First of all I feel it is long overdue. My views, as a matter of fact are a matter of record, because I believe I was the first, at least in our own denomination, to advocate that our Pentecostal friends should have representation on the board. I believe I said something about that in 1943 and that Pentecostal teachers should be employed, and the Superintendents of Education concurred with my views. As a result we did employ Pentecostal teachers. But that was only a fractional measure. I have always felt that there has been some injustice here in this situation. As the House knows, I have made a fairly detailed study of our education in Newfoundland, and I cannot find any similar case of discrimination. This matter of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, which has existed in the past in future I sincerely hope will be eliminated—for example, if I may recall to the House, it was in 1843 we first had a division in education, until then there was just two, Roman Catholic and Protestant and in 1874 after almost twenty years and prolonged debate here in this House,

sometimes almost violent, a straight denominational system was adopted. Now in order to implement that Act a census was taken and showed the population of Newfoundland divided denominationally into Roman Catholic 64,000 (rough figures), Church of England 69,000, Methodists 37,000 and Presbyterian 1,000 and Congregational 416. It is interesting to note, in spite of the very small proportion of Presbyterian and Congregational citizens their educational rights were recognized by this very House of Assembly. As a matter of fact they were given the right to create their own academy right here in St. John's, and it existed right down to comparatively modern times. Then again in 1892 this Legislature recognized the existence of the religious body, the Salvation Army, and its educational rights were granted by this House. So that, as the Premier has stated, we must be consistent. As far as the Pentecostal Assemblies are concerned I know of not better citizens in the province—and I happen to have in my own district several communities which are all Pentecostal, one on the Labrador to which I have already referred to in this House, also Happy Valley and Port Hope Simpson have large communities. But the educational work on the Labrador is suffering, as it does, I am sure, in certain other districts in Newfoundland because our Pentecostal friends do not enjoy educational rights and privileges. They have a tremendous amount of energy and interest—nobody can dispute that, which should be mobilized in the cause of education, yet partly because of technical difficulties that interest is not being made use of. I don't think I need to labour the point any more, Sir, except to say I give this my unqualified support.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the petition which has been presented to the House by my friend the Minister of Education, and supported by certain of my colleagues. From my several years of experience in the Department of Education, both as an executive officer and as Commissioner for Home Affairs and Education, I have some first-hand experience of how awkward it is and how inefficient it is for the denomination concerned not to have any direct representation in the department, and be recognized there for the distribution of educational funds by their own hands, especially when the denomination in question represents so large a proportion of our people as are in fact represented by the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland.

I do not wish to add indefinitely to the remarks already made except to say that in the district which I represent there is a very large concentration of Pentecostal Assemblies, particularly in the community of Victoria near Carbonear, where there is in fact one of the largest concentrations of that denomination outside of St. John's. They have petitioned me to endorse the petition on behalf of their denomination which might at any time be presented to this House, and that I gladly do, and I am expressing that support in the words which I have just spoken to the House.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my support to this petition presented by the Honourable Minister of Education. I would not have known just exactly what he wanted us to do had I not received a brief which apparently accompanied the petition just a few moments ago, and I merely had to glance at it to

give it my support, and I feel, Sir, the support of the whole Opposition. I want the House to bear with me for one minute while I read one or two paragraphs: "Our early contacts with schools in Newfoundland were vile and very distressing. Teachers were put out of schools because they no longer belonged to the denominations running the schools, members turned off boards of education for the same reason, and the same applies to-day where like situations arise, schools are closed, not because of lack of schools or school children but because Pentecostal children were involved. That means that for some years we had to supply our own teachers without help from the Department of Education."

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that is wrong. I am glad to pay a tribute to a departed friend of all of us here, a friend of Newfoundland, and of education. This statement says, Sir, the situation pertaining was worse until the late Mr. I. J. Samson, then Chief Executive Officer for Education cut across all red tape and set conventions and in the name of common sense and fair play permitted us to build with support at Windsor and later Salt Pond." Since I have seen that much, Sir, I have no hesitation in assisting these people to gain proper recognition from the Department of Education, particularly in view of the fact there are so many here. Of course it is quite obvious the Government can't set up separate boards of education for every small religious body that comes into the country, but I believe when they have grown to a certain size they must have some representation on the Board of Education. We on this side of the House, Sir, support this petition.

Incidentally, before I sit down, I might say, Sir, this is not politics at all, but we are very happy that we have in our West End District the Headquarters of this religious body, so I give an invitation to all the members of the Government to come along to service sometime. I am quite sure they would be glad to see us up there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already been there.

MR. B. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I would like to point out that in the District of Green Bay we have some fifteen Pentecostal Assemblies, that is you will find fifteen settlements in the district with branches of this Faith. I know something of their difficulties in trying to get their children into schools, and I also know about some of the work which they have done towards the building of the schools, rebuilding of old schools, yet without any say in the management of these schools.

Like the Honourable the Attorney General I have had a number of representations made to me from these settlements to support this petition, and I very gladly and wholeheartedly do so.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the previous speakers in supporting this petition on behalf of the various Assemblies in Humber District. We have several Assemblies there, one quite large one in Deer Lake. I, like the previous speakers, have had several requests in the form of letters etc. asking me for my support of this petition presented by the Honourable Minister of Education, and I go along with the pre-

vious speakers, and give this petition my full support. I would like also while I am on my feet, and knowing that the Honourable the Speaker cannot speak for himself, I would like on his behalf to support this petition for the various Assemblies in St. Barbe District. I know there are several Assemblies there, and I feel these people will be glad to know they have the support of their member. I gladly give the petition my full support.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing of substance to add to the discussion. I merely rise to indicate my support of the petition. Here we have a very serious matter referred to this House, a religious denomination in Newfoundland of a considerable congregation. Apparently from a matter of conscience with them now as citizens of this Province they have every right to approach their elected representatives on any issue, but when the representatives in this House are approached by those whom they do represent on a matter of conscience, then we must naturally give to it careful scrutiny and very mature and balanced consideration. Today the only action that the House can take is to refer the petition to the department concerned. When the department concerned moves to examine the prayer of the petition with a view to making recommendations to the Government, undoubtedly it will take note of the very serious considerations that the petition has had in this House. Of course the department concerned will also be obliged to look at the administrative implications of the prayer of the petition, and how the present denominational structure would be affected if the prayer of the petition were granted. However, the final say

in the matter will not rest with the department concerned, but will go back to the Government for consideration and those concerned may have every assurance when it comes back to the Government for decision it will have the consideration every elected Government must give to every matter of conscience referred to it by the people it is elected to represent.

MR. M. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise, Sir, to give my support to the petition brought before this House by the Honourable Minister of Education. I beg leave, Sir, to give my full support to this petition, due to the fact that I have in my district also Pentecostal Assemblies—at Sunnyside and Hants Harbour and New Chelsea. I give the petition my full support.

MR. I. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that this is a non-partisan issue, and I am very glad to see and to hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition supporting this petition. I too rise to support it. I feel it is non-partisan and provincial, because I also have received representations asking my support of this petition not only from my own district but from several other districts in the country. They are beyond doubt an established religious order in Newfoundland. Therefore there is absolutely no reason why they should not be represented in their educational efforts. I would presume, Sir, with all the support which has come from both sides of this House to the Honourable Minister of Education, that he will do his best to see that this denomination is given due recognition.

MR. G. JANES: Mr. Speaker, my thoughts, Sir, on denominational education in Newfoundland, I think, are

pretty well known to this House. In the meantime I am going to support this petition presented here today by the Honourable Minister of Education. I do so, Sir, on a matter of principle. I think the principle was set forth by the Honourable the Premier himself when he stated that as long as we did have denominational education in Newfoundland, every denomination in Newfoundland has a right to be represented. Today it is the Pentecostal Assemblies, of which we only have two in the District of Fogo, two small Assemblies. Tomorrow it will be the Jehovah Witnesses and the next day the Baptists and the next day it could be the Christian Scientists and probably some will gather in the name of Billy Sunday and ask here for schools, and this House of Assembly, Sir, would have no alternative but to hear the petition and give it serious consideration for that reason, and on a matter of principle. If we are to give denominations already here the right to operate schools I think we have no alternative other than to give that support and that right to every denomination which is prepared to bring in a petition here.

On motion petition tabled and referred to the department concerned.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Motion**

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Health, who I see happily is present—I thought he was still ill and in bed, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium."

I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

#### **Giving Notice of Question**

(69) MR. BROWNE (St. John's West)—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Who are the members of the Workmen's Compensation Board?
2. What was the date of their appointment, and what is the present salary of each?
3. What was the age of each member of the Board on his appointment?

(70) MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Give an itemized list of equipment and machinery shipped to Newfoundland by the German firm of MIAG, for the various new industries, including that shipped for the Cement Plant, and the Gypsum Plant, together with invoice values of said machinery and equipment.
2. What rate of insurance was charged on said machinery, and what was the amount of insurance premium on each shipment of machinery and/or equipment,

3. Name the Company or Companies who carried said insurance and also the persons or Companies to whom insurance was paid by the Government.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 66 :

MR. SMALLWOOD: (1) J. R. Smallwood; Hon. L. R. Curtis; Hon. E. S. Spencer; Hon. C. H. Ballam; Dr. Alfred Valdmánis; Managing Director Mr. Ernest Leja.

(2) No change has been made since that date except that Dr. Valdmánis ceased to be a director of the company or a member of the Board.

(3) I regret that I did not notice until now the fact that was asked, but the answer is that when he handed me his resignation in writing as Chairman of the Board of NALCO he included his resignation as a member of the Board of the Atlantic Gypsum, which was some five or six or eight weeks ago. If the honourable gentleman still wants the actual date I can get it for him.

(4) Gustof Carl Weis, and it is German, and of course the German "W" is pronounced "V" and Dr. Oswald Wyss, a Swiss. Dr. Wyss is a banker, Mr. R. Hanhardt of Switzerland. J. T. Hacker of Montreal of International Building Products of Montreal and Dr. Valdmánis.

(5) The Company informs me the answer is, no. I think perhaps the House will not have difficulty in realizing that certain events were quite recent and that whatever may follow it is a little early at the moment to expect anything to follow in that regard, if not impossible, the board could not have held a meeting. Two of the directors are in Switzerland, one in

Montreal, so that the Board cannot have had a meeting recently.

(6) Yes. Mr. Braun Wogan, Director of Hanning Electric, and Mr. Ludwig Grube, a director of the Superior Rubber Company. I don't know, Mr. Speaker, that I am called upon to answer a question such as this which might be any three or four names drawn at random. I don't know that I am required to give the answers. However, in view of the situation, and not creating any precedent, so long as it is understood clearly that the Opposition has not the right at any time it feels like it to pluck any five or eight or ten names out of a telephone directory or newspaper and fling them at the Government and say: "Will the Government tell us where these people are?" Provided it is understood in answering I create no precedent I am quite happy to give the information. Dr. Rothe is here in the City of St. John's. He arrived here this morning from Corner Brook. He went to Corner Brook some days ago from St. John's to attend to business connected with the cement plant and returned here today and will be here for some days, and then will go to Montreal.

Mr. Max Braum Wogan spent six or eight weeks in the General Hospital at St. John's suffering from a disease which some six or eight or nine doctors were not able to diagnose. He then flew to Germany, to Munich, and spent some two months in hospital where his disease was diagnosed and curative treatment was successfully given so that a few weeks ago he was released from the hospital and has since been convalescing in Switzerland, but is now at this moment en route to Holyrood to resume his duties. His health, I am glad to say, is virtually fully restored. Mr. Braun Wogan, I may say, was as close to death as a human be-



ing can very well come and not die. He went away to a mere shadow of himself. He is a big built man and he went away to a veritable skeleton, going for weeks and weeks on end without eating or drinking. However, I am glad to say he is restored virtually to full health.

Mr. Grube is due to arrive in St. John's the day after tomorrow. He is the owner of the Superior Rubber Company, and his knowledge of English is still limited. Mr. Braun Wogan, one of whose parents was English and whose father was a banker in London for a good many years, speaks perfect English, with hardly a trace of an accent. He is Mr. Grube's right-hand man. As soon as Mr. Braun Wogan is able to return to his duties Mr. Grube is coming out for a few days or a week to help to get the operation moving more swiftly at Holyrood than it has been during the absence of both these gentlemen.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, in this connection that some pretty foul and contemptible things are said and done in Newfoundland as elsewhere. And one of the foulest ones, one of the most contemptible ones is the rumour that has been circulated to which my honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's East, has referred in this House—Yes, a pretty contemptible thing, and I don't know if there is any defense against it.

I suppose we shall have to resign ourselves to it. But we will survive it. We will live through it. These industries will prosper in spite of it.

(7) Who is the President of the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust and who are the Directors of said Company?

The President is Mr. Paul Hagenback and Mr. Walter Buehler is a Director. I am not saying these are the only ones. They are the only ones of whom I have knowledge. I am inclined to doubt that there are others. I could not say that there are not.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to comment that the Chair has the right to delete improper questions or refer them back to the questioner. Question 6 already referred to was permitted to stand, although strictly speaking, the Chair has jurisdiction to rule against it. This question seemed analogous and it was up to the Minister concerned to answer it or not.

Question 67—In course of preparation.

Question No. 68—

MR. CURTIS: I wish to table a report of the Commission of Public Utilities. I may say I have at the office copies for every honourable member.

Question No. 64—In course of preparation.

Question No. 65—

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister is absent and will be absent until Saturday; I ask that the questions standing in his name be allowed to stand.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): I beg leave to table answer to Question No. 61, also Sections 1 and 8 of Question No. 24. Other sections of this question have been referred to the Department of Economic Development.

QUESTION NO. 61:

Annie Ryall.....	Botwood	June 22nd., 1953	1,827 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
Terra Nova Taverns Ltd.....	Deer Lake	June 22nd., 1953	1,322 "	"	" " "
Caribou Tavern.....	Deer Lake	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. W. Furey.....	Holyrood	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. H. Davis.....	Holyrood	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. M. Cahill.....	Placentia	June 22nd., 1953	507 "	"	" " "
A. Lundrigan.....	Colinet	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
E. M. Vail.....	St. Mary's	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Aiden Pearcey.....	Seal Cove	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Richard Parsons.....	Seal Cove	June 22nd., 1953	18 "	"	" " "
J. J. Hickey.....	Holyrood	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Wm. Crawley.....	Holyrood	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Andrew Noseworthy.....	Bay Roberts	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
L. R. Murrin.....	Spaniard's Bay	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. M. Geehan.....	Topsail	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Robert O'Toole.....	Conception Hr.	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. Rose Furey.....	Hr. Main	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. T. Kelly.....	Avondale	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
M. F. Doyle.....	Conception Hr.	June 22nd., 1953	13 "	"	" " "
Mrs. Grace M. Gill.....	Grand Falls	June 22nd., 1953	7,000 "	"	" " "
Clifford James.....	Brigus	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Con Aspell.....	Bay Roberts	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Mrs. M. Liddy.....	Torbay	June 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Gordon Greene.....	Bishop Falls	June 23rd., 1953	6,900 "	"	" " "
Gus Hynes.....	St. George's	June 25th., 1953	1,351 "	"	" " "
Andrew Butt.....	Northwest Brook	June 25th., 1953	185 "	"	" " "
Chesley C. Mercer.....	Sunnyside	June 25th., 1953	149 "	"	" " "

W. & S. Mercer.....	Sunnyside	June 25th., 1953	223 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
Summit Restaurant.....	Buchans	June 25th., 1953	2,212 "	"	" " "
Fred N. Clarke.....	Stephenville	June 25th., 1953	3,328 "	"	" " "
E. Billard.....	Stephenville	June 25th., 1953	2,255 "	"	" " "
Howard House.....	Port Saunders	June 25th., 1953	1,031 "	"	" " "
W. F. Butt.....	Bonne Bay	June 25th., 1953	545 "	"	" " "
Jensen's Limited.....	Hr. Breton	June 25th., 1953	1,617 "	"	" " "
Robert Gillard.....	Englee	June 25th., 1953	470 "	"	" " "
Frank Pike.....	Port aux Basques	June 25th., 1953	2,133 "	"	" " "
Geo. H. Guy.....	Arnold's Cove	June 25th., 1953	105 "	"	" " "
Anthony Power.....	Chapel Arm	June 25th., 1953	389 "	"	" " "
Alfred Farrell.....	St. Lawrence	June 25th., 1953	900 "	"	" " "
Lawrence Mitchell.....	Norris Point	June 25th., 1953	1,043 "	"	" " "
Garland Snow.....	Hampden	June 25th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
Fred Drover.....	Bonavista	June 25th., 1953	2,450 "	"	" " "
Battiste Wholesale.....	Channel	June 25th., 1953	2,809 "	"	" " "
A. L. Gillies.....	Codroy	June 25th., 1953	3,471 "	"	" " "
W. Brockway.....	Benoit's Cove	June 25th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
Harry George.....	Brittania	June 25th., 1953	66 "	"	" " "
Frank Smith.....	Benoit's Cove	June 25th., 1953	1,103 "	"	" " "
John Bishop.....	Cavendish	June 25th., 1953	899 "	"	" " "
Walter Dicks.....	Bell Island	June 25th., 1953	142 "	"	" " "
Allan Farrell.....	St. Lawrence	June 25th., 1953	1,125 "	"	" " "
E. V. Royal Stores.....	Buchans	June 25th., 1953	289 "	"	" " "
Joseph Dohey.....	St. Bride's	June 25th., 1953	786 "	"	" " "
Lakeside Bottling Co.....	Channel	June 25th., 1953	2,839 "	"	" " "
Donald Cuff.....	Bonavista	June 25th., 1953	4,490 "	"	" " "
A. B. Cranford.....	New Hr., T.B.	June 25th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
Silas Turner.....	Happy Adventure	June 25th., 1953	716 "	"	" " "

Walter W. Ginn	Howley	June 25th., 1953	594 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
S. J. Whyte	Southeast Bight	June 25th., 1953	510 "	"	" " "
Wilson Rideout	Swift Current	June 25th., 1953	2,092 "	"	" " "
Mrs. C. M. McFatridge	Stephenville X-ing	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
J. M. Ash	Hr. Grace	June 26th., 1953	191 "	"	" " "
Amos L. Payne	Parsons Pond	June 26th., 1953	230 "	"	" " "
Martin Penney	Cox's Cove	June 26th., 1953	678 "	"	" " "
James Collins	Chamberlains	June 25th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
John Manning	Hr. Buffett	June 26th., 1953	180 "	"	" " "
G. N. Banfield	Bay L'Argent	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
John Duffett	Clarenville	June 26th., 1953	3,983 "	"	" " "
Rufus Baker	Bonavista	June 26th., 1953	1,786 "	"	" " "
G. Alyward	St. Lawrence	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
E. Baker	Elliston	June 26th., 1953	533 "	"	" " "
Stanley Baker	Newman's Cove	June 26th., 1953	86 "	"	" " "
Mrs. L. M. Barnes	Hr. Mille	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
J. E. Billard	Port aux Choix	June 26th., 1953	517 "	"	" " "
B. Boland	Stephenville	June 26th., 1953	5,367 "	"	" " "
John Brown	Little Paradise	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
C. Brut	Conche	June 26th., 1953	136 "	"	" " "
H. D. Beck	Swift Current	June 26th., 1953	324 "	"	" " "
Max Crocker	Trout River	June 26th., 1953	75 "	"	" " "
P. Dobbin	Port Saunders	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
St. Fintan's	St. Fintan's	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
John Fleming	Port Union	June 26th., 1953	937 "	"	" " "
Lorenzo Gillard	Englee	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
W. Hennessey	Fox Hr.	June 26th., 1953	120 "	"	" " "
Donald Hillier	Hare Bay	June 26th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
Simeon Johnson	Little Catalina	June 27th., 1953	NIL	"	" " "

Leo Wall	Shoe Cove	June 27th., 1953	1,089	c/s	Unknown	\$6.80	per case
Lockyer, L.	Lethbridge	June 27th., 1953	60	"	"	"	" "
E. Legge	Howley	June 27th., 1953	221	"	"	"	" "
Joseph Matterface	Boat Hr.	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
Lester L. McCarthy	Marystown	June 27th., 1953	100	"	"	"	" "
Daniel McCarthy	Bellevue	June 27th., 1953	292	"	"	"	" "
James Matterface	Baine Hr.	June 27th., 1953	670	"	"	"	" "
Mid-West Buying Club	McKay's	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
A. McIsaac	South Branch	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
E. J. Bartlett	Buchans	June 27th., 1953	239	"	"	"	" "
R. G. Budgell	Baie Verte	June 27th., 1953	1,548	"	"	"	" "
L. Cameron	Shoe Cove	June 27th., 1953	332	"	"	"	" "
Edmund Chaffey	Musgravetown	June 26th., 1953	135	"	"	"	" "
F. Perry	Hawk's Bay	June 27th., 1953	588	"	"	"	" "
N. Toms	LaScie	June 27th., 1953	138	"	"	"	" "
John Upshall	Kingwell	June 27th., 1953	372	"	"	"	" "
Gus Payne	Cow Head	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
A. Quinton	Princeton	June 27th., 1953	325	"	"	"	" "
George Rideout	Wiltondale	June 27th., 1953	115	"	"	"	" "
F. G. Stanley	Clareville	June 27th., 1953	5	"	"	"	" "
W. T. Vater's	French's Cove	June 27th., 1953	295	"	"	"	" "
Reginald Webb	Burgeo	June 27th., 1953	200	"	"	"	" "
A. Woodman	Hampden	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
W. White	Gallants	June 27th., 1953	830	"	"	"	" "
Murdock White	Benoit's Cove	June 27th., 1953	NIL				
George Ruth	Sunnyside	June 27th., 1953	1,072	"	"	"	" "
Chesley Pittman	Hr. Deep	June 27th., 1953	218	"	"	"	" "
Ford Elms	Griquet	June 27th., 1953	320	"	"	"	" "
Arch Taylor	Raleigh	June 27th., 1953	217	"	"	"	" "

Harvey Freake.....	Boyd's Cove	June 29th., 1953	50 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
James Wicks.....	Benton	June 29th., 1953	NIL		
M. T. Croke.....	St. Brendans	June 29th., 1953	268 "	"	" " "
J. Humphries.....	Middle Brook	June 29th., 1953	417 "	"	" " "
Frank R. Carter.....	Greenspond	June 29th., 1953	25 "	"	" " "
Theodore Keats.....	Benton	June 29th., 1953	735 "	"	" " "
H. R. Bursey.....	Gander Bay	June 29th., 1953	NIL		
Carl Johnson.....	Trouty	June 29th., 1953	307 "	"	" " "
Samuel Russell.....	Port Union	June 29th., 1953	1,169 "	"	" " "
Victor Rowe.....	Seldom	June 29th., 1953	22 "	"	" " "
Andrew Murphy.....	Plate Cove East	June 29th., 1953	827 "	"	" " "
Randell Hobbs.....	Keels	June 29th., 1953	233 "	"	" " "
Frank Monks.....	King's Cove	June 29th., 1953	351 "	"	" " "
John E. Humby.....	Summerville	June 29th., 1953	763 "	"	" " "
G. W. Parmiter.....	Point Leamington	June 29th., 1953	814 "	"	" " "
Absalom Janes.....	Little Bay	June 29th., 1953	483 "	"	" " "
Donald Wheeler.....	Springdale	June 29th., 1953	1,730 "	"	" " "
W. J. Pittman.....	Pilley's Island	June 30th., 1953	379 "	"	" " "
Melvin Brett.....	Lewisporte	June 30th., 1953	1,947 "	"	" " "
W. G. Morgan.....	Springdale	June 30th., 1953	NIL		
N. Callahan.....	Badger	June 30th., 1953	1,022 "	"	" " "
Roland C. Richards.....	Glenwood	June 30th., 1953	736 "	"	" " "
John Heath.....	South Brook	June 30th., 1953	882 "	"	" " "
C. E. Snow.....	Millertown Jct.	June 30th., 1953	NIL		
J. A. Monroe.....	Glenwood	June 30th., 1953	340 "	"	" " "
Lloyd Foster.....	Badger	June 30th., 1953	587 "	"	" " "
Mrs. A. Potter.....	Lewisporte	June 30th., 1953	1,925 "	"	" " "
E. W. Hewlett.....	South Brook	June 30th., 1953	NIL		
E. V. Royal Stores.....	Millertown	June 30th., 1953	149 "	"	" " "



M. Britchett .....	Gambo	June 30th., 1953	370 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
M. Hutchings .....	Bell Island	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
J. Brennan .....	Stephenville X-ing	July 3rd., 1953	489 "	"	" " "
Arthur LeDrew .....	Rattling Brook	July 3rd., 1953	165 "	"	" " "
P. J. Brennan .....	Stephenville X-ing	July 3rd., 1953	957 "	"	" " "
Adams & Sons .....	King's Point	July 3rd., 1953	46 "	"	" " "
Harold Pitcher .....	Burgoyne's Cove	July 3rd., 1953	93 "	"	" " "
Westcoast Supply Store .....	Stephenville X-ing	July 3rd., 1953	15,610 "	"	" " "
Robert McCarthy .....	Wood's Island	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
Patrick Brennan .....	Marystown	July 3rd., 1953	300 "	"	" " "
Willis Ayres .....	Fortune	July 3rd., 1953	709 "	"	" " "
Russell Blanchard .....	McIver's Cove	July 3rd., 1953	315 "	"	" " "
James D. Barker .....	Openhall	July 3rd., 1953	277 "	"	" " "
Gilbert Cake .....	Lamaline East	July 3rd., 1953	100 "	"	" " "
Durnford & Sons .....	Rencontre West	July 3rd., 1953	313 "	"	" " "
Nicholas Ford .....	Upper Amherst Cove	July 3rd., 1953	NIL	"	" " "
Ronald Foote .....	Burgeo	July 3rd., 1953	309 "	"	" " "
Walter Hounsell .....	Jackson's Arm	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
Rupert Morris .....	Trinity	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
Absalom Matthews .....	Jamestown	July 3rd., 1953	50 "	"	" " "
Joseph Normore .....	Horwood	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
John Matthews .....	Musgravetown	July 3rd., 1953	123 "	"	" " "
Fred Olford .....	Lethbridge	July 3rd., 1953	188 "	"	" " "
Levi C. Pardy .....	Hr. Mille	July 3rd., 1953	278 "	"	" " "
John C. Quinton .....	Redcliff	July 3rd., 1953	387 "	"	" " "
Max Rex .....	Port Rexton	July 3rd., 1953	998 "	"	" " "
Len Quinton .....	Redcliff	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		
Harry Slaney .....	Bay Bulls	July 3rd., 1953	1,701 "	"	" " "
Walter Strickland .....	Newman's Cove	July 3rd., 1953	NIL		

Roy Tucker.....	Elliston	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
S. G. Tilley.....	Robinson's	July 3rd., 1953	339	c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case		
George Watkins.....	Summerford	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
Kenneth Mills.....	Plate Cove East	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
Simeon Penney.....	Port Union	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
J. Piercey.....	Port Rexton	July 3rd., 1953	47	"	"	"	"	"
Vincent Ricketts.....	Knight's Cove	July 3rd., 1953	236	"	"	"	"	"
Ben Tippet.....	Little Catalina	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
Cyril White.....	Elliston	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
C. Brinston.....	Arnold's Cove	July 3rd., 1953	160	"	"	"	"	"
Adam's & Sons.....	Round Hr.	July 3rd., 1953	NIL					
Claude Parsons.....	Musgravetown	July 3rd., 1953	271	"	"	"	"	"
Mrs. Norman Warren.....	Burin	July 3rd., 1953	2,941	"	"	"	"	"
Clifford Shirley & Sons.....	English Hr. West	July 3rd., 1953	445	"	"	"	"	"
S. Hannaford.....	Goulds	July 4th., 1953	NIL					
Peter Keough.....	Plate Cove	July 4th., 1953	NIL					
Chas Messervey.....	Barachois Brook	July 4th., 1953	402	"	"	"	"	"
S. Williams.....	Petty Harbour	July 4th., 1953	NIL					
Don Fagan.....	Freshwater	July 4th., 1953	2,762	"	"	"	"	"
J. S. Kearley.....	Rencontre East	July 4th., 1953	300	"	"	"	"	"
Woolfrey & Moore.....	Notre Dame Jctn.	July 6th., 1953	NIL					
William Kelly.....	Sweet Bay	July 7th., 1953	254	"	"	"	"	"
Elias Major.....	Norris Point	July 7th., 1953	416	"	"	"	"	"
H. R. Senior.....	Flat Island	July 7th., 1953	182	"	"	"	"	"
Mercer & Greene.....	Clarendville	July 7th., 1953	2,830	"	"	"	"	"
William Willis.....	Dover	July 9th., 1953	190	"	"	"	"	"
Mrs. Margaret Curran.....	Gambo	July 9th., 1953	936	"	"	"	"	"
John H. Abbott.....	Doting Cove	July 9th., 1953	254	"	"	"	"	"
John Saunders.....	Shearstown	July 14th., 1953	3,775	"	"	"	"	"

Mac Saunders	Bay Roberts	July 14th., 1953	11,800	"	"	"	"	"
Daniel Boulos	Deer Lake	July 14th., 1953	1,575	"	"	"	"	"
Charles Cormier	Steady Brook	July 14th., 1953	8,304	"	"	"	"	"
Philip Murphy	Long Hr.	Aug. 13th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Mrs. R. Blackwood	Steady Brook	Aug. 14th., 1953	715	"	"	"	"	"
James Aiden Keough	Ferryland	Aug. 17th., 1953	2,199	"	"	"	"	"
C. A. Mews	Pasadena	Aug. 17th., 1953	870	"	"	"	"	"
A. Taylor	Cormack	Aug. 17th., 1953	324	"	"	"	"	"
George Lawrence	Bay L'Argent	Aug. 18th., 1953	1,182	"	"	"	"	"
Mrs. Mary Fewer	Avondale	Aug. 18th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Stanley Clarke	Flat Bay	Aug. 20th., 1953	100	"	"	"	"	"
James Swyer	Black Duck	Aug. 20th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Eugene Doucette	Black Duck	Aug. 20th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Jerry Chaffey	St. David's	Aug. 20th., 1953	336	"	"	"	"	"
Joseph Perrier	St. Teresa's	Aug. 20th., 1953	659	"	"	"	"	"
Paul Gale	South Branch	Aug. 20th., 1953	1,018	"	"	"	"	"
George White	St. George's	Aug. 20th., 1953	688	"	"	"	"	"
Steadman Crocker	Trout River	Aug. 20th., 1953	150	"	"	"	"	"
Goodyear Humber Stores Ltd.	Gander	Sept. 1st., 1953	70	"	"	"	"	"
Harold Feder	Stephenville	Sept. 3rd., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
M. Boland & Sons	Stephenville	Sept. 3rd., 1953	2,640	"	"	"	"	"
Nehemiah Andrews	New Perlican	Sept. 5th., 1953	126	"	"	"	"	"
Hubert Day	South Dildo	Sept. 5th., 1953	195	"	"	"	"	"
John Ward	Leading Ticks	Sept. 5th., 1953	117	"	"	"	"	"
Martin Wiseman	Fortune Harbour	Sept. 5th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Gerald Bouzanne	Little Bay	Sept. 5th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Baird Manuel	Lewisporte	Sept. 5th., 1953	NIL	"	"	"	"	"
Tobias Haley	Port Blandford	Sept. 5th., 1953	138	"	"	"	"	"
Caleb Brinton	Thornlea	Sept. 5th., 1953	50	"	"	"	"	"

G. W. Hewitt	Joe Batt's Arm	Sept. 5th., 1953	NIL				
David Andrews	Ship Cove	Sept. 5th., 1953	304 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case		
Cyril St. George	Heart's Desire	Sept. 5th., 1953	NIL				
Richard Tucker	Elliston	Sept. 5th., 1953	16 "	"	" "	"	"
R. J. Maloney	Buchan's Junction	Sept. 5th., 1953	50 "	"	" "	"	"
Eli Cutler	Trinity, B.B.	Sept. 9th., 1953	45 "	"	" "	"	"
Lionel Glover	Bragg's Island	Sept. 11th., 1953	236 "	"	" "	"	"
Simon Ricks	Sops Island East	Sept. 11th., 1953	36 "	"	" "	"	"
Charles Pynn	Raleigh	Sept. 11th., 1953	NIL				
Andrew Fortune	Jeffrey's	Sept. 11th., 1953	192 "	"	" "	"	"
Nathaniel Cassel	Hr. Deep	Sept. 11th., 1953	NIL				
Roland Reid	Roddickton	Sept. 11th., 1953	NIL				
Danny Joseph	Deer Lake	July 14th., 1953	650 "	"	" "	"	"
H. P. & H. Granter	Safe Hr.	July 15th., 1953	494 "	"	" "	"	"
Michael Walsh	Knight's Cove	July 15th., 1953	455 "	"	" "	"	"
John Wyse	Southern Hr.	July 15th., 1953	56 "	"	" "	"	"
Mrs. Bride Corbett	Otterbury	July 20th., 1953	1,070 "	"	" "	"	"
John Brenton	Little Bay	July 20th., 1953	NIL				
Wm. Barrow	Greenspond	July 20th., 1953	250 "	"	" "	"	"
Bond Beverages	Grand Falls	July 22nd., 1953	21,429 "	"	" "	"	"
Lawrence Jackman	Grand Falls	July 22nd., 1953	1,380 "	"	" "	"	"
Grand Falls Co-op	Grand Falls	July 27th., 1953	1,889 "	"	" "	"	"
John Lush	Gander	July 27th., 1953	1,307 "	"	" "	"	"
James Way	Musgrave Hr.	July 27th., 1953	239 "	"	" "	"	"
Joseph Delahunty	Calver	July 27th., 1953	1,370 "	"	" "	"	"
Lloyd Snow	Bell Island	July 27th., 1953	12,768 "	"	" "	"	"
Granvil Hunt	Bell Island	July 27th., 1953	1,995 "	"	" "	"	"
Veteran's Inn	Torbay	July 30th., 1953	NIL				
J. I. Basha	Norris Arm	July 30th., 1953	374 "	"	" "	"	"

Bert White.....	Norris Arm	July 30th., 1953	642	c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
Arch Freeman.....	Norris Arm	July 30th., 1953	377	"	"	" " "
Cyril Drake.....	Garnish	Aug. 4th., 1953	465	"	"	" " "
Frank Power.....	Gander	Aug. 7th., 1953	NIL			
Edward Fahey.....	Bellevue, T.B.	Aug. 7th., 1953	226	"	"	" " "
Silas F. Dyke.....	Eastport	Aug. 7th., 1953	59	"	"	" " "
Francis Johnson.....	Quirpon	Aug. 7th., 1953	NIL			
Lethbridge Cash Store.....	Lethbridge	Aug. 7th., 1953	NIL			
Boyd Pretty.....	Dildo, T.B.	Aug. 7th., 1953	155	"	"	" " "
A. A. George.....	New Harbour	Aug. 7th., 1953	115	"	"	" " "
Morgan Simmons.....	Greens Hr.	Aug. 7th., 1953	5	"	"	" " "
John Cumby.....	Heart's Content	Aug. 7th., 1953	523	"	"	" " "
W. H. Drover.....	Whiteway	Aug. 7th., 1953	13	"	"	" " "
Veteran Sales Co.....	Deer Lake	Aug. 11th., 1953	12,814	"	"	" " "
Marshall Barbour.....	Bloomfield	Aug. 12th., 1953	NIL			
Lloyd Hounsell.....	Pound Cove	Aug. 12th., 1953	435	"	"	" " "
Bown & Co.....	Badger's Quay	Aug. 12th., 1953	664	"	"	" " "
Ralph W. Combden.....	Jackson's Arm	Aug. 13th., 1953	40	"	"	" " "
Robert S. Reid.....	Heart's Delight	Aug. 13th., 1953	10	"	"	" " "
Harold England.....	Springdale	Aug. 13th., 1953	1,250	"	"	" " "
Alex Lockyer.....	Woody Island	Aug. 13th., 1953	1,096	"	"	" " "
Harry Bishop.....	Bay Roberts	Oct. 1st., 1953	687	"	"	" " "
Harry Slaney.....	Bay Bulls	Oct. 1st., 1953	NIL			
Guy Jones.....	Chamberlains	Oct. 1st., 1953	NIL			
Kevin O'Keefe.....	Barachois	Oct. 8th., 1953	NIL			
Garrett Norman.....	Red Island	Oct. 8th., 1953	259	"	"	" " "
J. D. & H. Chippett.....	Cape Ray	Nov. 5th., 1953	100	"	"	" " "
M. J. Boland & Co.....	Stephenville	Nov. 9th., 1953	NIL			
Douglas Regular.....	Hampden	Nov. 27th., 1953	43	"	"	" " "

Raymond Ward.....	Dunville	Nov. 15th., 1953	125 c/s	Unknown	\$6.80 per case
Walter H. Darrigan.....	Lark Hr.	March 31st., 1953	NIL		
Beaton Wellon.....	Deer Lake	March 31st., 1953	NIL		
O. H. Pike.....	St. Fintan's	March 31st., 1953	NIL		
James A. Flynn.....	Petite Forte	March 23rd., 1953	NIL		
Walter G. Reid.....	Dildo	March 22nd., 1953	NIL		
J. R. Rodway.....	Baine Hr.	March 22nd., 1953	NIL		
Arch Manuel.....	South Brook	March 19th., 1953	NIL		
Arch McLellan.....	O'Regan's	March 19th., 1953	NIL		
P. J. Connolly.....	Howley	March 19th., 1953	NIL		
Gerald Peddle.....	Tilton	March 15th., 1953	NIL		
Kevin Power.....	Dunville	Feb. 26th., 1953	NIL		



## QUESTION 49:

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

COPY

Hamilton — Ontario

OUR ORDER NO. 4573      DATE June 22, 1951      INVOICE NO. 21215

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Shaw's Street

SHIPPED TO Same.

St. John's, Newfoundland

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 Only Yates A-23 Hardwood Flooring Matcher

D.M.D. 2/60/220 ..... 28,600.00

1 Only Yates F-23 Feeder ..... 2,390.00

1 Only Yates #137 Grinder 3/60/220 ..... 1,010.00

32,000.00

Less down payment of \$15,000.00 ..... 15,000.00

17,000.00

Insurance—Trip-Transit Policy ..... 96.00

\$17,0096.00

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. April 2, 1951      INVOICE NO. 21218

OUR ORDER NO. E 19153 MNV Bo-1      DATE June 22, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

SHIPPED TO Same.

St. John's, Newfoundland

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 only Starter for E-1 Conveyors. CR 1062, 1200 RPM ..... \$17.13

VIA : CAR WITH A-23.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. April 2, 1951      INVOICE NO. 21219

OUR ORDER NO. E 19154 Bo-1 MNV      DATE June 22, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

SHIPPED TO Same.

St. John's, Newfoundland

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

12 only 6 dia x 6" Face x 1-11/16" Bore, Canadian

pressed stat pulleys ..... 86.40

12 only P2—127 R—1-11/16" Link Belt Pillow Blocks

12 only P2—127-1-11/16" Link Belt Pillow Blocks ..... 235.00

12 only #1531—1-15/16" Angle Pillow Blocks ..... 158.40

\$480.00

VIA : CAR WITH A-23.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. April 2, 1951 INVOICE NO. 21220  
OUR ORDER NO. E 19155 MNV DATE June 22, 1951  
SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same.  
St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
12 only 1-15/16 Safety Collars ..... \$18.48  
VIA: CNR WITH A-23.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. May 14, 1951 INVOICE NO. 21221  
OUR ORDER NO. E-19568 MNV DATE June 22, 1951  
SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same.  
St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
4 only 35 lb. pails Yamco Hudralube ..... 33.00  
2 only 25 lb. pails Yamco Gearlube ..... 16.50  
1 only 5 gal. can Yamco Translube ..... 17.50  
..... \$67.00  
Plus 10% Sales Tax ..... 6.70  
..... \$73.70

VIA: CNR WITH A-23

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. Jan. 9, 1951 INVOICE NO. 21222  
OUR ORDER NO. E 19608 DATE June 22, 1951  
SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same.  
St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
1 only 108" Cyclone Collector with Spiral ..... 1,535.00  
1 only 12" 2 Way Shavings Valve ..... 119.00  
1 only 48" Cyclone Collector with Spiral ..... 302.00  
2 only Barber Wire Tying Machines ..... 670.00  
1 only A-1" Bushing ..... No charge  
..... \$2,626.00

VIA: CNR WITH A-23

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
Hamilton — Ontario

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same.  
St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

YOUR ORDER NO. June 14, 1951 per REStackhouse INVOICE NO. 21223

OUR ORDER NO. E-19855 MNV DATE June 22, 1951

1 only Magnetic Switch P.B. in Cover for 30 HP, 3 ph	
60 cy. 220 Volts, 1800 RPM	122.65
2 only Magnetic Switch P.B. in Cover for 10HP, 3 ph,	
60 cy. 220 Volts, 1800 RPM	138.70
2 only 4 x 14'-0" (Tape Measure)—combination Belts	
for splicing on machine with Cement	115.20
1 only 4" wide x 23' 8" combination belt with lap	
for Splicing on machine	94.72
2 only 3" x 8'-7" Endless Combination Belts	55.20
	<hr/> \$526.47

VIA: CNR WITH A-23

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

St. John's, Newfoundland

SHIPPED TO Same.

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

OUR ORDER NO. 4573 DATE May 23, 1951 INVOICE NO. 20920

1 Pr. Yates E-1 End Matchers DMD 60/3/220	19,100.00
1 Yates G-50 Rip Saw MD 60/3/220	7,880.00
4 Yates G171 Knot Saws 2 LH, 2 RH, 3/60/220 3 HP	1,360.00
1 Yates G-11 Lightning Cut Off Saw	770.00
Cut Off Bar Gravity Swings and Table	600.00
1 Yates Century Grinder 60/3/220—32"	1,425.00
1 Only Tally Meter #5	98.00
1 Only Model A 1 H.P. 60/1/110 Blower	165.00
1 Only 270 Balance	150.00

---

31,548.00Insurance—Trip-Transit Policy 

---

94.64

---

**31,642.62**

---

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

March 8, 1951

INVOICE NO. 20930

OUR ORDER NO. E 19302 RHS

May 31, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

St. John's, Newfoundland

SHIPPED TO Same.

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 only 8" Collar Gate	9.50
1 only Saw Dust Pan for V-54 L.H.—per list	147.50

---

157.50

---

VIA: CNR

## COPY

## THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

January 9, 1951

INVOICE NO. 20932

OUR ORDER NO. E 19608 RHS

DATE May 31, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

SHIPPED TO Same.

St. John's, Newfoundland

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 only 26 XE Mill Exhauster .....	}	\$2,050.00
1 only 30 H.P. Motor and Base, 60/3/550/1750 RPM .....		
1 only "V" Belt Drive .....		
2 only 11 XE Mill Exhauster each complete with 10 H.P., 60/3/550/1750 RPM Motor and Base and "V" Belt Drive.....		1,488.00
900 ft. only 11" dia Pipe made up of 320—3' lengths .....		988.00
		<hr/>
		\$4,526.00

VIA: CNR.

## COPY

## THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

Your Order No. April 2, 1951

INVOICE NO. 20933

OUR ORDER NO. E 19153 MNV

DATE May 31, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

SHIPPED TO Same.

St. John's, Newfoundland

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

2 only Shafts 1-15/16" CR x 24"—3" of 1/2" KW each end and 12" in middle .....	30.70
75 ft. only 6" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt—4 ply .....	54.90
547 ft. only 6" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt—4 ply .....	360.36
5 only #3 Am. Red—Drives .....	1,287.50
2 only 4.4 PD, 3 Groove A Section Sheaves .....	16.02
2 only 18" PD, 3 Groove A Section Sheaves .....	53.28
5 only 3 HP, 1800 RPM, 3/60/220 Protected Type Motor and Base .....	630.00
5 only Starters, 2510 W 5, Square D.....	89.25
3 only 4.4" PD, 2 gr. A Section Sheaves .....	21.06
3 only 15" PD, 2 gr. A Section Sheaves .....	51.30
	<hr/>
	\$2,594.37

VIA: CNR.

## COPY

## THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. April 2, 1951

INVOICE NO. 20935

OUR ORDER NO. E 19154 MNV      DATE: May 31, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Topsail Road

St. John's, Newfoundland

SHIPPED TO Same.

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 only #2 Am. Red Drive, no motor	257.50
1 only #4 R Am. Red Drive with overload Release	392.43
1 only 4" PD, 4 groove A Section Sheave	9.81
1 only 19" PD, 4 groove A Section Sheave	32.31
1 only 5 HP, 3/60/220 x 1800 Motor, Protected Type with Base	149.00
1 only 2510 W 5 Square D Starter	17.85
16 only A-80 Vee Belts	28.48
270 ft. only 12" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt, 12" wide 4 ply	353.97
175 ft. only 9" wide Goodyear Klingtite Belt, 12" wide 4 ply	181.65
2 pcs. only 1-15/16" Ground Shafting x 14' Keywayed 1/2	134.10
2 pcs only 1-15/16" Ground Shafting x 14'—Plain	49.20
	<u>\$1,606.30</u>

VIA: CNR.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

OUR ORDER NO. 4573.      DATE October 10, 1951.      INVOICE NO. 22361

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,

Shaw's Street

St. John's, Newfoundland

SHIPPED TO Same, Topsail Road.

TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading

1 only Yates Type #177 Double Surfacers 30" x 14"	
M.D. 60/3/220	12,100.00
Extra for 6K Cylinders	210.00
Parts to use M-22	65.00
Top Outfeed Sectional Roll	380.00
1 only M-22 Cylinder Grinder, 90/1/110	265.00
Cash with order	5,176.00
Insurance—Trip-Transit Policy	39.06
	13,020.00
	7,844.00
	<u>\$7,883.06</u>

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED

Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. 1053-4-5

INVOICE NO. 22363

OUR ORDER NO. E-20743 B6-1 MNV.      DATE: October 10, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
 Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same: Dawe's Siding, Nfld.  
 St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
 2 only Desinond-Sherman Dressers #2 ..... 9.50  
 4 doz. only #2 Cutters for Dresser ..... 45.00  
 \$54.50

VIA: CNR—with #177 Surfacr.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
 Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. 1052 INVOICE NO. 22364  
 OUR ORDER NO. E 20757 MNV. DATE: October 10, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
 Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same: Dawe's Siding, Nfld.  
 St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
 1 only No. 207 Left Hand Belt Drive Band Saw  
 Cummer and Sharpener ..... 846.00  
 3 only PU 1502 x Saw Gumming Wheels ..... 16.65  
 \$862.65

VIA: CNR—With #177 Syrfacer.

COPY

THE P. B. YATES MACHINE COMPANY LIMITED  
 Hamilton — Ontario

YOUR ORDER NO. 1048 INVOICE NO. 22367  
 OUR ORDER NO. E 20485 MNV. DATE: October 10, 1951

SOLD TO Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.,  
 Topsail Road SHIPPED TO Same: Dawe's Siding Nfld.  
 St. John's, Newfoundland TERMS Sight Draft/Bill of Lading  
 4 only PS 273 Cut Off Saws ..... 44.68  
 4 only PS 107 Cut Off Saws ..... 36.68  
 6 only PS 274 Circular Rip Saws ..... 70.20  
 1 only 84" Left Hand Cyclone with Spiral ..... 616.00  
 \$767.56

VIA: CNR—with #177 Surfacr.

COPY

CHESTER DAWE LIMITED  
 St. John's, Newfoundland

DATE: Sept. 30th, 1951.

CREDIT TO Messrs. Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd.  
 St. John's.

Paid to P. B. Yates Machine Co.	\$	847.92
" " " " "		392.13
" " " " "		250.73
" " " " "		392.13
		<u>\$1,882.91</u>



## QUESTION NO. 24 :

- (1) To Government by Canadian Machinery Holding Trust—\$200,000.  
To North Star Cement by Canadian Machinery Holding Trust—No information in our records.
- (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) & (7). These should be directed to the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development.
- (8) (a) \$97,000. With reference to this amount, the relevant Clauses of the Indenture and Agreement read as follows :

(Indenture) —“ . . . the Mortgagor will :

1. Insure and keep insured against loss by fire to their full value with a reputable fire insurance company those parts of the plant hereby mortgaged which might be endangered by fire and to make the loss thereunder payable to the Mortgagor and to produce upon demand the receipts for all premiums payable in respect thereof; it is hereby agreed that the buildings themselves need not be insured under this covenant except the office building, the laboratory and the garage.”

(Agreement) —“9. The Company will insure those parts of the plant which are liable to loss by fire to their full insurable value and will pay the premiums therefore and make the loss payable to the Government or as it may direct.”

Attention is drawn to the fact that the plant is completely constructed of concrete and steel.

(b) Bowring Brothers Limited.

(c) Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In reply to another question directed to me by the honourable member for St. John's East—the member who is not a lawyer and who is momentarily absent from the Chamber; it is No. 55 on the Order Paper of Tuesday, April 20th. It took a little while to get it from the Department of Finance. I received it this forenoon. The question is: “What is the number of trips made by the Premier since April 1st, 1952? When were these trips made and how long did they last? Give the names of the places visited, the purpose for which each such trip was undertaken, and the cost of each trip?”

I am assuming this refers only to

trips made outside the Province. The number of trips made is 18, from April 1, 1952 to date. In May, 1952, I visited Montreal and elsewhere—(20 days); in July—New York and Washington—(16 days)—and I may add, Ottawa and Montreal. In August, same year, I visited Europe—a half-dozen countries—(62 days)—November, same year—visited Europe—(23 days); in December visited New York—(4 days). And so the number of trips in 1952 was five. In 1953 the number of trips is 11—4 trips to Ottawa; one to Halifax; one to London for the Coronation and back via Toronto (36 days); 5 trips to New York. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the costs are also shown here.

When Made	Duration	Places	Cost
1952	Days	Visited	
21 May	20	Montreal	\$670.30
4 July	16	New York, Washington	517.50
10 August	62	Europe	2,690.90
13 November	23	Europe	1,132.70
15 December	4	New York	272.80
<b>1953</b>			
1 January	3	New York	247.80
16 January	4	New York, Chicago, Ottawa	381.65
30 January	2	Ottawa	236.75
12 March	6	Ottawa	331.60
29 April	2	Ottawa	281.60
13 May	2	Ottawa	231.60
17 May	2	Halifax	70.56
21 May	36	London and Toronto	2,616.83

This includes the expenses of my wife who accompanied me—our steamship passage to and her steamship passage back, and my passage back here.

When Made	Duration	Places	Cost
1952	Days	Visited	
28 August	12	New York	672.80
23 October	12	New York, Montreal, Ottawa	517.84
22 December		New York	372.80
<b>1954</b>			
11 March		Ottawa	306.60

I might explain that the amount involved depends on the length of time. On the whole of this travelling, since I have been in office, I have travelled nearly one-quarter million miles, and I am out of pocket on my own expenses, at least \$3,000.00. The Treasury has paid for travelling, \$3,000 less than it cost me; the rest came out of my salary. That is the case of any Minister and indeed with any civil servant. I am out of pocket a very considerable amount.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives) Tabled answer to No. 58.

**Question**—What experiments were made in each year since 1949 with various types of fishing vessels owned or leased by the Newfoundland Government or jointly with the Federal Government?

**Answer**—1949-50—No Experimental fishing.

1950-51 — Government contracted with the firm of Huggins Ltd. for the carrying out of exploratory herring fishery for a two month period. The costs of chartering the vessel and purchase of herring nets amounted to \$7,593.

1951-52—Government chartered two Labrador vessels, the "Ruby L. M. Smith," and the "Hubert G. Smith" for the purpose of converting them for long lining and Danish seining.

The *Matthew II* was also operated as an experimental multi-purpose fishing vessel. Her operations included exploratory fishing and demonstrations in long lining and Danish seining. This vessel also served as a training ship for fishermen interested in gaining experience in the aforementioned methods of fishing.

1952-53—The *Matthew* was chartered to a private commercial fishing company who, in addition to operating the vessel commercially, undertook to carry out exploratory fishing with Government undertaking to guarantee 60 per centum of the net loss on the entire operation. Government was not called upon to implement its guarantee.

1953-54—No experimental fishing was carried out.

**Question**—Give the cost of purchase or hire of each boat with the value of returns if any.

**Answer**—No vessels were purchased for experimental fishing. The cost of construction and equipment of the "*Matthew II*" was \$36,683. The costs of chartering the "*Hubert G. Smith*" and the "*Ruby L. M. Smith*" were \$3,500 and \$1,750 respectively.

It is not in the public interest that the details of the returns from experimental fishing be made public, as such information might be construed as being the actual returns from commercial operations of these vessels which would convey an entirely erroneous impression of the practicability of commercial operation with such vessels and methods of fishing.

**Question**—How many long liners have been used and what was the cost of each and what was the value of the returns of each?

**Answer**—Three vessels were used: The "*Matthew II*," and the "*Hubert G. Smith*" and the "*Ruby L. M. Smith*." The cost of the "*Matthew II*" was \$36,683 fully equipped. The costs of the "*Hubert G. Smith*" and the "*Ruby L. M. Smith*" are unknown. Government operated these vessels under charter. As stated in the reply to the question immediately above the disclosure of returns from the operation of these vessels is not in the public interest for the reasons stated.

**MR. BROWNE**: On Wednesday, April 7, I tabled a question asking the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House all bills, invoices, receipts, vouchers and payrolls concerning (a) the construction and (b) the equipment of the plant for the manufacture of hardwood products at Donovan's (Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.) The Honourable Minister promised to bring it down and then discovered the bills were not up-to-date. I understood these bills and vouchers were available at the Department of Finance but they were not. At least, I attended at the Minister of Finance's office and the clerk on hand produced the bills that were there. As a matter of fact, there were a small number of bills there—there was a balance of \$2,800,000 not shown. Some of the documents were just stubs of cheques without any voucher or authority to show for them. These bills or vouchers must be in the Department somewhere and I wonder if the Honourable Minister would make enquiries?

**MR. SMALLWOOD**: In connection with the matter mentioned by my honourable and learned friend, I am very sorry to have to say that this forenoon I received a most unpleasant report from the Department of Finance

regarding the visit of my honourable and learned friend to the Department last night. I had informed my honourable and learned friend that he would be welcome to go to the Department and to examine the microfilms of the records they had there in connection with his question regarding the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. Just what they had there I do not know. The Department of Economic Development has no accounting system. We operate through other Departments as far as accounting is concerned. I am informed that my honourable and learned friend, accompanied by the Leader of the Opposition went to the Department of Finance. Whether the honourable and learned member was there first and the Leader turned up later, I do not know; but at any rate they both turned up at the Department, accompanied by a stranger who is not a member of this House. No invitation was ever extended to the honourable gentleman to bring along strangers or non-members to look at the records in the Department of Finance; and no intention exists for the Government to extend any such invitation. But, our honourable friends, without invitation, brought with them a stranger, a member of the general public, who sat in and began to examine the documents. The clerk who was left there to show them what was there, was, at the time, manipulating a microfilm machine—an outfit that shows each form on a long film which magnifies on a screen—and the clerk had occasion to leave the room to go to another room and as he was about to leave the room, so he says, the honourable and learned gentleman began to manipulate the machine which contained the film that contained the microfilm records. Just what it did have in there or what it had to do with

the matter, I do not know or care. I do know that the honourable gentleman took over the operation of the machine and he began to view records that had no bearing either good, bad, or indifferent on the Newfoundland Hardwoods; and that clerk in question expostulated with the honourable gentleman and asked him to desist. He refused to do so, whereupon the clerk dismantled the machine so that the honourable and learned gentleman could no longer manipulate it and he further refused to leave the room to bring in any further material. I have the report that the clerk refused to leave the room because the honourable and learned gentleman insisted upon operating the machine; he persisted in examining records which had no bearing on the matter which he was invited to see. I take a very serious view of this. We have positively nothing to hide. What is done is done by due process of the law; but we will not have members bringing strangers up there—members on either side—and still less non-members taking charge of government records. Before anything further is done, I will look into that.

MR. BROWNE: I am replying to the statement made by the Honourable the Premier about my bringing in a stranger. I felt, as I wanted to see thousands of bills in connection with the question which I tabled here, I should bring along someone familiar with accounting and I asked permission of one of the members of the Department to do so.

MR. SMATJWOOD: Was it a responsible official?

MR. BROWNE: You can find that out. You can put it before a Standing Committee. The honourable gentleman will do me the honour of accepting my statement as being correct.

The Premier stated that the clerk informed him that when he, the clerk, left the room—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said "when about to leave the room."

MR. BROWNE: I said to the clerk, "How do you work this machine?" and at the same time I put my hand on the lever. I told him he was a very good clerk to be able to do it; and very properly so. It was curiosity that prompted me to turn the lever; the machine was going so fast I could not see anything and although the light was on, I did not see a thing. I saw absolutely nothing other than vouchers to which I have referred. What I am interested in is seeing copies of these bills and vouchers in the amount of \$3,000,000. They are not there. The Premier says they are not in the Economic Development Department. Where are they?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman does not know how many are in the Finance Department. I am informed that the clerk wanted to leave the room to bring in more material. I am further informed today by the Comptroller of the Treasury that the bulk of the material is in possession of the Auditor General. I am Minister of Economic Development. I do not lug around tens of thousands of records. They are not kept in the custody of my Department. They are where they belong. They are in the possession of the Auditor General and I will not consent to have these removed. The Auditor General was requested by me to make an audit of the affairs of the building of the plant and the costs of it and all the vouchers were turned over to him. I will not consent to have them removed; I will, however, extend an invitation to the honour-

able gentleman to go to the office and if the Auditor General will arrange, after office hours, I will order them laid open to the whole of the Opposition; and, in office hours, if the Auditor General is agreeable, also after office hours; but not to strangers. If the honourable gentleman thinks there is any graft, any robbery or embezzlement, the thing to do is to move that a Royal Commission be set up.

I have sufficient confidence in the honesty with which this thing was done to believe there is to be no need of a Royal Commission. When I think there is need of a Royal Commission I will see there is a Royal Commission. When I see the need of an R.C.M.P. Investigation, I get the R.C.M.P.

MR. BROWNE: And when you don't see?

MR. SMALLWOOD: When I don't see—I am the Leader of the Administration until the people fire me out.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have been brought into these unpleasant statements made relative to the honourable member for St. John's West and myself.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable gentleman proceeds let me say this—The honourable and learned member for St. John's West asked a question in reply to which the honourable the Premier made a certain statement. The House in turn listened to the explanation of the honourable member for St. John's West; and it is my opinion the House is satisfied with what has been offered by the honourable the Premier and the explanation offered by the honourable member for St. John's West. Therefore, there is no point of debate

before the Chair. I merely say that for the guidance of the honourable members of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I then rise to a point of privilege on the statement just made by the Honourable the Premier, since my name, as Leader of the Opposition, was brought into it. Now, how contemptible the Honourable the Premier wishes to show the Opposition in the eyes of the public, I don't know. The statement which was made by the Honourable the Premier would tend to show that the honourable member for St. John's West and myself are contemptible curs.

Sir, I arrived at that place last night, and shall never go there again, and shall not accept the invitation of the Honourable the Premier to see these accounts for myself. I arrived there at about a quarter to eight o'clock and my honourable friend was there and persons to assist him were already there, as also a clerk, and I say this also, I thought he was a most reliable officer. He produced a handful of cheque vouchers. We examined them. We were only given, Sir, the vouchers showing purchases from Chester Dawe Limited. We were told they were not available and he said he thought they would be up at the Auditor General's Department. Then this clerk took the honourable member and myself and the other person out to the other room to show us his machine and what was in it. He said he had something in these machines and I stood up while he was opening this machine, and I said what was that—I did not have my glasses at the time. I asked him to wait just a minute while I put on my glasses, and I saw "D. Jamieson." He turned it off quickly and I did not get a chance to see anything else, and

I for one don't want to see—that is the true story. If anybody told any story differently he is a contemptible cur and liar. Neither the honourable member nor myself would attempt to do the thing described there this evening, and I deplore very much that the Honourable the Premier had to get up and say such a thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said this incident was reported to me by the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance and what the clerk reported to the Deputy Minister of Finance was what I reported to the House, what Mr. Channing told me, the clerk reported to him. He passed it on to me and I passed it on to the House.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it, Mr. Speaker, that is not sufficient evidence to damn an honourable member of this House. I deplore very much that the Leader of the Government should stoop to such a thing, and I throw it back in his teeth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order:

Adjourned debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to move at the opening of this House that a committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The debate ensued and a large number of this House, both from the Opposition and Government side, took part. I have now, Sir, the honour to close that debate. In doing so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to enter into the debate myself. I sincerely hope, Sir, that I do not too seriously offend certain reporters of the daily press who have complained that it was monotonous and repetitious to hear so many members of the Government side of the House speaking on the debate. I can only



say this, Sir, that it is not my intention to be very long. At the same time you cannot blame the members on the Government side of the House for so few people on the Opposition you will have to go back to 1951 and blame the people of the country for electing so few of them.

In entering this debate I cannot, even with the fear in my mind of being called boring and reptitious, do other than refer again to the very opening day of this House. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all will agree that the opening session of this honourable House in the past and I sincerely hope in the future it will continue to be a rather solemn, dignified and even friendly occasion, an unpartisan occasion, an occasion when the only people in the House outside of the members of the Government and the members of the Opposition; the only people admitted to the House are by invitation. First of all these invitations are to members of Church and State and after that to perhaps wives and relatives and friends of the members on both sides of the House. That, too, Sir, has long been recognized and practised. It is an occasion when there is no debate. This time, at the opening of this session, I had the honour to move the address in reply, or that a committee be appointed to draft the address in reply. My honourable colleague, the member for Burgeo and LaPoile, had the honour to second the motion. There were only two other speakers following upon the seconding of the motion, the honourable Leader of the Opposition who makes a brief comment on the Speech from the Throne, and, as usual, congratulates the mover and seconder. Following that the Premier, or Leader of the Government speaks. Now at that time nobody can make or challenge any statement made

by any person nor reply to any challenge, yet, sir, that was the very time when the honourable Leader of the Opposition chose to throw a sling shot at me. He said, after very politely congratulating me on moving the address in reply, "I wonder when I was introducing the honourable and learned member for St. John's West to this House of Assembly (which he had done just prior to my moving the address in reply) I wonder what the honourable member for the District of Port de Grave thought when I brought him in here on the other side of the House?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the dignity accorded this House I could not get up to reply, I could not answer that question, and I have never had an opportunity to answer that question until now. Having had Church and State dignitaries here crowding this House, and wives and relatives and friends—Surely this House knew, at the time when the honourable Leader of the Opposition made that crack, that in 1949 I was associated in politics with the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. So the crack was made but goes unanswered. The government did not know at that time that I could not answer it. At that time I did not want to disturb the dignity of the House, as apparently the honourable leader of the Opposition wished to do. I waited until now to answer.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that remark is quite right. If the honourable member will forgive me, I take it the honourable member just said that the honourable leader of the Opposition wished to disturb the dignity of the House.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I said "Apparently."

MR. SPEAKER: I think that might be better phrased.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I could rephrase it. It was so miserably low, in my opinion, that I do not know how to rephrase it, and I have thought it over considerably since.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the honourable gentleman's question: I thought the same thing of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West when the honourable leader of the Opposition brought him in here and introduced him to this House at the opening of the House, I thought the same then as I did in 1949.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the honourable member allow me? I believe, Sir, what I said was, I wonder how the honourable member for Port de Grave felt when he saw me bring in my honourable friend. If I am allowed an explanation, I was referring to the fact the honourable member for Port de Grave had acted as a solicitor for the person whom I had brought in—That was the purpose of my remark at that time.

MR. MERCER: I know nothing about that, Mr. Speaker—whom I defended, there was nothing about that. That may have been the intention behind the honourable member's remark.

MR. HOLLETT: I tell you it was.

MR. MERCER: I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, I thought exactly the same thing about the present honourable and learned member for St. John's West at the opening of this session

when he was introduced here as I did in 1949. And I said publicly in 1949 that I thought he was a good man, when I introduced him as a member for the riding of St. John's West, at his first public appearance as a "Tory" candidate in the C.L.B. Armoury. I said then that I thought he was a good man, that I thought he was the right man. I still think he is a good man, as a matter of fact. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the "Tories" can possibly get any better man.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear! A good man.

MR. MERCER: Now as to what I might think of him as a Liberal Member of Parliament, that may be altogether different. We have a very high standard over here on the Liberal side. Mr. Speaker, I only just made it to get in myself, barely did it. The honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition, also mentioned that he wondered what I thought was the purpose behind the remark, as to what I thought of the honourable and learned member for St. John's West coming into this House on the Opposition side while I was sitting on the Liberal side. What I thought of it was that since 1949 —

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I wondered how you felt.

MR. MERCER: Well, it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Leader of the Opposition is not a lawyer. A lawyer acts for many, many people that he may not prefer to act for. In fact it makes strange bedfellows. You know there are people to-day acting for people who would not be inclined to be too friendly a few months ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well said.

MR. HOLLETT: Not members of this House.

MR. MERCER: I am not mentioning any names. I merely point out, Mr. Speaker, it is possible for you to be acting for people that you may not be associated with otherwise at a later date or even at the time you are acting for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many members on the Government side have spoken in this debate, and despite certain reporters, I am very, very glad to see so many members speak on this debate because this has been one of the most important debates on a Speech from the Throne and I am glad to see so many interested in speaking in the debate. And I was very sorry to see that one of the few who could not, and I am very sorry that he personally is not here at the present time, Mr. Speaker—the honourable Speaker himself who has not because of his position in this House been able to speak to the debate. But I am sure, Sir, and I believe the Opposition will endorse this; that although he is in such a position in this House that he is unable to speak on behalf of his district—I am sure the Opposition will endorse me when I say, we sincerely hope, in fact we know, that the Government will not pay any less attention to his district as compared with other districts on that account.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. MERCER: Now, Sir, another thing strikes me in this debate, and that is the attitude of the Opposition. There was, and I say this without any fear of contradiction, there was just a continual flow of criticism against all and sundry of any policy of the Government or anything we have done. That attitude was even carried outside this House by an honourable

member of the Opposition. In fact I was very much surprised to hear last Saturday night on one of the "Tory" Radio Broadcasts—Oh yes! I have listened for the last three Saturday nights —

MR. HOLLETT: Where is the "Tory" one? Let us know.

MR. MERCER: To hear the honourable and learned member for St. John's East speaking very augustly on the radio. I am very sorry he is not present. There is nothing I would like better than to have him interject when I say this—He said to the people of Newfoundland—"All during the debate on the Speech from the Throne many, many members of the Government have spoken and with each speech they criticized the Opposition for not having a policy". And he said, (and I can really see him now at the radio)—"Ladies and Gentlemen, now you must realize that it is not the duty or purpose of an opposition to have a policy." He said: "That is the duty of the Government to have a policy. The Opposition is not supposed to have it. The only obligation the Opposition has is to criticize whatever the Government does, criticize the Government."

Now, sir, the same honourable member has been in this House exactly the same length of time as I have. And during that time at least I have learned this much: that I can see that the duty of the Opposition is first of all, certainly, to have a policy. Because they would not be able to be in the House at all unless they were elected, and they could not have been elected without some sort of a policy. Apparently the Opposition considers they have no policy, never had a policy and it is not their responsibility to have one.

Secondly, in addition to having a policy, some kind of a policy, something to ask the people to vote for, in addition to that then, I think, that they should not, as the honourable and learned gentleman put it, condemn the Government, but constructively criticize the Government's policy, and offer any suggestions they think may be a help to the administration of that policy. But when you listen in to the various speeches which have been made by all members of the Opposition, if you just ask yourself this question: What have these contributed to the debate? What have they contributed? I say, Mr. Speaker, the answer is absolutely nothing. In my view they have made a number of statements, they have for example, made such a statement as this (and I am going to read them because I took them down as they were said), "We should never have gone into Confederation with Canada." "It was a fraud to the public."

Now it was in 1949 that we went into Confederation with Canada, and in 1954 the Opposition are saying it was a fraud on the public, and we should never have done it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask a question—What is the benefit to this country, supposing it is true that we should never have gone into Confederation, even if it were true that it was a fraud, what benefit did it do to be alone in 1945. Five years later for the Opposition to make that statement? What benefit is it to the fishermen, the miners, the trappers, the agriculturists, what benefit is it to Water Street or to anybody?

MR. HOLLETT: What did you say in 1949?

MR. MERCER: The same thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In 1949 not in 1954.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MERCER: I am not disputing it at this time. Another statement, "The last election to this House in 1951 was a fraud," and, "this Government has wasted forty million dollars."

Now, Sir, if this election were a fraud, then about eighty per cent of the people of this country are dopes, yes, are stun dopes, are stupid, are foolish, because eighty per cent of the people voted for this Government. I think I said that last year in my address to this House of Assembly, the Opposition wastes the time of this House by repeating that this Government has wasted forty million dollars. Again I regret that I have to repeat what I said last year in this House, and that was: If we wasted the forty million dollars we either did not tell the people we were going to spend the money or if we did not we defrauded them, and if we did they are dopes, fools, stupid morons, because they voted for it. But again I am sorry that I have to take up the time of this House in repeating to the Opposition what I said to them last year, and what I said to the people of Port de Grave district in November 1951, and that is this: "The Premier has called an election. The time is not up for an election, but he called one. He is introducing some industries and is going to introduce some more, going to take all the money we have, and perhaps more, you will not have one cent of the forty millions left. In the course of the next four years you will probably have to borrow money. Now if you want to vote for that vote Liberal and if you don't vote Tory." That is all I said. But when the voters turned out, and the votes were counted in Port de Grave district it was eighty per cent for the Liberal

candidate. Now, could you tell the people any more plainly than that? Was that a fraud? Yet, Mr. Speaker, although the Opposition knows that very well they have kept on repeating that. Why? I say, Mr. Speaker, because they know of nothing better to say.

Now, they go on to make another statement of theirs: "The Government has done nothing for the fisheries." Now, Mr. Speaker, I have thought that during the past two years this Government has done a considerable amount for the fisheries.. There was nothing very tangible, nothing that you could shout about, done with regard to the salt fish industry, until last fall when the Government had to help subsidize the thing, and then later get it back from the Federal Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not subsidize.

MR. MERCER: Well make sure they would not get a price less than they got the year before. But one big thing was done for the salt fish industry, and with this, Mr. Speaker, I believe every fisherman in this country will agree. The only thing that could be done and the best thing that was ever done was done by this Government when they said we cannot and shall not rush into this thing overnight. Now we know that for four hundred years every Government has been making mistakes, and the fisheries have not improved—instead the fisheries have gone down. Even during the seventeen years of Commission of Government, an unselective body that could pursue its own ends, ways and means and do as it wished without being accountable to the people, and supposed to be experts, it was not able to do anything bene-

ficial for the salt fish industry. So then the Government, realizing this, said that we feel that we are not supermen, therefore we will appoint a commission to find out what we should do. "If that commission has to take a year or two years we will wait to get that report." I think that was the best thing that was ever done for the salt fishermen of this country. But then, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that—and I really had to laugh on many occasions in this House during the past week or two, to hear we have never done anything for the fisheries. I was quite surprised to hear that statement because I did not hear, until the past three or four or five years I have not heard of a fresh fish industry going on at Gaultois, with a lot of local capital involved where last year these fishermen received a million dollars returns for the fish. I had information from business people in Gaultois to me directly only in the past few weeks where they had operated fishing boats and bankers for the past fifty years, and this year unless that fresh fishing industry had started they would have had to go out of business, and they at one time had forty bankers. The Government supplied a loan to the Gaultois Fisheries Limited with the help of private capital to get them going. Had the Government not supplied that loan that would have never been there. In addition to a million dollars coming in now to the people of Gaultois and the near vicinity, had the Government not done that there would be no fishery there at all, but the Government would have to supply dole as there was no other industry there. All this was in just one place. I have heard the Opposition criticize and ask questions about how this money was loaned to the Northeastern

Fish Industries Ltd? How much was loaned to the Northlantic Fisheries Limited? How much was loaned to the Bonavista Cold Storage? How much was loaned to Fishery Products Limited, etc?

How much is it costing to put fresh fish plants into places like Trepassey, Harbour Grace and St. John's; and up on the West Coast and at Grand Bank and at Fortune? It seems to me that the Government has done a considerable lot for the fishermen, because had not the money been advanced to those private industries, had not loans been made during this period, we would not have had fresh fish plants.

Another statement offered by the Opposition was made with the imputation that members of this Government were all liquor vendors. I think the public realizes that this is a lot of nonsense. In fact the Premier challenged the Leader of the Opposition when he made the statement that we were interested in beer parlours. But it means very little benefit to the fisheries or any other industry to say that the members are beer vendors. It will never help to make the new industries succeed. Nevertheless the implication was there that all members of the Government are in the liquor business and that that is how we make a living. The public does not believe it and I am not interested in answering it, but it does go to show that the Opposition apparently has nothing else to talk about.

Another statement of the Opposition—(I am just summarizing the whole seven or eight or nine hours' debate)—was that the Director of Tourist Development was allowed by the Premier to speak publicly for the Liberals in the last Federal election in

1952. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is nothing very up-lifting mentally and nothing very helpful to the programme of economic development in this statement.

MR. BROWNE: May I make a correction? I said officials of this House were taking part in the campaign; other officials were working publicly in that campaign.

MR. MERCER: Well, I suppose the Director of Tourism is in the same boat as the others. I have not gone into the matter, but, supposing there is some law against it—I know of none; even supposing there is a gentleman's agreement to that effect—

MR. BROWNE: Supposing there is a tradition.

MR. MERCER: Supposing there is a tradition then, that they should not have come out and they have done so, can we say in the first instance that these two or three or four people defeated the honourable gentleman? If so, I should be glad to have them in my campaign in the next election.

MR. HOLLETT: You will need them.

MR. SPEAKER: Conversation seems to be going back and forth across the House too much.

MR. MERCER: As I was saying, supposing there is a tradition as the honourable member says and supposing they did help to defeat the same honourable gentleman, what benefit, what help can it be to the House of Assembly in a debate on the policy of economic development proposed by this Government? What help can it be to anyone to talk about it in the debate on the Speech from the Throne?



MR. BROWNE: Even the Premier has spoken of the high regard he had for the traditions of the House. That is one tradition—that civil servants must not take any part in politics.

MR. MERCER: Another statement made was that Mr. Power who was a civil servant was allowed to resign from the Department of Justice and run as an opponent of his.

MR. BROWNE: He was forced, not allowed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Trash!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. MERCER: I was wondering if the Government could be accused of allowing Mr. Power to win the election.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition remarked, a moment ago, that I would need someone to work with me in the next election. I have no doubt that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is thinking, perhaps, about a report made by a certain reporter that one person told him he was in my office to see me about getting a job. I asked him his name; how old he was; how many children he had and I told him I would try and get him a job. He waited for a couple of months and came back. This person said that I had forgotten all about it and asked him the same questions again. That report was made by a paid reporter from Bay Roberts, to the Daily News.

MR. HOLLETT: I rise to a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sit down!

MR. HOLLETT: I state that I made no reference whatever to the statement the honourable member is

making. I never referred to it and I demand that it be withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that, rather than rise to a point of order, the honourable member should ask the other honourable member to correct it or allow him to put it right.

MR. MERCER: The point I want to get across is that he said I would require help in the next election; and I am now giving the House what a paid reporter gave the Daily News. But out of four thousand voters there was only one disgruntled Tory, apparently; and that was the only one a paid reporter could dig up. That same reporter is now secretary for the C.C.F.

I have to say, to the credit of the Opposition that they did—at least the honourable gentleman from St. John's West did mention a couple of interesting topics. For example, I am sure the honourable gentleman said that there should be paved roads in St. John's and on the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. BROWNE: I said Grand Falls and Corner Brook, too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The original statement was "all highroads out of St. John's."

MR. MERCER: Even that, I must not agree with, because it is almost impossible to have all paved roads. I wish he had said a great deal more about the roads on the Avalon Peninsula. I sincerely hope the Opposition will back me up in what I have to say about roads. I realize that in talking of roads on the Avalon Peninsula I may not have everyone agreeing with me—not even the Premier who represents a district off the Avalon Peninsula—but I do say that the roads, generally speaking, on the Ava-

lon Peninsula, during the last five years, and maybe for many years preceding, generally speaking, the roads on the Avalon Peninsula, particularly sections where there are link roads connecting the settlements to the main highway, have been sorely neglected. Now I do not blame this Government for all of that. This Government has been doing a considerable amount of road work in places where road work had been neglected for the past fifty years; they have done road work in places where it had never been attended to before, and after all, there are eighteen districts off the Avalon Peninsula and those eighteen districts certainly helped to elect the Government. You could not blame the Government for saying that it has nothing to do with political patronage. Some of those people say "we cannot get from here to the hospital; if a breeze comes up, we cannot take to the dory. You have roads in St. John's but we cannot get roads." We could not blame the Government for saying "we will give them roads from here to there. It will help the country." Therefore, I agree with the Government policy. I agree that some people on the north east, north west and south west coasts have not got nearly enough roads. They are still entitled to more and more and this Government is entitled to give them more and more. At the same time, some sections which have not been getting much attention for twenty-five years will get, I believe, during this year, some attention.

And, speaking of roads on the Avalon Peninsula, the district of Port de Grave has more mileage of semi-highways and secondary roads than any other district in the country. For example, we have a road from Spaniards Bay to Tilton, a branch of which

goes to New Harbour, Trinity Bay; there is a road from Shearstown running through my district and up to Clarkes Beach; there is a road from Bay Roberts to Shearstown and towards Hodgewater; there is Hoyles-town Road going into North River; and again into the farming district, you have Coley's Point Road and Port de Grave Road running through the centre of Port de Grave; you have Cupids Road; you have Brigus Road, connecting with the main highway; you have South River Road; you have Roache's Line and others. Now all these roads run from six, seven and eight to fifteen and twenty miles in length and every one of these roads supports the people of the district. Take for example, last year, 1953, the blueberry industry in Newfoundland brought assistance to Newfoundlanders in the sum of one million dollars. One million dollars was earned by the Newfoundland people in the blueberry industry and that does not include the profit made by the exporter—the people who invested the capital? The berry-pickers, the truckmen, the loaders and the handlers earned one million dollars, and eighty per cent of that was earned in Conception Bay.

Now you can imagine that those roads built many years ago, built in those districts were built not because of politics but because of the localities in which people lived—our fishing districts and farming districts, but when the roads were built many years ago, they were built for the horse and cart. Nothing was done with the roads since the horse and cart days to provide for the heavy trucks transporting over those roads the products of the fishing and the farming of those settlements. In order to provide for the heavy trucks transporting over those roads the pro-

ducts of the fishing and the farming of those settlements, in order to provide for the heavy traffic, those roads need to be widened and ditched and graded.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Government would be well justified, this year, in spending large sums of money upon ditching, and widening the roads to take care of the traffic, not only for the industries over there now, but for the other industries when they come.

Another question asked by the Opposition—and I, for one, wished they had said more about it—was the Tourist Industry. They asked what happened to the Tourist Industry which was proposed by the Minister of Economic Development in 1949. And again I sincerely hope the Opposition will endorse me in what I have to say. The tourist industry can be one of our very largest industries. We have in Newfoundland what I would call, from my own experience of the salmon fishing, and from my reading of sports magazines about the United States and Canada, we have one of the finest places on the North American Continent for salmon fishing, with the exception perhaps of British Columbia and places north which are inaccessible at least financially inaccessible to the great majority of anglers. We have the finest moose hunting grounds on the North American Continent, again with the sole exception of far Northern Canada which is physically inaccessible to people at the present time. We have the finest caribou hunting grounds in North America, again with the exception of Northern Alaska and Northern Alberta which again are largely inaccessible.

Now, having sports fishing and the two biggest game animals in North America, is there any wonder that I say we can make this country a very large tourist resort, and make a very large industry and earn a very large income from the tourist industry? Then apart from fishing and caribou and moose hunting, I don't think any one will disagree that as far as the camera addict and the artist is concerned we have as good scenery for them to paint or "shoot" as anywhere else in North America.

Therefore I submit that this Government should be prepared to spend large sums of money on the tourist industry, because we cannot earn these dollars from the tourist industry unless the Government is prepared to spend money on serving the various tourists, on nursing these things along and on even spending money to help private enterprise to provide accommodations for tourists. Mind you, it requires money and a lot of money, but I do feel, and I suggest to the Government that they should be prepared to undertake it because I know that in a very short time it could become one of our biggest income earners.

The other subject I wish to speak of at this time is the fisheries. I do not know, Sir, of any person in this House who has a keener interest in the fisheries than I have. I was born and brought up in a fishing settlement where they did not use any cod traps—it was all cod nets. These nets were hauled out of 120 fathoms of water. That, Mr. Speaker, is 720 feet. I have often for two or three summers hauled 180 fathoms of cod nets from a depth of 720 feet. It is not light work—you gall your hands, you get what a fisherman calls salt water

welps. That fishery has been carried on for the past three or four hundred years, absolute slavery, and at the end absolute starvation. You can well realize, therefore, Sir, why I should say I don't think there is any person in this House on either side for that matter who has a keener interest in the fisheries than I have. That is why I am so glad to see the Government, as soon as they received that report spoken of in the Speech from the Throne, as soon as they had read that and as soon as the Government had their caucus with the Federal Government they were prepared and are now about to put something into force to see what can be done. I feel, Sir, that maybe drastic actions are required. Maybe we shall have to go out of the salt cod fishery all together. Because we have heard reports which go back to 1932, I believe, when experimental stations for drying codfish artificially were begun at Bay Bulls. It was burned down but I think by that time they were quite satisfied they could not make a success of it. Now it has been started over again since, and maybe we will be able to do it. But we do know this much, Sir, the salt fishery is a very precarious industry at its best. We do know that there are only certain markets to which we can export it. We do know that those markets are never terrifically rich, rather most of them are genuinely poor, but they have their ups and downs, and the prices have their ups and downs. We do know that fishermen must be dependent upon whether the fish are there this year or not. They may be plentiful this year and scarce next year. They are dependent on temperature, and tide, etc., and if they get the fish they have to depend on the sun to dry it, and might get a good week this week and it might be

fine or raining for the rest of the season. We do know that if they get the fish and have good weather to make it the markets may be down. There are so many things, so many influences at work upon the salt codfishery, much more than upon any other industry I have ever heard or read about. If the Government or the Governments to come within the next ten years can solve the problem they will be doing a terrific job. In the meantime I sincerely hope that this Government will, while on the programme for the fishery development, concentrate to a great extent in addition to the salt codfishery on the expansion of the fresh fish industry. Because I personally believe that if we could get a limitless market for fresh codfish that is where our fortune lies.

Now, Sir, to conclude, may I say that I consider it the duty of this House—and when I say the duty of this House—I mean the combined Opposition and the Government—it is their duty to serve the public both present and future generations, to serve and help to lay the foundation of services for future generations. In addition to our current plans we have to plan more and better schools, more and better hospitals, help to service and build more and better roads, more and better industries, develop the fishing industry. We have to do all these things as a service for many generations to come—in addition to servicing our present generation. Sir, this, I believe, is something which has not been brought up in this House, and which I am bringing up entirely on my own. I do not think that this generation should have to pay for services which we now supply and plan for future generations to come. If we have to build in our day the Trans Canada Highway, if we have to

widen all those roads and finish them and resurface them, and build them up from forty years ago to modern day usage not only in Port de Grave District but all over the country. If we have to spend some millions of money on a fishing industry to try and bring it up to modern usage, to see whether or not it can support the people and be a factor in our economy, if we have to supply better schools, more and better hospitals and service these, Sir, and supply more and better public services, then I say this Government, and I suggest it to this Government, and sincerely hope I shall be endorsed by the Opposition—this Government should do it in such a way, Sir, that future generations will pay their equal share with us. That, Mr. Speaker, can be done only one way, and that is by the Government of the day getting loans on the security of the province. There is absolutely no reason in the world why we should try to build up services for future generations for which we now pay and they now pay. Future generations will be only glad to pay for them, but they can only pay by the present generation getting the loans on the security of the province, and doing the work and doing it well. It is a great privilege, Mr. Speaker, to me to close this debate.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has now concluded the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I shall now put the question—

Moved and seconded the report of the select committee appointed to draw up an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne be adopted.

Motion adopted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I shall inform the House of the date of the presenta-

tion to His Honourable the Lieutenant Governor.

### Third Readings:

Third Readings of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Third reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Wild Life Act."

**DR. ROWE:** Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this Bill, I would point out there are only two minor changes involved here in this amendment. The first one; in the past it has been customary for us to give to U.S. Servicemen in the Province the right to a resident's license. That is in respect to salmon fishing, after six months in the Province. However, it has been found that that has placed extremely heavy pressure on certain areas of Newfoundland on the rivers and streams, in consequence of which it has been felt necessary to change that six months back to what it would have ordinarily been anyway, twelve months, so that this amendment is made.

The other one is also perhaps an unnecessary one, we were not sure, and legal advice will be consulted. In section 3 of the Bill, in the last line we have added—perhaps I had better read that section.

3. Paragraph (b) of subsection (1) of Section 5 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

- "(b) (i) to provide the issue of licences or permits to fish for, take or kill any fish and for the issue of badges to be worn by the holders of such licences or permits; and
- (ii) to prescribe the fees to be paid by applicants for any such licences or permits; and the fees prescribed under this paragraph may be varied in respect of different areas and different classes of applicants and different periods or any of them."

Presently the fees prescribed under this paragraph vary in respect of different classes, originally that is how it was. That gave the province the right to charge a resident one amount and a non-resident another amount, and that has always been done. But the added phrase is—also of different areas—this the province probably had before, we are not sure. This will of course give the province the authority which it of necessity should have, if the time should come, when it might be desirable or in the interests of the public to charge fishermen coming into the Province from outside an extra amount for an unusually attractive stream and a lower rate for another stream, which we would then be able to do. We are not sure that we had the authority to do that, therefore, we added—different areas which would have that additional charge. The reason for section 4 is purely a literal one. In the previous Act there was some anomaly and the Department of the Attorney General advised us we should

change it so as to change the lettering of the section amended in the proper way.

I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Almighty God gave to this Island a long time ago some great natural resources, and we are trying hard now to find some of them because they are not to be seen, they are underground, minerals and perhaps oil, and these natural resources exclusive, of course, of timber and water powers, include also trout and salmon in our rivers and streams, lakes and ponds. It seems to me that the people of Newfoundland including the Government of Newfoundland, have been terribly stupid, criminally stupid in recent years in connection with that precious heritage which the Almighty God gave to all of us. We have been terribly stupid in the way in which we have handled these resources, both our Newfoundlanders and visitors in Newfoundland, in our outlook and our attack upon these natural resources, these trout and these salmon. It seems to me, from what I have heard, that the end of the salmon resources of Newfoundland is in sight, that if nothing is done, if nothing drastic is done, if nothing seriously drastic is done we will live to see the disappearance of salmon from the rivers of Newfoundland.

All of us here in this House, most of us at any rate have already lived to see the disappearance of most of the trout on the Avalon Peninsula. Today there are virtually no trout compared with twenty or twenty-five years ago. As a boy I trudged along the road where the birch plant lies today from the city here with other boys to go fishing at the "Studies" as



we used to call it, and which I later knew more properly as the "Steadies." I did my trouting as a little boy where the birch plant lies today. I went with my father when he went grouseing as they used to say, in Buckmaster's Field, shooting snipes. I remember as a boy picking up empty cartridges to be commonly found in Buckmaster's Meadows. But now on the Avalon Peninsula, except in a few rare places, there are no trout left. This glorious heritage of our going trouting where you like is a heritage which is disappearing. The truth of the matter is, that situation is overspreading the face of this Island. Shortly, and by shortly I mean five, eight or ten years hence, there will be no trout in Newfoundland unless drastic steps are taken about the situation, and perhaps even sooner than that, no salmon.

Now my honourable colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources, has taken this matter to heart, and I personally have taken it to heart. I confess, more I believe than most of the Government have done, although they have, but I have perhaps more than any other because personally and frankly I don't want to have it said of me ever, that while I was leader of the Government, I allowed the precious natural resources of ours to diminish, that I allowed any serious wastage of those precious natural resources. I would hate to have that said of me, or of the administration or of the Government I had led. So that I welcome heartily here now the introduction of these amendments by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. I welcome them but I have an uneasy feeling that it does not go far enough. I have that uneasy feeling because I have a feeling of foreboding about the trout and

salmon in Newfoundland. I hope the Opposition will support this Bill, which will be No. 3 meriting their support in the present session.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I can say at the outset I do not support this Bill, one particular section at any rate. I don't know about my colleagues as I have not discussed it with them. As the honourable member spoke I was reminded of a piece of poetry I learned when I was a boy. I suppose, for after all I was a boy once also. "I remember the house where I was born, where the sun used to come creeping in at morn." That was when the Honourable the Premier used to go fishing out in the steadies. The Honourable the Premier made an excellent appeal to the House for class distinction in trouting. I am surprised that the Honourable the Premier should be the first Liberal to do so, I have never known the Liberals to be interested in the preservation of class distinction, I take it it is an innovation—whether or not another new attribute is now to be tacked on to the Liberal Party, I don't know. The Tories are always accused of class distinction and here we have a piece of legislation being introduced here under the guise of saving the natural resources—Class Distinction. Charge John Jones \$20 and Bill Brown (not this Bill) \$50 for a license. Mr. Pickersgill will probably get one for nothing.

MR. BROWNE: He is not allowed to fish.

MR. HOLLETT: If you are a "Liberal" you get one for nothing, and if you are a "Tory" you will probably get one for less, probably fish without a license anyhow. But I don't like that, Mr. Speaker, and the fees prescribed under this section may

be varied in respect of different areas and different classes of applicants and different periods, making flesh of one and fish another . . .

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I believe the honourable gentleman is out of order—will the honourable gentleman yield?

MR. HOLLETT: No, I won't yield unless it is a point of order.

MR. SPENCER: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't believe, Sir, that the imposition of a different fee upon different classes of people will have any beneficial effect in increasing the trout population of Newfoundland. The trout, to my mind, are as plentiful as they were when the Honourable the Premier went out to the Steadies, if you know where to go and look for them. There is only one thing that is lacking and that is the neglect on the part of the Department of Natural Resources, in the way of doing something with regard to preservation by planting, if you like, of the seed necessary to provide food for these trout, as certain other things have destroyed the food the trout feed upon. I think it would be much better if the department introduced something of that nature.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman allow one question? Would not the honourable gentleman agree that a larger fee ought to be charged to that class of applicant that comes on a visit from the United States or Latvia?

MR. HOLLETT: It does not say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then those domiciled—does it not say that? Would not the honourable member charge such applicants as come in from the

United States or Europe and want to go salmon fishing—it is not the class of applicants, but the classifications of applicants, if the honourable gentleman would prefer it that way.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, yes, if the Government is prepared to amend that and put it that way. It does not say classifications, it says classes. "Different areas and different classes."

DR. ROWE: That is not the amendment—that has always been there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You read it wrong again.

MR. HOLLETT: If it has always been that way then it has been wrong.

DR. ROWE: That is not under debate, as I understand. May I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker—are we debating the Wild Life Act?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable gentleman is quite in order. He conceivably might be mistaken but it does not follow he is out of order.

DR. ROWE: The words are not to be taken only in the way I used them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is human and therefore prone to error, but it does not follow he is in error. The Honourable Minister may show that when he replies—will the honourable member resume his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask, as it is getting near six o'clock—I think it might be wise for me to ask for an adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: It will be five past six by that clock when it is six o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, then I have five minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable speaker said the honourable gentleman has the right to be wrong.

MR. HOLLETT: Not only have I the right, Mr. Speaker, but I admit to being wrong on times—I am not the man that is perfect. I cannot say I am the man that never made a mistake. I cannot say I am the man who caught the trout out in the Steadies. I never did, but I may be wrong, Sir. I am the man who may be wrong, and have often been wrong, and I expect I shall be wrong again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, indeed.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I suggest, when the Honourable the Premier will be sitting in some other place a year from now. I could be wrong there even.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nineteen years.

MR. HOLLETT: Nineteen years is a long time to sit down. But let us get back to this Bill, Sir, I see here we have, when a Canadian citizen resided in the Province for a period of six consecutive months—there is a distinction there but I won't bother about that at the moment, but I am concerned over these things in this particular paragraph, section 1 of (5) which provides for the issue of a license or permit to fish for, take or kill any fish or—you see, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty big business, this. They are going to be able to issue badges for you to wear, and if you get a class A license you will get a badge of a certain kind which will clearly distinguish you to the river protector when he comes along. This class A badge costs \$20 so that you can catch that trout. Another chap has a class

B badge. I don't know, but I wonder if the honourable gentleman will say where he wears this badge. Does he wear it on his cap or on his coat or where?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the seat of his pants.

MR. HOLLETT: I shall not repeat that, Mr. Speaker. I shall not repeat that. I have no further objection to this. I don't like the word "classes." I don't think there should be any distinction whatsoever between Newfoundlanders. We will include these people from the mainland who have resided here for six consecutive months, nor, Sir, do I see any reason why a person whether Latvian or German who has lived in this country six months consecutively, in the new industrial plants or what-not should not be given a license to fish in our streams. The Honourable Minister of Welfare who looks very serious I believe, agrees that I am right, although he has not said so. I don't agree with that. None of us except a very few get any trout when we go fishing, but we go just the same, and set up our little camps and light our fires and boil our kettle and have pork and cabbage, perhaps, and some have fun, but we don't get any trout worthwhile. I don't think it is worthwhile to make any distinction whatever between the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. That is one place where I don't think there should be any distinction whatsoever.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't get any trout.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, as it is actually six o'clock, may I have the adjournment of the debate? I don't think I can move the adjournment.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: In fact all the honourable member has to do is to stand up and be told by Mr. Speaker, that it is 6:00 o'clock.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all further orders of the day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

#### THURSDAY, April 29, 1954

The House met at 3:50 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. At 3.20 this afternoon the Lieutenant-Governor was graciously pleased to accept our Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Jackson's Arm in White Bay requesting a road be built from Jackson's Arm to Bowater's Tailors' Brook Road. The petition is signed by a hundred voters of the area of Jackson's Arm, and I have much pleasure not only in presenting it but also in supporting it, because for several weeks after navigation opens in most parts of Newfoundland that section of White Bay is often blocked with drift ice, and the people have no means of get-

ting in supplies or even of getting water. It is also understood that Bowater's are extending their road from Tailor's Brook to Sop's Arm this year, and a few miles of road from Jackson's Arm to Sop's Arm will mean not only Jackson's Arm but also Sop's Arm and also Sop's Island will have communication with the Trans-Canada Highway, if arrangements can be made with Bowater's to use their road.

I beg leave to have this petition tabled, Sir, and forwarded to the department concerned.

Petition tabled, to be referred to the department concerned.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

The number of contracts let for (a) heating; (b) plumbing; (c) electrical installation from April 1, 1953 to March 31, 1954, together with the names of persons or firms to whom contracts have been awarded. Were tenders called for in each case? What was the amount for which the contracts were awarded in each case and who was the successful tenderer? Was the tender which was accepted the lowest in each case, and if not, why was not the lowest tender accepted? In how many cases were contracts awarded without tenders being called?

#### Giving Notice of Motions

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to intro-

duce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act."

### Answers to Questions

Question No. 69—Answer being prepared.

Question No. 70:

Hon. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in answer to that 70 (1) may I say that the only machinery shipped in to this Province by the German firm of MIAG was machinery for the cement mill at Corner Brook. None was shipped by them for any other plant or any other mill in this Province. With regard to the itemized list of equipment and machinery, that will take some little time to prepare. But it is being prepared and will be tabled by me as soon as it is handed to me.

As to 70 (2) the detailed answers to these questions are in course of preparation. I may say that my own recollection is that insurance was carried mainly by Lloyds of London, but that in one instance it was carried by the firm of Crosbie and Company of this City.

Question No. 67: Answer being prepared.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might make this observation? In connection with the notice of questions given by the honourable member for St. John's West, it is my intention within the next two or three days to present a report, a comprehen-

sive report, of the Farm Loan Board. Perhaps the honourable gentleman would wish to wait until he sees that report, and then there may be other questions he may wish to have answered.

MR. BROWNE: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand then it is not the wish of the honourable member to have the questions appear on tomorrow's Order Paper?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, we could drop these questions now, if the Minister could tell me when he intends to table the report.

DR. ROWE: It was placed on my desk this morning, for submission to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. This report should probably be tabled next week.

### Orders of the Day

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

"An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

"An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

"An Act Respecting the Evidence Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder who is looking after this Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951"?

MR. HEFFERTON: I am.

MR. BROWNE: Could I address a question then to the Minister. I notice that in Section 2 of the Water

and Sewerage Act of 1951, which is not included in the Revised Statutes, wonder if these Acts should be included in the Revised Statutes.

MR. HEFFERTON: 1951 would be included in the Revised Statutes.

MR. BROWNE: I am just wondering whether private Acts of this kind or semi-private Acts would not be included in the Revised Statutes.

MR. HEFFERTON: No, but there is an appendix. Certain Acts are not included.

MR. BROWNE: Is this one?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, I believe it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If honourable members will excuse me, I don't believe the first clause has been read as yet.

Clause 1 read:

1. This Act may be cited as The Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook (Amendment) Act, 1954.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I hoped that my suggestion would be accepted for what it is worth. It would be a great help to all members of the House if the section which was being amended could be printed on the opposite page. In discussion of these Bills very few members will be able to follow the debate because if they have not got the section to be amended they cannot get any sense in it. I know it involves a considerable amount of research to look up the appropriate Bill in every case and find the section to be amended. I make this suggestion in the hope the Minister will see something in it. It would be very helpful for all members of the House.

Now in this particular one here I was under the impression it might be in the Revised Statutes but it is not. So that I wonder if the Minister would tell me what is being changed.

MR. HEFFERTON: The section we are on now has no change at all.

MR. BROWNE: There is a new definition added.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is in Section 2.

MR. BROWNE: Speaking generally about the Act what changes are being made in it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member might consider that we are discussing Section 1. When we are discussing Section 2 probably he might raise the point.

MR. BROWNE: If that is the only change, yes.

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Section 2 of the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951, the Act No. 79 of 1951, is amended by adding thereto as paragraph (c) the following:

"(c) 'Land' means lands, tenements, and hereditaments and any estate or interest therein and any right or easement affecting them and includes land covered by water."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, in that connection there is no change whatever in the Act as it is at the present time, except this is added on to give an interpretation of the word "land" that is all.

MR. BROWNE: It has something to do with tax has it?



MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

Clause 2 carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. The Act 21 Geo. V., Chapter 11, entitled "An Act Relating to the Establishment of a Water and Sewerage System at West Corner Brook" is hereby repealed.

MR. HEFFERTON: The water and sewerage system of Corner Brook which has been taken over under amalgamation.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could answer this question? I notice in the paper that the town manager has recently resigned—Has the Government anything to do with that?

MR. HEFFERTON: The appointment is an autonomous one because the Board itself is practically autonomous.

Moved and seconded the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I take it the present Secretary-Librarian will become the Director of Public Libraries Services and shall serve as secretary-treasurer, and that the purpose of this section is to enable the Board to make that appointment. I wonder if the Minister in charge could tell us what is the function of the public libraries which are to be different from now?

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): They are to be exactly the same.

MR. BROWNE: Is there to be an increase in salary?

MR. CHALKER: No, as I see it the salaries will remain the same as at the time the Act is passed, at which time they will be increased to the standard of civil service salaries, and in some cases may go even higher, because they are having difficulty in getting specialized help in the library.

MR. BROWNE: In Section 4, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us what is taking place here. I presume that the Libraries Board will be dealing with the allocations in question, and will put in their recommendations to the Government. I notice that the Board consists of five or more persons, and one third of the members of a Regional Libraries Board will retire annually. If there are five that means only one will retire. So would it not be better to have six, but it does not make very much difference. How has the appointment of this Board been made up to this date?

MR. CHALKER: By the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The change here in this particular section is that the retirement of members was not in the parent Act.

Section 4 carried.

Section 5 read:

5. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 8 as Section 8A the following:

"8A. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Board may make contributions either directly or indirectly towards pensions, annuities, retiring allowances and gratuities for employees of the Board and may prescribe the terms and conditions upon which such pensions, annuities,

retiring allowances or gratuities may be paid."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is a new clause and I wonder could the Minister tell us what is involved.

MR. CHALKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is more or less put there to enable the Board, if they so desire to establish a pensions scheme.

MR. BROWNE: Have they done anything about it?

MR. CHALKER: Nothing at the present time. They have not the legislative authority to enable them to do so. This legislation will enable them to do so, if they so desire.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, what board is referred to in this section and the previous one—The Public Libraries Board or the Regional Libraries Board. I notice the definition of "Board" means Public Libraries Board, whereas in the other section the definition is not given.

MR. CHALKER: The Public Libraries Board referred to in this section received a contribution towards its secretary, I believe. The Regional Libraries Board serves gratis in every case, or by contributions from the centre in which the Board is established. In Harbour Grace and Corner Brook the councils themselves may underwrite some services in connection with the personnel.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to say I am pleased to see that things have come to a point where some scheme of pensions will be arranged for the employees of the Public Libraries Board who I think are beyond question very courteous and obliging

and give good service to the general public. I don't think you can find east of Montreal a library as useful and as efficiently operated as our Gosling Library. I think our scheme of libraries compares very well with library systems in any of the other provinces.

Moved the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendments.

"An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I raised the point the other day, and after hearing the Attorney General read from the Exchequer Court Act about other clauses that might have been inserted there in cases of a controversy between provinces . . .

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I thank my honourable friend for reminding me. I have been giving that matter some serious thought and I think that it would be wise to amend Section 2 in the Committee stage in that manner. It will now read: The Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada or the Supreme Court of Canada alone, according to the provisions of the Supreme Court Act (Canada) and the Exchequer Court Act (Canada) have jurisdiction in any

- (a) controversy between Canada and Newfoundland;
- (b) Controversy between Newfoundland and any other Province of Canada that has passed an Act similar to this Act;

And I think we should renumber the present section (b) as (c). I suggest that amendment, Mr. Chairman, and recommend it to both sides of the House.

Moved and seconded the Committee report having passed this Bill with some amendments.

The Committee of the Whole passed the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act" without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

Clause 1 read:

1. This Act may be cited as "The Plant Protection Act, 1954."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, when this matter was being discussed in second reading the other day I listened attentively to the explanation given by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. But after he had sat down and the Premier arose I was very much astonished and surprised to learn from the Premier that this Bill is being introduced to enable the Government to hold up sales of potatoes, (now I did not gather that from the Minister's statement) imported into this Province. I am very surprised that a Bill of this kind does not indicate clearly so that one may readily see and understand why it should be introduced for the purpose of holding up the sale of potatoes —

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member will forgive me, this is the first clause we are on now.

MR. BROWNE: This is the purpose, the name and the purpose, and I believe it is the appropriate place to deal with the larger questions involved. There is no section dealing with this point at all, unless the Minister can indicate it. When I stated

the other day that I would support this Bill I did not imagine for a moment that was the intention. It seemed to me from the Bill at the time the Minister made his statement he did not have this in mind nor any such subtle ideas as the Premier has stated. Now it seems to me, if it is the intention to keep out potatoes which are grown in other provinces that there should be a legitimate reason for it. The Premier told us how they only had two or three or four inspectors, and he was going to christen his own baby first, and therefore was going to inspect the potatoes produced in Newfoundland first and it might be Christmas before the potatoes imported here could be inspected.

Now, Sir, I doubt very much the legality of a procedure of that kind. The Premier was extremely anxious to bring the country into confederation and this is one of the hard conditions we have to face. And it seems to me that the idea to sell Newfoundland grown potatoes in preference to imported potatoes should be determined by other conditions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would forgive me, I think the point might be more properly taken up under Clause 13. When we come to that perhaps the honourable gentleman might raise that point again.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, I want to argue this out. This is very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the honourable member that I have given my ruling. I refer the honourable member to the fact we are on Clause 1, and this is the title. This is not where it should be discussed.

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. In this Act

- (a) "container" means any receptacle in which plants may be placed, stored, shipped, offered for sale or sold;
- (b) "disease" means any disease or injury in plants caused by any insect, pest, virus, fungus, bacterium or other organism and includes such insect, pest, virus, fungus, bacterium and other organism;
- (c) "inspector" means a plant pest inspector appointed under this Act and includes inspectors and other officers appointed to carry out the Destructive Insect and Pest Act (Canada);
- (d) "Minister" means the Minister of Mines and Resources;
- (e) "nursery" means a place where plants are grown, kept, packed, delivered or shipped for sale;
- (f) "owner" includes the lessee, occupant or manager of any premises described;
- (g) "plant" means any tree, shrub, or the fruit or seed thereof or vine or other vegetable growth any portion of any of them;
- (h) "regulations" means regulations made under this Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to sub-section (3) may I ask the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources now, at this stage, whether the officers appointed by the Federal Government are going to assist in carrying out the ideas of the Premier which he mentioned the other day?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, in re-

ply to that question, I would say that is our hope. I may add that in preparation of this Bill we had some consultation with the Federal officials, and while of course we must take responsibility for the Bill, yet we have had, as I said, some consultations with them, and it was our hope that in the main the Federal inspectors who are appointed under the "Destructive Insects and Pests Act of Canada," the Federal Act, would be able to assist us. In other words, that we could by a mutual agreement and understanding make use of them in the implementation of the provisions of our own legislation here. That is our hope. Yet we should have power to appoint but I can't say at this time whether or not we might find it necessary to appoint inspectors of our own.

MR. BROWNE: Have we any at the present time?

DR. ROWE: My understanding is that the Federal Government does have inspectors here at the present time. I know they do. But we have no inspectors to my knowledge, as a province. I don't see how we could have any inspectors as we have no authority to appoint inspectors.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the Government did inspect the vegetables coming into the Province on those grounds before they went on sale, and issue certificates? Is it not a fact the imported vegetables were held up because of lack of inspectors, and that locally grown were given certificates for sale first?

DR. ROWE: In answer to that I think there has been something done during the past several years, the details of which I am not too familiar with because it was decided on or worked out before my going into the

department. But I believe that officers of our own Department of Mines and Resources have assisted in the matter of inspecting. What the honourable member for St. John's East has said may be very well true, I should think, but I do not know. I am not prepared to say, but if it comes to a choice between the inspection of locally produced vegetables in the fall of the year and vegetables brought in from the Mainland, I would expect, I would not say so, but would expect the locally produced and perhaps I would say I might hope that the locally produced vegetables would get the preference.

MR. FOGWILL: I quite agree with the Minister that the locally grown vegetables should be inspected first. But, Mr. Chairman, is it a fact that instead of being inspected the people concerned were given certificates to put on the bags themselves—is that a fact?

DR. ROWE: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I would require notice of such a question as that. It is a matter of detail which I don't think I could be expected to answer instantaneously.

MR. FOGWILL: The Minister has no knowledge of it?

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): I do recall—As the honourable member knows we had no legislation at that time to deal with the matter of protecting our own vegetables, potatoes properly. And I want to say that if the validity of what had been done had been called into question we might have had to call the House together to legalize what had been done. But it was done in all good faith, and what was done was to protect our local products.

• Clause carried.

MR. BROWNE: Now I find the section—Under inspection—It says all plants grown in or imported. Now under this section the Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint (I take it at the present time there are no such inspectors in the department)—

DR. ROWE: That is so.

MR. BROWNE: Therefore it would be necessary, I take it, to set up a staff for the purpose of carrying out this section? Now the duties of an inspector seem to be very wide and very broad, and it seems to me that if an inspector discovers that there are farms where there are diseases, then his first duty should be to report to the Minister and not take it upon himself to decide what action should be taken. I think it would be very much wiser if he would do that. Here he is entitled to enter any farm where he suspects there are plants infected by or suffering from diseases, and make such inspection and examination as he deems necessary and order that precautions against the spread of diseases be taken. Under (c) he may inspect and examine all plants grown on or imported into the province for sale therein or for export therefrom and certify if so required to whom it may concern or to any person that the plants are diseased, and on instructions from the Minister order that they be destroyed—or destroy them himself.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the danger of disease is that it will spread. And it seems to me that the Minister should be informed so that he may make the provisions to see if these plants have already been taken off this farm and sold to other persons, because it is in that fashion the disease may be spread to other farms.

And these plants may be put in stores and bought and planted and passed around.

Now we are not dealing here with something that is impossible. Perhaps it is not going to happen every day, but it may happen. An Act of this kind, dealing with the prevention of pests and infections, should take into account, it seems to me, the wisest procedure that should be followed in case there are farms that have diseased plants on them. I am speaking from the experience which I have gained in connection with the outbreak of foot and mouth disease near Regina in Western Canada two years ago. Having studied the legislation in that respect, I recall the first duty of the person discovering the disease is to report it to the Minister. Unfortunately the Minister, in that instance, was the last person in the department to be informed, according to the evidence of other parties. If that had been brought to his attention perhaps he would have taken more prompt action than was taken. The chief inspector was away on his holidays at the time.

Now there are times when plants may appear to have a disease and may not have it, or any disease at all, but an inspector, and I don't think there are very many skilled ones to be engaged by the department, but an inspector should have some qualifications or some scientific advice as to what the nature of the disease is, whether it is dangerous or contagious or infectious, before taking action. But this section, it seems to me, empowers him to take action on his own say so, and we don't know whether he is to be a qualified inspector—as a matter of fact, we are told there are none at the present time. I think the Minis-

ter ought to give a little more consideration to that question.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, our Bill is based in part on the Federal Act, the "Destructive Insects and Pests Act" and also on similar legislation in other provinces, particularly in the Province of Saskatchewan. After due examination of all provincial legislation of that kind it was felt the most applicable. Going back for a moment to the point of inspectors' powers. Actually in the Federal Act—and I happen to have a copy here in front of me, and while the honourable member was speaking I looked it up again to refresh my memory—I find the Federal inspectors are invested with similar powers such as we propose to give. And I know also that in some provinces, in Alberta in all probability, these inspectors have that power which we propose giving our inspectors here. I could read it here from the Federal Act; "Where upon inspection, which are found to be infested with disease, in the presence of inspectors . . ."

We know such an Act is necessary—and due notice should be given to the owner. In actual practice I can assure the honourable member that inspectors would not abuse this or in no condition would the department tolerate any abuse of it. The natural practice would be that the Director of Agriculture would—

MR. BROWNE: Could we have a clause inserted to that effect? It would be very wise, it seems to me. There may be a very serious mistake take place and a disease spread which it may be possible to arrest if reported immediately.

DR. ROWE: I would have no objections whatever, Mr. Chairman, to



putting in there what the honourable gentleman has in mind. It would certainly happen in practice anyway, and I would have no objections to inserting it there, in Clause (d) where destruction is involved.

MR. BROWNE: Order that precautions against the disease be taken and shall immediately report its findings and precautions taken to the Minister. Would you be willing to accept a clause of that kind?

DR. ROWE: In order to clarify the section I have no objections whatsoever, although it is not in other provincial legislation, but it does happen in practice. I have no objection whatsoever to having that slight addition put in there, that these things should be done after reporting to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the committee like to have that clause stand so that the Honourable Minister could draft this sub-paragraph, and insert it later in the Bill?

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by my honourable colleague, perhaps if a clause were put in specifying the qualifications of the inspectors, it would not be necessary that inspectors would have to report to the Minister. That would be a round-about way to go about it. But if there were a clause put in there setting out the qualifications of the inspectors, a knowledge of diseases of plant, etc.—perhaps it could be done that way, and then the diseased plants could be destroyed immediately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To save time probably it would be better to let it stand and refer back to it later.

Clause 4 read and carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. No person shall

- (a) import or bring any plant grown in a nursery into the province from any other province; or
- (b) cause any such plant to be brought into the province from any other province,

unless the plant is accompanied by a certificate, signed by an official authorized by the government of that other province to issue such certificate, showing that the nursery in which the plant was grown is free from disease.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a very far-reaching section. I wonder if anything like that has been in existence up to the present time? There are a number of advertisements appearing in magazines telling how to get beautiful flowers for gardens, ten thousand blooms in six months and fifty thousand next year, and many trees and bulbs and things of that sort are on sale at various nurseries. Do they all now have to be examined by an expert before they can be bought and brought in. Is not this going to interfere a great deal with the sale of flowers, shrubs and trees?

DR. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point, I again appreciate the significance of what the honourable gentleman has said. But I don't see that we can fail to have these powers. I think we must have that power there. If you could think of such an extreme case—certainly we have no poison ivy in this province, and we hope we won't have—surely no person should have the right to send poison ivy down here and just plant it in his garden from where the seeds could easily be spread all over the province. That is an extreme case. But again I must repeat that other provinces have similar powers, and I have not heard

they have worked any hardship in actual practice. I do think we should have the same powers. Any such powers after all must be administered and made use of in a discrete manner.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while the discretion is always with the province, it seems to be very broad—for instance the definition of plant includes trees, shrubs, vines or other vegetables and growths of fruit or seeds thereof. Now take all the products which are brought in here, bananas, apples, oranges, plums, grapes—the definition of plants is very wide. There is every kind of vegetable imported into Newfoundland, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of every kind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable gentleman will forgive me—it is plants grown in nurseries.

MR. BROWNE: That is true, it applies more to flowers and nursery-grown plants and vegetables. Well, take tomatoes, there will be a great many of these, and cucumbers and fruits of that kind in any case. What is the practice now? Is there anything of that kind in existence at the present time?

DR. ROWE: It is inspected by the Federal authorities because most of this fruit comes from the United States. Speaking from memory now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure—and I have looked through this Federal Act and this Federal Government does have such powers. I imagine that in certain cases importation of ordinary fruit and such things, I should think it is almost a nominal thing, nevertheless I do think it is wise that that provision should be included, and the Federal Government should have such powers that can be applied if necessity requires it.

MR. HOLLETT: What I am asking the Honourable Minister—the honourable chairman has told us it does not mean a potato—what is the interpretation? We would like to have that information. After all the Honourable Minister must tell us—does it mean a potato or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must also draw attention to repetition. The same arguments have been made over and over again.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, will the Honourable Minister give the Opposition the assurance that the purpose of this Act as he outlines it will be used only for that purpose, or that it will be used only for the stopping of diseases in plants within the province and the importation of these diseases into the province?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the purpose—and I don't know whether I am out of order in going back. The honourable member for St. John's West started out when he referred to the Honourable the Premier's remarks yesterday—but the purpose of this Act is what it says it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Honourable Minister will forgive me, he is now infringing on what we must discuss in committee—the principle of the Bill, which must be discussed in second reading and not in committee.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself, if I may, to the point raised by the Opposition, namely, this Act in general and this clause in particular. The point I wish to make is that this Bill must work in collaboration with the Federal Act—The Destructive Insects and Pests Act—and on looking at these regulations which are made under the Federal Act both as they

relate to nurseries, as they relate to plants or as they relate to the powers of inspectors, I can say, even as a layman, the powers and regulations therein are as sweeping as they are in this Act.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister indicate what the definition is in the Federal regulations—we want to be satisfied that what we are doing is something sensible.

DR. POTTLE: Plant means all members of the vegetable kingdom including—

MR. BROWNE: Nurseries? There is an exception right away.

DR. POTTLE: Except flower vegetables, and field crops, seed bulbs, mushrooms and seed potatoes.

MR. BROWNE: That is excepted from nursery stock—then that is not in keeping. Is there any exception there? There is no exception here at all. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we could save a lot of time if the Minister would agree to let this stand until tomorrow so that we can look up the matter and give us a reasonable chance to examine into it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the committee agree that this clause stand?

Clause 5 stand.

Clause 6 read:

6. No person shall act as an agent, representative or salesman of a person operating a nursery situate outside the province unless he holds a valid and subsisting certificate of registration issued by the Minister.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, what does that mean? Does that mean that every agent or salesman—"No person shall"—now I have

to go back again, Mr. Chairman, to the definition of nursery, because it is included in this section.

"Nursery means a place where plants other than flowers, vegetable and field crop seeds and seed potatoes are grown, kept, packed, delivered or shipped for sale to be used for ornamental, propagation or cropping purposes."

So that a nursery has a very wide definition. It seems to me anyone who is selling vegetables or plants for someone outside this country has to be registered with the Minister. Has the Minister given personal consideration to this section?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I have given personal consideration to it. I have read it over and took note of what I think it denotes, and I understand it. It simply means that no person will be allowed to bring in or handle nursery articles unless he has a certificate. I don't think any person in, say Buchans for example, can bring in and on his own start in buying and bringing in articles and distribute them throughout the province without having a certificate—just as any member in any other occupation requires a certificate, or in certain occupations.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am not raising these points just for the purpose of obstructing this legislation by any means, but I feel there is tremendous room for objection in the way it is being carried out. Any person in any of the twelve hundred settlements in Newfoundland can write away to a seed company and order seed or any storekeeper can take orders for his customers. But they can't do it any more. Who is to

register every shopkeeper that is going to carry on that sort of business? They will have to be registered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the ordinary person who, as my honourable friend suggests, writes away and orders seed—it does not affect him.

MR. BROWNE: Any person, it says.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not anyone for his own use.

MR. BROWNE: Well he is covered by the previous section, the one that stands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this clause carry?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not sure this is properly clarified: "No person shall act as an agent, representative or salesman of a person operating a nursery situate outside the province unless he holds a valid and subsisting certificate of registration issued by the Minister." I think the honourable member for St. John's West is correct there. Mr. Speaker, I think this ought to stand over too until it is aired a little more.

Clause 6 carried.

Clause 7 read:

7. (1) The owner of every nursery shall register his nursery with the Minister and shall furnish him on a form which he shall provide particulars of

- (a) the location of the nursery,
- (b) the ownership and management of the nursery,
- (c) the kinds of plants grown, kept and packed in and delivered or shipped for sale from the nursery,

- (d) such other matters touching the operation of the nursery other than financial returns which the Minister requires,

and on registration of the nursery the Minister shall issue a certificate of registration to the owner.

- (2) The owner of every nursery shall display the certificate referred to in subsection (1) in a prominent plant in his nursery.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister—does this mean every farmer in the country, big and small, would have to register under this section?

DR. ROWE: I don't see that at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this word "nursery" means inside or outside the province or both?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Inside.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not say so.

DR. ROWE: I don't see why a nursery in Manitoba, for instance, should have to be registered down here.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I take it this means that every person who operates a farm or garden growing any kind of vegetable or any kind of fruit must be registered with the Minister and pay a licence. I would suggest to the Minister that would be a very unpopular measure, and I believe it is a very unwise and unjust measure. I don't see the necessity of doing that at all, as it is putting people to a great deal of unnecessary inconvenience.

MR. HOLLETT: Not only unnecessary—don't forget nurseries mean gardens any place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it does not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Nursery means a place where plants are grown, kept, packaged or shipped for sale.

DR. ROWE: Yes, for sale.

MR. HOLLETT: They are all for sale.

MR. BROWNE: Once again, can't I suggest to the Minister that this is a lot of unnecessary red tape and there is no need of this at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I know we personally buy potatoes from someone in Foxtrap, and have done so for quite a while. Will this mean that man has to be registered with the Minister, and will it mean that every other farmer in the country has to be registered, and certainly if so will have to pay something for it?

DR. ROWE: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable members on the opposite side are using their imaginations. I don't see that there is a lot of red tape any more than in the other Provinces of Canada. I can only say this has been examined by people in this field, and they do not regard it as red tape. No local farmer has to pay a registration fee, I think my honourable friend knows that is so.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend, the Minister of Mines and Resources, pointed out this is copied from Saskatchewan. I would point out that this does not obtain out there. There you have big farm-

ers who grow perhaps a million dollars worth of grain and their product is confined to one or two things like oats, barley and wheat, whereas here we have a lot of kitchen gardens where a man will raise a few barrels of potatoes, a little lettuce, a few turnips and cabbage and beet and other garden vegetables of which they take no account whatsoever in Saskatchewan where nobody would bother about such. Out there their money is invested in millions of dollars worth of machinery for the purpose of growing wheat. It seems to me that the conditions which apply in Saskatchewan are completely different from what apply here. I suggest we let this stand over too. There is nothing to be gained by rushing it through, there is no great hurry about it, and let us give a little further study to this section of the Bill.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I hasten to point out two things. One is that perhaps I did not make myself clear at the beginning. This legislation was prepared after an examination of all the provincial legislations in existence across the nation, and also, of course, after due examination of the Federal legislation to which I have already referred on several occasions. And it was done as a result of discussions and some collaboration with the Federal organization concerned. I do not mean to say that this is simply a copy of Saskatchewan legislation. I said, or at least I thought I said, that we had taken more from the Saskatchewan legislation than from any other. I don't know the exact words I used, Mr. Chairman, on that, but it is not an exact duplication of the Saskatchewan legislation, rather it is based primarily. I would say, on the Saskatchewan legislation. I am sure we all agreed in

the debate on the principle of the Bill that it was the sort of thing we are all anxious to bring into effect for the protection of our farmers, which is the principle involved here.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member may not discuss the principle.

**DR. ROWE:** Mr. Chairman, I was merely replying to the point raised here. What I would say is that we have no desire whatsoever to have this thing rushed through. I would be very happy, as a matter of fact, as I have already indicated my willingness, to have a clause inserted in section 3 which would elaborate a little more fully, and if some additions and deletions are indicated we could have them. There is no reason in the world why this should go through to-day or tomorrow or at any time as long as it goes through during this session.

Clause 7 stand.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Report received, ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

First Readings:

The Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

**MR. SPEAKER:** Before I put the question for leave on this item, I may tell the House that I have studied this Bill, and was somewhat puzzled by the question: "Was this a money Bill or not?" I searched for precedent, and I found conflicting authorities. However, I came to the conclusion that it may be regarded as not being a money Bill. That is based on a very close parallel which

I found enacted by this House on April 3, 1925, a Bill which set up the Highroads Commission. The similarity was that this Bill set up machinery and envisages the expenditure of possibly large sums of money which it seems will subsequently have to be voted by the House. A parallel case exists in the Highroads Commission Bill which called for the expenditure, as it turned out to be, of large sums of money, subsequently voted by parliament.

Therefore, I feel the House may proceed with this Bill.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask if you gave consideration to the fact that the Highroads Commission were men who received no salaries and were just citizens who were called the Highroads Commission?

**MR. CURTIS:** There were provisions in the Bill for salaries.

**MR. BROWNE:** I don't think they received any salaries.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I was just citing one. I have the Act here, and I might say there is another precedent which does specifically state salaries, and that was the Bill, the Adjudicature Constitution of the Supreme Court. I took those two into consideration in conjunction because this one is a very short Bill, "An Act Relating to the Constitution of the Supreme Court"—which reads—"The following salaries shall be paid." Which Act, it seems to me sets up statutory salaries. I have read the Hansard relating to both Bills, and on these two I base my decision that the present Bill might properly be considered as a non-money Bill.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to ask something about the Supreme Court? It had already been established for a hundred years.



You gave a ruling, I think, that there is a Bill already in existence and as it is the purpose to make some amendments it could not be so considered, but this is a new Bill which is going to spend millions.

MR. SPEAKER: Might I point out to the honourable member, that while the courts were in existence yet the salaries were legally not in existence. As the Minister pointed out, in this particular Bill, this Bill is to make legal a practice which we had been following out, which really could be considered illegal, if it were not legal. I might say in fairness to the House, I am not happy about the decision, but there are so many precedents in handling Bills of this kind in this way that I feel we could handle it as a non-money Bill. I think I may say that the time has arrived—certainly we ought not to change horses in midstream, but when we should clearly define the practice to be followed in this House with regard to Bills which involve expenditure of money.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I certainly abide by your judgment, but I must add this: That is a most important Bill, and as far as we can gather, involving the expenditure and consequently the collection of large amounts of money. We have not seen it, and it is probably lengthy. We were hoping it would be introduced as a money Bill to give us an opportunity to study it.

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure the House, however, that it would be quite safe to give the Bill first and second reading without, shall I say, forcing ourselves to carry on with it as a non-money Bill. The Attorney General can bear me out in that he studied the question also. In fact I called him in last night to get some

legal evidence on the matter. I see nothing further we can do at this stage.

Has the Honourable Minister leave to introduce this Bill?

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Provincial Parks." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Health asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium in the City of St. John's." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 30, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

None.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 71—In course of preparation.

Question No. 70:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday, at least in part. With respect to the remainder of the question, the Comptroller of the Treasury who is also the Deputy Minister of Finance called upon me this morning to inform me that he is preparing answers with regard to the remainder of the question. It is a monumental task because it involves a number of lists containing the names of literally tens of thousands of items—nevertheless, it was asked for.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will allow me, is that in connection with the gypsum plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I said yesterday the only equipment they shipped into Newfoundland was equipment for the cement plant. They had a contract to build, ship over here, erect and get into oper-

ation the equipment for the cement plant. That is the only transaction they had, and it is in connection with that that the answer is being prepared.

MR. HOLLETT: In that connection, I don't require every item. Different classifications is all that I want.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears from the wording of the question that the honourable gentleman thought that MIAG had shipped to Newfoundland, machinery and equipment other than what they had shipped for the cement plant. The fact is that the only machinery and equipment they shipped was for the cement plant, and it was in connection with that machinery that that list was required and is being prepared, as is also the information with regard to the amount of insurance carried, the rates of premium payments and the names of the companies to whom the insurance was paid.

Question No. 69—In course of preparation.

#### Orders of the Day

Third Reading of a Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this order deferred, also item No. 5 on the Order Paper, "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

Order deferred.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

MR. SPEAKER: This committee had leave to sit again. I do now leave the Chair.

MR. COURAGE: I believe the Committee had reached Clause 7.

MR. BROWNE: That was standing at the time.

Clause 8 read:

8. (1) The Minister may require the owner of a nursery to obtain a certificate of inspection from an inspector, who is hereby authorized to give the certificate, certifying that the nursery has been examined and found to be apparently free from disease before sending out or permitting any plants to be removed from his nursery.

(2) A certificate issued under subsection (1) is valid for one year from the date of issue.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may have the approval of the Committee to go back to clause 2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Move the committee revert to clause 2.

Motion carried.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, before going into it specifically I would like to point out one thing which was not clear at the beginning here, particularly to my honourable friend, the member for St. John's West, who has been absent from the Province a good deal during the past few years—this Bill is not meant for us to infringe in any way on our Vegetable Grading Act which concerns consumption of vegetables and looks after such things as inspection and grading consumable vegetables. This one is concerned with the spread of and prevention of certain diseases. I might say that right now we have some evidence that there might be a disease amongst potatoes which has never been in Newfoundland before, and which we are very anxious to get cracking on, and which could have very serious repercussions. It is a form of ring rot, I think they call it, which represents roughly to the potato, what "foot and mouth" disease would be to cattle, or cholera to swine. Having said that, Sir, I will now say that we have taken due notice of the various comments which have come from the other side, and we have made several modifications which, I think, will eliminate the criticisms which have been expressed. The first of these will be in the definition. I feel that the definition for nurseries and for plants could be modified without in any way offsetting the purpose we had in mind. I may say, I had expert advice on the preparation of this matter, in fact I spent almost the entire evening and last night working on this so that we could come to some agreement on the Bill.

I have a copy of the definition of nursery here if my honourable friends would care to have it. "Plants in-

clude all members of the vegetable kingdom and any part or product thereof where the plant or product is used for reproduction purposes."

These are the two definitions we agree to over here, Sir.

Now, Sir, I have several others involving other sections relevant to comments made by my honourable friends on the other side. Before going on to them I presume the Chair would wish to deal with this section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member, I take it, now wishes to delete these two items and substitute the amendments here given.

DR. ROWE: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this clause as amended carry?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask one or two questions. Do I understand that there is a disease known as ring rot at the present time being brought in here?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I said there is some evidence to show, from advice I have had, that there may be some ring rot in Newfoundland at the present time.

MR. BROWNE: In Newfoundland?

DR. ROWE: Yes, but it has not been definitely proven as yet. But there is some fear that there may be. If so then immediate precautions are absolutely necessary. That is one of the reasons why we should have this thing go through so that every possible means will be brought to bear to cope with it in the event that such a situation does exist.

MR. BROWNE: I appreciate the interest shown and the attention

which the Minister has given to this, and I am very pleased to see he has made these alterations, which correspond, I think, very closely with the definition and regulations put out by the Federal Department of Agriculture relating to the destructive pests and insects Act. But I think there is a difference in the definition of plant—including all members of the vegetable field. What I want to know is what does the products thereof mean? For instance if we are dealing with seed potatoes, is that covered under this definition, or cut-up seed, or certain plants which, I suppose could be divided?

DR. ROWE: As a matter of fact I notice that same phrase occurs in the other definition in the Federal Act as well, and I don't know what the technical interpretation would be. I presume it is meant to cover any part of a vegetable when it may be used for reproduction purposes, such as shrubs which can be separated.

MR. BROWNE: I have one other question before I sit down. I would like to ask if there is an understanding with the Federal Department of Agriculture that they will assist in regard to the inspection, and have they been advised as to the provisions incorporated into this Act. The reason I ask is because under the British North America Act, Section 95—In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the Province, and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the Provinces, and any law of the Legislature of a Province relative to agriculture shall have effect in and for the Province as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I may say in answer to that—only this morning officials of the Federal Department were consulted in regard to this, and they have been consulted all through. My honourable friend will be interested in this: I won't give it in detail—it occurred some years ago that the Federal Government did have an Act, (probably the same one as it has today) and Prince Edward Island did not have any Provincial Legislation. Arising out of the Federal Act, prosecution took place and an appeal was made to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the Supreme Court of Canada reversed the judgment. As a result of that it was afterwards decided that each Province, in order to make the Federal Act fully operable, should have complementary legislation. It was from this decision that the Provinces then brought in their own complementary legislation of a nature as is envisaged here. I might say also, Mr. Chairman, apropos of this matter of inspectors, we have no inspectors of our own as a Province. The Federal Government has inspectors here and their work is in close contact with our Department. We do not envisage, and certainly not in the immediate future, the appointment of any provincial inspectors here.

Clause 7 carried. Clause 8:

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have your indulgence again, Sir, and revert to Clause 3, which I am not sure was allowed to stand?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were several clauses allowed to stand. We may take them now if you wish. Committee reverts to Clause 3.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the possibility was pointed out by one

speaker that the powers given inspectors here appeared to be very wide. Personally I did not envisage any inspector taking any drastic action without reference to his Minister. Nevertheless we have put in a slight amendment here, which I would like at the moment to consider again. I have a copy here for my honourable friends. (b) as it originally in Section 3 will be deleted, and the amendment that I submitted will be put in in its place. (c) will be deleted and the amended paragraph put in in its place. That, I think, covers the point.

MR. BROWNE: Will (b) be deleted?

DR. ROWE: No, I don't think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the one we are interested in.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, it should be (d) rather than (c).

DR. ROWE: Yes, (b), (c) and (d) are deleted.

(ii) order that plants referred to in sub-paragraph (i) shall not be removed except to such place and under such conditions and whether for the purpose of destruction thereof or otherwise as he specifies in the order;

(c) inspect and examine all plants grown in or imported into the Province for sale therein or for export therefrom and certify, if so required, to whom it may concern or to any person that the plants are diseased, and on instructions from the Minister order that they be destroyed or destroy them himself.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this new provision,

which I think is necessary, as it does not put such power in the hands of the inspectors. Suppose for instance there is a shipment of potatoes. Up to a thousand bags are not inspected immediately and are held up for some time, perhaps two or three weeks or a month or two months and they go bad (it would not be surprising if they did go bad). Is there going to be compensation to the people who own these potatoes? It seems to me to be a very serious thing, if they are to be held up, and I think the Government will run into trouble and be liable to action. I have here today with me some of the certificates which appear on the bags which come in from Prince Edward Island. It must be remembered the potato business in Prince Edward Island is more important than the fishery to Newfoundland, and when Prince Edward Island gives a certificate like this, it is supposed to be the hallmark of quality and compares with any potatoes grown in the world. If these potatoes are held up and go bad, somebody will have to pay compensation, as these potatoes have this certificate upon them in every case. I think Canadian farmers have a wonderful reputation. It is the principal industry in Canada, and it would be a serious thing by inference to make an attack upon either their ability to grow potatoes or their ability to inspect them. I believe the case to be that in potato growing areas they have a great number of inspectors who inspect the crops at different times during the growing season, and right up to the harvesting they are under constant inspection and supervision, and are accordingly qualified for this grading as a No. 1 variety. Therefore, I think the Minister ought to bear in mind that if any drastic actions are taken against them it may

render the Government liable to action.

Amendment carried.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the next one which we have—I am not sure that anybody has commented on this yet—But after due consideration of the Federal Act we are suggesting a change to Section No. 5. I have a copy of the change here, which I can pass along. We are suggesting an amendment to clause 5 in this way: "The Minister may require that every person who imports or buys or causes any plant to come into the province from any other province shall obtain a certificate signed by an official authorized by the Government of that province to issue such certificate showing that the plant is apparently free from disease."

I notice that is only permissive—"The Minister may . . ." But we feel, in the light of experience, the amendment is a desirable one.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, are not these certificates good enough, certificates re the produce of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, which run into millions of bushels of potatoes, and the certificate is on each bag with initials and numbers so that they can be traced. Can we put up higher standards of certification for them than we require from our own people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, it is not necessarily a question of whether we can call for a higher standard. It may be that we wish to call for a different standard. It is not because they have a certain standard in other provinces that we must be bound by their standards.

MR. BROWNE: These are Federal.



MR. SMALLWOOD: Even Federal. If the occasion arises when even Federal regulations and Federal certificates, which are satisfactory to the Government of Canada, might nevertheless be unsatisfactory to the Government of Newfoundland. We had a very good case of it in point in Canada within recent days in the outbreak of the "Foot and Mouth" disease in the Province of Saskatchewan, when that Province refused point blank to permit the importation, across their border from that Province and certain Provinces of the west, of any beef, hogs, originating in these provinces—they refused, and that was that. What are you going to do about it? Now the time might come when we might wish to take exactly the same steps.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add that my honourable friend is now debating the Vegetable Grading Act which is designed to look after vegetables, and where he suggests the situation might arise—I don't think it would arise in regard to this Act—This is for the prevention and spread of diseases.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that Clause 5 as it now stands be deleted and the clause as amended be inserted—Amendment carried.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I may say these are all the amendments which we propose. We have examined this thing almost with a microscope with the appropriate officials and aided by our legal advisors as well, and we are satisfied that the objections raised by our honourable friends on the other side have been met by these amendments. We do not see that there should be any further amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee wish to consider Clause 7 now?

MR. BROWNE: We have considered it, Mr. Chairman, but the Minister still insists on going ahead with it.

DR. ROWE: The change in the definition might change it. I understood the objections were based more on the definition. I think we have met the objections there.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, all right.

Clauses 7 to 11 read and carried.

Clause 12:

12.—(1) Where disease exists or is supposed to exist on any plant the Minister may direct an inspector or some other competent person to make an examination and inspection, and may order that any plant so infested, or such part as he deems advisable, shall be immediately destroyed by burning, either by the person appointed to make the inspection or by the person owning or having possession of the plant, or some other person so directed in writing, and the person carrying out the order shall report to the Minister in writing as to the nature and extent of the work so performed, together with a fair estimate of the value of the plants destroyed.

If, in a nursery, orchard or collection of plants, an inspector finds disease on plants located in several parts of the nursery, orchard or collection and decides that it is advisable in the public interest to destroy all the plants in the nursery, orchard or collection, or in any part thereof, and so reports to the Minister, the Minister may direct that an inspection or examination be made by an additional inspector whom he may ap-

point and upon the advice in writing of both the inspectors he may direct that all the plants in the nursery, orchard or collection or any part thereof shall be destroyed without requiring that every plant therein shall be first examined.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, with regard to this section: I notice that the last line or so of Clause 12, sub-paragraph 1 . . . And the person carrying out the order shall report to the Minister in writing as to the nature and extent of the work so performed, together with a fair estimate of the value of the plants destroyed.

Now in that respect, a farmer may have diseased plants on his premises and it may spread to the farm of somebody and all his plants have to be destroyed. Is there any provision for compensation to the man whose plants are destroyed? That section there seems like it was taken from an Act where compensation was being considered, otherwise what is the purpose of making a fair estimate of the value of the plants destroyed? I think in the Federal Act there is provision for compensation.

DR. ROWE: I think the honourable member will probably find that has been covered under section 16, when we come to the regulations. If it is proper to refer to that? "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may make such regulations . . ." "(c) providing for the compensation that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council on recommendation of the Minister may, in his discretion, pay on account of the destruction of plants or containers in accordance with this Act, such compensation not to exceed two-thirds of the value of the plants or containers destroyed."

Clauses 12 through 14 carried.

Clause 15 read:

15.—(1) The Minister shall collect a fee of one dollar for every certificate of registration issued pursuant to Sections 6, 7 and 14.

(2) Every certificate of registration issued pursuant to Sections 6, 7 and 14 expires on the thirty-first day of December in the year in which it is issued.

MR. HOLLETT: The Minister shall collect a fee of one dollar for any certificate—If I may refer back to clause 14—No person shall carry on the business of selling nursery plants or as agent or representative of a nurseryman unless he holds a subsisting certificate of registration issued by the Minister." That refers to nurseries inside and agents outside the country, is that right?"

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I was just wondering if the payment of that one dollar might not be a hardship upon our own people inside the country who have nurseries. I can clearly see why we have to charge a dollar for registration—If the Minister would like to make some remarks—

DR. ROWE: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, it would be a hardship. After all it is a small amount compared with the registration fees persons carrying on certain types of business have to pay. I think most of the nurseries could find that dollar. It is just a small fee to cover some of the clerical expenses.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there are only half a dozen, or perhaps twenty nurseries in the country. Why go to the trouble to collect this

amount. It seems ridiculous and an annoying thing.

DR. ROWE: I think it is customary everywhere.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, it is customary to have a dollar on everything now.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, (h) says, prescribing the terms and conditions for the production and sale of seed potatoes. I wonder what is meant there? There is another comment I would wish to make: Is there any provision regarding the tabling of regulations. I have not seen any regulations tabled this year. I am sure there must have been some made during the past year, and there ought to be some provision to bring these regulations into the House so that we will know what has been passed.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to control, we feel it is necessary to provide in the final analysis that absolute control be exercised over seed potatoes. We might have to exercise discretion sometimes, but the time might come when we need to exercise ultimate control.

Most regulations I have had any cause to make have been gazetted and published.

MR. BROWNE: Nobody sees them apart from a handful of lawyers, and a handful of government officials unless some reporter is active enough to dig them up. I propose to ask that at an early date, the government lay on the table of the House all regulations made during the past year.

DR. ROWE: I don't think this side of the House will object to our laying the regulations on the table of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I think virtually all the legislation we have asked the House and that this House has passed in the past five years contained authority for the Minister or the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make regulations, and required also, that within fifteen days after the House opens, regulations so made shall be tabled in the House. I know I pretty well always circulate amongst my colleagues each year before the House opens reminding them of this provision and asking them to get together any regulations or reports which, under their own particular Acts, they are supposed to table. The fact that there is no such clause in this Act rather surprises me. I think, Sir, the omission has not been deliberate.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): The regulations under the Mothers' Allowances Act, for instance, have already been tabled here without any questions about them being raised.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): The regulations under the Fishery Loan Board Act also have been tabled during this session.

MR. BROWNE: I expect what happened is that they were tabled very quietly, and I did not get a chance to see them.

Clause 16 carried.

Clause 17 read:

17. Every person who

- (a) contravenes any provision of this Act or the regulations or any certificate issued or order made or given pursuant to this Act, or
- (b) fails to comply with or neglects to carry out or offers any hind-

rance to the carrying out of any provision of this Act or the regulations or of any order or direction made or given pursuant to this Act, or

- (c) fails to comply with any condition attached to any certificate issued pursuant to this Act.

is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding two hundred dollars or in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

MR. BROWNE: I notice that this penalty clause carries a maximum but no minimum fine. This is very good, because I was thinking that sometimes a man may voluntarily commit an offence—We must bear in mind that regulations are going to be made which sometimes may not be drawn to the attention of the person who commits the offence. So that often in these cases it is put in—every person who wilfully contravenes any provisions of this Act or wilfully neglects to comply—Actually as it stands, I think, it may be passed because there is no minimum penalty. I draw that to the attention of the Minister—It is someone who wilfully does something who is really responsible.

Now are you going to add something there about laying regulations on the table of the House?

DR. ROWE: If the Chairman would allow me, I would suggest that the section included in other legislation be added to section 16 as sub-section (2).

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could pass clause 17 and then revert to clause 16.

Clause 17 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I move the committee revert to clause 16. Motion carried.

DR. ROWE: The motion is, Mr. Chairman, that sub-section 2 be deleted and that sub-section 3 of Clause 24 of the Act Respecting Prevention of Fire be inserted. "Regulations made under this section shall have effect from the date of publication in the Newfoundland Gazette or from such earlier or later date as may be prescribed in the regulations, and all regulations shall be laid before the Legislature within fifteen days after they are made, if the Legislation is then in session, and if not, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session."

Clause as amended, carried.

On motion the committee reported having passed this Bill with some amendments.

Report received: Amendments read first and second time.

Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The debate on second reading was in progress, and the honourable and learned member for St. John's West adjourned the debate.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I had a marked copy. I did not think we would be going ahead with that one. I am sorry to delay the House.

MR. CURTIS: While we are waiting could we go on to first readings, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

On motion this Bill was read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act."

On motion this Bill was read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, with the consent of the House, we could consider a small Bill of which notice has not been given, but just to formalize things, I would give notice and I ask leave to present a Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Loan Act, 1953." It might facilitate the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, if in giving notice I just said this: This is a Bill which deals with an issue of bonds which last year we gave the St. John's Municipal Council permission to issue. The Bill is purely a formal one enabling the signatures of the Minister and the Mayor to be lithographed on the bonds instead of handwritten. I understand the bonds have been printed. We would like to have the amendment put through immediately so as to facilitate the sale of the issue. So that I will give notice, Mr. Speaker—the Bill has been distributed, and perhaps, with the indulgence of the House, we could have it introduced immediately and passed through all stages.

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered now read a second time.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I can add much to what the Honourable the Attorney General has just said. The amendment deals with giving authority for lithographing

signatures of the Mayor and the City Clerk. The matter is concerning the sinking fund, and that over a period of twenty years they are enabled to pay the sinking fund. The second amendment is to establish a sinking fund for the said bond. I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour this day.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

MR. BROWNE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, at the previous sitting we were discussing this Act, and after having heard the statement made by the Minister and by the Premier about the danger to our salmon rivers owing to the depletion of the stock of salmon, I asked for an adjournment.

Now, I have been a salmon fisherman for a great number of years, and I regret to say the salmon rivers have deteriorated during that time. This has been due to a number of causes. In my opinion the chief cause of the depletion of the salmon stocks around the coast of Newfoundland is due to the intensive fishing which has been carried on for export of frozen salmon to Great Britain. I believe, during the war a tremendous amount of salmon was taken and put in cold storage and shipped to the other side. That might have been before the war, I am not quite sure, but I remember the astonishing amount of salmon taken and bought from the fishermen around the coast and I believe Labrador as well and sent to the other side. I notice that the size of the salmon began to get smaller and smaller. There are other causes, of course. One other cause has been due to the fact of wood being cut

along the river banks more than it should have been. When that happens you get a quick run-off and a big flood in the river when the salmon go up to the headwaters, or again the rivers dry up and all the salmon are left to die. The rivers have not a steady flow of cold water from the little streams that should percolate into them from the woods where the snow has been resting sheltered from the sun, such as was formerly the case. I don't think that the fishing around the coast is very intensive at the present time, but in some places they do have regulations. I am not sure how we stand here regarding the lifting of nets over the week-end. I think we did have it here at one time, but I am not sure it is in effect at the present time. But leaving the nets over the week-end and allowing quantities of fish to be left there with the nets not attended to until Monday is not a good idea.

Now we can protect the salmon in various ways. One is by having proper river wardens on the salmon rivers, which are desirable as places for fishermen to go and fish. When the Federal Government took over the administration of the policing of the rivers, it seems to me they adopted a very serious practice of having one man, with perhaps an assistant, do most of the rivers on the Avalon Peninsula on a flying column basis. They have taken the river wardens off particular rivers and have these men going around. That is not satisfactory. It is very much better to have men on the rivers themselves. It is certainly desirable to have good men on these rivers.

I have not seen any figures, and I don't know whether the Minister has any showing the number of salmon which were being caught in the

various rivers in Newfoundland by those persons against whom this Bill is intended to legislate at the present time.

At the present time any person who has resided in the country for six consecutive months is entitled to take out a license for a resident. We have been told that the purpose is to prevent persons who have not been here twelve months, other than Canadians, but members of the U.S. Army if they are not here twelve months from taking out residents' licenses. They must take out the same kind as tourists. In other words, pay so much a day or a higher fee per week than they would have to pay if they had the privilege of taking out a resident's license. Now, I think we should know the number of people who are to be affected in this way, and how far that would improve the position on the salmon rivers, because I believe that this is a very trifling affair. I don't think it is worthy of the Government. I am not saying how worthy the Government is, but I don't think it is worthy of any Government to introduce such a thing for the reasons I propose to show.

Now, if a man is not entitled to take out a resident's license until he is here twelve months, it means a man coming here in September won't be able to take out a resident's license for eighteen months or twenty months because the fishing season does not begin for trout until January and for salmon until June. That means for twenty-one months he won't be able to fish. As it stands now with the six month period, as far as the salmon are concerned, if a person comes here at the end of August the season is practically over and he has to wait until the next June before fishing. That is nine months. Now, most of



these American servicemen, are here, I believe, between twelve and eighteen months, so that most of them will not be eligible to take out a resident's license at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They can still fish though.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and pay the tourist license. Now, that is very generous indeed for the Government to say to these servicemen—what are they doing down here but protecting the North American Continent from invasion against our enemies, and in doing so spend hundreds of millions of dollars? The United States is recognized as the protector of the civilized world today, outside of the Communist countries—we owe a great debt to this country. Only the other day—

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't owe our salmon, we are not going to pay our debt by allowing our salmon to be—

MR. BROWNE: The Premier must be in a very bad mood today, when he picks up so small a point. The United States, let me go on, is the country to which we send our fresh fish. We want them to buy more fresh fish and send more fresh frozen fillets up to the United States of America. And American firms come down here. There was a gentleman here on opening day who was a very good friend of the Premier's, an admirer of the Premier, and the Premier was an admirer of his. He was down here, and he established a fresh fish plant in Fortune. The Americans have proven in many ways that they are good friends of Newfoundland, and is it our return to say, yes we will get all we can out of you, and when it comes to fishing we will

just treat you like any other tourists coming in here, even though you are here to protect us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are not here to protect us! They are here to protect themselves!

MR. BROWNE: Now, the Premier is certainly going to wing altogether today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not get down and worship them.

MR. BROWNE: I think you might get down and worship them. I think we owe them a great deal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't owe them our salmon.

MR. BROWNE: I think that is the least we owe them. We owe them the privilege—and, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister to indicate if he could, how much this is going to improve the salmon situation. I doubt very much that it is going to improve it at all. It seems to me to be a very insignificant thing for the Government to do, a mean and miserable thing for the Government to do to the country to which we owe so much, and to whom we are going to look for so much and—

MR. SMALLWOOD: And who owe us a lot also, a great lot.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier has already spoken in this debate. He told us about his fishing experience as a small boy at the Steadies where the Donovans Birch Mill is at the present time. I hope that is not the reason he has the mill there. But we sell more than fresh fish to the United States. Our lobsters and frozen salmon, I believe, are sold there in considerable quantity. They are very good neighbours. The Buchans mine

is owned by the American Smelt and Zinc Company and a good friend of the Premier has been exploring for oil over on the West Coast. I regret to say he does not seem to meet with the success he had hoped. At the same time he is an American citizen. Does not the Premier feel that actions of this kind are small things, and it is worthy to be taken into consideration whom we are dealing with when considering residents for the purpose of granting licenses.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will my honourable friend yield for a moment?

Does not my honourable friend realize that the issue becomes extremely simple now. Nobody will have any salmon fishing in Newfoundland in another ten or twelve years, nobody at all, it is that serious. We have information on it. There was a conference in Ottawa the other day where we were represented, and we have information on this, very disturbing information.

MR. BROWNE: Why are we not given that information?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is this bad: The Government of Canada now want to make us a very special concession in this Province, that they will postpone by one year in this Province certain regulations they intend to bring in, because it is a Federal jurisdiction. In addition to sport salmon fishing it applies to salmon fishing in salt water, and that is a great concession. That is just how serious it is.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier, when speaking, should have told us all the circumstances reported to his Government. We should have been told when introducing this Act. I know the salmon fishery has gone

down because of the extensive salmon fishing taking place. I am aware of that. But I ask the House seriously, how good and how effective is this provision? What effect is it to have? There are other ways in which the salmon fishery could be preserved, other than this one. Only yesterday morning in the "Daily News" I read: "Northern Area Command Personnel on Increase during 1954—Spending \$871,000 in Newfoundland." This represents—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has nothing to do with salmon.

MR. BROWNE: It represents an increase over the first quarter—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might come from liquor—but they get free liquor, without paying any customs duty, not from the present Government, but because the Federal Government permits their liquor to come in free without paying any customs duty or excise tax.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier may be aware that is so, I am not. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, the arguments I have advanced today deserve the interruptions and sneers of the Government nor of the Premier. I am serious when I say he should not take that attitude with regard to this great country, such a friend to Newfoundland. I still feel that this clause is not going to help salmon preservation very much, and should be dropped from the Bill.

As for the provision to have different fees for different areas: In theory that is all right, but how is it going to work. The Minister has not stated that. When we get into the committee stage, he may be able to tell us how it will work. Today a man gets a license to go fishing for

salmon, and may fish in Trepassey, Placentia, Salmonier or the Humber, or any other river in the country. Now, according to this provision, he has to get a different license for each river, or for some rivers a different license from what he has for another—it may work—but I must say that this thing can be magnified as far as the benefits are going to be to the country. I do know that on the Humber River people have had tremendous catches, which they should not be allowed to take. Now, the catch is reduced, I believe, to seven a day, and the effect upon the river has been very much less than expected. In former years some of them took twenty-five and thirty and forty salmon a day out of the river.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would my honourable friend know how many have been destroyed by shots of dynamite?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are certain visitors who do that. That is what they use.

MR. BROWNE: If the Government knows of anybody whether a visitor or resident, who used dynamite, he should be prosecuted and punished accordingly. I don't think any magistrate would fail to take cognizance of that most unorthodox way of catching salmon. To my knowledge I have never seen it. I do, though, remember one occasion on the Codroy River finding dead salmon on the shore, and I was advised by my guide at the time that he believed dynamite had been used there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can my honourable friend make a guess as to how many caribou and moose have been machine-gunned to death by

airmen on this Island? Literally thousands, as I happen to know.

MR. BROWNE: I don't happen to know that. I am surprised. It is the first time I have heard it. I don't remember ever seeing anything about it in print, and I very much doubt the figure is correct. However, once again, I know there is great difficulty about finding out who does those things, but if the culprits are caught they should be brought before the courts and punished accordingly. But I don't see that that has anything to do with this provision here. This provision does not seem to me to be brought in because somebody used dynamite. There does not seem to be any justification for it. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Bill.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I oppose that section too. I don't think it is going to aid or help the salmon fishery of Newfoundland at all. In fact I am not going to say much about it in any case, but I will say this in respect to the warden—the qualifications of the wardens are not up to the standard on some occasions. In fact, I was told last year, in one nearby river, a warden was sitting by the bank while an angler had the salmon fouled and he did nothing. He was watching the salmon fouled on the hook and he did not know it. Another thing is the pollution of the rivers which has more to do with the loss of our salmon going up to the ponds to spawn, and as has been pointed out here by my honourable friend, when there is little water in the river the salmon lie on the bottom. I know that some people also use nets at night. These things are all detrimental to the salmon. I suggest to the Minister there should be legislation so that if the river is in

such condition that the salmon are lying on the bottom, and due to the lack of water it is difficult for them to get up the river, then the river should be closed for a week or ten days, to give the salmon a chance to go up. But this amendment Act, Mr. Speaker, is not going to help us save the salmon fishery rather it is the poaching and the pollution of rivers and such things that are destroying our salmon. There is one other thing. I took up the question of restocking our ponds and lakes with trout. That is one of the things done in practically every other province, restocking ponds and setting up hatcheries. The ponds and lakes of other provinces are restocked, and they take other means also to facilitate the increase of trout. The trout should grow a greater size in a shorter time if those other things were done. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to save the salmon by putting a limitation on the length of time a person has to be in the province, whether six or twelve months. There are these other things, river pollution, low water and all the other things having to do with salmon going up to spawning places. I think that is what the department should take into consideration, and not the wearing of badges, no matter where they are worn.

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say all I could probably say, Sir, in regard to salmon fishing in Newfoundland, and with regard to this particular amendment which we have before us now. But I do want to refer to the arguments used by the honourable member for St. John's West when he stated that this amendment is aimed at making it more difficult for American servicemen to obtain salmon licenses here in New-

foundland. He added that we should not be doing this because of the fact that they are buying so much of our fish and are such friends of Newfoundland. I contend they buy fish because they like it, lobster because they like it and not because they are friends of Newfoundland. Do you think if I want a suit of clothes and buy it at Joe Goldstones it is because I want a suit of clothes and not because I like Joe Goldstone. So it is with people who buy our Newfoundland fish, and it has nothing at all to do with the amendment in the Act here today. The Americans are here. They are our good friends. We like them, and we hope that they like us. They are here to defend the North American Continent, and it is our job, in this Assembly, to defend the Newfoundland salmon.

In my own district of Fogo, we have the Gander River. I am told that a hundred years back it was not uncommon for settlers down there, to take out of the mouth of the Gander River, thousands of barrels of salmon each season, these they salted and put in barrels and exported. Today, Sir, it is difficult to get a salmon in the Gander River to eat even. One could leave Glenwood to go down the Gander River, which is a very beautiful trip, and you will see pole after pole on that river day after day for the whole salmon season. As a matter of fact, Sir, there are so many people fishing on that river today it is even difficult to get through in a canoe. Last time I went down there I had to pull out as I could not get through in a canoe, there were so many people fishing there. No river in the world can stand that, no river in Newfoundland can stand it. The Humber River is just about gone for exactly the same reason.

Salmon to Newfoundland is important for two reasons: It is important to our fishermen as a source of livelihood, and it is important to us in that it is a tourist attraction. It is important to us as individuals in that it gives us some little relaxation as well. But if the situation is desperate and serious, as we are told it is, Sir, then it is the duty of the Legislature and the duty of the House to introduce measures to protect the salmon fishery. This probably is not the best method, it does not go all the way. Probably there are other methods of conservation that could be used. Surely we cannot sit by while trying to build up a programme of conservation and allow the fishery to go altogether. Once it is gone how are we going to conserve it? This amendment at least will do one thing, reduce the number of people getting residents' licenses and the number of people who will fish the Newfoundland streams. If that can be done now while other programmes are being prepared, surely it is our duty to do it, rather than let the whole thing go. Personally, I don't know if I would like to see the Newfoundland rivers leased to private parties. I have not given the matter much thought. I feel if I want to go on a salmon fishing trip I should be allowed to go, with certain restrictions placed on me. But surely we are not going to allow the situation to develop to where we are all going to take up the boats and there is nothing left to any of us. This is designed to reduce the number of people salmon fishing, who have no interest whatsoever in the salmon fishery of Newfoundland, and take these people out. They are not tourists. They are not residents. They are not fishermen. They are people who are just passing through and have little or no

interest and who are of little or no interest to the people of Newfoundland. Because of that, Sir, I support this amendment.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, assuming there is no one else who wishes to speak on this motion, I shall close the debate. When I moved second reading of this Bill a day or two ago I stated that there were two amendments (1) whereas in the past we had given American servicemen in Newfoundland, residents' licenses after six months residence in the Province, we now propose to extend that to twelve months, which incidentally would then coincide with the length of time they must spend here in order to obtain a big game hunting license. (2) the only other amendment in this Bill was the inclusion of the words "of different areas," but so that this would make sense we gave the relevant clause from the parent Legislation. I did not know, and simply do not know how to put that more clearly. Yet our honourable friends, or at least some of them, on the other side have made it appear, and have been so reported on the radio and in the press, that we are now bringing in clauses discriminating, that we are now introducing badges to be worn and a number of other things taken from the clauses as they are given in this amendment here. I shall deal with the comments of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He said he was against class discrimination and distinctions such as envisaged in this Bill here. Mr. Speaker, we did not envisage class discrimination. The words and clauses which he read are not new in this amendment, but they are from the parent legislation and have been in existence in that form or another, ever since the first control over salmon ever

existed in the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: What do they mean?

DR. ROWE: They are the words which make it possible for my honourable friend to get a license for five dollars and for a man from Texas to get his for thirty dollars. That is what they mean. That is what they have done, and always have done. That is why they were put in there in the beginning. We did not do it. It is not new. We are not introducing it. The only amendment in the Bill is that of "Different Areas." I explained insofar as I was able, just the purpose of that, so that the Government, if it so desired, at any time would be able to charge different rates, issue different licenses, different charges for different areas of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Minister allow me to ask a question?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not allowing the honourable gentleman to ask any questions or to interrupt in any way. I tried my best to set him right and he asked me to sit down when he was speaking, so that I am not yielding one fraction of a second. If he wants to speak to a point of order any time it is a different matter.

The honourable gentleman also cast ridicule on this, he thought was a novel thing, that is the wearing of badges. We are not introducing the wearing of badges, Mr. Speaker, because it has always been there, as far back as I can find it in any legislation, the wearing of badges is prescribed by the qualified officers who were appointed. There is no reference at all to trouters.

MR. HOLLETT: The trouters have to wear badges, is that it?

DR. ROWE: Our honourable friend also spoke about the lack of enforcement. He said the Department of Mines and Resources (I am paraphrasing what he said) are guilty of neglect by not enforcing the present regulations. I must confess I was astonished to hear that from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I thought he would know something that I thought was known by just about everybody in this Province, that is the Department of Mines and Resources of this Province was not responsible for enforcing the regulation, it is the Federal Department. We have no more say over the game wardens, no more control over the game wardens on Gander River, except through the recommendations we might make to the Federal Government, no more to say about them than we have to say with regard to Chiang Kai-Shek's soldiers on Formosa.

Our honourable friend, the member for St. John's West has offered some suggestions as to how we can improve the present situation, and what must be done, as has also his colleague from St. John's East. I take it both these honourable members have caught salmon, as I have myself, twice in my life, and they are only further proof of a phenomenon that I have noticed particularly in those last two years: Every man who has ever caught a salmon considers himself an expert on wild life matters, especially salmon matters. In the last three years I have heard many, many anglers give many reasons for what is happening to our salmon and our trout and to other game. I have heard hundreds of convincing arguments. The only trouble



is that very seldom do any two of the arguments agree or coincide, so much so, as a matter of fact, that the analogy is this; the expert advice one hears about salmon reminds me of the expert advice one hears about education. Everybody is an expert when it comes to education or religion or rabbits or moose. Every man who ever shot a moose can tell me just what we should be doing about the moose in Newfoundland, and just why caribou are not in such a place where they were twenty-five years ago. So with the salmon. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this House seems to have forgotten a very simple fact to which some publicity has been given, that is that the advice which has been coming in to me as Minister of the Department of Mines and Resources has been so conflicting, so contradictory that last year I recommended to the Executive Government that I be authorized to contact and engage the services of some qualified authority in the wild life field. My colleagues agreed with me, so I contacted the former head of the fish and wild life services of the United States of America, the man who is now head of the largest institute of its kind in the world, a recognized authority. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, he is considered the world's greatest authority on wild life. A man who has made surveys for nineteen states in the United States of America, not to mention surveys for other countries outside the United States. He has offered to come here without charge or remuneration, and bring his staff with him and make an impartial investigation of our wild life resources. He did come here and is due here again within the next two weeks, and will be here again next fall. A man who is one of the world's greatest authorities on wild life. I

am sure his report will not solve the problems of our wild life. I am doubtful if anybody knows the solution to all of them. I don't believe there is one man in the world today, Mr. Speaker, who knows why there are fewer salmon in some of our rivers today. Who knows why on the Eagle River, for instance, on the Labrador where a few years ago you could get twenty pound salmon yet the average salmon caught there last summer, I am told was five pounds. It is not pressure of population. Nobody seems to know all the answers. Certainly in certain instances like on the Gander and the Humber common sense tells us there must be a limit to the number of salmon that can be caught. In Big Falls, for example, where I believe nine rods are supposed to be the maximum, either nine or eleven, and where only last year on one occasion seventy rods were counted at one time. Certainly pressure of that kind must make a difference in the number of salmon. But there are other factors, and nobody seems to know them all. I can cite one example: A few weeks ago the Maritimes made a representation to the Federal Government with regard to our west coast (that is Newfoundland's west coast) salmon fishery, which is carried out with nets because the fishermen were intercepting salmon on the way up through the Cabot Straits making their way to the rivers of Eastern Canada, where there are notably fewer salmon today than a few years ago. They blamed it, as I said, on our important, basic and commercial west coast fishermen. They can't explain how or why their rivers on the Mainland today, that once teemed with salmon, are not all they were. The salmon must be intercepted by our west coast fishermen. Somebody else will say the

paper companies did it with wood in the rivers and pollution of the streams. My honourable friends know there are certain streams where there is never any recognizable pollution, yet the fish have declined in size and declined in quantity.

Our honourable friend from St. John's West is greatly perturbed over the injustice that we are perpetrating on our friends from the United States who are here protecting us from all the evils in the world. Mr. Speaker, I was in here in the Spring of 1941 when our friends from the United States actually came here. I worked with them actually for a few weeks when waiting for the University to open, and I have had close, friendly relations with them ever since. I have enjoyed their hospitality and have been very happy to have them enjoy mine. I fail to see how in the world our changing this from six months to twelve months, which is a normal thing anyway for anybody coming in who are just tourists—a bank manager who comes here in charge of a bank from Montreal. It happened last year such a man came from New Brunswick and had to wait twelve months before getting his resident's license.

MR. BROWNE: Six months.

DR. ROWE: But in cases where the salmon season has just begun. I fail to see how this can be considered to be an injustice. I said when I moved second reading that in certain areas pressure was very great, obviously areas such as in the vicinity of Stephenville where you might assume there are thousands of servicemen. The thing is this, Mr. Speaker, we have to make changes, and these changes we are recommending here might very well be in the interest of the American

servicemen themselves. That has escaped the attention of my honourable friend. Then again there is the matter of the income to this Province from this, what used to be considered a great resource. It is interesting to note my honourable friend enjoyed getting the right to catch a salmon, and paid five dollars. It would cost him in 1949 five dollars or less, I am not sure of that, but not more than five anyway. That very year it cost the people of Newfoundland, when we took in a total of twenty-five thousand dollars because my honourable friend got his license for five dollars or less, and others like him, the ordinary people of Newfoundland, all the people, had to pay ninety thousand dollars for the protection of these very rivers. And we collected \$25,000. This country then collected twenty-five thousand dollars and spent ninety thousand dollars of the people's money. It just did not make sense, not to me at any rate.

There is one other thing I want to say. First of all, we don't propose—and I am surprised at the amount of agitation this little Bill has brought forward—but we don't propose anything radical. I think some of our friends, or maybe I should not say friends, are a bit sorry we are not introducing the leasing of rivers. Then they would be able to say "I told you so." Of course now they say we had intended to do so but got frightened with everybody kicking up all over the Province. So, sir, perhaps I had better say here—

MR. BROWNE: Who referred to it?

DR. ROWE: Perhaps I had better say here that (and I need to say it) this Government has never considered formally or informally the leasing of rivers, never at any time.

My own department, which is the department responsible has never (as a department that is involving the Minister or the department) considered the leasing of rivers at any time during my connection with it, in spite of the fact that it has been made to appear that we have. The only thing that could ever be described as a consideration of it at all was the fact (and I did not even know at the time) that when the Director of Wild Life on one occasion was in the Maritimes on other business and had a little time to spare, he looked into the matter of the leasing of rivers as it applied to New Brunswick (he was not sent to do so by the department or myself) and rightly so. The Deputy Minister is now on the Mainland at Ottawa and has at least a dozen things I directed him to inquire into, and if he has time I hope he inquires into a dozen others, things I did not speak about. The Director of Wild Life did not bring back a report to me. As a matter of fact the first information I ever had that he had done so was when he said it to the press. I say now, as I said in the beginning, the fact that the Director of Tourist Development, who had every right to do it as Director of Tourist Development, expressed his personal opinion that rivers should be leased, he in no way committed the Government or indicated that the Government had given any consideration formal or informal to it.

**MR. BROWNE:** He can say what he likes? The Government does not take any responsibility for what he says?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Except during elections.

**MR. BROWNE:** Certainly then.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Full and complete then.

**MR. MROWNE:** As long as he is on the right side.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** He is on the right side.

**MR. BROWNE:** As long as he speaks in favour of this Government.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Is not that obviously the right side. Look at your small numbers and the large number over here.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order—The Honourable Minister has the floor.

**DR. ROWE:** My honourable friend seems to be disturbed, Mr. Speaker. This is not a panacea of all the ills in this Province. I did not anticipate that anybody would ever regard it as a panacea, as there are only two minor amendments. If they want at any time a full scale debate on wild life I would presume to oblige them. Let me say this: We have many serious wild life problems in this Province just as any other community has, and we are trying to get some advice on them. We hope to have a report on them this year or early next year, from Dr. Gabrielson.

I will say this in closing the debate, sir. We, as a Department and as a Government are fully aware of the seriousness of our wild life problems. We are not going to take any radical or drastic measures. We are not going to deprive our people of the traditional rights they have enjoyed down through the years by a wild life dictatorship at all. We are trying to do what appears to us to be sensible at this time. I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time.

Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, if the House would now agree to go into a Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Act we read first and second time today?

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953." Leave was given earlier today for this Committee to sit.

Committee of the Whole:  
 Clause 1 read and carried.  
 Clause 2 read:

2. Section 3 of The St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953, the Act No. 33 of 1953, is amended by adding thereto the following:

"The signature of the Minister on the said bonds may be lithographed or otherwise mechanically reproduced."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Is it customary to have it done in this way? Is it not necessary for the Minister to sign the bond formally?

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, unless it is provided in the Bill itself it would be necessary for the Minister to sign it.

MR. HEFFERTON: Anybody who has had the job of signing a big issue of bonds can appreciate the usefulness of this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This varies from one bond to another. Sometimes it is made a condition, each one be signed individually, but where it is not so provided they can be signed mechanically.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the City Clerk still has to sign the bonds?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, there must be one signature, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 4 read and carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendments. Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill I may say that the apprenticeship plan of the Department of Labour, set up in January 1953 an Apprenticeship Board, and following upon our experience the following amendments are indicated:

Section 2 of the Bill deals with two points (1) it delegates under certain conditions of the Apprenticeship Board certain powers to the Director of Apprenticeship, and (2) it enables the board to make recommendations, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. In the second paragraph the Board may review the actions taken by the Director under his delegated powers.

The other section deals with the additions of certain cases, and actually the whole Bill is merely an amendment of sections of the Act by adding these sections, which we will review when we get into Committee stage. I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I am very interested, certainly, in the training of apprentices. I have been engaged, Sir, in a trade for the past 37

years, I believe, and I have had the pleasure, Sir, and I have had the privilege of working with many young men who came into the places where I was employed, to serve their term as apprentices. However, Sir, I cannot go along with the proposed amendments to the Provincial Act which we have before the House now. For one thing, Sir, it gives too much power to the director; although I am personally acquainted with the director, and have been for quite a number of years, and feel he is well qualified and quite competent to carry out the provisions of this Act. He is a very qualified machinist. I know him well, and he is a grand chap. However, Sir, the powers of the board are being delegated to the director insofar as the powers which may be delegated to him under Section 9 of the Apprenticeship Act.

There is a new clause 27, which says "No person between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one years, who is eligible to be an apprentice in any designated trade, and has not completed training as an apprentice, shall be employed in a designated trade for more than a total of three months in any one year between the said ages unless the Board issues a permit authorizing him to be so employed, or unless he enters into a contract of apprenticeship."

In other words, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this clause 27 gives the director the right and the authority to decide for himself, whether a youth from 16 to 21 years of age, will work at a trade for any more than three months in any one year unless he accepts the director's dictates and lends himself as an apprentice. Now, Sir, I say this situation interferes with the civil rights of the young man concerned and with the civil right of his parents,

who I think are the first people who are to decide and the boy himself whether he should go and enter upon an apprenticeship or not. Now that is the section I disagree with, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly am opposed to it.

There is one other section I am opposed to and that is the new amending section where the Board would require any and all persons in any area, other than registered apprentices and persons who receive a permit under Section 27A, to hold a certificate of qualification, and prohibiting the employment of persons who do not hold such a certificate. This is qualified by the section which prescribes the terms and conditions under which certificates of qualification and permits may be issued. Under this new section, then, the Board may issue permits for those already engaged in a trade at the time of issuing of the regulations, and allow them to continue in the trade. But after that period, Mr. Speaker, the Board may not or may issue a permit for people who worked at a trade. Mr. Speaker, we have many people working at trades in this Island, and of all those who work at trades there are quite a few who have worked as helpers, and I will say of many of these people, and I know them just as well as I know many apprentices, that quite a number engaged in the trades could be classed as designated tradesmen who had learned that trade just as well in the past. Any young man of eighteen or nineteen through circumstances perhaps in which he may find himself or his parents may find themselves, could enter a trade as a helper and after a number of years be well qualified to do any work that trade required. He would not have a certificate, that is true. I know situa-

tions where a number of apprentices working at a place have become qualified after their term of apprenticeship but others have not qualified. Because of the fact that a person is apprenticed to a trade it does not mean he will come out at the end of his years of service as a qualified man.

I know this Act here describes the terms and conditions under which qualifications may be issued, also there are sections requiring the payment and subscribing the amount of fees for examinations for certain qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot go along with the amendment Act because it is discriminatory and interferes with the civil rights of youth and interferes with the civil rights and privileges of parents or anyone who may be eligible to enter a trade. The powers of the Board are delegated to the Director under Section 27A, it may or may not be used, but at the same time it gives the director the power, and regardless of the fact that the director himself is a fine man, he may not always be there. If it becomes law nobody knows what is going to happen to the director or when we may have a different person. That, Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to. I object to it and think he should not have this power over any boy. It is interfering with civil rights of a boy and the civil rights of his parents. I oppose this amending Act, Sir.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was a little late getting up. I am sorry, but I just want to add a word. I know the Honourable Minister of Labour and my esteemed colleague on my left have much more knowledge of the requirement for an apprenticeship than even I may have. But on the face of it, Mr. Speaker, it does

look rather arbitrary that the director whoever he may be has the power to require all persons in any area other than registered apprentices to receive a permit under Section 27A which reads:

"No person between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one who is eligible to be an apprentice in any designated trade and has not completed training as an apprentice shall be employed in a designated trade for more than a total of three months in any one year between the said ages unless the Board issues a permit authorizing him to be so employed or unless he enters into a contract of apprenticeship."

Then it goes on in Section 27B. "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Board and with the approval of the Minister may, by order, limit the application of this Act or regulations to any area or areas of the Province specified in the order."

Now that may be all right as far as I know. But on the face of it and Sir, my whole argument is merely on the face of the Bill, because as I say I am not well acquainted, not as well acquainted as I should be, with the Apprenticeship Act. This section which was read by the honourable member for St. John's East "27A" debars from employment anyone between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one. There is something there I saw a moment ago where an employer in certain areas may, on certificate from the director, be denied the right to engage such young men. I think in this little, small country of ours we don't need to be so strict as probably they need to be in bigger centres like Montreal and Toronto and such places. I can see no reason for it. If the Honourable Minister can give me



some cause why this should be absolutely essential in this country I would only be too happy to change my opinion. But I do support the remarks of my honourable friend from St. John's East who is a labour man of many years' experience, as is the Minister.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, I think the first point is that my honourable friend, the member for St. John's East, mentioned the fact that we are granting too much power to the director. The Board itself has recommended that. This Board meets about once in three months or sometimes a little longer period of time in between their meetings. They have a lot of work that has to be done, and a lot of decisions to be made. Because of that they feel that they should give certain powers to the director to carry on these things in between periods of their meetings.

MR. FOGWILL: If the Honourable Minister will allow me? Mr. Speaker, under Section 9 in the first part of the section (a) to (i) I don't mind that amount being delegated to the director. These are only ordinary things which could come under his direction and he could do these things rather than have the board settle them. But it is the new section in the amending Act, Section 27A, and under the new sections (k) and (l).

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman then agrees with all the amendments up to 27A?

MR. FOGWILL: No, Sir. We can deal with that in Committee probably.

MR. BALLAM: Well, Mr. Speaker, regarding the point I was speaking on just now—The powers delegated to the director, you will see further on in the Bill that the Board has the

power to review anything the director authorizes. You will also notice under 2 (b) "shall at the request of any person who feels aggrieved thereby made within sixty days of the exercise of the power or duty." If any person, therefore, be aggrieved by an Act of the director then they may, within sixty days, take up their case with the Board who would have it in its power to either change or review.

Now, the other point mentioned by my honourable friend, the member for St. John's East, was that he feels that we should not put such restriction on employment of certain persons. I may say that this is necessary, and it is not a restrictive measure altogether. It means that those employed or to be employed in a designated trade between the ages of 16 and 21 years should take up an apprenticeship course. Now these designated trades are agreed upon by the apprenticeship branch of the firms themselves, the firms in which those who would apply would be in agreement with the director, or the Board of Apprenticeship Training, and these terms the employers agree with. These advisory boards are made up by the employers and employees in the designated trades who have advised this sort of thing. It would not mean now that anybody coming in or wanting a job in a firm and who has had no contract of apprenticeship training, would be prevented or stopped from getting a job. The idea of the three months here is to provide work, if you like, for the students between the ages of 16 and 21 who just get a job in the summer time when not at school.

MR. FOGWILL: It does not say that.

MR. BALLAM: That is the point.

That is why that is put in there. That is the way out for such students to be employed during the summer, and there is nobody being prevented from getting a job.

MR. FOGWILL: There can be.

MR. BALLAM: There can not be. There is no idea or intention of preventing anybody from getting any job. The only thing is that we want to make sure that those between the ages of 16 and 21 who have a job in a designated trade will take the course of apprenticeship training. We know that that is necessary, and my honourable friend knows that it is very necessary. We have a shortage of skilled tradesmen in this country. The biggest trouble we have had in supplying the labour demands in this last few years is the shortage of and the lack of skilled men. The whole idea of the Apprenticeship Act is not to prevent a young man from getting a job, but to help him when he does get into a job to become proficient and to study as an apprentice, and to qualify himself for his future life. He would then, of course, as the Act says, be given a permit of qualification that he could present anywhere and demand his journeyman's job or pay-

There is nothing in this to keep anybody from having a job. It is well thought out and it is customary in all Apprenticeship Acts, I understand, and it is required by the Board. I certainly can't see how we can oppose it. If it should create a hardship I am sure that we can always change it. But I don't think it was ever intended that way, and the powers given to the director are limited. The regulations that we will make here will be done by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. There is no great fear of anything happening that is harmful, as

far as this is concerned. We are endeavouring to do good by the apprentices rather than to harm them.

I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act," I may say that at the present time Section 1 of this Act merely says how this Act may be cited. Section 2 states that executives or directors of a corporation may have to pay duplicate assessments where they serve more than one company. In some cases directors may spend only a relatively small time on the premises of a company where they serve. Under this amendment they would be covered by the Act only on application for coverage which may be made under Section 4 of the Act. Now, I may say that Sections 3, 5, 7 and 9 in the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1952, the Workmen's Compensation Act, as it stood in 1952 were consolidated into one Act. In that revision some of the numbers in the original Act were changed in 1953 and amendments were made to the Workmen's Compensation Act. But when we look at it now some of the references to the Original Act are incorrect. This is due to the fact that the revision of the Statutes had not been completed when the 1953 amendments were passed. To simplify references we are repealing the 1953 amendments and incorporating them into Sections 3, 5,

7 and 9 of this new Bill, so that all of these sections are already covered in the last year's amendments which we are just repealing now and incorporating into this Act.

The other sections of the Bill are two points: The first point is that the Board may at some time put up a building of its own. They are now in a rented building that may be required of them at any time. It is customary for several boards to have their own building. If and when they do that this section of the Act will enable them to do so.

The second point is that it is intended or hoped to introduce a pensions scheme for the staff and members of the Board. The scheme would be a contributory one and subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Under this provision, Section 28 (b) the employees and the members of the Workmen's Compensation Board, as you know, who are not civil servants and have no pension scheme, and there is nothing in the present Act that would enable them to have such a scheme for themselves, will be enabled to have such a scheme.

The other points in the Act are most of them the amendments of last year that we are incorporating here. I don't think there is anything else. All these points will come up, Mr. Speaker, in Committee stage. I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there are only a couple of points I wish to refer to. I noticed from the Annual Report tabled here a few days ago, that the Board feels pretty badly about the office space, and requires larger accommodations. I noticed that they pay nine thousand

dollars a year rent, I take it for the USO Building. It says the Board must of sheer necessity undertake the erection of its own building. I presume, therefore, the place is not big enough for the working staff there. I don't think the rent seems to be very exorbitant, besides it is a building owned by the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By the University.

MR. BROWNE: The Department of Public Works has charge of it.

Then they go on to say the staff and the committee are energetically engaged in examining various contributory pension schemes with a view to adopting one most suitable. Now, I placed a question on the Order Paper because I read that and because I know the men who are appointed to the Board are and were great friends of the present Government, and passed the age when they would normally be engaged into the civil service. I am wondering if it is an orthodox procedure to provide pensions for men of that type. I have no complaint against the work they have performed. They have performed, in my opinion, a very excellent job. They started from scratch and in a short time have built up this tremendous fund. I think the time has come to reconsider the rates they are charging. But that does not enter into the picture here today. They have a large surplus of money, and feel very generous, and are going to do in a short time what other compensation boards took a very long time to get around to. And this authority to inaugurate this pension scheme has been passed over to them. The Minister did not seem to be quite aware of how much attention they have been giving to it. They

seem to be ready now to come to a selection of the type of scheme they favour. It is true it is not going to cost the Government any money, but it is coming out of the money paid by assessment upon the employers and employees. I trust when they do make a scheme these points will be borne in mind and the scheme will be a competent one, suitable to the ability of the men that are there, and that they won't get any special favours because they were friends of the Government.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker—

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I may say that nobody has asked me for my support of this Bill, and I have been approached by no member of the Workmen's Compensation Board or no employee of the Board. But I do know some of the people who work up there, and I can assure the House that they are not all old men. As a matter of fact quite a number of them are younger than I am, and I don't consider myself so very old. Some are men who worked in civil service jobs previously, and quite a number have served in the armed forces, and are forty years and younger. I would suggest that if a pensions scheme is going to come in, it is going to be contributory. This should be considered in their salaries. I noticed the other day when the honourable member's question which he referred to a moment ago asked for the scale of salaries, which are not very large up there. There are quite a number of people up there getting between \$2,600 and \$3,000, and people in the civil service who are doing comparative work are receiving salaries just as large as that and their pension scheme is not contributory. I would like to repeat that point again, Sir: They are not

old men up there. Quite a lot of these people working up there are young people.

MR. BROWNE: Just an explanation, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has spoken.

MR. BROWNE: This is just an explanation of what the honourable gentleman has just said. I must interpret his remarks.

I was referring to members of the Board not to the services of the Board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are no old men on the Board. Two are quite young, and another is just middle age.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say against this Act at all except this—I am looking at the report which came in the other day, and I am a bit concerned over the large amount of money that has been built up in such a short space of time by this Board. I believe, if my memory serves me right, that there is something like three million dollars and over that has been collected from the employers since the Bill was brought in, of which about one million dollars was paid out by way of compensation, and one million dollars or thereabout invested in Canadian Government Bonds, and slightly over one million dollars invested in Newfoundland Government Bonds—I take it that was the bond issue of last year. So that I agree with my colleague on my right that some consideration ought to be given to the rates which they obtain, because after all you know, although you take it out of employers in a sense you take it out of employees as

well. You can only take so much. I was wondering—and there is machinery, I think, in the Act to take up the matter of the rates.

MR. BALLAM: It is arranged that if the accident rate in any industry is down they adjust the rates down and make a refund to the firms. The rates are fairly comparable with the rates in industry all over.

MR. HOLLETT: The point I wish to make is that since 1950, (I think the Act was then set up) they have collected three million dollars and only one million has gone to compensation and the other two million has been invested in bonds. If that keeps on you can see what you are going to have, and that you are going to have some difficulty.

MR. BALLAM: I wanted to move the second reading here before six o'clock, but to the point that my honourable friend made regarding the building up of this big fund. You see, Mr. Speaker, the Board started from scratch and there are none, or very few continuing claims at the present time. The assessments are made from the firms and the funds are to be built up from these assessments. For instance if you have in an industry a fatal accident then a family has to be looked after for such time until the widow remarries or the children grow up and so on. When you have total disability payments you have to pay these forever until the person dies, and these snowball every year until say in about ten years time there won't be any surplus at all. It will be a sort of using up of the surplus that we have accumulated to pay the continuing cases.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the House this afternoon I made additional charges against Dr. Valdmanis, of defrauding the firm of MIAG of the sum of \$360,000.

I now move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Attorney General what legislation we are going ahead with on Monday?

MR. CURTIS: Fisheries.

On motion House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 3, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

MONDAY, May 3, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a point of privilege about a statement published in the press. There does not, however, seem to be much point in making it at present and I wonder, if Your Honour would defer calling the House to Order for a few moments.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege; to invite Your Honour's attention to a report that appeared in Saturday's Edition of the "Daily News," of the proceedings of this House on Friday afternoon. The headline is: "Holds Servicemen Slaughters Wildlife," and the opening paragraph reads as follows:

"Servicemen doing duty in Newfoundland are using dynamite and machine guns to slaughter wildlife in the Province. Premier Smallwood charged in yesterday's session of the House of Assembly."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will admit that that is the only point in this account in the "Daily News" of Saturday last. In the rest of the statement there is no reference whatever to my having said what I am described in this paragraph of saying; namely, servicemen doing duty in Newfoundland are using dynamite and machine guns to slaughter wildlife in the Province. Premier Smallwood charged during yesterday's session of the House of Assembly.

Now, I think the whole House will remember that I said nothing whatever about servicemen in the present tense. Where I referred to dynamite, I said visitors, and did not say servicemen. I said visitors where I referred to machine guns, and it was in the past tense, and it did not refer to servicemen in this Province. As a matter of fact I was not even thinking of servicemen in this Province at this time. It was during the war—during the war, I repeat now. I said thousands, certainly many hundreds of caribou and moose were machine-gunned. I did not imply

who did so, I knew at least a dozen R.A.F. crews who machine-gunned. I know persons and have had personal accounts from them. I know of no one having machine-gunned caribou or moose or any other wild life in Newfoundland since the war.

With regard to dynamiting what I said was "Visitors." Now, this paper is the only one which made that statement, and the reporter who wrote this was the only reporter in the House who made this statement, the others did not. They were here representing newspapers or radio stations, and it is rather extraordinary that that one reporter should make that statement, and he be the only one who did do so. Incidentally, he has me shouting here, and leaping to my feet and doing all kinds of acrobatics, shouting and roaring and bawling and thundering. There are times when my voice is rather loud, but I don't know that I thunder. I don't know that I bawl. I don't know that I roar. Possibly the reporter in question was trying to be colourful. Perhaps that is his idea of being colourful. If so, perhaps there is no harm done.

The other point of privilege, Mr. Speaker is this:

I am informed that there has now been circulated widely through this city, and possibly outside this city, a rumor to the effect that it was only when the R.C.M.P. and/or the Income Tax Authorities of the Government of Canada came to me saying that either I prosecute Dr. Valdmanis or they would do so. That is the rumor: That it was only after the R.C.M.P. and/or the Government of Canada, the income tax people, had come to me saying, if I did not lay charges they would. That is the



rumor. There is not a sentence of truth in it, not a word of truth in it, not a letter of truth in it. It is a lie! It is made up, invented! It is a fabrication, and invented rumor!

The R.C.M.P. knew less than nothing about Dr. Valdmanis until I called them in and made my charges. The income tax people may or may not have, I have not the foggiest notion. They never consulted me. What I did, I did absolutely voluntarily. Whatever the consequence may be it was exactly my own action, without any knowledge of anyone until I called in the R.C.M.P., myself.

Now, I think it is fairly obvious that rumor was not only invented by my political enemies, but I think the reasons are fairly obvious. But when the facts come out as they will these rumors will seem pretty petty, pretty trifling, pretty small, pretty unimportant. But at the moment it is important that I should clear them up and destroy them.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, to that point if I may—I do hope the honourable the Premier is not including the Opposition as political enemies at this point, because the information the Honourable the Premier just gave to the House has come, to me at any rate, for the first time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman opposite, if they are political enemies of mine, are not the only ones.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. G. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition addressed to the Honourable House of Assembly from some 360 residents of Seldom and Stag Harbour and also supporting their petition, by the residents of

Fogo, Tilting and Indian Island—some 360 all together, requesting a road be built from Seldom to Stag Harbour.

Now, Sir, Stag Harbour is comparatively new as a community on Fogo Island. It is made up of residents who have moved in from Indian Island—one of three islands being deserted altogether, and they have founded a very nice community there in one of the best harbours probably north of Cape Freels. These people are only six or seven miles from Seldom, where the present highroad ends. They wish the extension of that road into Stag Harbour. By extending the road there, Sir, it would give these people the opportunity to get to hospital all winter. At present they have to tackle the job by boat and with ice in there these people have no transportation whatever. Anybody very well acquainted with Fogo Island knows how difficult it is, and what a stormy place it can be in winter. The extension of this road from Seldom to Stag Harbour would just about complete the necessary connecting roads on Fogo Island to the chief town of Fogo and Fogo Hospital in the centre of the island. I move the petition be tabled in this House and referred to the department concerned.

On motion petition tabled for reference to the department concerned.

#### Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motion

None.

#### Notice of Questions

(72) MR. W. J. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies doing business with the Government? Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies which have received loans from or have had loans guaranteed by the Government? Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies which have been established by Government funds?

2. Give the names of any such Directors with the names of the Companies of which they are Directors, together with salary, if any, paid in each case.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is that question in order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that question is out of order, and ought to be ruled out now. Does it not contain insinuations? Does it not assume the answer that members of the Government are directors of the company?

MR. BROWNE: Well you know they are, one is yourself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, could we have your ruling on that?

MR. BROWNE: Before you rule, Mr. Speaker, I may say it seems to me a perfectly legitimate question wanting to know how many members of the Government are directors, of what companies and what salaries, if any are received.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is directors of companies doing business with the Government, and assuming there are such companies.

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well it is a pretty big assumption.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall have to study the question at another time. At the present moment it is a notice.

#### Answers to Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before answering questions. There were no questions asked on the last day. Are we going into question before going on with the orders of the day?

MR. SPEAKER: That is right. Are there any answers to questions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Question No. 70 addressed to me as Minister of Economic Development by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I gave an answer here the other day, in which I said that the German Firm of MIAG had shipped machinery and equipment to Newfoundland to one firm and one firm only, to one plant and one plant only. i.e., the Cement Mill, but that they made no shipment to the gypsum plant or any other plant. That is to say they shipped no equipment and/or machinery and/or anything else to any other firm or plant or industry in Newfoundland, merely to the cement mill. The machinery and equipment for the gypsum plant were shipped to Newfoundland by the Firm of Beno Schilde.

Now, the question asks for an itemized list of equipment. The Department of Finance informs me, and the Controller of the Treasury informs me in a note today that the invoices and supporting documents relating to the shipments of this firm of MIAG to the Cement Mill are made up of over one thousand sheets of closely typed paper. The Controller of the Treasury in his note to me goes on to say it is clearly im-

possible to have these documents copied in time for tabling during this session. In the circumstances I can only suggest that, if the Opposition desire this information that members of that body could call at the Department of Finance during working hours where the invoices etc. have been segregated and are readily available for such inspection as the Opposition may desire.

Now the second part of the question concerns the rate of interest charged on the said machinery and what amount of insurance premiums were paid on each shipment of machinery and equipment. The answer is that goods were shipped C.I.F. and no data of the type requested is available. In short the government brought this equipment and paid for it as, and when, it was landed in Corner Brook so that it did not belong to the government until it was landed and was paid for by the government, but it did belong to the owners, to MIAG. MIAG owned it until delivered into possession of the government. They did their own insuring, paid their own freight, and it was their own goods until delivered into the government's hands; for that reason the insurance was entirely their own business and not the business of the government, indeed these are the terms, I believe of the contract. In other words this was done by the owners of the machinery in question. I said before, and repeat, virtually all of the insurance was carried by Lloyds of London, and in one instance I happened to know of, the insurance was carried by the firm of Crosbie and Company of St. John's, but all of that was done on behalf of the owner of the machinery and equipment, i.e., the firm of MIAG. It was MIAG insured, paid the premiums, and the govern-

ment had nothing whatsoever to do with it until the machinery and equipment was received by the government on Newfoundland soil, and all insurance up to that point was the concern of the makers, shippers and vendors of the machinery and equipment.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I have here the answer to No. 65 asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's West on the Order Paper of Tuesday, April 27th, 1954.

1. Question: What is the rate of license fee for three ton trucks?

Answer: There is no license fee fixed for three ton trucks. Fees are fixed on the basis of maximum gross weight. What is normally called a three ton truck would have a maximum gross weight of from 16,000 to 20,000 pounds, depending upon the equipment of the vehicle, such as size of body, springs, tires, etc. Following is the relevant scale of fees:

16,000—17,000 lbs.	.....\$180
17,001—18,000 "	..... 210
18,001—19,000 "	..... 245
19,001—20,000 "	..... 280

2. Question: Is it correct that such trucks in the Bloomfield, Bonavista area have been licensed annually at a rate of \$100.00 or \$72.00 below the regular rate?

Answer: No reduction in the set fees has been allowed in any part of the Province, nor has any special concession been made to any vehicle owner. The maximum gross weight for which a vehicle is licensed is the governing factor. If a vehicle were licensed for less than its possible capacity it would not be permitted to carry a load which would cause the maximum gross weight for which it had been licensed to be exceeded.

3. Question: How many vehicles have been licensed below the regular rates and give the areas where such reduced rates have been applied?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

4. Question: How long has the practice of granting reduced rates been in force-

Answer: See answer to question 2.

5. Question: By what authority have such reduced rates been made?

Answer: See answer to question 2.

"That does not mean there will not be heavier loads than 20,000 lbs. carried on the highway. That is the maximum grade load for which our roads and bridges are being prepared from now on. In fact for the past year or so that is the standard for the Trans-Canada Highway, the mean gross load or actual load of 20,000 lbs."

#### Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Order of the Day are called I would like to ask a question either of the Premier or the Attorney General. On Friday the Premier said a new charge was being made against Dr. Valdimanis for \$360,000, I believe. It has been reported over the radio that the charge was reduced to \$280,000. That is in order to enable Dr. Valdimanis to get bail more easily. Is there any truth in that statement, or any explanation as to why the charges have been reduced?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no significance in the amendment at all. The facts are that a certain charge was made against Dr. Valdimanis by the Honourable the Premier last Thursday, I think it was,

or Friday, and when they checked it up they found that within the dates mentioned, I understand, that it was a lesser amount, and it was just reduced to that amount to bring it, I think, within the dates referred to in the application. I think I can tell the House that in fact the amount will be found to be the amount as mentioned by the Premier for which the warrant was prepared. We did not want to prejudice the application for bail by having the amount larger by one cent than the amount actually involved, or was strictly within the compass of the dates in question. The amendment was made purely in Dr. Valdimanis's interest. We did not want to have it said we had blown up the amount prematurely, although I am satisfied that the amount as presented to the court is the true amount. But for the purpose of the bail application we did not want it to appear greater than the period in question. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to rise to a point of privilege in reference to Item 11 on the Order Paper (second reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority"). Mr. Speaker, you will remember we did not have that Bill before us when Your Honour was referring to it on Friday. Since then, it has come to our notice and we are inclined to believe that it is definitely a Money Bill, and therefore should be brought in, in another manner, i.e., by resolution, and submitted to a Committee of the Whole House, for discussion.

If I may, I would like to quote the

various rules and regulations which I, myself, have looked up in reference to this, Mr. Speaker. I refer first to standing order No. 46.

"If any motion be made in the House for public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House be passed thereupon."

Then, sir, I would refer the House to Section 54 of the British North America Act, which is the Bible now of us all, and of Canada as a whole:

Section 54 of the British North America Act, 1867: "It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address or a Bill for the Appropriation of any Part of the Public Revenue or of any Tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by Message of the Governor-General in the Session in which Vote, Resolution, Address or Bill is proposed."

Following that, sir, I would like to refer the House to Page 163, Third Edition of Beauchesne Parliamentary Rules and Forms which states:

"All Bills providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of public funds of the Dominion must be first considered as resolutions in Committee of the Whole. And all such resolutions necessary to the introduction of a Bill must first obtain the recommendation of the Governor-General. It often happens that

bills are introduced with certain clauses providing for salaries or other charges on the public revenue, and in that case the Bill may be introduced directly on motion while the clauses in question (which should be distinguished by italics or brackets), are considered in the shape of resolutions in Committee on the Bill. But this can only be done when the Money Clauses are merely a part of the Bill. Whenever the main object of the Bill is the payment of public money, it must directly originate in Committee of the Whole. The rule also applies to releasing or compounding any sum of money due to the Crown and to the imposition of any State tax upon the people but not the pecuniary penalties necessary to the operation of a Bill."

A Money Bill was defined as follows in Section I of the Parliamentary Act passed in the British House in 1911:

"A Money Bill means a Public Bill which in the opinion of the Speaker of the House of Commons contains only provisions dealing with all or any of the following subjects, namely, the imposition, repeal, remission, alteration, or regulation of taxation; the imposition for the payment of debt or other financial purposes of charges on the Consolidated Fund, or on money provided by Parliament, or the variation or repeal of any such charges; supply, the appropriation, receipt, custody, issue or audit of accounts of public money; the raising or guarantee of any loan or the repayment thereof; or subordinate matters incidental to these subjects or any of them."

Now, sir, if I may, I would refer

Your Honour to Section 5—I don't know whether I would be allowed—

MR. SPEAKER: I am familiar with the contents of Section 5.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no need of reading it. Also, Sections 14 (b) 17, 24 and 25.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Sir, this Bill is of such great importance and may have such repercussions, shall I say, upon the financial affairs of this country in the years to come and in the immediate year, that I felt we at any rate should raise this point. We do, of course, believe that the Bill should get all the discussion that is at all possible, and as Your Honour will understand this gives us an opportunity for more lengthy and fuller discussion on the principle and on the various sections of the Bill. This Bill provides not only for the payment of certain salaries but for the raising of money, involving a loan to the tune, if you like, of twenty-five million dollars. It is tantamount, sir, to a loan bill, and should be brought into the House in the proper manner relative to a loan bill. I am quite sure Your Honour will give the appeal, I have made every consideration which it deserves.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has explained our position so well I don't think I need to elaborate except that there was sections to which I would draw Your Honour's attention: Beauchesne, 2nd Edition—Section 551: I don't know whether you have that one, but it is probably contained in the Third Edition as well. In our standing orders and in the old Rules of the House of Assembly the same situation arises as was

cited by my honourable friend here on my left, "If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the House thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House, before any resolution or vote of the House be passed thereupon."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I understood that this matter had been finally disposed of at our last sitting. The point my honourable friend has raised is an interesting one, but no body overlooked the fact that the situation is not the same here now as it was when we had an Upper House. We have now no Upper House, and the difference between a money bill and any other bill is really more or less purely formal at the present time. The procedure in this House, I think, ought to be laid down once and for all, so that Members of the House will know just where they stand on matters of this kind. The other day we saw by reference to this Highway Act of 1925 there was a Bill introduced into this Legislature by the Government of the Day, and that Bill provided for the appointment of a Commission and for their compensation, and that commission was given the spending of millions of dollars. My honourable friend opposite will remember that was the time the Monroë Government of the day did spend \$2,000,000 I think, which was then a huge amount on highroads. I want to point out, that Bill, Mr. Speaker, was introduced as an ordinary Bill, and notice was given in the normal way. It did not go into committee first, but went right through as a normal bill, and that same year, as I pointed



out in previous speeches in this House, a Bill went through similarly making statutory the salaries for Judges of the Supreme Court. Yet, Mr. Speaker, in those days, in 1925, there was both an Upper House and a Parliament. Now we have neither, no Upper House and no Parliament Act under which we are bound. I submit that this question is purely an academic one. Surely to do business intelligently, is it not better to follow the procedure quoted from Beauchesne which means that Bills calling for the provision of payment of salaries, etc., should have those clauses referring to such changes in italics, and should be dealt with when the House gets into Committee, at that stage, and not necessarily before the Bill is introduced. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the ridiculous situation of initiating an important Bill of this nature in Committee? Why, what we would have to do would be that we would have to prepare resolutions taking in clauses 17, 25, 57 or whatever they be, or does my honourable friend think we should introduce the Bill in Committee of the Whole and introduce the whole bill by resolutions? I think this is the proper procedure we are adopting and the only sensible one. Here we are introducing the Bill in the normal way. If in Committee there are sections of the Act which might be looked upon as money sections, there surely will be ample time for us to pass the necessary resolutions or pass the sections in the form of resolutions.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled on this matter, and had I known it would come up again I would have been ready to answer it in a more detailed manner. But I think the objections of my honourable friends are purely academic.

MR. HOLLET: Mr. Speaker, if

I may briefly reply to my honourable friend the Attorney General?

MR. SPEAKER: First may I ask if any other honourable gentleman wishes to speak to this point?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth while drawing attention to at least one fact, that is the two bills to which my colleague the Attorney General referred, when he spoke of two bills being brought in here by the Monroe Government, that did almost precisely what the Bill now in question proposes to do, i.e., to set up an authority to spend large sums of money. That, was the Highroad Commission. This will be the Fisheries Development Authority, but it is in each case an authority set up by statute under the government to spend considerable sums of money. When these two Bills were passed at the request of the Monroe Government the Honourable gentleman recently elected for St. John's West was a strong supporter of that government and voted for it, and I doubt not, spoke in support of the measures in question. Then he was on the government side. That is a long time ago now. He is now on the Opposition side. What he thought was right and proper then he now appears to think is improper. Perhaps that is because he learned something in the four or five years spent in Ottawa, and now brings us the benefit of his superior knowledge. Certainly when he was in this House before, and sat over on this side in support of the government of that day, he saw nothing whatever wrong in introducing a Bill such as this in the way we now propose to introduce this Bill, not only one but two Bills of that kind in one session.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speak-

er, I did not wish to interrupt any honourable member while speaking, nor don't want to hurt any honourable member's feelings now, but I submit this whole discussion is out of order from the very beginning. Unless my memory fails me, Your Honour gave his ruling on Friday, and Your Honour supported your ruling with appropriate references, and I submit that no member has any right, on either side of the House, to bring up that matter again, unless he did so in the proper way, and that would be to repeal Your Honour's ruling.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I did point out when I raised this point that the members of the Opposition had not seen the Bill at the time. If they had seen the Bill they would have raised the point at that time. I don't believe for one moment that it was the Honourable Speaker's intention to make a ruling on the matter, which the Opposition members were in full accordance with. I have every respect for the Chair, and I have found the Chair most respectful towards our feelings and towards our opinion, and I certainly would not rise here in my place to cast any aspersions on your ruling, Mr. Speaker, either now or on Friday or on any other day in the past, nor, as far as I know in the future.

But getting back to the point at issue: I have, Sir, quoted the various references to Bills of this nature which we regard as money bills. On that point I would like to point out to the Honourable the Attorney General that I fail to see that the existence or otherwise of an Upper House has any effect whatsoever on the point. The Bill at that time did not originate in the Upper House, and certainly there is no Upper House here to originate it in now. There-

fore I say that point is null and void. To my point of order, Mr. Speaker, I meant to raise a point of order: I did not wish to cast any aspersions on any side of the House, but if there was a ruling, I submit, the ruling ought to be followed—and I submit this whole debate is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not understand the honourable member was making a point of order.

MR. COURAGE: Maybe I am wrong, but if your honour did give a ruling, I submit, this whole debate is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I did not make a firm ruling on Friday, when the Bill came up for first reading purely because the Opposition had not seen the Bill I mentioned. I anticipated a debate similar to what occurred now, and gave as my opinion that the Bill was in a certain category.

MR. COURAGE: I thought Your Honour had given a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's point is well taken however.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that the mere fact that in 1925 a Highroads Commission Act, or whatever it was called, was passed and brought in by regular motion and not through resolutions, I fail to see where that has any bearing. As far as I know there is no comparison, look at the amount here, up to twenty-five million dollars—in that Act, and I have not read the Act for a long time, but I doubt very much whether any amount of money is mentioned in the Act. True it set up a commission, but I don't think it authorized the Government or the

commission or some authority that was to be set up to raise twenty-five million dollars. In my opinion this is definitely everything all in one, a loan Bill, a money Bill, a Bill which sets up an authority, and not only that; it states that they will receive certain remuneration. It does not state the amount of remuneration, but it states it will consider pensions for their officers after ten years, and not only that but pensions for their relatives if any one of the members should die. In the meantime I say it is definitely a Money Bill in our opinion. But, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to abide by your ruling, but see no reason why a delay of a day or two in bringing in this legislation would in any way delay the future of the country or our fishermen. Surely we don't want to get off on the wrong foot on a Bill of this nature. That is all I have to say. We do regard it as a Money Bill, and do believe it should be brought in by way of resolutions.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I have a word?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has already spoken in the debate.

MR. BROWNE: Well I had not foreseen this statute was going to be referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: That is unfortunate. Now, it seems that the Chair is placed in the position where it has to decide whether this is a money bill or not. Such a condition ought not to occur in the House. It is, as the Honourable the Attorney General pointed out, time a clear-cut policy were laid down so that such a situation, which might be embarrassing, could not arise, as it certainly ought not to arise.

I listened with interest to the arguments offered by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. But it does strike me that the paragraphs and sections quoted apply to a parliament in the full sense of the word. This is not, and cannot be held to be a parliament. A Legislative Assembly is vastly different from a parliament such as the House of Commons either in Ottawa or at Westminster. Therefore, it would follow that you cannot take the rules, orders, customs and usages of a full-fledged parliament and apply them to a provincial legislature. Some of them may be applicable but only, as I pointed out in earlier ruling, if the principle is in effect. Otherwise there would be repugnance between the legislation of this body and of the House of Commons at Ottawa, not necessarily in this Bill, but it could happen.

The sections quoted from "May" and "Beauchesne" both refer to the House of Commons, and you cannot adapt them to a provincial legislature merely by deleting the word "Governor-General" and substituting the words "Lieutenant Governor." I will have to hold that the presence or absence of an Upper House does have some effect.

The honourable member quoted section 54 of the British North America Act, and that one is especially designed for the House of Commons. But it must be remembered that prior to Commission of Government this was a House of Commons in the full sense of the word. By Term 14 of the Terms of Union the constitution of Newfoundland, in so far as it affected the Legislature, has been changed only in one degree, i.e., by the absence of an Upper House. Therefore, and as I stated before, any

usages and customs of the Newfoundland House of Commons may quite lawfully, under the Terms of Union, be applied to this House bearing in mind the principle "Mutatis mutandis" the Upper House does not exist any more. Certainly then, if a thing were done in 1925, in a session of parliament with an Upper House being disregarded, it may be done in 1954 when the Upper House does not exist. In other words the customs and usages of Newfoundland prior to Commission of Government are still in effect according to the Terms of Union; and Section 54 of the British North America Act does not apply. The Highroads Commission Bill contained an almost identical clause with regard to salaries and powers of the Governor-in-Council. True this Bill does make reference to loans, but the commission which it sets up, as I see it, will not be able to raise loans without the sanction and approval of this Assembly. I will not hold that it is a money bill, at the most I will say it is a hypothetical question. I will say here that it would be impossible to read all that has been written in "May," "Beauchesne" concerning money bills, but I will just cite this to give the honourable members some idea: "Although the principle purpose of a Bill might clearly involve a charge (a cash charge upon the people) yet it may require a machine to establish and administer it. For instance the creation of a new board or department which is relatively so important as to be considered subsequently the main purpose of such a Bill is held not to involve a charge, and the Bill referred to in this instance merely treats its money clauses as the clauses referring to money as money clauses."

For that I would say this Bill

might possibly be given second reading, and I think the House might decide later on to treat these special clauses as money clauses, as the Honourable the Attorney General suggests.

Further I find, and my reason for mentioning it the other day was that it seems to me first, impossible to initiate this Bill by resolutions, and secondly, even if the impossible were attempted, it seems to me, it would choke off intelligent debate, and reduce the chances of the Opposition to discover what the Bill was all about and offer their comments. For when resolutions go into committee only the resolutions may be discussed.

Further, until the Minister piloting the Bill has explained the Bill, with all due deference to our own ability to understand the printed words, I really don't think the House is in a position to decide on the Bill, good, bad or otherwise. In short, I mean that when the Minister has moved the second reading of the Bill and he has then explained it to the House, and the House is in much better position then to criticize the principle of the Bill.

From our present Standing Orders from which the honourable member has quoted: These Standing Orders are taken almost word for word from previous orders of this House, and what I said about the constitution of Newfoundland relating to Legislative Assemblies still holds, regarding these Standing Orders. As I see it, and at the risk of contradiction I will say: giving this bill second reading, not as a money bill, does provide better opportunity for the Opposition to discuss it. And without prejudice to either side; apart from that, I do not see how this bill can be treated in any other manner than by first read-

ing in the House and second reading and by being referred to a Committee of the Whole House. But the other day I was not happy about treating the entire bill in Committee of the Whole, and I did welcome the suggestion that certain clauses be regarded as money clauses.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is quite agreeable to the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall go a step further, and perhaps this is too soon, but I do suggest, in view of what the Honourable the Attorney General said, the time has come when we do need a clear-cut policy. We discussed this in 1949, I and the then Leader of the Opposition who was a Queen Counsel, and we recognized something of the sort was needed. Shall we then take this as an indication of future policy in regard to bills in which clauses contain money matters? Otherwise we shall debate this on every bill that comes up. This has no effect, however, on the second reading of the bill as offered by the honourable minister concerned.

I will then call Item No. 11, Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fishery Development Authority."

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): The subject matter of this Bill is so comprehensive and the implications so far-reaching and the need to be precise is so obvious that I thought I should introduce it to the House from a prepared text in order that I might be more thorough and precise. I would crave the indulgence of the House for that procedure.

Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to emphasize the creativeness of the purposes it

is designed to serve. What is involved is not merely a question of regulation or of organization. Other voices than that of this House must be heard in matters concerning the regulation and organization of the fisheries of Newfoundland—the voices of the fishermen, of the processors and exporters, of the Government of Canada, and—not least important—of those who buy and consume the products of our fisheries.

May I, Sir, describe briefly the nature of the interests of these other parties, in order to show the pattern and the perspective into which the interests of this House and this Government must be directed. I would ask the indulgence of honourable members of the restatement of some facts and considerations, of which they are doubtless already aware, that form part of the whole body of information and reasoning upon which the requirements and provisions of this Bill are predicated.

Let us remind ourselves first of the interests of our fishermen, whose lives and whose labour contribute significantly to the social and economic well-being of this Province and of this nation.

They have been the victims and the supporters of a tradition of service in return for survival that has, until recent years, forbidden all but a very few of them to entertain ambitions of substantial economic progress in the occupation to which they were born.

They have, of course, shared in the general economic progress of this Province, but to a lesser extent than many engaged in other occupations. They have usually been among the first and hardest hit by general

slumps, depressions and economic recessions, in addition to having to undergo the peculiar hazards and hardships of working in partnerships with a fickle Nature, whose "helping hand" as often as not gives her colleagues a black eye!

The last ten or fifteen years have brought changes in our fishing industry that have given many fishermen the opportunity to sell their catches fresh, or in saltbulk, who might otherwise have had to spend time, energy and money in making their fish. Nevertheless, there are still many who have not benefited appreciably from these developments—mainly, perhaps, because of their isolation in areas not hitherto found suitable for the successful operation of fish plants.

There has also been some progress in the utilization of species other than the dominant cod; except in a few limited areas, however, the contribution made by these other species to the fishermen's income has been small, albeit welcome.

On the other hand, in recent years, there have been substantial increases in the costs of articles that fishermen must have if they are to continue catching fish—not only articles of general consumption, such as food and clothing, but items of fishing and processing equipment and other special supplies such as fishery salt.

Many of our fishermen have found themselves caught in a squeeze between costs of their supplies and falling prices for their produce. They are not, perhaps, unique in this respect—other primary producers can doubtless tell a similar story—but our fishermen represent a much larger proportion of the people of this Province than the fishermen of other parts

of Canada do in their respective provinces. They have, moreover, not received proportionately as much government assistance as primary producers in some other important fields. Their plight must be correspondingly of greater concern to us in view of our responsibility for the domestic affairs of this part of the Canadian federation, and, I would suppose, also to those elsewhere who are concerned with promoting the progress and well-being of that federation as a whole.

This Government has supported and encouraged the formation and growth of an organization through which the fishermen of Newfoundland should be able to speak for themselves in clear and precise statement of their needs and problems. This objective is gradually being attained, and our fishermen have already found their organization a practical and useful means of expression. Their voice is now being heard more effectively than ever before, although, perhaps, not yet as clearly as it should be.

To us, their elected representatives, their government, the custodians of their economic interests, the fishermen of Newfoundland are saying with increasing urgency that strong and even revolutionary measures must be taken to improve their situation—either to reduce their costs or to raise their income, or both.

And here the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee has come to our aid. The Report of that Committee tabled in this House last April, indicates the weakness, the faults and the shortcomings in production and handling that have to be eliminated in order to help the fishermen to secure the best advantage from their labour. But the Report



goes further; it indicates positive measures that can contribute towards making that labour more successful, more rewarding. The programme of development is colossal in its implications for the reorganization of our fisheries. It comprehends improvements in ways of catching fish—the finding of the fish, the use of better vessels, gear and equipment for bringing it from its native waters to the places where it can most efficiently be transformed into a wholesale food product. The programme includes improvements in the treatment the fish receives when it is landed by the fishermen and during its subsequent processing. It envisages, too, improvements in the amenities of life that are or can be enjoyed by fishermen and their families in communities that can be developed to greater prosperity, with greater social and educational facilities.

All these things the fishermen rightly demand, and I have no doubt that they are prepared to exert themselves personally, in and with the industry and with governments, to obtain them.

Before discussing how this Government proposes to perform its duties in this regard to the fishermen, I would like, Sir, to refer to the other voices that, as I said at the outset, must be heard in matters concerning the regulations and organization of our fisheries.

The processors and exporters are not unwilling to let their voices be heard, difficult as we may sometimes find it to distinguish between a ventriloquist and his dummy—difficult as it may sometimes be to know whether the subject of discussion is fish, flesh, fowl or good red herring. I hope I shall not be unjust if I interpret in my own words what this voice is say-

ing. Let us acknowledge first that the overtones of this voice still vibrate with a sincerity that has never been entirely lost—the sincerity of men who, while seeking their own gain, have not been heedless of the needs of those dependent on them in the industry; who have foregone that gain, and more at times, so as to help the unfortunates who would look only to them for succour. Let us acknowledge also that this voice should be listened to because it speaks in the name of a group of people who have played and must continue to play an important part in our fisheries.

The processors and exporters—and I refer, Sir, to the functions that are performed rather than to those who perform them—are as essential to the prosperity of the catchers of fish as the catchers of fish are to the prosperity of the processors and exporters. This Government is concerned with the success of both groups—we are concerned to see that fish is caught by methods that are efficient and economical—we are concerned to see that fish so caught is processed and exported by methods that are efficient and economical.

Honourable members are already aware of the steps that this Government has taken by way of loans and guarantees, to assist processors of both salt and fresh fish to establish and develop their operations. In all such transactions, the Government has studied closely the probable effects of such development upon the fishermen of the areas concerned, upon the industry generally and upon the economy of Newfoundland. While most of these transactions were entered into before the programme of development was defined for us by the Development Committee's report, the practi-

cal aspects of development have always been in the forefront of our considerations.

Now, we propose that the steps we have already taken along this road shall be co-ordinated with those we must take in the future, so that progress shall be steady and general, rather than spasmodic and local.

In this co-ordination, provision must be made for the enterprise and exertion that processors and exporters can and will contribute to realizing the programme of development. The role of government in this section of the industry is most appropriately that of facilitating—with technical assistance, public works, research and financing—the orderly and effective development of the resources by private or co-operative enterprise.

The third voice I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is that of the Government of Canada. It is a voice that is well able to speak for itself. This voice has already made known its owner's anxiety to make its special and appropriate contribution to fisheries development, and I should mention that where we can help to make that contribution more effective, by action within the scope of our responsibilities as the Government of the Province we shall strive to do so.

The Fisheries Development Committee indicated that we should pay particular attention to the fourth voice—the voice of those who buy and consume the products of our fisheries. This involves, of course, study and investigation of marketing of its procedures and objectives, of market conditions and consumer preferences.

Such study and investigation are, of course, primarily the responsibility of those who perform the functions of

exporters; they are the most immediately concerned in finding customers abroad who are willing and able to pay remunerative prices for the products offered.

The functions of Government in such matters are both delicate and vital. The promotion of foreign trade on a sound basis is one aspect of the duties of the Government of Canada—one that it has accepted with zeal and imagination. Honourable members are aware of its recent decision to concern itself more closely with questions of salt codfish marketing, and to facilitate its operations in this regard by bringing them under the supervision of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

The scope within which the Government of Newfoundland can seek to study and investigate, and such other means as may be available to us, to assist in the solution of marketing problems and in improving overseas markets, is of necessity more limited. The great machinery of foreign trade, with all its financial, economic and mercantile accessories, does not, and cannot, lie under our hands. Our activities must be concentrated, then, on the products of our fisheries, between the time when the fish is landed on our coasts and the time when it leaves our ports on its journey to the foreign buyers. That is, indeed, a field big enough to call for a large measure of our energy and abilities, and this Bill, Sir, is a necessary step towards securing the machinery and skill that we must have at our command if we are to operate effectively and beneficially in that field.

We have surveyed briefly, Mr. Speaker, the interests of the four other principal voices that must be

heeded in our fisheries affairs, particularly as to how those interests engage the attention of this Government; let us now examine at greater length our direct concern and responsibilities in the fisheries. This examination will show why we seek to establish the Fisheries Development Authority, what we believe it has to do, and how we consider that it should be equipped to do it.

The structure and production and processing methods of our fishing industry (apart from the recent innovations of the fresh frozen fish industry) have been subject to a minimum of changes since the early days of our history.

And not all of these changes have been for the best. Originally, the industry was not too badly organized for its period. There was a certain amount of specialization with fishing crews divided into separate groups—one responsible for production—and the other for work ashore—all under the supervision of a "Master of the fisheries." The change to present day conditions in the salt fish industry was brought about in part by the fish merchants relinquishing the management of the fishing enterprise. They had found it more lucrative to become traders—which they are today—and to concentrate on the handling of supplies and provisions in exchange for the codfish.

With the passing of the processing function to the fishermen, his whole family—wife and children—was drawn into the picture as unpaid labour. This type of family enterprise, while rapidly declining—with nothing to take its place—remains almost peculiar to Newfoundland. Other producing countries have long since given up this practice.

The depressed state of the salt fish industry did not come about overnight. Crises have been recurrent for the last hundred years and in the present century our fishermen have enjoyed a modicum of prosperity only during and immediately after the two World Wars. In the interim their fishery earnings have been able to provide, at the best, only a bare subsistence level. In the thirties the fisherman's earnings were unable to provide a subsistence level and over a quarter of the population was on relief for half the year. And in recent years deficiency payments have been necessary to give the fisherman something approaching a decent living standard.

The average cash income of an in-shore skipperman's family in 1950 was \$1,100, of which only \$700 was drawn from the fisheries. The balance was derived from supplementary operations, such as woods work and from other sources, such as family allowances. To say the least this average, which would be lower if the earnings of sharemen were included, is extremely low not only by general Canadian standards but by the standards of other industries in the Province. When we remember that three-quarters of the total number of fishermen in Newfoundland depend mainly on the production of salt fish we can appreciate all the more the plight of the industry.

As a result of these conditions there has been a steady decline in the number of fishermen since the first World War. At that time we had some 40,000 fishermen. In 1951 we had 19,500. Today, there are perhaps 15,000 or 16,000.

The withdrawal of a certain number of men from the fishery is, of

course, not in itself a cause for alarm. To some extent it indicates an expanding and more developed and varied economy and as such should be welcomed. It is recognized by us all that a modernization of the industry which will bring about a substantial improvement in income and living standards will probably bring with it some decrease in the number of fishermen. At the same time, of course, there will be a substantial increase in the number of shore workers.

It was pointed out by the Development Committee that if the productivity of the fishermen were raised to that of the most efficient current operations, i.e., dragging and long-lining, the present annual catch of cod-fish of 500,000,000 pounds could be landed by 2,000 fishermen. A fish processing industry capable of handling this catch would absorb some 6,000 shore workers in addition to those now employed.

The situation today differs in two important respects from that of earlier years. Heretofore, when times were hard the fishermen had no alternative but to pull in his belt and put up with it. Today, while many are still immobilized through isolation there are others who can and are taking advantage of opportunities outside the fisheries.

But, what is more important, the Government today is taking vigorous and positive action to place our fishermen on a level with his brothers across Canada. It recognizes that, as a result of his labour, a fisherman is entitled to a decent standard of living for himself and his family, an education for his family, an opportunity for his wife to devote her attention to her home and her children and it is taking such action as seems

called for on its part to cause such things to be.

In 1951 the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee was set up by the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland to look into the whole problem of fisheries development in Newfoundland and to make recommendations. If I may restate its terms of reference they were these:

1. To examine into fisheries resources available to the Province of Newfoundland, with a view to the fullest utilization of known resources and the discovery and development of others.
2. To examine into the economics of existing methods of fishing and of other methods that may be applicable.
3. To examine into the economics of existing methods of processing and other methods that may be applicable.

These undertakings were for the purpose of recommending increased utilization of fishery resources through methods of fishing and processing based on sound scientific, economic and social considerations. In particular the Committee was to recommend a programme capable of implementation by both the Federal and Provincial Governments and those engaged in the fishing industry; and to suggest the share that each should take in carrying out the programme.

After an intensive study of the problems, covering a period of two years during which time the Committee had at its disposal the services of an expert research staff provided by other Governments, as well as expert advice from the fishing industry and trade in Newfoundland, it came up with a

comprehensive plan for the development of the fisheries of the Province and the rehabilitation of its fishermen.

The programme developed by this Committee is the most revolutionary and far-reaching ever presented to a Government of Newfoundland. It affects the lives not only of all our fishermen—it touches the lives of all who live in this Province.

It might not, perhaps, be out of sequence if I were to divert attention at this time to a matter of constitutional jurisdiction about which some people appear to be in doubt. Actually, the truth of the matter may be stated, even if the doubt cannot be set at rest, by saying that the choice of the places where development will be undertaken and the scope and nature of the development rest with the Government of Newfoundland.

Constitutional jurisdiction over the civil and property rights of the people of a Province of Canada is vested in the Government of that Province. Thus, in matters respecting fisheries development the Government of Newfoundland exercises control over all property such as fish plants and other shore facilities as well as over roads, schools, water-power, municipalities and indeed over all the property factors bound up with the development of a fishing community—excepting the marine works which are the responsibility of the Government of Canada.

Since I have brought up the matter of constitutional jurisdiction it might be just as well if I went on to indicate the extent of the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada over fisheries—since not everybody appears to be quite clear with regard thereto. The Government of Canada has jurisdic-

tion over fish while it is swimming in the sea. So the Government of Canada presides over the catching of fish. Mainly its responsibilities are these: to explore for new fish populations and experiment with new methods of fishing, to carry on research to find new and improved techniques of preparing fish for market, to institute adequate conservation measures to prevent over-fishing and consequent depletion of fish populations. At the other end of the scale the Government of Canada has jurisdiction over fish at the point where it becomes a product offered for sale—i.e. once it is inspected and packed for sale to another Province or to another country. May I note in passing that this means among other things that if this year our fishermen should have complaints to make to Government about the price of fish they should be directed to Mr. Howe and Mr. Sinclair and not to Mr. Smallwood and Mr. Keough.

I have said that fish while it is swimming is Federal. Up to the point where it is landed the responsible Minister is Mr. Sinclair. I have said that fish at the point where it passes into trade outside Newfoundland is Federal. The responsible Minister is Mr. Howe. In between is the large area of responsibility concerned with civil and property rights. Fish, once it is landed, becomes property. It so remains until it is exported from the Province. While it remains in the Province it comes under the jurisdiction of the Government of Newfoundland. Thus this Government has the responsibility for the decision as to the kind of plants that will be licensed to operate and how they will be built and where they may be built. Further, no person can buy or sell or handle or transport or pack fish in

Newfoundland without the consent of this Government, if, when and as the laws are passed by this Legislature and regulations are made under those laws to exercise such controls. Maybe I should repeat those words since many appear to be under the impression that this Government has nothing to do with fish per se, as an article of food that goes into world commerce. To repeat—"No person can buy or sell or handle or transport or pack fish in Newfoundland without the consent of this Government, if, when and as the laws are passed by this Legislature and regulations are made under those laws to exercise such controls."

There is of course nothing new about all this. It is the same in the other provinces of Canada, excepting Quebec, which has a special arrangement with Ottawa for administering her fisheries. The responsibilities of this Government cover all that affects fisheries between the catching and marketing of fish—which means that the responsibilities of this Government in respect of fisheries development extend to everything ashore except certain marine works that border on the sea and are the responsibility of the Government of Canada.

Now, to return to the Fisheries Development Committee. The Report of the Committee put its finger on the low productivity of our fishermen, and their isolation, as the hard core of the problems of the Newfoundland fisheries. So the programme recommended by the Committee calls for large new centralized fish plants, fish meal plants, artificial dryers, mechanical fish flakes, modern salt stores, community fish stages, new and more efficient boats, engines and gear, new methods of processing. It calls for

the establishment of fishing towns with the more essential amenities of life, such as electric light, water, sewerage and proper housing. All this is to be done in conjunction with the exploration of new resources, experimenting with new fishing techniques, the development and strengthening of new markets and the instituting of an adequate marketing system.

This is a gigantic task to be spread over the next ten to fifteen years—and one which we cannot undertake alone. The Government of Canada is aware of its obligations to Newfoundland in the development of its fisheries and undoubtedly recognizes that Newfoundland cannot come to enjoy the full benefits of Union unless its fisheries are fully developed. The Government of Canada in expanding its programme of fisheries exploratory and experimental work, will be dredging and also building breakwaters and breastworks and wharves and will provide the aids to navigation. It will contribute half the capital cost of constructing community operated plants in selected centres to gain experience, which may lead to Federal legislation providing for similar plants here and elsewhere. It will also build and operate a large experimental fish plant.

The Government of Newfoundland will enable the building of fish plants and other fishing establishments, both privately and community owned. It is responsible for community development with all its implications such as roads, water, sewerage. It is responsible for bringing about improvements in both production and processing techniques through the means of centralized operations and demonstration and training schools.

Here is where the Fisheries Development Authority enters the picture.



Because of the monumental proportion of the planning that had to be done to ensure a start in fisheries development in 1954, the Government felt justified in establishing the Authority by Order in Council pending the presentation of this Bill to the Legislature. The ambit of the Authority's authority herewith proposed is—to take charge of the whole fishery development programme insofar as it is provincial in jurisdiction.

Since so large a responsibility would rest upon the Authority the choice of the persons who should compose it demanded most careful consideration. The Government realized that these persons must be men who were specially qualified in three main fields: finance, fisheries and social organization.

The Authority would obviously be called upon to handle very large sums of money, either in outright expenditure or in loans and other forms of investment. It was therefore necessary that the Authority should include a man of considerable experience in money matters and in the ways in which money can be most efficaciously used in the encouragement and development of industry. In a programme as comprehensive as that of our fisheries development, the old adage "penny-wise and pound foolish"—and its converse "pound-wise and penny foolish"—must be given equal regard: perspective and proportion are essential to the best use of financial resources that, while substantial, are not unlimited. Briefly, what was needed was a man with broad knowledge, backed by wide experience, of how dollars and cents can be most effectively made available in a speculative primary industry. The Government believes that it has found such a man in Mr. H. G. Dustan.

When Mr. Dustan came to Newfoundland 5½ years ago, as manager of the main branch of the Bank of Nova Scotia in St. John's, he had already spent twenty-one years in the service of that Bank—seven of them as manager of branches in Ontario and the Maritimes. In 1952, Mr. Dustan left the Bank in order to take a more direct part in the sea-born business of Newfoundland, as General Manager of Northlantic Fisheries Limited and Director of its associated companies. Having capped his banking career with this experience in activities directly stemming from our fisheries, he became an obvious choice for the job of Chairman of the Authority when, last summer, the decision to establish it was taken.

In fisheries matters, the choice was no less obvious; the Authority had to have the advantage of possessing vast and varied experience in all major branches of our fisheries; there had to be somebody in the Authority who knew the ropes—who could assess the value of an idea or a proposal with knowledge and sound judgment based on long and intimate acquaintance with what has been done, what can be attempted and what must be avoided. Our choice inevitably fell upon Mr. Ross Young. Mr. Young, a certified public accountant, has been long recognized as one of the ablest executives in Newfoundland; he served for many years in a key position with an organization whose operations in fisheries have been perhaps more diversified than those of any other concern in this Province. He has an unrivalled knowledge of the industry and of those engaged in it—a knowledge essential to the Authority in its tremendous task.

There we had two basic needs satisfactorily provided for; skill and un-

derstanding in finance and in fisheries, comprehending not only Newfoundland but the Mainland and a large part of the world beyond. The exercise of these skills, the use of these assets, must, however, involve consideration of its effect upon human beings—upon our fishermen and upon those whose livelihood grows from their labour. The development programme, after all, is not devised for the benefit of the fish, or of the buildings or of the machines; its single aim is the betterment of the industry for the sake of people—the people who, by serving the industry, establish their claim that it shall serve them.

The two members already selected were fully aware of this aspect of the matter: their concern for the people would certainly be no less because of their more specialized concern with the technical side of development. But they were entitled to be given some relief from that over-riding responsibility by having as an equal partner someone whose specialized concern should be with the human angles, with the social effects and with the personal considerations of the development programme. So there was need to have in the Authority somebody with a better than average understanding of human values, whose training and experience would enable him to take a rounded-out social view of fisheries development in the widest sense of the term.

Our choice here was Mr. Harry C. Winsor. Mr. Winsor, who was born in Musgrave Harbour, first served Newfoundland as an employee of the Newfoundland Fisheries Board; his ability and sincerity carried him thence into international service with the Combined Food Board in Washington during the war and, more recently, in Rome with the Food and

Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. He has, throughout, been particularly concerned with fisheries, and has gained knowledge and experience of world fisheries and the social problems connected therewith that is shared by very, very few individuals. That sincerity to which I have already referred has led him to undertake for us, in concert with his no less distinguished colleagues, this great endeavour of fisheries development upon which we are now embarked—the immensity of which cannot be comprehended at a glance—the realization of which must unfold slowly upon us and our fellow-Newfoundlanders. The Government is content to entrust to these three with confidence the carrying out of this programme that offers so great and perhaps the only hope and promise of betterment, happiness and prosperity for so many of our people.

The measure of the endeavour, of the responsibility and of the hope, must be the measure of the recompense to be given the members of the Authority: they will have hard work to do, hard decisions to make, hard knocks to take and hard facts to face; they will be exposed to criticism, to pressure and to anxiety commensurate with the importance of their duties; they may have to disappoint many for the benefit of more; they may have to incur displeasure—even enmity—in carrying out their functions properly and fairly; and they may have to resist efforts to modify their integrity and singleness of purpose. To be able to do all this, to be able to devote themselves with their whole hearts and souls to the service they have undertaken, they must be made to feel secure personally and in their private affairs. We have, therefore, given them complete economic secu-

rity—the greatest immediate contribution we can make towards enabling them to do the job we have given them, and the least they are entitled to expect from us.

To give the House some idea of the magnitude of the task with which the Authority is confronted here are some of the projects upon which they are already engaged :

(1) The construction of a centralized salt fish plant with salt storage at Quirpon which will eventually be owned and operated by the community. In the meantime the Authority will be largely responsible for the successful operation of the plant while at the same time engaged in strengthening and equipping the community or organization, so that it will be in a position to take over full responsibility at the earliest possible date.

(2) A similar operation at Seldom but on a larger scale.

(3) A full-fledged community development at LaScie involving the erection and operation of a large scale salt fish plant, equipped with artificial dryer, cold storage, salt storage and pickling vats, a fresh frozen fish plant, bait storage, fish meal plant; town planning, housing, electric power, water and sewerage.

(4) Community development in Valleyfield, including housing, water and sewerage, in conjunction with the activities of the Federal Department of Fisheries who propose to erect a large scale salt fish plant there.

(5) Enabling the erection by private interests of a frozen fish plant at Bay de Verde.

(6) A small-scale community-operated plant for Merasheen for the

centralized handling and processing of cod, herring and mackerel.

(7) Enabling the establishment in Joe Batts Arm of a plant to process both fresh frozen and salt fish.

(8) Enabling the establishment of a fresh frozen fish plant and a large fish meal plant in Twillingate.

(9) Enabling the establishing of a frozen fish plant at Change Islands.

(10) The administration of all agreements in respect of Government loans and Government guaranteed loans made heretofore for fisheries development.

The purpose of the Bill before the House is to incorporate the Authority and to provide it with the means successfully to carry through to completion these undertakings, and the many others large and small that must receive their attention in the years that lie immediately ahead.

I do not propose to deal at length with the provisions of the Bill, but I should like to highlight some of the more important items and to explain the reasons for their inclusion.

A section of the Bill provides for the constitution of the Authority as a Crown Corporation and defines its powers.

Here the question might be asked, "Why a Crown Corporation to implement fishery development? Why could not the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives and other Departments of Government do what the Fisheries Development Authority is being set up to do?" Such questions are comparable to these questions. "Why does not the Department of Public Works for Canada directly administer the work of the Maritime Commission

—of the Board of Transport Commissioners—of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority—of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation? Why does not the United Kingdom Department of Agriculture and Fisheries directly administer the work of the White Fish Authority? Why does not the South African Government perform the functions undertaken by its Fisheries Development Corporation?

The answer is clear. It makes for better Government and it is better protection for political institutions to have established by legislative action, through an appropriate Minister of the Crown, an organization to undertake the functions which are not normally those of a department of Government. It is not the normal function of Government to assume responsibility, as of its Departments, to do the sort of things that development on the scale recommended by the Fisheries Development Committee requires. I take it that it will not be necessary for me to go into this matter further than to say that it is not a normal function of Government to build boats or plants, to supervise plant operations or do the many other specific acts that will be necessary to locate plants and other facilities at specific places in specific communities.

Another section of the Bill describes how the business of the Authority is to be conducted. The Authority is given powers, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to make regulations. Honourable members will, I am sure, appreciate that it is well nigh impossible to anticipate every contingency and provide for it in this Bill. The Authority is entering a new field of endeavour as far as this Province is concerned and it is imperative that it

not be handicapped by our failing to clothe it with sufficient powers. The Bill therefore provides the Authority with power to make such regulations as are necessary to proceed with the job, should it be found that inadequate or no provision is made in the Act.

Conditions are laid down under which the Authority may employ personnel and engage services. Persons employed by the Authority, do not by reason of such employment become Civil Servants.

As I said earlier, the Authority is charged with the full responsibility of implementing the revolutionary fisheries development programme which has been blue-printed by the Fisheries Development Committee, insofar as the responsibility is Provincial in jurisdiction. It goes without saying that improvements in fishing techniques, improvements in processing facilities, diversification of effort and so on, are not in themselves the ultimate goal. The end result of this development programme must be a decided betterment in our fishermen's way of life, with the resultant beneficial effects for the Province as a whole. To accomplish this, the first essential is a substantial increase in his income which can be brought about by a marked increase in his present productivity. This increase in productivity will go hand in hand with, and often as a result of, more efficient handling methods, improved and expanded processing facilities and a reorganization of our marketing structure. Even if it is possible to increase substantially the fishermen's income while he remains in his present state of isolation, scattered along several thousand miles of coastline, in hundreds of small communities, we shall not have reached our goal. The

development of fisheries forms a part of a wider programme which will ensure not only a higher economic standard, but also a much higher social standard for our people engaged in the fisheries.

The programme, therefore, involves a co-ordination of all Government and community services within areas, and concentration of these services at places suitable for development such as LaScie. In addition to large scale salt and frozen fish plants, fish meal plants, salt and bait storage, we want these expanded communities to have good roads, modern houses, electric lighting, water and sewerage, good schools and recreational facilities for the children, hospital and medical services.

This is, of course, a long-term programme. In the meantime, thousands of fishermen must continue their operations in the traditional way. They do not have the necessary means of replacing their shore facilities or of acquiring the necessary equipment for the proper handling, processing and storage of their fish. To solve their problems the Authority, in some instances with financial assistance from the Federal Government, are bringing about minor centralization of curing operations of the type at Quirpon and Seldom. It is hoped that these operations will prove sufficiently successful to warrant the bringing down of Federal legislation to provide for financial assistance to small scale community operations.

It must be recognized that there are bound to be places—perhaps many places—where development would not be a practical possibility; where the best that the inhabitants could hope for would be to maintain themselves, without enjoying the improved facili-

ties and circumstances that can and will be brought to more fortunately situated communities. We have to face this fact—and so do they.

The responsibility of saying which these places are is ultimately one that the Government must bear; the Government must shoulder also the responsibility of deciding how the welfare of the people of these places is to be safeguarded—whether they should be encouraged and assisted to move to other settlements, or whether they should be sustained if they choose to stay there and, if so, for how long.

The Government will look to the Authority for advice on these questions, advice that must be given with thorough knowledge and understanding of the problems of each settlement and must include recommendations supported by arguments that weigh justly every ascertainable factor that can have a bearing on the final decision.

The Authority will be responsible for screening all proposals for fisheries development, whether they originate inside or outside the Government and for putting into effect those proposals which the Government may accept.

We may expect—and indeed we hope—to receive proposals for development from many sources; from fishermen and their organizations; from communities, from business men, from plant operators, from our own officials, from all and sundry.

No proposal can be ignored or rejected without examination; all must be examined, not only on their own merits but also in relation to the whole development programme.

They must therefore all be brought

before one body, one examining board, as it were—in fact, one authority—which must investigate each proposal and recommend to the Government what action should or should not be taken in each case.

The Authority itself must also consider and make recommendations on fishing settlements and development projects that are not covered by proposals received from other sources.

The Authority must be able to make such recommendations with reason and confidence, and declare them without fear or favour—whether the proposal originates with the Government, the fishermen, the trade, or anybody else.

The reason and confidence can be assured only if the Authority brings its unique knowledge and experience to bear on facts; wishful thinking, undue optimism—or pessimism, and inadequate information must not be allowed to cloud its view of essential facts. And to get facts—technical and scientific facts—the Authority must be free to seek expert advice, to engage the most highly-skilled services available—if the great professional and technical staffs of the Government of Canada, and our own, are unable to give the information and advice required.

The Authority will be responsible for the administration and enforcement of all agreements made heretofore between the Government and any other party for the development of the fisheries. This in itself is a sizable undertaking.

This Government has already made or guaranteed loans totalling more than \$7,000,000 for fisheries development purposes, and we shall have to provide more millions in loans, guar-

antees and direct expenditures to carry out our part of the development programme.

We have to do this because there is not enough private capital readily available for the long-term investment that is essential to the great plan of development. The preference of large private investors for more liquid and rapidly productive forms of investment is not peculiar to Newfoundland, but it is magnified here by the growth of opportunity for merchandizing and other short-term investment; it is strengthened in our fisheries industry by the all-too-familiar uncertainties of overseas marketing and by the daunting magnitude of the sum required to achieve any substantial progress in development.

So we have to provide a large part of the financing needed, on a scale far beyond the scope of the normal functions of a government department—even a Department of Finance.

Every dollar must be made to count—they cannot be spread about haphazardly, on the other hand, we cannot risk spoiling the ship for a ha' penny of tar. The financing of fisheries development that we have so far undertaken has not been either haphazard, parsimonious or unmethodical, but our future operations will be so much greater and more complex that co-ordinated and specialized supervision and control will be essential.

The Authority will therefore be made responsible for the management of all existing and future loans and other financing for fisheries development; it will be responsible for seeing that the funds are properly used, that repayment and other obligations are duly met, that government security is protected.



The Authority will, at my request, co-ordinate the work of all Government Departments which are concerned with the development of fisheries. This is of prime importance for the successful carrying on of community development schemes such as that for LaScie. In addition to the purely fisheries aspects of the problem—construction of plants, improvements in boats and gear—questions will arise of community organization, housing, roads, water power, education and the like—which are the responsibility of other branches of government.

Similarly our collaboration with the Federal Government, and agreements for the implementation of any part of the programme will be channelled through the Authority. I must add here that the Authority have already entered into a very effective working relationship with those Federal Government officials who are concerned with the fisheries of this Province.

While fisheries exploratory and experimental work are the responsibility of the Federal Government the Authority will be called in from time to time to assist in the operations. The Authority will also undertake the demonstration of new fishing and processing techniques and the training of fishermen in the use of these techniques. This latter work will, of course, be undertaken in close collaboration with our own Department of Education and the Federal Department of Labour.

It is not necessary for me to dwell at length on the finances of the Authority, except to say that ample safeguards have been taken to protect the Treasury's position. Honourable members will notice that those functions presently performed for Government

by the Department of Finance in respect of loans or guarantees to assist private enterprise in undertaking fisheries development, will be taken over by the Authority. However, it should be noted that a limitation is placed on the amount of funds which the Authority can use for this purpose.

The expropriation powers which are given to the Authority are most essential for the successful carrying out of its work. This is especially true for community development projects. These expropriation powers are similar to those contained in the Industries Act, Chapter 246 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952. The Authority will have the power to expropriate land on behalf of private industry as well as for community operated projects.

On the question of publications, the Authority may issue reports and other documents on the distinct understanding that it will not disclose information which it has received in confidence, unless it has the written consent of the persons who supplied the information.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority," as now presented to this Honourable House, embodies a concept at once practical and idealistic in its design to serve the development of our fisheries for the benefit of the fishermen, the processors and our people generally—practical in its provision of the precise instrument that the Government of Newfoundland will use to carry out that design.

The design is to achieve, concurrently, in as short a time as possible, two gigantic undertakings; to bridge the gap in development of our fish-

eries by which they lay behind those of our sister provinces, and to project development into the future (with all that that implies of technical, scientific, sociological and economic progress) so that our fisheries shall be organized and operated in a manner that befits their world pre-eminence in tradition and resources.

I am confident, Sir, that this concept, this design, this instrument will find ready and whole-hearted approval among all people who have knowledge and understanding of the personal and national problems of Newfoundland's fisheries and who have the sincere desire to see those problems solved most effectively—I am confident that particularly will such approval be forthcoming from the members of this House. In that confidence, Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

MR. SPEAKER: Motion is this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable minister would consider postponing further debate until tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman wish to proceed tomorrow with the debate? If so, we would be quite agreeable to that delay.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I think we will go ahead tomorrow.

On motion by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney General, the debate is adjourned.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is quite simple. Under the existing legislation, the Local Government Act, town councils are empowered to issue permits for digging of wells and the installation of septic tanks, etc. In some instances where this is being done it has been against the advice of the local medical health officer of the area. These medical health officers are responsible for the health of the people, and ultimately for any epidemic that might arise. It is felt that the power of a Town Council existing under the Local Government Act should be subordinated to the powers of the medical health officer such as they hold under this amendment. Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have just seen this Bill this afternoon. I wonder if this debate could be adjourned, as we have just seen it now for the first time, and have not had a chance to read the Bill.

On motion debate adjourned.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, during the last three or four years, particularly during the last year, several groups of co-operatives were enabled to start housing projects, mainly by reason of the fact that they were enabled to borrow some of the money from the Provincial Government in order to carry on their building. This was done on the understanding that when the houses were at a certain stage of construction they would be able to receive the

money which had been advanced to them from the Central Mortgaging and Housing Corporation, who would take a mortgage for the money which had been refunded to the Government, and the Government would receive the money it had advanced the co-operative houses owners. The owners would then be given a period of time in which they would be able to amortize and pay off the monies, which, of course, in the first instance they had received from the Government. On completion of the House to a certain stage the money would be refunded to the Government by the Central Mortgage and Housing who would hold the mortgage. During last year that involved sums of money, during the year, in fact, it was somewhere around the neighbourhood of half a million dollars. During the last six or seven months we have received some information that possibly ten, twelve or fifteen groups would be interested in trying to receive similar aid during this year. Even with ten groups averaging per group an amount of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars outlay was involved, and the Government naturally tried to ascertain if it were possible to try and find some means of financing the co-operative groups without having to make the initial outlay for the period it was actually under the old undertaking. With this purpose in mind we explored the possibility of financing from the banks, and also explored the position with Central Mortgage and Housing. After some discussion we agreed with Central Housing and Mortgage that the co-operative building groups might be treated exactly the same as ordinary building contractors. This means, of course, that instead of waiting until the house has been com-

pleted before any refunds were made that there would be progress payments during the course of construction.

This Bill enables us to enter into an agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing so as to take advantage of the arrangement to which we have come. In each instance it means, of course that the outlay the Government will have to make at any one time would be considerably less than it was under the old arrangement. We still make the initial advances, but when it comes to the second advance we can get it from Central Mortgage and Housing.

That is the main purpose, Sir, of the amendments in this Bill. The second amendment, of course, merely deals with the registrations.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think the name of this Bill belies its purpose. I am not familiar with the original Act, but it does not seem to be an appropriate name to describe ventures of this kind of co-operative groups which have been operating in the City and the suburbs during the past couple of years. I don't know of any group of such people who could have been considered as slum dwellers before their groups were organized.

MR. HEFFERTON: They have not.

MR. BROWNE: Therefore, I wish a more appropriate name had been found to describe the Bill dealing with co-operative building in this fashion.

Now, Sir, if I may be pardoned for speaking in a personal way at this

time, I may say that I have organized a building group back in 1937, I think it was, in connection with the civil servant association. We had at that time about ten in the group, and a person well qualified to instruct the members of the group who were to build their homes. At the time we were fortunate in having here two ladies from the United States, from the State of Maine who had been working with co-operative groups in Cape Briton, and who already had had considerable experience in assisting members of groups there to construct the houses at a place called Tomkinsville, I believe. The group at Tomkinsville was the first project in Canada to build houses on the co-operative basis. I remember very well the details of that project. Dr. Tomkins, celebrated highly in the co-operative movement and who has become famous throughout the whole world for the remarkable work that he has done, bought himself fifty acres of land and ten of these he distributed to ten members of a building group, and they proceeded in the fashion now recognized as the most practical method of carrying out a building project of this kind. They met two or three times a week, and discussed the plans of the building. Then these ladies assisted the wives as to the interior layout and decorations.

As I said, we formed this group here, and we were ahead of our time, I think, it will be appreciated. It was during the days of the Commission of Government, when money was very scarce, and actually we had a group at the Mental Hospital, a group of the workers there, who were ready to start building. For a site we had a piece of beautiful land, thirty acres which would provide an

acre apiece for thirty men, which we could have obtained at a rate of one hundred dollars an acre. Those familiar with today's housing projects will realize how cheap that was. And although these gentlemen had the promise of assistance of their friends and of use of a cement mixer for the foundations, the Government of the day, the Minister of Finance especially, would not give them, the members of the group, individual credit for the work they would put in the scheme, and there it fell to the ground. The whole scheme depended upon the effort which the individual members of the building group put into it. I have heard men say that the value of their efforts, and the value of the efforts of their friends in the construction of these houses amounted to something like five or six thousand dollars, and it will be easily seen when Mr. Pinsent would not give credit for that effort they were unable to go further with the project. But I don't believe the effort we made then was lost. It was a pioneer movement of its kind, and there is no doubt that those who were concerned with it kept hold of the idea, and talked about it amongst their friends, and it has been brought to completion, I believe, at this time. At this time, too I should give credit to Mr. James V. Ryan of the Railway Employees' Welfare Association of the Railway who organized the construction of over a hundred houses on the Topsail and Craigmillar Avenue. That was a wonderful project by which men came to possess houses at small monthly payments. He was given assistance by Mr. Lodge, and I have no doubt that he was wise in approaching him rather than the Commissioner of Finance. Those houses may not be in the fashion that

is more desired today of separate houses with gardens in front and at the rear and that sort of thing. Nevertheless they constituted a desirable change from the places where these sort of people had to live, and enabled a man to own his own home.

Therefore, Sir, it was a pleasurable thing for me, in the House of Commons at Ottawa, to advocate greater attention by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation toward this question of co-operative building of houses. I was certainly glad to learn that here in this city several projects of that kind have been on foot during the past few years. As the honourable member for Green Bay, I believe it was, stated in his speech a little while ago, I was the moderator of a panel discussion on co-operation a couple of weeks ago on this very subject. Four members of housing groups in the city discussed the problems which they had to face and the ways in which they faced them at that time. One member of the panel had been a member of the housing group which had built houses. After studying how to proceed they built one house first, and I believe they drew lots as to which of the members should get it. But having built one house they saw themselves that the idea was practical, and that they could build the others, and so they did. It is inspiring, in my opinion, to meet members of a group of that kind, men who sit down and plan ahead a year or two as to how they are going to build a home. It is a most inspiring thing, and I congratulate all those in the Government who are responsible for encouraging the promotion of this idea.

I am glad to know now that the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation are going to be more gen-

erous in assistance which they are going to render to facilitate construction of houses along these lines. And I am certainly glad to know that there are so many groups in the city at the present time who have taken up this plan.

The work of the pioneer groups who have built houses in the past couple of years has certainly inspired a great many workers in this city and encourages them to obtain homes, when they recognize the tremendous savings they can make and also the important social work they do themselves by building such homes, and the pride and pleasure they will get in after years when they look back on what they have done. I think it is a major project, and I do not hesitate in giving all the praise that they deserve to the members of the Government who have promoted this project.

Now, it is a good thing to know that there are ten or twelve groups that have between them a hundred or a hundred and twenty people who are planning to build houses during this year or during the next two years. I have been in touch with a good many of these people, and know the care with which they have selected the land upon which they are going to build, and I know the type of land they have selected, and I believe they are going to be very happy in their surroundings, because having studied and planned this project together I believe that they will be happy as neighbours after their houses have been constructed. It gives this party very much pleasure in supporting this Bill today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not get the impression that the honourable gentleman was

trying, even vaguely, even remotely, to claim any credit whatsoever for this legislation. Because he has had as much to do with it as the man in the moon. The credit for this legislation, not this particular Bill before us today, but the whole idea out of which this Bill grows belongs to my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, entirely. The honourable gentleman who has just spoken has as much to do with it as though he lived in Timbucktoo. The fact that he believed in co-operation is interesting. I am glad he does believe in the co-operatives. I know that he does. But the fact that he does has no bearing on this Act. The fact that some years ago he belonged to some group of a dozen or ten men has no bearing, not at all, not a scrap. He may have belonged to many various groups, some of them co-operative, but that has no bearing on this here today. It may have some bearing on it that the Minister of Co-operatives and his deputy at that time came to me on this matter, and they had my support. Now, I will tell the House that Mr. McLellan, the General Manager of the Bus Company, had a lot to do with it. He even acted as my personal agent in making approaches to the authorities in Ottawa on this very matter of co-operative housing. On more than one occasion he went especially to Ottawa to induce the Minister of the Government of Canada under whom housing comes, and to induce the head personnel of the Central Mortgage and Housing to agree to a much wider, much more generous treatment for co-operative housing. Mr. McLellan, I think, is due a great deal of gratitude for the progress of the co-operative housing, the progress it has made and is making

in this province today. Quite a bit of it is due to me personally. I would not have bothered to say so, but for the extraordinary attitude taken by my honourable friend who tells us that somehow, some years ago, he was a member of a group, and he left in my mind at least the inference to be drawn that somehow therefore he was the father of this, because he was also the father, I understand, of the Fishermen's Federation. He believed in it, therefore he is the father of it. I, myself, took part in a broadcast forum in Ottawa at which the speakers were, amongst others, Mr. Winters, the Minister under whom housing comes, and I think it still comes, I believe he carried it with him into Public Works, if I am not mistaken—and I am very rarely wrong in such matters—indeed under whom it still comes, Mr. Winters. He was one of the participants as was Mr. Calwell. At the forum in the Chateau Laurier, which was broadcast on the network throughout the nation, I then demanded that the Government of Canada do something about co-operative housing, demanded it.

MR. BROWNE: When was that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Two or three years ago.

MR. BROWNE: I was at it before that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman have a race to see who began the co-operative too? Although the honourable gentleman is older than I, I can assure him I could go back at least twenty years before him in my advocacy of the co-operative movement, yes twenty years, I joined my first co-operative in 1920. I joined it as a member, and I am still a member of that co-



operative. Yes, in 1920. Newfoundland, as a matter of fact has taken the leading part in all Canada, of all the Governments of Canada, in including the Government of Canada and the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to broaden and liberalize its scope with regard to co-operative housing—we have taken the lead, Newfoundland. We are not the pioneers. The pioneers were the Government of Nova Scotia, and my honourable friend when he spoke in the House of Commons referred to that. He then said that he had visited some of the housing in Nova Scotia. I read his speech. I had visited the same projects and was taken through them one after the other, and they were not by the St. Francis Xavier people. When I attended a convention they took me through that housing project. The Government of Nova Scotia were the pioneers, but this Government has gone further than Nova Scotia's Government was ever willing to go. We went to this point: We would put up enough money to enable a man to get his house covered in. We would virtually finance him to the point where Central Mortgage and Housing were willing to accept a mortgage and finance its completion. He was financed up to that moment. We were the only Government in Canada willing to do that. With the result that today it is the policy of the Government to lend almost entirely, overwhelming on co-operative housing. It is natural, it is common sense, it is logical, it is practical, and we would like to see those of our working people, working for wages, take advantage of this co-operative housing. I think we would be willing to spend a million dollars a year, and a million dollars a year from this

Government would enable a great many thousands of houses to be built in the next few years. If the people would adopt this co-operative technique, especially now in the light of the legislation introduced by my honourable colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and this present Bill which carries it ahead some considerable steps from what it was before this. It is the essence of liberalism — co-operatives and liberalism, what is the difference? This grows out of a movement which is the essence of liberalism.

MR. HOLLETT: Socialism.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, my honourable friend is talking about socialism. If he wants to find two schemes more widely separated than socialism and the co-operative movement I would like to hear what they are. These two schemes are the antithesis one of the other—so my honourable friend, as usual, is wrong. But I do hope my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, does not attempt to read this Bill. Because I have never known him once in this House since he came in to take up a Bill and read it, without making a mistake. He does not appear to be able to read a Bill without misunderstanding it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman asked for it did he not?

MR. SPEAKER: One does not always get what one asks for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Speaker, that is the irony of life. Look at me for instance. Do I get what I deserve? Do I? Do I get it from my honourable friends opposite?

MR. SPEAKER: I hope you do not provoke the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with that question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended speaking about this Bill. But every time my honourable friend gets up and claims he is the father of the Fishermen's Confederation or the father of the Co-operative Housing, I propose to get up and answer him that he is not the father not even the stepfather. I don't know what other kinds of fathers there are, but I do know he had nothing to do with it. He was not even around, not even in the Province at the time, but was up in Ottawa. So that he does not get any credit for this Bill or any part of it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal explanation, I think the Premier once again has been unfair, and certainly ungenerous in his criticism. I did not claim to be the father of this Bill. I went, in fact, out of my way to congratulate all members of the Government in connection with it. But I do say that in the House of Commons I advocated every chance I could get the utilization of co-operative techniques in the building of houses and urged the Minister and the Government to help in every way they could. I feel that was apparent from what I had to say.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to support the Bill. Of course everybody knows that the Act was very inadequate in its original form, and I support the amendment. I may say, Sir, in doing that, that the taunts and the insults thrown at me practically every day since this session opened by the Honourable the Premier have no effect whatsoever upon me. It is like water off a duck's back, runs off just as it falls. I might point

out to the Honourable the Premier that it is sometimes very unwise to claim credit for anything in this world. I have heard people claim credit for doing a big lot for this country, bringing in all sorts of new industries, bringing in men, Sir. Why, we would not wish to be premier. It is not always wise to claim credit for this, that or the other thing. I would like to point out to my honourable friend that the matter of co-operative housing has been in being before he or my honourable friend on my right ever saw the light of day. I fail to see why either one of them would want to claim to be the first that ever thought about it. There is nothing new, Mr. Speaker, under the sun, and the man that gets up and says: I and I alone did it, is just a fool, Sir, that is all.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I want to support this Bill too. Perhaps that is surprising to the Honourable the Premier, but maybe it is not. But I wish to say I am personally acquainted with several of the groups building homes. I know many of them, and I would like to say that of the two groups, that I am acquainted with most of the members. They are doing very fine work, and are very happy, I think, to get the chance, and have the means at their disposal to build homes for themselves. Because, today, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult indeed for young people to build a home for themselves. When we realize the terrific cost of living and the cost of materials and the tremendous taxload the young people are carrying today—take the young people in the average wage group, between \$3,000 and \$4,000 a year, and the terrific taxload these people are carrying. I think we all realize that without something such as we have here in this Bill, something

which would assist and aid these young people to build homes for themselves they would find it very difficult indeed. That is the reason the governments of the day must put forward and the provinces find it necessary to pass legislation to allow the people some means by which they can build homes for themselves.

There was one other point made by my honourable colleague, the member for St. John's West in respect to the R.E.W.A. who in the mid-thirties built houses. In the first instance it was the officials or directors who pledged personal credit at the bank to get the first money to build houses. I have nothing further to say, but I do support the Bill. Now it is useless for the Liberal members on the opposite side to take credit for everything. I was connected with the co-operatives twenty years ago, in the early thirties, and attended several meetings where the honourable member for St. John's West was present and gave us advice on how to start meetings—the next thing, Mr. Speaker, will be that they invented baseball.

On motion Bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all further orders of the day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday at 3:00 of the clock.

---

TUESDAY, May 4, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): I am quite sure all the members of the House noted with

regret today the fact of the death of the late Michael A. Shea.

Mr. Shea was once a member of this House. My own personal recollection is that Mr. Shea was first elected to membership in this House, from the district of Ferryland. I believe he was elected under the leadership of the late Hon. W. S. Monroe in the year 1924.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: He was elected in 1932 under the leadership of Mr. Alderdice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would have said 1924, but then I recall now that Major Cashin was elected on that occasion. It was later, after Major Cashin dropped out, that Mr. Shea offered himself and was elected under the leadership of Mr. Alderdice. Mr. Shea—I am speaking from memory and have not had an opportunity to check the facts—I have a feeling that Mr. Shea was Chairman of Committees at that time. He was for a number of years, one of the most active and most prominent businessmen in Newfoundland. He was connected with the well-known firm of Monroe Export Co. Ltd., now better known as Fishery Products. In his capacity down there, Mr. Shea had more experience in fishery matters, in the fishery supply, in the sale of salt and dried codfish, than perhaps any other man of this time.

It is probable that the late Mr. Shea came to know every male voter in the district of Ferryland by his first name; and I am quite sure that if his legal duties did not detain the Minister of Provincial Affairs in another place this afternoon, he would be desirous to add to this expression of regret over the passing of this man who was a true gentleman. I move that an

expression of sympathy be forwarded to the relatives of the late Mr. Shea.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): I too, on behalf of the Opposition, couple our regrets at the passing of the late Mr. Shea. He was a man who was well respected by all who came in contact with him and he was particularly respected by the people of Ferryland district whom he represented.

I am sure we all join in the expressions of sympathy to his family and I second the motion so well put by the honourable the Premier.

MR. BROWNE: As one member of the Alderdice Government when the late Mr. Shea was elected in 1932, I would also like to join in the expression of sympathy so ably expressed by the honourable the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition. As a director of Monroe Export Company, as the Honourable the Premier stated, he was thoroughly experienced in all phases of the fishing industry in this country. I remember in 1933 making a tour of the district of Ferryland with him and I can vouch for his popularity with all the fishermen down there.

I would like to join with the expression of sympathy already given to all the members of his family.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk will forward a copy of the resolution to the relatives concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I should like to substitute the name of Honourable Myles P. Murray, Minister of Provincial Affairs and Solicitor General, for that of Honourable P. J. Lewis, Minister Without Portfolio, on the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

HON. DR. POTTLE (Minister of

Welfare): I rise to a point of privilege. Yesterday I received a copy of the issue of the Western Star dated April 24, 1954 in which there is marked a special Stephenville edition. In the centre of the front page is carried a four column cut, "A Street in Stephenville," with the following sub-title:

"Newfoundland's Welfare Minister, Dr. Herbert Pottle, is said to have described Stephenville as a shack-town huddled in filth and squalor on the fringe of Harmon Air Force Base."

There is a leading article on the front page of that issue written by James Browning Roe, editor of the Western Star. It reads:

"Today at noon a special train pulled in at Corner Brook's Station bearing a troupe of youngsters smart in red and navy blue uniforms."

Further on it says, "The young Tumblers are on their toes today because they are determined to show Corner Brook that Stephenville is not such a bad place after all."

Then it goes on, "Of course the Tumblers had planned to take part in the Sports Day Review event here long before Dr. Herbert Pottle's controversial speech in which he suggested that Stephenville's youngsters are 'contaminated.'"

Then I read the concluding section as follows:

"Stephenville's people deeply resent Dr. Pottle's remarks in the Legislature on April 6th. They have been labouring widely to make Stephenville a fine progressive town. Their Council, only legally constituted for a year, is pressing at its town planning, utilities and street-paving. The Lion's Club is about to open an \$11,000 children's

playground which they expect to be a real show-piece.

They claim that they have not received any satisfactory replies to a number of protests they made to the various politicians interested for one reason or another in Stephenville. They want a retraction, but none has come. The Western Star hopes that the pictures and stories in this special edition will demonstrate that Stephenville most certainly is not, as Dr. Pottle said, 'a shack-town of 4,000 huddled in filth and squalor on the fringe of Harmon Air Force Base.'

Nor is that all. The special page in the back section of this issue carries pictures of various aspects of Stephenville life. One article is headed:

"Civic Leaders Guide Youthful Development."

"How would one expect children and young people to behave in Stephenville if they were 'contaminated' as Dr. Pottle said; and if our home-town were 'a shack-town huddled in filth and squalor.'"

Another article at the bottom centre reads:

"In his address in the House of Assembly earlier this month, Dr. Herbert Pottle, Newfoundland's Minister of Welfare, described a community that he left nameless at the time, as 'a shack-town of 4,000 huddled in filth and squalor on the fringe of Harmon Air Force Base.'"

Another paragraph said, "Every adult in Stephenville and many of the kids, too, are perfectly aware that Dr. Pottle was referring to their Town in his speech. There is no community of 4,000 on the fringe of Harmon Air Force Base except Stephenville."

Still another paragraph says:

"The Western Star toured the school this week with Rev. Father P. J. Bromley, Parish Priest, as a guide. Surely, these bright-eyed youngsters were not 'contaminated' as Dr. Pottle suggested."

Then, each picture, is more or less tied up directly with my address to the House of April 6th.

Nor is that all: Here is another series of articles and pictures on Page 3 of the second section. These pictures are, likewise, pictures of Stephenville. In one of them, the editor of the Western Star seems to be presiding at a Meeting, or at least, he is seated at a table. A paragraph to the right of the picture says:

"All residents of the West Coast town described by Dr. Pottle as 'a shack-town of 4,000 huddled in filth and squalor on the fringe of Harmon Air Force Base' are now drawn together as a unified body by this insult to the Town's integrity and morals."

Now, Sir, I hope I have given enough to this House to indicate the seriousness of the matter to which I am drawing attention at this moment. This terrible thing was done by the Western Star, eighteen days after my original speech in this House in which I made no reference whatsoever to Stephenville.

This awful thing was done by the Western Star ten days after I had denied I had made any reference to Stephenville by a public statement in the Press and by the same statement over the radio.

This awful thing was done four days after I raised the question of privilege before this House because of unfair

reporting by the Evening Telegram. On that occasion I read a transcript of my speech in which it was shown to the House once again that I made no reference to Stephenville. I added when I sent a copy of my speech to Stephenville, that no thought of Stephenville had even crossed my mind.

Yet, we are confronted with this terrible thing today. I saw it for the first time yesterday, in this House.

I was prepared, up until that time, to leave this matter in the hands of the Committee which had been set up by this House, qualified to deal with issues of this sort. But then, Sir, I saw this outrage was from the 24th April edition of the Western Star and I decided I would have to take other steps to safeguard my name and reputation in Newfoundland and outside Newfoundland as far as civil liberties of this land will allow. I am therefore instructing my solicitors to take action at once by way of instituting libel proceedings for \$150,000 against the Western Printing & Publishing Ltd., publishers of the "Western Star" of Corner Brook; H. M. S. Lewin and all other Directors of the said Company; as well as James Browning Roe, Editor of said paper. I am also instructing my solicitors to proceed with libel action at once in the amount of \$200,000 against "The Evening Telegram," the publishers of "The Evening Telegram" in St. John's; R. B. Herder, and all other Directors, C. E. A. Jeffery, Editor-in-Chief, and Harold Horwood, reporter of that paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member table a copy of the newspaper?

DR. POTTLE: I have pleasure in tabling any copy of the paper from which I quoted.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

None.

#### Giving Notice of Question

(72) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies doing business with the Government? Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies which have received loans from or have had loans guaranteed by the Government? Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies which have been established by Government funds?

2. Give the names of any such Directors with the names of the Companies of which they are Directors, together with salary, if any, paid in each case.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I am wondering just what information the honourable member is looking for? "Are any members of the Government Directors of Companies doing business with the Government?" To get the answer to that, I would have to get in touch with the Minister of Supply. There is no date mentioned.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could make an observation? I could drop that part?

MR. CURTIS: That is helpful. In the second part there, I would like to know if the honourable member



wishes to know about Government Directors or is he interested in Directors who have financial interest in the Companies. I wonder what is meant by the second part. I myself am a Director of Bowaters for instance.

Question No. 71: Stand.

Question No. 69: Answer tabled by Honourable Minister of Labour.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Labour in reply to Question No. 69 asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's West on the Order Paper of April 29, 1954.

Question: 1. Who are the members of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Answer:

Mr. Irving Fogwill, Chairman  
Mr. John J. Maddigan, Vice Chairman  
Mr. Clarence V. Hancock,  
Commissioner

Question: 2. What was the date of their appointments, and what is the present salary of each?

Answer: (a) Appointed 1 August 1950 as Workmen's Compensation Committee. Confirmed as Board when Workmen's Compensation Act came into force on 1 April 1951.

(b) \$6,000 per annum, Chairman  
\$5,000 per annum, Members.

Question: 3. What was the age of each member of the Board on his appointment?

Answer: Mr. Fogwill .....	48
Mr. Maddigan .....	59
Mr. Hancock .....	32

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, could I bring to your attention Question No. 67 addressed to the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The last answer given was that the question was in the course of preparation.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I may say my deputy was out of town for the Woods Labour Board Meetings—the answers are being prepared and I shall have them tomorrow.

### Orders of the Day

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading was moved by the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, and the debate adjourned until today.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to the principle of the Bill, I believe I ought to express to the Honourable Minister who introduced the Bill my appreciation of the manner in which he delivered his address on presentation of the Bill. I am of course not offending anybody on the opposite side of the House if I say that the Honourable Minister of Fisheries is a most excellent speaker and debater. Although I have not heard him in debates I am sure he is probably tops on the opposite side of the House. At any rate I do congratulate him because he gave the introduction to this most important Bill in a very able and efficient manner.

Sir, I have to admit right at first that I find some difficulty in arriving at just what is the principle involved in this Bill. I have read it again and again. Whilst I remember hearing some opinion expressed on the Government side of the House as to my ability to read any Bill right, I do confess quite openly here that it is not easy to pin down any one prin-

ciple in this Bill. There are several principles involved, and I propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal with them as they come up.

The title of the Bill: "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" on the face of it is a quite innocent, quite an excellent thing for any government to do—to set up an authority or a board or a committee, as the case might be, to be known as the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority. I believe we have had a Newfoundland Fisheries Committee before. We have now advanced to the stage of an "Authority." I read the newspaper reports of the Honourable Minister's speech of yesterday, and I do not say it reported the exact words which were used by the Minister. I note that the newspaper did say that some of the work, which the Authority is already engaged on, was outlined by the Minister. That included responsibility for such projects as the construction of salt and fresh fish processing plants at Quirpon, Seldom, LaScie, Valleyfield, Bay de Verde, Joe Batts Arm, Twillingate and Change Islands. In most of these places development will be along community lines involving the construction of homes, schools, roads, water facilities and electric power plants. I must confess I found no mention of that in the Bill whatsoever. It may be that it is possible to include that in this Bill, but there is certainly nothing in this Bill that we have to indicate that the Authority is, as a matter of fact already engaged on it. While I am on that point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that we are asked to support this Bill to set up a fishery development authority which, according to the Honourable Minister yesterday,

has been working ever since last June. They have been spending money ever since last June. I take it they have made considerable progress along the line of development which we, as a Legislature, know nothing at all about. As far as I can see Mr. Speaker, it sets up a Crown Corporation. It is an agent of the Government and is given the power to make contracts either in its own name or in the Name of the Crown, and can appoint its own agents. In one sense it is not a creature of this Legislature at all. It is a creature of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council set up last June and operating ever since. So that it is not really a creature of this House, and it is entirely irrelevant whether we on this side of the House or on the other side of the House support the principle involved here or not because it is an established fact. It is a fact accomplished. This three-man Authority is already involved on the work which it is supposed to do. I believe, Sir, that the Government has already, as far as I can gather from the Act, has already entered into an agreement with each of the three men on this Authority. Here again, although we don't know anything about the agreement, we are asked to sanction and agree to the principle of this Bill. We have been told by rumour (and only by rumour) that each of these three men is to get more or less fabulous sums, in the eyes of the Opposition although it is not so, I take it, in the eyes of the Government. We have been told, by rumour, that they are to get twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars a year each. I don't know whether that is correct or not, Sir. I must surmise that it is pretty nearly correct because it has already been stated here in this House and has not been contradicted.

We are also told that according to the agreement made apparently last June, that three-man Authority was given a contract which would last for a period of ten years. That they would get somewhere between twenty-two and twenty-five thousand dollars each for ten years, and at the end of ten years each will be eligible to a pension of five thousand dollars. That is the rumour, and also, if any of the Authority should die in the interval then their dependents would also receive a pension. Now how true exactly that rumour is I cannot say. Therefore I am not in a position to say whether or not I would agree that these men should get that amount or whether they should not. In one sense it is none of my business as to what the Government might pay, but on the other hand it is the people's business.

I note too that by regulation the Government requires us to vote authority for both these things they have already sanctioned, and having paid the salaries they are now asking us to sanction that. We were told yesterday by the Honourable Minister of Fisheries that the compensation of these three individuals should be commensurate with the magnitude of the task which has been set up. I think that is a very good statement and a correct principle on which to work. I think it would be a grand thing if everybody got paid according to the magnitude of the task being set. He also stated, Mr. Speaker, that the proposal of the Government was to make these three men economically secure. That is to say that they would have no more worries about their own affairs, their financial affairs, so that they would be able to devote full time to the task before them. That may or may not be a good policy. I

doubt very much whether a definite surety of economic security is good for any man or any creature on this earth. I do not think it is the best thing for any of us that we should get the feeling that we are absolutely economically secure. I don't believe anybody could get the best work out of us if that were so. Take these three men: Supposing it is true they are getting twenty-five thousand dollars a year, that they will get a pension of five thousand dollars, I wonder is that a good thing? Is there anything to indicate just how far these men may or may not go with regard to performing this task which they have, and how far they may not go before they would have to forfeit such economic security?

I was speaking a moment ago about the task which was set me. I would like to ask before I go on to that, Mr. Speaker, (I made a note here Mr. Speaker) if this Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee is a recommendation of the Walsh Report or is it a suggestion of the Federal Department of Fisheries? There has been no indication either in the Bill or in the Minister's introduction yesterday as to whether it was something which was laid down by the Fisheries Commission under Sir Albert Walsh or whether it was a recommendation which had been passed along from the Federal Department of Fisheries on account of the fact that the Federal Government was to co-operate with the Provincial Government in carrying out the work which Sir Albert Walsh had recommended. I don't know whether the Government is prepared to answer these two questions or not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I answer them? Regardless of who recommended or did not recommend the

idea to the Government the fact is that the Government now recommends it to the House, and does it as its own proposal, and stands or falls on it.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Premier, Mr. Speaker, for his information. I can now dismiss these two questions from my mind. We must remember though, Sir, that the Walsh Report was set up and worked for two years. As I speak I am looking straight at Sir Albert Walsh on the opposite wall. This committee was set up and worked for two years, at a cost of many, many thousands of dollars. I don't know if we ever got the cost, but it is somewhere in the vicinity of \$75,000, or something like that. I just forget the amount, at any rate many thousands of dollars. They made recommendations relative to the duties, or if I may not call it duties, to what they proposed the Provincial Government should do and the Federal Government should do and what industry should do, and what the fisherman should do. Now I find here an act is being brought in which has nothing whatsoever to do with any recommendations which were made by the Walsh Report. We all remember the Walsh Report and what its recommendations are. I remember trying to give a synopsis of them during the Speech from the Throne, but I was interrupted by somebody on the opposite side of the House. But I remember well what these recommendations were, and now we have here the task as outlined by this Bill, this authority of three men, Young, Dustan and Winsor, to examine into all proposals and suggestions touching the development of the fisheries and put them into effect, if the Government approves. They are to undertake research and investi-

gations and to recommend projects for the development of the fisheries, again if the Government approves. They are to investigate existing and potential markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on that one: I think I must inject here that although that Authority must do these things, that has already been laid down as the particular obligation of the Federal Department of Fisheries, and the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce. I see no reason why there should be any dislocation of it, although there is nothing wrong with everybody, of course, trying to improve the markets and investigating the existence of potential ones.

They have to enforce any agreements here, by the Government or anybody, for the fisheries. I take it that has to do with all the loans which have been made relative to the development of fisheries. I think that is the impression I got yesterday. I would say that would be a task which at any rate that two members of this committee would find they knew something about. I remember we were told yesterday that Mr. Dustan was a bank manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia and went from that to, I believe it was, the Bonavista Cold Storage. As you look at this list of loans which are to be taken over by that Authority and handled by them I find the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils \$40,500 as outstanding as at the 27 February 1954, and I find Bonavista Cold Storage Limited \$1,018,000 as the amount owed the Government by way of loans. I remind myself that Mr. Dustan was at one time a member of both these, at least of the Bonavista Fish Meals and Oils, and no doubt participated in the effort which he derived from such an expenditure of such a large amount of

money loaned by the Government to that firm.

With regard to Mr. Young, we are told that he for many years worked with Messrs. Crosbie and Co., and as I look down the list I find that there are companies mentioned here which received loans upwards of six hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which were closely allied to Crosbie & Co. and which, no doubt, Mr. Young had something to do with in the administration thereof. So that all these loans here, and I total nine million in one place and seven million dollars in another, down through the years, all these are to be handed over for administration, for collection and paying off, by these very people who only a brief while ago were attached to the corporations to which these loans had been made. That is neither here nor there. I just pointed it out, Sir, in order to show that these two at least are well qualified to deal with the situation when it comes to getting these particular loans back to the Government, and that they would know how to proceed.

They are to enforce all agreements heretofore made by the Government to anybody for modernization of the fisheries. Now these things, Sir, they "Shall" do. They are mandatory. They have to do them. In addition, at the request of the Minister, they will attempt to co-ordinate the work of all Government Departments in so far as they relate to any agreement between the two Governments for fishery development, and on their own initiative they may make direct cash loans and guarantee loans to any person to build or establish processing plants or to acquire vessels or equipment. That, I believe comes under Section 14. Yes. Assist persons, directly or indirectly, with financial aid or

otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries. I find, Sir, they might do that on their own initiative. Apparently they do not even have to consult the Minister and do not have to consult the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and even more important, Sir, I take it they never mention it to the Legislature at all until a year hence, as the case might be.

Now, Sir, that is one of the principles at any rate, involved in this Bill, to which we of the Opposition take a serious objection. The Authority may—these three men—may assist persons directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries. I think, Mr. Speaker, you will see this importance as we proceed further into the heart of this Bill. Under that particular section they can do other things, of course—assist the operations of such enterprises of an exploratory or experimental character, and do other things there, a dozen other things, Sir, which are basically dependent upon that first one which I mentioned.

There is another significant thing there, Sir, which gives them the power, from time to time, to grant funds for the carrying out of the work—at least it gives the Government the power. In other words we are supposed here and now to give the Government the power from time to time to grant funds to these three men for the carrying out of work assigned to the Authority or which it may undertake on its own initiative.

I take it that authority, if granted here now by this legislation will go on for the period of ten years at least, if not for longer. I fail to see how the Government could expect the Legislature to grant that authority here now. We have no idea as to the amount which this three-man Authority may need to carry out the most important task which has been assigned to it. We have no idea as to what imagination they may have with regard to the effort being made so far on our fishermen—and, Sir, I will point out that we have men in this country today with imagination such as, I think, we have never had before. These people have imagined all sorts of things, imagined that men were coming in here with their millions and millions of dollars to invest in our great natural resources. These men may have the same idea in their minds, and they may step out and make us liable for large amounts of money, if we here and now vote the Government authority to carry out the work assigned to these men in that Development Authority.

Here, Sir, is another altogether new principle—the Authority may, with the approval of the Government (and that is not the Legislature) the approval of the Government—the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, borrow up to twenty-five million dollars to carry out their work. And is not this silly, Sir, the Minister of Finance, acting for the Government is empowered to pay off any loans of the Authority, and to guarantee as to principle and interest the repayment of any moneys borrowed by the Authority up to an amount of twenty-five million dollars. As I have pointed out, Sir, this is exactly the kind of power which we were asked to and did vote for NALCO : and Sir William

Stephenson and NALCO we remember, Sir, how unattractive they found that to be to the investing public of North America. We remember how NALCO and Sir William Stephenson found it absolutely impossible to borrow even ten million dollars—and yet we are asked here to give this three-man board, this three-man Authority, Messrs. Dustan, Young and Winsor, authority to expend that amount and to borrow that amount from the Government, as the case might be, or from any other source. Not only can they borrow it from the Government but they can borrow it from any other source, up to twenty-five million dollars, and the Government is in duty bound to guarantee the payment thereof, and pay back the loan. I say, Sir, that is something, even though it is for the fisheries, on which I think we ought to have some sort of assurance, and some protection with regard to such matters. Even for the fisheries I don't believe even our most ardent fishermen would expect this House to abdicate its powers, its duties to the people of this country as a whole. I don't believe they would expect this House to give any three men in this country that amount of authority with regard to finances, which after all are taken from the fishermen's pockets and from everybody else's pockets.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman here? I am not referring to his last comment, which is perfectly in order. I must admit it is difficult to discuss the principle of such a Bill as this without going into many matters, but it does seem to me that the honourable gentleman is anticipating the committee state. He is reading clause after clause through. He is not giving the numbers but he is reading the



clauses and commenting thereon, but particularly these clauses which the honourable member himself yesterday identified with money clauses, and which the House agreed would be considered in the proper manner. Surely he is anticipating the debate of tomorrow on these clauses. I admit the point is a fine one, but I think I should suggest that point to the honourable member.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour not to make the error again. I may say I have jotted down in my own words the contents of each section, and I am not reading the Bill, although it might appear that way, I must admit that, Sir.

In addition, of course, then the Authority is given the right to expropriate land, buildings, stages, in fact anything they want. They can expropriate, but actually I have no serious objections to that.

Now, Sir, as I said in the first instance, I find difficulty in pinning down the principle of this Bill—if the principle is to assist our fishermen to make a decent living then of course we are all for it, we are all for it. But I cannot see that there is anything in particular in this Bill which would indicate that that is the principal reason for this Bill. Although the Minister told us yesterday, Sir, that this Authority would supervise and superintend certain developments which are to take place at LaScie and Merasheen and Twillingate and other places, there is nothing in this Bill whatsoever to indicate that that is the principle. I have read at least extracts from the sections and it is very difficult to say just what the principle involved is, except, as I said, there are other principles apart from the main one involved, to which we on this side

of the House find great difficulty in giving our support.

Would it be that the Government's aim is nationalization of the fishery? If it is the Government's intention to nationalize the fisheries, why did they not come out and say, "This is a nationalization Bill, we are going to take over the fisheries, we are going to run them"? Because, as I read this Bill, it is tantamount to nationalization.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Trash!

**MR. HOLLETT:** It is not trash. I went to the Black Book and I find this:

"The Department of Fisheries has legislative jurisdiction over all the fisheries of Canada. In the administrative field the Department has administrative authority over the public fisheries of the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, where for administration purposes the Eastern and Western Fisheries Divisions are established.

The Eastern Division is in charge of a Chief Supervisor of Fisheries and is divided into three regions: Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, each of which is in charge of a Regional Supervisor of Fisheries. Each region is divided into units as follows: Nova Scotia 8, New Brunswick 5 and Prince Edward Island 2. Each unit is in charge of a Senior Inspector and according to the intensity and importance of the fisheries of each unit a number of Junior Inspectors are employed. In many units, part time fishery guardians or wardens are employed for protective purposes.

Protection of the Eastern Sea Fisheries is maintained by six coastal patrol boats owned by the Depart-

ment and 13 boats chartered for seasonal operation. The Department also operates a fisheries protection cruiser.

The fish culture branch provides a field service which operates 30 hatcheries, 6 rearing stations and 6 salmon retaining ponds in the Eastern Division. The object of this work is to maintain and increase fish stocks. Conservation is also achieved by regulatory action.

The Fisheries Research Board carries out investigations of practical and economic problems connected with marine and fresh water fisheries. It co-operates with other branches of the Department in providing advice and instruction to the fishing industry regarding the most efficient methods of fish handling and processing. Adult education in this connection is carried out at several centres.

The Board operates 7 scientific stations, 4 of which are located in Eastern Canada. The latter are: the Atlantic Biological Station at St. Andrews, N.B.; the fisheries Experimental Station at Halifax and Grand River P.Q.; and the Atlantic Salmon Investigation Station. There is a trained staff of scientists also employed. The Board is associated with other scientific committees such as the Joint Canadian Committee on Oceanography and the Canadian Committee on Food Preservation. The Board is also responsible for the direction and execution of the work of the Atlantic Herring Investigation Committee. This Committee was created in 1944 as a result of negotiations with Newfoundland and with the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec.

The Province of Quebec is the only

Province administering its own sea fisheries."

The point I want to bring out is that once the fish is caught it comes under the legislative jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

Section 9 of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority says, the Chairman is the chief executive officer of the Authority, is charged with the general direction, supervision and control of the business of the Authority and has such other powers as may be conferred upon him by regulations. I say that this Fishery Authority is merely a duplication of effort—or triplication of effort. I see it will mean the setting up of another Department where hundreds of people will have to be employed and many other things will have to be attended to before it will go about its business.

Of course, if the principle of this Bill is that after five years of hedging by the administration, they have decided to do something about the fisheries, we will support them. We will give them credit for good intentions. If the principle of this Bill is to take the fisheries out of the hands of incompetents, the principle would be a good one. We have to admit that we have a very large staff in the Fisheries Department, a large staff. Some are being paid \$15,000 a year at one time. I do not think they get that much now. These men were hired to do the very job that is now being assigned the Fishing Authority. Our fishermen have waited a long time for this. There were 28,000 fishermen when we came into union with Canada; today there are 10,000. They have waited for the promised land which was guaranteed us way back in pre-Confederation days. I do admit that in certain places it is im-

portant and high time that something was done to take control of the fisheries away from what I shall call "blood-thirsty" Commission Agents—blood-thirsty suckers that I have known. There was a time they were so numerous that they sucked each other's blood; they were bloated blood suckers. Later on a certain number were given privileges and consequently they grew rich overnight.

I am wondering if the idea behind the Bill is to replace NAFEL. That may be one of the ideas to do with marketing. They are given the right to investigate existing and potential markets and marketing methods for products of the fisheries, and where necessary undertake such research promotion as it deems desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to those products. That, surely is one of the duties of NAFEL and is now given to this Fisheries authority. I do not know if I can go into the general discussion of fisheries in Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not?

MR. HOLLETT: I was born to fisheries, Mr. Speaker. I fished as a youngster, I fished when I should have been in school. We all fished—fathers and sons. Our mothers and sisters worked on the flakes. They all worked hard and I say now they were not too lazy to work. I say our people have never been too lazy to work. They could not have lived if they had been. Everybody worked hard. We put the fish out on the flakes in the early morning, turned it at 11 o'clock, turned it again at 3 o'clock and made it up in the evening. I was born in a fishing settlement; like a good many of my friends in this House. I was born in a place where there was a population of 96

families. Today I have to report to you not one family remains there and a study of that one community could give anyone the history of our fisheries. There are other places along that coast where the history of fisheries during the past 40 or 50 years could have been written. The people caught fish; they made fish; they deserved a living. When we were young not one man in the settlement in which I lived took Government relief. There was one extra poor man there but rather than allow that man to take the dole, the neighbours got together and gave him enough for the winter. They did not look for loans. They were co-operative too. If John Jones wanted to get married the neighbours helped him get the lumber for his house, helped him build it. He did not have hot and cold water, I grant you, but he had a nice comfortable home. The people all helped. They had private initiative and they worked hard. I am wondering now how far any Government of any country should go with regard to assisting people. I do know the fisheries are in a bad state and I do know that in some communities it would be better for the fishermen to take up their lines and go to some place which would give them a better opportunity to live.

I am wondering too if one of the ills of fishery failure is that the Government has been helping certain individuals more than others.

Let us look at this list of loans again—Alberto Fisheries Ltd.; Andrews Labrador Fisheries Ltd.; Arctic Fishery Products; Fishery Products Ltd.; North Eastern Co-operative Fisheries Ltd.; Bonavista Cold Storage Co. Ltd.; Trepassy Fisheries Ltd.; Gaultois Fisheries Ltd.; Blue Water Shipping Co. Ltd.; Geo. T. Dixon Ltd.;

Lake & Lake Ltd.; etc. Now what possibility is there for John Jones, an enterprising fisherman in places where these firms operate, to compete unless he too can get a loan; he has no incentive to continue. I submit we are on dangerous ground when we give these three men power to make loans and make other decisions with regard to fishery. Would not perhaps their past association with the merchants in question befit them to be trusted to do a better job of sharing the wealth than the Government had done in the past? Would they not perhaps pick out the same few merchants for assistance? I submit that the man who worked hard to make a success of the fishery is of much more value than the man to whom the Government grants a loan. We are on dangerous ground and we are turning away some of the best brains from the fishery. It seems to me that the success or failure of the programme to be carried out by this Bill depends on these three men. I do not question the background of these men. I do not know them well enough. I do know that Mr. Dustan came here with the Bank of Nova Scotia; then he went to Job's, from there he went to Bonavista and was associated with Mr. Russell. He is no longer there. He now heads this Fisheries Authority. I state these facts in order that we may not deceive ourselves. I submit that any man who has to head up this Authority has the biggest problem in the world, that is the rehabilitation of the fisheries. These men might be the best people in the world, but whether these three men are properly fitted to make all plans regarding fisheries is something which time and experience will show. I submit the extreme security of these gentlemen constitutes no safeguard whatsoever, that they will do a good

job. I do not know whether the fishermen whom they are supposed to represent have been consulted about this Authority. We all remember in 1950 when the Fisheries Federation was set up. That was hoped to be one of the first steps towards rehabilitation of the fisheries. I wonder if they were consulted about this Fisheries Authority? I want to point out to the fishermen that whatever the system is that is being set up by this Authority, their lives and their future is at stake. No system can be perfect. There will always be sharks in the ocean just as there are pests in the soil. We belong to a system of free enterprise, or should I say "controlled free enterprise," where every man with the necessary intestinal fortitude worked as hard as his neighbour. That is the system which they have tried in the past. Are we now perchance going to give up this system for planned economy by the Fisheries Authority?

I am wondering if this planned economy in LaScie is in the best interest of the people. If you take away these men's spirit of independence, it will ruin the country and these men's lives. Give them the initiative and the ability to carry on as they see fit. If there are regulations to be made about curing, processing and marketing, very well. Our fishermen can catch more fish than they can sell. Our big job is to try and sell it for them. Therein lies the work of this Government, the Federal Government and every agency which has been set up.

I spoke to a man last night who told me that between himself and his two boys, they had caught 300 quintals of fish. He claimed that although the price was all right, he could not live on it. Why?

The cost of outfitting—I think I said here a short time ago, I cited that rubber clothes were sold here in St. John's for certain prices and around the bay for another, and sold at Bonavista for a much less price. These are things which the Government department should inquire into. I submit, Sir, that rather than a planned economy there should be some system of control, a half-way road between the two, the styles of living; that we still have in North America and the style they have behind the iron curtain. There their lives are planned, everything is planned for them. They have no private initiative, and if they have they are not allowed to exercise it. But we on this side of the iron curtain are different, and nothing should be done in this little country of ours which would cramp the style of men who were brought up on private enterprises. Oh, I know the Premier will say how miserably they were brought up. That is true. Their lives were hard. They fished hard, worked hard, but they were honest.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Honest but hungry!

MR. HOLLETT: I did not get that. I have this to say on that remark, Sir—during my boyhood days, as a fisherman and mixing with fishermen, and mixing with fisherboys until I went away from home, I never saw, that I know of, a hungry child. I never saw a child who did not have enough clothes to wear. Now he might have the seat out of his pants, but most of us boys had these torn out. We had enough to eat, we did not have the kind of grub, and I will say it again "Grub"—we had in those days, food, good honest food from gardens and from the sea, and we did not have it in cans, unless we put it

in bottles ourselves. But we were not hungry and our parents were not. But I do remember days when as a magistrate in Burin, acting as a relieving officer also, though Burin was one of the most prosperous places in this country that there was sixty per cent on dole. It went that way, Sir, over a period of two years. Prior to that I don't suppose there was a hundred and fifty dollars spent altogether on Burin Peninsula in dole. These were the days of depression, Sir. These were the days when they had a depression in Canada, when they had people lined up on the streets for hundreds of yards in the United States, and all over the world. Sir, miners went hungry, farmers went hungry, clerks went hungry and everybody was hungry in those days. To ascribe that condition alone to Newfoundland is unfair. It is a greater libel, on this country, Sir, than any libel, which has been instigated herein this House this evening. Our people were not starved rats, they were men, and they produced men. True they did not have fine foods, oh no, they had a rough diet. That is in my day, which I am speaking of. But there were days, Sir, when people were hungry, and as I pointed out, they were hungry all over the world in those days, and you will also find hungry people today even in England, and I dare say in New York. But as a population, Sir, our people were not starved by any means. Yes, they had their hard times like every people in the world, and they are going to have them again, Sir. Don't let anyone run away with the idea that we are at last and forever more out of such danger. Oh no, we will be hungry again. The peoples of this world will be hungry again, and we need not fool ourselves on that particular point.

Unfortunately for our fishermen, Sir, very often they seem to be in a sort of a squeeze-pinch, a vise controlled by the thumbs of selfishness of people, of people who want to get rich quickly, e.g. certain commission agents which I knew even in my own boyhood days and squeezed and squeezed and made their pound of flesh, and so later became millionaires, some of them, in this country. You will find that in every country. That is something for the Government to occupy itself with, get after some of these.

I want also to raise this point, Sir: This Bill will set up a host of civil servants—a host of civil servants—and as you increase the number of civil servants and or paid Government services in any country you increase the cost of living. If you increase the cost of living you increase the cost of production whether it be fish or potatoes, and if you increase the cost of production, Sir, you price yourself out of the markets in Portugal or Spain or Italy or what not. I am not against this setting up of an Authority, Sir. But as it is outlined between the pages of this Bill it is going to set up more overhead which the Government will have to pay for, in addition to the twenty-five million dollars which these people are allowed to borrow. There is no doubt in my mind, Sir, that this is a central planning scheme. The Authority is to act as an economic dictator to my mind, in any area where they set up shop. That is to say in so far as the fishery is concerned. If they can do so in so far as the fishery is concerned in these communities they will do so in regard to anything else. They can, according to the Act, and as I see it, they will survey all the whole resources of the fishery both human and material in

any community, and they will decide how those should be used, for the people and what should be done with the product. As I pointed out Soviet Russia is doing exactly that. Now understand, mind you, I am not accusing the Government of any Soviet or Communistic tendencies whatever. I am pointing out the trend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not?

MR. HOLLETT: I have no evidence to prove it except this Bill, and I am not going to ascribe it. If the Honourable the Premier wishes to be ascribed as a Communist, it is his affair and not mine, Sir.

I say this Authority will have to decide where to put each plant, by whom the plant is owned or by whom the fish or drier, and what method of production is to be used, how many houses are to be built, the type of houses and where, and many such like questions. I perceive that the honourable the Premier is getting restless.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all—if I had my pyjamas on I could have a nap.

MR. SPEAKER: Order: I don't think personal remarks are in order.

MR. HOLLETT: Has he any pyjamas, Mr. Speaker? He raised the pyjamas, I will lower them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, they listen and lie in their pyjamas dreaming of the day in Newfoundland, but they must leave their pyjamas at home, they can't have them in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The debate is out of order—will the honourable member continue the debate.



MR. HOLLETT: Sir, I must insist the Honourable the Premier does not snore in his slumber while I make this announcement. While I will admit to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries that something needs to be done, something has to be done, something has to be done right quickly, but that is not being done—something has to be done to help that poor lone man in the Bill of Cape St. Georges. He can't wait fifteen years—something has to be done immediately—and that is where I would like to see some action on the part of the Government. I will give the Government credit for what they did last year in the matter of the \$1.50 per quintal. Leaving politics out of it altogether, I think that was the work of a man, and I congratulate the man who did it. It was needed and nine-tenths of our fishermen on the coast could not have survived without it—I congratulate the Government on that. Indeed I will point out, Sir, the twenty-five million dollars which this Authority will raise would do the same thing for all our fishermen who fished in Newfoundland for the next twenty-five years. I wonder if that Authority will spend it so wisely as that \$1.50 per quintal was spent? That is a thought for the consideration of the Government.

We are asked to agree with this agreement drawn up between the Government and these three men on that Authority. We don't know what the agreements are. We know nothing about it at all. I am sure, Sir, I don't feel like subscribing to the principle of allowing the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to either loan or borrow unlimited amounts even for the fishery.

I don't wish to take up any more time, Sir, particularly as the Honour-

able the Premier on the opposite side of the House is so drowsy and his eyelids are drooping. I want to quote, Sir, if I may, an editorial from "Life Magazine," speaking on industry generally throughout the world, and in which the writer says; "In Italy, for example, the economic strait jacket designed by Mussolini still loads pay-rolls with unnecessary and underpaid workers, while the Government on private monopolies control everything from matches to bananas. But an increasing number of Italians are getting hep to what's wrong and are trying to do something about it. They were given new heart and direction by a recent speech of Don Luigi Sturzo, the founder of the Christian Democratic Party, who launched a basic attack on the whole philosophy of statism and called for new freedom, new private responsibility, new incentives, a new acceptance of risk. This speech, said Rome's *Il Tempo*, is destined to become one of the most important and precious pages in the annals of the Italian Parliament." Maybe it will; as Don Luigi himself warned, "the time will come when we will all be civil servants, a host of irresponsible people."

Now that is no reflection on civil servants. If we were all civil servants then certainly we would be a host of irresponsible people. There are various other things, Sir, I could refer to. I think the other day when I referred to fishery places somebody did not know what I was quoting from at that time—but I can tell them now—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I don't think the honourable gentleman is permitted to refer to a debate which took place earlier in the present session and which has been concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. I may say again members speaking to a motion may not refer to something said in the House in a previous debate in the same session.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member still has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we have already assured the House and the Government that we are most anxious to assist in every way and to help in anything relating to the fisheries. It is our bounden duty to refer to these things in this Bill which we do not like. I have referred to them, and I take it my colleagues will refer to them. I do not see it as the panacea for all of the ills attached to the fishery. I do not see it in this Fishery Authority which was not recommended by the Walsh Report, and we have already been told it was not recommended by the Federal Government, but is the brain-child of this Government, I take it, of the Minister of Fisheries. Whether that brain-child will grow into a man who has the experience and will be the champion of our fishermen is something that I could not say. I do say that as an Opposition we will do nothing to debar the Government from getting the best out of this committee, and out of any effort they make for our fisheries, because undoubtedly, Sir, we have to do something immediately. We have to do something more than just build a plant in LaScie or Merazheen or Twillingate or what not. We have to do more than that. As I pointed out before, in the last five years our fishing population, that is per fishermen, has gone from twenty-five thousand down to about ten thousand according to figures given

me by the Federation of Fishermen. Is there any reason to see, Sir, why they would not go lower than that if something is not done, something almost in the nature of that done by the Premier and the Government when they gave that \$1.50 a quintal last year. They saw the need and gave the \$1.50. I congratulate them on it. I think it was both wise and necessary. I don't think as a policy it would be good. Sir, we are most anxious to help, but there are principles in this Bill we object to, and we shall probably have to object to them again in Committee of the Whole. Apart from these objectionable things, we give the Government our blessing in trying to carry out and implement services such as in most of this particular Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives on the able way he explained and went into the details of this, a new Bill, setting up a fishery Authority. In his usual manner, Sir, he did make some very good remarks with respect to this proposal, and in his usual grand manner. It is always a privilege and a pleasure to me to listen to the phraseology of the Honourable Minister. Although at the same time, Sir, I believe I did detect a note of caution or anxiety back of his words, and perhaps he may be a little alarmed at what the Government is proposing to do. I have listened to the Honourable Minister on many occasions, and on yesterday, Sir, his remarks were not as positive as remarks he has made in this House on many occasions before.

Now, Sir, in this country of Newfoundland we have been dependent upon the fisheries so much during the lifetime of the people of this island,

and perhaps it might be in order if for a moment I say something about the people who earned their living at the fisheries. All throughout the past two or more centuries the people of Newfoundland have made a living, sometimes good, sometimes bad of course. People have made fortunes and people have lost fortunes in the fishery. People have had full bellies and empty bellies, that is those engaged actively, in the catching of fish. That, Mr. Speaker, is nothing new to any person who earns a living whether it be in the fisheries or those engaged in manufacturing, on the farms or any place where people are working for wages or working for a living.

If you go out throughout this island (I have not travelled very much. We of the Opposition have been accused of not being conversant with many of the settlements and villages where people fish) I have visited some, and I will say this; no matter where you go, what village or settlement you visit, you will find citizens who are honest, industrious, and you will find clean towns and villages and settlements, and above all, Sir, you will find the evidence of the Christianity of these people in their communities. These splendid churches they have erected throughout all the years in all of these villages and settlements, where these people who work at the fisheries reside. I know, Sir, it has taken a lot of effort and hard work, much hard work, by these people to build these villages and settlements into what they are today—clean, decent, well-planned, good houses, clean houses, clean children and good law-abiding citizens. All of that, Mr. Speaker, has come from what they earned in the fisheries all through the years whether the fisheries were good or bad. They managed all through

the years to set something by to build into the community in which they lived, something which I believe commands the respect of every person in this House or any person in this island or of the world. That is the character of the people, Mr. Speaker, which this Bill is proposing to deal with.

Now, Sir, all throughout the years, for this last ninety or a hundred years the total catch of salt cod in Newfoundland has been practically a million quintals which has been sold yearly. In good times it has been sold at good prices and in bad times, of course, returns were not so good. But there is one thing we must remember Mr. Speaker, and it is this: During the past fifty or sixty years the diet of the people who formerly ate much fish foods has been changing. This has come about with the advent of large cattle ranches in the South Americas, the United States and Canada and other places. I believe most members will agree with me that there has been a change brought about in the diet of people who formerly did eat more fish than they do today. Because ninety years ago, Sir, when we were one of the biggest salt fish producing centres in the world we could sell that million quintals at that time. At that time the people who purchased it had the money to pay for it. The populations of these places where they purchased so much of our fish foods have grown enormously, but you can see the pitiable amount of fish we have exported and what has been caught and exported by other countries shows that the consumption of fish foods has not increased comparatively with the increase in population of the people who formerly ate fish foods. I think, Sir, that is one factor which has some

effect upon the marketing of our fish products.

Now, Sir, the Joint Committee on Fishery Development has made a very exhaustive investigation into all phases of the fishing industry, and their recommendations of course, Sir, are opinions. Whether or not what the Government proposes to do today is based entirely upon the opinions expressed by that Committee I do not know. But I believe the Premier pointed out that this proposal is a proposal from the Government and upon which the Government will stand or fall. Mr. Speaker, if you go into any of the large stores in St. John's and elsewhere I expect, in other towns, you will find fish products from many other countries on sale. You can find on sale here in the city fish products from Norway and Denmark and the United States, and you can find fish products from Canada—from New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia. I wonder, why? Why it is that in Newfoundland where we catch so much fish and where we are so dependent upon the fisheries and so close to one of the greatest fishing ledges in the whole world that we have fish from other lands coming in here and underselling our own? I would like to point out just one instance in respect to one phase of the Newfoundland fisheries. We have on sale in St. John's, Sir, small cans of Newfoundland lobster, two and one-half ounce tins of lobster selling at 68c. a tin. Now, Sir, gold may be where I find it, and probably you may find gold in these cans. That is at the rate of 25c. an ounce, and if you want to buy it by small cans you pay over four dollars a pound for it. I understand, Sir, that the fishermen concerned, these people in the lobster

business get anywhere from 25c. to 30c. a pound or 35c. a pound for lobster. But if you want to put it in two and a half ounce tins you pay over four dollars a pound for it.

Mr. Speaker, it is proposed, I believe, as pointed out by the Minister when he introduced this Bill yesterday, that most of the work which the Fishery Authority will do or proposes to do at once will be confined to the Northeast Coast. I would like to point out, Sir, that on the Northeast Coast the fishery season is limited. I don't know, I am not a fisherman and don't know how long the season is, but on the southern part of the coast it probably may run into seven months, and as we go north the fishing season becomes shorter, and probably at the tip of the island it may be limited to only perhaps four and or five months. If it is proposed, Sir, to spend twenty-five million dollars or a proportion of twenty-five million dollars in building plants, artificial dryers, cold storages and bait depots in those areas, I would like to ask, Sir, what are the people going to do when they stop fishing in the fall, in September or October, or at the latest in November? What are these people going to do in the meantime? They possibly may be in the same position as they are now, because the building of these facilities, Sir, is going to add an added burden to the cost of processing of fish.

I would like to point out here, Sir, one or two things which may be of interest, in respect of fishing supplies. I did not look up any items, but the most important item, I think, in respect to fishery supplies would be salt.

In 1935 the price of salt which cost the importer \$2.50 a ton, had increased in 1945 to \$7.90 a ton. In

1946 it was \$9 a ton and in 1947 \$9.01, and according to Mr. Abbott of the Newfoundland Federation of Fisheries, prices charged the fishermen were going up still faster and by the 1953 fishing season had reached an average level of over \$7 a hoghead.

For the fiscal year ending 1935, our total exports were \$27,229,000 and the total for fisheries exports was \$8,289,000—29% of the total exports were products of the fishery. Nine years later, the total exports for fish were 40%. In 1944 and 1945 the percentage was 41%; in 1947 and 1948, the percentage was 37%. It is difficult to get the figures for later years because we have no Customs Returns now.

No matter what the Government does with regard to the fishing industry, I believe the Government, as well as the Opposition, must realize that Newfoundland's economy is vulnerable to what happens outside of this Island. We are still dependent on exports. If we do not export, we will suffer.

I think the most important thing the Government should consider in respect to the fisheries is this: lower cost of supplies and wider and better markets for our fishery products. For those people engaged in the fishery today, if they have to pay high prices for fishery supplies, they will find it difficult to compete or sell their product in places where the economy or standard of living is lower than our own.

There is not much more I am going to say; but it appears to me that this is an attempt at socialization of at least one part of the Island. It appears to me that the Newfoundland Liberals have now caught up with the C.C.F. If they make any attempt to socialize or nationalize the fisheries,

they are going to make a great mistake. If they take away these people's independence, I do not think it will be to the good of the community—I think it will be, rather, a great loss.

MR. JANES: Would it be in order for me to adjourn this debate now?

MR. SPEAKER: If there is no further debate, I will put the motion.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable member moved the adjournment; it is necessary to have a seconder.

MR. JANES: I was intending to speak on this Bill tomorrow. I will withdraw the motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Let them all speak on the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: If the honourable member does not wish to go on with the debate and wishes to withdraw the motion, perhaps we can carry on. I can see that the desire of the Premier is to shorten the debate, but it is one that is deserving of expression—one of the most important measures—in fact, the most important measure that has come before us in many sessions. It is important for many reasons—it is important because it deals with industries that affect the lives of thousands of our people. It affects many more than those actually engaged in the fishery.

My honourable colleague has indicated the decline of the fishery over the past forty or fifty years. I believe the decline has gone back further than that. Our marketing picture had never looked too happy. A level of prosperity was reached during the Napoleonic war in the early 1800's and that was not again duplicated until the First World War brought about an all-time record for price

levels and general buoyancy in the industry and this rapidly advanced. Then there followed a slump from which many firms and companies failed to recover.

I think we all know enough about Newfoundland to know the changes which have taken place during the last 50 years. We all know of the development of iron ore at Bell Island; the developments which took place at Bishop's Falls, Grand Falls and Corner Brook; the discovery of Buchans. A lot of fishermen or sons of fishermen gave up the fishing industry and went to work in these places. We all know something of the decline in the price for fishery products during the past 50 years. We remember that at the end of the second world war the Commission of Government had to ask the assistance of the British Government in the marketing of our codfish. After Confederation, things did not improve. We went into difficulties in 1949-50 when fish merchants had difficulty in marketing codfish. We know that the Fisheries Price Support Board had to come to Newfoundland's rescue and purchase thousands of quintals of fish which were dumped on farms for fertilizer.

The next year was a tragic year, when the price of fish sank lower than it had during the present generation and people were receiving as low as \$3.40 a quintal for fish. It was then thought that an Organization should be set up to protect the fishermen. I do not think that anybody here can argue that the setting up of an Organization or Federation of Fisheries is sufficient unless it has a scheme for the training of new techniques; but I do not think any attempt should be made to change the independent way of life of fishermen. One of the outstanding things

about their way of life is the religious, law-abiding upbringing it means to thousands of our people. The men work near their homes, sell the products of their toil, make a living for their families and they lead good clean family lives. If you begin to uproot that, you are on dangerous ground.

Newfoundland, in my opinion, should not rush into complete conversion to fresh fish. Competition from Iceland and Norway in 1952-53 nearly ruined our fresh fish business. Also, if we concentrate on fresh frozen fillets, we are likely to run up against a decrease in quotas of imports into the United States because the New England fishermen say they cannot tolerate any more imports.

The salt codfish market, it seems to me, was allowed to disappear too easily. We were not anxious to please the Portuguese and Spaniards.

A few years ago Newfoundland sold a million quintals of fish a year to just three markets—Portugal, Spain and Brazil. It is understandable about Spain, but even there I believe our market could have been brought back. In the House of Commons I advocated greater efforts by the Department of Trade and Commerce to get back the market. Portugal, for example, had a favourable balance of trade with Canada and could well put up dollars for her salt fish imports. Mr. Mayhew thought they were in a position to buy fish if they wanted to do it.

I have pointed out that the fresh frozen filleting industry is not very satisfactory in this country on account of competition and embargoes. There is another feature noticeable in this country, the plants do not always take the fish. Even in St. John's boat loads of fish have been thrown in the Har-



hour because Job's could not take it. I have seen many boat loads of fish brought in and the plants did not want to take it; the fishermen were bringing in too much fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That would be in the midst of the trap season.

MR. BROWNE: It was before the election. When the report of the Fishery Development Committee came out, I obtained a copy. I read it many times and I must confess that I cannot see how the fishermen have been able to study it. There were parts of it I could not understand. I do not believe the fishermen are familiar with it or with all the things in it. As I read the Walsh Report I remember nothing about a Fishery Development Authority in that. The co-operative principle was stressed a great deal. That I think was what the Walsh Committee had in mind when they recommended development on a community basis. I am sure they did not mean the socialization or industrialization of the industry as outlined in the Fisheries Development Authority Bill.

We are told by the Minister that LaScie is going to have a salt cod-fish curing plant; a bait depot; a meal manufacturing plant; a fertilizer plant and they are to have all the amenities that go into a modern town. I have been in LaScie and it strikes me that it is not a suitable place for a fresh frozen plant because it is going to be tied up for such a long time during the year. Now we are told it is going to have year-around production.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the inconsistency?

MR. BROWNE: It is this: They are going to have a fresh frozen filleting plant there, tied up five or

six months of the year, where it might be in operation all year around.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The quotation just read refers to a large filleting plant. There is no such plant going into LaScie.

MR. BROWNE: I take it then a small plant would be there. Then when you get this small plant you face the argument as to whether it would be as efficient as one which was operating all the year around.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will allow me. He is missing the whole point. The LaScie development is a testing out of an operation, dryers, sun-drying, artificial drying, mechanized drying, fish meal plant, salted fish plant, frozen fish plant, fertilizer plant, fishmeal plant, all balanced out, no one thing, but a balanced operation. That is the whole point of LaScie.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. But still the argument can be made that if that is what is wanted, why not have it on the South Coast or the South East Coast where you can fish all the year around. There you can't have any fishing at all for four or five months of the year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the answer is obvious. You don't need to spend it on the South West Coast where you know the people can fish for twelve months a year. But you need to spend it on the Northeast Coast where the overwhelming majority of the fishermen are, and constitutes therefore the overwhelming part of the fishery problem. That is why we must try something on the Northeast Coast.

MR. BROWNE: Certainly it is desirable that something should be

done. But is this whole experiment to be confined to the Northeast Coast? I mentioned that along the Southern Shore, apart from Fermuse there is no such setup as the honourable gentleman has spoken of in LaScie. But if you are going to have a scheme of such a character as that why not try it on the Southeast Coast or the South Coast. Is there any place in Newfoundland today where you have a salt fish industry, a fresh frozen filleting industry, a fishmeal plant, a fertilizer plant and a bait depot all combined such as you are going to put in LaScie? No. Then why not have one of these first in a place where it is feasible all the year around, rather than start with a place blocked with ice for five or six months of the year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend does not see the point yet.

MR. BROWNE: I think I see the point. The honourable gentleman means that on the Northeast Coast there are a number of fishermen, a great number of fishermen, and they are prevented from fishing during five or six months of the year, and they want to see if a community such as mentioned for LaScie will work under these conditions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Then select the people from the bays and bring them into LaScie and make a big town. Now I believe, Sir, (honourable members can correct me if I am wrong) that is the Premier's idea, because I remember reading his manifesto. I am not sure whether it was his manifesto in 1951 or in 1949, but I do remember these words, and I shall always remember them: "We want centralization and modernization of our fishing industry, centralized plants so that we can take the women and

children away from the slavery of making fish." The honourable Premier can correct me if I have misquoted him. But it seems to me that is what he said, I feel pretty sure about that. Now, Sir, that all strikes me as being unsound and unjustified. In the first place making fish is not slavery, and the part that women and children have taken in the production of salt codfish has never been regarded by the people or by the women and children themselves as slavery. Unlike—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has not been regarded as slavery by the women, you would say?

MR. BROWNE: I would say, no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say, yes.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman knows women today do much work in other countries, and in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, in India, China and Korea.

MR. BROWNE: I would say there is no comparison there. But they are doing other things, and harder. The honourable gentleman himself has seen, and I am sure my honourable friend who was in England during the war, has seen women working in munition factories, and the same way in Canada, working on machinery. Ask my honourable friend here who has just sat down whether it is harder working out on the flakes turning over the fish, as they still do, thank God, in many parts of Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is difficult to make the making of fish on flakes by women and children an appealing and an attractive life in 1954.

MR. BROWNE: No the idea, I take it now, is to put in fish plants and put them in front of an assembly line of fillets as they come along, and have them put them in packages. That is the ideal, where they are pushed through their collars, as the saying goes. What is the difference in working on a fish plant at Job's on the South Side for somebody else they know nothing at all about or working for a husband or father at Little Heart's Ease or Heart's Desire or Old Perlican or Grate's Cove or Bay de Verde, where my honourable friend comes from.

MR. MURRAY: In one place they get 60c. an hour.

MR. BROWNE: It is different because in one place they get 60c. an hour, and in another place the time is not related to a special price.

MR. JANES: They get 3c. an hour.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman has kept an account in full.

MR. JANES: I kept time in Joe Batt's Arm.

MR. BROWNE: Sir, I think there is an important factor to be considered in connection with the communities, which the women and children have given in the production of fish. They are working with their families. They are working at home. I can recall the time when I helped my own father when he was fishing down in Quidi Vidi. I helped make the fish, and I must say I never regarded it as slavery. Now take the French Canadian people in Quebec. They have grown from a few thousand people to nearly four million people in the last hundred and fifty years. They have done it because of the family life. I think you will find that the women

in Quebec work as hard, if not harder, than the women in Newfoundland. In the farming settlements they have to do many things. I think it is a very desirable thing that the children should be taught from the earliest possible age to assist the family in bringing wood, in chopping wood or doing any of the little chores around the house that children can do, and even in helping harness up the horses, and going on messages and that sort of thing; and in fishing places in helping put the fish on the stagehead for the men to cut. As they grow along help in every way they can to assist their parents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would my honourable friend yield a moment? Does my honourable friend actually argue that it is right, it is just, that a fisherman's wife and children ought to help him to earn the living for the family, and that he ought not to get enough by his own labour to support his own family? Does he argue that way?

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable the Premier is thinking of industrialization of this country. He has had it in his mind long before he became Premier of the country, and he would like to see everybody working in a factory and getting wages. He knows perfectly well that is not a sound economy, because the factories have to close down from time to time, the industries in which they are engaged will become flat on their backs—he spoke the other day about the birch plant and people being laid off. If their industry is attached to their homes they have greater security than they have otherwise. It is in another direction in which aid should be given to the fisheries rather than industrialization. The honourable gentleman may not propose communiz-

ation or socialization but he certainly intends to industrialize it, and he believes it is in that direction the sole solution for the fishery problem rests.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us the honourable gentleman's idea of what should be done, and in what direction?

MR. BROWNE: No. You had a committee for two years—and you were making suggestions to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was not!

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman did not need to appear before the committee to get his ideas through to them, and find out what it was doing. He announced last year before the publication of the report, what the report was going to contain, and he also made another announcement last year—I would remind him—a firm coming into this country was going to take over sixteen of the bait depots and establish fish filleting plants here, would have gone ahead with the idea if the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa had not stopped it—giving a monopoly to one firm to produce fish fillets in this country. Would that be desirable? That is what the honourable the Premier advocated at that time. I would not attempt to give a solution to the problems of the fishery alone. It is the whole economy of the country that has to be regarded. We have to take into consideration all the different industries that are in existence in this country and correlate them, and give each one the proportion that it should have in our economy. As the honourable the Premier knows, I have been interested and have advocated greater assistance to agriculture in this country then has been given to it in the past. He knows the importance of agriculture in every community. It is of vital importance. It is a staple in-

dustry and should be given far greater recognition by the Government than it has been given in the past five years.

Now, Sir, I listened with great interest, as we all did, to the Minister's speech. It was excellently delivered. Like the honourable member for St. John's East, I felt too that the Minister was not delivering it in what you would call an enthusiastic manner. That might have appeared from the fact that he read it, but it was certainly interesting and clear. But the Government has already embarked on that scheme. We are asked to give second reading to a project which is already approved since October. Mr. Pickersgill is well satisfied with the fishery plan. Speaking of the Federal Government's participation in Newfoundland's Fishery Development projects, the Secretary of State said—the major undertaking at this time would be the scheme with experimental drying at LaScie and the construction of an experimental salt fish plant in the Valleyfield-Badger's Quay area as well as a smaller centralization and partial mechanization of fisheries at Seldom-Come-By. LaScie is situated in the riding of J. W. Ashbourne, and he stated that the Valleyfield-Badger's Quay was in his own constituency, the Provincial riding of Premier Smallwood. Is it accidental that these places have been selected because they are in the constituency of the Secretary of State and of the Premier? If these schemes are successful, the Minister went on, and there are good hopes that they will be, the biggest single step will have been taken to modernize the salt cod fishery. He went on then to talk about the collaboration of the different departments of the Federal Government. He finally ended up the article with; (I

am not sure if he finished it up, but I believe it was from him the information came) the City of St. John's will benefit directly by this increased activity. The construction of a new fishermen's wharf supplied in the Federal Share of the development will undoubtedly supply the provincial capital with more and better fish and better prices. Now the Honourable Minister yesterday made no reference to that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To what?

MR. BROWNE: To the wharf.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The reason for that is that efforts to procure the foreshore has not been successful. Should these efforts prove successful, and when they prove successful this provision will be met. That is part of the initial plan.

MR. BROWNE: Yes. But, Mr. Speaker, that should not have prevented the Minister from making a reference to the matter which is of so much importance to the fishermen operating out of St. John's, and of so much importance to the people who purchase their fish, and have been purchasing it from Steer's Cove. The fishermen in St. John's, it seems to me, did not get very much recognition from this Government when they were being rooted out from a place, which, for as long as I know, was used for selling fish.

Now, my honourable gentleman here on my left, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, asked the question, I believe, as to what extent the fishermen's organization has been consulted in regard to this programme. I know that many of the members of the Fishermen's Federation had their suggestions made to the committee, were they consulted? I wonder if they

are convinced that the creation of an authority of this kind from the top is the best way to solve the problem of the fisheries? We have often been told that the way to solve a problem is to start at the bottom and build up. This one seems to start at the top and build down. The Premier picked these men first and then said; Now I want you to try and solve this fishery problem, put into effect the recommendations of the committee that has been set up for two years—and they are going to start from there. It seems to me that it is going to be a top-heavy affair, and where is it going to lead? How far does the Government intend to go? Are they now making a leap into the dark? They had forty millions of dollars, at least forty millions in 1949, and they invested twenty millions into the new industries, and today the Premier is not in a position to say if they will prove successful. He spent a great deal of money in connection with exploration for minerals, and today he is not in a position to tell us if that money has produced any returns up to the present time, and he is ready to spend another million, as he told us, taking a gamble. Is he taking a gamble today to the extent of twenty-five million dollars? Is he justified in taking a gamble to that extent. I don't intend to refer to any previous debate, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister, who is also Minister of Co-operatives as well as Minister of Fisheries, that the way in which the co-operative movement has worked, has been built on a much sounder basis than this. The people who are to benefit are the people who study their problems, and they solve their problems themselves, under trained guidance. They get together in groups like the Co-

operative Housing Group that we were talking about yesterday. They get together and they talk about their problems, and they find the solution themselves. Here things are going to be done for them. I was expecting to see some reference to the Co-operative Movement in the Bill. I was certainly expecting to hear some reference to the Co-operative Movement from the Honourable Minister when he was speaking, but I don't believe he mentioned it or made any reference to it while he was speaking yesterday.

Has the Government sat down and planned this thing, and seen where it is going to go? Have they consulted with the people that they propose to benefit by the adoption of this plan, and the setting up of this Authority? Is it just going to be superimposed upon them? There is the Northeast Coast, La Scie, Seldom-Come-By, Joe Batt's Arm, give them these—Is that the way they are going to solve the problem? Now, I have tried as I went around my district where there are a great many fishermen, Placentia, Ferryland—in Placentia Bay I was pretty horrified to find what problems they have to face. I have asked, and they have told me many times: Our problem is not how to catch fish but how to market it, how to get a price for it. What attention has been given that problem during the past five years? Or what attention is going to be given it now? The minister told us yesterday: if you are talking about marketing fish, see Mr. Sinclair or Mr. Howe. Don't see the Premier. Don't see me, we only have to do with fish from the time it is taken out of the water until it is ready for marketing, after that we have nothing to do with it. This is the problem the fishermen have to face. He told the fishermen a time ago to take

every cod's tail they could out of the water. Does he think the fishermen believed him after their experience in the past five years? Have they faith in his present decision? Is it possible to sell every cod's tail this year, and if not sold will the Federal Government come to the rescue? For two years they have had to come to the rescue with the Fishery Support Board.

Where is the precedent for this wild, all embracing scheme? Can you find it in Canada? Can you find it in England?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Can you find the problem?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and they have the same problems with every industry in every country. They must have it in Iceland and they must have it in Norway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, forty or fifty years ago, and solved it as we now propose to do.

MR. BROWNE: They could not solve it very well last year when they could not sell their fish in England and had to send it to the United States and block the fresh fish market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A serious incident, but only an incident.

MR. BROWNE: It is then Iceland that provides the ideal. My honourable friend tries to imitate them. He should give more attention to their agricultural industry because agriculture has been almost the chief industry. The sheep industry in Iceland is a very substantial part of their economy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the honourable gentleman know we sent a



man over there? Mr. Pat Murray, the Deputy Minister, spent weeks over there studying their economy.

MR. BROWNE: No. I did not know you sent a man over there. I knew you sent a man to Norway and Denmark.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the same man. No, that was a different man.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and that gentleman got into difficulties shortly after his return.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We know of no difficulty in which he got.

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the minister of Fisheries has a better memory.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know of no difficulty whatsoever, none.

MR. BROWNE: Ask him some time. Now, Sir, I have one question, one timely matter to talk about, i.e., where does private industry fit in in this programme? Has any estimate of the cost been prepared of how much this is going to cost? It should be possible to say how much the cost is to be to put the fresh frozen fish plant and salt cod fish plant and mechanical driers and machinery for manufacturing fertilizers, etc. We have not been given these figures. I presume the minister will be in a position to give them when we get into committee.

It seems to me, Sir, that the Government has allowed too much time to go by in this matter. It came in here in 1949, and they knew the importance of the fishing industry, and they certainly knew of the importance of the fishermen. They were put here mostly by fishermen, and they forgot about them. They have helped, I know they have said, to the tune of

seven million dollars, the fishing industry. But what help did they give directly to the fishermen? My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, is not here this afternoon. But I know the fishermen in Island Cove. A man down there I met two or three years ago, and he was crippled, and the next year I met him again getting along with crutches. He brought me into his stage and showed me where he had an electric pump to get fresh water to wash his fish and a very clean stage, and had electricity in his stage. Then he showed me his fish which seemed to me to be excellent fish. I think they make excellent fish up in that section of Placentia Bay. Then he showed me his farm and he produced figures the honourable the Premier will be interested in. He had three pigs there for which he stated he expected to get nine hundred dollars at Christmas, and it seemed to me—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Get how much?

MR. BROWNE: Nine hundred dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For three pigs?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, selling it at 50c. a lb.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And make three hundred dollars each? A good price. That is three hundred dollars each, fifty cents, six hundred pounds of pork dressed. It is nice doing.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I am afraid you got me in a miscalculation there, I confess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was a pig raiser myself. I would say it is a miscalculation by the honourable gentleman.

MR. BROWNE: Now the gentleman who had produced the pig had produced pork each year to help his fishing industry and was making a very good living. Now then suddenly the Government has taken up this industry and they are going into these projects on the Northeast Coast, and the problem which is agitating the fishermen in other sections of the country, the question of marketing, is going to be left to the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Federal Minister of Fisheries, in Ottawa. Well, Sir, I feel that the Government has made certain mistakes in connection with this Authority. I think they have tackled it from the wrong angle. I think they have overlooked a very important factor in connection with improving the prosperity of the fishermen, and I am surprised that they should do it. I mentioned it before, but I must mention it now, and it is the last thing I shall have to say in connection with this debate: Where is it going to place the co-operatives? Now the honourable minister and I have been associated with the co-operative movement for a good many years, sometimes together. He has had more active time more recently with it than I have had, but he knows that the co-operative movement in this country has not progressed as it did in other places because of political interference.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because of what?

MR. BROWNE: Because of political interference, and I don't mean political now in a bad sense altogether, but I will say it has not been wise politics, there has not been the same continuity. The report of the committee has recommended that the co-operative movement should take an

important part in the development of the fisheries and should be placed under the Memorial University College. I don't know whether that has been done up to the present time. (I feel that is true; it should be placed under the Memorial University) and that greater attention should be given it in the working out of this solution with the Government. In the solution of this problem greater attention must be given to the Co-operative Movement, and it must take a much more important part than we have been led to think that it is going to have under the scheme as it has been outlined yesterday.

Finally, Sir, we are all certainly anxious to see the fishery improve, and we hope that when we get into committee the minister will be in a position to give us information and more statistics which will perhaps alleviate some of the difficulties we have had in following and accepting the arguments which he has advanced.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all further orders of the day do stand deferred.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

Carried.

WEDNESDAY, May 5, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

**Presenting Reports of Standing and  
Select Committees**

None.

**Giving Notice of Motions and  
Questions**

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Attorney General or other appropriate Officer to lay on the table of the House the following information:

A copy of the Report made by Mr. C. E. Hunt, Q.C., following an inquiry into conditions at the Mental Hospital and the dismissal or suspension of some 14 employees.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

A certified copy of Government Payment Voucher 15/363 of 50/51 Account, together with a certified copy of all documents which form part of same, and having to do with the voucher as it relates to the Birch Plant, the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd., Chester Dawe, Chester Dawe Ltd., and the Government of Newfoundland.

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Explain the reason for paying over to the Canadian Machinery Industries Ltd. an amount of \$25,000 in excess of the 2½ million dollars called for under the terms of the Canadian Machinery Industries Ltd. Act?

2. Give name of person who valued the machinery on entry into this country for the said plant. Table a copy

of all certificates of evaluation issued in each case.

3. Is the Minister in a position to state the value of all machinery in said plant as to invoice price? And if so will the Minister advise the House as to said value.

To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to take legal action against the Canadian National Railways for a return to the taxpayers of Newfoundland of all excess rates paid by the people of Newfoundland to the railway from April 1, 1949, up to the time a decision was given by the Canadian Supreme Court in favour of Newfoundland?

2. What was the total cost to the Newfoundland Treasury for the handling of Newfoundland's case in the dispute over these freight rates?

3. Give details of such costs to date and inform the House if any other legal retaining fees have been given to any solicitor or firm of solicitors to handle any future proceedings which the Newfoundland Government may take in this matter.

4. List the persons to whom legal fees have been paid over this freight rate issue and the amount in each instance.

MR. HOLLETT: I might explain to the Minister that when the honourable member for St. John's West and myself were at the Department of Finance there was one document attached to the vouchers a copy of which I at the time asked the clerk to request from the Deputy Minister. He has since written me that he will not be able

to give me a copy of that without my having asked a question here in the House, so I do so now.

**MR. BROWNE:** To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

How many (a) automobiles, (b) trucks, (c) other motor vehicles are registered for each Electoral District of Newfoundland for the past fiscal year? How much has been received by way of license fees for motor vehicles and drivers and dealers' license fees for each Electoral District during the same period?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 72—being prepared.

Question No. 71—being prepared.

**HON. C. H. BALLAM** (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 67 asked by the honourable member for St. John's

East. I will go over some of these things briefly.

I may say the work of this Labour Relations Board is shown in a report I tabled here some time ago. You will note also, Mr. Speaker, there is an amount of \$10,948 shown. A little over fifty per cent of this was used in conciliation of disputes, and there were thirty-eight labour disputes reported and settled, with the exception of one strike. What I want to point out is that any one of these disputes, if they had not been conciliated and had resulted in a strike, could have resulted in the loss of thousands, yes, hundreds of thousands of dollars to the working men, and probably to the country as well. So that, in my opinion, I am very glad the question was asked by my honourable friend, so that I could point out just the work that is being done by the men of the conciliation board, and how little is being spent by this Government to get what I would call a good job well done. I table these answers:

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Labour in reply to Question No. 67 asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's East (F. Fogwill) on the Order Paper of 28 April, 1954.

Question: 1. To table a statement showing the total amount expended by the Department of Labour for travelling expenses for the fiscal year 1953-54, to whom were the amounts paid and what services were rendered in connection with such travelling?

Answer:

Office	Amount of Expenditure	Cumulative Total
1. <i>General Office</i>		
Conciliation Officers travelling to sites of disputes	\$ 400.66	
Deputy Minister travelling to meetings	667.34	1,068.00
2. <i>Boiler Inspection Branch</i>		
Inspectors travelling to inspect boilers, etc.	4,364.22	4,364.22
3. <i>Apprenticeship Branch</i>		
Director	711.34	
Apprentices	380.51	1,091.85
4. <i>Conciliation Boards</i>		
Members travelling to Board meetings	517.47	517.47
5. <i>Labour Relations Board</i>		
Members travelling to Board meetings	1,700.00	
Investigating Officer travelling to investigate applications for certification	642.09	
Witnesses summoned before the Board	128.59	2,470.68
6. <i>Minimum Wage Board</i>		
Members travelling to Board meetings	369.75	
Secretary travelling	124.31	494.06
7. <i>Apprenticeship Board</i>		
Members travelling to Board meetings	942.26	942.26
Total Expenditure		\$10,948.54

Question: 2. Table a Statement showing the following information for the fiscal year 1953-54.

A. How many labour disputes were reported to the Department during this period?

B. How many labour disputes were settled with the assistance of a conciliation officer?

C. How many conciliation boards were set up, what were the results in each case, give the location and cost of each board.

Answer:

A. There were thirty-eight labour disputes reported to the Department of Labour during the period 1 April, 1953 to 31 March, 1954.

B. Twelve labour disputes were settled with the assistance of conciliation officers during that period.

C. Eleven conciliation boards were appointed during the period. The results of the boards are as follows:

1. In four cases the parties accepted the board's recommendations and settlement was effected.

2. In two cases settlement was effected through conciliation.

3. In five cases the parties did not both accept the board's recommendations. One of these cases resulted in a strike, two were settled later as a result of further negotiations and the remaining two cases are still outstanding.

<i>Location of Board</i>	<i>Cost</i>
Corner Brook .....	\$320.00
Corner Brook .....	567.78
Corner Brook .....	450.00
St. Lawrence .....	796.22
St. John's .....	400.00
St. John's .....	520.00
St. John's .....	887.00
St. John's .....	915.00
St. John's .....	700.00
Port Union .....	893.47
Bell Island .....	750.00

Question: 3. Have any applications for conciliation boards been refused, as from 1 April, 1953, to date, if so, how many and for what reason.

Answer: There were 15 applications for the appointment of conciliation boards where no board was appointed.

In 4 cases the applicant was informed that the circumstances of the case did not warrant the appointment of a board. In two of these cases the conciliation officer continued negotiations after the parties were notified

of the refusal to appoint a board and a settlement was effected.

In 2 cases the disputes were settled with the assistance of a conciliation officer.

In 4 cases the parties reached agreement after a conciliation officer had been unsuccessful in effecting settlement of the dispute and filed his report.

In 2 cases the disputes were settled without assistance from the Department.

In 2 cases, when further details of the dispute were requested, the application for a board was dropped and the parties concluded an agreement without assistance.

In one case the parties were requested to resume negotiations and a settlement followed.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before you go on with the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask the Attorney General when we might expect the District Courts to work. It is of very great interest to lawyers and citizens, and they would like to know why the District Court is not operating at the present time.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in reply to that I may say, the two newly appointed judges are at present in Ontario looking into the procedure up there. I expect as soon as they return the rules will be formulated, and they would start work.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to remind the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources that I asked for a report the other day, and he promised to table the report this week,



HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I was checking on that report this morning and I find it is now being put in order for presentation to the House. I hope to have it tomorrow, and if not tomorrow then on Friday.

Third Reading:

"An Act to Amend the Evidence Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

"An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants, the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

"An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would never have advocated Confederation for Newfoundland if I had not been quite convinced that Confederation would make it possible to make the fishing industry profitable and prosperous for our Newfoundland fishermen. In my view Confederation will be an utter failure for Newfoundland if, as a result of Confederation, the fisheries are not made profitable and prosperous for our fishermen. I don't care what other benefits Confederation might have brought they will all be a hollow mockery without a prosperous fishery and prosperous fishermen.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I conceive it to be the one big job left for me in this life to lead the Government that will make our fisheries and fishermen prosperous. This is the biggest job this Government has tackled, and as head of this Government it is my biggest job. Far more difficult than getting Confederation, far more difficult than facing and conquering Water Street, and Water Street's political influence, far more difficult than anything with which I had to contend in the National Convention or the National Referendum; indeed the opposition I met in those historical battles was trifling, picayune, easily overcome compared with the obstacles in this battle. Because here we face a problem which has conquered every government before us, and which no government has ever conquered in this Island. This is a problem which has licked every government which ever had anything to do with it, and it may lick this Government. We may not be big enough to handle it. We may not be brainy enough, we may not be courageous enough. Time will tell. But if we go down we will go down fighting for the fishermen of Newfoundland and their wives and children. Because the problem of the fisheries is the problem of economic rehabilitation of one-third of our entire population, nothing less than that. It is the rehabilitation of two-thirds of our fishermen, or one-third of our entire population.

Now before such a problem as that, if we had enough imagination, we would shudder from it, we would shrink from it, because great men of the past have bitten the dust, and great men, some of whose pictures are on these walls, have battled with it; and I have been present in this Chamber when some of them battled,

and I heard and saw their battle here on this floor. And they were all licked. They all lost. The fishery problem licked them all. Incidentally, if this Government licks this problem it will be no thanks to the Opposition. For of all the puffing and trifling and nonsensical trashy arguments I have ever heard in this Chamber on a serious subject what I heard yesterday from two at least of the three honourable gentlemen opposite, the first two who spoke to the subject, were the worst. The third gentleman at least contributed a few points, as he nearly always does.

Now, our Government has been in power for about five years. In that time we have been busy with plans for the development of Newfoundland, and we have made great strides.

In the first eighteen months we had very little time for anything except to grapple with deals and projects and programmes concerned with the economic welfare of Newfoundland. During that time I went to Ottawa and we had numerous talks on fisheries. We had some long talks with Mr. Bradley and with many other officials of the Department of Fisheries. At that time we had no fisheries policy nor did the Canadian Government have a policy for the Fisheries of Newfoundland. The policy now being implemented has developed only after long and careful study of the Fishery Development Committee. The member for St. John's West has hinted that I inspired the report of the Fishery Development Committee. I can assure him I did not. I admit I kept in close touch and on literally scores of occasions members sat in my house until three and four o'clock in the morning—very long sessions—during which we discussed proposals for

the fisheries, trying to get the proper diagnosis and the proper cure. If there is one thing I admit I agreed with, it was with the idea of the co-operative movement, completely. In section 8 (1) (c) of the Memorial University Act, 1949, the application of science to the study of fisheries is stated to be one of the special functions of the University. Space in the University building is limited but this does not present any real difficulty. The Committee considers that the University should provide degree courses in which students can major in biology, chemistry and physics, and that post-graduate work should be undertaken in subjects relating to the fisheries and particularly biology and bio-chemistry. The Committee considers also that courses in commerce and co-operation should be introduced into the University curriculum and that a course should be specially devised to qualify students for executive and managerial positions in processing plants and in private firms and co-operative societies engaged in the different branches of the industry. That idea to send men to the University where they will learn more about fisheries, co-operatives and other matters pertaining to the fisheries is feasible. Men with University training can probably do a better job. At any rate they have found that they do derive certain benefits from it.

Now, the first great step taken in fisheries development was the appointment of a Committee. On occasions fifteen or twenty men have sat in my office until two or three o'clock in the morning discussing various phases of the fisheries. I have had men from Wesleyville, Greenspond, Brookfield, Valleyfield, Flat Islands, St. Brendans and many other places—and some Labrador fishermen—and

they sat in my office and we talked until three o'clock in the morning discussing fisheries and fishery problems.

If you look at the history of the fisheries you will find every government adopted expedients of one kind or another. They guaranteed supplies; guaranteed insurance; guaranteed prices for salt and such like. When Water Street went on strike and said "No, we are not supplying," it brought governments to their knees. All the merchants, the Tories of Water Street had to do was to announce that they were not supplying for the fishery and the governments bowed to them; they got down and crawled when Water Street cracked the whip. This Government is not having anything of that kind. We are not interested in granting subsidies, so count me out. We are interested only in fundamental reform and not in transfusions to help a dying industry.

Our market for the fisheries is unique. We have a unique foreign market. It is hard to understand. You need to have done a tremendous amount of travel; you have to know about various conditions before you can begin to understand it. It is not self-contained; it is highly exclusive; you have to know a lot about it otherwise it might as well be written in sanskrit.

As we know, Newfoundland's resources consist of soil, forests, water-power and fish. I, personally, have written perhaps more about fisheries than any other living man in the Province. I wrote many, many pages about the marketing of fish and other fishery matters. From 1920 on, I wrote millions of words about the fisheries. I went hungry doing it. I always felt that something should be

done for the fisheries of Newfoundland. As a result, virtually all the fishermen voted for me. All the others, they voted for the party. Each government should make a supreme attempt to make the fishermen prosperous. This is the Government that ought to do it. We have everything else tucked away. We have had land and agricultural surveys, we have had our timber surveyed; we have the possibility of minerals, and more than a possibility—and there is a possibility of oil. We have horsepower. We ourselves, have negotiated the greatest search for minerals. This year we will spend three million dollars searching for minerals. The year before and for the past three years we have been increasing the amount spent in search of minerals. If this Government has nothing else, we have this much to our credit, we have spent more in search for minerals and brought about more in a tremendous search for minerals than have any two governments combined. We are not Gods and we may have to spend many millions before we find the minerals, but if they are there, we will find them. No government has done more.

As far as waterpower is concerned, we have done a tremendous job that has cost thousands of dollars. We encouraged the Power Corporation of Canada to bring in fresh capital to the country and we hope this will bring about a hydrographical development which will hereafter bear fruit in Newfoundland.

We have had timber surveys made. Unfortunately these have not resulted as yet in another paper mill. As a matter of fact, if you look at the history of North America, in the last twenty years, you won't need the fingers of one hand to count the number

of new paper mills built in the Western World in the last twenty years. They have extended, they have enlarged as has the A.N.D. Company and Bowaters and as have the paper mills all across Canada and in the United States, but there has been virtually no new ones. But at least we are ready: We know where the water power is, how much is there, how much per horsepower it would take to develop it. We have the blue print, we have the plans. Waterpower is needed for a paper mill. We have the timber. We know where we have the timber. We have had the surveys and have the information on it. Now the Royal Commission will put the finishing touches on that.

We have the Royal Commission on Agriculture. Personally, as a bit of a farmer and one who has had some experience and some considerable interest, and still has very considerable interest in farming, that is where I am going to end my days. I don't make any bones about that, on a farm. There is one thing about fishing, no matter how much you love it you don't resolve to spend your declining days in a fishing boat. You might resolve to do that on a farm but not in a fishing boat. I have no ambition to spend my declining days fishing, but I have a great ambition to end my days farming and I have great faith in farming of a type. I am afraid I am going to disappoint my honourable friend from St. John's West—How much it has been impressed upon us in this House the extent to which he has taken over the intellectual leadership of his party; not the nominal, political leadership but at least his study, research and work has made a fine contribution to this House, as I forecast it would—He will be disappointed to learn here again my ideas about the possibilities

of agriculture, which are rather radically different from his own. Here again I think he pictures the Maypole, the happy little family out tilling the soil. But that happy little family out tilling the soil will be on dole, and always was on dole in Newfoundland. The dole might have been direct from the Government but mostly it was a dole they earned, and that is all they earned, most of them. I allow for exceptions of course. There were people who made big money in Newfoundland farming, but they are very much the exception.

Now when I speak of my faith in the possibilities of agriculture I don't mean peasant farming but something far from it. I don't have very much faith, I may be a bit brash to say this before the Royal Commission reports—But I have not too much faith in the root-crop farming. I have great faith in animal husbandry. My honourable friend from St. John's East, if he does not mind my making an absolutely personal illustration, has a very clever, indeed I might say brilliant son whom I saw only once in my life, and that was during the National Convention when he appeared before the committee of the National Convention which was writing a report on agriculture. That young man, who had just returned from a sojourn in New England or New Hampshire or Vermont or somewhere up there on a farm, appeared before this committee and gave the committee his ideas. He was only twenty-one years of age but his ideas were amazingly mature and he possessed an arrived knowledge that was a pleasure to behold. Perhaps he made all the more impression on me, and I thought all the more of him because his ideas happened to be so similar to my own. We always think a man smart when he agrees with us and

has the same ideas. But he had great faith in the possibilities of beef cattle in Newfoundland. I also have great faith in the possibility of beef cattle, and I have great faith in the possibility of sheep raising in Newfoundland, because the House beholds in me the biggest pig-man Newfoundland ever had, the biggest pig-man and hog-man. In fact my honourable friend the Minister of Education is also much more at home dealing with hogs and pigs than in the Department of Education, just as I would be much more at home cleaning out after pigs, as I have done many, many times than I am in dealing with certain types of humans. I prefer incomparably certain types of hogs to certain types of human beings. I have great faith in the possibility of poultry raising, in the possibility of turkey raising, and duck raising. I have faith generally in the possibility of a livestock industry in Newfoundland. I do not say there are no chances nor opportunities in the root-crops, but my faith in the possibility of root-crop farming is at the very minimum. So that what you are left with is fishing: Now we have come to that—To the fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just what is it that has got to be done in the fisheries of Newfoundland? I will tell you my opinion of what has to be done.

The House may remember in an earlier debate to which I am not allowed, by the Rules of the House, to refer for what I said or what anyone said in an earlier debate in this session, is now a debate that has concluded. But let us put it this way: The House will recall on some occasion or other I pointed out that along the North East Coast of Newfoundland the number of settlements in the past hundred years or so had grown

from some thirty odd to some five hundred—in a hundred years. Now I am going to suggest to the House here today that, just as surely as night follows day, just as surely as that, about three hundred of these five hundred places must inevitably disappear from the face of the earth. Three hundred of the five hundred places there are along the northeast coast must disappear, Mr. Speaker. Between, say 1814 and 1914, say that century, a man might live in a cleft in a cliff. He might live with his family in a hole in the wall, a dent in the rugged shore of Newfoundland with no harbour, no soil, no land, no timber, nothing, just a bald rock. He might live there in that century, those hundred years, and wear the one suit of clothes throughout his entire life, and all the rest of the time wear a canvas jumper, and moleskins, before that. His wife might, and did undoubtedly, dress in the roughest conceivable kind of clothes, his children go barefooted for a large part of the year and dressed in the roughest conceivable kind of clothing. They might eat white bread, a few herring, molasses and an occasional bit of corned beef, such fresh birds as he could shoot. This might, and in fact did, go along for a whole century with such fishermen and families living the most primitive kind of existence. They did do that. But, Mr. Speaker, I am going to suggest this to you now and to this House—Whereas there was every likelihood that up to the outbreak of the first World War a race of men, strong, religious, devout, simple, strong-bodied, living alone for a whole century like that, one generation after the other never seeing anything and never knowing anything, might do that. But the First World War killed for all time any

possibility that they would do that willingly thereafter. That kind of life died the day on October 3 or whatever it was in 1914 when that war broke out. That was the end of a whole era in our history in Newfoundland. At that time there was a full stop, a period came to an end.

Now, since then we have had another World War and in between a depression. We had elections, the spread of newspaper circulation to some small extent, and the revolutionary introduction of radios, we had a rising up of movies. Do you know that in Newfoundland today there are five hundred different settlements where movies are shown regularly—five hundred—That is incredible, past belief. Yet here in this little country of Newfoundland that has happened in the last four or five years.

I suggest to the House that the family that was willing for that century to wear the roughest kind of clothing, live in the roughest kind of homes, eat the roughest kind of food, will no longer do so—that is finished. They are not going to do it. Now what does that mean? That must mean something. There must be a moral to be drawn from that. That is not just a fact which has no particular meaning. Rather is that fact full of meaning, brimful and vibrant with meaning. The meaning is this: They are not even going to try to live that kind of life. If they can't get jobs from Bowater's and the A.N.D. Company and from Buchans and Bell Island or at Gander or Goose Airports or at Stephenville or Argentia or Seven Islands or St. Lawrence or with the C.N.R. or with some factory, if they can't get some kind of a job, a wage paying job, they are bound inevitably

for Nova Scotia which, backward as she is, compared with Ontario, is so far ahead of Newfoundland as Ontario is ahead of her. They are bound for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and they are bound for these parts of Canada which are so very much ahead of Newfoundland from the standpoint of material living, the material standard of living. They are not ahead of Newfoundland in character. We all know that. We don't need to consider ourselves swell-headed to hold firmly that our people intellectually, mentally, morally are the equal of anything anywhere in Canada. But I am talking about material living. I say that it cannot be done. Wall Street, the Bank of England, no power under God can make it feasible, make it economic for the people in these three hundred of the five hundred settlements to live decently, have a good standard of living, good homes, to have good food, good clothing out of the fishery. It cannot be done. It is physically impossible, humanly impossible, it never was so, it never did exist. It is true that in the midst of the two greatest blood-baths humans have ever known, the two world wars, prices of high protein foods went sky high, including salt codfish, and during these three, four, five years altogether during the two world wars prices went so sky high that in these places, these terrible little places, these people did earn enough to have lots of food, clothing and to live on a material plane such as they never lived in all the history of Newfoundland before that. That is so. But I don't think we can base any policy on the continuation of war, continual blood-letting. No one can build on that. The only way you are going to have a decent standard of living in these three hundred little nooks and crannies along our



northeast coast, apart from their going out each summer to get jobs and leave their families home and they themselves go into the bush or go out on construction jobs or go out of the Province and come back in the Fall, apart from that the only way to live is to leave these three hundred settlements. Now there is the rub, the heart of the whole thing—Where are they going? They are going somewhere. You can mark that down. That is one thing we can be sure about, if nothing else—they are going to leave these three hundred places. They will become depopulated. Unfortunately if it is left to them they won't become entirely depopulated, and that will add to the tragedy. If everyone in these little settlements moved out there would be no settlements left, but if 80% or 90% move out and 10% or 20% are left that is a worse tragedy than ever. That is likely to happen unless something is created to attract, not compel but attract, the whole population of these places to move out. Therefore whether we like it or not that the Government must do if it does not want to lose its people to Ontario and the other provinces of Canada—Certainly I don't think any of us supported Confederation for that purpose—to lose our population—And I think the Opposition, all of whom are anti-Confederates, will be as one with us in that. They have no interest in building up Ontario any more than we have.

The problem therefore is this: How to find a means of attracting the people who live in these three hundred of the five hundred places to live somewhere else within Newfoundland. That is the problem. The problem is how to do that. Now I have heard the suggestion, in fact I once read a brief prepared by a certain gentleman

who was once a member of this House, once a member of the Government, once a member of the House of Commons in Ottawa, a very prominent gentleman who wrote this report to the Commission of Government, suggesting that the Commission of Government should adopt a scheme of moving all the families of the islands of Bonavista into the Mainland of Bonavista Bay. He showed me the report. I read it and I said: "Are you mad? What have you accomplished after you have spent a couple of million dollars to move these families off the islands of Bonavista Bay into the mainland settlements of the same bay except to have spent the money? What chance have they got to live in there?" "Well," he said, "there is water; they can get fresh water to drink and they can't always get that on the islands." That is true. And they could get wood to burn and they could not get that on the islands. They got gardens and land where they could cultivate gardens which they could not do on the islands. True. But how were they to live? They could not live on firewood—lots of fresh water to drink and just a little garden to grow a few vegetables. You got to have a means of living. If they were taken from these islands where they had a means of living, such as it was, and put in the mainland settlements in the same bay without any means of living, what have you done? You have done a bad thing, a bad thing. No, there is no suggestion that the Government should pay the cost of moving families on a big scale from their homes in those small places to bigger places. There is no such suggestion. And there is no suggestion of forcing the people to move from these small places to bigger places. The suggestion is this: Along the north-

east coast of Newfoundland probably some two hundred places—we can't say, it is difficult to say because the surveys are not completed, but they are still going on and will continue to go on—Thank God the surveys will continue—The surveys are not completed but when they are completed, the topographical surveys, the marine surveys with a team of men moving along and doing a whole section of coast—a man who can lay out a town, a man from the organization to size up the land and say how many gardens can be contained, a man who knows water power to see what water power can be developed in these places, a marine engineer to survey the water depth, the type of wharves and breakwaters necessary to make a good harbour and what it will cost, and a housing man. With a team of men like that, actual engineers, when they go along to the northeast coast, as they have now for two summers and again this summer, when all that is finished it will probably boil down to this, I don't know, I am only guessing: That there are along the northeast coast say twelve places or fifteen or twenty, I really don't know how many, and nobody knows that yet, but there will be a limited number of places that are either ideal or almost ideal to be the homes, to be the centres of absolutely modern, absolutely streamlined, absolutely progressive and up-to-date techniques and methods of fishing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me give you a picture, of the ordinary kind of fishing settlements I am talking about—In the first place it has a good harbour. Maybe at this moment it is not perfect. Perhaps what it needs is a breakwater which will make it a practically perfect harbour, but it is now a good harbour to begin with. It is commodious and the opening of the

harbour is not against all the prevailing winds. It is sheltered with deep and good anchorage. It has a good foreshore, landwash, that is the land contiguous to the water is not humpy, rocky, uneven and rough but is relatively level for a townsite, to lay out streets according to modern ideas. If the land is a mile up the valley or two or three miles it does not matter. That is nothing now. In these days it is nothing to be two or three miles back from the salt water. It is a trifle and not important, and is just as good as being within a quarter of a mile. Ideally it would have a river flowing into the harbour with a head to develop a thousand, twelve hundred or two thousand horsepower at not too great a cost. In other words physically speaking it would be almost ideal. Now there are not too many of them. But each of them is big enough to be a complete town. Not Halifax, not Grimsby, not one of these lovely Danish or Swiss or Norwegian fishing towns, not that. This is not America, you can't get that. It takes centuries to build that. There is a certain spirit behind these Danish towns I have seen and these Swedish towns, but in such a place as that you have a thoroughly modern town. Why not here!

MR. BROWNE: MacLean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not exactly. The big difference is that it is on their own initiative, their own effort. Against that the land up there belonged to the company, the machinery, factories, hotel, the movie, church, everything was given by the MacLean Brothers. No, I don't mean that sort of thing. I mean something far better. Now if you had a dozen such towns as that on the northeast coast with a population, each of them, say of ten thousand people, a very little

town it is true, but modern, newly built, progressive, very up-to-date. Now how do the people live there? How do they make their living? They have to make their living, but how do they do that? Primarily from the fishery, primarily but not entirely. You have to have so many shopkeepers, so many clerks, whether in private enterprise or co-operatives is up to the people themselves, but at least there must be clerks and people working in different trades. There will be civil servants working there, teachers, and the different denominations will have their respective schools there. There will be the doctors and dentists and the movies and other entertainments, probably a tavern if the people like a glass of beer, but not if the people don't like a glass of beer. There will be all the little amenities of life, of a town, all of them. But overwhelmingly the great, basic resource for the town will be the fishery. Now what kind of fisheries? Where the man gets up before dawn and gropes his way down in the dark to the punt and tumbles aboard the punt and rows out to the boat or schooner and gets the engine going, the old Coaker, four or six horsepower, and gets out on the fishing grounds reaching them about dawn and starts jigging or catching or dragging the trawl. No. That kind of fishing cannot support that kind of town. That kind of fishing cannot give the people a living, a decent living. It never could and it never will, mark that down, it never will give these people a decent living, it is impossible. It never has done it anywhere anyway. That kind of fishing was abandoned in Norway between the years 1900 and 1911. That kind of fishing was abandoned in Iceland around the same time. That kind of fishing is carried on today rather

similarly in the Faroe Islands. That is the only place in the world, the Faroe Islands and possibly China, Ceylon and Colombo, possibly. Our fishery is today the most backward of all the fishing countries of all the whole group, ours in Newfoundland except for a few spots in Asia where they still go out in their funny boats, and they have a great long pole mounted on a pivot. They dip it down on one end with a big basket and haul it up again and may bring a few fish up. With the exception of that we have the most backward, the most crude, the most undeveloped and underdeveloped fishery in the world today. That is why we have poverty amongst our fishermen. That is the reason. These things go together. You cannot have one without the other, and if you have the one inevitably you have the other.

No. In those towns you have got to use every last modern idea in connection with the fishery, in connection with fish. Now my honourable friend spoke yesterday about a word of warning, that we should not depend too much upon the United States markets for our fresh frozen fish. There is a big element of truth in that. But obviously there has not been too much truth because, of course, unless the United States should experience a great depression and a prolonged depression lasting six, eight or ten years, unless that should happen, personally, I can't see—I am not the one to whom the world will look when the world is making up its mind whether to have a depression or not—But in my own personal view we will not have a depression, not with Russia around, not while the iron curtain is there. I don't think candidly we can afford a depression. I don't think the democratic world can ever dream of allow-

ing a depression to take place. So that I don't look for a depression. But except in case of a depression I cannot see American fishermen continuing to fish. I cannot see it. There has been down through the years a rapid increase in the diminution, in the reduction, in the number of fishermen fishing out of the United States. I remember being down in Boston on the fish piers about three years ago. I spent a day down there with a couple of newsmen. There were at that time about eight draggers, and we were down on the pier looking at these draggers. I said: "How many have you actually got here now?" I forgot the exact figure he told me at this moment, but I think it was altogether some twenty odd draggers, using the Boston fish pier, which is one of the biggest in the world. That number had fallen from hundreds down to twenty odd draggers. No matter how modern you make fishing, no matter how modern the boat, how good the food or good the money, how quick the returns, no matter how pleasant you try to make fishing, Americans, with the kind of standards of living they have are increasingly disinclined to go at it. So that I see in the United States, with its hundred and seventy million people increasing as it is at the rate of several millions a year, a virtual new market every year, born every year, a quite considerable, quite sizeable market. If that were the only market in the world it would be a very considerable one, the one born every year in the United States. I see there, especially with modern methods—I don't know if my honourable friends there on the other side are familiar with the block frozen fish, the great new development. I don't know if they are familiar with fish fingers. I don't know if they are

aware that now it is almost like the old fashioned candystick, the kind we used to have here in St. John's years ago, the shape of a walking stick, like a barber's pole—What did you call them?

**MR. HOLLETT:** All-day suckers?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** My honourable friend knows I did not have all-day suckers in mind—it is not all-day suckers we are talking about now. Anyway that is how millions of pounds of our Newfoundland fresh codfish are being sold in the United States, for fish fingers. It is most interesting, a most fascinating process—remember up to now the great difficulty in our frozen fish industry was disposing of our cod. If you had rosefish and flounders and sole and all the other kinds of the more exotic types of fish to sell, you could get rid of so much of your cod. Now it is altogether different. You can take any kind now, trap fish, hand line, any kind, skin it and put it in a press and freeze it into a square block. Freeze it solid, hard. While it is frozen put it through your band saws, not just one saw but a whole bunch of them, and push your block against them, and it is sawed into strips. When you have done that and you get the long fingers, then these go through a new process. This new plant we have built, or financed, in Trepassey, this huge new plant which is the most modern on the face of the earth today, at this moment, is not open yet, it is not finished yet, but up there they have vast new machinery which goes along, I suppose, a hundred and fifty feet—a very modern, streamlined, electronically operated oven through which after this is breaded and mixed in the breaded batter—beaten eggs and crumbs and other ingredients—

each individual finger is breaded, and finally comes out as breaded fish fingers, ready to eat, and frozen. They have been frozen, defrosted, mixed in batter, cooked and then become frozen again, and they come out of the other end, having gone in frozen they come out frozen.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a question. When you are doing that you are manufacturing a new article altogether—will it be affected by tariffs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Up to now the United States Congress has not imposed any extra or additional duties against that product. Even if it does it is a new product sweeping the United States. It is like "Oh Henry" when it first came out. Some members may remember when "Oh Henry" came out in the United States, a new chocolate bar—some members here can remember "Yes, We Have No Bananas Today" a popular song. There was never anything like it. Fish sticks are the new wonder now popular, sans music, but they are the rage sweeping across the United States. In the United States they have not got the fish. They are importing it from Newfoundland and up to now, nothing has been done in Newfoundland to develop such an industry. Now think of such an industry as this frozen fish fingers in Twillingate or Trinity Bay or Green Bay or Quirpon or White Bay or Carbonear or LaScie, especially where bait depots are. The beauty of it is this: When you block freeze this fish—I do not know how many members are familiar with such plants—they skin it, put it through a press and freeze it and pack it. When the package is open and it is put in the frying pan or bake pot or skillet, the pieces come apart.

They do not adhere. In the block-frozen process, the beauty is you may have ten or thirty or forty pieces, they do not adhere. That is why they call them "block frozen" into sticks or fingers. They are ready for immediate consumption. That one thing is worth to the fishermen scores of millions of dollars—the fact that you can freeze cod fillets and they are not frozen together. With the block frozen idea, you no longer need frozen plants; by adding a quantity of equipment, you are in the block freezing business. It is a gift from God for the North East Coast. On the South Coast you have the most prolific grounds to serve these plants.

In the United States, in tens of thousands of places where they have curb services, people drive up in their cars and are able to get these fish sticks. But, at the peril of your life, they must be fresh. Obviously if there is a bad flavour or if they stink, people stop eating them. And where can you get better fish than in Newfoundland? Where can you get fresher fish?

Take a dragger leaving Jobs in St. John's or Monroes in Burin or Cy Moores in Fermeuse; they spend three days fishing; by the time that boat gets back to port the fish is four days old; by the time it gets to Boston it is relatively stale; but compared with some fish going in there, it is relatively fresh. No thanks to our government for that; thanks be to God—thanks be to science and that is God. The fishermen on the North East Coast of Newfoundland and in other parts of Newfoundland are to be relieved of the century-old slavery of fish flakes, because with this block frozen idea, this will be eliminated. This Government spent two million dollars to promote this industry of



block frozen fish because we believe in it. We want it done—we want to get in on this market in the United States where there are one hundred and seventy million of a population, and we can do it.

There is a great field for investigation for further new ways to use and market our fish.

Three years ago the head of the Fisheries Research of Canada, together with three officials of the department came here to see me and tell me they were here to do some scientific research in regard to codfish. I used some very rough talk. I said, "The great Government of Canada is going to do some very scientific fisheries research. How many men have you? What is the size of your establishment?" He said, "We have three or four men." I said, "Do not waste my time." I said, "In Britain, when they were producing more milk than they could use, scientists got to work and began making telephone poles and door knobs." When they were producing more milk than they could sell science got to work and began making telephone poles and door knobs and such things out of milk, and making all kinds of synthetics with milk as a basis. I say, if we don't sell our fish, if we can't sell our cod as cod, so that it looks like cod and tastes like cod and is cod, and there is no doubt about it, it is cod—if we can't sell it that way, and at a price to give people a decent living, then let us start working, I say, and find some other way to put it up so that it won't smell, taste or feel like cod. But sell it at a price to give our fishermen a decent living—get at it and do it. In Iceland, Mr. Speaker, and in Norway a great effort has been made and is being made to find a satisfactory formula for manu-

facturing codfish into albumen. The House will be aware of the fact that one of the great agencies in the baking trade of the world is albumen. That albumen comes from the whites of eggs. China has been a great source of it for many years, and since China went behind the iron curtain she has ceased to be a great source of the whites of eggs for albumen for the baking industries of the world. So that in Norway and in Iceland a great effort has been going forward for the last four or five years in their scientific laboratories and research laboratories to find a way to turn the codfish into albumen. Now I have samples of it over in my office that were brought to me from Norway and from Iceland. Unfortunately that albumen, which is a pure white powder, like flour—they have not yet been able to get the flavour of the fish out of it. So that if you put it in bread or pastries or biscuits or any baking in fact everything would taste like fish. Obviously they are not going to sell a great quantity until they get that fishy flavour out of it. But let us assume they do that—and if they can make hydrogen bombs they should be able to take the fishy flavour out of fish powder. If they can take a man's heart out and freeze it to perform an operation on it and then unfreeze it and put it back and the man goes back off to work—if they can do that and other things that are wonders in the world today, it may not be very long before they can take the fishy taste and smell out of fish powder made from codfish. Once they do then you have a vast new outlet for codfish.

In Britain it is a commonplace saying amongst farmers—there is a great relationship between pigs and potatoes. The price of each is watched



carefully. The price of potatoes may be so low and the price of pork so high that it pays to market potatoes as pork—grow potatoes, feed them to the pigs and sell pork. Then you are marketing your potatoes in the form of pigs. But if the price of potatoes be better than pork you market potatoes as potatoes. I suggest that fish as fish if it cannot be marketed at a profitable price, one that will yield a decent standard of living we must find ways of marketing the same fish in other forms. Why not? Why not?

Now it may seem a mad world, and it is a mad world when we are unable to market a high protein food such as fish, which is one of the highest protein foods in the world—meat, fish and eggs—these are the three great protein foods which mankind must have. And in a world where half the population is undernourished, in such a world yet it might become a profitable and attractive manner in which to market that high protein food, not as a high protein food but as a telephone receiver. Yet, Mr. Speaker, anyone is familiar, anyone at all who is not an ignoramus, who is not an illiterate, who has read at all the magazines and modern newspapers, is well aware of the fact that one of the great new industries of mankind is the synthetics. Everybody knows that. Everybody knows that, and the endless search on the part of the industries and the scientists is on the increase for new outlets for synthetics and new sources of synthetics. Now think of this as a basis of an outlet for synthetics and a new form and new outlet in which to sell it, and it is entirely conceivable that fish will be sold in that form. Who would have said two years ago, since the last general election, who would have said

just immediately following the last general election that codfish caught on the northeast coast would be put up as fish fingers and fish sticks and sold in the midwest of the United States? Who would have said that two years ago? Nobody. So I say that there is a great field for research, for investigations by scientists. I say it is a reproach to Canada that that great nation is doing so little in fishery research. It is a shame and a disgrace to Canada, it is a scandal. Far better if Canada as Canada concentrated on these things than that she spend time and money, public money, on research into uranium and hydrogen and the rest of it. Far better for the world, for Newfoundland if the National Research Council, especially the Fishery Research Council of Canada would do more experimentation and fishery research than they are doing on fish, because, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland fish is one-third of all the fish landed in Canada—one-third of all the fish landed in the whole Canadian nation is landed here in this Province. And fish means to us life or death. And at least Canada as Canada, now that Newfoundland has become a province, at least she might spend a million a year, a mere trifle, the merest trifle to a government that is spending three or four thousand million dollars, they might spend a million a year or a couple of millions on straight scientific fishery research. The Government of Canada, I hold, should scour Europe to get fishery technologists of Sweden, Denmark and England and Scotland — that Government should scour Europe for twenty or thirty of the great fishery scientists they have, and put them to work on straight fishery research and investigations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may have wandered a little afield, but what I am trying to do is to convey to the House something at least of our feelings, of our conception of what fishery development means. I have said that the crux of the problem is the northeast coast. Now that is not because I happen to be so small or restricted in my concept of Newfoundland as to think that because I happen to be elected personally in a constituency on the northeast coast therefore my interest is in the northeast coast. That is nonsense, pure nonsense. The greatest support I get is on the southwest coast.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, may I make a correction? I think the Fisheries Board spent a lot more than the honourable gentleman mentioned. I think it was about two million dollars.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I mean here in Newfoundland.

You talk about what they spend—we have a potential industry here that is worth, let me see, British Columbia two hundred thousand tons, call it ten dollars a ton, or five dollars a ton at two hundred thousand tons is what? One million dollars in the herring industry. Now we have more herring in Newfoundland than they have in British Columbia. I took an extremely low figure. It is probably worth fifty dollars a ton. We have more herring in our waters than they have in British Columbia waters—and what research has been done?

**MR. BROWNE:** The value of herring in British Columbia is one million six hundred thousand.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** All right Newfoundland's is not half a million.

But we have far more herring and they are better, far more and better herring than British Columbia. That is the report of several people who have come to Newfoundland, brought here from British Columbia, people who are thoroughly familiar with the British Columbia herring industry, and who have investigated here. How much money does the House suppose was spent in herring research in British Columbia? The Government of British Columbia and the Government of Canada, and the herring industry between them spent over twenty million dollars in research. Today in British Columbia they know herring so well, their movements, their migration, the location of herring, that they can tell you now where the year after next the herring will appear and when and what size they will be. Now they can fix the fishing dates of the year for the year after next for herring in British Columbia. And on that date they will say the date and the dates for which the fishing should extend, and on that date a great fleet of herring seiners will go out and meet the great schools of herring as they come in towards the coast. They may be a hundred and fifty miles off, but they will be there waiting to meet them, and each herring seiner with its supply ship catches them and loads them aboard and hurries off in to the fish meal plants or canneries. The year past, I noted in the papers when the date was up they extended the time by one day, and on that one day the seiners went out and caught, I think fifty thousand tons or barrels, anyway a fantastically large quantity of herring. Now we have more herring than they have, and our herring are better. We have records of our herring seiners steaming over thirty miles of herring, a solid mass of herring. How many

thousand tons would be in such a mass thirty miles long? How many tons? I suppose there would be half a million tons.

MR. BROWNE: Where was this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The south-west coast, Placentia Bay. My honourable friend has been away from the province for five years, and he has to catch up.

MR. BROWNE: Why did not the Icelandic boats catch some of them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were none that year.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Did the Ship Cove man know anything about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That year nobody caught any anywhere. There just were none. Nobody, Icelandic boats or anybody else. But if the Government of Canada would spend a couple of million dollars here in this province on herring research and tell us where to go to meet them, when they are coming in—today you never know there is a herring within a million miles until they are within a mile of the coast. That is the first notice you have of them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable the Premier permit me? I believe it is in the Terms of Union, the Canadian Government will carry out such requests if asked by the Provincial Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think there is such a term in the Terms of Union—I ought to know that.

MR. HOLLETT: Natural Resources.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have a reference there to the natural re-

sources but there is no such term as the honourable gentleman just cited.

MR. HOLLETT: In my opinion there should be. There is a term which says: "Should the Government of the Province of Newfoundland institute an economic survey of the Province of Newfoundland with a view to determining what resources may profitably be developed and what new industries may be established or existing industries expanded, the Government of Canada will make available the services of the technical employees and agencies to assist in the work."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has been done. And technically they can say quite truthfully that they have carried out that term. I say they have not. I say they have not carried it out within the meaning of my understanding of the spirit of that term. Technically they have indeed made available to us all kinds of technological services and have had men here in Newfoundland ever since Confederation with water gauges running all over the main rivers, very important work which must be done, but we would be a long time getting hydro-electrical development as a result, important though it is. They have also made available other men in agriculture, in geology, in surveys on topography, marine surveys. We have all kinds of surveys here and technically they have kept that term, but, not in my view, in the spirit, not at all in the spirit.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Premier allow me? Do I understand from the Honourable the Premier that the Government has asked the Federal Government and they have refused to carry it out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not refused to carry it out, in fact

now over the past five years, as soon as we had Confederation they began. And I say technically they are within that term of union. I say actually they are not carrying it out in the spirit I intended when I personally negotiated that particular clause. I happened to be the father of that particular clause of the Terms of Union. As a matter of fact I don't mind saying that the one unpleasant incident that ever occurred between the Prime Minister of Canada and myself was with regard to that clause. My honourable friend who sits to the immediate left of the Leader of the Opposition, if he spoke to or reminded his brother of it, I am sure he would remember quite well the occasion. You say you are not on speaking terms with him?

MR. HIGGINS: Oh yes I am.

MR. SMALLWOOD: His brother would undoubtedly remember the occasion when I raised the matter. The Prime Minister flushed and got extremely angry, and I wondered what made him angry. I said nothing to make him angry at that point nor had I anything in mind. But I wondered why he was so angry. I dropped it at the moment and raised it again as though nothing had happened, and in the clause went. But actually in the spirit it has not been carried out the way I wanted. What I would like to see—while I am at it let me put it this way—Canada is a nation and Canada is a federation of ten provinces. She has eleven governments. Each province has its own government and then there is the eleventh government for Canada as Canada. Now the best thing that the Government of Canada could do for Canada is to do anything within its power, and within its constitutional jurisdiction, anything it can for the upbuilding of any par-

ticular province. Canada can become great as the individual provinces comprising Canada become great. All right. There is precious little need of the Government of Canada doing anything for the Province of Ontario or the Province of Quebec or the Province of Alberta or the Province of British Columbia, because these provinces have such known resources, such discovered resources, such blue-printed and mapped resources as to attract fantastic capital from all over the world, and get fantastic results. But now when you come to the Governments of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland, these four provinces down here on the Atlantic coast, which have not got such resources—we may have them—when I say such resources what I mean is known resources, mapped and blueprinted, ascertained resources. We have not got them. And the job is to do precisely that, to ascertain them, to survey them. I hold that, provided the Government of each province concerned raised no objections, and I can't imagine their raising any objections, surely this Government will raise none—I hold that if the Government of Canada did right it would do this—it would scour these four provinces with a fine tooth comb, scour the provinces, put on such an intensive survey for a measurement of the resources as the world has never seen. Now there always has to be a "biggest," always has to be a "best", and this survey should, I hold, be made by the Government of Canada and should be the biggest and best the world has ever seen.

MR. HOLLETT: They are not doing it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they are not doing it. I hold that in the interest of Canada as a whole that should

be done. Now my honourable friend must not get small about this.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you try to tell me I am small?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Look, this business of being part of Canada is now five years old. It is not perfect. I don't suppose anybody ever expected it would be.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly I did not. The point is that it is now five years old. I think we have been now long enough a Province of Canada to be able to do a little self-analysis and a little criticizing of Canada without being suspected of disloyalty to Confederation. I hope nobody will suspect any disloyalty on my part toward the idea of Confederation, but I do say this: It would be real Canadian statesmanship, clearly, obviously. Anyone looking at Canada today, taking a quick look at it or a long look will see here this vast nation, more than half of the North American continent, the northern half, bigger than the United States, a vast nation. There are only two nations in the world which are bigger—Russia and China. Canada is the third largest in the world. This vast, sprawling nation extending over more than half of a whole continent is made up of ten provinces. Not only is she fantastically rich—Quebec is fantastically rich.—Since the war ended Quebec province has had more than four thousand new industries. Ontario has had slightly more new factories, new industries, new economic enterprises. Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that can continue, and should there be another war—that process was vastly accelerated in the first world war, and as for the second world war it accelerated in

a degree virtually unbelievable. In other words the gap between Central Canada and the other provinces was vastly widened in the first world war, and immeasurably widened in the second. This process would be vastly accelerated by a third world war to the point where Canada's economy would be so lop-sided as to be quite hopeless. She might as well then lop off the other provinces, because after all Newfoundland cannot even be a good customer for Ontario manufactured goods unless she prospers. Even if it is only to make a prosperous market in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick for the products of Canada. The only way to make them good is to make our fisheries prosperous, make our industries prosperous, to give us more industries, to develop us more than we are developed. When we are developed and prosperous in this Province, this Province then becomes an even better market for Ontario, so that it would really be good citizenship. Another way would be this: I hold that the Government of Canada ought to scour these four provinces. Now we have done it ourselves in Newfoundland at a great expense and we are continuing to do it at a great expense, and it is our duty to do it, because under the Constitution of Canada property and civil rights are properly, and very properly, very rightly, the responsibility of the province and the jurisdiction of the province—God forbid it should ever be otherwise. But, by arrangement and by agreement and mutual consent let the Government of Canada take twenty, thirty, forty, fifty million dollars—Mr. Speaker, that is not much money. The Government of Canada spends, I think it is, twenty-three million dollars or some such figure



they are spending on the bridge between Halifax and Dartmouth. That is enough, spent on this one bridge, to conduct a survey of, say this province. They are spending enough on the new ferry from Port aux Basques to North Sydney—that is a good thing and I am not condemning it obviously, but they are spending on that one ferry enough to conduct surveys of this province which might well have the result of opening up five or six new industries. Now while we want the ferry we also want the mines, while we want family allowances, we want industries, while we want old age pensions we want a developed fishery, while we want prosperous railwaymen we also want employment for our other people. Surely it is in the interest of Canada as a whole and is the broadest kind of statesmanship for the Government of Canada to spend a great many millions of dollars on the greatest and most intensive survey, economic survey, not only of Newfoundland—Newfoundland is my particular care of course, as it is of every member of this House—but I hope I am not so small as to see Newfoundland and Newfoundland alone. I hope I am big enough to realize that in the long run the prosperity of Newfoundland depends upon the general overall prosperity of Canada, and then beyond that, the general overall prosperity of North America and of the world in general. I hope I shall never be just a "Little Newfoundlander" I hope I will be a "Big Newfoundlander."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to give the House some concept of what we mean by fisheries development. One thing I think we will have to agree on—except my honourable friend from St. John's West. I don't think we will ever get his con-

sent to this proposition. I don't think he will ever agree, he and Ohesterston, Belloc—and I know the philosophy so well. Indeed my honourable friend introduced me to it himself when he lent me a book by a gentleman named Summerville, if I recollect correctly. I know his philosophy and respect it, and God knows, in some things I am with him, but I have to reject it in others—we must agree, I say, that salt cod, the old traditional industry of Newfoundland of salt cod is doomed, finished. It will stagger along with shots in the arm and blood transfusions, now a fishery advance, now a guarantee, now a subsidy, every year something or other to keep it alive in the hope that we are to have something bigger and better, just keep it alive in the meantime.

MR. HOLLETT: That is true of agriculture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was talking at the moment of the fishery. If you don't mind we will stick to fishing, and if my honourable friend insists we can come back to farming. It is a cold fact that our traditional salt codfishery has no future to it, or a black future, unprepossessing and an unattractive future. Let me assure the newly elected member for St. John's West that regrettable as it may be it is nevertheless a fact. His concept is gone. It is out. Take even the southern shore, a shore which is more exclusively a fishing section of Newfoundland than I think any other section of the Island—without exception I think that the settlements of the southern shore are more wholly composed of fishermen than any other group of settlements in this province. Take Bonavista Bay for instance, there is a great fishery down there, always large, Green Bay and White Bay with great fishermen and they are also larger.



But for right down-to-earth fishermen the southern shore is it, Ferryland district is it. There are the real fishermen. Now I ask my honourable friend, the Minister, does he think honestly now, sincerely, does he think that it is rational to consider as a thing that is possible, probable and likely that the people of Ferryland District, in all these fishing harbours right up to St. Shotts will be content to carry on the fishery, they and their wives and their children, on the flakes, with small boats, the trap fishery, the trawls, the hand lines, the old fashioned way like they had a hundred and a hundred and fifty years ago? Do you think they will be content to do that for the next ten or twenty years as if nothing had ever happened, as if none of them had ever gone off to the air force, none of them joined the artillery or the navy, none of them ever worked on military bases in Newfoundland, none of them had gone down to Goose Airport or Stephenville, as if no two world wars had been fought, as if the world had stood still from 1914 on? Does any honourable member seriously think that kind of fishery can continue and give a satisfactory living to the people in Ferryland District?

MR. MURRAY: No, Sir.

MR. HOLLETT: No—and that is it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No one else said it. But I think my honourable and learned friend has it in his mind. My honourable friend is an energetic type of person. He did not win Ferryland District without being that type of person. My honourable and learned friend from St. John's West has another ideal in his mind, and it was beautifully painted for him by his leader in his speech here yesterday. It was most interesting—that was my

honourable friend the leader, the nominal leader—the leader.

MR. HOLLETT: Not the intellectual?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, as between two Rhodes Scholars sitting side by side it might be a little difficult there to really make a choice as to who is the more literary of the two. My honourable friend described an idealic life about sixty years ago. He told us of his early existence, his boyhood, and I assume he was talking of about half a century ago in Great Burin. He told us of the good people, kindly people, God-fearing people, hard-working people, where the man fished and his wife worked in the fish store and on the fish flakes as the children did, and they lived very well with no hunger, no poverty and certainly no starvation. There was one man got on relief. But he did not like it, and all the neighbours got together and decided to help him, and he did not go through with that disgrace. Now that was a lovely existence in a way. I don't deny its attractiveness, but it was fifty years ago, half a century ago. And now my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West yearns for that. There was only one thing missing in the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's description and that was the maypole. If he could have had a few folks dancing and prancing around the maypole, each holding a ribbon and some folk dances! Oh yes, it is lovely, ideal. But there have been two world wars. A Communist revolution, and—

MR. BROWNE: May I interrupt? Remember when I started yesterday I reminded you of what the Honourable Thomas Lodge stated when he came here. What you are saying to-day is practically his thesis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No it is not his thesis.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps if I had the pages turn on the lights the House might see I am here and address me occasionally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke yesterday he described this Bill introduced by the Government as nationalization of the fisheries. Then his first follower, who followed him, the honourable gentleman from St. John's East, the non-legal member, I would not say non-lawful, but the non-legal member.

MR. FOGWILL: I don't think I am unlawful.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the non-legal member. He followed by calling it socialistic or socialization. Now we are getting along. First the Leader of the Opposition says it is nationalization of the fisheries and then the next speaker on that side said it was socialization of the fisheries. Now the intellectual of the party comes on as the third speaker and he rebels—no, Sir, he has not spent four years in the House of Commons for nothing. He has not been a student all his life for nothing. He has not been a man of intense convictions all his life for nothing. He reads through this Bill and says, of all the trash I have ever heard my leader has just uttered, and he has been bettered a little by my colleague from St. John's East. My leader calls this Bill nationalization and my colleague call it socialization of the fisheries. I think that is damn nonsense, so that I will call it what it really is—industrialization of the fisheries. So that you get the three isms of the Opposition: Nationalism, Socialism and Industrialism. Now my honourable friend is right in this

matter. I prefer his opinion to those of his friends. He is right. That is exactly what it is industrialization.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to know Grand Falls town pretty well. There was a day there when I knew virtually every man in the place. And I happened to know Corner Brook town very well. I know many, many hundreds of men out there by their first names, in fact I know them in both towns. I can tell you this about Grand Falls and about Corner Brook: You have in those two towns two modern mills, my honourable friends know that they are extremely modern. The techniques of making paper are as well advanced in those two mills as anywhere in the world. So that you have in those two towns those two mills, magnificent examples of modern, streamlined, completely up-to-date industrial equipment. That is my first point.

My second point is this: Ninety-eight per cent of the men who operate them are fishermen, former fishermen. I know papermakers, I know boss machinists both in Corner Brook and Grand Falls, boss machine tenders, I know them personally. I believe my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, knows them personally also. These men were fishermen, brought up to fishing, and today in these great factories they are making three dollars an hour, easily. Fishermen or former fishermen making \$24 a shift, fishermen. It is true. I have talked with them in their homes, and I have detected in them a yearning and wistfulness in their voices when they say, "the happiest days I had were when I was in the fishing boat back in the home settlement." But after all is not that what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said? Is not that what everybody says? We look back to our

own boyhood, to those far off years, with yearning. Now my honourable friends will know what I mean when I say the honourable member is more intellectual than his leader—getting down to a low level I will talk pigs—if my honourable friend insists—I know something about pigs, both kinds.

MR. HOLLETT: I wish you had stuck to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend would probably be the leader today if I had stuck to pigs, and had not come in from Gander to the National Convention. I don't know that there would have been anybody to oppose my honourable friend in his advocacy of ruination for Newfoundland except me. Responsible Government. He might have been Premier of Newfoundland suggesting another Commission of Government to take us off the rocks—if I had been interested in pigs and stuck with pigs instead of coming in here. But I came in here, and I continued to deal with pigs, peculiarly enough, I never seem to get away from them. However, let us drop that side of it.

I hold there is nothing in God's laws nor in man's laws and there is nothing in nature, and there is nothing in logic that ordains that fishermen must be a poor, poverty stricken lot, nothing. I can't find anything in the Bible, I can't find anything in the teachings of any of the great religions, anything in our Statute Books, I can't find anything anywhere that suggests that our fishermen must live worse, be poorer and their wives and children poorer than the men who work in the paper mills. I don't find it. And I say if there is any chance of getting for our fishermen and their families the kind of life, the kind of living

that the papermaker and the pulp and sulphite and paper mill workers and their families have in Corner Brook and Grand Falls, if there is any hope of doing that, it is not by following the system that we have had for the last four hundred and fifty years. It lies rather in a completely new direction, industrialism, industrialization of the fisheries. Not in socialization, not in nationalization of the fisheries either, but in centralization and industrialization, modern fishing towns. LaScie is to be the prototype. I hope to see LaScie become as modern as small town as any in North America, to be found anywhere. I hope to see it a beautiful little town with beautiful little homes, not big ones, but beautiful, with water and sewerage in them, central heating. Is that ungodly? Is there anything irreligious about that? That such fishermen should have central heating in their homes and hot and cold water, is that irreligious, is that communistic? That they should have paved streets and sidewalks, that they should have beautiful schools, modern, new, shiny, efficient new schools; that they should have beautiful churches, and beautiful playgrounds, all based on an absolutely new fishing technique, is that wrong? We do not have to investigate these techniques; thank God for that. We just have to implement them. A dozen such towns then of say eight or ten thousand people, each of them with possibly two thousand fishermen, four thousand shore workers, and another thousand or so otherwise employed. I am only guessing. That is all it can be at the moment, but another thousand or so in auxiliary services that you get in any town, shopkeepers, clerks, civil servants, teachers, doctors and clergymen—and beer parlours, if they want beer parlours. Why not? Not

because my honourable friend does not take a glass of beer and I don't, he and I should stop another man from taking a glass of beer if he wants to. Surely he agrees with me on that—can't he agree with me on that much?

MR. HIGGINS: And not a lawyer in the place?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now if you get a dozen such places as that, does that mean that you can reduce the fishing towns on the northeast coast to a mere dozen? No it does not, because you have another type of fishing settlement, far from ideal, but it is not one of the three hundred places that will have to disappear. You have two hundred that will continue, two hundred which would not be modern fishing towns, idealistic, modern towns such as I have tried to describe. They would be small settlements, a Quirpon, a Seldom-Come-By, a place such as Joe Batts Arm. You will have, I should think, easily one hundred places on the northeast coast far too good to disappear, but not nearly good enough to become modern centralized fishing towns. Now what about them? People live there. They have their roots down deep in these places. They go back many of them, some go back to the sixteenth century and some go back to the seventeenth century, they are very old, very ancient, very historical. And there are people living in them whose families have been there for centuries. They are not ideal. They cannot be made ideal, but they can be made incomparably better than they are today. We are going to attempt to show that that is so. That is the meaning of Quirpon, that is the meaning of Seldom-Come-By, that is the meaning of Joe Batts Arm, that is the meaning of Bay de Verde. We are

testing the big scale concentration and industrialization of the fishery at one place only, LaScie. That is to cost a great many millions of dollars. This very year we figure that it will cost in all from the two governments three to four millions.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): One half million on LaScie.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a mere beginning. I would say that housing and everything in LaScie will run probably five millions, quite easily five million dollars. That is a lot of money.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the population?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the moment there is a small population. But we hold that by the time that money is spent for housing, streets, water and sewerage, we hope that all the people of the hinterland of Fleur-de-Lys, Coachman's Cove, all the places west or north and south of LaScie, Shoe Cove, around this side of Cape St. John, from all these places the people will move in to a beautiful, modern town. That is what we hope and if it succeeds—now in my view the Government of Canada will not go along with us on a second LaScie until the soundness of the LaScie project is established. I believe it will be established, but until it is I doubt that the Government of Canada will go along with us. That would mean that if we ourselves decided to go it alone, which I think unlikely, we would not in that case, if we went it alone and have to do all that we are doing with LaScie together with all that the Government of Canada are doing at LaScie, that would make the whole thing prohibitively expensive. But if

you have a dozen LaScie's that could run to fifty million dollars, and that could centralize and benefit perhaps a hundred and fifty or two hundred small, extremely backward fishing settlements along the northeast coast.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Is it all based on these frozen fish fingers?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** No. As I said yesterday, because LaScie is an imbalanced, a balanced out operation, not just one thing, not just block frozen fish, not just salted fish, not just artificial dryers, not just natural drying, not just mechanization of drying and handling fish. It is not just mechanization of salt codfish handling, not just a fertilizer plant or merely a fish meal plant—it is all of these and other things as well.

**MR. BROWNE:** Has the blueprint been made for all of this?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** We have the blueprint for the actual townsite, the street lines the curb lines.

**MR. BROWNE:** Will they be produced here?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I don't know any reason why not, why they could not be nor would not be. They are a Federal matter, perhaps, but we have them. I don't know that there would be any objections to tabling them. My honourable friend, who is, I believe, an engineer (civil engineer) would probably get some enjoyment out of them. Personally I have not taken too much interest in the purely technological side of it, because I am not an engineer. But if we got a dozen such towns as that we could not get them before ten years from now because it is going to take this year and probably a good bit of next year to get LaScie built. They have

not commenced yet. There has been a tremendous amount of engineering done down there, and after all that engineering was done they began to drill the bottom and drilling the bottom was a thing they knew they had to do if they were going to do dredging and deepening of the water. When they drilled the bottom they discovered it was altogether too prohibitively expensive to dredge it. So they had to shift the position of where the plant would go and certain breakwaters and wharves. All right, they get LaScie constructed this year and next year. Let us say it is in part operation this year and full operation next year. Let us assume that it is going to take a couple or two years to test it out. Now that may be some encouragement to the Opposition. If it is going to take that length of time to test it out, then possibly there is some hope for them in the next election—possibly there is—possibly our fishermen—

**MR. HOLLETT:** When is that?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Due in the next three years, I believe.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Three months, I think.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** My honourable friend will get an election when he gets one—maybe sooner than he wants, sooner than he is ready for it.

Well in the meanwhile what? In the meanwhile what? I am not foolish enough to fool myself that the fishermen of Newfoundland all now understand this development idea. I am not fooling myself that one word which I have said this afternoon is going to convince them. I am not fooling myself at all. I think the fishermen of Newfoundland are rather



skeptical and doubtful of this whole idea of fishery development. Personally I could not care less, because when I go back as Leader of a Party in the next election whether the people like me or not, fire me out, believe me it will be a matter of supreme indifference to me—supreme indifference. They will have their opportunity to give me the burden of another five years, or to give me the relief, put me out on the pastures. In fact the pasture is being prepared right now on Roache's Line. The pasture is being prepared, and if people decide to put me on that pasture it will lengthen my life. So that I can go, and I shall go to the people in the next election supremely indifferent as to whether they elect me or fire me out. That means, if it never happened earlier, and if it never happens again, this time we will be able to talk jack blunt to the people of Newfoundland, and tell them I don't care whether they elect me or defeat me. If it was never said before it will be said to them this time. I assure you now I have not any doubt as to what the result will be, no doubt whatsoever.

Now in the meantime what is going to be done about this fishery development? People are not going to be happy, not going to be content, not going to wait for LaScie to be tested out, wait for two, four and ten and fifteen years, they are not going to wait for that. Today they are waiting with merchants discussing the prices of fish, and I can assure this House that 99.9% of the fishermen of Newfoundland are today far more concerned about what the price of fish is going to be this year than they are about all this Bill, this nationalization of the fishery, this socialization of the fisheries, this industrialization

of the fisheries. Believe me they are far more interested in the price of fish this year, and the price last year, and perhaps the price next year than they are in this.

In some ways what is required is a government that is fanatic about the matter, that does not give a tinker's curse, that is absolutely convinced as we are, that we are right, that there is no future in the salt codfishery, in the old way of carrying on. A government has got to be convinced of that. We are convinced of it. We are convinced that we have got to industrialize the fisheries. We are convinced of that. On that we will stand or fall. Now in the meanwhile of course we are not fools. We build all the roads we can. If they want roads we will give them roads. Oh yes, we will build the roads. If they want hospitals we will build the hospitals. Sure, and we will build the schools, and we will find the school teachers for them. We will carry on all the ordinary affairs of government. In the meanwhile we will give them all the social security that my honourable friend is able to think up. And he is the best thinker-upper of social securities and social security measures of anyone I know in Canada. And the best backer-upper of a government for ideas like that I know of anywhere in Canada. In the meanwhile, of course, we are prepared to leave it to Trade Minister Howe to deal with the price of fish—the greatest trader in the world.

MR. HOLLETT: Not traitor Howe?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is not funny, not a bit funny, and is getting less funny every moment.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have cleared



away the situation so that I can speak tomorrow on this Bill. What I have said is merely an introduction.

**MR. HOLLETT:** We did not interrupt you—

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Now I am hoping that every member of the House on this side will speak and I will be deeply disappointed if any member fails to do so on this subject. I will be greatly disappointed if this is not debated for the next ten days. I have been already disappointed to have had the members of the Opposition speaking and occupying a half or three-quarters of an hour on this Bill. I have only made the introduction to my speech this afternoon, my speech will commence tomorrow. If it is what my honourable friend says it is, the nationalization of the fisheries, surely they should be speaking for two weeks. If it is what my other honourable friend said, the socialization of the fisheries, the honourable gentlemen opposite should be calling public meetings. They should be doing everything to stop it, because they don't believe in socialization of the fisheries. They don't believe in nationalization of the fisheries. I do hope this debate at least will do this, and in this regard we are completely at the mercy of the newspapermen and the radio reporters, we hope through the newspapers and the radio, chiefly the radio because the radio is quicker—it takes a newspaper a little while to get on the train and the boats and get circulated amongst

the people—but the radio is instantaneous, so that we are hoping that within the next week or ten days while on this fishery debate, through the medium of the newspapers and the radio to get the fishermen and the people of Newfoundland, the fishermen particularly, to understand that great and revolutionary things are afoot. That the greatest effort ever made in Newfoundland's history to do something real and big for our fisheries is at least about to begin.

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

**MR. CURTIS:** I move **Mr. Speaker**, that all further Orders of the Day stand deferred, but might I first ask the indulgence of the House to ask leave to give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited, and N. M. Rothschild and Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the 21st Day of May 1953."

On motion all further orders of the day deferred.

**MR. CURTIS:** I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 6, 1954 at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 6, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### **Presenting Petitions**

None.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Motion and Questions**

None.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, have I your permission to lay on the Table of the House a Report of the Farm Loan Board set up by this Legislature last year. Actually the board was operating for about six months last year. It did not really get under-way until November. Since that time it has been most energetic. The Board is made up entirely of senior officers of the Department of Mines and Resources, the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister, Crown Lands and Director of Agriculture and the Assistant Director and Secretary. The Board is operated entirely on its own and does not refer its decisions to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or even to the Minister for approval. The Board has its own powers.

I should like to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the Board has not included in this report a list of the names of those persons who have applied for loans and have been approved. The Board has, and I may say I have, taken the attitude that when people are negotiating loans for their private business for its improvement and expansion, etc., their business should not become public prop-

erty particularly at the time of the negotiations. However, there is no wish at all on the part of the Board or of the Department to keep any information from the Opposition or for that matter from the public when it is in the public interest. So that I have had prepared simply a list of those persons to whom loans have been approved and who have either received their loans or will receive them whenever they are required. I am prepared to make that information available to the Members of the Opposition, with the understanding that the information will not be published. I don't think, in fairness to all these farmers who have made application—I have seen the names for the first time this week and it included people from all parts of the province—I do think that the purpose of the Act and of the Loan Board would be to some extent defeated if every time a man made application to the board for five hundred dollars and that information whether approved or otherwise were spread over the province.

I would ask leave to present these reports. I would repeat that I have prepared the list of the people who received loans or whose loans have been approved, and I am prepared to make that information available to the Opposition with the request that at the present time this information will not be made public.

Report tabled.

#### **Answers to Questions**

Question No. 73:

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in furnishing the report.

Question No. 76:

MR. CURTIS: It is not usual for the Government, Mr. Speaker, to announce in advance what its intentions are.

MR. SPEAKER: I must at this point uphold the honourable member. That question may not be asked which asks a minister what advice he intends to give the Crown.

MR. CURTIS: The remaining parts of the question, Mr. Speaker, are being prepared.

Question No. 74:

Question No. 75:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and I were out of town until a few minutes ago, and the minister has gone to his home to change his clothes and should be here in a matter of minutes. I do know that he has not been to his office today, and I would rather doubt that he would have any answers to questions.

Question No. 77:

Question No. 72:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the statement is being prepared. It is quite a laborious job and actually I think it will not be possible for me to answer until I raise the matter with my colleagues in Cabinet, and find out from the individual members who are the parties of these particular companies, also ask all the companies who have received guarantees and loans from the government who on the government side is on these boards.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in connection with that question. I have a recollection that the Prime Minister of Canada was asked an almost identical question in the House of Commons and refused to answer it.

He said he was answerable to the people of Canada as Prime Minister for the honesty and integrity of his colleagues in the Cabinet, and if he had any doubt on that he knew what he would do. I think perhaps I could take that same stand if the question were on all fours with that asked by the Prime Minister of Canada, but my honourable colleague, the Attorney General says, he will bring this before the Cabinet, and we can consider it there at our leisure, and decide what attitude we ought properly to take towards a question of this calibre.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): It is not your intention to answer it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not today. It is not the intention to answer it today.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the answer until I try to find it.

#### Orders of the Day

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. I refer now, sir, to the issue of the "Evening Telegram" dated May 5, which reports on a statement I made in the House on May 4 in which I advised the House that in view of the recent libellous statements in the "Western Star" involving my name I was proceeding to take legal action against that paper.

On April 20th the House, following a motion made by me, referred to the House Committee on Privileges and Elections my complaint that "The Evening Telegram" had unfairly reported my speech in the House on the 6th of April during the Debate on

the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

On Tuesday, May 4th, I informed the House that having seen certain libellous references in "The Western Star" to the same speech I had decided to institute legal proceedings against that paper in order to protect my name and reputation as a citizen, and at the same time to institute similar proceedings against "The Evening Telegram" whose unfair reporting gave rise to the articles complained of in the "Western Star."

Under these circumstances I feel I should ask the House to give favourable consideration to a suggestion that no action be taken here which might prejudice in any way the fair trial of these proposed actions.

Accordingly, sir, I move that the House Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to suspend their sittings until the Courts have ruled upon the matters I am referring to them.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded the Committee on Privileges suspend its sittings on the matter referred to them on a point of privilege by the Honourable Minister of Welfare until the Courts have decided.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, that being a motion, I think it would be only fair for us to have some sort of notice of such motion. As the House will see, three members of the Opposition are not here, and have had no notification of this, and certainly I have not had an opportunity to consult on this issue with them. I know not whether the legal members of our Opposition would like to express themselves on that. We have two

legal members—I am wondering if that motion could lie over until later in the day. I would make that request anyway, Mr. Speaker, and if you see fit to allow it—

MR. CURTIS: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion that I think it is very thoughtful and indeed very fair of the Honourable Minister to suggest that the Committee on Privileges should not discuss this matter, and certainly not bring in a report while the action is pending in the courts. I am quite aware of the fact that we are not bound to do anything, but this House if it likes can go ahead and dispose of the matter. But in view of the fact there is an appeal to the courts outstanding, I think it is very proper this committee should at least defer taking any action until the matter comes before the courts.

MR. HOLLETT: May I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the government are not prepared to let the matter hang over until later in the day?

MR. SPEAKER: I did not gather that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a government measure. If the honourable gentleman who has moved it, is agreeable to that idea, we agree.

MR. CURTIS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I myself understood so.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that a decision on this question be left to a later hour this day. Motion carried.

I should add two comments on what has taken place so far: One is, that the remark, that an honourable member was prepared to let a matter of privilege drop, alleged to have been

made by the honourable member after the matter was referred to a committee on privileges is a ridiculous one. You might as well say that you will not appear in court after the court is set in action. That matter is in the hands of the House. It is the House and the House only who can now decide whether this committee should carry on or suspend its action. I must point out that, as far as I see it, it could be quite legal for the committee to continue its deliberations. But I am of the opinion that, for the House to discuss the findings of the committee afterwards would then be debating a subject that was sub judice. Therefore, if the House is agreeable to letting the question stand over until a later hour today?

Question ordered stand over until a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I tried in my opening remarks yesterday on this Bill to give a rough and ready outline of the general policy of this Government with regard to the whole field of economic development. I spoke without notes at the time. Afterwards I realized I had not in fact made my point as clearly as it needed to be made. So that before I move on I will attempt to make my point with absolute clarity.

First of all, may I say, speaking my own personal views, and after all, I suppose, as long as I continue to be the Leader of this Administration of Her Majesty's Government in Newfoundland, my own personal views on these matters will have some bearing on the attitude of the Government, just as the views of any member of

the Cabinet will have a bearing, and just as the views of any member of the party will have a bearing on Government policy because Government policy is made up of the views of all our friends on this side of the House and indeed of all our friends generally throughout the province. But at the moment I should like to give the House a purely personal reaction to these things. Although I had, I suppose, the ordinary amount of ambition about the matter of forming the first Government of Newfoundland under Confederation, nevertheless, whether the House believes it or not, and regardless of who believes it or refuses to believe it or is incapable of believing it, the fact is that my ambition to become Premier of Newfoundland was not merely that of a personal ambition. It was not merely to satisfy my ego or to enjoy the rather unique power that comes to any man who is the Leader of Her Majesty's Government in any Canadian Province. These things played their part. I would be an arrant hypocrite if I were to deny that I had a certain amount of ambition and in me a certain personal satisfaction in becoming the first Premier of the Province of Newfoundland, and indeed joining the array of great men of Newfoundland, at least joining them in the sense of occupying the same office that they once occupied. I would be a hypocrite if I denied that I had that kind of personal interest in this position. But my real reason for wishing to be Premier of Newfoundland was that it would give me, as Leader of the Administration, an opportunity which I could not possibly have, which no man can have in Newfoundland unless he occupies that very position. Because it would give me an opportunity to put into effect certain thoughts, ideas

and plans that I had thought about for many years before that time.

These ideas and these plans had all of them to do with enabling our Newfoundland people to make a better living. They all had to do with that. I had gone through my life seeing and experiencing a lot of poverty in Newfoundland, a lot of it. Such poverty as I never again want to see on this earth and certainly not here in Newfoundland. Like many Newfoundlanders who do a bit of thinking, a bit of reading, move about a bit and get to see things and acquire a certain amount of experience, like many such Newfoundlanders, and this was not unique, I had come to certain conclusions as to what could be done. And anyone who does not come to certain conclusions about what could be and should be done and must be done for the people of Newfoundland is a pretty poor type. It seemed to me that there was a terrible irony about the fact that we had been talking down through the decades and even longer about our priceless natural resources. We used very colourful adjectives about them, Sir, perfectly marvellous, wonderful, untapped, inexhaustible. But, although we had used such terms, none of us had any idea what they really were or how many of them there were, of their extent, of their size. Take for example water power: During the National Convention my honourable friend, the member for St. John's East—both my honourable friends, opposite who were members of the National Convention—will remember that during that National Convention we had a committee on something—timber, perhaps it was or water power. At all events we had a committee, part of whose duty it was to

find out what Newfoundland had—it was a committee on Hydro-Electricity and Water Power, a special committee in the National Convention. I sat in at some of the meetings but I don't believe I was a member of that committee. I did follow it very carefully and talked with the members of it, and certainly saw the evidence they had and which they brought in from the Department of Natural Resources, as it was at that time. This evidence contained maps and reports and ideas and what information they had. All they did have they gave us in the National Convention. What they had was merely this: They had a map of Newfoundland showing certain rivers. They did not know how much horse power you could develop on any of them, except in so far as Bowaters were prepared to tell them what they had in fact developed on this or that watershed and in so far as the A.N.D. Company were prepared to do so with regard to the other watersheds as was also the case with regard to the Newfoundland Light and Power and the United Towns and the Union Electric Company of Port Union. They could tell us in so far as the electrical horse power which had actually been brought into production at that time. But they could certainly tell us nothing about the undeveloped water power—we knew nothing—nothing.

Unfortunately we did discover that a great many of these potential water powers had been given away, ten, twenty, forty, seventy and a hundred years ago. They had just been given away. One source of hydro-electricity, running to something in the vicinity of a hundred thousand horse power, had been given away by the government of that day, some half century or more ago, for the payment of one



pepper cone. I was the one in the National Convention who tabled a question asking the government of the day to produce the pepper cone, which they were not able to do. Whatever had happened to it nobody could find out, but the water power was gone, a hundred thousand horse power was gone and there was not even a pepper cone to show for it.

We discovered when we came into office five years ago, or soon after coming into office, that the information that existed up in the department now presided over by my honourable colleague, the Minister of Mines and Resources, about our timber resources was pitiable and pitifully meagre. It was terribly inadequate, and the public information in the possession of the government about timber stands whether privately owned such as those owned by Bowers and the A.N.D. Company and many other private companies or whether publicly owned by the Crown, regardless of ownership or alleged ownership, actually we knew nothing about our priceless natural resources of timber as they existed.

We knew nothing of our priceless natural resources in so far as they consisted of hydro-electric potentialities, i.e. water power. We knew less than did any part of the North American Continent, we knew less about our mineral potentialities than did any other part of North America. No Province of Canada and no state of the American Union knew so little about their mineral potentialities on their own areas as did the Government of Newfoundland about the mineral potentialities of our area. In fact it was pathetic; it was heart-breaking. We had had a great geologist, Alexander Murray and before him Y. P. Jukes. Any member

who has not read their reports ought to read them. Then the great Alexander Murray followed by a great Newfoundlander, James P. Howley, who was a great man. I would advise every honourable member of this House to get hold of Howley's Reports and read them, and follow them by those of the Government geologist, Dr. Baker, and then lately we have had Mr. Claude Howse and presently Dr. Baird. It is true that we have had some very distinguished men as Government geologists, but forty-two thousand square miles is an enormous area to survey with a view to finding minerals. It is an enormous area to survey even with a view to getting the geology of it, to get the general geological character of it. But, Mr. Speaker, even if the geological surveys of Newfoundland had been incomparably better than they were, the fact would remain and the fact remains it was not sufficient to have even a richly painted picture of the geology of an area. Because, after you have got that you have still to fill in countless blocks which the geologists cannot be expected to fill in, and can only be done by the prospector and the diamond drill. But we were deficient in the geological surveys, let alone the actual mile by mile physical prospecting. So it was when we took office five years ago.

Now, we came in with an ambition to do something to enable our Newfoundland people to earn a better living. We came to the conclusion that there were only a limited number of possibilities in that direction. One was our timber, another was our minerals, another our soil, the actual land itself, and then there was a fourth about which there has been a great deal of talk in this House and

out of it, new industries, new industrial plants which we have been instrumental in establishing, some twelve or fourteen in our time. That is more incidentally than any other ten governments put together in the history of this province, in the history of this Island, in the history of Newfoundland.

Now, may I make a personal statement? I intend to go out of politics in Newfoundland. I intend to drop out. I am going out. I can't say when, not yet. I am not in a position at the moment to say when. But I am going out before I am kicked out and before I die in harness. I am going out of public life. I can tell the House without naming a date just when that will be. I can tell the House right now when I am going out of public office—

I think I have them listed here. Yes, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. I am going to tick them off. (1) Minerals. I think we can forget about minerals. I think that is in hand. I think this Government has so organized this that we can forget about minerals. If there are any minerals in the province they are going to be found because many millions of dollars are being spent, and will be spent, by private enterprise, by BRINCO, particularly by BRINCO and by many other companies to search for minerals. If they are found there will be development. We will forget about minerals. That is ticked off. That is a job well done. We will forget it.

(2) Timber. Now, I can here put in the first part of the tick, but I can't complete the ticking off of it. We have ourselves conducted some important surveys of our timber resources in Newfoundland. But what is far more important is the fact that

we have set up a royal commission, headed by a very great man in that field, General Kennedy. He is very famous in forestry. He was the chairman of the great and famous royal commission on forestry of Ontario. He is the author of the great report on forestry in Ontario, the report which now forms the foundation of all Government policy, forestry policy, in Ontario. He has associated with him another great forester whom we have just brought back to Newfoundland from Mexico, Mr. Cameron, who is the second royal commissioner. He was down there working for the United Nations. The third man also is a Newfoundlander in the person of Mr. Roland Goodyear who has personally traversed on foot virtually every square mile of this Island. He is a man who is in his seventies, agile and energetic as a man in his forties. He brings to that royal commission a profound background of knowledge of Newfoundland. These three men, about a year or so from now, say, will bring in a definite programme—just as definite and just as well documented and just as well blueprinted as the programme brought in by the Fisheries Development Committee headed by Sir Albert Walsh. So that in about a year from now we will be able to complete the tick on this number two item.

(3) Agriculture. We got diverted here yesterday for a few minutes on agriculture. I shall not do that again today, except to say that there again we have set up a royal commission on agriculture. Now, that is one of the smartest things we have done since we came into office. I know of one member of the Opposition who will agree with me on that, the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West. He knows

nothing about agriculture, but he is tremendously interested in it and he really believes in it. It is not that he knows anything about it, and I don't think that he would contend that he does, not in the technological aspect of it, but sociological aspect of it. He is a firm believer in agriculture. He believes a good agriculture gives strength and solidity and health and happiness and wholesomeness to society and to life. He is perfectly right, absolutely right in that. I agree with him a hundred per cent. But we disagree in the kind of agriculture we advocate. He fancies a rather happy peasantry dancing around a maypole whereas I fancy a scientific, practical, hardbitten type of agriculture in which men can make a good living. Because I hold we can't keep them at it unless they can. They will go off to good jobs in Ontario instead.

We have set up this royal commission. I don't think our people in Newfoundland nor even those in this House are aware of the type of man we have gotten to head that royal commission in the person of Dean Shaw. Everybody here has heard of the great J. J. Hill, the great railroad builder of America. When the great James J. Hill some fifty years ago was in his heyday and building railroads in the United States he looked around the North American Continent for the best man he could find for such a purpose and picked a young Canadian, I think, from Ontario. He called him in and said to him, "Look, I know nothing about agriculture. You are a college man with your degrees, won't you come into our organization? Wherever I build railroads and open up the country I want you to organize the agriculture, be the boss, and what-

ever you say goes. You will answer directly to me." The man he picked for this was a young man named Shaw. At one time he called in this young man, named Shaw, then in his twenties, and said to him; "Shaw, I am going to build a new railway now five or eight hundred miles, and I want to establish there the greatest herd of dairy cattle on the earth, and I want you to do it." Shaw asked him, "What breed do you want your cattle?" The answer was "You tell me, that is what I am paying you for," "All right," said Shaw, "I know the kind." How much do you want to spend? The answer was, "You are not asking me. Tell me. A million? Five million? I want the best dairy herd on earth." Shaw went and got it in Scotland. That was fifty years ago. From that day to this Dean Shaw has piled distinction upon distinction, honour upon honour. Now then today, in Canada, the Right Honourable James G. Gardiner admittedly is the greatest Minister of Agriculture that has ever lived anywhere in North America and perhaps in the world. It is doubtful if any country has ever produced a Minister of Agriculture who is his equal or anything like it as Minister of Agriculture. The right-hand man of Jimmie Gardiner is this same Dean Shaw. He was Dean of School of Agriculture of Alberta. He has gone personally to all parts of Canada, all the ten provinces. He has been down in the Peace River, and in the far northern area. He has gone into all the principal areas where farming is done in Canada, and now he has come to Newfoundland in the past year or more, in June of last year. He has travelled around Newfoundland. He has with him, Dr. Drummond, another distinguished agriculturist and

also our own Newfoundland Agricultural Specialist, Mr. P. J. Murray, Deputy Minister of Agriculture in the Department of Mines and Resources of the Government of Newfoundland, who is one of our best practical, local agriculturists. I think at the end of about a year from now we should have the same detailed, documented, blueprinted, programme for agriculture that we now have for fisheries and that we will then have for timber.

So that in a year from now we can tick that off. Now, I have done that, I have ticked these items off on a sheet of paper. What I mean is that a year from now we will be coming before this House, we hope, with a great policy on agriculture. A great new policy designed to make it feasible, to make it practical for many thousands of people to earn their living within this province. That is our hope, that this royal commission on agriculture will give us the kind of practical, down to earth programme that Newfoundland has always lacked, and has never had to this very moment—an agricultural programme so practical that we can budget for it, that we can include it in the estimate, the public expenditure to be made on it.

(4) The new industries: As I conceive it, this Government's clear, manifest duty is to bring these new industries through — bring them through—we have staked our faith and our own reputation on the soundness of these industries. We have done more than that; we have invested twenty million dollars of public money in them. Now, having done that it is our duty, our clear duty, our bounden duty, our clear manifest duty as a Government to carry these industries through to com-

plete success. That we will do. How long? I do not know. To be very honest, I frankly do not know how long that will take. My honourable friend, the Minister of Education, who is by way of being a business man, not a great industrialist but a businessman who gets down to work at six o'clock each morning to his factory and then goes to work as a Cabinet Minister around ten o'clock. If I don't keep a sharp eye on him he slips out and down to the factory. He is certain to be there again after tea, six days a week he is still a businessman, still runs a factory. He tells me, "Mr. Premier, don't let anybody fool you about this thing. You know it always takes industries five or six years or seven years to get the kinks ironed out of them. Don't think you are going to start an industry and right off it is going to start making money." My honourable friend, the Attorney General, a lawyer, and connected with one kind of business or another for thirty years, helps to raise the finances for all kinds of business enterprises, all kinds up and down Water Street, as every lawyer does. He told me, "Mr. Premier, don't be too optimistic now that these industries are all going to prove themselves in a year or two. It is going to take longer than that." So that when practical-minded men tell me these things I suppose they know what they are talking about. So that we must conclude that it is going to take another four or five years to make these industries sound, and to make sure, that they will prosper, that they will make profits, and certainly that they will pay us back the money we have lent them. That is number 4. Now, we are left with number 5.

(5) The Fisheries: The fisheries

which are bigger than all these put together. This Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority," is a Bill my honourable friend, the Minister of Fisheries, has brought in here, asking this House to enact. He has done it on behalf of the Government. Of course when he does so he acts as our spokesman. We, as a Government, have considered that matter in Cabinet repeatedly. We have gone through this Bill line by line and word for word, and we put it to the House asking that it be made law. Now, what is it in fact? It is a Bill which will create, or if it does not create, authorize the creation of a great new authority, a great legislative entity, a great new legal body in Newfoundland to be brought into existence for one purpose and one purpose only—not to win elections, not to go out campaigning, not to run beer parlours, not to deal with the new industries, not to have anything to do with forestry, not to have anything to do with minerals, but one great, new legal authority set up for the sole purpose of carrying out our programme of fishery development. That is what the Bill is. It says the Authority shall (Section 13) and it says the Authority may (Section 14). The Authority "shall" and the Authority "may." The Authority shall what?

"Receive and examine all proposals and suggestions that may be made to or by the Government of Newfoundland touching the development of the fisheries and report thereon to the Government with such recommendations as the Authority may think fit and put into effect such of those proposals and suggestions as the Government approves."

Now, let us take another look at

that. I don't see anything there about socialism, I don't see anything in that paragraph about nationalization nor socialization.

"The Authority shall:

(a) Receive and examine all proposals and suggestions that may be made to the Government of Newfoundland touching the development of the fisheries and report thereon to the Government with such recommendations as the Authority may think fit and put into effect such of these proposals and suggestions as the Government approves."

This is the new body of dictators. That is what we are told. That side of the House is now asked to create a new body of dictators. We were told that here by the Opposition. A body that has the duty imposed on it by the Legislature to put into effect such of the proposals and suggestions as the Government approves is a body of dictators. No wonder my honourable friend laughs. But why not laugh when making that claim? Who could say seriously what he said?

MR. HOLLETT: I laugh now at you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then (b) "the authority shall undertake research and investigations of any kind that may be necessary to enable to devise and recommend to the government of Newfoundland projects for the development of the fisheries and undertake such projects upon their being approved by the government."

You see, Mr. Speaker, one thing the government has no right to do, cannot do is to abdicate while it remains in office. It cannot abdicate its responsibility. It cannot shuffle off its jurisdiction. That is why we, the

government, ask this House to set up this Fisheries Development Authority. It cannot at the same time ask this House to give that Fisheries Development Authority, authority that superseded the authority of the government, which is the parent body on behalf of this House of this Fisheries Development Authority.

(c) "The Authority shall investigate existing and potential markets and marketing methods for products of the fisheries and, where necessary, undertake such research and promotion as it deems desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to those products." And finally:

(d) "The Authority shall supervise the carrying out and enforcement of all agreements made before the passing of this Act between the government of Newfoundland and any person to assist in the development, modernization or improvement of the fisheries."

Now all that means is that up to this moment the government has made agreements with some ten or fifteen companies and individuals in Newfoundland for expansion of the fishing industry. We have made agreements under which we lent large sums of money totalling altogether six or seven million dollars. There are agreements under which we lent large sums of money to establish fishing industries, for example, Gaultois in Hermitage Bay, Trepassy, Grand Bank, all brand new plants. Then we have made agreements with companies under which we lent them money to expand their existing plants, for example, Bonavista, Dildo, St. Annes. Then again we have made agreements with one or two other companies with which to acquire deep-sea trawlers to increase not only the quantity of fish

for their fish plants but the variety of fish, to enable them all the better and more easily to dispose of their products in the American markets.

Now, this clause merely states that we are, with regard to all these agreements, delegating to the Fishery Authority, which is the one great authority we are setting up, to deal with the whole matter of fishery development, and they shall, while they are at it, take over the implementation of these agreements. Now in fact what does that mean? That means merely that the collecting of the money due the government either by way of interest or reduction of principal, the inspection of the plants to see that any conditions laid down in the agreements to be fulfilled by the recipient of the loan shall in fact be observed; to see that insurance is carried; to see that all the terms and conditions of the agreement under which these loans are made are in fact respected and carried out.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that not the job of Her Majesty?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the job of Her Majesty, but Her Majesty at the moment is travelling in the Mediterranean and has been around the world. So that Her Majesty has to have a government, and the government sets up various boards to do that sort of thing. So that is what this is: Her Majesty's Fishery Development Authority in the province of Newfoundland. I am glad my honourable friend enabled me to bring out that point, Sir. Surely my honourable friend is not foolish enough to think that Her Majesty would personally be making these loans and handling the fishery development in Newfoundland.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask



the members of the House, in (a) (b), (c) and (d) where the obligatory duties of the Fishery Authority are outlined, is there anything ominous, anything sinister here. No. There is no socialization here. There is no nationalization here. No. These are innocent clauses—No? Well, let us see what is sinister, ominous, revolutionary or questionable about Section 14.

"The Authority may:

(a) At the request of the Minister co-ordinate the work of the several departments of the government of Newfoundland insofar as they relate to any programme for the development of the fisheries and, on behalf of the government and any of the said departments, collaborate or enter into agreements with the government of Canada and any of its departments or agencies in the implementation of any programme for the development of the fisheries that the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland may agree to undertake."

I think that is a pretty innocent clause. I don't see anything wrong with that. It is always at the request of the Minister that the Fishery Development Authority may co-ordinate the work of the various departments of the government of Newfoundland that may be concerned in fishery development. I will give the House some example of how more than one department might very well be concerned in fishery development. Take for example, La Scie where the great new fishery development is to take place. In La Scie there will be a problem of the erection of factories, buildings in which fish will be frozen and filleted, buildings in which fish will be salted, in which fish will be dried, in which

fish will be made, in which fish will be smoked, in which fish fertilizer will be manufactured. Then obviously the Minister of Public Works should be a pretty useful person, and the Department of Public Works a pretty useful department to be involved in that aspect of fishery development. The construction of a building is not of necessity an aspect of fishery development because it might be a museum or a hospital or a fertilizer plant, a building nevertheless is a building. Similarly where plumbing regulations are concerned water and sewerage and their construction in La Scie, my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, can play a tremendous part and has a tremendous amount of practical experience and knowledge to bring to bear upon the problem from the fact that he has already worked in municipalities inspecting and installing water and sewerage, in some eight or ten Newfoundland settlements. Therefore it is feasible that if the Fishery Development Authority require the installation of water and sewerage facilities they should be able to call upon a department of the government who has had considerable experience in that very field. So it would go with all the different departments of Her Majesty's Government whose work or whose jurisdiction has a bearing upon these matters, as they concern the Fisheries Development Authority. But I would also ask the House to take note of the phrase "At the request of the Minister." Then again there has already come and there will come continually in the future case after case of collaboration between the government of Newfoundland on the one hand, and the government of Canada on the other, with regard to actual or practical fisheries development in

some particular harbour. Now there again what is required is some practical form of implementation of an undertaking agreed to by both governments. If my honourable friend, the Minister of Fisheries, agrees with Mr. Sinclair, the Minister of Fisheries of Canada, that certain actual developments are desirable for Joe Batts Arm or Herring Neck or Come-by-Chance or Burin or Ramea or anywhere else it won't be expected that my honourable friend and Jimmie Sinclair will go up arm in arm to Ramea or Burin and personally engage in the business of fishery development. Yet the two governments have agreed that it is desirable, and the two governments have agreed between them to spend some money, one government on this and the other on that aspect of the development. Therefore what is needed clearly is a practical form of collaboration within the two governments and it is here as — "At the request of the Minister, etc." Enter into and collaborate with the government of Canada and any of its departments or agencies in the implementation of any programme for the development of the fisheries that the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland may agree to undertake. Now is there anything sinister about that? Is there any socialization, any nationalization? There is nothing there to be frightened at, nothing to frighten the people, nothing to suggest that the government is practically working into Communism, to suggest that, if the truth were really known, we were in the pay of Malenkov, nothing to suggest we are secretly joined to the Fourth Internationals. There is nothing in that nor in any other clause I have so far read in this Bill to suggest anything like that.

I may read clause 24 in passing:

"The Authority, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money from Her Majesty or otherwise for the purpose of paragraph (b) of Section 14, but the aggregate of the amounts borrowed under this Act and outstanding shall not at any time exceed twenty-five million dollars."

That is a good indication of the complete intellectual bankruptcy, the refusal even to read the Bill and the more complete refusal to understand it, that the worst they can say, all they can say, is that this is socialization, this is nationalization. It is not funny, it is not funny. This is one of the greatest pieces of legislation for good or bad, for good results or bad results, one of the greatest pieces of legislation ever brought before this House, under which scores of dollars of public money may be spent. It may be sound or unsound, true or false, but it is big. It was my honourable friend's clear duty to enlighten the people of Newfoundland, the fishermen of Newfoundland, but he merely dismissed the whole thing with one characterization 'Nationalization.' 'Nationalization' of the Fisheries.

MR. HOLLETT: We have heard that before!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and may hear it again. Now I will give credit to my honourable friend's colleague from St. John's West who did not descend to that in his speech, but he called it "Industrialization of the Fisheries." That is a good word, an accurate word, a word that describes it. He asks, "Who is to own all the houses to be built? Where does the public come in? Well, who owns the houses that are built in all the ten provinces of Canada, and have been built for years past and financed by

public funds? Who built all the houses in Churchill Park up to a year or so ago? It was public money that built these houses. I don't know but my honourable friend had something to do with it. I don't know but he was a member of the original housing commission. If he has not then he might have been and others were. Millions of dollars of public money went into building these homes. Who owns them now? Most of them, I don't know as I am not a member of the organization, but most of them I believe have been sold to the occupants. That is excellent. It is far better that a man should own, that a family should own a house they occupy than that they should merely rent it from someone else. No one knows better in this House than my honourable friend, that public housing is a sheer necessity in Canada and that it has been a sheer necessity in the United States and it has been a sheer necessity in the United Kingdom even before the war, even before hundreds of thousands of their homes were battered and shattered by bombs and air raids and buzz bombs and all the rest of it. Even before the war, in all modern countries public housing has been a sheer necessity because private capitalism just has not been willing to build homes that were within the reach, financially, of the average family. So the governments had to come to the rescue of the underpaid portion of the public and provide public housing. But Democratic Governments, unlike totalitarian governments, try where it is possible to assist the public to acquire title to those homes. Has he got any reason from this Bill to think that the actions of the government in connection with housing infers anything new, anything radically different from our record in

public housing? He has not got the faintest reason to imagine that in the matter of public housing in connection with fishery development we are going to be one bit different from what we have been in connection with public housing in all other fields. My honourable friend, while he asks the question, in his heart knows the last thing in the world this Government, democratic, liberal as it is, all of us, virtually all of us strong advocates of Co-operative Ideas and Ideal as he is himself, that we would think of anything in connection with public housing other than of providing the opportunity to fishermen to acquire these homes for themselves—That is the answer to the question.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we go on: "The Authority may assist persons, directly or indirectly, with financial aid or otherwise in the establishing of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries."

Yet my intellectual friend, who without a doubt prides himself for it, and most properly so, prides himself upon his intellectual integrity, yet, that same intellectual honourable friend of mine asked yesterday—Where does private enterprise fit into all this? I took down his words and have them here. In all this, what is this? In the fishery development programme. Where does private enterprise fit into it all? He was concerned to ask this. I wonder if he asked it honestly, and if so how can he explain the things I have just read.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: I asked particularly in regard to La Scie.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In La Scie everything that will be built there

with the exception of purely public works such as breakwaters, wharves and the like which will be held by Public Works.

"Statism" is another word which was used by my friends opposite to describe this Bill. I hold that public wharves and breakwaters will continue to be public, but fish plants, etc. in regard to such things our fondest dream is—Now we want to be practical about it—but our fondest dream is that the whole community of La Scie, the people themselves will own these things. They have a very fine Co-operative in La Scie. It is one of the finest in Newfoundland, one of the best and most educated, one of the best and foremost, founded on the basic principles of the Co-operative Idea and Techniques. They have a fine Co-operative there and we have had our people down there from the Co-operative Division, from the Fishery Division of my honourable friend's department. They have sat down repeatedly again and discussed the matter of fishery development. Let me assure my honourable friend here and now—

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable the Premier yield?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain he should be loaning this money in his department and not delegating his duties and passing them over now to this Authority. That is the point on which I say the Government is giving up not only the authority of the government but also of this House—to lend money to private individuals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we did it you say it would not be nationalization. But if we take a banker from a bank and a merchant from a mer-

cantile firm and give them authority it then becomes socialization.

MR. HOLLETT: They borrowed money from us before. And I did not say socialization.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am going to win over my honourable friend from St. John's West with one blow. I cannot resist this. It is not new. I am taking it up now for the occasion. It is one of the deepest convictions of my mind. I expressed it at a convention of the Maritime United Fishermen at one of their annual conventions when I said, "The last thing, I, for one, want to see in Newfoundland is a fishing proletariat. My honourable friend knows what a proletariat is—It is a landless and propertyless people. The last thing I want in our fisheries is a proletariat. Now, mind you, I don't know but I would choose to have a proletariat if the choice were given me of having a proletariat fairly well paid or practically speaking little capitalists on the dole. I think I would choose rather to have a proletariat providing they got a decent salary. But the last thing I want is to take away the very wonderful, sturdy, independent mindedness, if not independent pockets, of our people. Because our people have been far more independent in heart and mind than they have been in their pockets. The last thing I want to do is to turn our fishermen of Newfoundland, with their personalities, their colourful characters and with their integrity of person and integrity of character, natural gentlemen, all of them, the last thing I would want to do would be to turn them into shiphands, into seamen, sailors. That is the last thing on earth.—Pray God it will never be said of me that during my time of office that is all I did for the fishermen of

Newfoundland, turn them into proletarians! Pray God that will not be said of me or of the administration I lead!

That is the great essential difference between these great fish plants of the south of that line I mentioned, the line drawn from east to west from St. John's across the island coming out somewhere around Point Riche. South of that line and north of it the great difference is this: South of it you are right cheek by jowl off the Banks of Newfoundland. You can come into Fermeuse, come into Trepassey, Placentia, Marystown, Burin, Fortune, Grand Banks, Gaultois, Hermitage, Harbour Breton, just a hop a skip and a jump from the finest fishing there is in the world today. While that fishing is there you are going to have the great draggers. That is it, unless you pass a law to prevent it. And if you pass such a law you won't prevent it, but prevent only your own fishery and the others will have it, the Spaniards and Portuguese, the French and the Scots and the English. You can stop the Newfoundlanders and Canadians from using draggers but cannot stop the draggers. So that south of that line it is so easy to imagine great industrial plants, and great companies served by draggers costing three hundred thousand dollars each that can bring in at one trip three hundred thousand pounds of fish. That is what you can imagine. In fact it is a little difficult in the circumstances to imagine anything else south of that line. But north of it, and thanks to that thing I described here yesterday, block frozen fish, thanks to that now you can have on the North East Coast half a hundred little plants up and down that North East Coast that you could not even dream of two years ago, or

even one year ago. Half a hundred small plants freezing and manufacturing block frozen fish, and yet make these plants balanced industrial plants similar to La Scie but on a smaller scale than La Scie but similar to it in the sense that they are balanced. If they take some fish and smoke it, and some fish and can it, and some fish they salt, and some of it they salt then dry artificially, all of it they handle mechanically in mechanized flakes, who will supply the fish? Certainly not these great draggers, not these great mechanical draggers. Not these ships which are the property of industrial companies such as is Gaultois, Grand Bank, Fortune, Northlantic Fisheries, Fishery Products, these great fishing companies.

Now on the North East Coast you can have long liners, purse seiners, different types of boats, boats of the type of the Matthew II which cost \$38,000 and it should be feasible to have them costing much less than that, considerably less than that. With new types of boats, small boats, with four, five, or six or seven men, boats within the practical reach of ordinary fishermen, boats that would cost no more than a Labrador schooner used to cost and perhaps less, or perhaps a little more, built with the help of our loan boards or Fishery Development Authority—It is not for nothing we have made the Chairman of these loan boards secretary of the Fisheries Development Authority. I hope the House will notice the connection there. We have, as the House is aware, set up three loan boards, Industrial Development Loan Board, to make small loans for small industrial enterprises. We have a Co-operative Development Loan Board which is probably one of our mistakes. But they have only lent \$36,000 or \$38,000. It



is not a big mistake although it may be a bad one. Then we have the Fishery Development Loan Board for lending money to fishermen with which to buy boats, engines, gear and the like. Now the chairman of these loan boards is the man who has been appointed to be secretary of the Fishery Development Authority, so as to make for the closest integration of effort and approach and technique between the two. In addition to that we have the bounties, the boat building bounties. In addition to that again the Government of Canada pays bounties using our Fisheries Loan Board as their federal authority through which they can make their federal payments, which co-ordinates the provincial payments with the federal payments in dealing with any given fishermen.

Now, what we can have on this Northeast Coast is, say fifteen, say twenty, I don't know how many there will be until the final surveys have been completed, but fifteen or twenty and maybe thirty towns ranging in population of say two or three thousand on the one hand and up to ten or twelve thousand on the other hand, two general classifications of towns, the La Scie type and the Quirpon type or Seldom-Come-By type. Because Quirpon and Seldom-Come-By are in a class, these two are under test to test out the feasibility of fishery development in a harbour where it is not feasible to have the relatively large scale town and concentration, but where you can have for instance: community stages, community flakes, mechanized community flakes, put in a fish dryer, etc., and have the whole thing, preferably, owned by the community itself. Now if you can get, say your five hundred places on the Northeast Coast boiled down to say a

hundred with twelve or fifteen of them towns, small cities like La Scie we hope is to become, and say eighty or eighty-five of them places such as we hope Seldom-Come-By, Bay de Verde, Valleyfield, Badger's Quay, Merasheen about which I hope my honourable friend from Placentia West will tell us more.

So that I hope my honourable and learned friend will agree that in addition to the industrialization aspect of fishery development there is another side of which this government is extremely sympathetic. After all, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to have it said after we have gone out of office nineteen years from now, and my honourable friends across are older and wiser men than they are today—of course we will all be older and wiser men by then—but we don't want it said of this government when we go out that what we did had this effect, that it could be said of Newfoundland—Where wealth accumulates and men decay. Or if men don't decay they become just proletarians serving ever bigger and richer fish merchants.

Now up to this moment how many applications have we had and how many has the Fishery Development Board approved to individual fishermen or little groups?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Probably twenty or thirty. Maybe a hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. There is the tragedy of it. But with an organized fishery development programme what you get is this: You set up a Fishery Development Loan Board. You get a man like James Baxter as the chairman. He is a man



who spent his entire life as a banker. Perhaps he was not the best choice we could have made but we were most anxious that loans that were made would be made cautiously and soundly and that the money would not be just wasted. But in four years we have had some twenty or thirty fishermen who have had their loans approved, and they got a total of a hundred thousand dollars or less. Whereas, during the same period some fish merchants have come to us and have received loans of five hundred thousand dollars, six hundred thousand dollars, seven hundred thousand dollars, eight hundred thousand dollars, nine hundred thousand dollars and one got a million dollars, or a million and eleven thousand dollars I think it was. Now why is that? Is that because this government has a soft spot for Water Street in its heart. No. The spot that this government has in its heart for Water Street is as hard as the hobs of hell. I go on record, deliberately on record—As hard as the hobs of hell. If we have lent seven million dollars to Water Street for fishery development it has not been to please Water Street, it has not been to help Water Street. It has been to help the fishermen who would be able to get jobs from those firms at cash wages. And it was to help the fishermen who could sell their fish for cash and thereby escape the slavery, and escape for their wives and children the slavery of making the fish on their flakes. These figures I have just quoted up there, for loans to fishermen, are figures I consider to be pathetic in the extreme. I would hope that as a result of this great fishery development programme that, in the course of the next four or five years, it will become possible and feasible for a couple of million dol-

lars or more, perhaps much more than a couple of million dollars, to go out to many hundreds of fishermen in loans to enable them to acquire the types of boats, the types of engines and the types of fishing gear that the modern fishing techniques demand. We plan for the Newfoundland Government to put out several millions of dollars in that way to fishermen for those purposes—and it will amount to very much more because it will of course be added to, by means of the Federal Government Bounties or subsidies for the same types of boats, provided they don't measure more than sixty feet, or fifty nine feet eleven inches.

Mr. Speaker, it has been drawn to my attention that we have only one stenographer, and, if it is pleasing to Your Honour and the House, I would suggest that we have a recess for ten minutes.

House recessed for ten minutes.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, before we recessed I was quoting the principles of the Fishery Development Authority which this Bill, if it becomes law, will have the effect of creating. I was pointing out that section 13 puts certain obligations upon the Fishery Development Authority and that section 14 enables, under certain conditions, the Authority to do certain things, and I had quoted Section 14 (b) "To assist persons, directly or indirectly, with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries."

Then it goes on in the next section: "The Authority may assist the operation of such enterprises as are of an

exploratory or experimental character or for demonstration in methods of fishing:

Now I regard this Section 14 (c) as being one of the most important sections of the Bill. It gives the Fishery Development Authority the authority the government itself has had in the past five years. And we have done incomparably more than any other government in Newfoundland's history by way of exploratory and experimental fishing. We built the Matthew II. Mr. Speaker, when we first came into office we found that, with the exception of one, no government in Newfoundland had ever sent any one to any other country where fish was produced with a view to looking at their methods and techniques of fishing and processing of fish. That one exception was the Squires Government that sent the Speaker of that day, Mr. Speaker Penney, the late C. H. Penney of Carbonear, to Iceland. He was afterwards Magistrate Penney of Carbonear. He had many years earlier been a fisherman fishing on the Coast of Labrador. His familiarity with the fishery was confined almost entirely to the type of fishing that was done on the Labrador. He brought back with him a very notable report which was to the effect that the Icelanders of that time (that would be in 1920-21) were actively engaged then in an effort to imitate our Labrador Cure. I remember talking with the late Magistrate Penney just before he left on that trip and after he returned. The Labrador Cure was in very great demand at that time in certain of the European markets. Now that was the only case I had ever heard or read of the Government of Newfoundland sending any one to other fishing countries to observe their fishing methods, etc. This fact shocked me and my

colleague, the Minister of Fisheries. Indeed the whole Cabinet agreed that it was common sense and so ordinary a thing for a government to do as to be considered almost routine, and that the selection of such a man and the sending of such a man should arouse no particular attention. That was, however, one of the first acts of this government to arouse antagonism,, ridicule and sneers.

The man we choose was Colin Story. He was an excellent type of man. He was a quite well educated man. He was well spoken. He was very personable and presentable. He was a man who could hold his own in any company. In addition to having these qualifications, he was also a practical fisherman. He had fished on the Coast of Labrador. He had fished in North Dame Bay. He had fished on the South West Coast. He had operated his own boat as master of her. He was at one time one of a small group of young men sent by the Commission of Government at one stage in their history to some school in the United States conducted by the U.S. Wild Life Organization, where he had some introduction at least to the study of fish processing and fish hauling. So that Colin Story appeared to be a well educated practical fisherman, who could go to any of those countries and quite competently, quite adequately, observe what was going on. He did that. He went to Iceland, Scotland, England, Denmark, Germany, Norway and Sweden. He spent some months over there. He went out in their boats to their fishing grounds. He went to the fish plants. He examined their boats. He knew enough about the practical features of boats and engines and gear to be able to give us a report on what he had noted. He

also knew enough about plants to be able to bring us a report.

He came back, and he reported to my honourable colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, and to myself. He came night after night for many nights to Canada House and stayed until two or three o'clock in the morning. He told us such a fascinating story that I called a caucus so that all the members of the party at that time might have the advantage of being briefed by Colin Story. What he told us was that we were asleep. Newfoundland was asleep in so far as the fishing industry was concerned. We were asleep. We were fifty years behind the times. That is four years ago. He told us we were then where Iceland and Norway had been around the turn of the present century.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is it? I repeat why is it that our fish merchants, with the exception of Arthur Monroe, Ches Crosbie, and there may be one or two others of whom I have no knowledge, why, with these exceptions, our fish merchants in their fond conceit, in their impenetrable vanity, should have imagined that the great countries of Europe had nothing to teach Newfoundland? Why is it they should imagine that our fisheries were sufficiently up to date, that they were not open to improvement, not susceptible to improvement? That is beyond me. That is beyond my comprehension. Now, they must have imagined it, or else, surely, they would have sent their top men or gone themselves to those countries to see what was going on. Not only Arthur Monroe and Ches Crosbie but all of them would have gone, surely they would have gone, if they thought there was something to learn in those countries.

So this Government built the ex-

perimental "Matthew II." She was the first of her kind in the Western Hemisphere, the first Danish Seiner ever built in the new world. This Government built her on the recommendation of Colin Story. Others have been built since, but we pioneered in that. Now, this Government knows that is not work for a Government, that is work for private enterprise, that is the sort of thing that private enterprise does. Does anybody suppose that the United States would have the great position she has today in the industrial and technological world if first she had not thrown her doors open to people from every nation under the sun virtually, and secondly if her private enterprise had not been so enterprising as it was by way of scientific innovations. Without that, would the United States be the nation she is today? I think the answer is obviously clear. And if our fishermen have starved, if our fishermen have lived on so low a standard of living as they have it is because their industry has been mastered, controlled and bossed, regulated yes, but principally owned by a handful of ivory headed, stone-headed, fossil-minded merchants. Oh, they could make an easy living, and they did. No country in the Western World is as easy as Newfoundland for men of some wealth to become wealthy, for men of some wealth to be powerful. There is no other country in the western world in which a little fellow can be a big fish in a small pond. And if our fishermen have languished, if they have lacked the ordinary things which people of Continental America, have, as for instance these ordinary things they look upon as sinful ambition to look for, milk, ordinary whole milk, if our people have

lacked, and if our fishermen particularly have lacked a standard of living which more advanced people regard as just commonplace living, it is because the fishing industry has been in the hands of knuckle-headed fossils.

MR. HOLLETT: You are going to take it out of their hands?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not going to take it out of their hands. But we are going to give them the "bums rush." Does my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, know what I mean by that? Well I will tell him what I mean by the "bums rush."

MR. HOLLETT: You got it in New York one time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I never had. If I had I would not be ashamed to say so. Because if there is one thing about me, I have a lot of pride in my accomplishments but no pride in myself. Most of my life since I was born I was extremely poor and I expect to die that way. I don't claim any aristocratic blood. On the contrary I claim I come from ordinary people, the ordinary working class of Newfoundland, a real tough working people—I have no pride at all, no social snobbery. So that my honourable friend cannot hurt my feelings. I have a sort of pride in the fact that I have nothing to be proud of. I am proud of that. Proud of the fact that I am just an average, ordinary Newfoundlander. But I am proud of my accomplishments although not all of them. Because, like my honourable friend, I have made some mistakes too. I have made far more than my honourable friend has made—oh yes—but I am proud of my accomplishments. But I won't be diverted from what I was saying by

talking about my mistakes. We were talking not about my mistakes but about the mistakes of my knuckle-headed merchants. When I say "a bums rush" what I mean is that we intend to create an atmosphere in Newfoundland in which the merchants, private enterprise will get new faith in Newfoundland. They are already getting it. I wish I were in a position to announce the name of one of the oldest, one of the most conservative firms in Newfoundland that has decided to launch out again into the fishing industry. I am delighted to hear that. I want it to be understood also that when I give my frank and candid opinion of Water Street I always make allowance for some exceptions. There are some exceptions. But most of them I would not have them running bulls-eye shops. Most of them have not enough brains to get out of their own way. Most of them have not enough initiative to get in out of the rain. Most of them have not enough brains to count their money, they have to hire people to do that for them. But it is an obviously easy place to get rich this Newfoundland. If you are worth a couple of hundred thousand in no time at all you have a million and from that two million, three, four, five millions. And if I am challenged I will name them. They all voted against me, virtually all of them. They all put up money to put this party down. They are the people who financed the campaign against Confederation. You see how much gratitude I have for them, as much as I have for half a dozen rattle snakes, about the same amount of gratitude, and as much fear of them as I have of any ferocious mouse. That is how much fear I have of them. I have as much respect for

them as I have for a rattle snake and as much fear as I have for any mouse be he ever so ferocious. But they are the crowd that our fishermen have to depend upon. They are it. They are the fishery. The fishery could never rise higher than they would allow it to rise. The fishery could never be any more progressive than they made it, never could be, so that our fishermen have starved.

Now, what we are hoping is that private enterprise, big and small would come to the Government, come to this Fishery Development Authority, and that they would borrow a million, two million, five million, ten million, twenty million, or fifty million in the course of the next fifteen or eighteen years. That is what we hope. But if they don't then we hope the fishermen will borrow it in the same amount over the same period of time. Then if they don't we will spend it, and then we will have socialism.

MR. HOLLETT: Where are we going to get it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend need not worry about that. Don't let that give him a thought. Two years ago he stood in this House, and with such power as he had, which admittedly was not great, but with such power as he had, he did everything possible to prevent us floating a bond issue, he and his then leader.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not correct? It is absolutely true!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

my honourable friend called upon the bond holders to be aware of us, and then called upon the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise now to a point of order: I will not allow it to be said in this House that I ever endeavoured to damage the credit of this country in any way; and I shall ask you to take it back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, so far from taking it back I will now repeat: My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition stood in this House, as his leader did, and called upon the bankers and bond houses across Canada not to lend this Government one cent. He did that in this House two years ago. Do you think I am going to take that back when the whole House knows it?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, since the Honourable the Premier will not take it back, I will say it is a damnable lie. He is nothing but a damnable liar.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—the honourable member is absolutely out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Nobody will assist me in my request.

MR. SPEAKER: When any honourable member makes a point of order he must do so without any unparliamentary comment about another honourable member. The words used here were entirely unparliamentary and entirely out of order. The point in question is easily proven, as it is a matter of excerpts from Hansard, or bringing in the journal to show the vote of the House on that occasion. I will not say what the vote was, as it is not for me to do so. I do not recognize as a point of order a statement made in such unparlia-



mentary language. Let me inject a further point: I and the Deputy-Speaker have constantly warned honourable members of the constant use of the personal pronoun "You." "You did this," and "You did that." This Chair cannot be called upon to rule on private conversations which improperly take place in the House. If the honourable members would speak through the Chair more attention might be paid to points of order. Will the honourable the Premier continue his speech, and refrain from personal comments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, asked me where we were to get the money. I went on to tell him then that some two years ago the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had done his best, which was not good enough, to stop the Government from borrowing a dollar across Canada, and read out a statement calling upon the banks and bond houses not to lend money to Newfoundland. That was two years ago. If my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition hopes somehow this has been forgotten, it is a vain hope.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order: I must have that Hansard produced here. I have certainly no recollection of ever making such a statement. I don't think the Honourable the Premier is right in making such a statement, unless he produces the facts. Surely I would not advise any banker not to lend money to this country. If I did, I must have been a sick man at the time. I am aware that money must be loaned to all Governments. As to this particular Government, of course, it is a different matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole party advised the banks not to lend money. He not only did, but his entire party did. It was the then leader, not by him but by another leader. That party met downstairs and the honourable gentleman who is a lawyer and represents St. John's East refused to be identified with it. But they all met that day in the Opposition Room and drafted a statement, which their leader then came up and read out, calling upon the banks and others to be aware of this Government, and not to lend money to it, with only the member for St. John's East, who is a lawyer, refraining. That was two years ago. Does he think the peoples' memory is that short?

MR. SPEAKER: I must take up the point made there by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He has a right to ask for documentary proof of the statement made. It will be impossible to produce that at once, but it certainly can be produced. But I am not saying that evidence can be brought to show that what the Honourable Premier has attributed to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is so. But the circumstances surrounding the debate itself will be shown. I will ask Mr. Clerk if the journal of the final vote on that bill is readily available at short notice.

MR. CLERK: Mr. Speaker, what was the name of the Bill in question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Loan Bill, Mr. Speaker. It was on the occasion of the debate on the Loan Bill. The quickest way to find it is—the official statement of the Opposition was published in the press at that time. It was a special session and the Leader of the Opposition



stood up and just read it out, and passed it around to the newspaper reporters, and it appeared in all the papers and on all the radios, and undoubtedly appears in Hansard. May I continue, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** If the Honourable the Premier can keep away from that point.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Yes, indeed. Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend need not worry. We will finance the fishery development programme. We will do that. This Government will do that. We will finance it.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I hope so.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I can gauge the honourable gentleman's hopes so well. Whether you hope so or not we will do so.

**MR. HOLLETT:** You were going to do a lot of stuff.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** We are going to finance this programme of fishery development in Newfoundland, not on behalf of Water Street, but we are on behalf of the fishermen, the people we are here to serve, who put us here and can put us out whenever they feel like it. They have the power to do it. So that I say, the Fishery Authority may assist the operations of such enterprises as are of an explanatory or experimental character or for demonstration in methods of fishing. They will be carrying out on a much greater scale and a much more intensive scale the very programme of the Government itself in the course of the last four or five years. That is, as I was saying, we, the Government, have done more than any other Government in the history of Newfoundland in this very direction.

Then again the Authority may on its own initiative or on reference to it by the Government of Newfoundland, advise and make recommendations to the Government in respect of legislation, regulations or organizations touching on the fisheries; and then:

They may make, direct or otherwise participate in research or investigation in any matter that concerns the fisheries if the authority is satisfied that the result of such research or investigation will be of such value to the fisheries as to justify the undertaking; and the results will be available to any person engaged in the fisheries who requests information thereon; and finally:

The Authority may assist directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the provision of education and training in respect of the fisheries.

Under clause 14 (f) the Authority may, if and as it deems fit, and on such conditions as it determines, dispose of buildings, installations or equipment that it acquires for the purpose of conducting research or investigation under paragraph (e);

Now, I will give my honourable friends opposite a reminder that in this sub-clause (g) of Clause 14, they have an opportunity which they could use. They could say that this Government now after five years in office, are now going to launch out to educate the fishermen, and that is what all this boils down to. They could leave out all references to Clause 13, (a), (b) and (c), they could just omit all references to that, omit all references to Sub-sections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of Clause 14 and just touch on 14 (g), just one part

of it. They could boil down the whole issue of fishery development into a radio speech for example and say, on Saturday night next, come out and say—"Well fishermen your wonderful Liberal Government have a great big programme now. What do you think they are going to do but start to educate you. Now, that is not what you feel is wanted. It is not education you want. You want prices for your fish." That could be one line of opposition propaganda in connection with this Bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have explained the two sections of the Bill which set out as clearly as possible the functions of the fisheries authority, the jurisdiction of the Fisheries Development Authority. One section of them, i.e., Section 13 is mandatory and one section of them, i.e., Section 14 is permissive. I ask the House in all fairness, and I hope that a couple of years from now or five years from now my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, if he is in the House at that time, will not say that he never said that the fishery development programme is just socialization, or nationalization of the fisheries. I hope he won't say that he did not say that. He said it here the day before yesterday. He called it nationalization and his colleague on his immediate left said it was socialization of the fisheries, and now confirms it by nodding his head.

Now, having read the two sections of the Bill which sets forth the Authority and the functions and jurisdiction and the purpose of the Fisheries Development Authority, I ask the fair question—Is this socialism? Is this Nationalism? Nationalization?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is necessary in dealing with one or two

points made by the Opposition, the two speakers the day before yesterday, they drew attention to the financial side of this "Fisheries Development Authority." You will notice that the first provision is that the financial year of the Authority shall correspond to the Financial Year of the Government of Newfoundland. That is to say from April 1 to March 31 in the following calendar year, and,

The Authority shall annually submit to the Minister an operating budget for the next following financial year of the Authority for the approval of the Minister.

The Minister shall annually lay before the Legislature the capital budget of the Authority for its financial year approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

That is to say its very budget has to be prepared a year ahead, and submitted to the Minister for approval. Now, the procedure is every year the Fishery Development Authority draws up its own budget for the coming year. It submits that budget to the Minister to whom it is accountable, the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries submits it to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, that means the Cabinet, practically speaking it means the Cabinet. The Cabinet having analyzed it first, and his officials in his department having analyzed it and had finally brought it to a point that they could approve it, they then present it to the Cabinet who then analyzes it in the light of all the consideration which a Cabinet is expected and indeed must give to such things. These are financial considerations, and other practical considerations. Because a Cabinet Government is a political government wherever it is found. Then, having

passed the Cabinet, the Minister brings it before this House, the Legislature, where it is debated. Now, so far there is no hint of dictatorship. So far there is no hint of it here. Now then that is not all: The Treasury Board which consists of the Minister of Finance as Chairman, the Attorney General as a member, the Minister of Labour as a member, the Minister without Portfolio, the honourable member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, and one other minister make up the Treasury Board, on the joint recommendations of the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Finance, may by regulations prescribe the form in which the budget required by this section shall be prepared. That is not all: Because I find that Section 17 of the Bill, "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from moneys voted by the Legislature for the purpose, make available and pay to the Authority from time to time such funds as it may require for the proper carrying out of its work." But I ask the House to note the essential fact in this sub-clause that—it shall be from moneys voted by this House that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall pass over to it such funds as it may require for the proper carrying out of its work. Now, we have the picture fairly complete. Let us take it step by step.

The Fishery Development Authority draw up their budget for a year ahead. They submit it with their recommendations to the Minister to whom they are immediately accountable. He, with his department and his other officials attack that and list it, break it down and finally in a form that they approve recommend it to the Cabinet, which examines it and finally approves it in some form, either as it was referred

originally from the Fisheries Development Authority or as it was received from them and amended by the Minister or in such form as the Cabinet may amend it, and they finally commit it to the House and the House votes on it, and the House, including my honourable friends opposite vote on an appropriation Bill, a sum of money voted on the information that has been laid before the House, and the Government passes the money over to the Fishery Development Authority. Now, what is undemocratic about that? Where is the dictatorship?

MR. HOLLETT: No one said that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know it was called nationalization; and socialization; and industrialization which was something I agreed with. I know my honourable friend talked about dictatorship the day before yesterday, but it does not arise in this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not talk about dictatorship.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now it says: "The Authority may receive and accept such other sums of money as may from time to time be paid to it by way of grant, contribution or reimbursement from any source, if it receives such funds to assist it in the attainment of its objects or in the proper exercises of its functions or to re-imburse it for disbursements made by it on any behalf." That is in connection with fishery development.

MR. HOLLETT: So they may take up a collection.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They might take up a collection or my honourable friend might leave them a large sum of money—from any source legally

any money might come to them, and this permits them to receive it and also permits them to receive back money they paid out, interest on or the repayment of principal.

"The Authority shall keep proper books of account and proper records in relationship thereto."

"The Auditor General shall at least once in every financial year audit and may, during the course of the year, make an interim examination of the accounts and financial transactions of the Authority and is entitled to have access at all times to all records, documents, books, accounts and vouchers of the Authority and to require from the members and employees of the Authority such information and explanations as he deems necessary."

I don't think there can be any doubt about or objection to that. When the Auditor General makes an interim examination under sub-section (1) he shall submit a report to the chairman and to the Minister. Then it goes on and on and on, providing in every instance, in every clause, in every section and in every sub-clause and every sub-section allowance for sound, businesslike, decent, honest administration, which is naturally the thing it ought to provide for, and which are naturally the things which any Authority such as this having the spending and the practical administration of the spending of so many millions of dollars ought to be bound to. That is what it is bound to, these basically sound sensible, prudent provisions.

Now, the Auditor General shall report annually to the Minister the result of his audit or examination of the accounts and financial statements

of the Authority, and the report shall state whether in his opinion (a) the Authority has kept proper books of account; (b) the financial statements of the Authority were prepared on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year and are in agreement with the books of account, in the case of the balance sheet, give a true and fair view of the state of the Authority's affairs at the end of the financial year, and in the case of the statement of income and expenditure, give a true and fair view of the income and expenditure of the Authority for the financial year, and the transactions of the Authority that have come under his notice have been within the powers of the Authority under this Act and any other Act applicable to the Authority. And the Auditor General shall call attention to any other matter falling within the scope of his examination that in his opinion should be brought to the attention of the Legislature.

In any case where the Auditor General is of the opinion that any matter in respect of the Authority should be brought to the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the Treasury Board or the Minister of Finance, he shall make such report forthwith through the Minister of Fisheries.

Now, here is the one to which my honourable friend gave some considerable attention when he spoke of this Bill.

Section 24—The Authority with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money from Her Majesty or otherwise for the purposes of paragraph (b) of Section 14, but the aggregate of the amounts borrowed under this Act and outstanding shall

not at any time exceed twenty-five million dollars.

That is the aggregate borrowed under this Act, not under this clause, but under this Act, borrowed and outstanding shall not at any time exceed twenty-five million dollars.

Now, from that clause, my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, whom I have said so often jokingly, but not always jokingly, seems to be quite incapable of reading any statute and understanding it from his reading of it—from that clause my honourable friend actually argued in this House that the Fishery Development Authority, without any permission, without any sanction of the Government can go off and commit Newfoundland for twenty-five million dollars. He very conveniently overlooked the words "The Authority with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time do so and so."

MR. HOLLETT: Should it not be "With the approval of the Legislature?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will come to that. That is adequately covered in the Revenue and Audit Act. The Government itself cannot give authority that it has not got. And if it gives authority that it does not possess then that authority is unconstitutional and unlawful. The Government can only give what it has. And what the Government has is lawful and constitutional authority as contained in the Statutes, and the Statute is known as the Revenue and Audit Act which lays down, spells out with great clarity, what the Government may and may not do in the matter of borrowing. There are Provinces in Canada that have the right to go on the financial market at any

time and borrow on behalf of the public purse without reference to the Legislature. There are other Provinces in Canada that have to come to the House each time it desires, that the Government of that province desires to float a bond issue. Under our Revenue and Audit Act every individual bond issue has to be separately authorized by a separate statute. Now, in the absence of such a statute we cannot borrow. I have already stated publicly that this Government proposes to ask the House at this session to authorize it to float a bond issue. We cannot float that bond issue until first we get authority from this House. If there is a case to be made for having a government possess the power that without specifically referring back to the House it may go and float a bond issue, there is of course a case to be made against it. But both techniques are in use in the various Province of Canada, as I have no doubt they are in the various states of the American Union. The one advantage of being able to do this without having to come and get a special act passed is that you don't have to wait for the House to meet or the House having met you don't have to wait until the Act is passed. At any given moment when the financial market is favourable such provinces as have this power may float a bond issue. Issues have been floated in Canada in recent months at extra low rates and extra convenient terms compared with six months ago, due to certain unusual and exceptional circumstances. This Government could have floated a bond issue, undoubtedly, in recent months at most extraordinary advantageous terms. But we did not. We did not have authority. The House was not open. To this moment we

have not even asked the House for the authority, but until we do we cannot borrow. So that this clause here has to be read in the light of that fact, the fact I have just stated.

"The Authority, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money from Her Majesty or otherwise for the purposes of paragraph (b) of Section 14, but the aggregate of the amounts borrowed under this Act and outstanding shall not at any time exceed twenty-five million dollars." That otherwise means by a bond issue. That authority the Lieutenant-Governor in Council cannot give until first authorized by this House to do so.

MR. HOLLETT: They are going to raise your loan for you, is that it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is not being fair to himself now. I assure him he ought not to say these things, because if he says them people will think he is stupid. He ought to be fairer to himself than that. What my honourable friend is suggesting is that this is a way we have devised to get our loans raised for us, get the Fishery Development Authority to get them for us. My words seem to have fallen on deaf ears, I said before; I can explain a thing to the honourable gentleman, but only the good God can give him the brains to understand. The Government cannot give what it has not got. It has not the authority to give to the Fishery Development Authority power to borrow until first the Government gets the authority from this House. So that before the Fishery Development Authority can borrow they must get the authority, and they can then borrow only what this House has authorized except in the case of

borrowing from the fishery, and even this is fully covered. To borrow otherwise they must first have the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council must first have the authority of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: You have not got it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Therefore they cannot borrow. In other words the power of the Fishery Development Authority to borrow lies in this House.

MR. HOLLETT: There should be a loan Bill before you pass this.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that particular point would be better discussed in committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was merely attempting to show my honourable friend and to assure his immediate associates in this House. What I was trying, somewhat fruitlessly I fear, was to explain to my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition himself. The capacity to learn is one of the great attributes of mankind. Once a man reaches the point where he cannot learn then the greatest teachers just fall down in humble failure.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps you passed that stage long ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I admit it is possible in so far as my learned friend is concerned. There are so few things he can teach me. I don't know what it is my honourable friend can teach me now that he is getting advice from his new colleague.

MR. BROWNE: I say nobody can teach you anything.



MR. SMALLWOOD: He is so wrong, my honourable friend. He himself has taught me much in this present session. I hope my honourable friend does not underrate me so much, because I have learned a lot in this session, very much, and I hope I shall continue to learn. One of the things I learned from him is how better to win elections.

MR. SPEAKER: Interesting but I doubt if pertinent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate so that I may resume the discussion of this great subject at the sitting tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot at this moment, of course, rule on the point of order raised. It would mean I would have to refer to Hansard of that time. Certain extracts from it must be placed here in the House. Personally I am not prepared to admit that a newspaper report is evidence for this House. It is not. However, if the honourable Leader of the Opposition desires, I think I should grant him his wish to have laid here on the table a report by the "Evening Telegram" and the "Daily News" regarding the comments alleged to have been made by the Opposition at that time. That can be done. However, I will not order it from the Chair, because it would not be fair to bring in a newspaper report of what the honourable member said and take for granted that he did use these words.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I just have this to say: I see the difficulty in which Your Honour has been placed, but it was not by me. At this particular point, since the Honourable the Pre-

mier will not retract that statement, then I am prepared to let him go on and say it and have it go all over the Island, as he has made other statements about me and repeated them. It will get him nowhere.

MR. F. FOGWILL: No, it gets him no place.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot accept that. The point of order has been made and recognized by the Chair. I am not prepared to accept that. The honourable member asked for the words he did say, and the House is prepared to show them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the only point I raised was that I never advised any banker nor advised the public not to buy Newfoundland Bonds. I think it is a terrible thing for any man to say. I deny having said it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member appealed as a point of order and asked that the Premier retract. The Honourable the Premier said he would not retract as he could prove it. Now, if the Chair refuses to carry on with the point of order surely the Chair could be accused of favouring either one side or the other. I would be open to suggestions from the House. Would the House permit the honourable member to withdraw his objections if he wishes? This would merely leave the Premier's remarks and the contradiction of the honourable Leader of the Opposition as mere allegations of fact without intent to prove it.

MR. HOLLETT: You mean, Mr. Speaker, do I want to leave these words of the Premier that I advised the bankers and the public not to buy Newfoundland Bonds? You mean

do I want those words to be left as read?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know what the honourable member wishes. All I am concerned with is that a certain remark was made and the honourable member said it was not true and asked the honourable member on the other side to take it back. That honourable member said: "I will not take it back." Then the honourable member rose to a point of order. There is nothing left for the Chair to do but have Hansard of the time to show who is right.

MR. HOLLETT: That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I merely said that if the honourable member wished to forget it I was quite prepared but would not have myself accused of favouring somebody. I don't know whom. I can assure the House I don't feel like favouring anybody.

I cannot see six o'clock because the House has ordered that a motion ordered earlier finally put at a later hour this day. Mr. Clerk will now read the motion offered by the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare.

Mr. Clerk reads: "I move that the House Committee on Privileges be directed to suspend their sittings until the Courts have ruled upon the matter I am referring to them."

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, that is open to debate, I take it?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been considered here and there has been an alleged breach of privilege of the House. According

to all precedents it is the duty of the House to proceed as quickly as possible to consider whether that breach of privilege has occurred. A committee has been appointed. In fact there was a standing committee already in existence since the beginning of this parliament. This committee was designated to consider this alleged breach of privilege that has been referred to them, and it is their duty to go ahead and consider it. It seems to me they can't consider a directive which tells them not to consider it. They certainly cannot have it taken away from them. After all if you look at it in an impersonal way we know what often happens to lawsuits, they are often discontinued and not proceeded with at all. The reason the House formed this committee in the first place is that the House considers its dignity, its high position in the land has been brought into contempt before the general public. It must therefore look upon the affront which the honourable member feels has been offered him as a breach of the privilege of this House. This select committee has been appointed to consider it and it seems to me then it should continue with the work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have no strong feelings one way or the other, but it seems to me this House which has ordered the committee to consider this matter can withdraw the instructions it gave, surely, and refer it back. The motion is not to do that, but merely to defer or suspend the work of the committee until later.

MR. HOLLETT: The purpose in raising the point, as far as my own involvement in this is concerned, is that no steps be taken in this House to prejudice in any way a consideration of any claim before the courts.

I don't know the legality of the point I raised but must say to my mind it is a matter of equity and fairness.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, it must be understood we come far above any court. We create courts, we pass laws, we create them and can pass laws abolishing them. We are away above any court in Newfoundland. We have the privilege as the House to deal with the matter. We may do so and no one may say, no. But if we feel that all things considered, it might be better in the meanwhile, in view of the fact that action has been entered on or is about to be entered on in the court, we might prefer to hold our hand for the time being. We have every right to do that too.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, that is the very point I was about to raise, but I was not raising it in that light at all.

**MR. CURTIS:** Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—how many times can a member speak on a motion?

**MR. HOLLETT:** The honourable member spoke twice. I have not spoken at all yet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** We could debate the thing. The arguments I have heard from both sides are incorrect. I am not entering into debate. But this House has set up a committee to deal with a point of privilege; regardless of what the court is doing or not the committee may deliberate. The point I made earlier, before the Honourable Member for St. John's West came in—if the committee does deliberate and bring in a report, if we discussed the report we would be breaking a parliamentary rule by debating a matter definitely sub judice. Since the motion of the honourable

member is that the committee merely suspend a deliberation for a time, I don't see that we would be denying ourselves any of our privileges, and the committee would still have a right to sit at some other time named by the House. I understood the motion has been moved so that people appearing before the court may not be embarrassed by what has happened in this House. So that Mr. Clerk will read the motion again.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I want to raise. I think I have the right to speak. I have not spoken to this motion except to request that the matter be postponed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am afraid merely standing and saying, Mr. Speaker, constitutes speaking. The honourable member has spoken before, I let him get up then because the Honourable the Premier did also. So that I am not strictly enforcing the rules of debate at this point, because we are attempting to get the best possible solution.

**MR. CURTIS:** I move, Mr. Speaker, all remaining orders of the day stand deferred.

On motion remaining orders of the day deferred.

**MR. CURTIS:** May I, Mr. Speaker, give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled: "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

**DR. ROWE:** Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I would request leave to give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled, "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, May 7, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the voters of Sandy Cove in the District of Bonavista South. The petition asks that the Government of Newfoundland use its strongest influence to see that the road from the highroad from Alexander Bay to Happy Adventure is extended to the Government wharf at Sandy Cove. The road to this wharf is in very poor condition and it is impossible for motor vehicles to use it. This road is the only road in the area that cannot be used by motor vehicles, and is the road to the high school and church. The road has received very little attention from the Department of Public Works and needs to be rebuilt. We, therefore, wish the Government to see that the road in question receives the necessary attention to make it equal to other roads in the area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed on behalf of some 126 residents of Sandy Cove. I know Sir, that the general condition of the roads in that area is anything but good, especially at this time of year. I am hoping that some extra money can be spent in this area this year.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition, and I

move that it be placed on the Table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the people of Sandy Cove were amongst those who returned me as a member of the National Convention, I think I would be a little ungrateful if I did not add my voice to that of my honourable friend in support of the prayer of this petition. As the petition states, it is correct that the road leading down from Alexander Bay station to Eastport and to Happy Adventure has been put in very good condition, and also the road leading from Eastport down to Salvage. All these roads have been put in very good shape in the last few years. It is only now that my honourable friend brings the petition of his friends in Sandy Cove to our attention. I am reminded of the fact that it is perfectly true that little, if anything, has been done in recent years to put that particular road in shape. Now, I think every living soul down there in Sandy Cove are good friends of mine, many of them personal friends, and because it is common justice, and they deserve what they have requested, I give this petition my very sincere support.

On motion petition received and ordered referred to the department concerned.

### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

### Giving Notice of Motion

None.

### Giving Notice of Questions

(78) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the Table

of the House the following information :

How many long liners have been built during the past fiscal year? Who are the owners of same? How much was paid by way of bounty on the hull and how much on the engine of each vessel? What amount of loan is carried by the owner? Is there a mortgage on the vessel for the amount of the loan in each case? Have any other vessels been built for which a bounty was paid? If so, give the name of the owner, state the kind of vessel, amount of bounty together with loan, if any, made on each vessel.

(79) MR. BROWNE—To ask the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

To what persons have loans been made for :

- (a) The purchase of livestock;
- (b) Land development purposes;
- (c) The purchase of farm equipment, giving the amount loaned in each case, the conditions for repayment. What was the date of each loan? Has a first mortgage been taken on borrower's real estate as security? If not, state the reason. Have other applications for loans been approved but not yet granted? Who are these applicants and for what amounts have the loans been approved? Who drafted the mortgages given by borrowers? Was there any charge for same? If so, how much was the

amount in each case? Is there a registration fee on each mortgage? Who pays for costs of mortgage and registering?

#### Answers to Questions

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I draw attention to Question No. 25 on the Order Paper of March 21. It has not been answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I will inform the honourable gentleman that this information will be forthcoming upon presentation of the estimates and the budget. Any information which will be forthcoming on that occasion is not information which may properly be asked in the meantime.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the agreement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It could be asked for on that occasion. I don't think it will be tabled until that occasion. That is not denying information, that is simply asking the honourable gentleman to wait for the proper moment.

MR. HOLLETT: I may say I was informed on the day after that was brought in, that it would be answered when the Bill was brought in. The Bill has been brought in but it has not been answered.

Answers to Questions No. 74 and 75, being prepared.

Question No. 77: Honourable Minister of Public Works absent.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question No. 38.

**QUESTION NO. 38:**

**I. Travelling Expenditure by Department to 31/3/54.**

<b>(i) Legislature</b>	
(a) Members of Legislature—Travelling and expense allowance .....	\$28,000
<b>(ii) Premier's Office</b>	
.....	2,287
<b>(iii) Finance Department</b>	
(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 509
(b) General Office .....	2,570
(c) Auditor General's Department .....	4,654
(d) Social Security Assessment Division .....	12,051
	19,784
<b>(iv) Provincial Affairs</b>	
(a) General Office .....	490
(b) Museum .....	49
	539
<b>(v) Education</b>	
(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 1,053
(b) General Office .....	2,437
(c) School Supervisory Service .....	23,840
(d) Vocational Institute .....	249
(e) Adult Education .....	2,689
(f) Audio-Visual Division .....	794
(g) Public Examination Division .....	217
(h) Curriculum Division .....	662
	31,941
<b>(vi) Attorney General</b>	
(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 887
(b) General Office .....	899
(c) Magistrates .....	10,700
(d) Constabulary .....	2,070
	14,556
<b>(vii) Mines &amp; Resources</b>	
(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 594
(b) General Office .....	1,229
(c) Accounting Office .....	179
(d) Forestry Division .....	28,545
(e) Agricultural Division .....	25,203
(f) Land Development Division .....	8,602
(g) Crown Lands and Surveys Division .....	41
(h) Wildlife Division .....	29,370
(i) Mines Branch .....	3,570
	97,333



(viii) **Public Works**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 531
(b) General Office .....	647
(c) Accounting Office .....	51
(d) Registry of Motor Vehicles .....	3,496
(e) Buildings Division .....	8,748
(f) Roads and Bridges Division .....	10,254

---

 23,728
(ix) **Health**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 2,387
(b) General Office .....	4,915
(c) Accounting Office .....	96
(d) Medical Staff .....	1,771
(e) Nursing Service .....	8,186
(f) Health Inspection Division .....	794
(g) Business Management Division .....	405
(h) General Health Services .....	5,681
(i) Public Health Laboratory .....	726
(j) General Hospital .....	10,130
(k) St. John's Sanatorium .....	989
(l) West Coast Sanatorium .....	1,969
(m) Mental Hospital .....	1,617
(n) Gander Hospital .....	955
(o) Botwood Hospital .....	407
(p) Cottage Hospital .....	6,677

---

 \$47,705
(x) **Public Welfare**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 2,033
(b) General Office .....	1,781
(c) Accounting Office .....	55
(d) Mothers' & Dependents' Allowances Division .....	265
(e) Regional Welfare Services .....	57,604
(f) Child Welfare Division .....	282
(g) Public Assistance Division .....	10
(h) Old Age, etc., Division .....	196
(i) Boys' Home & Training School .....	526
(j) Girls' Home & Training School .....	82
(k) Family Court .....	768
(l) Northern Labrador Division .....	1,238
(m) Corrections Division .....	422

---

 65,262
(xi) **Board of Liquor Control**

(a) Administration .....	\$ 1,131
(b) General Office .....	2,276
(c) Sales .....	54

---

 3,461

(xii) **Municipal Affairs and Supply**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 1,363
(b) General Office .....	927
(c) Municipal Affairs Administration .....	433
(d) Local Government Division .....	12,111
(e) Price Control Division .....	107
(f) Supply Administration .....	17
(g) Purchasing Division .....	43

15,001

(xiii) **Fisheries and Co-operatives**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 1,161
(b) General Office .....	362
(c) Fisheries Administration .....	7,485
(d) Fisheries Engineering Division .....	2,670
(e) Fisheries Economic Research Division .....	522
(f) Vessel Construction Division .....	6,446
(g) Fisheries Training School .....	2,168
(h) Co-operative Extension .....	8,081
(i) Co-operative Registry .....	6,526

35,421

(xiv) **Economic Development**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 5,760
(b) General Office .....	238
(c) Tourist Development .....	4,314
(d) Economic Development .....	1,240

11,552

(xv) **Labour**

(a) Minister's Office .....	\$ 1,202
(b) General Office .....	1,094
(c) Boiler Inspection Division .....	6,800
(d) Apprenticeship Division .....	704
(e) Minimum Wage Division .....	41

9,841

**2. Amounts charged to Suspense Account as of 31/3/54****Head I: Finance**

(i) Minister .....	\$ 400
(ii) Auditor General's Department .....	684
(iii) Social Security Assessment Division .....	2,000

3,084

**Head VI: Education**

(i) Minister .....	400
(ii) General Office .....	50
(iii) School Supervisory Service .....	1,300
(iv) Adult Education Division .....	760
(v) Audio-Visual Education Division .....	125
(vi) Curriculum Division .....	87

2,722

**Head VIII: Mines and Resources**

(i) Forestry Division .....	350
(ii) Agricultural Division .....	797
(iii) Wild Life Division .....	1,447

2,594

**Head IX: Public Works**

(i) Minister .....	850
(ii) General Office .....	400
(iii) Registry of Motor Vehicles .....	750
(iv) Buildings Division .....	280
(v) Roads and Bridges Division .....	1,230

3,510

**Head X: Health**

(i) Minister .....	250
(ii) General Office .....	400
(iii) Accounts Office .....	100
(iv) Nursing Service .....	200
(v) Health Inspection Division .....	100
(vi) Business Management Division .....	150
(vii) Public Health Laboratory .....	100
(viii) Gander Hospital .....	150
(ix) Botwood Hospital .....	150
(x) Cottage Hospital .....	2,200

3,800

**Head XI: Public Welfare**

(i) Regional Welfare Service .....	600
(ii) Old Age, etc., Division .....	375
(iii) Northern Labrador Affairs Division .....	1,143

2,118

**Head XIII: Municipal Affairs and Supply**

(i) Municipal Office Administration .....	150
(ii) Local Government Affairs Division .....	400

550

**Head XIV: Fisheries and Co-operatives**

(i) Minister .....	500
(ii) Fisheries Administration .....	1,900
(iii) Fisheries Engineering Division .....	300
(iv) Vessel Construction Division .....	2,800
(v) Fisheries Training School .....	760
(vi) Co-operative Extension Division .....	1,685
(vii) Co-operative Registry .....	1,203

9,148

**Head XV: Economic Development**

(i) Minister .....	325
(ii) Economic Development Division .....	500

825

Head XVI: **Labour**

(i) Minister .....	300	
(ii) General Office .....	100	
(iii) Boiler Inspection Division .....	1,200	
(iv) Apprenticeship Division .....	120	
		<hr/> 1,720

NOTE: The above figures show the position as of 31/3/54. Since that date, in accordance with Treasury requirements, the majority of these Suspense Account items have been cleared.

NAME	Total Advanced	Accounted for as of 31/3/54	Date of Absence	REMARKS
(i) Premier .....	\$2,287.00	\$ 664.80	28/ 8/53— 9/ 9/53	Balance represents expenditure on account of pre-1/4/53 travelling.
(ii) Finance .....	909.00	(a) 167.65 (200.00)	(a) 28/ 8/53— 9/ 9/53 (28/ 8/53— 9/ 9/53)	(a) Represents T.C.A. fare. (Imprest charged to Suspense).
		(b) 167.65	(b) 22/10/53— 5/11/53	(b) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(c) 172.80 (200.00)	(c) 14/ 1/54—22/ 1/54 (14/ 1/54—22/ 1/54)	(c) Represents T.C.A. fare. (Imprest charged to Suspense).
(iii) Attorney General .....	887.05	(a) 172.80	(a) 11/ 5/53	
		(b) 172.80	(b) 23/ 5/53	No imposts drawn.
		(c) 172.80	(c) 18/ 7/53	Expenditures represent T.C.A.
		(d) 172.80	(d) 22/10/53	fares only.
		(e) 167.50	(e) 14/ 1/54	
(iv) Mines & Resources .....	594.00	594.00		Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
(v) Education .....	1,453.00	(a) 40.00		(a) Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
		(b) 400.00		(b) Accounting for pre-1/4/53 travelling.
		(c) 412.65	(c) 13/ 4/53—29/ 4/53	
		(d) 200.65 (400.00)	(d) 28/10/53 (28/10/53)	(d) Represents T.C.A. fare. (Imprest charged to Suspense).
(vi) Public Works .....	1,381.00	(a) 98.00		(a) Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
		(b) (850.00)	(b) .....	(b) (Imprest charged to Suspense).
		(c) 212.65	(c) 14/ 1/54	(c) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(d) 220.00	(d) 12/ 2/54	(d) Represents T.C.A. fare.
(vii) Health .....	2,687.00	(a) 505.70		(a) Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
		(b) 1,069.35	(b) 23/ 5/53—11/ 6/53	
		(c) 630.80	(c) 2/ 1/54—24/ 1/54	
		(d) 181.60 (250.00)	(d) 12/ 3/54 (12/ 3/54)	(d) Represents T.C.A. fare only. (Imprest charged to Suspense).

NAME	Total Advanced	Accounted for as of 31/3/54	Date of Absence	REMARKS
(viii) Public Welfare .....	2,033.00	(a) 92.50		(a) Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
		(b) 204.65	(b) 14/ 6/53—19/ 5/53	
		(c) 459.70	(c) 21/ 9/53— 1/10/53	
		(d) 691.51	(d) 1/12/53—17/12/53	
		(e) 589.30	(e) 13/ 1/54—29/ 1/54	
(ix) Municipal Affairs & Supply .....	938.00	(a) 528.00		(a) Miscellaneous travelling in Province.
		(b) 410.55	(b) 11/ 9/53—24/ 9/53	
(x) Fisheries & Co-operatives .....	1,621.00	(a) 312.37	(a) 19/ 4/53—23/ 4/53	
		(b) 354.60	(b) 26/ 5/53—31/ 5/53	
		(c) 286.35	(c) 5/ 7/53—12/ 7/53	
		(d) 181.60	(d) 13/ 1/54	(d) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(500.00)	(13/ 1/54)	(Imprest charged to Suspense).
(xi) Economic Development .....	5,760.00	(a) 3,952.37		(a) Accounting for pre-1/4/53 travelling.
		(b) 306.60	(b) 29/ 4/53— 2/ 5/53	
		(c) 381.60	(c) 12/ 5/53—19/ 5/53	
		(d) 247.65	(d) 5/ 6/53— 6/ 6/53	
		(e) 517.84	(e) 26/10/53— 4/11/53	
		(f) 172.80	(f) 28/12/53	(f) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(200.00)	(28/12/53)	(Imprest charged to Suspense).
		(g) 181.60	(g) 12/ 3/54	(g) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(125.00)	(12/ 3/54)	(Imprest charged to Suspense).
(xii) Labour .....	1,502.00	(a) 990.20		(a) Accounting for pre-1/4/53 travelling.
		(b) 212.65	(b) 21/11/53	(b) Represents T.C.A. fare.
		(300.00)	(21/11/53)	(Imprest charged to Suspense).

NOTE: Since 1/4/53, claims have been submitted in respect of all amounts shown above as being charged to Suspense, with the exception of Fisheries & Co-operatives and Economic Development.



**Orders of the Day**

Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fishery Development Authority."

**MR. SPEAKER** A point of order arose in that debate yesterday afternoon. I shall remind the House of the situation: At the time the point of order was taken yesterday we had agreed that the Clerk would read the appropriate extracts from Hansard. I shall now ask Mr. Clerk to read the extracts from yesterday's Hansard.

"Mr. **HOLLETT**: Where are you going to get it?

**MR. SMALLWOOD**: My honourable friend need not worry about that. Don't let that give him a thought. Two years ago he stood in this House, and with such power as he had, which admittedly was not great, but with such power as he had, he did everything possible to prevent us floating a bond issue. He and his then Leader.

**MR. HOLLETT**: That is not correct.

**MR. SMALLWOOD**: That is not correct? It is absolutely true!

**MR. HOLLETT**: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order:

**MR. SMALLWOOD**: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend called upon the bond holders to beware of us, and then called upon the government—

**MR. HOLLETT**: Mr. Speaker, I rise now to a point of order: I will not allow it to be said in this House that I ever endeavoured to damage the credit of this country in

any way; and I shall ask you to take it back.

**MR. SMALLWOOD**: Mr. Speaker, so far from taking it back I will now repeat: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, stood in this House, as his leader did, and called upon the bankers and bond houses across Canada not to lend this Government one cent. He did that in this House two years ago. Do you think I am going to take that back when the whole House knows it?

**MR. HOLLETT**: Mr. Speaker, since the Honourable the Premier will not take it back, I will say it is a damnable lie. He is nothing but a damnable liar.

**MR. SPEAKER**: Order—The honourable member is absolutely out of order.

**MR. HOLLETT**: Nobody will assist me in my request.

**MR. SPEAKER**: When any honourable member makes a point of order he must do so without any unparliamentary comment about another honourable member. The words used here were grossly unparliamentary and entirely out of order. The point in question is easily proven, as it is a matter of excerpts from Hansard, or bringing in the Journal to show the vote of the House on that occasion. I will not say what the vote was, as it is not for me to do so. I do not recognize as a point of order a statement made in such unparliamentary language. Let me inject a further point: I and the Deputy Speaker have constantly warned honourable members of the constant use of the pronoun "You," "You did this,"

"You did that." This Chair cannot be called upon to rule on private conversations which improperly take place in the House. If the honourable members would speak through the Chair, more attention might be paid to points of order. Will the Honourable the Premier continue his speech, and refrain from personal comments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, asked me where we were to get the money. I went on to tell him then that some two years ago the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had done his best, which was not good enough, but his best, to stop the Government from borrowing a dollar across Canada, and read out a statement calling upon the banks and bond houses not to lend money to Newfoundland. That was two years ago. If my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition hopes somehow this has been forgotten, it is a vain hope.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order: I must have that Hansard produced here. I have certainly no recollection of ever making such a statement. I don't think the Honourable the Premier is right in making such a statement, unless he produces the facts. Surely I would not advise any banker not to lend money to this country. If I did, I must have been a sick man at the time. I am aware that money must be loaned to all governments. As to this particular Government, of course, it is a different matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The whole party advised the banks not to lend money. He not only did, but his

party did. It was the then Leader, not by him but by another Leader. That party met downstairs, and the honourable gentleman who is a lawyer and represents St. John's East refused to be identified with it. But they all met that day in the Opposition Room and drafted a statement, which their Leader then came up and read out, calling upon the banks and others to beware of this Government, and not to lend money to it, with only the member for St. John's East who is a lawyer, refraining. That was two years ago. Does he think the people's money is that short?

MR. SPEAKER: I must take up the point made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. He has a right to ask for documentary proof of the statement made. It will be impossible to produce that at once, but it certainly can be produced. I am not saying that evidence can be brought to show that what the Honourable the Premier has attributed to the Leader of the Opposition was in fact said. But the circumstances surrounding the debate itself will be shown." (End of extract from Hansard, May 6, 1954).

MR. SPEAKER: On that quotation the point of order was taken, and the request made for the production of Hansard. I might say that the entire matter is most distasteful to me. Therefore, I must ask the House to try to appreciate the situation: A certain honourable member makes a statement. He is asked to retract. I cannot order a retraction unless I know that it is properly in order to do so. I can only find that out by referring to Hansard. If I let the matter pass, then I can be

accused of favour and prejudice. I must strive to maintain impartiality.

It was further stated in that debate by the honourable member making the point of order, that he was getting no help with his request. On another occasion he said he made a point of order of which nobody took any notice. The word "Nobody" whether intentional or not must of course refer to the Chair. Therefore, I shall have to ask the Clerk now to read the shortest possible excerpts from the debate referred to by the Honourable the Premier; make my ruling on that, and leave it to the House to decide. I do think that is the best way to handle this. While, of course, I cannot choke off debate on the point of order, I think the best way to receive it would be without comment. Certainly we cannot rehash the debate of July, 1952.

Will Mr. Clerk please read the two items which I have indicated, Item No. 1 and No. 2.

(Excerpt from Hansard July 2 "Afternoon Session" 1952).

"MR. HOLLETT: . . . I issue this from this side of the House, Sir, a warning to the banks in general and to those mentioned here this morning in particular, that they will have to be careful, and they will have to go very carefully in their backing of such a proposition of any government in this little province of ours if they wish to retain the respect with which they have been held in this country for many generations."

(Excerpt from Hansard July 3 "Morning Session" 1952).

"MR. CASHIN: . . . We in the Opposition intend to convey to the

underwriters, and the four Canadian Chartered Banks, our definite opposition to the subscribing of this new first loan by our Government since we became united with Canada, particularly do we object to the raising of this loan at this particular time to incur a further burden of taxation upon our people as is evidenced by the iniquitous tax of three per cent upon all food commodities. Further, in view of the fact that it does not appear to us to be good business to pay an annual rate of five per cent approximately on ten million dollars when the Newfoundland Government has on deposit with the Federal Government at Ottawa approximately eleven million dollars bearing interest at just 2½%.

"Now, Mr. Speaker, some of us in these thin ranks of this Opposition have been accused of being traitors to our country, and have been called names which at this moment I consider unparliamentary to mention. Therefore, in view of the fact that we have given our views and will continue to give those views, that we are opposed and strongly opposed to the granting of this proposed loan to the present administration, which, again I say, in our opinion, is incapable, inefficient and untrustworthy to handle public funds. We therefore, in this debate unequivocally register protest. We feel that we would be wasting not our time but the time of this House if we continued in repetition. We have decided, therefore, to leave any further comment on this particular legislation to the members of the Government, to the bankers and underwriters whom we have warned to be careful of investing in what we

consider an irresponsible Government any further money belonging to the people of Newfoundland." (End of extract taken from Hansard of July 2 and July 3, 1952)."

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I am not ruling on the correctness or otherwise of the inference drawn by the Honourable the Premier from his recollection of that speech. The question only is: Can he be asked by the Chair to retract these statements made yesterday. I cannot see that I can make such a request.

Again I would advise the House to let the matter rest there. However, appeal may be made. I go perhaps beyond the limit of my power when I make an appeal to honourable members to try to conduct the business of the House in a manner which would redound to the dignity of the House, and to avoid all personal comments. The way is clear. As I said yesterday it was laid down by myself and by the Deputy Speaker—as soon as an honourable member begins to say "You" he is bound to provoke, or say something which will arouse temper and bring debate into disrepute. There must be a way to criticize an honourable member's speech, surely there must be a way to criticize a policy, without frequent loss of temper or the saying of words harmful or opprobrious to another honourable member. Is the House satisfied?

Adjourned debate on second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Premier was speaking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the House that there are really two Newfoundlands:

One is the twentieth century Newfoundland and the other a nineteenth century Newfoundland or perhaps an eighteenth century Newfoundland. The twentieth century Newfoundland is made up of Corner Brook and a number of other modern and prosperous towns of that whole Humber area; of Grand Falls and a number of prosperous and very modern towns and villages of the Exploits Valley; of Buchans which contains, we understand, one of the richest mines in the world, or known to exist in the world; of Bell Island which has the largest known deposit of iron ore in the world although it is not of particularly high quality; St. Lawrence where there are two mines together constituting, as the United States Bureau of Mines handbook says, the largest deposit of high grade fluorspar in the world; Gander, a great international airport; Stephenville which has lying close beside it a great airport; Argentia, another great military area and a few other places, all of them together constituting a part of Newfoundland that is, generally speaking, as modern, as up to date, as progressive and as prosperous as any part of continental North America.

The other Newfoundland, the nineteenth or eighteenth century, and in some respects the seventeenth century Newfoundland is all the rest of the Island. St. John's—the least said the better. I leave it to my honourable friends opposite to speak for St. John's, four of them, as they face me, represent St. John's, God help them!

We represent Newfoundland on this side. It is in this other Newfoundland that the fishery is carried out. It is because the fishery is the central occupation of the people of that other Newfoundland that it is a nineteenth or eighteenth or seven-

teenth century country—it is because our fisheries are so miserably poor, that they are so miserably backward, that they are so miserably underdeveloped and undeveloped, that they are so completely or almost completely lacking in the scientific touch of modern capitalism, the touch of very modern industrialism—because our fisheries are still little more than a handicraft—because for the most part our fishery is carried on today almost exactly as it was carried on in the year 1500 and the year 1600 and the year 1700 with no essential difference, or with one or two superficial differences. The fact that the small boats, in which the fishermen go out a mile from the landwash or two miles to the grounds, are boats that are propelled now, for the most part, by small engines whereas formerly they were propelled by small sails or oars—with that slight superficial difference, there is no difference whatsoever in the way our salt cod fishery is carried on today and in the way it was carried on by the first fishermen who settled here the year following the discovery of Newfoundland by John Cabot in 1497. We are told that the Matthew, the seamen aboard the Matthew got codfish by dipping baskets into the water over the side of the boat, and that fish were so numerous that they could actually get codfish in that way. But if they used baskets, and doubtlessly they did, it was only because they were not a fishing vessel, her crew were not fishermen. She was a boat of discovery. They were seamen but they were not equipped to engage in the codfishery. So that catching cod by dipping a basket into the water was never an actual, common practice. The common practice was to jig the fish, which we

still do. It was to set trawls, which we still do. It was to handline, that is to say, let out a line at the end of which was one hook which was baited with little pieces of squid or caplin or herring and just hold the line and when the fish got caught on to it you give a little jig and haul in as fast as you could. That is the way they did it, and that is the way they do it. The same holes that were worn in the gunnels of boats from the lines coming in are still worn in the gunnels now, four hundred and fifty years later. There is the same tough and calloused skin on the index finger, it is still seen today four hundred and fifty years later. It is still the same primitive handicraft. Although it is true—it is true—for centuries fishermen could rear their families in these little nooks and crannies along our long coastline with a fair degree of contentment—these were the happy days described by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition the other day when he was telling about when he was a boy fifty odd years ago. These were the happy days my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West loved to picture in his mind, where they dance around the maypole. While it is true that down through the centuries fishermen following their handicraft could make a living of a kind which left them reasonably contented, it was only because in those days our fishermen wanted but little here below nor wanted that much very long. It was only because they lived on hard bread known as hardtack and some herring.

MR. BROWNE: They lived better than that, you malign them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't want to be too personal about how the

honourable gentleman lived when he was a boy. I am referring to centuries ago. Indeed I am referring to the period down to the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. From the first fishermen that squat in a little out-of-the-way cove somewhere along our coast, back four and a half centuries ago, down to the outbreak of the First World War. Throughout that whole long period, I say, the fishermen lived on Hamburg Bread (Hardtack) on some herring, some leggings as they call them today, on a few potatoes, and frequently not even potatoes, occasionally a bit of fat pork, fatback.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the honourable member what authority he has for that statement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am my own authority. I happen to be a Newfoundland historian. I am the only one who has made a living out of that, Newfoundland history, and I did it for seven years when it was my only source of income. I was a professional historian. I was secretary of the Historical Society, and author of a half dozen books on Newfoundland history. So that I am my own authority to save time. I could bring in a raft of references.

MR. BROWNE: The "Barrelman" not excepted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend has never accepted me, but a lot of people have. I am here. There is a difference in the number of acceptances as shown by the division of this House.

I say they lived on a starvation diet for most of four hundred and fifty years. Our Newfoundland fishermen and their wives and their children dress more poorly. I have

already said in this House, and I repeat, the overwhelming number of the fishermen in Newfoundland have but one suit of clothes in their entire life.

MR. BROWNE: Nonsense!

MR. SMALLWOOD: One suit of clothes! Indeed in my own time I have known fishermen who had only one suit of clothes throughout their lives. I have personally known fishermen like that. Mostly they wore a pair of pants made of sail canvas or canvas ducking and they wore a coat known as a canvas jumper. If they were a bit aristocratic they had a blue guernsey. It was a sign of blue-blood almost to see a fisherman wear a blue guernsey—I remember seeing a member of this House of Assembly, on this side of the House, wearing his blue guernsey. He was not only on this side but was for a little on that side. "They wanted little here below nor wanted that little long." So, they could live on forty quintals of fish a year. That supported them because they lived on a sub-human standard. Then came this First World War. We had a larger proportion of our young men enlisting in the Royal Navy and in the British Army and in the Forestry Battalion and then later in the Royal Flying Corp, a higher proportion than the young men of any other part of the British Dominions overseas. We had, I believe, between eight and ten thousand of our young men who went off to train in Scotland and in England and on to France and Gallipoli. Then they came back after four years, those who lived, and most of them did. Thousands of them went through the hard times between the two wars and then another war broke out and thousands more went off to Canada, to the United States, to the United



Kingdom. We had, perhaps, twenty thousand Newfoundland men in the various services of the allied nations in the last war. Then they came back, most of them. In the meanwhile radio had become widespread, movies had become widespread. At this moment in Newfoundland there are five hundred places, many of them little fishing settlements, in which movies are exhibited every week. All of these things; the effect of the two great wars, the effect of the various circumstances during these two world wars, the effect of radio, the spread of newspaper circulation, the fact that during the war, the last war, some seven or eight hundred million dollars was spent by the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada to construct and expand military bases, army, navy and air bases; and that tens upon tens of thousands of our young people, our fishermen, our loggers, engaged upon the greatest migration of men Newfoundland has ever known in her history. The Island was criss-cross, it was like an ant hill of men leaving their homes and going to Gander, Harmon Field, Corner Brook, Goose Airport, Stephenville, tens of thousands of them going to work in these construction camps, getting good food, getting the best food they had ever known in their lives. I remember that during two or three years of that period I, myself, lived at Gander. I was raising pigs. I ate at the cafeteria where there were five hundred Newfoundlanders, civilian workers of the Royal Air Force Transport Command. These were manual workers who lived, for the most part, in great barracks. Those who were rather better paid lived in buildings containing single and double rooms. But we all ate at the one cafeteria, five

hundred Newfoundlanders. I talked on scores of occasions with my friends there at Gander who had come from virtually every point of the compass of this Island. We discussed the food, the fresh celery every day and the fresh beef in some form or another every day, seven days a week. On Fridays and Wednesdays for those who would not eat meat there was fish of all kinds. High-class living, we thought it was, but it was just the ordinary fare that ordinary Canadian and American citizens were accustomed to, without which they would consider themselves put upon.

All these factors added together, and many others I could mention, meant that that eighteenth or nineteenth century Newfoundland would not continue to be an eighteenth or nineteenth century Newfoundland. Let no one for one moment suppose that the fisherman living in Joe Batts Arm is less ambitious to enjoy a degree of good living and a decent standard of living than is the paper-maker in Corner Brook. Let no one suppose that the fisherman down in the heart of White Bay wants less or desires less than the mine-worker in Buchans. Let no one suppose that the humblest fisherman in the smallest little nook or corner wants less, desires less, than the most prosperous and advanced wage-worker we have in our most prosperous industry. So that psychologically our fishermen are not at all behind our most advanced workmen in industry. They are only behind them materially. They live on less family income: I will quote now from the Newfoundland Fishery Development Committee commonly known as the Walsh Report:

### FAMILY INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

"The discussion of income, expenditure and savings in the families of in-shore fishermen is restricted to the families of skipper men, thus the limitations of the primary data. The averages obtained are probably higher than they would be if other fishermen's families had been included in the sample. Even so, they are very low indeed by general Canadian standards. While there are, of course, wide variations in the actual size and composition of these families, the average may be represented by a family consisting of the skipper, his wife and three children (some of whom assist in the fishing enterprise) living at home."

So that he will get the best of it. It is an account of how the skipper man lives, the owner of a forty, fifty, eighty or ninety or a hundred ton schooner, the skipper man, the planter, the small businessman. It is not the shareman we are talking about now, the hired man or the shipped men or the sharemen, the proletarian of the fisheries. These are the small capitalists. They could not gather enough information about the others. The averages obtaining are probably higher than they would be for other fishermen.

"In 1950 the income of such a family averaged about \$1,100 in cash and \$200 in kind, or a total of approximately \$1,300. This represents a decline of over \$300 from 1949, attributable to the fall in the price of fish which was off-set only to a very small extent by an increase in receipts from other sources. At least half of all families come within the income range of \$1,000 to \$1,800. Income by source for the average family in 1950

may be summarized as follows, using round figures:"

Now they are talking here about Captain Thompkins, Captain Stanford, talking about the Picketts, about the great fish-killers of Bonavista Bay. Talking about the men who carry the great Labrador fishery on their shoulders.

MR. BROWNE: He is speaking of inshore fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a matter of fact they are better off even than the Labrador fishermen. Now, let us look at the list of the income of such a family in 1950, averaging about \$1,100 in cash and \$200 in kind or a total of \$1,300. That represents a decline of \$300 since 1949.

MR. HOLLETT: Since Union.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Attributed to the fall in the price of fish which was off-set only to a very small extent by an increase in receipts from other sources. My honourable friend is always very apt, very ready, to draw attention to anything that he thinks is a slur upon Confederation. He is always equally apt and equally ready to maintain a very discreet silence on anything that is a credit to Confederation. But my honourable friend is fooling no one. My honourable friend ought to know that the people of Newfoundland have settled that matter. Their minds are closed on it and they are only irritated by that little, petulant, pettiness. They are made impatient and irritated by it and they keep rejecting the people who indulge in such pettiness, and that type of carping criticism.

## "From fishing :

Skipper .....	\$ 500	40%
Other members of family .....	200	15%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	700	55%

From other occupations	200	15%
------------------------	-----	-----

## From Government :

Family allowances .....	100	8%
Other .....	100	7%
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	200	15%

Sub-total, cash income	1,100	85%
------------------------	-------	-----

Non-cash income .....	200	15%
-----------------------	-----	-----

Total income .....	\$1,300	100%
--------------------	---------	------

Now there is your great fishery : The skipper man \$500 and other members of his family \$200, a total of \$700, and from the other occupations he has he gets \$200 bringing the total to \$900. He gets from the Government in Family Allowances and other Government sources another \$200 making the sub-total of his cash income \$1,100, of which \$200 came from the Government. Then he has a non-cash income of \$200. Non-cash income consists of home produced food and fire wood for family use. This item appears in almost 100 per cent of family budgets, and in 50-60 per cent of the cases accounts for over 10 per cent of the total family income. In more than 10 per cent of the cases it represents 25 per cent or more of the family income. Firewood is the chief item, followed in descending order of importance, by garden produce, meat, dairy and poultry products, fish and fruit.

"Government transfer payments (excluding price support) are of consid-

erable importance in many family budgets, although about 30 per cent of the families surveyed received none at all. Some 20-25 per cent of families obtained a quarter or more of their total."

So it goes on and on and on.

Then the report says :

"The foregoing statistics suggest that, for a good many families, income from fishing is insufficient to sustain even the low standard of living to which they are accustomed, that only a few of them are able to obtain supplementary income to any considerable extent from farming or from regular seasonal work in the woods and that a large number have to rely, to a considerable extent, on Government payments, home-produced food and a variety of occasional occupations to make up the deficiency.

The preceding analysis of sources of family income is of particular interest if one is concerned, as we are, with the possibility of a substantial rise in the general standard of living of fishermen. Fishing income, as we have seen, is much too small to maintain even the present low standard of living and is being supplemented from other sources. An increase in fishing income, in order to make an appreciable difference to family living, would therefore have to be very great for the majority of the fishermen. Such an increase can hardly be brought about by a rise in the price received by the fishermen for his product because the scope for price rises, whether they may be due to improved quality or market conditions, is too limited. What is required, therefore, as already suggested, is a great increase in production per man. That, in turn, requires a change in production methods."

Page 50 :

"To conclude, therefore, we may define the problem of the Newfoundland fisheries in these terms: The traditional equilibrium of the resources, the industry (including the population dependent on it or involved in it) and the market is breaking down—as a result of pressures from several directions. The objective of a development programme should be to establish a new equilibrium on the basis of a fully modernized fishing industry—on that, utilizing the resources to the greatest advantage and meeting market requirements to the fullest extent, provides the fishing population with a living conforming to the national standard."

That is not fishermen dancing around the maypole. That is not your women out yaffling fish nor in the store gutting fish and cutting fish throats. That is not children kept back from school to dry the fish on the flakes. That is not your happy medievalism brought back in the twentieth century to the fish flakes, but rather a fully modernized fishing industry, one that utilizes the resources to the best advantage, and meeting market requirements, and providing the fishing population with a living conforming to the national standard. Note those words "conforming to the national standards." It does not say "to the provincial standards." Have you noticed that is not good enough, a standard of living that will equal our provincial level is not good enough.—But "conforming to the national standard of Canada," and that is the second highest standard of living, materially, in the world, Australia being first and it is a toss-up between Canada and the United States. In sheer cash income, probably, the United States is higher than

Canada, but admittedly Canada has one of the highest standards of living in the world. Here what is called for is a fully modernized fishing industry utilizing the resources to the best advantage and meeting market requirements to the fullest extent, and by so doing provide the fishing population, the fishermen, with a living that conforms to the standard of Canada as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what this Government is trying to do. That is our objective. That is the purpose of this Bill, to which my honourable friends on the opposite side attach so much importance. All of them present at this moment have spoken on it, and were able to express their views in a matter of sixty minutes, the three of them put together. Their views were boiled down to three words. The Leader of the Opposition described the whole programme as "Nationalization of the Fisheries." His immediate follower on his left summed it up as "Socialization of the Fisheries." The intellectual member, the Tory Representative of the Intelligentsia, or the Representative of the Tory Intelligentsia, the honourable member for St. John's West—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman entitled to make these personal references? I object to it, Mr. Speaker. I think he should withdraw them.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, with reference to a party, not in reference to the honourable member concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I referred to the honourable gentleman as the representative of the Tory Intelligentsia. Is it insulting to refer to a man as representing the "Tories"? I am afraid it is, although it is not meant to be.

There is such a thing as "Toryism." My honourable friends opposite seem to be identified with Toryism. They are the representatives in this House of Toryism. Now they may be "Liberals" and some of them are personally, but they are here as representatives of the organized Tories. So the third honourable member summarized this whole fishery programme as "Industrialization of the Fisheries." When he did so, I agreed with him, and I do now. But he did not mean that as a compliment. He does not think that to industrialize the fisheries of Newfoundland is a good thing. If I understand his philosophy, he thinks that is a terrible thing, to industrialize the Fisheries. He honestly thinks, and I believe he sincerely thinks, it would be a terrible thing to do. On the contrary we think it is the thing to do, and certainly it was recommended by this committee after two years of hard work investigating the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself for a few moments to another aspect of this matter. I said I think it was yesterday, that I never would have advocated Confederation with Canada, not for a moment, if I had not believed that Union with Canada would have meant automatically that our fisheries could then be made to be prosperous. Not just that the mere fact of Confederation would mean it would follow automatically. I do not mean that. But I did think, and I did mean, and I did say, that the fact of Confederation would of itself make it possible, make it feasible, make it practical that prosperity would be brought to our fisheries and our fishermen. I did say that, and I did believe it. I never would have advocated Confederation otherwise. I went on to say, as I repeat today, that

unless Confederation means that, unless it produces that result, then it is a failure, because we never became part of Canada to live on Family Allowances. We never became part of Canada to live on Old Age Pensions nor to live on Unemployment Insurance nor to have all our people employed by the C.N.R. and get the good C.N.R. rates of pay nor to have the rest of us employed by the Canadian Government as Federal Civil Servants; we did not become a part of Canada, a Province of Canada, to become poor relatives of Canada. We certainly did not become a province to become a Canadian poor house. We became a Province of Canada because we believed, some of us, in fact, most of us Newfoundlanders believed in the end, by the time the final vote was taken, most of us believed that in union with that great nation, that great British nation, occupying more than half of the North American Continent, in union with that great nation, an up-and-coming nation, with so brilliant a future, governed by such able men; in union with such a country as that Newfoundland could not go down, but that she had to go up, had to go forward. Well that carried with it the inevitable belief that the thing that deals with half our entire population, namely, the fishery, that thing too must go forward. Newfoundland cannot go forward, cannot prosper, unless the fisheries prosper. It is just foolish, just hypocrisy, just a mockery, just wrong to say that you can have a prosperous Newfoundland without a prosperous fishery. It just cannot be done.

Now, I wonder if anyone in Ottawa would dare to stand in the House of Commons or in the Senate and say boldly that the Almighty God made a mistake when he made the waters

that lap the shores of the eastern side of Canada, including Newfoundland, to team with fish? Was that a mistake on the Almighty God's part? Would anyone in the Government of Canada or the Parliament of Canada say so publicly? Or will anyone say that this great natural resource, which is unlike coal, unlike iron, copper, lead and zinc which can get mined out and disappear, or unlike agriculture which you have to cultivate, is a mistake. You don't have to plant and cultivate codfish but just go and haul them out of the water. It is a very natural, natural resource. Is anyone going to say that great natural resource is a mistake? Is anyone going to say that ought not to be used? Is anyone in Ottawa going to fly in the face of Providence and say: a plague on your fisheries? It is only a few years ago when the Governments of the United States, Canada and Newfoundland formed a joint board to take possession, sure and certain possession, of every codtail that was produced in North America, or any other kind of fish. The Joint Food Board said to Trinidad in the Caribbean, Europe, North Africa, their democratic friends—If you want fish, all right you can have so much, so many cases of sardines, so many million pounds of salt cod, you can have so many pounds of fillets. Most of the fillets went to the United Kingdom to keep them going. That was only a few years ago, when fish was regarded as one of the great ingredients of winning the war. That was only a few years ago. When Newfoundland went into the Canadian Union we made Canada at once, overnight, the greatest single source of fish of all the nations of the world. We made Canada the world's greatest fishing country.

Now we won a great advantage when

we induced the Government of Canada to come in with us in the appointment of this committee. It was a joint effort and that was a joint committee. They were represented in its personnel as we were. We agreed unitedly on the chairman, he was to be Sir Albert Walsh, the Chief Justice of Newfoundland. Now, Sir Albert Walsh is a Federal agent being appointed Chief Justice of Newfoundland by the Governor General of Canada, acting on advice, of course, of the Prime Minister of Canada. So that he would not become Chairman of this committee except with the consent of the Government of Canada. That was the first point at which the two governments agreed. Then we agreed that there should be two representatives of the fishermen, two representatives of the fish merchants and one representative of the two governments. That was done. So that at least they went along with us that far, that there should be such a committee. They went along with us a lot further than that since then. They have agreed with the idea of taking some five or six or eight fishing settlements in Newfoundland, of different types, with varying conditions. They have agreed with us on that. They have agreed with us also that they will spend several million dollars of Federal money, as we spent several millions of provincial money, roughly half and half, to test the ideas suggested and that are recommended in the Fishery Development Committee's Report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to bring in this Bill. This Bill is not superfluous. It cannot be done without. It had to be brought in here, and it is here. It was necessary that the Government (this Government that is) should ask this House to set up in this Province such a special Authority



to handle all these matters. That is what this Bill does. It was necessary that this Bill should give that Authority its power, that it should lay down the limitations of the powers, a clear definition of its jurisdiction, this Bill does that. For that reason this Bill has to be passed or there is no fishery development programme.

Now, I said something here yesterday that I want to amplify today. It is necessary that I should amplify it today because I noticed at lunch hour that one of the radio commentators, Mr. Donald Jamieson, to be exact, dealt in his broadcast today with a point I made yesterday or the day before when I said that my knowledge of the fishermen of Newfoundland made me think that the average fishermen would settle for a better price for his fish this year. Mr. Jamieson went on to say that (by way of defending the fishermen and quite properly but a little unnecessarily perhaps) could be expected. The fishermen only lived always from hand to mouth, from day to day, month to month and year to year, and learned to expect the worst and not the best. That is true. What Mr. Jamieson said is perfectly true. That is why I said what I said. It is one of our tragedies that after four and a half centuries of being battered, battered by fish merchants, and the gentleman whom my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition called, blood-sucking commercial agents, after centuries of that it is a little futile to expect the fishermen to have an abiding faith in the likelihood of their getting justice, especially social justice. They might perhaps expect if they bring a man before a magistrate to get legal justice, but to think that they would get social justice in Newfoundland is a little bit optimistic, is it not, when

you view the history of the fisheries and the history of the fishermen of Newfoundland? So that I won't be surprised if our fishermen in Newfoundland hearing this Bill is debated for a solid month, and there is never a day passing for a month when on the radio they don't hear that the House of Assembly is at it again today debating fishery development, and the only talk in the House of Assembly now is fishery development. I would not be a bit surprised if the average fisherman is left as cold as at the beginning.

MR. HOLLETT: He is now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that he was concerned only with how much he was going to get on the price of this year's fish he is going to take out of the water. As Don Jamieson said today—That is what affects the standard of his living for the winter months coming. That will decide the question, will they have to come to the Government for a dollar-fifty or will they get enough from the price of fish to be able to live in frugal comfort and in Christian decency. (I know the source of that. My honourable and learned friend, my honourable and intellectual friend was the first to introduce me to it in 1925). But they will not be able to live in frugal comfort and Christian decency out of the price of fish as it has been in these recent years.

Mr. Speaker, I am a confederate. As long as I live, and I suppose after I am dead, that will stick to me. People will believe that somehow I believed in Confederation. I am sort of stuck with it, and because I am, I never feel like saying anything very harsh, at least not publicly, anything very harsh about the Government of Canada. I think the House will un-

derstand that, I don't think it will have much difficulty in appreciating how I feel on that matter. A lot of people would like to be able to say—Well he is beginning to learn—a lot of people would like to be able to say that. A lot of people would like to be able to say—Well, Smallwood is not as keen on Confederation now as he was. They would be very wrong—very wrong. But I will say this: That I doubt very seriously that the Government of Canada has, with regard to the fisheries of Canada, a sense of appreciation that these fisheries deserve to have—I doubt it. You have on the northeast coast today a hundred thousand people living on an industry that is a depressed industry. Tell me another industry in the length and breadth of Canada that could be in a state of chronic depression as long and as badly as our fishing industry, and receive so little national attention, attention at a national level, as the fisheries of Canada have—tell me one!

MR. HOLLET'F: Go on with that. We will back you up. Go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend is going to start backing me up I will start talking differently. I will not be backed up. I will not have it. I must be wrong. I am wrong somewhere.

MR. HIGGINS: Start all over. No, don't start all over again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders are very often, especially around here in St. John's and in Gander and Buchans and Corner Brook and Harmon Field and Argentia, and in the more prosperous places, usually very proud and tough people. My own experience is that in the fishing settlements they have not that same type of pride. They

have pride, but it is not the same type, it is not a nationalistic pride that we find in our fishing settlements. But I think all of us are a proud people. We think we have some reason to be proud. After all we are the first of Britain overseas. This is where the British Empire was planted. Here in St. John's is the oldest town in the Western Hemisphere. Oh yes, the oldest, never mind your St. Augustine nor your saint anything else—St. John's is the oldest continuously settled place for the white man in the Western Hemisphere. St. John's has been continuously settled since 1497, on June 24, 1497. From that day to this it has been continuously settled. If my honourable friend wants a debate on historical matters, let us hire a hall and do it, the CLB Armoury, and make it real poetic justice, let us have the CLB Armoury.

We Newfoundlanders are a proud people, and we thought we honoured Canada by becoming Canadians. We are willing to admit Canada was bigger than we and richer than we and probably endowed with more natural resources than we, but not better than we are—that is our feeling. Now, as surely as God is in Heaven this is what is going to happen to Newfoundland—one of these two things:

(1) We are going to be increasingly dependent on Ottawa for our living, Family Allowances and Old Age Pensions and Unemployment Insurance and the salaries and wages of the Federal Civil Servants in Newfoundland and the salaries and wages of the CNR employees and the CNT employees, the Federal Department of Public Works moneys spent on building of wharves and breakwaters and on the erection of buildings. All

these things put together, and a little handout in the way of deficiency payments on salt codfish, will loom bigger and bigger in our eyes, and we will become more and more dependent on them, and these sources of income will become proportionately greater and greater. In other words we will become a glorified poor house, or—

(2) We will become an independent province contributing more to Ottawa than we take from Ottawa so that it will be possible for the Premier of Newfoundland to do in this very chamber what the Premier of Newfoundland did last year, produce figures to show that in the first five years of Confederation the Government of Canada poured many millions of dollars into Newfoundland more than that Government took out of Newfoundland. That could be reversed. Then Newfoundland would become a great market for the manufacturers of Ontario, for the wheat growers of Saskatchewan, and Newfoundland would become a great market for the Province of Quebec.

MR. BROWNE: Is it not now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. With a hundred thousand people on the northeast coast living on a simply barbaric standard of living there is no great market there. Of course in Gander, Grand Falls, St. John's, Argentia, Harmon Field, Stephenville, Corner Brook, Deer Lake, Bell Island and in all the industrial centres yes, but not in the fishing settlements. Along the coast of Newfoundland there are miserable markets. Surely —am I so muddled in my thinking that I am wrong when I say that the only way Canada can be great, permanently and enduringly great and continually becoming greater is for

every individual province to be a "Have" province. You go ahead or you go back, you cannot stand still. Surely that is the way it is done. It is not to have half "Have" provinces and half of them "Have-not" provinces, and the half who are "Have-not" sort of living in a way of the half that have. Surely that is not the way. Why not be logical about it? Why not lop off from the Canadian nation such provinces as full-fledged provinces, make them dependencies, make them colonies, Canadian Colonies, if you like? But lop them off as full-fledged Canadian Provinces. Why not lop off Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and give us an inferior status? Why not just make us colonies for Canada? Just Canadian colonies, Canadian markets increasingly poorer and poorer as markets but that is all we would be, just markets. And if by chance there should happen to be found some raw material, some natural resource not found elsewhere in Canada, produce that and ship that up to the factories as a raw material to be manufactured into a finished product in Ontario. Now, surely it is either that or it is a case of making or helping to make these four provinces down here (I say it quite candidly; I don't give a tinker's curse for the others. My concern is here in Newfoundland. It was Newfoundland that elected me. I did not get any votes in Nova Scotia. But I see their case is the same as ours and that ours is about the same as theirs. I can see that. So that willy-nilly we have a case in common). We are four provinces down here. Here we have the fishery. It is something already here. We have got the fish. I think I said once before, if I did

not say it in this House, I said it somewhere else. I will say it again now: Our biggest bay is Placentia Bay. If all the codfish and haddock and rosefish and halibut and plaice and flounder and grey sole and scallops and herring—no leave out the herring—if all these other fish swimming around our coastline headed for some mysterious reason for Placentia Bay and all swam into Placentia Bay they would misplace the water completely. You would have, where you have now an ocean, you would have a solid jam of fish, millions upon millions of tons of fish.

Mr. Speaker, the day is shortly coming when there will not be enough beef cattle in Canada and the United States to provide North America with enough beef. And they are the great beef eaters of the world. It is not the English who are the great beef eaters but the Americans and the Canadians. The time is rapidly coming, I suggest, when there won't be enough beef. The time has already come when poultry and eggs and beef and pork are really fish marketed in the form of poultry and eggs and beef and pork. They are really fish because a beef animal won't put on weight and a cow won't produce milk and a hen won't produce eggs or meat poultry without lots of protein food. The ordinary grains they eat are not enough. Wheat, corn and barley and the other grains and other cereals are not enough, you have to enrich them greatly with protein supplement, concentrated fish.

Most assuredly we have one of the greatest natural resources of nature in our fish! And assuredly, it requires only the capital, brains and determination to turn that fish into wealth to feed people, and especially

to feed the people who produce the fish and to give them a decent living! I claim that our fishery should become as modernized as our paper mills. I hope that the same exactness, the same preciseness technologically should be applied to the production and processing of fish as has been applied to the manufacture of newsprint paper, sulphite pulp. It has to be taken out of the class of handicraft and put in the class of being a scientific industry. Now, I know I could get an awful hearty laugh from a public meeting of fishermen—and I can picture in my mind now if the honourable member for St. John's East, the legal member, should happen to go on the radio Saturday night or any Saturday night when his turn comes, I can picture in my mind what he could do if any fishermen were listening to him, if by any chance he got some fishermen to listen to him. I can imagine what he could do with his St. John's sense of humour. That is a peculiar brand of humour. It is about one-third Irish, one-third English and the other third a sort of melting pot of all sorts of nationalities. St. John's humour is a thing all by itself. I can imagine my honourable friend and what fun he could make, poking fun at all this whole idea. "Do you know what the Premier was saying? I was listening to him down in the House of Assembly. I sat there saying nothing, and I just listened. Do you know what he was saying? He said there was not enough science in the fishery." I know what my honourable friend could do. In fact I believe I could almost do it myself. I believe I could caricature myself.

Mr. Speaker, we know one thing full well. We know what we get when we have not got that science

applied to the fishery. What we get is poverty. What we get is destitution. What we get is an extremely low productivity on the part of those individual fishermen. What we get is pure slavery on the fish flakes for the women and children. What we get is generally a low standard of living, a sort of peasant existence. That is what we get. That is on the record. We have four and a half centuries to prove it. That is the result of not applying science to the fishing techniques.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest a recess of ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Before we resume I am going to make a statement. I would be grateful if honourable members present would pass it on to those who are not here: It is the duty of all members to attend the sittings of the House. When the buzzer is pressed it is a signal to come in. Honourable members should not keep those here waiting beyond the time of recess. Otherwise we shall dispense with recess.

Will the honourable member resume his speech:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like now to deal with one or two absolutely practical aspects of the Fishery Development Programme. My honourable friend, the newly elected member for St. John's West, asked a question of me, I think it was yesterday or the day before. The question was: "Where does private enterprise fit into all this?" I think he meant into all this whole programme of fishery development. Of course it is a very practical question and a very fair one, and is deserving of a straightforward answer, especially in view of the fact that two of his colleagues had described the programme in the

terms they were pleased to imply. One of them called it nationalization and the other called it socialization of the fisheries. Now, I am not going to be enticed into a discussion of socialism. I have no doubt in my mind and my honourable friend himself has none in his, I am sure, that socialism is a good thing in some ways. I think he believes in socialism for posts, if not telegraphs then certainly for posts, for mails. I don't think he would be happy to see the distribution of letters passed over to private enterprise. I think he would prefer to see it socialized. I think he would prefer to see the navy, the army and the air force socialized. But I am not going to be drawn into a discussion of socialism. But I think we can both agree on this one point: If there is anything on this earth that you should not attempt to socialize or nationalize it is the fishing industry of Newfoundland, because you could go far and not find an industry so individualized and so inherently by its very nature competitive as the fishery. I had wondered what this Russian boat was doing out on our banks. Is she owned by the state? Are the fishermen and fisherwomen who are apparently on her, employees of the state? What are they paid in wages? Do they get a share? What is the sociological and economic arrangement under which they operate? It would be interesting to know. It would be interesting to compare these arrangements with those of the Portuguese and the Spanish ships that fish side by side with them on the same banks. But whatever might be the case in Russia, I think it must be agreed that the fisheries of Newfoundland will be the last economic enterprise on the face of the globe that will be nationalized.



Now what is left? If they are not to be nationalized or socialized what is left? It seems to me that there are two things left, two possibilities: One is private enterprise, private capital and the other is co-operative enterprise. I am quite satisfied that the fisheries of Newfoundland (and I speak of them now as fisheries not manufacturing) for all time be carried on either by one or the other or by a combination of the two. Certainly insofar as this Government is concerned (and I can speak for it as it is now, as it will be as long as we are in office) what we seek is ever more and ever more and still ever more co-operative endeavour. We are now concerned, the Honourable Minister of Co-operatives and all of us in this Government, and are all convinced now that the co-operative movement should grow naturally from the ground up and not be superimposed upon people from above. We found ourselves when we took office with a Co-operative Division, we made it into a department of the Government with a Minister in charge of it. Our whole policy has been, and my honourable friend's the Minister has been announced at Co-operative conventions, our policy in that regard is for the Government to get out of it; to have the functions of the Department of Co-operatives taken over progressively more and more by the Co-operative Unions of Newfoundland. We have done quite a bit to assist the movement to be born and to grow. It is also our policy to have a truly great department of extension in the University. Indeed if I were to express my own personal feelings in the matter, it is that we ought to have a great department of extension attached to the work of the University. It should take over the sponsorship of

that great work amongst our people in Newfoundland. That movement should be a peculiarly and distinctive Newfoundland blending of the land grant colleges of the United States of which I doubt not my honourable friend is familiar—the work of the United States Department of Agriculture and county field men and county agriculture of the United States Department of Agriculture, of the various farmers and primary producer co-operative organizations across the United States, and a number of other such types of activity. We should have a peculiarly Newfoundland blending of all of these with certain Newfoundland aspects added in, and the whole of them carried on by our Extension Department in our own University. That is what we would like to see.

On the other hand our fishery is by its very nature inherently so individualistic a thing, and such rather sizable aggregates of capital are necessary, and will continue to be necessary so much and so often in so many places that it is quite inevitable that private enterprise, private capital must play a large part in fishery development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one great difference. If you consider the newsprint industry of Canada as a whole, the greatest producer of newsprint paper in the world, bear in mind that Newfoundland produces ten per cent. We produce here in Newfoundland ten per cent of all Canadian newsprint. If you look at the newsprint industry you look at an industry that has produced a great many experts, scientists with the exact and precise knowledge of the industry, scientists in the making of newsprint. If you look at the mining industry you find the scientists. It is a scientific trade, prospecting. You have your



scientists in every industry. In agriculture, for example, you have your horticulturists, and when we think of agriculture, of fruit, wheat, root crops, livestock the whole varied field of agriculture, they have tens of thousands of skilled and practical men and trained men. You will find them in all these industries. Then come back to the fisheries, and you will find there, as you do in no other industry in North America, a dearth, an almost complete absence of trained men. It is a pretty formidable fact, a frightening fact, a pretty discouraging fact. There is scarcely a fish firm in Newfoundland today of any consequence that can afford to lose one man of its trained staff. Take for instance, Mr. Si Moores. I am quite confident he has to work Sundays and nights and whole holidays when he should not have to work, because he personally has to do things which he ought to have men trained to do, but has not. The same thing applies to Mr. Arthur Monroe. The same thing applies to Mr. H. Russell. Mr. Russell has two sons who are coming on very well. You can count the trained men on the fingers of one hand. He has two sons and himself. It is tragic. I am now talking fishery development. No matter how good it is on paper, and no matter how much money you may be able and willing to put at its disposal it boils down to the actual men who will do the work. That is what it boils down to. Unfortunately this fishing industry of ours has produced what? What has it produced?

**MR. HOLLETT:** A few, quite a few fishermen.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Well, yes, it has done that, produced fishermen, tens of thousands. I suppose it has produced a couple of million if you

count them all down through its history. It has produced a lot of fishermen and a lot of women who cut throats and hauled the guts out of the fish and a lot of women, who in the words of my honourable friend and colleague the Minister of Fisheries, as I heard him describe it in this very room as a member of the National Convention—Remember so well him saying: "I saw a women spell a bag of fish guts in her hands up the side of a cliff." Is that a part of our Newfoundland culture? The answer, of course, is that it was.

Yes, our fishery produced a lot of that sort of thing. But that fishing industry has not produced scientists, has not produced scientists, has not produced skilled men. So if we apply that fact to LaScie—will somebody please tell me where we will find the men who will operate these industries in LaScie? Have we got to raid Arthur Monroe's organization? But Arthur Monroe himself is probably going to have to raid somebody else's organization to find the men to operate the new plant he will open this year. Where is Arthur Monroe going to get the men? Where is Si Moores going to get them? Where are all of them going to get the men? Where are we going to get them? What we have to have in LaScie is at least one man who can operate a freezing plant; one man who can operate a dryer, one man who can make fish meal, which is a pretty precise skill; one man who has to be experienced in marketing fish and one man experienced in catching fish. There are five men. Where are we going to get them? That is just LaScie. That is only one place. That is one of the serious difficulties with which this whole fisheries development programme has got to contend. And if

it fails in the end it will fail primarily for lack of highly trained, highly skilled personnel.

Now you could start a few shops. Sir William Coaker, for instance, had a chain of some thirty-five shops scattered down the northeast coast, branches of the Union Trading Company. He was able to pick up from amongst young fishermen with Grade X and Grade XI and without any previous commercial and certainly no industrial training but with a little training in the fishery, and set them up as managers of these stores, and they made a success of it. Some of them are today amongst our most important outport merchants, having gotten their main training as managers of the Union Trading Stores. These were just ordinary shops taking in a few yaffles of fish, and storing the fish in a back store until the company came along and took it to Port Union. But these plants that are being planned are plants to turn out a high quality product. That, I wish the House now to know, is one of the many serious problems in the way of the fishery development programme. If this programme fails it will fail not for lack of energy and enthusiasm on the part of this Government because that will not be lacking. It will not fail for lack of capital—we will find the capital. If it fails, and it won't fail because it is intrinsically wrong or intrinsically unsound. It will fail on that one ground, the lack of trained personnel. Where can you go to get such trained personnel. Now, personally, perhaps I had better not say —

MR. HOLLETT: I know what you are going to say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, exactly! Well I will say in that case (and it

can be quoted) we might have to go to Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Germany and England for these fishery technologists. I know it is not a popular thing to do, because anyone who will stand up as I am standing here this afternoon, if he is a politician, and say publicly, as I am saying that we have not got them here in Newfoundland either does not care whether he gets elected again or he is a fool. I am not a fool. No, I am not a fool. I am trying to be honest about it, trying to be candid. The Opposition may make all they like of it if they want to do so.

Another serious point in the whole matter is this: Have we got the merchants left to tackle this? Have we got them?

MR. HOLLETT: What do you want these for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have we got the merchants? Are they here? Are they in Newfoundland today of the type that will tackle a real pioneer job? Have we got them? I greatly regret that one of the most progressive, forward-looking merchants we have, Senator Pratt, is in very poor health and has been for months past. I understand he is under his doctor's orders to take it easy. It is a great loss to Newfoundland. A great loss! These merchants that are energetic and progressive and modern-minded are so few that the loss of even one is a serious matter for this Province today, and it is in this whole field of fishery development a serious matter.

Sir John Crosbie, I am told, who was once a running-mate of my honourable friend, or at least he was a running-mate of Sir John Crosbie—That was the year they ran in the west end, the "CLB" I think it was

called—Crosbie, Linegar and Browne. Capital, labour and brains. Capital that was Crosbie, Labour was Linegar and Brains was Browne. I understand that Sir John Crosbie was down on the wharf at six o'clock in the morning at the latest to see that the men were on the job. At eight o'clock he would go home to breakfast and at eight-thirty or quarter to nine he would be back on the job. How many fish merchants in St. John's today get down on their premises at five o'clock in the morning. Now-a-days it is ten o'clock and maybe a quarter to eleven and by four o'clock they are out at Bally Haly playing golf.

MR. BROWNE: How many workers get down at six o'clock and work until seven o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly! I wonder seriously how many fish merchants we have today that are really 'entrepreneurs'?

MR. BROWNE: Very good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many have we got who are entrepreneurs, doers—how many have we got? Are they pioneers or are they so wrapped up in their gold and the waffle irons and their tin beans and tin puddings, tin spaghetti and their casinos, or are they so wrapped up in the quick buck.

MR. HOLLETT: Kick-back?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope my honourable friend knows no more about the "kick-back" than I do. Are they so concerned with the fast buck and easy living that the idea of pioneering in fishery development is positively nauseating to them, turns their stomachs? Have they become so fastidious that the good, honest smell of salt codfish now turns their

stomachs and makes them sick? I would say that as far as St. John's is concerned that is about the case with very few exceptions. But when you get out in the outports and run into the Moores in Carbonear and you run into Harold Dawe in Port Union and Sam Mifflin and his sons in Catalina and Joe Squires and his sons in Bonavista and the Ashbournes in Twillingate and the Earles in Fogo and what is left of the Sticks in Little Bay Islands, and Bernard McDonald in Englee and Stan Moore in St. Anthony and there are a few more on the northeast coast. These are the bigger ones. Then you have a few scores of smaller merchants to whom to this moment the fishery means something. Perhaps as Quirpon is tested, is tried out and proven to be sound and Seldom Come By, perhaps twenty or thirty of the smaller merchants, young men with a future, most of their lives ahead of them, with their health, their strength but with not too much capital but wrapped up in the fishery, perhaps twenty or thirty such young men will come forward and launch similar enterprises with financial assistance provided by the Fishery Development Authority. Perhaps it will be so. Certainly we hope it will be. It is possible that when we as a government at a cost of millions of dollars of public money, and with the assistance of the Government of Canada, establish these initial, experimental plants along the northeast coast and these are proven to be sound, perhaps, and our hope is, the co-operatives will form themselves to take over such plants and small progressive merchants, energetic and ambitious young men, outport men used to hard work and not golf clubs, used to hard work, early and late, ambitious and energetic such as

you have not on Water Street today. There is down there today a crowd of lounge lizards, waffle iron artists. Ye Gods! Where have we come in Newfoundland. There was a time when these were the greatest merchants in the world. There was that time when little St. John's had the greatest international merchants in the whole world, right here on Water Street. They were here, they traded with the greatest, with Spain, with Portugal, with Malta, with West Africa, with all the countries of the Caribbean, with Brazil. Just one man would do all that. Yes, and I have known them to do that after the First World War. I have known a Water Street fish merchant to ship fish to Brazil where he was not allowed to be paid for it because of currency restrictions which were such that you could not get paid in dollars for the goods you sold. The Government would not allow you, if you were a Brazilian importer to pay for them in dollars. Not only that, the Government of Brazil would not allow the Brazilian importer to pay for them in their own Brazilian money. It was that fish merchant in St. John's who shipped fish in scores of thousands of quintals to Brazil. How did he do it? I will tell you how he did it. He bought the equivalent in coffee and other products of Brazil. He then exported these products to another country where the currency restrictions were almost as bad, but not quite so bad. In that other country he sold these products of Brazil. He did it through his office on Water Street. He is still on Water Street. He sold the products of the other country and got part payment in currency of that country which he was able to convert to dollars. The rest he spent in that country to buy

the products of that country and these he shipped to a third country and did the same thing. By the time the thing had gone around five or six or seven countries his fish was paid for. Today these merchants are in NAFEL, the great merchant princes of Water Street. Today they are out on the golf links and are leaving it to NAFEL to market their fish. NAFEL! Don't let me get going on NAFEL, I might become obscene in my remarks. It is enough to say that the old, pioneering fish merchants are gone. They are gone. They are not here any more. They are selling waffle irons and radios and vacuum cleaners and soon they will be selling television sets. They are ashamed of codfish. Their stomachs turn over at the smell of salt codfish. That is what our fishery has come to. It may be that the fishery development programme will fail because of the fact that the old, pioneering fish merchants are gone. I never thought I would live to see the day when I would be mourning the loss of the fish merchants, wishing that we had them. For any detestation I have for fish merchants is the detestation and utter contempt for lazy lounge lizards, social butterflies with their cocktail parties. I am tripping over them every time I am tricked into going to a cocktail party. I am tripping over Water Street merchants. Do they do anything else except play golf and go to cocktail parties and sell waffle irons? Do they do anything else besides that and sponsoring casino programmes on the radio?

The position we take is the position recommended to us by the Fishery Development Committee. My honourable friend will find on page 316 of the report:

"Doubt has been expressed above as to whether mercantile firms will undertake the risk of establishing large modern plants for production of salt fish, fillets and meal at the selected sites on the northeast coast. The responsibility is that of private enterprise and it is hoped that some of the more enterprising firms in the industry, on study of the advantages of the new locations, will be prepared to promote and undertake development. With all public facilities for the conduct of this business provided by government, it is expected that these advantages will attract private investment to avail of the opportunities for conduct of a large modern business."

Then again :

"Assistance for the creation of additional filleting plants will be available in the form of concentration of marine and other facilities at sites selected on the engineering survey as suitable for development. The advantage which such sites will provide will, it is considered, offer sufficient inducement for the establishment of plants at such sites with finances subscribed by private investors."

Then finally :

"It is hoped that, if the full amount of capital for the establishment of each of the large plants cannot be subscribed by private investors, they will be able to supply a large amount of it. It is desirable in all cases to promote co-operation between the mercantile firms on the one side and fishermen and plant workers on the other. All features of the scheme can be most successful if the efforts and interests of these firms and the community to be served are combined. The

operation of a large modern plant, producing about thirty thousand quintals of salt codfish, a million or more pounds of fillets and a large quantity of meal and oil, and the marketing of these products constitute a business undertaking of large proportions. The skill, experience and interest of those engaged in these features of the industry would, if applied to these new ventures, go a long way towards ensuring their success. Development will probably take different forms in different areas. In some areas there may be existing premises which, on the engineering survey may be found to be reasonably suited and capable of adaptation for economic operation. In other areas mercantile interests may wish to invest a large portion of the necessary capital in entirely new premises. In such cases the committee sees the possibility of promoting a development of great social importance in the operation of the industry."

These are their recommendations, and that is our attitude. That is our hope. I say that with a certain amount of misgiving as to the actual, practical, probability that private enterprise, private interests will invest the capital. Certainly I don't think they will do it until we have gone in there first. I think that is imperative and unavoidable, that we build the plants. When I say we I mean the Treasury, the Government, that we build the plants, that we operate them, that we put them to the test, that we prove whether they are sound or not. If they prove to be sound or reasonably sound under that type of management, then should private enterprise see a reasonable prospect of success in a plant so operated they will realize that there is a dollar to be made



and will come to the Government seeking the opportunity to take over those plants themselves. That is our hope. Even better it would be if soundly conceived and soundly organized co-operative fishermen or communities of fishermen would come to us and say: "Let us take over the operations of this plant." Provided they could convince us, or our agency, the Fishery Development Authority of their sincerity and of their willingness to sacrifice something and not just wanting to take a hand-out, get something for nothing. They must show a willingness to sacrifice something for that kind of community ownership, community enterprise. Then the Government would go along with such a request.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how else I can put it, I don't know what other words I can employ to convince my honourable friends opposite that so far from believing in or advocating or providing for socialization or nationalization of the fisheries we are doing precisely the contrary, precisely the opposite. We are unorthodox to the extent that we should like to see co-operative organizations of fishermen. That is as far as our unorthodoxy goes. I have had enough myself to do with co-operative societies and co-operative organizations over a sufficiently long period of time, and under a sufficiently great variety of circumstances to know this: The co-operative movement, for some reason that I have never been able to discover is extremely difficult to organize in Newfoundland, but less difficult to organize than to maintain, to keep going and to keep organized. For some reason that I have never been able to discover, and that I think my honourable friend and colleague, the Minister of Co-operatives has not

been able to discover, and he was a professional, full-time organizer of co-operatives and organized quite a number of co-operative societies in the District of Port aux Basques. I remember when Mr. J. H. Gorvin brought in the "Gorvin Report" and the "Gorvin Plan" he telephoned to me and asked if I would come down to this very building where he had his offices and discuss the "Gorvin Plan" with him. I said: "Mr. Gorvin, if you don't mind, I prefer not to do so." He said: "Well, don't be like that! Come down and talk the thing over." I told him that I did not think it would do any good, but I would go down anyway, it can't do any harm. When he outlined his plan I said: "Mr. Gorvin, I think that is a magnificent plan." "I am delighted to know that you think so." I told him that I did think so, but that I had one misgiving about it. "Who is going to do it? Who is going to carry it out? Do you think that a bunch of civil servants will do it? You find me a William F. Coaker, a K. M. Brown right in the ranks, a man who feels he has a mission from Almighty God, and no less, to organize the fishermen into co-operatives. Find me some man like that and I believe your plan has some chance. But if you think you are going to hire civil servants to superimpose the Gorvin Plan upon the outports you are making the greatest mistake of your life." I have the same feeling about the co-operative movement. Either it grows out of the very soil, springs up out of the very sea or it does not grow. I hope, however, that there will be a co-operative movement in Newfoundland. I remember the fish merchants. I think all the fish merchants of Newfoundland, when we were in office about six months, wrote



me a letter and asked if I would come and address them. So I called my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and I said: "Bill, we are going up in the world. The merchants are writing letters and asking us to come and address them. What would you say if we were to go down and address them?" He said: "Sure."

So the two of us walked down. They had brought them in from all over the island. The meeting was down in the Board of Trade Building. The Minister and I went down and made them a speech in which I said: "I understand you gentlemen are going to bed every night and tossing in your cots, sleepless and restless all night, fearing that if you go asleep you will wake up in the morning to find that this terrible government has taken your fishery business away from you and have handed them over to the co-operative movement. You expect that daily, hourly, but gentlemen, I hope the day will come when you or your sons and if not your sons then their sons, your grandsons, will be hired managers for the co-operative societies. I hope that day will come. I hope your grandsons will be sufficiently lucky to get jobs as managers and accountants and cashiers for co-operative societies of fishermen. I hope your grandsons will be that fortunate. But insofar as you, yourselves, are concerned, I frankly don't think you have too much to fear. You are not going to wake up some morning and find your businesses taken away from you by this wicked government and handed over to somebody else. Will you take my word for that?"

That was five years ago. I know they did not believe me. They thought it was some kind of fair talk to their faces, but down underneath we are ravaging wolves, and be-

hind their fair face we are ravaging wolves—"The Communists." They thought that we were red, rabid Bolsheviks. Smallwood, they felt, if the truth were known, was in the secret pay of Mr. Stalin. Then he tells us that he is not going to take our businesses from us. A plague on that story! Don't let him fool you. That has been their attitude. That was five years ago. We still have not taken them. Yet no doubt they had a couple of sleepless nights last night and the night before because, did not the Leader of the Opposition tell them that this Government at last has brought in a Bill to socialize the fisheries, and that is even worse than handing them over to the few co-operative societies. My honourable friend called it nationalization and one of his followers said it was socialization. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can make these two honourable gentlemen ashamed that they ever used those words in connection with this Bill. I hope that five years from now we can taunt them with having said that the Government, in this Bill, is trying to nationalize the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, for four hundred and fifty years, if you could take the toil of our fishermen, if you could take their sweat for four hundred years, if you could take their tears, if you could take the suffering of their wives and of their children in Newfoundland, you would have one of the saddest things since the world began. Wherever they did show a little ambition to climb up off the stage head there was someone waiting to kick them in the face, back into the water. Down through history ever since there were fishermen in Newfoundland they have been crucified. That crucifixion was not always the crucifixion of cruelty. Today I accuse the fish merchants of

Water Street not of showing cruelty to the fishermen. I would almost prefer they did that. I accuse them of showing stupidity, of showing ignorance, of showing laziness, of which the fishermen were the victims.

It is the fishery that is the victim of mercantile indifference, mercantile incompetence, mercantile stupidity and mercantile laziness. It is the fisheries that suffer. And when the fisheries suffer it is the fishermen who are the first victims. The terrible thing about it is this, Mr. Speaker (and this is so terrible that there are no words to describe it, or if you could find words you would be ashamed to do so) the terrible thing about it is that the fishery can suffer, the fishermen can starve, they can even rot in poverty, as they have done at times to the point where fishermen staggered about with beri-beri, as I have seen them with my own eyes, suffering from all the diseases of malnutrition, hunger and starvation. They can do that. The fisheries can suffer in that way and to that extent while the merchants bemoan the state of the fisheries. But never for a moment, not one moment, would they be touched in their private lives with any suffering. They never suffered when they went broke. They did not suffer even when they were declared insolvent. They did not go hungry when their incompetence, stupidity and greed had brought this great industry, which is Newfoundland—It is not the foundation of Newfoundland, it is Newfoundland: When they brought it down they did not suffer. The fishermen starved and they rotted and their children starved and rotted in ignorance and discase. Who can deny that? Who can deny it? I know it is not polite to say it, it is not nice to say it, but it is true. Yes, it happens to be true.

If I could only find the words to describe the contempt and loathing I have for the masters of the fishing industry in Newfoundland, the masters and the owners of that industry upon which to this day a hundred thousand of us Newfoundlanders depend. They get a living from that or they starve. There is nothing else for them to do while they remain Newfoundlanders. They can leave Newfoundland and go to Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and probably get jobs up there where they will be paid wages. They then cease to be Newfoundlanders, and Newfoundland comes crashing down.

There are no fishermen in Nova Scotia that are half as bad off as our Newfoundland fishermen, none. Just across the Gulf and they are not half as bad off. There are no fishermen in New Brunswick that are half as bad off as our Newfoundland fishermen. Of the ten provinces we are the poorest in Canada because our average is brought down by the fishermen. If we could raise the standard of our fishermen to the level of Gander, Grand Falls, Corner Brook, etc., then Newfoundland would be the second or third most prosperous province in Canada. The reason our standard is so low is that our fishermen are down so low that they drag down our provincial average. Why is that? Why are they so much lower than Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Quebec? Why? Is it their fault? Are they to blame for it? Are the fishermen to blame? Is it because they cannot work as well or as hard or as long as Mainland fishermen? No, that is not it. They work harder, they work longer, they work better, they are better fishermen. They have battled with the open Atlantic Ocean for centuries, while these others fish in calm waters of the Caraquet shores. My honourable

friend here and another Minister who is not here at the moment visited there three or four years ago. It is a beautiful little haven, a pastoral rural town where they go off fishing in calm, sheltered waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. They are good men. I am not running them down, but I think of the fishermen going off the bill of Cape Bonavista, the bill of Baccalieu, the bill of Cape Freels, the bill of Capt St. John, the fishermen off the coast of Labrador, the men of White Bay, the men down on the South Coast, twelve months a year, fishing all the year round—You are not going to tell me these fishermen are not as good as any other fishermen you like to mention on the face of this earth because I don't believe it. It is not that they won't work. It is not that they are lazy. It is not that they are stupid. Well, where is the blame? Must it not be the merchants. Has it not got to be their fault. If it is not the fishermen it must be the merchants, the so-called merchants, the apologies for merchants, the substitute merchants, if I could only find the right word to describe the utter loathing I have, the inexpressible contempt for these lounge lizards who control the destinies of a hundred thousand people far better than they are themselves. Far better. These fishermen and their wives and their children have more character, they have more personality. They are better men and better women, yet, they are their masters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this programme has nothing more than a fifty-fifty chance. I say that without caring, without minding because I know that the fishermen of Newfoundland are not going to judge this Government by whether this programme succeeds or fails. That is not

how we are going to be judged. We are going to be judged by the fishermen according to whether we try or don't try. They won't demand that we succeed. All they demand is that we try. Now we are going to try. That is what this programme is. It is a great effort on the part of this Government, a tremendous effort, a tremendous drive. It is going to cost many, many millions of dollars. It is going to cost, I would say, four times as much as the causeway across the Gulf of Canso. It is going to cost, I would say, ten times as much as the new ferry on the Gulf. Now, Mr. Speaker, you will begin to get the proportions of the effort. It will cost ten times as much for a great fishery development for a hundred thousand of our people as it cost to have just one new ferry they are going to provide for us. I will put it another way. It will cost twice as much as the Trans-Canada Highway across this island. Can we not afford that? Must we not afford it? It will cost a lot of money. The money we will put in. The energy we will put in. The enthusiasm we have and lots of that. Five years in office and we are not a bit tired. Five years in office and not a bit discouraged. Five years in office and a little bedraggled and a little bit spattered, maybe but I have never seen the government yet that had the ideals of this Government after five years of office. We have not? My honourable friends will find at the next election they want to contest that we have. So far as I am concerned, if the need were there (it is not there) I would go tomorrow to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor and hand in my resignation, and advise a general election, and have a completely new slate of men—if there was any necessity of it. And I would carry them.

We would win. Don't fool yourself! Don't ever kid yourself about that. We will win! We will sweep Newfoundland. And if between now and the next election any one colleague of ours should prove unworthy, I say it without hesitation—That is our strength, but it won't be malicious gossip that will do it.

MR. HOLLETT: When are you going to do it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: When there is any need. If, as and when there is any need.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the attitude of my honourable friends is handsomely demonstrated. Today, if they had their time back I think they would not have demonstrated so eloquently what their attitude is, as they did by speaking, all of them. Now the only thing I could suggest to them is this: I make them a suggestion—I have noticed that my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West has been making copious notes. Unfortunately he cannot speak in this debate again. Possibly he has been saving up these notes for another day, another occasion. I know of one honourable gentleman whose favourite practice was to take tape recordings of anything he could that was broadcast—God bless him! I am going to suggest to my honourable and learned friend that all the notes he has taken and the notes any other honourable gentlemen have taken be passed over to the honourable, the professional gentleman from St. John's East, as he has not spoken yet. And I suggest that all the notes be passed over to him and that before the debate is over and the vote is taken on this Bill, that he express the revised opinion of his party.

MR. HIGGINS: As to nationalization or socialization?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nationalism, Statism, Nationalization, all these matters. Above all I suggest that he try to show the House if that first flippant comment of his party on this great Bill represents the considered attitude of the Opposition.

MR. HIGGINS: The reconsidered?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that attitude represents the considered attitude or whether he might give the revised and brought-up-to-date edition. What they said on that date was merely a first edition and that with time to consider they now issue the definitive edition of their views, and that my honourable and learned friend from St. John's East be the medium, the publishing firm, so to speak, through whom that definite edition of the Opposition's views on fishery development be expressed in this House.

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

On motion the debate was adjourned until tomorrow.

First readings:

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty-first day of May, 1953."

On motion, Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to

Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): I move, Mr. Speaker, all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

MONDAY, May 10, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

None.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 79:

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have some comment I would like to make in connection with Question

No. 79. But in as much as the question was asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's West, I would like to defer the answer until he is here, perhaps later in the day, or I could table the answer on tomorrow.

#### Question No. 78:

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives has left the House for a few minutes to make a telephone call. Perhaps he may be back here in time, or Mr. Speaker, perhaps he could table the answer at a later hour today, that is assuming he has it.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 74.

#### Orders of the Day

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier adjourned the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, when the Province of Alberta and the Province of Saskatchewan entered the Canadian Confederation in 1905, they being the last provinces of Canada to enter into Confederation, before Newfoundland, they brought with them into the Canadian Union, into the Confederation, distinctive and great problems of an economic nature. Of course, the one great problem they brought with them into the family of Canadian Provinces was the problem of the prairie farmers, or perhaps I should say the whole gambit. The whole wide range of problems associated with the distinctive type of farming known as prairie farming. Sir, it is inconceivable that confed-

eration could ever be a success for those two provinces if that great problem of prairie farming were not solved, if their entry into union did not mean also, almost automatically a solution of that problem or of those problems. If that were not so then their entry was bound to be a failure. This fact was well recognized by the people of those two great areas of British North America, and it was equally well recognized by the Government and the Parliament of Canada. What do we in fact find? Do we find that problem ignored by the Parliament of Canada? No. Do we find the people of Alberta and Saskatchewan demanding further references to that problem. The answer in both cases is, No. Indeed one of the greatest pieces of legislation in the history of Canada is the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act. That was really one of the greatest Acts of the Parliament of Canada. The passing of that Act has meant since then that the Parliament of Canada has voted dozens and scores of millions of dollars of public funds to assist prairie farmers to overcome their problems, and to make prairie farming sound, and to make prairie farms prosperous. They got their reward. The reward they got was the solution of the great, basic problem which they took with them into Confederation when they entered the family. Sir, even before that a similar problem obtained in British Columbia, on the British Pacific coast of North America. That colony was no more a part of Canada before Confederation or immediately after Confederation than she was part of the United States. Indeed within that British Colony there were two sentiments, one highly favourable to the idea of remaining British and the other almost equally favourable to the

idea of becoming American. As a matter of fact the population was by birth partly American. The Americans naturally advocating that British Columbia become part of the United States, and the British advocating that they should remain British, and join up with Canada. Now they not only brought a problem with them into Confederation, but they brought with them a problem which had to be solved. There was no if, and, or but, about it. They made it a straight condition of their entry into union. That problem was the problem of sheer physical contact with the rest of Canada, sheer physical contact because needless to say the Rocky Mountains lay between them and the rest of Canada. The only way then known to get to British Columbia was to go around the Atlantic Coast of North America and down to the southern tip of South America and up the Pacific Coast of South America and so along the Pacific Coast of North America, until of course, the Panama Canal was constructed, whereupon they could sail to the British Colony of British Columbia by that means. Indeed we know that Captain Vancouver, after whom the City of Vancouver is named, sailed from St. John's here to the port that now bears his name.

What British Columbia needed was a railway that would join them physically with the iron band to the rest of Canada. It was agreed that Canada as Canada would lay down that railway, right across the Prairies of North America and then across the Rockies; and that they would do it within—I speak from memory—within ten years of British Columbia's entry into Confederation. They did it in ten years and less. In doing it they accomplished one of the greatest en-



gineering feats of the human race since the dawn of history.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland upon entry into the Canadian Union brought her problem with her into that union, and that her problem ceased thereupon to be distinctively, or at least to be solely her problem. It remained and remains a distinctive and peculiar problem but ceased to be solely her problem and became a Canadian Problem, a problem of Canada as a whole. I suggest to this House and to the people of Newfoundland, and to the people of our nation at large right to the Pacific Coast, where I expect to be myself in a few days from now, I suggest that the problem of the Newfoundland fishery is a problem common to all the nation. I suggest that the solution to that problem should follow as automatically from union as the solution of the prairie farmers followed automatically the entry of those two prairie provinces into Confederation, and as automatically as the building of the great Trans-Continental Railway followed the entry of British Columbia.

I was most interested to note recently that Mr. Pickersgill addressing a body somewhere on the continent of Canada, and that more recently when he addressed another body, and all the way out to British Columbia he made addresses and that in each of these addresses, as an honest man, as an honest Canadian, as a man with a very well developed sense of history and a knowledge of history, said that it was at least as important to Canada that Newfoundland became part of Canada as it was to Newfoundland that she should become part of Canada. He said that the old Canada, the Canada of the nine provinces

stood to gain as much from that union as did Newfoundland herself. Now let us make due allowance that our Newfoundland representative, moved by a sense of decency and by a sense of gratitude to Newfoundland for the honour Newfoundland has done him in electing him, a stranger, a visitor, to represent a Newfoundland Riding, let us make all due allowance for Mr. Pickersgill's desire to be decent and grateful in the matter. Nevertheless I think it remains true that Canada as such gains enormously. Mr. Speaker, does this House realize that our Newfoundland case of six years ago was quite unique in the modern history of the world. It was a case of secret ballot, voted, admittedly by no great margin, but nevertheless voted by a majority in a secret ballot to merge their interests and their future with those of another people, they too being British, admittedly, but nevertheless another country. There have not been many cases in the last century of the people of one part of the world voting by secret ballot to join up with another nation. And when the people of Newfoundland by a majority, voted to become Canadians they undoubtedly paid Canada a very great compliment. They did more than that. They made Canada a nation. They completed one of the greatest dreams of mankind; the dream of the original fathers of confederation, a great dream, that all of the British North Americas should be one nation, one great British Nation, a great dream which at one time seemed impossible of achievement. We Newfoundlanders made that dream come true. It would not have come true without us. We made it come true. We realized that dream of the early fathers of confederation. We added

to the dignity of Canada. We added to the importance of Canada in the world sense. Undoubtedly the United States came at once to have more respect for Canada because the people of Newfoundland, by secret ballot, voted to become Canadians.

Now, all these facts and many others I could cite, could argue very eloquently for Canada taking a real interest in this problem, in the solving of this problem that we brought with us into Confederation. Mr. Speaker, if there is a hundred and fifty thousand of our people, men, women, and children, or two hundred thousand of our people, who depend principally and primarily upon the fisheries it might be argued that the sheer disappearance of our fisheries that now give a living, such as it is, to that number of people would not be a fatal or conclusive thing to happen. It may be argued—if the fisheries disappear, so what? Some may argue that way. Yes, if those people lived in one harbour, one town or even in one bay of our many bays, the complete and absolute disappearance of the fisheries we might survive. But these people do not live in one harbour, one town, one bay. They live in seven or eight hundred settlements two and three and eight miles apart, stretching along a coastline of six thousand miles. While it is true undoubtedly and undeniably that a considerable number of them still can get jobs in the bush, in the lumber woods when the trap fishery is over, and not waiting for a fall fishery, they go off and get jobs in the lumber woods. While that is true the fact is that the number of fishermen who can go and get jobs in the woods is becoming steadily smaller because woods work itself is becoming rapidly so specialized a

type of work, conducted during a season of the year when fishing is actively proceeding, and to a large extent logging has become increasingly a class to itself and loggers are not fishermen any more. It is true that a certain number of fishermen can still get jobs on Bell Island in and around the mines and at Buchans in and around the mines. But that number is decreasing steadily as you find both companies insisting, as far as they can enforce their wish, they want to have men who do not come in for a few months' work but who work all the year around, professional miners and mine workers and not part-time miners and part-time fishermen. So you get down to this: A fisherman, living in a fishing settlement where nothing exists except the fishery has this choice before him (1) to continue fishing and (2) to get a job at Goose Airport, at Stephenville, at Seven Islands, at Harmon Field, at Argentia, at some housing project in the City here or (3) of pulling up stakes altogether and going off to live in another part of the nation. Now while defence works are carried on to any considerable extent, while economic windfalls came to us every now and then, some special but non-recurring form of employment that props up every now and then, a certain number of fishermen will continue to leave the fishing settlements and take these jobs while these jobs last. As soon as the jobs cease they will go back automatically and instinctively to their little fishing settlements. As these jobs disappear altogether you will find these men back in their little settlements, thinking again of going fishing because there is nothing else for them to do. Although they may starve at the fishery there is nothing else for them

to do. Although they may get virtually little or nothing out of the fishery, little as it is, it is more than they can get anywhere else. So that the sharp bite of hunger forces them back into the fishing boats.

I say that this fish problem has got to be solved: Now in the course of my lifetime, my adult lifetime, Sir William Coaker was the first man in our Newfoundland history to see our fishery as a whole, and not just piecemeal. He was the first man to have a really wide knowledge of the fishery. He had a practical knowledge of it. He could call ten thousand fishermen by their first names. During all those years the problem of the Newfoundland fisheries was something that was entirely different from the problem as it exists today. Sir William Coaker (before he was Sir William Coaker and was William H. Coaker) travelled over to Spain and to Portugal (and they cracked jokes about him as they do about me now and my gallivanting around the world) and gallivanted around the world to Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, Brazil in South America, and to every country of the Caribbean and certainly to some if not all the countries of Central America, and to South America. He was the first man, incredible as it may sound, and I am talking, not about the day before yesterday, but I am talking now about that period at the end of the first world war, when he was the first man in the fishing industry, the fishing trade of Newfoundland actually to go personally to every fish market.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was the first man in our history! Individual

merchants went to individual markets before him. But he was the first man in the fishing trade, the fishing industry of Newfoundland to go personally to all the markets. He was the first man, and I would say probably to this moment he was the only man in the fishing industry to go to all the fish markets.

In those days the great central problem of the fishery was the problem of consignment selling. You had a broker. You could take your choice from a number of brokers in all these countries. In these fish market countries half of the population seemed to be fish brokers. If you were a fish exporter you took your choice of fish brokers amongst them, and shipped off a cargo of fish consigned to a broker in the hope that there would not be too many other cargoes arriving there at the same time, and that yours would arrive when there was not too much there, and that your broker somehow would have managed to sell your cargo of fish for you. You shipped it on consignment to a broker while hoping all that. The problem was if your cargo of fish arrived there and found six or seven other vessels from Newfoundland with an equal amount each of them all on consignment and unsold, lying in a relatively hot country, unsold. There is your broker trying to sell your fish for you while other brokers are trying to sell fish for other vessels, fish for the other vessels in the same market. The sale is made, starting off originally for 60 shillings and finally for 45 shillings. Then when it was accepted it was subject to inspection and they inspect it and find all kinds of things wrong and claims begin to be made against even that price. That was a terrible problem in connection with our fisheries from 1918

to 1930. For fifteen years all of us who were concerned with the problems of the fishery were concerned with that aspect. That is not our problem today.

Our problem today is fish. It is types of fishing, classes of fishing. I won't go over the ground I have already covered, I think, in sufficient detail during my remarks on this Bill, but the fact that there has been two world wars, the fact that there is a germ of discontent that has gotten into our people, inevitably, understandingly, and inescapably, which makes them dissatisfied and completely unwilling to live in the way they and their families once were willing to live in the homespun clothing with the canvas jackets, and before that the moleskins, on the most meagre kind of food. After all, Mr. Speaker, you need only go back a hundred years to find they had a cup of tea around Christmas and for the rest of the time drank a mixture of spruce beer and a bit of rum to spice it up. When finally they began to drink tea they could only sweeten it with molasses. I remember vividly one of the great social reforms in our Newfoundland history was when Sir Edward Morris cut the duty on sugar and allowed the poor fishermen to take sugar instead of molasses in his tea. There are people to this day that prefer molasses to sugar. It is a sociological problem as well as being an economic problem. In the language of my honourable colleague the Minister of Welfare: "It is a problem of people and their likes and dislikes."

My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, and I were talking the other night about this whole problem of the fishery. He said, "You know Mr. Premier, there is one point you

left out so far. Have you ever stopped to think, if the young girls in their teens in a fishing settlement left that settlement and go off to St. John's or Corner Brook or to Toronto to live, that the young men of the settlement will follow them."

MR. HOLLETT: Naturally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And that if you have a settlement that has lost its young men and young women and consists entirely or almost of middle aged and older people, what future has the fishery got in such a settlement. No matter how modern you may make that fishery, no matter how attractive you may make it for the people to live in such a settlement what chance has the fishery there? I say the problem is largely a problem of people, of human beings, their likes and dislikes in 1954. What they are prepared to do now compared with what they were prepared to do thirty years ago, the standard of living they demand to have now is not the standard of living that seemed somehow to leave them fairly contented, fairly happy, thirty years ago. I would venture to say that down in White Bay, where my honourable friend is the member, the average man who works for Bowaters today with a bucksaw lives at least twice as well as the owner of a sixty or seventy ton Labrador Schooner did ten years ago.

MR. S. DROVER: More so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Probably twice as well. And yet, Mr. Speaker, almost half of our population depends on that same industry. There is no health in us if we don't solve this problem. There is no future for Newfoundland if we do not solve that problem. We have got to do it. We have no choice but to solve it.

We must solve it, and solve it we will.

Now ideally here is how it could be done. I am going to give you an idealistic picture. It is tragic that I should have to call it idealistic because in a country such as the United States it would not be called idealistic nor in most of the Provinces of Canada, but it would be called straight ordinary, common-placed, hum-drum, matter of fact procedure. But I have to call it idealistic. This is how the fishery problem could be solved in Newfoundland. It could be solved by the entrepreneurs. (I know German better than I know French).

MR. HOLLETT: You should.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do. I can pronounce German pretty well. But the entrepreneurs, the enterprisers, the merchants, as we usually call them in Newfoundland, the capitalists as they call them in other parts of the world. It is not the Government in the United States not in any state of the United States, or in most of the States of the United States, that starts industries. It is private enterprise that does such things. It should be private enterprise or co-operative enterprise but certainly not the government. There was a time in Newfoundland when it was so. But the enterprise has gone out of private enterprise. All that is left now is the "private" but the "enterprise" has vanished. I spoke the other day of Sir John Crosbie. I might have spoken of Sir William Coaker whom I have seen, title and all, knighthood and all, down on the wharf at five o'clock in the morning, the busiest man on the wharf. There was some devil or something divine, something in him that was driving him. So it was with most of our merchants. They had

drive and gumption, those merchants. But they have not got it today. Perhaps it is not reasonable to expect it. I don't know, I don't know. But they have not got it. But where does that leave us? That leaves us in a most precarious condition, industry looking for leaders, profits in search of profit makers, and profits in search of profit takers, enterprise in search of enterprisers, business in search of businessmen. Mr. Speaker, the killing part of this business is the contrast between what is and what might be. The fisheries of Newfoundland could be developed as to outrank mining and forestry as sources of wealth for our people. The fisheries could be organized in such a way as to give our people a better living than the paper industry is giving them today. Now my honourable friend from White Bay will find that a little difficult to believe. My honourable friend from Green Bay, with a lot of loggers in his district, will find that a little difficult to believe, but I have seen it. I have seen it. I was out in British Columbia once in my life. On a Sunday morning in Victoria, one of the most beautiful cities of the whole world—after I had breakfast that Sunday morning instead of going to Church which I should have done, I said to the waiter: "Are there any fishermen in Victoria?" He said, "Yes." I asked him if there were many. He said he did not know the number, but there were thousands. I asked then where they hung out, where they put their boats, where they fished from. He told me they had a fishermen's wharf. That sounded interesting. So I got a taxi driver to take me to the fishermen's wharf. We went over around the other side of the harbour, just a few gunshots from the Parliament Building, the



Provincial Parliament Building and here was this superb wharf built by the Federal Government. It was superb. But I saw no fishing boats there. There were hundreds of boats, yachts, I was wondering what the yachts were doing at the fishermen's wharf. So I walked down on the wharf. It was like a breakwater, running hundreds of feet long and running out from it at right angles into the water were what we would call wharves, and on both sides of every one of them dozens of yachts were tied on, yachts two and three on each side and at every wharf, dozens and dozens of them with their hulls shining, mostly the spars built of mahogany. But that was not what I had come to see. I had come to see the fishing boats. I went down on one of the wharves where I saw a young man sitting in the deck house of one of these yachts. There was a deck house about two-thirds of the way forward. The door was open, and I stood there and looked in through the door of the deck house. He was sitting in his shirt sleeves, a nylon shirt, spotlessly white, wearing a beautiful suit of clothes, and with his coat off and hanging on the back of a chair. He was reading the Sunday Paper. I skuffed my feet to attract his attention. He looked up and said, "Good morning!" I told him I had come over to see the fishermen's wharf. He said, "This is it, you are on it now." I told him then that the reason I had come was that I was hoping to see the fishermen's boats. "Well," he said, "haven't you seen them? They are all around you."

"Where?"

"This one here is a fishing boat."

"That is a fishing boat?"

"Yes."

"Excuse me, you are reading your paper, but I am a visitor here. I am a Canadian but from a long way off in the eastern part of Canada. I wonder if you would not mind giving me a little information?"

"Certainly."

He put away the newspaper and I went aboard. In that beautiful cabin here is the story I heard:

Every one of these boats was a fishing boat. He was a fisherman. He looked like the manager of a bank or a factory. His income for the previous year was \$4,800 net. He had fished five hundred miles away, down the Pacific Coast from Victoria. All these boats there, hundreds of them, fished anywhere from fifty miles to eight hundred miles up and down the coast. Talk about going down from Trinity Bay to the Coast of Labrador, they went well beyond that, hundreds of miles.

I went down the next day, on Monday, because there was not much doing around on Sunday, and it seemed to me this one chap might be telling a bit of a tall story. So I went back to see them get ready to go to work. Smart looking, intelligent looking, pretty well all, I would say, educated. I got talking to one and he told me he belonged to Ontario. He had come out here just after the war and had a few dollars, put up at a hotel and looked around to see what he was to go at. He decided that fishing out of different trades and occupations would give him more independence. So he invested his money in a boat and engine, and this was the boat. He told me he had not told his mother and father at home in Ontario that he was a fisherman. If



he should let them know and their friends asked them what he was doing they would be ashamed to say he was a fisherman. He was making \$4,800 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced of this: Mr. Si Moores was in my office this morning and we talked for an hour about our Newfoundland fisheries. I have talked for many hours with Mr. Arthur Monroe on our Newfoundland fisheries, and I have talked for many hours with Mr. Ches. Crosbie on our Newfoundland fisheries. I have talked for many hours with Mr. Hazen Russell on our Newfoundland fisheries. I have talked with Mr. Spencer Lake on our Newfoundland fisheries, and I am not alone in my belief that our fisheries can be developed to give a magnificent living to people who engage in it. It can be done. It can be done and it must be done. Because if it is not done Newfoundland must go down, she must, she has to go down, and she will drag others with her. I mean the fishermen in going down will drag others with them. I will sternly resist all temptation to comment on the events of the past few days in connection with the price of fish, except to say that I would a thousand times prefer to be tackling the basic part of the problem, the fundamental side of it, to dealing with the hardy annual—the price of fish, the hardy annual. Except for the last two years of this late war you had the same old, hardy annual, but the last couple of years and two before that, four years, the last two of the war and the first two of the peace, four years, and three in the first world war, seven years, except for these seven years, as long back as I can remember, we have had this hardy annual amongst us.

MR. HOLLETT: It is now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As far back as I can remember.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what we want to hear about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend may be sixty-three but he evidently has not learned what I have learned, he has not learned that you can spend the rest of your natural life dealing with the price of fish, the hardy annual, and after you are dead and you are replaced by somebody else, his strength can be used up for perhaps half of his lifetime dealing with the hardy annual. When he also is gone and buried and another strong, hardy man comes in his heart can break dealing with the same hardy annual, the price of fish. For me in my lifetime, it is too short, I have too many things to do for Newfoundland to use up my strength dealing with the hardy annual, the price of fish. We will not see the fishermen stuck, no, never. THIS GOVERNMENT, WHILE THERE IS A DOLLAR WE CAN LAY OUR HANDS ON, WILL SEE THE FISHERMEN ARE NOT STUCK. Every one knows that. We will never see them stuck. But we won't waste five minutes discussing the price of fish. But it will take the time and all the cash and all the strength and all the energy that we can find to tackle this basic problem, to change the very nature of this industry.

"Of life could you and I with Him  
conspire

To grasp this sorry scheme of things  
entire

Would we not shatter it to bits

And model it nearer to the heart's  
desire."

That is what we are doing. We are going to make this fishery go or something is going to pop.

MR. HOLLETT: You said that five years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, my honourable friend. I know no more about the fishery then than my honourable friend knows now.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the benefit of the House may I say that this is not an election speech.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought it was. Is it not? I know it must be a tremendous relief.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It must be a tremendous relief for him to know he has not to go back at once and face St. John's West.

MR. HOLLETT: If I might be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to ask the honourable member if he is speaking to the principle of this Bill. In some ways I hate to interrupt any man talking about the fisheries. But I like to come back occasionally.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman would listen closely and not let his mind wander to elections and facing his constituents in St. John's West, in the next few weeks, he will notice I am speaking and sticking extremely close, from the day I first opened my mouth on this Bill to this moment, I am sticking very close to the principle on which my honourable friend expressed himself in a space of twenty minutes.

MR. HOLLETT: An hour and a half. Be honest.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What my honourable friend did was scandalous in the extreme. I never thought I would see the day that the Leader of the Op-

position in this Province—I would not mind it in Ontario, but I cannot understand the Leader of the Opposition in this Province getting up and dismissing in a few lack-a-daisical sentences the greatest Bill ever brought into this House in Newfoundland in connection with the fisheries in Newfoundland as he dismissed it in a few sentences.

MR. HOLLETT: You won't solve the problem with hot air.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is outrageous. My honourable friend, so I hear, in his conversation with radio stations has been smarting from the fact, even since he has realized what a horrible blunder he has committed. We won't let him forget it either.

The principle of the Bill is that the fisheries of Newfoundland shall be revolutionized. The principle of the Bill is that machinery shall be set up to do it. But I have to tell what the machinery is that is to be set up to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: MIAG?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is such a heavyweight, such a deep thinker, so profound. He must be bitterly disappointed from what he must by now have heard about MIAG. He must be horribly disappointed by now, and he will be far more disappointed as time goes on, and he finds he has been dealing with an honest man. He will be a lot more disappointed yet, I can assure him.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope so, for your sake.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not for my sake, but for Newfoundland's sake. Mr. Speaker, if I had the strength to

speaking for the next two weeks on the principle of this Bill I still would not have exhausted the subject and could not exhaust it because there was not a man, starting with Mr. Alderdice, Mr. Monroe, Sir Richard Squires, Lord Morris, Bond, come right around the top row of portraits, John Buckley, Garland, every one of them has talked fish in this House more than they have talked any other topic. Why? Because fish is our life. Fish is what made Newfoundland tick. Fish is what brought people here in the first place. Fish is what made them settle here. Fish is what kept them here. Fish has been the basis of our economy. You cannot talk too much about fish. You can act too little but you cannot talk too much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had some maps prepared, and they tell an astonishing story of stupidity, of insufficiency, and indeed you might put a stronger word on it and call it mercantile insanity. It is a map of Newfoundland; and honourable gentlemen will see that it has lines drawn in many colours radiating from certain points, St. John's, Bonavista, etc., and going into other settlements. It is a network, a maze, a labyrinth of lines of different colours reaching from a limited number of places but going out into many places. Now these lines represent the fish collections of the merchants. Here is what I get: Here is the key to the design here. Each of these here is a fish firm and the lines show where each firm gets its fish on the northeast coast and on the southern shore, Trepassey, St. Mary's Bay, Placentia Bay and Fortune Bay. Now the only one that seems to have any sense to it all is Fortune Bay. That is the Grand Bank fisheries, reaching out to all these places. There is not

another firm collecting there. There is no overlapping whatsoever.

MR. HOLLETT: Salt fish?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. And there is simply no overlapping here. But in all the other cases the criss-cross and the overlapping is something fantastic. It would almost put you in the horrors to look at it. You would think that it was a man in the horrors that designed it or a man in an insane asylum. It is the most inefficient system of collecting fish from the fishermen and transportation to a store where it is to be packed and sorted that you could conceive. If you went into the hospital for the mental and nervous diseases and asked an unfortunate patient to design a system this is the sort of thing you would get.

Now we have had another one prepared, dividing the island into sections showing the volume of the fish produced within each of the sections. Just to give the House an idea: from Port aux Basques north to take in St. George's Bay and Port au Port Bay there are only fourteen hundred quintals (that is in 1953). Then from Port au Port half way down the St. Barbe coast and including all of Bay of Islands and all of Bonne Bay and down to Bellburns, half way down the St. Barbe Coast, three thousand quintals. From Bellburns north to the Straits of Belle Isle, taking in the Labrador side of the Straits of Bell Isle, roughly twenty-four thousand quintals. Then take the tip of the peninsula from Boat Harbour around to Hare Bay, a total of twenty-six thousand quintals. Then coming south, a part of White Bay, twenty-one thousand quintals and another part of White Bay forty thousand quintals, so that White Bay has sixty

thousand quintals, Green Bay seventy eight thousand quintals. Twillingate thirty-nine thousand and then Fogo, or the shore part of Fogo District, eighty-six thousand quintals. That is what my honourable friend calls the Home of Cod.

Then Bonavista North, the district, I have the honour to represent, twenty-five thousand quintals, Bonavista South thirty-nine thousand quintals. That is sixty four thousand quintals. That includes the Town of Bonavista, the Trinity North thirty-four thousand quintals. Here is an area which includes some Labrador fish. The South Side of Trinity Bay and all of Conception Bay from Conception Harbour North, that whole area, eighty-five thousand quintals. That includes the fish that is being brought into that area to Bay Roberts etc., from Labrador; then the Southern Shore and the St. John's Shore and St. Mary's Bay, ninety thousand quintals. That leads the whole of Newfoundland and second is Fogo with eighty-six thousand quintals.

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): That does not include what is sold fresh, does it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is part of the district of my honourable friend from Ferryland and part of the district of the Honourable Minister of Finance and part of St. John's District.

Placentia East, leaving out St. Mary's Bay, twenty-seven thousand quintals, Placentia West, the district of my honourable friend again, forty-six thousand quintals, away up high on the list. Then there is Burin District with twenty-one thousand and Fortune Bay and Hermitage Bay and Bay D'Espoir seventy thousand, and much more surprisingly the whole

district of Burgeo-LaPoile four thousand quintals. The reason, obviously being so much is packed fish and not salted fish. If you were to add the fresh and frozen fish to these figures it would bring the total very much higher indeed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a map which shows in the first place the quantity of salt fish in each of these sections. Then in the same section it shows the quantity of fish packed. That is a fascinating picture just listen to this: In an area where twenty-one thousand quintals of fish were produced, packed were sixty-seven thousand quintals. Now all the people actually got in that area was the actual fishing. They produced twenty-one thousand quintals but only sixty-seven hundred of them were packed in that area. Now the next one, again in White Bay, forty thousand quintals produced and packed ten thousand quintals out of that forty thousand. In Green Bay the same amount is produced as packed. In Twillingate District thirty-nine thousand produced and thirty thousand packed. The reason for that being, of course, that the well-known firm of Ashbourne and other firms in and around that area are well-known packers and exporters as well. Then in the District of Fogo sixty three thousand quintals produced and packed twelve thousand quintals. Now what happened to the rest of it? What happened to the rest is that collectors in St. John's sent vessels down and picked up some and brought it into St. John's and collectors in Carbonear sent vessels down and picked up some and brought it into St. John's and collectors in Carbonear sent vessels down and picked up a part for Carbonear and packed it in Carbonear as

did also collectors in Catalina and Port Union, and collectors in Bonavista. So that you have this criss-cross of schooners beating their way down to Fogo District and all these others. So that you can go right around the map and get the same results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one and it is only one of many factors operating in the salt fish industry and in the salt fish trade as it operates now at the present time and has operated for many years past. It is operating now to make the fishery nonproductive for the fishermen who engage in it. I noticed that Mr. Lane, the Secretary-General of the Fishermen's Federation, issued a statement within the last day or so, following the release on the question of fish prices. He made what to me was a most striking statement when he appealed to the trade unions and others involved not to drive up too high the cost of packing fish. I don't know if Mr. Lane realized what an utterly pathetic appeal that was. I don't know if he realized how sad it was to hear the representative of the primary producers, the men who go out and produce the fish in the first instance, the men who take it out of the water, for those men to hear through their representative an appeal to the longshoremen, the plant workers, the cullers, the people who make the fish, people who handle the fish, wage workers, those who worked for a fixed hourly rate or fixed daily or fixed monthly rate, the primary producers, the gatherers of the wealth in the first instance appealing to the people who work at it afterwards not to drive the price too high. That is one of the saddest things I have ever heard. Yet it is only one of a dozen factors that enter into the picture, all of them bad, all of them combining to keep the

standard of living of the fishermen and their families down low, all of them combining to produce that one effect, all of them operating down through the decades and some of them down through the centuries, always having the same effect that the last man who can make a living out of the fishery is the fisherman. He is the very last man and not the first.

The shops in Jamaica, in Kingston, these little shops we saw when driving around the highway out through the farm sections of Jamaica, the little shops on the side of the road, the shops that sell the cod fish to the coloured people, they can make a living. The larger shippers and merchants who wholesale the fish to these little shops, they can make a living out of the cod, and make a very good living in fact. The importers who bring the fish into Jamaica (and when I speak of Jamaica it might as well be Puerto Rico or any other market) the importers who buy and bring in the codfish can make a living out of the codfish. The men on the very boats that transport the fish to the market from the producing countries make a living. The men who barrel it and handle it and pack it in drums or boxes or other containers make a living. The merchants who packed it and shipped it off make a living. The local merchants who receive it in from the fishermen, nine times out of ten will make a living. There you stop. Right there you stop. You have come back now to the primary producers. You cannot go back any further. You are right back to the fisherman, and there you stop. There is no living in it for him. He is only the man that produces the fish. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that I ask for a recess of ten minutes, in view of the

fact that we have only one stenographer.

MR. SPEAKER: There will be a recess for ten minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the machinery that is being set up under this Bill is machinery designed to carry out the purposes and recommendations of the Fishery Development Committee as contained in the report to the two governments. Honourable Members who have the report before them will find on page 263 a very fine summary of the purposes of the report and of the recommendations, especially commencing on page 268 under the sub-heading "Area Development." Up to now in these remarks of the past few days I have concentrated most of my attention on the northeast coast. I would not have it thought from that, and I doubt if anyone would think from that fact, that I attach more importance to it than I do to the other two coasts, the northwest coast and the southeast coast. But the northeast coast because of the fact that it is there that the great bulk of the salt cod fishery is. If you can take the northeast coast as meaning from Cape Race say to Cape Bauld or Cape Norman, the east and northeast coast. Formerly in Newfoundland we divided our coast into northeast, southeast, west and southwest coast. We still subdivide it as the northeast, southwest, and west coast and the north west coast, but generally, I think we divide it into three sides of a triangle. Well, here in this report they deal with this very matter. Under Area Development (a) General: "The establishment of filleting plants strategically placed for diversified production and year-round operation at large centres of production along the south coast from St.

John's to Isle aux Morte near Port aux Basques has gone a long way towards modernization of the fishing industry on that coast. These plants form the bases from which long-liners and other large craft using modern fishing techniques can operate. They also provide a market for a large number of trap, trawl-line and hand-line fishermen operating near their locations. In addition a few firms operate as purchasers from the knife for pickling and salt-bulk production.

"Plant development along that coast should take the form of extension of existing facilities for more diversified production. It appears desirable that these plants have space and facilities sufficient, under normal conditions, to take in all fish offered by the fishermen and place under salt suitable fish surplus to filleting requirements. Small fish and species not suitable for filleting or salting, together with fish offal can be utilized for production of meal, oil and solubles. Extensions to existing plants would provide for the necessary space for holding and storing the estimated salt fish production, for one or more mechanical driers, for refrigerated holding rooms and for the plant to reduce meal, oils and solubles. All features of these operations should be mechanized. Until it is demonstrated that light salted fish can be produced satisfactorily by mechanical drying at all stages, it will be necessary for plants to have outdoor flakes for partial drying by sun and wind.

"The erection of additional filleting plants in this area is in contemplation. Some of the existing plants, while conveniently located for procurement of supplies of raw material, have not been placed in locations suitable for requirements of plant labour or for



development of a community having proper services and amenities. Selection of sites for development after a thorough survey will be discussed later."

"The erection of further additional plants on the south coast will in due course accompany or follow upon market expansion. The aim in all such cases should be full utilization of all products available. This will give the maximum benefit to the fishermen and plant workers and should at the same time result in economies in operation and higher returns on investment.

"At small places along the south coast which cannot be served by these large plants and where fishing will for many years be carried on in the traditional way, or where a few larger craft may operate, development may take the form of minor centralization and improvement of shore facilities dealt with hereafter for similar settlements on the northeast coast where the real problem of the Newfoundland fisheries exists."

I ask the House to take note of the last part of that sentence which gives the opinion of the Fisheries Development Committee after nearly two years of extensive examination of the whole of the Newfoundland fisheries problems on all our coasts. They say, in reference to the northeast coast: "Where the real problem of the Newfoundland fisheries exists." Now that is all they say about the southwest coast, and in this part of the report, and properly so, for a very good reason. When you stop to figure it out you have got at Fermeuse a fine modern plant and you have at Trepassey an even more modern one. You have one at Burin which I think is the largest in Newfoundland, one at For-

tune which has just come into production, and a large one under construction at Grand Bank; one at Gaultois and then further up the coast you have two or three, at Ramea, Burgeo and Burnt Island and Isle aux Morts. That is ten plants or eleven plants, fresh frozen fish plants on the south coast, beginning at Fermeuse (if you can say that is the south coast). Now these plants are all south of that line I mentioned, drawn east to west from say, St. John's across to Point Riche or somewhere in Bay St. George. They are all south of that line where you have all-weather seaports, where boats come in and out any day of the year. I am not revealing any secrets when I say negotiations are going on (I see members looking at me hard) I won't say any more than that negotiations are going on for still other modern plants south of that line.

So that it is quite easy, especially when reading the figures on this map that I have read from, to imagine that the fishery south of that line will very quickly, and it has already in spots, become quite profitable for all engaged in it.

Now when you take the west coast, I think my honourable friend, the Minister, will agree that in his own district of St. George's-Port au Port there is really no big fishery. There is a fishery but not a big one, not any more. It is not half as big nor quarter as big as it was twenty years ago.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): There is a big potential.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I think that is true even of Bell Island, which could be the home base for a very important fishery, as almost any

part of Newfoundland could be a centre for fishery. No matter where you go in Newfoundland on any coast line at all you are reasonably sure of finding a big potential for fish.

But as to the west coast generally—What are the totals on the map? For one whole side of the triangle? I don't think it is any more than twenty thousand quintals for the whole of the western triangle of Newfoundland. I don't think it is more. So that what are you left with? You are left with the northeast coast. I am now told there are thirty thousand quintals for the whole of the west coast. I was not far wrong. That is from Port aux Basques down to the Straits of Belle Isle and including the Labrador Straits of Belle Isle, the Labrador side. So that if the south west coast is helped by the way of being put into a generally sound and prosperous condition we may pass on for the west coast is primarily now a great newsprint, pulp and paper industry where they have the biggest mill in the world, Bowaters Mill, a vast ramification of pulp operations, and where they have the great City of Corner Brook with seventeen or twenty thousand population, and a great airport at Harmon Field and a great woods operation in the District of St. George's-Port au Port, and a very considerable farming activity in that district as they have also down in certain sections of St. Barbe District. I think if we can omit reference to the moment to the potentialities on that coast. I think we can say truly that the fishery on that western side of the triangle is not presently important, and that leaves the northeast coast.

The northeast coast is the problem child, and as they truly say here in this report, it is where the real problem lies. Now if the honourable gentle-

man would follow through with me, and see the graphic, striking, extremely depressing picture we get of this coast.

Quoting again from the report :

"Establishment of large filleting plants on the northeast coast does not appear to be feasible. North of Bonavista the season is too short to permit of operation for more than six or seven months."

Now until very recently that sentence could have struck dismay into the hearts of all people concerned with that great coast—"Establishment of large filleting plants on the northeast coast does not appear to be feasible," and north of Bonavista the season is too short to permit of operation for more than six or seven months. The overhead costs would place plants on that coast at a great disadvantage in competition with those having year round production on the south coast and in places outside of Newfoundland. At present, diversification of product can be obtained only by operation of draggers to fish on the Grand Banks with a longer haul. Marketing, too, becomes more difficult and costly as part of the production must be stored at the plant or moved to winter shipping ports or to some place near the market for storage. These factors influenced the closing of two plants on that coast and the transfer of machinery to a south coast site a few years ago. It is not to be expected, therefore, that persons proposing investment of capital in the frozen fillet industry will decide upon a plant location along the northeast coast."

That is already out of date insofar as it refers to large plants, but you can still have freezing plants because of the block frozen process, the first nec-

essary step leading to frozen fish sticks and frozen fish fingers.

"Along that coast development should, in the view of the Committee, be by centralization of the salt fish industry at a number of plants located at suitable places in large areas of production in the inshore fishery and near grounds on which long-lining can be successfully carried on. The operation in these plants would be as fully mechanized as possible and the aim should be ultimately to produce light salted fish by mechanical drying."

That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of a most fascinating conjecture. Everybody that you ask will tell you that in Italy for instance they must have, if they buy our Newfoundland codfish, it must be codfish of a certain cure. There can be no if and but about it, but that is that. That heavy salted fish is out of the question. It has to be light salted fish, what is called the Italian cure, a special kind of light salted codfish. We, as a government, sent the late Chesley Holmes to Italy and to Spain and to Portugal. He died in Portugal. We sent the late Chesley Holmes to Italy, and he did get to Spain and to Portugal to check on one simple question and to get the answer to one perfectly simple question. You see if a market will take a fish of a certain kind then it is a bit silly to try and sell them, (if they will take that type and no other) fish of another kind. Sell them the kind they want; if they want a light-salted cure and nothing else then don't send them a heavy-salted cure. But the question is, do they want a light-salted cure and only that and nothing else? Everybody tells us that is what they want. Any merchant in Newfoundland will tell you that, any reporter will tell you, any official of NAFEL will tell you, anyone that

was ever stationed in Italy on behalf of the Newfoundland Fish Trade will tell you Italy wants light-salted cod. Well, of course, some things in this world have been accepted down through history as being absolutely final. Don't ask further questions. Close your mind. But some of those things turned out not to be so. So that it occurred to us to be a little unorthodox about it; to go out and find out if it is true. Because it is an extremely important question. You can make heavy-salted fish in driers and handle it mechanically with an ease and comparable cost but trying to do the same thing for the light-salted fish is quite different. It is much cheaper to take heavy-salted fish and handle it mechanically and dry it in mechanical driers than light-salted, much cheaper and easier. With heavy-salted fish it is relatively easy, put it in a drier and through phases of heat, but it is not quite that simple with light-salted. You have with light-salted to try to imitate the sun, you got to try and reproduce the heat and relative humidity of a perfect drying day. My honourable friend who has lived in a fishing settlement will remember a summer day when you look at the stones on the road they are wet while the air is almost certain to be quite damp. If the stones are a little lighter in colour they have collected some moisture and the air is probably damp and the humidity is probably too high and it is not a good drying day. The perfect drying day with exactly the right amount of heat and relative humidity is what is needed. Trying to reproduce that in a mechanical drier is a pretty expensive thing and quite difficult although not impossible. Then just as you can draw a graph of a perfect drying day at 8:00 o'clock in the

morning until 11:00 and from noon up to 7:00 o'clock at night, and maybe get perfect drying weather for say four hours out of the whole day. All right, do the same thing in your drier, bring the heat up and the humidity down, gradually to a peak, and let it fall off. Take the fish out and work it, put it back again, that is expensive, but it can be done. You can make light-salted fish in a mechanical drier as perfectly as with the sun, but it is expensive. You must either do that or get them to take heavy-salted. If they will take the heavy-salted cure the problem is obviously easier. So that we sent Mr. Holmes to get an answer to that question. He was the man who knew those countries, knew their language, he could mix with them, be convivial with them, and he could get a lot of information from them. Unfortunately, for Newfoundland he passed away in Portugal. He died before his mission was completed. We never had a report from him. He kept his notes in his mind and he died without making a report to us.

We sent another gentleman there who joined him just before he died. But he was not with him long enough to get the answers to these questions which Mr. Holmes carried in his mind. So that to this day we do not know whether Italy would take heavy salted fish or whether it is just silly and nonsensical to think of it. But if she would and if other markets for light-salted codfish would take heavy salted then the problem of mechanical drying would be solved.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Has that suggestion been passed on to the trade delegation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not properly a question to be settled by them. They are trying to work up

markets and have no time to introduce questions of that character. That is why we sent this man around quietly, unostentatiously, socially so to speak, to try and discover the answer to that question. Naturally if he were there officially and asked that question the answer he would get would be—We have always had that type and that is the type we want. You have to get underneath. Get down and talk to traders and the people actually dealing in those products.

Now to get back to where I broke off: "The operations in these plants would be as fully mechanized as possible and the aim should be ultimately to produce light salted fish by mechanical drying. While it has not been definitely established that this is possible, the experiments being conducted, the scientific study being made of the problem and the progress made to date tend to justify the assumption that within a short time the success of the process will be demonstrated."

As a matter of fact it has been demonstrated since these words have been written that you can produce light salted fish mechanically in mechanical driers, the average of which will be higher than the average of the same type dried out under the sun.

MR. BROWNE: The average of what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has now been proven that light salted fish can be made in a mechanical drier of a quality which on the average is higher, better, than the average of the same type of fish made out under the sun. That is for this reason: If you could control the sun and the weather outdoors as you can control

it within the drier, then day after day you could have perfect drying weather and your average would be very high and your cost very low, because it costs nothing to turn on the sun, if you only knew how to turn it on. But it costs money to turn on the sun inside the dryer, because you have to create your own heat. But it would cost nothing if you knew how to turn on the sun. That is what the fishermen do not know how to do. If they could do that you would not need these driers.

**MR. BROWNE:** It does not cost very much—between five and six dollars.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I am not able to deal with the figures at this moment. The answer is that it is rather expensive. It can be done but it is expensive to do it.

"Initiation of development of the fisheries cannot, however await the solution of this problem. Partial sun-drying with completion of the process by mechanical drying would appear to offer a procedure by which costs would in the meantime be reduced. For sun-drying there would be some mechanization by use of motor conveyance to haul from store and return wire flakes on which fish would remain spread except when press-piling is required. Mechanization should be affected at all possible stages from receipt of the raw fish to shipment of the finished product."

Now, the Government last year made a grant of five thousand dollars to Mr. Donald Andrews to assist him to conduct some experiments. While I am at it, Mr. Speaker, may I pay a tribute to Mr. Don Andrews who is operating in Bay Roberts and Coley's Point and by means of financial assistance given to him by this

Government over a period of two or three years. Mr. Andrews is by way of being a highly original thinker and investigator in the physical processes of the fishing industry, and has devised some astonishing contraptions, astonishing perhaps only when considered against the background of the Newfoundland fishing industry which is so antiquated and which is so backward. Against that background he has devised contraptions which are really quite astonishing. It is quite a sight to go over to Coley's Point and go into a fish store and see a great bulk of Labrador fish still in salt, not washed out, three thousand and five and six thousand quintals and eight thousand quintals, and to see a contraption which, speaking very candidly but not by any means underrating the genius of Donald Andrews in these matters, a contraption which would remind you somewhat of the Toonerville Trolley, although the idea works perfectly. It is a machine put together by hand with a piece of wire here, a piece of rubber there and a piece of wood and a piece of belt all fastened together with nuts and bolts, nevertheless it is a strange-looking contraption. You will see this machine in length about from that wall to here, and about one yard wide, and about one yard high. One end is placed against the great bulk of fish which has a hose coming in and pouring water into it all the time. Men are standing at the end taking the fish from the big pile and laying it on, slime and everything else, on the machine, where a stream of water is pouring on it, and it goes through great round brushes revolving towards each other, with long bristles which bend somewhat but are nevertheless fairly stiff, while the water is pouring all the



time. Then the belt flips and the fish turn face up and the same process goes on. Then it comes out at the far end and goes aboard a truck—it is really something.

Now, we gave Donald Andrews five thousand dollars last year to experiment with the idea of mechanized flakes. Mr. Speaker, just for a moment consider two of the simplest processes, economically speaking, in the world today. They are the laying of an egg and the making of codfish. I want to ask the House to exercise its imagination—the laying of an egg is essentially an economic operation. The hen simply goes into the nest and lays the egg, does a little cackling and moves off—very simple, uncomplicated. They wrote a popular song in England some years back—"The hen simply goes and lay an egg. There is nothing to it, but can Winston Churchill do it? Can Ramsay McDonald do it? Can Lloyd George do it? No."

That is all, the hen just lays an egg. It is one of the simplest of all the economic processes in the whole history of economics. Now, I will tell you the second most easy that I know about. It is the lady with a hat on and a shawl over the hat to keep the sun out and the big dress and the apron, and the yaffle of fish, and all the kids, the happy family group that my honourable friend likes to visualize, the yaffle of fish, spreading it out, the back-breaking bending down and laying the codfish one by one on the flake. Then at the first sign of rain gather it up quickly again, one by one, every individual fish. I wonder how many times do human hands handle every individual codfish? How many times? A man hauls it out of the water. He gets it in and gets it up on the stage

head. That is twice he handles every codfish. Then it is handled again and placed on the table. Then this time a woman cuts the throat. That is four times it has been handled. Cuts the head off then guts it, then splits it. That is six times. Then it is washed. That is seven times. Then it is salted. That makes eight times. Finally they come down and get around the tub and with their oil skins and rubber boots on and put it in the water and wash it. Then it is taken out and spread. That is eleven times it is handled up to the time of the first spreading. There you have the very elements of economic simplicity. There is this difference: If you want a hen to lay an egg, and I have some little experience in that matter, if you want a hen to lay an egg really consistently and economically you have to go to enormous trouble and expense feeding that hen. You have to give the hen the very best hard Manitoba wheat, the best barley, best rye, minerals, proteins. The care you have to take to get eggs out of a hen is one of the greatest arts of all mankind today, a great art. But you don't get the fish dried on the flakes without expense. The expense begins the moment you take the fish up out of the water. Well please God; we are going in the right direction to put an end to all that. Remember this, salt codfish is exported from Newfoundland during the whole year. Allocations are made in respect of much of the salt fish produced on the northeast coast where additional transportation costs are involved and the provision of adequate stores at some winter shipping ports for such large quantities of fish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the moment



anything living dies it begins to decompose, vegetables, fish, animals.

MR. HOLLETT: The Liberal Party for instance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Liberal Party has never been so alive. The Liberal Party, though, has to go back to the people every so often to get recharged. It has to go back to its battery, the people, to have its battery recharged, its idealism revived. We are great believers in going back to the people. Now, the honourable gentleman has succeeded in making me do something he has never succeeded in doing before, forget my point.

MR. HOLLETT: You were talking about the storage of fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I know what I was talking about. Codfish is not perishable as for example are strawberries. There are various degrees of perishability in various living things. Nevertheless codfish is a perishable article. It is one of the most astonishing facts that in all Newfoundland today there is only one warehouse or storehouse for the storage of fish, codfish, with controlled temperature. Now you can cook codfish and destroy the bacteria. You can freeze it and hold it in a certain ideal holding temperature the same as meat and that will prevent for so long but not permanently, not indefinitely for years and years, but for many, many months you can arrest the process of decomposition, and you can hold its quality.

Now, what happens with the controlled temperature warehouses in Newfoundland is this: It should not be but inevitably if you put a thousand, five, eight, ten or twenty thousand quintals of fish in a store, pack-

ed or bulk fish, in a store without controlled temperature, where the temperature varies up and down, where the relative humidity varies up and down and the climate changes daily and hourly, then every week and in fact every day that fish spends in such a store it loses its quality. Yes, there is an industry to which the fishermen have contributed their full part, they have done all the hard work, the dirty work and the dangerous work, they have done all they could do; and now the fish passes from their hands, and from that point on deterioration sets in. Their fish, legally the merchants' fish—but I don't suppose the House would find it difficult to appreciate the fact that the price that the fishermen get for their fish is determined by what happens to it at various stages along the way. It is determined by the kind of storage it is put in, what kind of packages it is put in, and the warehouse in which the packaged fish is placed, and how long it is kept there, and the condition of the warehouse and the condition of the fish when it finally reaches the market, and finally reaches the consumer. Who could attempt, I wonder, to assess the amount of human suffering that has been caused in Newfoundland in the last century, the last hundred years or the last four hundred years, or in any one year, the amount of human suffering caused amongst the fishermen and their families by the simple fact that the fish, which is the product of their hard labour, which they have in dirt and danger to produce, is lowered in quality by holding it in fish stores that are a filthy mass of vermin, rats. Oh yes, my honourable friend shakes his head. He could never have been out of St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: If that were so, why publish it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why publish it? Four and a half centuries and it has not been published, and we still have it.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense!

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not nonsense. They are alive with bacteria. Now I will admit in common fairness that most merchants, if not all, make to the limit of their ability and knowledge an effort to clean their stores and whitewash them at virtually every opportunity. When the last fish has gone out they scrub the floors and whitewash the walls and sometimes the ceiling and certainly brush the cobwebs and dust out. They do that. But that is not enough in a store eighty, ninety, a hundred or a hundred and forty years old. The stores all up and down the waterfront of Water Street averaged one hundred and forty years. Don't forget this is human food going into them; it is not animal food or poultry food but human food. I know fish stores in Newfoundland that date from 1778. What do you know about that, fish stores that have been there since 1778. They cannot be very clean. Now, I say that it is a disgrace to Newfoundland that in all the Island today there is only one modern fish store. That fish store was built by Senator Pratt. It is concrete. It is thoroughly clean and has a good quantity of water available. It is built of concrete in the first place, and there is plenty of water. It then has controlled temperature. Let me give the House an idea of what a fish store should be like. My honourable friend the Minister of Finance and I visited the fish store of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia.

There you have this picture: You have a wharf, and the schooners come up from the banks or wherever they fish. Out over the edge of the wharf, slightly out over the edge is a roof built, a shed roof, and underneath the shed on the wharf are the fish washing machines. They are not as good as those of Don Andrews in Bay Roberts. The fish is taken off the schooner and goes immediately through the washing machine, then by conveyor they are brought into a large concrete room, approximately the size of this room, but not as high with a smooth concrete floor which is hosed out frequently. Now the fish had come in. It is washed. It is then stored in controlled temperature, not a steady temperature but a controlled temperature with a certain temperature for certain purposes. From there it goes to the drier and from there comes out into a room of another temperature, and finally when it is dried it goes into another room of still another temperature. Finally it is packed in that room into boxes. Then the boxes of fish are put into another room at still another temperature. Finally that fish is loaded into the holds of refrigerated vessels which take the fish direct to the markets.

Now, that is to say, as soon as the fish are caught they are dressed and salted aboard the vessel, so that they are under preservation. (Salt, of course, is a preservative). Take a piece of fresh beef and sprinkle it very generously with salt and it will arrest the process of decomposition and will so remain until it is washed out. But the moment it is washed out the process continues.

In Newfoundland, on the other hand, what have you? You have one fish store with controlled temper-

ature. That one was completed last year, and I don't know even if it is in use yet. Mr. Speaker, what kind of an indictment is that of our fishing industry? What kind of an indictment is that of our fish merchants? If fish is a food the way they handle that fish determines the standard of living of a hundred and fifty thousand to two hundred thousand persons in Newfoundland, men, women and children. The way they handle that fish determines not only the standard of living of those people but the income, the revenue of the government. The way the merchants handle the fish at one point after another determines the amount of revenue the Newfoundland Treasury will get, and therefore determines, in a way, how much can be spent on hospitals, schools and roads and on municipal affairs and public housing and justice and a host of other activities. In short, the way our fish merchants handle their side of the industry clearly determines the shape of Newfoundland.

Now the great system of private enterprise, private capital is described by Adam Smith, and all the economists of the school of private enterprise from that day to this function under these principles: You have a process of selection, the worst is being dropped, the best is being held and kept and retained, and the worst is always being dropped so that gradually one year after another, one decade after the other continual progress, continual improvement continues. Look at modern machinery and you see exactly what I mean. Take the whole business of refrigeration: If what I said were not so you would not have the great scientists, the great trade, the great industry of refrigeration brought to a degree of perfection

it has been. Take the whole business of packing and packaging food. It would not have been brought to such a degree of perfection it has reached in these recent years. So it is in almost all of these things. But when you come to the salt codfish industry and the salt codfish trade of Newfoundland you discover to your chagrin, inevitably, inescapably you discover that the industry has lagged behind, has lacked leadership, the leadership of enterprising, energetic businessmen; the leadership and vision and wisdom of men keen to make a profit, in other words, private enterprise in our fishing industry has not been enterprising. In short, Mr. Speaker, the salt codfishery has been an industry in which it was too easy, altogether too easy, to get rich, too easy to do well, too easy to get along if you are a merchant. I am not saying that every merchant became rich. I am not saying that because they did not. But it is an industry in which by paying the fishermen a very low rate you can always live yourself. If you are a merchant you always had the fishermen to take the brunt of it. You could get along very well so long as you could pass your failures, to do a good job, on to the fishermen in the form of lower prices of fish. So long as you could do that the incentive was lacking for you to become expert and proficient as a merchandizer. Is not that so?

MR. HOLLETT: That is correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only that, but so long as you could pass the result of your failure over to the fishermen you could be inefficient and not only as a merchandizer but as an industrialist. Remember the fish merchant is not only a merchandizer, he is an industrialist in the sense that

he takes the fish in from the fishermen, he sorts it, sorts out what has grown a little damp and has to redry it, he has to package it in the drums, in the butts, in the casks, in the boxes. It is an industrial process. So that he is an industrialist and he is a trader because he trades and sells the fish. So as a trader and an industrialist the temptation is overwhelming for a merchant to be careless because he always has twenty, thirty, forty thousand fishermen between, so that twenty-five cents a quintal off, a half dollar off the price of fish would pay for a lot of merchants' mistakes and a lot of merchants' failures to show initiative and show enterprise. My complaint is that when I say that I cannot find words to express the loathing and contempt I have for our fish merchants. Believe me it is the contempt of a man who lives to see industrial efficiency, it is not a personal dislike. The fish merchants whose methods I loathe and despise I may like personally as individuals. That is not material. That is not important whether I like them or whether anyone except their own immediate friends and relatives like them. Personally I don't suppose they are very much concerned themselves about my attitude towards them. But my attitude is an official one as Leader of Her Majesty's Government here in this Province. I say that these leaders of the fishing industry have been blind leaders. It is a great tragedy, a terrible tragedy, a terrible, terrible tragedy. I listened again today to Don Jamieson and his comments on my remarks here of last week.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Did he do that?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** His comments on my remarks about the fish merchants on Water Street. He said

he thought he detected an inconsistency on my part. He said I pointed out how I loathed and despised these Water Street fish merchants, and then I had gone on to say that the Government hoped to create an atmosphere, a new atmosphere in Newfoundland in which merchants could have a new faith, a new confidence, in the possibilities of the fishing industry. He pointed these two facts out (both correct) as an inconsistency on my part. He said: if you abuse the merchants how do you expect to persuade them to have new faith and new confidence? Where Don went wrong was that he did not realize I was talking about two entirely different sets of merchants. I look for nothing from the Water Street gang, nothing except bigotry, intolerance, rank hatred. That is about all I look for from the Water Street merchants, with a few exceptions, brilliant exceptions, Arthur Monroe, Ches Crosbie, Hazen Russell, Spencer Lake, and a few others. The rest of them are the lounge lizards, as I called them, social butterflies who go to work at ten or twelve o'clock in the morning and are off playing golf in the afternoon. Newfoundland was not built that way. No country can be built by businessmen who are lazy. If you are going to have private enterprise, let it at least be enterprise. No, the merchants to whom I look are the young outport merchants, young men brought up in that great tradition of the salt codfishery, one of the great fisheries of the world, one of the greatest. Don't forget that. If you go to Boston, the State Capital of Massachusetts, you will find hung over Mr. Speaker's Chair a codfish. That is right, in the State Capital of Massachusetts.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Don't tell me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether in the Commonwealth of Nations, Mr. Speaker has a codfish hanging over his head. But it is there for all to see, to remind everyone that Massachusetts was based and founded on codfish. But it was never so much so as it was for this Island of Newfoundland. I hope that the young, energetic merchants of the outports brought up in that tradition, are not despising codfish, not ashamed of its smell. Codfish, you know, Mr. Speaker, is a wonderfully aristocratic thing. Some of the greatest families of the West Coast of England began by carrying on the salt codfish trade, became wealthy and became great, because much greatness is based on wealth. I know a good many of them came from the salt codfishery of this island of Newfoundland. So I hope most fervently that the young fish merchant, young, enterprising men with energy and ambition, hope and faith and confidence in Newfoundland that we in this Government have, will take hold, see it for themselves, and will come in, and if they lack the capital to come in, they will come to the Government, not the Government directly but to the Fishery Development Authority that we are setting up for that very purpose, and ask the Authority to back them. They have everything but the money. Unfortunately very frequently the people who have the money have nothing but the money. Sometimes but rarely you meet someone with brains, with energy, with intelligence, with initiative, with enthusiasm and with money, meet it all in one man. But that is a very rare bird. Usually by the time he has lots of capital to do things with he has lost the energy and the flair, the divine inspiration, the desire to take the world and change

it. Now we hope with the active help and co-operation of a hundred or a couple of hundred active, energetic young outport merchants, men to whom Bally Haly is only a name, and cocktail parties they never even heard of, men who get up at six o'clock in the morning as our pioneers all did in Newfoundland, who get up at six and think that by eight o'clock the morning is half gone. Give us a hundred men like that and a hundred million dollars of public money and private money combined, say fifty millions of each, and a hundred young Newfoundlanders with gumption and energy and enthusiasm and brains and hardheaded practical experience and we will build a Newfoundland that will be a prosperous Newfoundland for every man in it including the traditional and historically poor fishermen of this Province.

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

Third Reading of Bill: "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that all further orders of the day do stand deferred. I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

---

TUESDAY, May 11th, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

### Giving Notice of Motion

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited."

I also give notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance," and

I also give notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. On what date did the machinery which was to be used in Dr. Sennewald's Optical Plant arrive in St. John's?
2. What was the amount of the declared Customs value, and the value of said machinery as appraised by the Minister, or other person on his behalf?
3. What was the exact amount of Government moneys transferred at any or all times since Dr. Sennewald signed his contract?
4. How much money was paid in Customs duty on goods and machinery brought into this country

for Dr. Sennewald? Table all correspondence between the Department of Economic Development and the Federal Customs Dept. relative to the return of said duty? Is it a fact that the Newfoundland Government assisted Dr. Sennewald to get said duty refunded?

5. On what date was said machinery shipped out of Newfoundland, and by what route, and state its destination. In what Insurance company was said machinery insured when shipped out of Newfoundland, and what amount of insurance was placed on same?

MR. HOLLETT: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Is the plant owned by the Hanning Electric Company yet in production, and if so on what date did it go into production?
2. How many men and/or women are presently employed at this plant?
3. What is the total amount of Government moneys paid to this Company and/or to Mr. Hanning personally? Give the dates on which moneys were paid to this Company, and the separate amounts paid on each date.
4. Is the plant owned by the Superior Rubber Company now in production, and if so on what date did the plant go into production?
5. How many men and/or women are presently employed at this Plant?
6. What is the total amount of Government moneys paid to this



Company? Give the dates on which moneys were paid to this Company, and the amounts paid on each separate date.

7. Table a copy of all Acts and/or agreements in connection with the setting up of each and every new industry and into which Government moneys have been paid or loaned since April 1st, 1949.
8. Account for the payment of \$25,000 to Canadian Machinery and Industry Construction Co. over and above the amount pledged in that Company. Give the number of men employed at present with this Company, and the number in employment there at the end of 1953.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 78—Answer in course of preparation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, while on that matter, might I say I have a list of questions which I have checked over and find that up to Friday last, sixty-nine questions have been asked. Out of that sixty-nine, fifty-two answers have been tabled here, which leaves quite a large number unanswered.

Question No. 79:

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, before I give the answer to that question, there are certain comments I would like to make. What I have to say is really repetitious, as I have already made those comments on the occasion of tabling the Report of the Farm Loan Board. Unfortunately the honourable member for St. John's West who has asked these questions

was not present at the time and I do not know whether or not the substance of what I said on that occasion was reported to him. What I said then, Mr. Speaker, is that I would endeavour to give my reasons for stating that I do not think I should table the names of those persons who have been given loans by the Farm Loan Board or who have made application which have been approved but who have not yet received their loan. My reasons for that are: If ever there was a farm loan board set up by any government in the world intended to be completely professional it was this Farm Loan Board. We have, as the report shows, as Chairman, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Resources and the members are: The Deputy-Minister, the Director of Agriculture, the Director of Crown Lands and Surveys and one of the agricultural officers in the Department as clerk. All these serve without remuneration. The Act contains a clause whereby the Minister may require that any loan has to be referred to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. In actual practice that has never happened. So that to this moment the Lieutenant-Governor in Council does not know the names of those to whom loans were granted. Furthermore, until the report had been put on my desk, about a week ago, I did not know one of the names of the people who had made application for these loans. They are farmers for the most part scattered all over the Province. I have the list right here. As a matter of fact I am prepared to give that information to any member of the Opposition, but I do not think I should table it in the House, certainly not this year, or at the present time, for publication. I don't think that the fact that John Brown of Eastport or of Codroy Val-

ley has made application to the Loan Board and for a thousand dollars, which he has not yet used perhaps, but which was obtained for a certain purpose, I don't think that should be made public. I don't think it is in the public interest, in fact, to make that fact known to the general public and to have it blazoned all over the province through the press and by the radio. I may be wrong on this point. This has obviously not been referred to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for advice. I am giving this just as a personal opinion. We have absolutely nothing to hide, Mr. Speaker, but I think these men are entitled to that. I have just looked over the list, Mr. Speaker, and some of them are very great friends of our friends on the other side of the House. These men are entitled, I think, to ordinary business courtesy even though they are receiving money from the Loan Board. I do think that in a small country such as ours, every man's little private business, even when dealing with the Government Loan Board, should not be blazoned around the community and certainly not at a time when he is considering a mortgage and making plans to expand or carry on other activities. I do not think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that it would be fair for me to table this list. I don't think it would be in the public interest for me to table the actual names of those people. To any person who has, I would say a political, moral right to know the names, I am prepared to give them or to any member of the Opposition. As it happens all of these agreements are registered in the Registrar of Deeds, and any person can go there and for twenty-five cents get that information. But I don't think that would give that person the right to immediately put it in the press or

spread it all around the Province in one way or another. Personally I don't think it would be done. We are not trying to hide anything, but I do think we have to give some consideration to the farmers of Newfoundland who make application for such loans, and they should be protected in some measure from having their affairs published all over the Province.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might be permitted to make a statement on this matter on behalf of the Government. My honourable colleague finds himself in a very embarrassing position. There he is trying to protect the interest of the farmers who feel they want to apply for a loan, and some of whom have been given loans, and some of them have not been given loans, and he feels that their names ought not to be published. I think my honourable colleague ought to be willing to table the information, if the Opposition would undertake not to publish the names in the press or on the radio. There would be no objections in the wide world to their having the information. The only objection is to having that fact that John Jones applied for a loan and did not get it, or applied for a loan and did get it. I think that would be a very good way to stop virtually all farmers applying for loans. If we adopt the practice of publishing the names of all fishermen who apply for and receive loans that would be a very good way to stop all fishermen in the future from applying for loans. I think the Opposition will agree that is a practical attitude to take, after they have given the matter some thought.

MR. HOLLÉTT: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I can see very well the point taken by the Honourable Minister and

reiterated by the Honourable the Premier. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the shoe is on the other foot as far as the Government is concerned. As a matter of fact I don't think there is anything detrimental for any man in the fact that the world knows he has gotten a loan from the Government. If we attempt to hide these things just in one instance, farmers or fishermen or whatnot, then, I think, we are, as a government, laying ourselves open to suspicion, and suspicion is something which should not apply to any government nor to members on either side of the House. I think, if I were to come to the Government for a loan for a farm or fish plant or any other thing, there is no reason why, if the information is requested, the general public should not know it, because it is not the bank's money. It is not my money. It is not your money, Mr. Speaker, it is the people's money. I think the people as such, that is the public, have a right to know the names of the persons and the amounts. I think it would be unfortunate if we adopted the principle suggested by the Honourable Minister. We have had tabled here and published information about all sorts of loans made by the Government, and I don't think we can afford to make any exceptions whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, as the House knows, there is no debate on questions or comments on any answers to any questions. However, I did allow the Leader of the Opposition to state their views. The answer to the question is that the Minister concerned will be prepared to table all information other than the names of persons granted or refused loans.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, at this stage I would not like to go on record

as making that categorical statement, that I refused to table that information, at this time. If the honourable member would permit, I would perhaps give the answer to that further consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand the honourable member to say he is prepared to make the list available on condition they maintain it as private information?

DR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think that is acceptable to the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone has any information as to when the budget is likely to be brought down?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Speaker, from what I have heard from the Minister of Finance the answer would be just about the same as last time.

#### Orders of the Day

Second reading of a Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have heard some suggestions, or I have read them, I forget which, either one or the other, that I am in this speech attempting to create a record for marathon speaking. I have also heard or read (I forget which) the suggestion that I was making a political speech. I should like now to say that I am doing neither. I am voicing my opinion, my views on this whole matter of fishery development in Newfoundland. The matter is itself so big, so vital to the welfare and

the future of Newfoundland and therefore of this Government that I have felt and feel that I should make an attempt to make my own views thoroughly well known to the House, and if possible, through the House to the people, particularly to the fishermen. The last thing I have had in mind is to make a political speech, and certainly I have not in mind any thought of establishing a record in the length of my speech in this House. Anyone that would imagine that I was doing either has a very poor sense of the life and death importance of this matter to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the shape of our lives in Newfoundland, and the shape of the lives of tens of thousands not yet born in this Province will be determined by what happens in our great fishing industry. Whether we like it or not, the fact is that half of our economy is based on fisheries, half of our people get their living, such as it is, from the fishery. When half of the economy of any country or state or province is dependent upon any one industry, when half the population of that area gets its living from one single industry, even if that one industry were agriculture, even if it were agriculture, but much more so when it is the fisheries, the economic state of that area is perilous. Because the economic state is perilous the political and social state is perilous as well. In consequence twenty years from now the flavour of life in Newfoundland, the shape of things in Newfoundland in almost every field, education, health, roads and a score of other important departments of our provincial life will be what they will be because of what the fishery is and will have done for the economy of our people. In other words, anything that determines the character of half of

our economy, anything that determines the livelihood of half our population directly, and indirectly a large portion of the other half, anything doing that is clearly, is obviously of utterly vital importance to us. I have, I confess, been trying in a leisurely sort of way in these past few days, and I hope with some clarity of thought and some clarity of expression, to paint a picture, as I see it, of fishery development in this Province.

I regret sincerely that it should be as late as this, five years after confederation, that we should be ready to launch the programme, and that we were not ready to launch it contemporaneously with Confederation, or half way through between then and now, but we were not. I doubt that in the writing of Newfoundland history that will ever be held against us. I think that any sober historian will see that the setting up of the Fishery Development Committee was an indispensable first step, and that it took two years, and that this report was no sooner out than that a general election in the federal field became imminent. Everybody knew it was coming. Therefore the remainder of 1953 was virtually lost in that matter because of the dissolution of parliament and the holding of the general election. Clearly it would have been very short-sighted of this Government to launch the fisheries development programme without first knowing precisely what the Government of Canada was prepared to do, and what it was not prepared to do, to join the Newfoundland Government in a programme of fishery development. So inevitably, unavoidably the time was lost, for which this Government cannot be held accountable. Indeed no government can be held accountable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have men-

tioned a figure of one hundred million dollars as being the probable cost of fisheries development in Newfoundland. I have not meant by that figure that a hundred million dollars would need to be spent by the Government of Newfoundland, nor have I meant that a hundred million dollars would have to be spent by the Government of Canada. I took that as a figure representing the combined costs, the combined federal and provincial costs of fisheries development. Incidentally, in connection with that figure of a hundred million dollars which I gave in this House before, I was somewhat amused to notice that the "Western Star" saw in my announcement reason for the publication by them of an editorial commenting on my announcement. Now obviously it is the right of a free press in a free land to offer free comment on any utterance of a public man, any public utterance of a public man, especially the public utterance of a public man on a public matter, in a public place. The right of a free newspaper in a free land to offer a free comment on such a statement is undisputable and not to be questioned. It seems to me, however, that it is the clear duty of a newspaper not to attribute to a public man on whose statements it sets out to offer its own comments, it is the clear duty of that newspaper to comment on what the man said, the public man or the Minister said, and not on something he did not say. There is no reason why it should not comment on something he did not say provided it did not attribute to him the thing that he did not say. The "Western Star," to my amusement, stated editorially that the Premier had announced the intention of the Government to float a bond issue this summer of one hundred mil-

lion dollars for fisheries development. That is quite a bond issue! To this moment I have not said anything to indicate the size of the bond issue which, so I have announced, we intend to ask this House to authorize us to raise. I have said nothing as to the size of the bond issue. The "Western Star" editorially declared that I had said in this House that we are going to float this year a bond issue of a hundred million dollars for fishery development.

Now, I did mention the figure "a hundred million dollars." I did say that we were going to raise a bond issue. But the two statements were not made together. They were separated by at least an hour. How anyone could put the two together; the fact that the fishery development programme over the next twelve or fifteen years would probably cost a hundred million dollars, that statement, and the statement that we proposed this year to float a bond issue in an unnamed amount. How he could put these two statements together and write an editorial about it? Now that same man would scream like a stuck pig, the man who wrote that would squeal like a stuck pig if any public man anywhere suggested anything by way of limiting the freedom of the press. He would squeal like a stuck pig. He would have recourse then to the loftiest principles of British freedom, and rightly so, rightly so. He would have to do quite a bit of writing to equal the writing I have done in my life in defending the freedom of the press. But he might do it—he might well equal it. He would undoubtedly make a strong attempt to confuse the public mind into thinking that somehow or other by some strange transformation of the press meant the right to say



that a public man said something that he never said. Then if you complain that you are misrepresented you are somehow making an attack upon the great principle of freedom of the press. If you complain that your words have been garbled and distorted you are making an attack upon the freedom of the press. Now patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel, and appeals to the great principle of freedom of the press can equally be the last refuge of a literary scoundrel.

I said that. I mentioned the figure of one hundred million dollars as the probable cost of fishery development in this Province, of which I would visualize approximately half being found by the Government of Newfoundland half by the Government of Canada, spread over a period of a decade or rather more. In other words, an average of something between three million and three and a half million dollars a year from each government for fishery development. Mr. Speaker, I know of no part of the Western Hemisphere where the spending of a hundred million dollars to reorganize the economy of an area would be so well spent as it would be if spent on reorganization of the fisheries of Newfoundland, because I know of no people in the North American Continent intrinsically better than our Newfoundland fishermen, braver, tougher, more generous, more ingenious, more hospitable, more devout, more God-fearing, than our Newfoundland fishermen. I know of no people in North America with finer human qualities than that of our Newfoundland people. A hundred million dollars invested in that industry by which they live and by which alone they must live, if they continue to live in Newfound-

land, and so long as they continue to live in Newfoundland, I know of no people in whose means of living a hundred million dollars could be better invested than in those people. There are about one hundred and fifty thousand of them, men, women and children. They are of English stock. They are of Irish stock. They are of Scottish stock. They are of good stock. They are good people. They are not afraid of work. They are not lazy. They are wholesome-minded, they are clean minded. My honourable and learned friend from St. John's West may differ indeed, as we do, as to what is the ideal type of life for them. But I think we agree, and all members of this House regardless of party affiliations agree that although there are indeed in various parts of North America some excellent people, our people, our Newfoundland people, are at least, basically, intrinsically, as good as ever water wet.

MR. HOLLETT: The merchants too?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are not pouring money down the drain when you invest in the industry by which such people live. You are not pouring good money after bad. It is a good investment in human welfare. It is a good investment in good people.

Now, I have already said that I cannot guarantee the kind of success such as I believe I can guarantee our industrial enterprises. I believe that without exception, I do not think that there will be one collapse, or one failure amongst our industrial enterprises. When I say our industrial enterprises I mean these industrial plants that have come here from the Continent of Europe, with financial assistance from this Government. I am not referring to all our local in-



dustries. I am referring to these particularly promoted by this Government. I do not look for one failure amongst them. I do not look for one collapse amongst them. I do not, on the other hand, look for unbroken and continuous success. I don't look for that. That would be unreasonable. But I firmly believe, and I am in very close touch with them daily, I firmly believe that after they have gotten over the hump, each one has its own humps and a number of humps, not just one, which have to be ironed out, but I believe that each of them when it has surmounted these difficulties, which will go on for several years yet, but after they have surmounted these obstacles, they will pay back the loans we have made them, service the loans in the meantime, they will employ people and they will make a profit. I don't know, and I certainly won't attempt to prophesy that in the fishing economy we can get it so industrialized as to give us the same confidence in its capacity to pay big dividends to the owners of the shares. On the other hand I shall be the last man in Newfoundland to be surprised if twenty years from now the fishery is giving the Newfoundland people engaged in it a better living than even the newsprint industry or any of the mines of Newfoundland. I shall be the last one to be surprised because the potentialities are there to do that, we have that. We have the fish. We have the people in North America and South America—we have the fish and we have the people of these two continents. Somehow these can be brought together so that those who produce the fish and process and handle it will make an excellent living out of it—an excellent living. But I won't guarantee it.

Mr. Speaker, some short time ago I was reading in an industrial publication, published, I believe, by the Canadian Paper Organization, and showing a table indicating that they had canvassed four thousand five hundred industries across Canada asking each one to state how much capital it had invested in its business and how many employees it had in its business and the returns they received, four thousand five hundred industries, real industrial concerns, stretching across Canada. They learned that the average worker in industry required eight thousand dollars to be invested in industry to provide him with a job, eight thousand dollars per worker. So that a million workers would represent a combined investment of eight billion dollars. Eight thousand dollars per worker is the amount of capital required in industry as the average in Canada. I saw another table compiled in the United States showing that it requires an average of ten thousand dollars of invested capital to employ one worker in industry in the United States. Therefore it is on the average of eight thousand dollars in Canada and ten thousand dollars in the United States. Doubtlessly the figure varies from country to country, and within a given country. I doubt very much whether it would be humanly possible, economically and financially possible to invest a hundred million dollars in Newfoundland in straight industrial enterprise and employ as many people as the same amount of money would employ if invested in the fisheries—I doubt it. I am not absolutely sure of it. I am not certain of this, but I doubt, if the Government at this moment had in hard cash in the till, one hundred million dollars in bank notes, and

was trying to make up its mind whether to invest it, if it had the opportunity to invest it in, let us say, thirty or forty industrial plants of one kind or another, and all of them prospectively sound and profitable enterprises as far as you could foresee—

MR. BROWNE: What about a steel mill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable and learned and intellectual friend, after a short stay of a few weeks in this House, after living for four years in the Motherhouse of Canadian parliament, sinking so low as to be copying tactics learned from his Leader rather than giving lessons! He has been giving lessons up to now. He is, as of today, taking them. My honourable friend, the latest leader of the party, I hope, is not to be replaced soon. My honourable friend is smarting from a number of things, some bitter and savage disappointments of the past several days—he has suffered some bitter and savage disappointments. I happen to know what they are, and incidentally one of the causes of his irritation, one of the causes of his bad feelings at the moment is the realization that has been borne in upon him within recent days of the ghastly political miscalculation and mistake he has made in having himself and two of his followers occupy an hour or so in this House to discuss the greatest topic brought before this House in the present century.

MR. BROWNE: It does not look like we shall ever get another chance to say anything.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friends cannot speak any more about it. They are permitted by the rules to speak once only on second

reading. They followed the rules, and they spoke. But they did not think the matter was so big. They did not realize it, because, as my honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare, remarked—if they cross Ocean Pond they would get seasick. And as my honourable friend, the member for Fogo remarked; they never go outside the City of St. John's. What do they know about fish? What do they know about Newfoundland who only St. John's know?

MR. HOLLETT: What do you know about this Bill? That is what we want to know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have told my honourable friend many times already that I can explain a thing to him but only God can give him the brains to understand it when I do explain it. This is the fifth day, and my honourable friend either can't, or won't or does not want to understand it. He can take his choice amongst these three.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I know of no group of people in Canada nor in the United States in whose way of making a living a hundred million dollars would be more wisely invested than in the fisheries of Newfoundland.

Now what is the alternative to it? Does any member of this House doubt the alternative? The alternative, it seems to me, is a swift depopulation of the outports. My honourable friend, the member for Fogo District, told me a few weeks ago that on Fogo Island, since the end of the recent war, nine years ago, in the past nine years on Fogo Island which is one of the great fishing areas of this Island of Newfoundland, virtually every young man who has left school has emigrated to some other part of Newfoundland, and some of them

have left Newfoundland altogether. I don't know if my honourable friend has the actual figures?

MR. JANES: We have no boy or girl who has passed Grade XI in the last four or five years who has remained.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the last four or five years, my honourable friend tells me, not one girl or boy who has passed Grade XI in Fogo has remained in Fogo.

MR. HOLLETT: No boats, I suppose. They hauled them up, did they not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I find my honourable friend's reference a little obscure.

That is the alternative. The alternative is that these places will become depopulated. Now admittedly Fogo Island might be a rather dramatic example and in some ways an exaggerated example of the situation that is general throughout the Island. But that is not quite as bad because Fogo Island is an island in Bonavista Bay. I know islands where today not a living soul is left where five or eight years ago, as recently as that, dozens of families lived. I know one island that I canvassed, indeed I canvassed every dwelling on that island when I was seeking election to the National Convention, in the District of Bonavista Bay centre. There were there then some eighteen or twenty families. In addition to these families there were other families who went there every summer to carry on the fishery. Today there is not a single family there. We all know of other cases around the coast of Newfoundland where people have left the islands to go on the mainland of Newfoundland. That is only a more

dramatic demonstration of what is going on somewhat less dramatically, somewhat less spectacularly all over the coast of Newfoundland. People are moving from the smaller places and going to the larger centres. Some of these places are in Newfoundland and some of them are on the Mainland of Canada. But people are leaving these outports. What people? In the main young people. Now, Mr. Speaker, to be quite brutal and to be quite realistic about it, it may be that 1954 is too late to launch a great fishery development programme. The opportunity may have come and gone. I don't know. I hope not. But it may be the case. Possibly 1950 would have been too late. Possibly any time after the second world war was too late. I don't know. I can only hope not. I do know that social forces were let loose, particularly during the second world war, that are operating yet which may make it quite impossible sociologically, people-wise, may make quite impossible the kind of fishery development we are planning in this legislation. Maybe it is futile to expect people to go out on the Atlantic Ocean and fish, young men. Maybe it is just a waste of time to expect young men will make a career of fishing in the salt water. I don't know. I hope not. I hope that is not the case. But it may be the case. If it is the case it is poetic justice. It is the past catching up with us. It is the historic chicken coming home to roost. It would be the result of centuries and decades of injustice if now the young men of our outports, who fifty years ago would have looked forward to no more than an entire lifetime in the salt cod fishery, if now they have their minds made up never to touch a salt codfish. That would be the

historical chicken coming home to roost indeed. I don't know. I can only hope that it is not so. If I could make my voice heard by every young fisherman in Newfoundland today I would say something like this: There is something to be said for leaving the outport home and getting a job at Goose Airport. There is something to be said for getting a job at Seven Islands. There is something to be said for getting a job on some other airport or in some military establishment. There is something to be said for going off to Nova Scotia or Ontario and getting a job for the summer. There is something to be said for that. The wages are paid in cash. They run up 90c., \$1.00, \$1.20, \$1.50 an hour. There is something to be said for it. God in Heaven knows that there is something to be said for it especially compared with what young, able-bodied men and ambitious and energetic fishermen have known in the past, compared with what they have been able to get out of the fishery up to now. There is something to be said for it. But I would also say this: There is no future, no real future in going from pillar to post, a job now for three months and then at another airport, another job for four months, and at Harmon Field a job next year for three months, and at Gander the year after, if you are lucky, for three or four months. Then a job, maybe the year after, on some construction job for three or four months. There is no future in that. There is no real future for a young man in that.

I had a relatively young man, not real young, in his fifties, come in to see me in my office last night. He comes from Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay. For the past three years he has been working at Goose Airport. He

was making \$1.48 an hour as a foreman. He came in now to go down there again, only to learn that he is past the age limit, which is fifty-five years of age. His job is finished. There is no more future for him. He is fifty-five years of age. He is a patriarch at fifty-five. He was a foreman for three years getting nearly a dollar and a half an hour and with lots of overtime. Now he is fifty-five, and he is turned out on the scrap heap.

But you are not on the scrap heap at fifty-five if you are a fisherman. You can fish at fifty-five and at sixty, and if you want to, at sixty-five, if you are still in good health and active. And you are more likely to be in good health and active than if you were living in some city working in some factory or on some industrial job. I would admit to the young fishermen of Newfoundland that, if they had to judge the future in the fishery by the past, then keep away from it. If the only prospect at all they can see ahead of them in the fishery is what they have seen in their own lives up to now, and in the lives of their fathers and grandfathers before them, stay away from it. Let that be my advice!

But I would not be talking for five days in this House about fishery development if I saw nothing better in the years right ahead of us than there has been in the years right behind us. I would not waste my breath and my throat for five days talking fishery development if I saw nothing in it. That is the message that I would send out to young fishermen: What should have been done in the past is going to be done now! What former governments did not do this Government is going to do (and

I am not naming former governments).

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could ask a question: The Fishery Development Committee Report says that the industry, if mechanized, will only need two thousand men. That is what you are talking about. What about the rest of them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is talking about complete mechanization of the fisheries? I have not done so. I don't propose to do so. I said this Government is going to do what former governments did not do. When I say that I am not condemning former governments. They could only do what was possible for them to do. It was not possible for them to tackle this great fishery problem, as we are going to do now.

If it costs one hundred million and the Government of Canada pays fifty million of that, that is then fifty millions that this Government do not have to pay, and it is fifty million we do have to find. But where would former governments of Newfoundland have found fifty million dollars? Between the two wars or between the end of the first world war and the outbreak of the second world war the various governments borrowed over fifty million dollars in bond issues, over fifty million they borrowed between the two wars. What for? They borrowed it to pay the ordinary running expenses of the Government. A little portion of it, but only a small portion of it was spent on capital expenditure, the vast bulk of it was spent to finance the ordinary running expenses of the government.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to help out this argument—I think you will remember that between 1919 and

1931 that fifty million dollars was borrowed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, virtually none was borrowed after. As I said it was borrowed between the two world wars but after the Commission Government came in 1932 we borrowed practically nothing. In 1931 we collapsed. We could not continue. There was some fifty million dollars borrowed in these twelve or fourteen years. That is about the same period of time we have in mind for this fishery development programme. That is roughly the same period of time in which these governments of these days borrowed over fifty millions not for fishery development but to stay alive, to keep the government alive, to pay the ordinary, day to day running expenses of the government on current account. Now of course I know very well it was necessary for the governments of those days to disguise the purpose of their borrowing. They could not very well go unbrokenly every year, year after year, with the regularity of the calendar, to the financial markets and say, we are back again, we are running into difficulties, we cannot collect enough from the people to pay the ordinary running expenses of the government, so we have to borrow to do it. They did not do that. They always passed their Loan Bills with a flash of trumpets and speeches by the Minister of Finance and announcing some great programme of a capital nature.

MR. HOLLETT: Like they are doing now.

MR. BROWNE: Except the last loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Like we are doing now? We are not even borrowing now. We are bringing in a Bill to set up an Authority, a Fishery De-

velopment Authority. Then the gentleman, who is not the intellectual member, says; "Like you are doing now!" This is on a par with the honourable gentleman's contribution to this debate on this great topic of fishery development. I say these various governments borrowed fifty millions and more in twelve or fourteen years to carry on. We propose in about the same period of time to borrow some sum for fishery development, ranging between twenty and fifty million dollars. My hope is that it will be closer to ten millions than to fifty. I am now referring not to what we propose to spend but to what we propose to borrow because, unless there is an economic recess and unless there is some kind of a depression, we hope to continue budgeting, candidly, for a substantial surplus on current account. That surplus will help to finance the fisheries development as well as will the amounts we borrow. But the surplus we earn ourselves on current account, if, as and when we earn it will reduce by these amounts the amount that we will have to borrow for the purpose of fishery development. So that, I say, to spend fifty million dollars from the Provincial Treasury in those years does not necessarily mean that we have to borrow fifty million dollars. We have to borrow what we don't earn and no more. The ambition we have is that for our part as a government here in Newfoundland, as a government of this province, we will spend about fifty million dollars while at the same time and during the same period the Government of Canada will spend another fifty millions, making a total of a hundred million dollars.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that appears to some members to be a lot of money

will they please bear in mind that the Parliament of Canada just a couple of years ago, with scarcely a blink of an eyelid, was able to vote an amount of seventy millions of dollars in hard cash to the wheat growers of the prairie provinces. I can assure this House that it is a long time now since the wheat growers of the prairie provinces needed financial support as our fishermen need it. It is a long time indeed since the wheat growers of Canada were in the kind of need that our fishermen are in at the present time. So that I say, when we talk of a hundred million being spent on fishery development, not in a year or two, but in a decade or rather more, we are talking after all what is quite a modest statement. Indeed I sometimes wonder if technological progress in the fisheries of the world generally might not make the estimate of a hundred million dollars obsolete even in the next two or three years. Whatever the figure required, however, we should be prepared to spend. Our attitude should be and our attitude must be the attitude that nothing is too much and nothing is too good for the fishermen of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me today that in view of the fact that we have but one stenographer a recess of ten minutes should be taken.

On motion House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before the recess I was at a point that I fear I did not develop thoroughly, and which needs undoubtedly to be developed. I would say that if I were in a position to talk to every fisherman in Newfoundland today, to have my voice heard by all the fishermen



in the province, I would agree with them that if the next few years are to be like the last few years I would not blame them if they decided to stay away from the fishery altogether, give it up, abandon it. I would not blame them. If I were a young man living in an outport today and could see no more for the future in the fisheries than the past, no better future than the past, then I for one would not only give up fishing in that harbour but I would give up living in Newfoundland. I would go out of Newfoundland and try to get a job in Ontario or Quebec or perhaps in British Columbia. I say that quite frankly. How could I say anything else? How could any man with a conscience, with any practical knowledge of how our fishermen have in fact lived in the past, how could he advise fishermen to continue living in the outports, continue fishing, if the future of the fisheries are to be no better than in the past, and especially in the immediate past?

But if I were able to talk to all the fishermen of Newfoundland today I would say this: The Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland have agreed on launching a great fisheries development programme. They have agreed on it. In the view of this Government, in this Newfoundland Government, it will take ten or twelve years or so to carry out that programme, and it will cost a hundred million dollars. We would not spend that money, we would not set up that Fishery Development Authority if we did not have two things first; great faith in the future of the fisheries and great determination to carry out these plans. I would say that to all the fishermen of Newfoundland. I would say this also: With fishery develop-

ment carried on at a great scale there will be for young men in the outports a far better future in the fishery than in anything else they can go at except the professions perhaps, and only a relatively small number of persons ever go into the professions, medicine, the Church, etc. There is a better future in the fishery than in anything else they can go at in the years immediately ahead. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the fishermen, young fishermen of Newfoundland: Unless the fisheries are made the most attractive thing they can go at then fishery development is a failure.

I have heard many fishermen say that there is no better life, if you can only make a living at it. Even if you can picture the fisheries conducted with a far greater degree of modernization of boats, engines and gear than exists now fishing will still be a free life and a good life. It always was an attractive life, if you could make a decent living at it. That is all the fishery really lacked. It is a good life but you could not make a living at it. Men had to get out of it because they could not make a living. Fishermen rarely left the fisheries for any other reason. When fishermen give up the fisheries it is only because for the most part they cannot make a living at it.

So that if I were able today to talk to every young fisherman in Newfoundland I would say to them: Before you make up your mind to leave the fishery, to give it up, before you abandon it finally and completely give those two governments in Ottawa and in St. John's a chance to show if they are bluffing. I can answer for this Government and I believe I can answer for the other one, but I can answer for this Government. Give

these two governments a chance to show if they are bluffing, to show if they mean business, to show if they are really going to bring about fishery development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I before passing on to the final point I wish to make in these remarks on this Bill at second reading, may I pay a very sincere tribute to the radio stations operating in this province for a perfectly magnificent job they have done in reporting these remarks of mine. I spent most of my life as a newspaperman and radio man, most of my life. In fact if I am ever kicked out of this job the only other kind of work I can go at is back to newspaper work or radio work. I understand it. I know it. I spent my lifetime at it. I began in 1918 and was at it until five or six years ago. I know reporting when I see it or when I hear it or when I read it. I ought to know it. I made a living at it in London and in New York and in Boston and in Halifax and here in St. John's. I am a newspaperman. That is my profession, and given the occasion, politician by profession. They have done a superb job of objective reporting, of compression and of thoroughness, they have left out nothing of consequence. They have gotten in everything of importance. They have compressed it, made it interesting. They have done a proficient job. I say that, not caring a tinkers curse what they say about me or how they report me. I could not usually care less. But this was important. This Bill is important. This fisheries development is important. It was important that our fishermen should know that the head of the Government in Newfoundland considered it important enough to give five days talking to it, and that

the Government as a whole and the party as a whole considered it big enough and important enough to give many more days to it. It is important that the fishermen should know that. It is important that the fishermen should know that this Government has faith in the fisheries. I thank the radio stations, and while I am at it I thank the newspapers also. They have done a good job too.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to deal with one final point I have in mind in connection with this Bill, and that is the men themselves, the men who constitute the body to carry out this great programme. The Speech from the Throne said that—I don't remember if it said "never" or "rarely" but it might have said "never"—never in Newfoundland's history were three men entrusted with such a gigantic task as that which has been entrusted to Mr. Dustan, Mr. Young and Mr. Winsor.

MR. JACKMAN: Twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is back in the Chamber. Well, I hardly knew him. He visited us a couple of weeks ago. A rare visitor! He has been sick—he comes in as large as life and knows all about it, and is prepared at the drop of a hat to make a contribution to the debate. Anything you like to talk about he will make his contribution at less than twenty-five thousand dollars a year.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—have I a right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman knows what is best he will sit down and stay very quiet. My honourable friend had

better do that. If he is wise he had better do that.

MR. JACKMAN: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, my absence from the House can be clearly explained. I have been sick.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is sick now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable gentleman has made his point and his explanation.

MR. JACKMAN: It is up to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I said the honourable member has made his point, and he may sit down.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there have ever been three men in our history in Newfoundland who have been given such a terrible task. Their failure, if they fail, will be a terrible failure, just as their success will be an enormous success. But win or lose, succeed or fail, the task that has been given to them is the biggest task ever given to three men in the history of this Island. We think we have chosen well. We have chosen a banker, a merchant and a gentleman whom it is difficult to describe with one tag, in the person of Mr. Winsor. He is a man of great knowledge of world trade, world markets, world conditions. He was one of the very highest ranking officials of FAO and a Newfoundlander of whom we have all been quite proud for the success he has achieved in that great field.

Mr. Dustan is a very successful banker. He was head of the Bank of Nova Scotia here in Newfoundland for a number of years. Then he went with Job's—Northlantic, as top man in that great fishery organization. In

fact I believe that as Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia he had a great deal to do with financing Job (Northlantic Fisheries) and the various other companies associated with Job and Northlantic Fisheries. I believe that as Manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia in Newfoundland, Mr. Dustan had a great deal to do with financing and therefore the upbuilding of that great company in the fish trade and fish industry.

Mr. Ross Young, as everyone who knows him and knows Water Street is well aware, is perhaps the most brilliant and the most capable young merchant that Water Street has produced. For a quarter of a century he was a director of Crosbie and Company. He was the first person not being a member of the Crosbie family to be made a director of the Crosbie firm. He has been up to his elbows very actively and very extensively in every branch of the fisheries, with one exception, the exception of the frozen fish industry. He has been up to his very elbows in it for a quarter of a century, the export of fish, the production of fish, Shore and Labrador and Bank operations and the operation of draggers, and the operation of shipping of various kinds, freight ships, foreign-going ships. He has at his very fingertips the buying and selling of all kinds of goods including, but not only, fish supplies. He is a man with a remarkably wide knowledge, remarkable experience, remarkable background in the trade and industry of Newfoundland. He is known to thousands of fishermen and is respected by them. He is known to hundreds of businessmen and just as widely respected by them.

Mr. Harry Winsor was once with the Newfoundland Fisheries Board. He was then stationed at Washington

for a number of years, I believe, in government service. Then he was employed by FAO (Food and Agriculture Association of the United Nations) and he moved with that organization to Rome when its headquarters was shifted to the Eternal City.

So that we think we have chosen carefully and well. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very Jack-blunt about these three men. The Government can afford to be very blunt about them. We felt that we had to get three men who would burn their bridges behind them, burn them completely and absolutely and be absolutely and completely independent of every merchant and business firm in existence anywhere on this earth—absolutely independent.—Not only will they work with us, but forever, as long as they live, as long as they breathe they have to be, absolutely independent, operating for this Government and for nobody else on this earth. They must have no other loyalties, no other interests beyond their purely personal and family interests. They must burn their bridges behind them, be completely independent, completely loyal to this Government and the task we entrust to them for as long as they live and not merely through the period of their service. We agreed, therefore, that not only would we pay them large salaries, the type that Bowaters and the A.N.D. Company would be prepared to pay them —

MR. JACKMAN: To another point of order, Mr. Speaker. Will the Premier state their credentials and qualifications, please.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order, it is a question.

MR. JACKMAN: Well, it is a question—Are you going to answer it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am breaking a resolution I make in this House five years ago that at the first sign of a certain thing I would act as ruthlessly as a man knows how to act. I will break that resolution. I will be a Christian. There is one thing I determined I would not have in this House —

MR. JACKMAN: You are always a Christian, Sir, God love you!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, don't provoke.

MR. SPEAKER: In the opinion of the Chair the question asked has already been answered.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I said that we felt it necessary not only to insure the permanent interest, the complete interest of the Fishery Development Authority in two ways (1) to give them high salaries of the type, for instance, that Bowaters would pay their top men or the AND Company would pay their top men, and (2) to give them pensions, whether they died or whether they retired later and (3) go a step further and pension their widows so that, Mr. Speaker, if there are three men in Newfoundland tonight who are completely independent, absolutely, absolutely, independent financially it is these three men. (1) Because they have high salaries. (2) Because when they go out they get pensions; and (3) when they go out, if they die, their wives will have pensions. Now we can't go any further than that. That is as far as we can go, and we have gone that far to insure that this great development programme, which is our policy on which we are cheerfully willing at any time to stand or fall. Tomorrow, next week, if you like, say the word and we will have it, next week, any

time at all, we will stand or fall on that great programme which has taken nearly three years to devise and which will cost a hundred million dollars to carry out. We think that great programme should be entrusted to men who are body and mind, not soul, but body and mind at the service and in the service of the Government and the people of Newfoundland. We are not willing to take any chances, to run the risk of divided loyalty. We must own their loyalties one hundred per cent. They don't have to save money. They have a pension when they go out. If they died their wives will get the pension. That is how independent we try to make them, because this programme is too big, too much depends upon it in the life of Newfoundland, and in the history of Newfoundland, too much depends upon it to entrust its success to men who might not be loyal and who might not be loyal because they are not independent.

Now let me say again what I have said once before. I have been in public life now since the first day I held a meeting in Gambo where I began my campaign one night in Gambo which is my birthplace. There I raised the flag of Confederation, there at that meeting. That was the summer that the members were elected to the National Government. I don't even remember what year it was, 1945 or 1946. Well, that was eight years ago. I held my first meeting in Gambo. I spoke that night for four hours, my first speech on Confederation. I campaigned then throughout Bonavista Bay, on every island in that bay, I was in nearly every home in that great district. From that day to this I have not stopped working. I am prepared, personally prepared and willing to do this; to go on working

for this Government to get this fisheries development programme well and truly launched—Then I am out—Then I am going, I am getting out. By then the mining programme will be well ahead. The great new forestry programme, please God, which my honourable colleague will be introducing into this House a year from now, a great new forestry programme, for development based on the report of the Royal Commission. A year from now in this House my honourable colleague will be introducing an equally great new agricultural development programme. Now what else or what more can we do? Fisheries development, forestry development, agricultural development and economic development. That is why I came into public life, that is the only reason. I must accept some responsibility for the fact that Newfoundland is a province of Canada. I have no apologies to make for that fact. I glory in it, I glory in it! No pen will ever write nor tongue ever tell the happiness and welfare brought to Newfoundland by Confederation. But it is not yet a complete success. The only thing that can make it a success is economic welfare. Our people must make a good living. They cannot live on family allowances and old age pensions and unemployment insurance and civil service salaries and railway pensions and railway salaries and all these things. There must be a firm and sound economic foundation for Newfoundland's future, without that Confederation can be and will be only a hollow mockery. I have felt it to be my bounden duty as one who is most personally responsible for the fact that we are a province of Canada, my bounden duty to help, to assist in laying that broad economic foundation for the welfare of our

Newfoundland people. I feel that what has already been set in motion the last great step is now in launching this great programme of fishery development. I am willing to stick with it, in fact I am determined to stick with it until all these are well in hand, until they are out of the realm of debate, until even the Opposition will cease to sneer at the new industries, until the fisheries development programme is going ahead and the forestry development programme and the agricultural development programme and the mineral development programme. I am willing to stick with it and determined to stick with it until these things are operating and the people of Newfoundland have a great sense of confidence in them and in their own economic future, their own economic security. There is nothing heroic about that. It would be a cowardly thing on my part to walk out before that is done. There must be an easier way for me to make a living than the way I am making it. There must be somewhere in the world an easier way for me to make a living. But I am not only willing but determined, because it is my plain duty to stick it out and resist sternly any temptation to drop out and take it easy. Because I can make an easier living giving lectures across Canada if I were to accept ten per cent of the invitations I get. I could make an easier living writing. I could make an easier living in half a dozen ways than in this job. But I will resist the temptation. This will be bad news for some of my friends opposite, but I can't help it. They thought I was just about ready to drop out.

MR. JACKMAN: That is very good news, Mr. Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is one thing about my honourable friend—I

I believe he is glad that he and I are going to be over here together, he over there and I over here for the next eighteen or twenty years.

MR. JACKMAN: I don't know about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not that long?

Mr. Speaker, if this greatest of all the Government's achievements can be brought about then I can step out of harness, with the words of Scripture on my lips:

"Lord, now let thy servant depart in peace."

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate until tomorrow.

MR. JACKMAN: I second that, Mr. Speaker.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

"2. Paragraph (1) of Section 2 of the Wild Life Act, chapter 197 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as enacted by Section 2 of The Wild Life (Amendment) Act, 1953, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(1) "resident" means

(1) a Canadian citizen who has resided in the province for a period of six consecutive months immediately preceding his application for a license or permit under the regulations;



(ii) any person, other than a Canadian citizen, who has resided in the province for a period of twelve consecutive months immediately preceding his application for a license or permit under the regulations:"

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would indicate how he is going to carry out that provision—Would that mean several men would have several licenses depending on the area in which they are fishing?

DR. ROWE: No consideration has actually yet been given to that. I might say we felt we should have that authority. We have always had authority with regard to the different classes of applicants, but we thought we should also have this authority, which we thought we had in the current legislation. They are not too sure in the Department of the Attorney General, and thought we should put it into the amendment to the Act. Mr. Chairman, I can tell you now no infringement of the privileges the citizens of our province enjoy is in mind. We can, however, visualize certain problems developing especially on the west coast when the ferry gets on the Gulf and the road is completed there and we have many thousands of tourists, we hope, in the summer time, armed with fishing rods and seeking licenses, and we could very well have all our rivers accessible to them and monopolized by this influx of visitors to the detriment of the local population. We would like to have the power which this gives us to say to the visitor coming here—If you want to fish there you are going to have to pay a higher rate. But as I said there is no intention whatsoever of curtailing the privileges of residents.

This may not be availed of for years to come if at all. The fact is the different classes of applicants have never been availed of except in the one particular instance of residents and non-residents although it has been in this legislation as far back as we have had it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would give us some assurance that this section is not designed if not intended to meet the suggestion made by the Tourist Director. During the past month, as we all remember, feelers have been spread out all across the country by the Tourist Director hinting at possible leasing of rivers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is not so.

MR. BROWNE: He certainly put out the feelers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not leasing but controlling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: May I repeat that feelers have been put out all across the country by the Tourist Director as to the advisability or otherwise of leasing certain of our salmon rivers and trout rivers possibly, but especially salmon rivers. This particular section here will give the Minister power to practically do that same thing by issuing a permit to such an extent he will make it prohibitive for most of our population, and increase the cost. We have only a small country with a few lakes and rivers, and I would like to think that at least during my lifetime, as I hope do all of us, that we would be able to go to

any of these rivers, pay a moderate license fee and fish, and build a camp fire and boil a kettle. Perhaps I would like to take the Honourable the Premier along some time. I am not suspicious at all, Mr. Chairman, but I can't help having a feeling that the Tourist Director, Mr. Vardy, knows something about this section. I can't help thinking it has been inspired by the Tourist Director, and I can't help—

MR. BROWNE: By the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. HOLLETT: No. He would not take the fishing rights away from anybody after talking five days on fish. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier would not keep any member of this country from fishing. But I fear that there is a suggestion at least to have some part of these powers controlled by the Director of Tourism. While his desire may be quite valid and laudible in a country the size of Canada or the United States or Australia where territory is unlimited and the rivers, lakes and ponds unlimited, it may be unfortunately necessary where they have large populations. But here we have just forty-two thousand square miles not counting in Labrador, and we have a small population of three hundred and eighty thousand, and I am quite sure we all want to go salmon fishing once in a while. I wonder, therefore, if the Honourable Minister can put a limit on the cost of permits to fish on these rivers. If I am correct, the authority is given to the Minister to make these regulations.

DR. ROWE: To the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: You say you may vary the fees in respect of different

areas and different classes of applicants—I would like you to give the people of Newfoundland some assurance there is not going to be prohibition against going to these places by reason of large fees. I think we would all feel much better about it.

DR. ROWE: I can only give this assurance: The Government, since my connection with it, has never considered formally or informally or in any way whatever the matter of leasing rivers anywhere or in any part of the country or any part of rivers, and I am assured by the Honourable the Premier that never since the Government came into power in 1949 has it been considered. Speaking for my own part as Minister of Mines and Resources we have never considered formally or informally or in any way doing so, and we have never had any suggestion, to my knowledge at any rate, from the Director of Tourist Development or anyone else with regard to this clause. What the honourable gentleman refers to as feelers were not feelers insofar as either the Government or my Department were concerned, but were statements made by the Director of Tourist Development just as statements he made previous about the terminals at Port aux Basques and the conditions at Gander Airport. He is not putting out any feelers prompted by the Government and certainly not in this particular instance. There is absolutely nothing behind it other than what it says. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the Director of Tourist Development called me in my office only yesterday to ask me what was in this Bill we had before the House because he has had recent inquiries throughout the Province and he had no idea what this amendment contained. That is all I can say: The Government is not con-

sidering leasing rivers, and as far as I know, have no intention. I cannot speak for future governments.

This amendment here is exactly what it says: It gives the right to charge, but we have never even discussed the application of it. I would say also that this Government has been elected by the people and having to go back to the people periodically to get re-elected, is not likely to do anything which would not be favourably received. If I had been a party to say, raising the rates for Cartwright or Sandwich Bay on the salmon rivers and Eagle River, I would not want to go back. After all we are living under a political system. That is all I can say. It is not instigated by the Director of Tourist Development. He did not know until yesterday when I told him what was in the Bill. There is nothing underhanded there designed, as I think it was reported somewhere outside, as a first step of the beginning of an attempt to lease rivers. It is exactly what it says and it is nothing else. As to how it will be implemented in years to come I don't know any more than the Minister who brought in the original clause of different classes of applicants knows how it would be implemented ten years later.

MR. HOLLETT: On this point of the Tourist Director not knowing of the amendment, I cannot make that conform with the things that have been going on relative to the statement he has made concerning the leasing of rivers. He has been all over the country and has made addresses in Grand Falls, Gander, and I believe, Corner Brook, on the possibility of leasing rivers. I grant he comes under the Department of Economic Development. Surely the Tourist Direc-

tor would not go out in his capacity as Tourist Director and comment to the people on the possibility and feasibility, and in some cases, I believe, the desirability of leasing certain rivers. He certainly would not do that without the knowledge of the Minister of Economic Development. It looks to me that there is not very much, shall I say, co-ordination between them. There is no relationship between the Department of Economic Development and the Department of Mines and Resources. The Minister admitted that. I have not yet understood apparently on account of the lack of intelligence on this side of the House, and he has not convinced me as to his reason for doing this, and until he does that I am not in favour of it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, only this morning I was reading the Corner Brook notes in the "Daily News" and the reporter there said that the Director of Tourist Development stated that he was in favour of leasing rivers in certain areas.

MR. HIGGINS: That is a misquote?

MR. BROWNE: If he was properly quoted then we should have a statement from the Minister of Economic Development that he is not in favour of it and the Government does not intend to consider it because, it seems to me a combination of these words—"and the fees prescribed under this paragraph may be varied in respect of different areas and different classes of applicants of different periods"—it certainly gives the Minister power to lease rivers. On that account I think we should know for certain from the Minister of Economic Development, who has great influence with the Government, and with the

Minister of Mines and Resources, and if he were to favour that change in the policy that has been in effect up to the present time, I think he would likely be able to carry it out. It might be so arranged that it would not be so important to the constituents represented by the Minister as it would be in certain areas on the West Coast. Now, if we are to have the leasing of rivers we should at least know it so that we can discuss it because there are many points to be discussed. Maybe the Honourable the Premier is in favour of it. I would like to know at any rate from the Premier and Minister of Economic Development what he thinks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't feel called upon to give any such opinion. The view of the Government has been stated with great clarity by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. Do they want a statement by several Ministers? Who cares in this debate what any individual around Newfoundland thinks? The view of the Government was stated a moment ago by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, and you have no other alternative except to accept or reject it.

MR. BROWNE: Does the Minister of Economic Development support the point expressed by his Director of Tourist Development, one of the paid officials, one of the gentlemen who has nothing to worry about as far as salary is concerned. He is paid, I believe, ten thousand dollars a year. He goes out and makes a statement that, in his opinion certainly, certain rivers ought to be leased, and his Minister has no comment to make on his statement.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, in

case I did not make myself clear let me do so now: The question arises as to this clause being connected with the leasing of rivers—is it designed to permit the leasing of rivers as I said, and put in here without any reference to the leasing of rivers. It has no more to do with the leasing of rivers than it has to do with fishing on the Grand Banks. It is put in there because our Department feels we should have that power. It is not put in with any view on the part of the Department to make use of it. If use could be made of it for the leasing of rivers, and I don't think it can, as I have pretty good advice that it cannot, and it is certainly not designed for that purpose—I can only repeat neither the Government nor any part of it has ever considered the leasing of rivers in any way whatsoever.

MR. HIGGINS: Am I to understand the words as they now read cannot be applied to cover the leasing of rivers? It is not your intention to cover the leasing of rivers by that?

DR. ROWE: It is certainly not put in there for that.

MR. HOLLETT: I think the Minister would admit that if he wanted a permit fee of five hundred or a thousand dollars and a person wanted to fish on a certain river that is tantamount to leasing it. That is the authority you are asking for. It is all very well to get up and say you have no intention of leasing, but here you are giving authority to charge license fees no ordinary Newfoundlander can pay, and therefore he cannot go there and fish. That is leasing a river.

DR. ROWE: There is one final thing: We have always had that power in the different classes of

applicants. That is not new. That was always there. We could have always charged five hundred dollars to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if we had wanted to do so. That power was always there. I am not going to say anything more about this except to say this clause has no ulterior motive other than what it says.

Clause 2 carried.

Clause 3 read—carried.

On motion Committee reported having passed the Bill without amendment. Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is a simple amendment to the BRINCO Act. The period provided in the agreement as ending before the 31st of March 1954 shall be a new period ending by December 31, 1954, the period during which they can overlook all of the area in which they are to make their selection of their fifty thousand and ten thousand square miles. They had until the 31st of March this year to do that. They have asked to have it extended until the 31st of December instead, the reason being that by the time the agreement was finally signed last year it was then so late in the season. When they got up there with their parties and aircraft and their supplies it was very late in the summer. They have not, in fact, to this moment been able to look over the whole of

the area in which they are to make their selection. So they asked for this extension and we agreed, dependent upon the Legislature agreeing to do it. We agreed to give them until the end of December. I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say the Opposition would like to have until tomorrow to look over the Bill. It is not this Bill I want to look over but the original one. I see nothing against the principle, as it is merely, as the Honourable the Premier pointed out, an extension of time. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all enamoured with the original Bill, but I think it would be a good policy on the part of the Government to extend the time a little longer because once BRINCO has discarded certain areas it is unlikely that any other company would want to go in there in a hurry. I think while they have the opportunity now we ought to give them the necessary time, and perhaps a little more time than they so desire, to thoroughly search the area to see if there are any minerals there, because, as I have said, once they leave the area, and discard it, having discovered nothing, it is there, as far as the country is concerned, for a long time to come.

On the face of it, I see nothing whatever wrong with the principle, and we agree with it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development a question. He announced as a matter of very great importance a short time ago that this corporation intended to make a survey of the watershed of the Hamilton River. Has that been put into writing, or is

it a verbal undertaking given by the corporation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other comments, may I reply at once to my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West. The decision of BRINCO to conduct this great hydro-electric survey in Labrador is their decision. They informed me of the fact and I informed the House of the fact. It is not part of any special agreement or any supplemental agreement nor any additional agreement, it is merely the exercise by them of the rights they have under their Act. Their telling me of the fact that they are going to exercise that right in that way in that time was the significance of my announcement.

Now, with regard to the Bill itself—what my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says is perfectly true. It is merely an extension to December 31st of the rights already given them in the original Act, so that during the rather longer period, six months, they can take a somewhat better, longer and harder look at some areas they might have just glanced over. I cannot say I agree that once they drop an area, that area will lie dormant for a considerable time thereafter. That has not been a fact in other cases I know of. There is an area right now that has been dropped by one company which another company is eagerly waiting to get. The fact is the shorter the period the better the likelihood of leasing the areas they reject. The rights we gave BRINCO in the original Bill we are now amending only as to time. We gave them possibly a hundred thousand square miles or more, possibly a hundred and twenty thousand square miles from which to make a selection by March

31st past, of fifty thousand square miles. Well even by the end of December 31st they will not have looked very hard or long at a hundred thousand square miles. What they have in fact done is to go and look at the less promising of the hundred thousand square miles, because their first job is a job of rejection, a job of elimination, so that they have kept what they think are the most promising areas for their fifty and ten thousand square miles, ten in Newfoundland and fifty in Labrador. So that their first step is to reject what is fairly obviously not very interesting. But they would like to have until December 31st to do so.

MR. HOLLETT: Has the Government been informed as to any particular areas of any amount of square miles so far selected by that corporation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we have. They have selected tentatively but have not informed us officially.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources wishes to table answers to a question. Does the House give leave?

Leave granted (Answers already referred to at an earlier hour today).

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, after considering the matter I consider I have given all the information required. I am quite sure that the feelings of the people concerned will be kept in mind in any use that might be made of it.



The House at its rising adjourned until, tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 12, 1956

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Premier in his New Year's address promised the teachers that the Government would provide an additional million dollars in the vote for teachers' salaries.

I, as Minister of Education, was requested by the Government to arrange a series of meetings with representatives of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and the officials of the Department of Education so that a thorough analysis of the implications of the teachers' proposals could be made and that a scale be devised for consideration of government, which would come within the scope of the million dollar increase.

As a result of these meetings a salary scale has been put forward to the government, and I take great pleasure in announcing to the House that the government has agreed to implement the scale as presented by our teachers. It will take effect as from April 1, 1954.

In this new scale emphasis is placed on the training of teachers. The ultimate goal is to fill all our classrooms with fully qualified teachers, that is with those who have had a minimum of one year's professional training. This will take time, perhaps up to a period of ten years, but it is a goal well worth achieving. In the mean-

while ample time will be allowed non-certified teachers to obtain the necessary training required for permanent certificates. The new scale will also enable more teachers who have had professional training to return to university for further work. Thus, too, the number of teachers in the highly qualified class should increase yearly.

One of the provisions of the scale is the equalization of salary for male and female teachers. This principle is being recognized more and more in educational administration and is very apt in our province where the majority of those in the teaching profession are women.

The implementation of this new salary scale represents a great step forward for education in Newfoundland. In keeping with its policy of regional and central high schools this government is determined to provide our children with the opportunity to complete a good high school course and to be trained by teachers who have been fully qualified to give this training.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister if he would clarify one point. The increase amounts to one million dollars in the present fiscal year, is that right?

MR. CHALKER: That is right—On the salary scale.

**Presenting Petitions**

None.

**Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

**Notice of Motion**

None.

**Notice of Questions**

(82) MR. BROWNE (St. John's West): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Give the names, addresses and date of information of all Credit Societies now carrying on business in Newfoundland.
2. What is the total amount of share capital for such Societies and what amount of money was loaned by them during the past fiscal year?
3. Have any Societies been suspended for any reason during the past year? If so, give the names and addresses of such Societies.

(8) MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

Has any part of the programme of road construction or reconstruction planned for this year been put into effect? If so, give the nature and location of such work?

**Answers to Questions**

Questions No. 90, 91.—In course of preparation.

Question No. 78.—In course of preparation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Public Works is in town? I have a question to ask him, or anyone acting on his behalf.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): No, Mr. Speaker, no one is acting on his behalf.

MR. BROWNE: I was going to

ask if any part of the programme of construction of roads for this year has been put into effect. If so, give the name and locations of such roads.

MR. SPEAKER: It must be put on the Order Paper.

**Orders of the Day**

Third Reading: A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act," on motion read a third time. Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading: A Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority," Adjourned debate.

MR. P. J. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the principle of this Bill which we are now debating I would at the beginning state that in regard to the future social and economic life of the people whom I represent this is the most important piece of legislation ever to come before this House of Assembly.

As this House and Province, sir, are now aware, the purpose of this Bill is to establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority to implement the recommendations contained in the report produced by the commission under the chairmanship of Sir Albert Walsh.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the fisheries from the day the first cod was caught by our ancestors up until the day this commission was appointed and on until 6.00 o'clock yesterday has been so ably, thoroughly and factually set forth by the Honourable the Premier that it leaves very little for me to add about it, if I am able to avoid repetition. I might say, Mr. Speaker, his words were our thinking

and so his opinions are ours. We, Sir, are sincere in having the welfare of the fishermen and their families at heart, as he has although most of us, I am sure, never hope to be capable of expressing our thoughts with such gift of oratory as he is blessed. However, Mr. Speaker, with the time at my disposal to defend the Bill—I will try to be brief and to the point.

When this Government took office, Sir, we found the fisheries industry like most of our industries to be an extremely sick patient. Like most of our industries, sir, the diseased patient was crippled, dilapidated and fallen down. We found the fishermen, Sir, battling against great odds, with obsolete gear and boats and under a vicious system with thousands of our fishermen giving up in despair and leaving for greener pastures, the bases or to other industries or to the mainland.

This Government, Sir, could have done like all other governments did in the past. They could have given the industry a sedative, boost its morale for a while. But that only meant that later the disease would result in the death of the greatest industry we have at our disposal. But, Sir, this government does not believe in sedatives. This government believes in getting at the seat of any evil and destroying the cause and building up anew. After all, Mr. Speaker we on this side of the House are a different type than those chosen by our electors in the past, and are different from the choice our electors had in the past. Sir, if there is one thing that the people of Newfoundland are modernized in, it is in their thinking, except of course the Tories, who still live in the far back ages. Most of us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have come

from families who have worked, sweated and toiled to feed and educate us. Some of us who have come from larger families had to sweat and toil to educate ourselves and prepare ourselves for the world that lay ahead. Mr. Speaker, I don't think anybody can deny that the men on this side of the House are practically all comparatively young, well educated. When I say well educated I mean in the broad sense of the word. They are broad-minded, daring and energetic men who have studied the history of the past, have noted the pitfalls and triumphs such as they were, and the failures of men who have stood here, and the lives of great politicians of the past, especially Mr. Speaker, such politicians as had tried to bring about great things, but were crushed by other forces which held the control of the power to the detriment of the common people. So that what this government is doing now, Sir, is history, which I feel sure, when it is written, will come under the heading of something like this: The four hundred and fifty year old problem of our fisheries was solved by our Liberal Government under the leadership of Newfoundland's greatest premier.

The government, Sir, in 1949, when we took office realized that the problem of the fisheries was the greatest problem ever to face any government in Newfoundland. They, knowing the problem's great magnitude, a problem which if not solved would mean every fishing port in our country would become a ghost port, knowing the attention the Government could give it after its normal duties were performed, they took, Sir, the next best logical course and appointed a Royal Commission of well chosen persons from within and without our land to make a thorough survey of the fisheries from

an economic and social viewpoint. Then, Sir, based on the findings of this survey it was the duty of the Commission to suggest a remedy by recommending ways and means to improve our most important industry. This survey, Mr. Speaker, was carried out over a period of two years. That Commission, produced its findings and suggested a remedy. That report, Sir, has been in the hands of the people of this province, the fishermen of the province for over a year. Sir, I have studied that report thoroughly, and have read and reread it. I have studied every item, to the best of my ability, from every angle. Apart from that, Sir, I have discussed it with men of far wider knowledge of the province and of the fisheries than I possess. I found, Sir, that they all have come to the same conclusions as I have come. That is that the successful application of the recommendations will result in the solution of our four hundred year old problem. By modernizing equipment and all the methods of catching and processing the many varieties of fish nature so kindly placed at our disposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have come to the point where this great programme is about to be launched. The Fisheries Authority are about to be made a legal body with certain powers to enable them to guide the programme through to reality. In other words, Mr. Speaker, they are the machinery which is to put into motion and guide, where necessary, the forces which will bring science into the lives of our fishermen to change their mode of catching, curing and processing our fisheries' great products, and aid them along the road from the old system and have them industrialized to improve their standard of living.

To do that, Mr. Speaker, fishermen

will be encouraged to centralize, not in overcrowded cities, but to well planned fishing ports with decent housing, good schools, medical centres, where they can enjoy modern conveniences which have been denied to them in the past.

Those men who have been chosen for this committee, Mr. Speaker, are experienced and well qualified for the great responsibility under which they are placed. After the appointment of this committee, Mr. Speaker, I made it a point to check on these men. Having been interested in the fishery, and interested in the way it got along it was only natural that I should, when I heard that the government had appointed a committee, try to find out who the men were. Sir, the other day when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking in a short speech he gave us, he ended up by saying that he wondered why they were not staying at the same work that they had been at for years. Take the Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dunstan: He has had twenty-five years of experience in the Bank of Nova Scotia, four years of which he was manager of a bank in Ontario, two years in Nova Scotia, and three and a quarter in St. John's, Newfoundland. From there, Mr. Speaker, he went to the Northlantic Fisheries Limited, Job Brothers, and was general manager for eighteen months. Well, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition wondered why he was not still at the bank. We are lucky he is not at the bank still. Because if he were we probably could not find another man with so much experience in banking and bank loans, etc., as he is. I am quite satisfied that the government was lucky enough to obtain the services of such a man. I have had some dealings with him, Sir, during the past

two or three months. I can assure you that I am confident that he will carry his responsibilities, great as they are, to the best of his ability, and I am sure we will never regret that we were so lucky as to obtain such a man.

Another member of this committee, is Mr. Young. He is a young Newfoundlander who went to work at fifteen, at the Royal Stores and spent ten years with that firm, and he has spent twenty years with Crosbie and Company. He was a director of that latter firm. He is familiar with fish selling and while with that company was also actively associated with the cost and operation of the whale fishery. He is familiar with shipping, insurance and other matters relative to the fishery

The third member is Mr. Winsor. He was born in an outport, attended different schools in the province. He graduated in business administration from Boston University. He spent three years with the Newfoundland Fisheries Board, and administered the fisheries assistance claims in 1938-39 and 1940. He was secretary of the combined food branch of the fisheries committee in Washington practically from its inception until the committee disbanded in 1947 or 1946 and became an associate of the United States Food and Agricultural Committee, setting up a directorate of fisheries division in that association. He was for years in the United Nations Foods and Agricultural Organization. From there he resigned and became a member of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated in this House, these men have the greatest responsibility ever placed on any committee in the history of this province and in the history of

Newfoundland. But, for those men to carry out their duties to a successful end they need the co-operation of us all. This programme, Sir, will decide for Newfoundland if she is to go up or down. To me, Sir, the fishery of Newfoundland is like education. It has been everybody's business to solve it for four hundred years. This problem is a challenge to the Government, it is a challenge to businessmen, it is a challenge to the fishermen and it is a challenge to the teaching profession, co-operative field workers and all others, Sir, that are interested in the civic affairs of this country. I feel sure, Sir, that those who have borne the brunt of the cruel fate of the past will have the courage to rise and throw off the feudalistic regime under which they have lived for centuries. Personally, I have an undying faith in our fishermen. I feel sure that with the help of this Government, in whom the fishermen have demonstrated undying faith, we will in the years ahead see our fishing industry the greatest in the world and our standard of living equal to any in North America.

First, Sir, we have the fishermen, the finest seamen in the whole world. We stand directly in the midst of the greatest fishing grounds in the whole world. To me, the fishermen are as the British Forces were to Prime Minister Churchill when he said, "Give them the tools and they will finish the job." Show them the things—give them assistance to modernize their equipment and boats for them to discover the fish. Give them a decent wage and they will bring forth the products of the deep.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be one of this Government who are prepared and courageous enough to lay bare facts, such as the Premier has

done in the past few days, of the cause of our fishermen's long struggle for survival, and to launch forth a programme, which is long over-due, to modernize and revolutionize this vital industry of ours; to raise the standard of living of our fishermen and their families to a decent standard to which human dignity is entitled.

On the other side of this House there are two men, one of whom was born in Placentia Bay and the other whose ancestors came from Placentia Bay. I don't think he was born there, but if he were not, his father was, i.e., the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. His ancestors came from Sound Island. By the way my grandfather also came from Sound Island. But, Sir, the only thing that we have in common, or I have in common with those two gentlemen is that I was born in the same area. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the Leader of the Opposition for the past two years, and having listened to the other honourable member, who is now absent, through this session, having heard them express their viewpoints, it makes me wonder (I don't know exactly how to put it) how they can differ so much from my point of view. It may be necessary here, Sir, to give a brief history of my background: Mr. Speaker, I was born at Merasheen, of a fishing family. I had to leave school at fourteen and go fishing and worked around in other jobs. I had it pretty hard, Sir, and came up the hard way. I saw people in Placentia Bay go through the bad times of the thirties. In 1939 I volunteered for the Royal Navy and spent approximately six years overseas. During that time, Sir, I gained much knowledge. Being in the navy I mixed with fishermen of several countries, visited several coun-

tries, and saw the way that the fisheries were carried out, and I noted, their standard of living. I think I owe to that experience the realization of just how backward our fisheries were in Newfoundland. After my return, but before I go on further—there was one thing I found during my experience, that the lack of education amongst Newfoundlanders in the Royal Navy kept us back. We had no chance of promotion. It was not from the fact that we were not good seamen, or that we could not learn pretty fast, rather it was the fact that we did not have the mathematics required to take the courses in navigation. But, during that time, realizing our shortcomings, I made up my mind that I would be educated. I was almost thirty years of age when I returned to Newfoundland to resume school and to finish my high school, which I did not have the opportunity to do in my younger days. I stated earlier, Sir, that I had left school at fourteen, with Grade IX. When I came back I attended the ex-servicemen's school, finished my high school and went on to Memorial College. There I took teachers' training, as I realized with my own experience that if there is anything we need in the outports, that need was to educate our youth in the broad sense of the word. I felt after having travelled, that I would make a good teacher to go back amongst young girls and boys who were in the same position as I had been, I felt that I could do a good job, that I could tell them of my experiences, of what I had learned, and make them realize just how we were kept back by our mode of living in the outports. Sir, I spent three years at Memorial University. Before I finished I had my "U" Grade. Then I went into politics. I went up to my



district with some knowledge of how things were in the past, with a knowledge of political science and the history of our country as a whole. I went in there as something new in politics. I went in not as the old politicians of the past. I went in there and I carried on my campaign to suit the age that we live in. I came out openly as the Premier has come out in the past five years, and laid the facts before the people. I was one of them. Some of my people are still fishing in the district. I did not mind being frank. I told the people where we had stood. I told them how backward we were. I told them that in all my travels through Europe, Africa and the Mediterranean, England and Canada and the United States I had never found anywhere where the standard of living was so low as right there in Placentia Bay or in Newfoundland. I told them of how the fishery was carried on in other countries, how the people lived etc. Sir, I forecast at the time the end of the fishery. I told them that if we were to go on as we were, I could see an end within five or ten years of the salt codfishery of Newfoundland. I had watched it for several years going down and down, and I knew the end was not far off, if we carried on in our old way.

At the time the National Convention was on, and the people were waking up, I think. The speeches made by the Honourable the Premier of today opened their minds, with the radio at their disposal they knew more of what was going on. When I laid these facts before them they did not feel insulted, which perhaps they would have a few years before. I think they grasped the idea. From then until now they have realized

that they must modernize or else they can't just go on in the old way.

I made the people few promises. But I promised them that I would do my utmost during the time I represented them to modernize the fisheries. I told them that if I failed, and if they had to go on in the old way that then the Government had not measured up, and I would go back to them and tell them we had failed and advise them to leave the district, leave the province and go elsewhere to earn a living and get a decent standard of living.

Well, Sir, in the past five years I don't think anybody in the Government has taken the fisheries more to heart, maybe others have taken it as much to heart, but nobody has taken it more to heart than I have. I don't think there is anybody who has visited the Premier's Office more often than I have. Each time I went in there it was to talk fishery. I have kept in close contact with the Department of Fisheries.

I may admit that there were times when I was discouraged, times when I felt like going back and telling them we could not do anything about it, to pack up and get out. But, thanks, to the attitude of the Premier, the Minister of the Department and others whom I had contacted, they could not give the industry a sedative. They intended to start properly to get at the heart of the disease, and start from there up to reorganize and revolutionize and modernize the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, all through this period I had confidence in the people, in the fishermen. I knew that if they were given a chance to improve their lot, if they were modernized, they would rise above the old fashioned

ways and make the industry a profitable one. As I told the fishermen, my ideas coincided with the ideas of the Premier and of the Department of Fisheries and others who could look ahead. I knew that the fishery was not finished. I knew that if the obsolete gear could be replaced with modern gear a good living could be made, and I held on trusting and hoping that the day was not too far off when we could launch into a programme such as we are launching to-day.

Now, that was my contention, that was my conviction, that we had to change from the past to something modern, we had to uplift the standard to give the people a better chance. I had confidence in the people. But when this Bill was introduced I found that my honourable friends across the way, particularly those two to whom I referred earlier, who came from the same area as I came from, or their ancestors came, and I found that they were living in a different age. I don't think they have the same confidence as I have. Their ideas are an awful lot older. I don't think the people whom I represent will agree thoroughly with them.

First of all I would like to deal with the Opposition. They got up to attack or to object to this Bill. They started off with the Commission set up under Sir Albert Walsh. I judged, Sir, that they did not have any confidence in that committee, nor very much confidence in the recommendations. They were worried about the cost of implementing the recommendations. They went on and came to the Authority, and their pay, and wondered right through why they were not in their old jobs, and finally wound up with a cure for all ills. Their leader suggested what we

should do was to go back fifty years and live and work as they did in Burin. He brought us back to fifty years ago, to the days when we had schooners without engines, with merchants lording it over the people, school children working for five cents an hour, some of them out of school and could not afford to go to school but had to help their fathers to bring up their earnings high enough to have something to eat for the winter; to the days when women worked on the flakes. He said, that is the way that the fishery should be carried on.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order or a point of privilege or something. I don't think I said that that is the way the thing should be carried on. If the honourable gentleman is quoting me he must quote me correctly. I went back to describe some of these days, but I did not say I thought the fisheries should be carried on in that way. I want to have that corrected.

MR. CANNING: I have made no mistake. The honourable member painted a picture of the old days in Burin, and gave me to understand that is good enough. I don't intend yielding, Mr. Speaker, I have only an hour and forty minutes. It is not much sense the honourable member trying to defend some comment he has made and has regretted ever since. I don't intend sitting down any more.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of privilege. I won't sit down. Can I do anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the honourable gentleman objecting that he is being misquoted? The honourable

member agrees he painted a picture of half a century ago, but does not agree he advocated the return to conditions that existed at that time.

**MR. CANNING:** Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that was the picture he painted, and he thought that women and children should get back on the flakes. I am pretty well certain, Mr. Speaker, that was what he meant.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member cannot say the honourable member in question really did mean that. He may say, "I think that is what he meant," yes, but not that he actually did mean that.

**MR. CANNING:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just judging from the way the honourable member has gone on here since he came in here, since 1951.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, that drives me to rise to a point of privilege again, Sir. The honourable gentleman has started judging my statement on how I acted since 1951. There he gives it a difficult construction. If he is to quote me I must ask—

**MR. SPEAKER:** The honourable member has said now that the inference he drew is hardly a point of privilege. Allegations of facts can't of course be proven. It gets down to an argument—you did—I did not—that is no solution of the problem.

**MR. CANNING:** Mr. Speaker, I am not quoting him. I just told him he was following the trend he has followed since he came into this House. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, he gave us a picture of the old flakes and old stagheads, and the women and children working on the flakes at

Burin. Not at any time did he mention the modern plant they have today nor the way Burin has improved in the last, I will say, five years. He did not mention it, so I came to the conclusion that he did not agree with it. If I came from Burin and got up to talk on the fishery and overlooked the fact that there is a modern plant there, and that Burin has gone ahead so much in the last five years, and ignored that, and did not mention it, anyone would come to the conclusion that I did not agree with it, with modernizing the fishery. He talked about fifty years ago. Fifty years ago Burin was fifty years behind the time, so that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has put the clock back one hundred years. So by turning the clock back a hundred years or even fifty years what did he mean to do? Build up the flakes at Burin, get back the sailing schooner, scrap the engines, close the modern fish plant, send the women and children back to the flakes, put away their radios, cut off their electricity, get the old kerosene lamp in, and I think he could have added, set potatoes on Marystown highway, and if he wanted to get into St. John's, to the capital, get a boat and it will take me three days when you can drive from that area in six and a half hours.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the honourable member should have done then: He should have traced that history in those days, how the people lived, how the merchants overlorded and then he should have come down through the years, not very many, when that system in Burin disappeared. I happen to know a little bit about the history of Burin. I know what he told this House was true. They had flakes all around Burin, fishing premises, merchants

with bankers. They carried on. The merchant educated his children. If they could not get an education in Burin he sent them in here. But the fishermen carried on like in the rest of Placentia Bay. They were slaves. They were kept down. The merchants lorded over them. They never got a chance to throw off the shackles that bound them. However, that picture he painted of the merchants and flakes and those days, became clouded and dim down through the years and then disappeared. He did not follow on through and tell us that one morning he got up and there was none of it there. They went on for a few years, and then they failed. They failed because it was a vicious system. They failed because there was nobody getting any thing out of it only the merchants. The story of Burin is the typical story of the whole of Placentia Bay, as I know it. We had Jersey Rooms up there, we had so and so, but all that is left today is a few stores and what they call sunken wharves. I think it is one time in the modern age that God got angry. He treated them as Sodom and Gomorrah, and they disappeared. And why should they not? They set the prices. They told the fisherman what he was going to get the supplies for. They told him what he was going to have to work for, what the fish would be, what his wife was going to work for. They told them what they were going to give them to try and have them exist over the winter so that they would be there the next spring to work for them again. That is the idea of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition—in 1954 children would work for five cents an hour, as they did not fifty years ago, but nearer five years ago in Burin, for five cents an hour. The Honourable Leader of

the Opposition should remember—should remember, and what is more, should remember the days when he was a magistrate up there, when he had to go down to Placentia Bay and talk to the people on the dole and try and persuade them to kill their cattle so they could make out their dole order, and the day he arrived in Merasheen—

MR. HOLLETT: I rise, Sir, to a point of privilege. That, Sir, is absolutely foolhardy. He is referring to the time when people did kill cattle and did do other things at the order of the relieving officer, I may say I was the one who complained to the Department of Justice, and they asked me to go into the bay and make some inquiries about it. I certainly did not go down to order them to kill cattle.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, there is a point there. There is a very grave danger of attributing as a personal power, power which a magistrate exercises from higher authority. The honourable member must not make personal such powers as applying to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CANNING: No, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the system at the time. I know for a fact that some magistrates were told to go around. I don't know if the honourable member who was a magistrate at the time had that unpleasant duty. But I am talking about how far down the people went under the old system of fishing, under the system, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition recommends to this House, as he did the other day.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense! I did not recommend that. I don't intend to have my head cut off by a hatchet

man anyway. I want to state on a point of privilege, I did not say that, and the man who says so is not telling the truth. I realize the fact that the man has been sent here to do his job and cut me to pieces if he can. The point is that I am not going to stand for it. Every time he makes a statement like that I will demand—

**MR. SPEAKER :** As I said before, there is no point of privilege. The honourable member may complain he is misquoted by words attributed to him he did not say, or that he did not remember. However, I may say I have no recollection that the honourable member did say such a thing. True he painted a picture. The honourable member may express himself, I think, without suggesting to the House that the Leader of the Opposition advocated the return of that policy. Conclusions may be drawn but an honourable member cannot say the honourable member intended to do so. I cannot say more. I would be making the honourable member's speech for him.

**MR. CANNING :** Mr. Speaker, it seems the honourable member is going to jump to a point of privilege and to a point of order so as to cut my time to the time he spent on the fishery the other day.

I won't go into detail any further. In those days that system which I was referring to failed, because, Sir, the suffering of the people in those days in my district was a nightmare, and I would not wish to recall them. When I start talking about it, Sir, it makes me bitter, it may convert me into a bit of a radical. There are few things that I never like to recall. Some of them happened when I was overseas in the navy, hard times we had when I saw several die, etc. I

never like to talk about it any more. Next to that, Sir, I never like to talk about the thirties in Merasheen or in Placentia West or in the Island of Newfoundland.

Well, sir, I shall try my luck on the other honourable gentleman, seeing he has arrived, and see how I get on with him. He did not enlighten us very much, during his comments on this Bill which I am now debating. I just forgot how he started off, but I think he started to encourage co-operatives. Well, if the honourable gentleman has read the fishery report he would see that right through it that their angle is certainly to encourage co-operatives. I shall, further on in my talk, if they give me time to do it, tell them of the project which is about to go into operation at Mera-sheen, which is wholly and solely a co-operative venture.

**MR. BROWNE:** Wholly and solely?

**MR. CANNING :** Yes, wholly and solely. When this government have done their duty it will be wholly and solely, when the State does its duty to the people, the people who are down and out, the project at Mera-sheen will become wholly and solely co-operative. I say, after the state has done its duty, the duty it is expected to do.

Then he went on, and he said the fishermen should have training. Well, I began to think to myself, if he has read that book he is just repeating what that book had already recommended. It said they should be trained in techniques, the recommendations are there. That is our aim to bring technical knowledge to the fishermen, so long overdue, which they need. To enlighten the honourable gentleman I would tell him that

recommendation is already in practice. In my district, this spring, Sir, in March, the Navy Teacher went to Little Bay. He had a class of, I think, twenty-one or twenty-two, fishermen there. He gave them a course in navigation, radar sounding apparatus and the other modern machineries used on ships today in the navy, especially the fishing branches. They made charts of the fishing areas of Newfoundland, the Grand Banks, St. Pierre Bank, etc. So that he was a little late in telling us we should set up training. While on this subject, Sir, if I might, I may make a remark that some years ago, after the first world war I believe, we had here in St. John's the old naval ship, and I think it was the R.N.V.R. who were trained on board of her. They were trained in navigation, engineering, electricity and so on. I think that, in this age, the Federal Government could again bring back the naval training ship. I can see that it would serve general purposes. Of course the first and foremost would be to train personnel for naval warfare, but at the same time it would give a chance to some of our young men to train in navigation, engineering and other modern apparatuses used on ships, such as radar, etc. I think that this government properly should approach the Federal Government and request them, or at least have them look into the matter, and see if it would not be worth while. I feel certain Sir, that the Federal Government would agree to it, and see that these advantages are given our seamen in this Island of ours where we have so many fishermen, sailors, etc.

But, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West solved our saltfish problem in a few moments. I was a bit surprised. It was good to

hear a solution. After all, the saltfish problem is the greatest problem we have had in this country down through the years. We have it today, and probably it will be a problem of the future. Anyway, Sir, in my opinion (again I am not quoting him) as I understood him he said that he thinks we should get back the Spanish market. He did not give us ways and means whereby we could get it back. He talked of the Spanish seamen who came to town and said we should treat them nicely. Do not just say hello to them but go down and take them to our homes, give them dinner and look after them, and when they sail out of St. John's back across the Atlantic Ocean, they would go back and tell Spain all about it. They would say, those Newfoundlanders are certainly lovely people. I think now we will buy their fish from them. At least, that was the conclusion I came to. I have been wondering ever since how many Spanish sailors the honourable gentleman sees down on the street and brings up to his house and does things like that. Then he goes on to make that awful statement I never expected him to make. I was very much surprised—I think the women and children should go back on the flakes—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything of the kind. The honourable member has made a number of inaccurate statements as to what I said. Now if I may be allowed to say so, I said, I did not see very much difference between women and children working on flakes and working in factories and fish plants. And on another occasion, a number of occasions, I said it was a good thing to have a family life where fishermen were working at home and the wives and children helped them, and that



it was a good thing for children to be trained under the auspices of their parents.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, to defend that, he gave us a picture of a certain gentleman in Arnold's Cove who was lame, who had a little fishing boat and again I began to think that was a pretty good life down there in Arnold's Cove, and I think he meant we should leave that Arnold's Cove fisherman there to carry on like that. That fisherman in Arnold's Cove had three pigs and a motor boat. If I know anything about the fishery, and I do, he is going to need his wife on the flake.

MR. BROWNE: I cited this man as a sample of a modern fisherman. He had electricity in his stage and plenty of running water and he kept his premises clean. In addition he raised cattle and had pigs to sell as pork. He also had poultry. I said he was a good example of a fisherman. I still think he is.

MR. CANNING: And I was wondering what kind of school they have, what kind of medical services? I wonder can the honourable member deny that if somebody belonging to him takes sick he can go up to a phone and get a doctor. That is the kind of life he thought was good enough for our outports.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say anything of the kind. I did not say at all that that was good enough for our outports. I said that man was a credit and an example.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member did not say that was good enough for the outports, no.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, again I was just judging from the trend. Anyway, he went on, and looked across at this government with a pitiful look on his face and said: Don't uproot them, leave them there—he definitely did say that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. He is misrepresenting me by the manner in which he refers to my remarks, suiting them to his own argument.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course any honourable member has a right to twist remarks to bear out his own point. Personally I don't think it matters very much if the honourable member said that or not. The thing is, it is a very good thing to stay rooted. I could find it in my heart to wish more of us were. The honourable member may refer to speeches made but may not convey to the House he is announcing what a member of the Opposition did actually say, when as a matter of fact he did not.

MR. CANNING: These recommendations, Sir, contain a recommendation to centralize the fishery and people. I think the day has come when I think everybody must realize how very serious this problem is for our outports. I have in my district in Placentia West seventy two children who are not at school today. They come from harbours of twelve families, ten families or five families. The committee's report, Sir, recommends that we should aim at centralizing the population as well as modernizing the fishery as a whole.

At this point I shall give an account of what is to happen at Mera-sheen and the development that is about to take place there. Merasheen is an island situated in the centre of

Placentia Bay, with a population of approximately four hundred and twenty eight people, I think, to be exact. In 1937-38 they formed a Co-operative Society. They started with eleven dollars, with that, Sir, they started a business with anything you could buy for eleven dollars. They started in a room within a house and went from there to a small store somebody gave them to use rent free. From that they went to a larger store and then to an old school that was vacated. They now have a fairly large set-up. During these years they proved they could adjust themselves to the co-operative idea. They have a stock in their store at this time of the year of about thirty-five or thirty thousand dollars, and have ten thousand dollars in credit. They have gone into producer co-operatives. They have a herring factory. They pool their fish co-operatively. On the whole they have made a wonderful success of it. I think it is one of the best of the successful co-operatives in all the outports of Newfoundland.

When this report came out last year I had copies sent out to this co-operative society. They studied it and had meetings, and spent five or six weeks on it under the guidance of a man Finn who was head of the co-operative scheme, and have done quite a lot in that capacity for the co-operative movement. They came to the conclusion that they could measure up to be recognized as a small co-operative centre. They wired me to come there. I went out to see them, and gave them a talk on the fishery development report, and told them what I could about it at the time. That was followed by a request to the Minister of Fisheries to have the deputy minister go out and go further into details with them. He went out to them and

told them what he could about how far they had gotten up to that time. He came back and they sent somebody in with their proposition. They felt they could measure up and carry on a small co-operative enterprise. In this respect for a small community, first and foremost the essential thing is a co-operative scheme. The people of Merasheen had proven themselves to be able to work under the co-operative system successfully so that in that respect they measured up.

Their proposition was presented to the Authority. They studied it and sent out men to survey it, and finally the government decided that they would start a project there. Merasheen is another small outport on the coast which had obsolete gear, and had motor boats, stages and flakes. Now it is proposed they build one central plant for salt fish, pickled fish, pickled herring or any other type that can be cured; artificial flakes—These mechanical flakes, I believe, can spread five hundred quintals in forty minutes. That is quite a contrast to the time it would take under their system. It is also visualized that they will have a small filleting plant. So that I think in probably a month from now this operation will go ahead, or the building of the plant. By next year the people of Merasheen will be landing their fish at this central store, with all modern conveniences. This is a trial, and I feel that these people who have proved so successfully their ability to work under a co-operative scheme will make a success of it, and I sincerely hope that other places in my district will follow suit. But I may say this is not based on the bigger community scheme. It is just a small outfit to suit the community there. Merasheen is an island, and I don't think it is envisaged that people

should move in there. But if I had time at my disposal I would go into details of this plant. There is certainly much left that I could say about it, and I could compare the new methods with the old as it would refer to Merasheen itself.

Considering my district, I feel, Sir, this great programme we are now launching will mean an awful lot to the fishermen who have so long toiled under the old system. I hope to see at Mortier Bay in the not too far distant future a large fishing plant. As the House is already aware, Mortier Bay itself is one of the finest harbours on this side of the Atlantic. When a fresh fish plant is erected there and gets going I feel sure that from many of the smaller places the people will be encouraged to move to Mortier Bay. With good housing, electricity, which I hope is to come, and a well organized town, Mortier Bay will attract people and I am sure they will gladly take advantage of the opportunity offered them. Before very long probably Mortier Bay will be one of the biggest ports in Newfoundland.

At the present time, there are negotiations going on with a company, but I won't say anything more about it. But I feel sure that perhaps in a few days we will have the result, and the long looked for plant at Marystown will be in sight.

My district and its people are to me as the province is to the Premier. I hope, Sir, to see the people who trust in me are rescued from their low standard of living and given a decent standard, which I am sure they deserve. They have trusted in us, and we have believed in them. We are under the greatest leader that Newfoundland had ever had, the

Liberal Party. So that is what we have—a great people, a great industry, a great leader and a great party who will stand behind its leader and the people. Justice will prevail, and we shall succeed.

MR. S. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice in support of this Bill now before this Assembly. As a Liberal and as a member of the Liberal Party I will support any Bill that is brought in to this House that will grant to the fishermen of this country a better livelihood and better living conditions.

I was born in a fishing settlement, the son of a fisherman. I know too well the anxiety and the hardships that a fisherman in those days had in raising a family and to feed, clothe and educate them.

I spent five summers myself in Trinity Bay fishing for turbot. I fished in one hundred and fifty fathoms of water. At times fishing was good and at times we experienced a failure, and consequently we had to go in the bush to cut logs to help augment our income. Our livelihood depended on Labrador and inshore fish, and it was the common thing to hear fishermen in those days say: "We can't make ends meet this year, but next year the price of fish will be better."

There are very few perhaps in this House who can speak any better than myself on the conditions that existed in Newfoundland anywhere from 1920 up to the present time. The Honourable the Premier painted a vivid picture of conditions in Newfoundland, and many people will say he exaggerated greatly. I say that he did not exaggerate. Before I entered politics I spent twenty years working

amongst fishermen and in fishing communities. I remember the days when the children came to school in their bare feet. I remember the days when they were ragged and tattered. I remember the days when cocoa and milk was first introduced to the schools as a means to try and keep the kids going, and I remember the gaunt and thin faces of the pupils. I also remember the days when the wife of the Governor of Newfoundland raised clothing drives and sent it to the outports amongst the fishermen and distributed it amongst their families to try and clothe them. I remember too well the days of the Commission of Government when they raised up forty millions as a surplus, and at the same time the wives of fishermen were starving or semi-starving on fifteen dollars a quarter and the worn out fisherman, when he had reached the age of seventy-five, got eighteen dollars for three months, and a fisherman worn out but not old enough to receive an old age pension received a sum of five dollars a month. As late as 1947, under the days of Commission of Government we had worn-out fishermen in Newfoundland who could not earn a living, who did not get enough money to put something by, we had them in this country who actually starved to death, and the records of the Public Health bear that record—the cause of death, starvation—their files bear that record.

I am sorry to say, in this day and age, of social wealth and social government we have men in this country today, fishermen, who have to live on the sum of five dollars a month. Recently I came from Roddickton, and I felt very badly to know that one of the men in that community had to live on \$45 a

month to feed a family of nine, and with five of the kids going to school. But never mind that—in the old days the slogan was: "The merchants are starving us." A little later on come around and find—"Oh, we must have a better fishery product, we must have more sanitary conditions, we must have whitewashed walls in the stages and stores—yes we are going to get a better price." That was in those days, the old days. So the government of the day sent out inspectors and experts. We had almost as many of them trotting over the country as we had fishermen themselves. Well we did improve and have a better product, but it certainly did not improve the lot of the fishermen. Later came the Federation of Fishermen. I was very happy indeed when the Honourable the Premier announced in this House that the Federation would be formed. I was sitting on the opposite side at the time as an Independent and I was the first member in this House to raise my voice in support of such a Federation. The task which confronts the Federation is not going to be an easy one. But I believe that eventually untold benefit will accrue to the fishermen, will keep them informed of market conditions, and will fight the fishermen's battles when they arise.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have the Newfoundland Fisheries Development. We have the plan. Is this to be the solution of the fisheries problem which so often besets our fishermen. I am supporting this Bill with the hope that it will help solve the problems of the fishermen or at least some of them. In supporting the Bill I make five points or suggestions to the Government:

(1) Compensation for the labour of generations.

(2) Insurance for families.

(3) Fifty-fifty chance.

(4) St. Anthony not Quirpon.

(5) Don't let the fisheries die while the fishermen are waiting.

In 1949 the Honourable the Premier asked all members of his party to prepare a report for him on conditions in each one's district. I think that was a very wise move. I did that, along with the other members of this party. One of the things which I did say in that report was that I believed that centralization of the population of White Bay was the salvation of its people. One of the chief aims of the Fisheries Authority is to bring together people from a number of settlements. These people have spent years building their homes. They have stores, barns, and their plots of land. Should they move into La Scie, what plan has the Government to compensate these people for the property which they have built up around them? Will the Government care for the people and give them compensation not only in La Scie but in other places where they are to be centralized?

*Insurance for families:* When the town of La Scie (we will take that as an illustration) is remodelled with new homes, fishermen will move in there. They will have, perhaps, fishing equipment, they will want engines, modern fishing equipment and homes. Some of them will undoubtedly have to pay out their homes, which will be mortgaged. What arrangements will the Government make, or what insurance will the Government give to the people

moving into those centralized areas, should the husband, the bread-winner of the family, become incapacitated through accident or sickness or should the head of the family die? What will happen to his family? Who will feed, house and clothe them? If something is not done to care for that family should he die or become incapacitated then he will go back, the old story. It is said that the brains of Newfoundland died in the fishing boat; and the brains of Newfoundland will continue to die in the fishing boat. If some kind of security is not given them it may prevent families from leaving their present homes.

*Fifty-fifty chance:* A fifty-fifty chance with money does not matter a great deal. But a fifty-fifty chance with the lives of people, humanity, the uprooting, it matters everything in the world. We are told that we are going to make a model town of La Scie. It is a wonderful thing. I am glad that the first pioneer venture is going to be in my district. But it will cost five million dollars. What is five million dollars? In time of war the value of that would be fired away before breakfast, five million dollars any day while we are at war. The Government is at war. This action is a declaration of war on poverty, a war on dole and degradation. None of us want to see it again. I hope, I shall hear the Honourable the Premier say in the not distant future that he has a better chance of success than that fifty-fifty chance. I would like to hear him say it, with co-operation, sacrifice and perhaps with many set-backs, but I think that by joining together, going forward together, taking the ups and downs together, I believe he will, before this session of the House is

finished, say there is better than a fifty-fifty chance in dealing with the lives of our people.

*St. Anthony and not Quirpon:* Now, for centralization of our people, the bringing together of our people—I feel today that in comparison, knowing the northern territory of Newfoundland as I do, St. Anthony with eighteen hundred people, should be the centre of centralization. I am not saying anything which will be detrimental to the people of Quirpon nor to hamper them in any way from a chance at earning a livelihood. I don't want to do that, and it is not my intention to do that. But I feel, Sir, today that instead of having centralization at Quirpon it should be at St. Anthony, and for this reason: St. Anthony has a hospital, it has a strong co-operative society, it has town planning and it has a fresh fish plant. A road which would link St. Anthony with Quirpon, (and road construction must go hand in hand with fisheries development just the same as hospitals and hospitalization, one must go with the other). A road from St. Anthony to Quirpon would include Little Brehat, Great Brehat, St. Luniar Bay, Griquet, Quirpon, Pigeons Cove, Noddy Bay, Raleigh and Cape Onion. Quirpon is the farthest away, and if there is a road constructed it will mean that within one hour fish landed at Quirpon could be in the fish plant at St. Anthony, within one hour. The Government is already building the road towards these places. It is already under construction and has been for two years. With centralization of our fishery concentrated at St. Anthony, within a short while the population of that place will rise greatly from its eighteen hundred at the present time.

*Don't let the fisheries die while the*

*fishermen are waiting:* Last year the government gave the fishermen \$1.50 deficiency payment to save our fishermen. We have more fishermen in White Bay than in any other district in the country, far more fishermen, even to outdo my honourable friend from Fogo, as statistics will show. Yesterday you brought them up a little because we have a lot of fresh fish going out of White Bay. Last year the Government saved our people from a lot of hardship by coming forward with that deficiency payment. The Federal Government is reimbursing the Provincial Government \$1.12 per quintal on the 1953 catch. Now the Fishermen's Federation demands \$12 a quintal or, they say, they won't go fishing. We don't know if they will or not. The trade said it would give them \$10 a quintal. Well, let us do this: Let the government make a break and come out and say to our fishermen: we will go in with you and give you the happy medium of \$12 on this year's catch. I think we should try and force the position and have the Federal Government pay any further deficiency payments so that the fishermen would get \$12 and always be a year ahead instead of a year behind in receiving their payments.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up I want to say that I give this my wholehearted support, or any bill at any time if it will mean a war against poverty and a chance for all our fishermen to raise themselves up from the dole and degradation they have known for so many years. But my words of caution are these (and I repeat again) and mostly they concern my own district of White Bay:

(1) Compensation for the labour of generations, (2) insurance for families who concentrate or centralize and (3)



better than a fifty-fifty chance and (4) St. Anthony not Quirpon as the centralized area of the north and (5) don't let the fisheries die while the fishermen are waiting.

MR. C. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Second Reading of Bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carriers' Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor amendment to an Act which appears in the revised statutes, and with this amendment we will be able to ignore the 1953 Act altogether, because in 1953 when we amended the Act we did not know what chapter that Act would appear under in the revised statutes. So that in future the policy of the draftsman in my department in amending an Act is to, if possible, include in the current amendment any amendments made during the year 1953, so that in time we will not have to refer to the 1953 Act at all. So that Paragraph 3 is simply a repetition of the amendment made in 1953.

The additional clause, section 4, is a clause that was omitted by accident last year. It was an oversight made when the Act was passed. It was of course presumed when the Act was passed that there would be a prohibition against public service vehicles not holding a certificate of registration.

The new section, which really is the reason for the Act, is section 5, which states that, notwithstanding the provisions of the present Act, the City of St. John's or a town or rural district or a local government area establish Act, or any of the unrepealed Acts in Schedule A to this Act or the holder of a franchise or license to operate

issued by any such body may apply to the Board for the approval of a tariff of tolls in accordance with Section 5 thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the section that is here involved is Section 10 of the Act. Nevertheless if the City of St. John's or any of these areas want to have the board fix tariffs and fix fares the Board is empowered to do it. It is really an enabling provision enabling the City of St. John's in the case of St. John's or any of the town councils or anybody handing a franchise to ask the Board, and the Board is empowered if so requested to fix rates.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have examined the Act in the Revised Statutes, and I have found out that what the Attorney General has said in regard to the first two sections is, of course correct. In regard to Section 4 which deals with the issuing of certificates I cannot find in the original Act any reference to certificates at all. I am just wondering whether it is one for which a charge is to be made, or what does it mean? A certificate is to be issued as to the suitability of the vehicle or that he has made an application and that he is a qualified person to operate, or what really does it mean? I think when the Attorney General is answering he might perhaps give us the explanation for this.

I understand the necessity for Section 5, and that is a very good idea.

There is just one observation I want to make in regard to section 3. I notice it is an old section, but it deals with something that is likely to come to our notice before very long, and

that is, that this Act does not apply to any motor vehicle for any other province of Canada or the United States of America carrying only tourists on one continuous trip to, through and from this province under contract made outside this province. Now recently there has been a federal provision and conference upon the question of controlling inter-provincial transportation. I am wondering if we sent a representative? I understand we did not. Have we been kept advised as to what is going on? They have had difficulties in other provinces over this subject, about passengers and freight transported from one province to another. I suppose one of the reasons is because the bridges have not been designed to carry tremendous loads such as have been transported. Take fish for example from Halifax for the United States and going through New Brunswick and over bridges which are not suitable for heavy loads. We are likely to have buses and transport vehicles of that kind come to Newfoundland as soon as the ferry boat is in operation, which I understand will be later this year. It is certainly conceivable that within the next couple of years many vehicles of that kind are likely to cross over on the ferry and come to Newfoundland and drive over our roads. When the Attorney General replies I wonder if he would advise us if any consideration has been given to that matter.

**MR. CURTIS:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps when we go into committee I could reply to the point raised by my honourable friend, which deals with the question of these certificates. I think the honourable member will realize that these are really for the committee stage. These things are actually prepared by the Department

of Public Works and just come to my department, and I am not as familiar with them as perhaps I should be. I presumed that there was some reference in the original Act to a certificate. But in just glancing through the Act hurriedly I don't see any reference to certificates. I certainly will check up that amendment before I ask the House to pass it.

As to the other point, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that is a section that is really going to interest us in Newfoundland very much in the foreseeable future. The reference to a motor vehicle in any other province or in the United States of America carrying only tourists on one continuous trip, etc. I really think that section was just merely adopted from the current form of the Legislative Committee. I cannot imagine tourists going anywhere through Newfoundland. I think that section then does not apply to us here but would properly apply to areas like New Brunswick and Nova Scotia where tourists pass through and do not stop. Here I could not imagine any tourists passing through Newfoundland. Yet I think that is the only way I can read the section, is that it deals with cars or vehicles going through Newfoundland. I don't know where they would be going if they were to go through Newfoundland.

**MR. BROWNE:** They could go through and come back again.

**MR. CURTIS:** Perhaps so; perhaps that is a matter we could discuss a little more freely in committee.

**MR. BROWNE:** Yes.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable minister has introduced the bill.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been talking to the minister since he made his speech in this debate, and I would like to make a few observations, especially in regard to certain incidents that happened in the neighbourhood of Placentia. At Placentia or rather in that area there are several councils, there is Placentia Council, Jersey Side Council and Freshwater Council, and the American Base, all of whom get their water supply from Larkin's Pond. There is a man there who has his home and has a big family there, ten people living in the house, and it is not desirable that he should have his residence there for obvious reasons. But it appears to be nobody's business to compensate him for removal. If it were in the hands of one council then he could deal with it. He tried to deal on several occasions with the Placentia Council, and they are very sympathetic to him. If it were their business they would try and compensate him for his home, and enable him to build elsewhere. But the government has apparently an overriding jurisdiction, or the Government acts as a liaison between the different councils I have enumerated. It seems to me the responsibility is upon the government to try and arrange that this man should receive compensation which would enable him to build elsewhere.

Now the summer is coming close at hand, and if he is to remain there it is important that some action be taken. The fact is that the drainings of sewerage from his home will

go into the pond and influence and affect the water there which has been tested, and I believe, has been given a very bad percentage. It is not good water and it is certainly not desirable that so many thousands of people should have to drink water which has a dwelling close alongside. It seems to me that this Bill which is designed to give the minister power in other areas to allow septic tanks and sewers disposal to be regulated also should make him responsible when a situation such as I have described occurs.

There are some points in the Bill which I would like to make up in committee. But it seems to me this Act is being designed, and so the minister told us, to deal particularly with the situation as it exists in surroundings near Corner Brook. I believe that is what it is intended to deal with. But I would draw to the attention of the minister in charge of this Bill that he should take up this matter with the minister of health and advise him of my remarks here, and see if something can be done in that situation. It is really a very tragic situation for the family concerned. They don't want to be a source of annoyance to so many people, and they are very much concerned about it at the present time. If the Minister of Finance were here he would know of the situation personally from his own knowledge of that area and would know that what I am saying is correct. I have it from the best of authority, from the Placentia Town Council, that they are powerless, and they are not really in a position to do anything about it. I was talking to the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe he may have something to do with it. He thought it was the duty of the Placentia Town

Council. Placentia Town Council tells me they are powerless to deal with the matter.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the authority over the Placentia Watershed is vested in the Placentia Town Council, and Freshwater Town Council and Jersey Side Town Council. I think the trouble is that they cannot get together to decide on the amount or to agree to the amount which this gentleman is asking for compensation. I am very familiar with that case, but I am still rather in doubt as to whether he could be moved. The House has been there for a good many years, and I think that during the past six or seven years a place has been built nearer to the pond. There was a subsequent lawsuit here in St. John's and the man who built the house was allowed to remain there. During the past year the Freshwater Council has installed a chlorination system, and the Placentia Town Council is in the process of installing such a system. So that I don't think the problem is really as terrible as the honourable gentleman would suggest. I know I would be in favour of compensating the man in question for his property, but I think that the three councils concerned will have to agree as to the amount, before any one on the outside can make a motion. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to say very much except that we support the Bill on this side of the House. If I may, without any harsh statements from the other side, I would like to pay a compliment to the government at this juncture for the Public Health and Welfare Act, I think that is one of the really grand things this government has done. It

is not often, of course, that we have the opportunity or at least that we take advantage of an opportunity to compliment the Government. But I really do think we want the government to feel, and everybody here, that we are sincere when I pay a compliment to this instrument of public welfare which is being operated by the present administration, also to the officials of the Department of Public Welfare who in every case, practically where I have had occasion to bring any matter before them have acted promptly, and where there was a possibility of help or assistance to some poor individual they have done it insofar as this Act allows without too much hesitation and without too much delay. Where there was no hope for such an individual then they just told me the facts. They just carried out the Act, and that is all I expected them to do. I do want to take this opportunity to say that this government or any government with an instrument of public welfare such as this in its hands must do an awful lot of good for the people who may be unfortunate enough perhaps to have to come under it at various times.

I do want to extend my congratulations to the government and to the minister and to his departmental officials for what they are doing and the way in which this Act is being carried out.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, may I add just a word to what has already been said. During the past few months we have found several instances where there has been a conflict of authority between the regulations made under the Local Government Act and the regulations made under the Health and Welfare Act, or

in other instances under the Highroads Act. As a result of consultations amongst our various departments we have tried in each instance to bring about an amendment so that there would be a certain conformity, and the absolute authority would be delegated more or less to one department. Consequently in this Act before us now, in the amendment we say: Where there is a conflict in regulations between the Local Government Act and the Health and Welfare Act that the Health and Welfare Act shall have the final word in any instance where we have some trouble occurring, as there always is. The particular instance raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's West is one with which we have been troubled for some time. Delay in taking action, or making a decision on what action to take has been deferred repeatedly because in some respect, anyhow, there was this division of authority amongst the departments. Inspectors from the Department of Public Health were sent out on different occasions to see what the matter was. Various plans were put forward to try and overcome the difficulty there. I am hopeful that in some way or another the situation may be remedied in the not far distant future.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for his references to the government and to this department. I will take the further opportunity of passing these over to the minister concerned. I will also call to the attention of the minister concerned the point raised by the honourable member.

On motion bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to raise a loan by issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill. The members of the House are aware, I think, of the purpose of this Bill, and most of them are familiar, I think, with something of the history leading up to this particular enactment. They will recall that an attempt to build a Stadium for St. John's emanated as a result of initiative of the St. John's Branch of the Lion's Club. Their efforts to raise money to build the stadium proved a little bit beyond their capacity. But again arising out of subsequent action taken by them the task was undertaken by a group of St. John's citizens who made an attempt to try and collect the necessary funds in order that the stadium might be built. They, too, found it exceedingly difficult to get the necessary large amount of money in order to complete the building. I think talks were then held between the Stadium Council and the St. John's Municipal Council and arrangements were made whereby the City Council extended a loan to the Stadium Council of a certain amount in order to complete the building. As a result of that undertaking the St. John's City Councillors wrote us seeking authority whereby they may float a bond issue up to a maximum of seven hundred thousand dollars in order that they might carry on the necessary financing required by the Stadium Council. That is the primary purpose of this Bill.

The other provision of the Bill, of course, deals with the raising of that particular money and deals also with

a loan of one hundred thousand dollars which was made to the stadium. That original one hundred thousand dollars was interest free and arrangements are made under this Act to provide that the hundred thousand dollars remain interest free, but that during the period of the twenty years the loan liquidates itself by yearly amortization.

The other two or three provisions in the Bill, sir, are merely technical, and deal with the carrying out of the bond issue and the payment of same by the St. John's City Council to the Stadium Council as and when required.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill. I do so with a certain amount of surprise in one way, because I was more or less of the opinion that there had already been large sums of money collected, and almost enough to build a stadium. I had not been apprised of the fact that it would be necessary to collect another seven hundred thousand dollars, as the case might be. I must say I have not had time to read this Bill carefully. But I do want to say now that the St. John's Stadium, of course, is something which is coupled in my mind with certain political features. I have heard the matter raised in here before, I think it was back in 1951 or 1952. I think, Mr. Speaker, we owe a word of praise to the patriotic and civic minded citizens who have gotten together, and by a very great effort, succeeded in raising quite a large sum of money towards the building of this stadium. We all agree, of course, the stadium in a community of this size is something absolutely essential, and that it cannot be done without if the community is to advance in keeping

with the times. I think it is all the more appropriate therefore, Sir, that we should issue a word of congratulations and of praise to these people who have gotten together and drawn up plans and schemes whereby they could collect money from the citizens.

Along with that, Sir, we ought and do tender our thanks to our people in the City of St. John's for the way in which they have contributed by way of direct contributions and by way of amounts which have been taken from their wages and from their salaries. I say it is a great credit to them. I hope that this stadium will soon have the roof on it. I see it going up as I pass there nearly every day, and I see a change and improvement in the structure, and it looks to me as though it is to be a very fine building indeed. I say all credit is due to these people, and particularly to the chairman of this board, who I believe is Mr. O'Leary. He, Sir, is one of the most civic-minded men in the community, and great credit and praise should go to him. I am quite sure that he has given a large amount of his time and energy to the raising of the money for this stadium. He and all the various workers and clubs have contributed adequately, I am sure. I join with the government in congratulating them. We did not think it would be necessary, of course, to pass such a bill as this. But if it is necessary then we are all for it. If there is anything further that we have to say we will say it in committee. We certainly support this Bill, Sir.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, being a citizen of St. John's, and for some time a contributor towards the building of the stadium, I wish to say that I do support this, because at this time it seems, to me at least, we are



to have the stadium completed and put into operation so that the young, and also the old, of St. John's can enjoy themselves and take part in various sports, etc., which will no doubt be carried on down in that place on King's Bridge Road. However, this seems a considerable amount of money, seven hundred thousand dollars, which I understand will really amount to six hundred thousand, as one hundred thousand is to be paid back to the government. However it seems to me if we are to have a stadium that is the only way to get it. The citizens have been very good as a whole, and have contributed largely towards the stadium, I may say, I concur with my colleague, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, as to the wonderful work done by the people who at the beginning started this fund to build a stadium, as also the present officers of the stadium council, under the chairmanship of Mr. Frank O'Leary.

I support this bill, Sir, because I believe this is the only way the citizens of St. John's are going to get a stadium. Due to the high cost of material, etc., it appears the cost will be much higher than it was expected.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, like my two colleagues I would like to express my support of this bill. Of course, like the other speakers, I too realize the committee has had to deal with the increased cost of material and the increase in the labour costs and the cost of construction since the movement began. They have been faced, I presume, with difficulties for which they could find no solutions other than ask the Municipal Council of the City of St. John's to help them in making the stadium an accomplished fact. I realize that the citizens who undertook this venture in the first place took on a very diffi-

cult task, probably not realizing how difficult it was. They did put a great deal of work into it, and deserve praise for the effort they made, especially the last committee who seemed to be doing so well that it was a surprise to find that this bill was now necessary. However, in these modern times when there is an artificial ice rink at Bell Island and Buchans and Grand Falls, to see a city the size of St. John's without an artificial ice rink is unusual. There is not enough natural ice available to enable visiting teams to come here with any degree of certainty, and therefore the city is deprived of those games of sport and hockey and of having the pride and advantage of seeing their home town team take part in the games for the championship of Newfoundland.

It is therefore apparently necessary that we should have a stadium here, and as it seems it would be too slow a process to wait for voluntary contributions the municipal council has taken it upon themselves to assist the effort the citizens have made hitherto. I hope this bill will provide the funds necessary for the completion of the stadium.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my honourable friends opposite have expressed a little surprise that after all the contributions that have been made it should be necessary still to find the sum of six hundred thousand dollars to enable the stadium to be completed. The fact as I understand it, is, that the stadium is to cost about a million dollars which is a very large sum of money. There are only one or two of all our industries that cost that much from the public till, all the rest of them costing considerably less than a million dollars. But this is a large

modern building of steel and concrete construction with a very modern ice plant and fixtures and seats. I believe the seats are to be of poured concrete. At least they appear so to me when driving past there. I see forms being built at this moment that appear to me to be the forms of seats for the building. Nevertheless a million dollars is of course a lot of money for a stadium, especially in view of the fact that two or three or four years ago the estimate of what it would take to complete the thing ran somewhere around three or four hundred thousand dollars. It is surprising now to find that it is to cost six or seven hundred thousand dollars more than was estimated two or three years ago, and it is just a little shocking. But we in the government have, I confess, grown a little accustomed to that. We have had a lot to do in the past two or three years with construction in Newfoundland, the construction of hospitals and schools and the construction of factories—We have had quite a lot to do with the construction of factories—And it is a rare case indeed that we have found of a contract costing what was actually estimated to be the cost. Indeed in virtually every case construction of these factories has been much more costly than was figured in the first instance.

The city is to find around six hundred thousand dollars to be raised by the sale of city bonds, and this, together with the one hundred thousand dollars that the government have lent the stadium project makes a total of seven hundred thousand dollars. This leaves approximately seven hundred thousand dollars, the stadium collected from other sources, mainly the public of St. John's and a few people from outside St. John's, an amount of approximately three hundred thousand

dollars including two, if not three, but certainly two annual payments received from the Government of Canada and a ten-year hundred thousand dollar grant which that government have agreed to make towards the cost of the stadium building upon conditions that the building itself be available for the purpose of a provincial fair and exhibition.

Indeed that is the principal condition imposed by the Government of Newfoundland also in making its loan, which is distinct from a grant from the government of Canada. That is a loan of one hundred thousand dollars, and the conditions were that it should be available to the Government of Newfoundland or its agents or agencies for the purpose of provincial exhibitions for not less than two weeks, I think, in each year.

The difference in the sums all have hitherto contributed to the stadium council is that the City Council of St. John's and the Government of Newfoundland do not get bonds for their loans. Furthermore the City of St. John's in legislation which is to come, I understand, later in this session, is to have title to the stadium, Title in the stadium will be vested in the City Council whereas the people who have contributed a hundred thousand dollars at the end of the ten year period will have no title, but all that is detail. The principal fact is that the stadium is now well underway and should be finished before the end of this year, and become available to the people of St. John's and year by year to the people of Newfoundland in connection with the annual fair and exhibition.

Now this raises the question of stadiums in other parts of the province. We have had a request from the Town

of Corner Brook, or the metropolitan town of Corner Brook for a grant towards a stadium out there. There is not any doubt, I suppose in anyone's mind that the people out there are at least as deserving of a stadium as are the people here or the people of Grand Falls. I doubt that anyone will have any hesitation in admitting that. The people out there I would say are contributing much more generously and with much more enthusiasm towards the fund for building a stadium in Corner Brook than the people of St. John's did for the building of a stadium here. I think there is no comparison in the generosity of the people of the two places. The government are right now, around this time I mean and not at this very moment, considering some sound formula under which a loan can be made to the stadium fund of Corner Brook in such a way as not to make it obligatory for us to contribute to any one and every one in Newfoundland that may want a stadium. I think it ought to be pretty clear that we cannot do that. We cannot agree in advance to contribute public funds to any drive that may start at any time in any part of this province for a new stadium. We cannot do it. That is clear, that is obvious. But whether we could divide the province into say three coasts, the east coast, south coast and west coast and have a stadium for each of these coasts and then call it square is something to consider, or whether some other formula that would be fair to Newfoundland in general and to the Treasury can be devised I do not know at this moment. But having contributed already, as we have done by way of loans to the St. John's Stadium on the grounds that it is the All-Newfoundland Headquarters of the fairs and exhibitions as dis-

tinguished from purely local fairs and purely local exhibitions, having done that we feel that we should find some way soundly to assist the people of Corner Brook to get their stadium established as soon as possible.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might add a word to what has already been said by the Honourable the Premier and honourable members. On reading the Bill I notice that we merely authorize the City of St. John's to raise this loan but we do not as a government guarantee the bond issue. So that there is no liability upon the Government of Newfoundland as is the case in most of our bond issues.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

#### First Readings:

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited.

On motion bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare asks leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

On motion bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

On motion all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3.00 of the clock.

The House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 13, at three of the clock.

---

THURSDAY, May 13th, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to present a petition signed by some 96 residents of Gander who were former residents of the District of Fogo. The petition is also signed by some 782 people on Fogo Island and 30 people from Seldom and 38 people from Change Islands. This petition is concerned with the construction of a high-road between Gander and Carmanville. Several petitions have already been presented here to the House, and I don't think I need say anything further except to read part of the petition which says: "Whereas Carmanville is the only safe harbour on the Mainland of Notre Dame Bay South and so provides a ferry terminal for the people and serving the whole area, your petitioners pray that those in authority take immediate steps to eliminate the isolation of this section, and further the Government's scheme for the centralization of population."

I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to table this petition and ask that it be referred to the department concerned.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motion

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development or other appropriate Minister to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Table itemized accounts presented to the Government by W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. in connection with all goods and services supplied by them in connection with the building of the Cement Plant at Corner Brook.
2. Table similar accounts presented to the Government by W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. in connection with all goods and services supplied by said Company in connection with the building of the Gypsum plant at Corner Brook.
3. Table payment vouchers for all amounts of monies paid over to said W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. on account of the building of these two plants.
4. Table a statement showing total amounts of money in each year since April 1949 paid to W. J. Lundrigan Ltd., also on what accounts were these monies paid, whether for the building of plants, construction or repair of roads, or for any other cause.

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

Receipted bills and other vouchers for the travelling expenses of the Director of Tourist Development for the various trips undertaken by him outside of Newfoundland during the past fiscal year.

**MR. BROWNE:** To ask the Honourable the Premier to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What machinery, trucks or other motor vehicles, if any, were purchased in Montreal, for or by the Government during the past two years? By whom were purchases made, and what prices were paid in each case? Give year and model of trucks purchased.
2. Was any machinery bought by, and/or paid for, by the Newfoundland Government for the use of contractors from Canada, working in Newfoundland?

#### Answers to Questions

Questions No. 82 and No. 83—stand.

**MR. BROWNE:** Could anyone tell me, Mr. Speaker, where is the Minister of Public Works? Is he in the City? And what is the situation in regard to these questions?

**HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD** (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Public Works is in town, and is exceedingly busy in his Department getting ready for an exceedingly busy year, and except insofar as it is exceedingly imperative for him to be here at every session he will continue for some time yet to work in his office on the road programme for this year and other public works programmes for this Government for this year which will not wait on the House of Assembly nor anything else. Except insofar as it is imperative that

he be here to perform his parliamentary duties he will continue at his office getting the biggest programme we have ever had ready for launching this year. Any questions directed to him will reach him and the answers when prepared will be handed to me, except on such occasions as the Minister is himself present. I will table such answers as I receive them.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with Question No. 80 addressed to me on the Order Paper of May 12:

(1) The machinery arrived on three different dates, i.e., Aug. 1, 1952, Feb. 14, 1953 and March 31, 1953.

(2) On these same dates \$29,996; \$39,987.80 and \$40,306.84—Grand total \$110,290.14.

(3) The answer is the same as the answer to (2) that I have just given.

(4) In answer to the first of these three questions I say I don't know. In answer to the second part—There has been no correspondence, and the answer to the third part of the question is, No.

(5) In reply to these two questions my answer is that I have not got even the foggiest idea of any information. It is none of my business. I did not make it any of my business. I just don't know, and I may add that I don't care.

Question No. 81.

(1) The answer is that it has not as yet gone into production. The plant is not as yet complete in its construction. In that connection I would explain that at the far end or the inner, northern end of the building, a partition has been run across and in that section that is so partitioned off is an acid treatment process to be carried

on, and an extremely unusual, extremely exceptional floor had to be made and it is only now that that floor is in process of completion. It should be finished within a week or so, whereupon that whole section of the building can and will come into use and production will commence. Up to the present they have made a few hundred batteries without the use of that special acid-proof floor, and I am glad to say that these batteries have been exceptionally good and have had exceedingly good reception. They are of excellent and very satisfactory quality.

(2) I do not know.

(3) No money was paid to Mr. Hanning personally, but amounts have been paid to the company and the amounts and the date of the payments I now table.

Question No. 81 (3):

Date	Available to 31/3/54
23/10/52	\$ 15,000.00
23/10/52	25,000.00
22/1/53	18,256.00
11/2/53	30,804.80
5/3/53	30,120.40
13/4/53	31,188.90
21/5/53	109,993.80
10/6/53	50,790.75
19/2/54	13,845.85
	<hr/> \$325,000.00 <hr/>

(4) I can't truthfully say the plant is in production now, but is beginning to go into production. They have some fifty people taken on, and I noticed on one of the radio stations during the past day or two they have been advertising for some girls to go to work there. Within the past week or so the owner of the company, Mr. Grube, has arrived back in Newfound-

land, and within the same period of time the general manager employed by him, i.e. Mr. Max Brown has also arrived. So that it is only now that the plant is beginning to go into production.

(6) I table herewith the detailed answer to that question.

Question No. 81 (6):

Date	Advances to 31/3/54
2/10/52	\$ 25,000.00
17/11/52	25,000.00
25/11/52	92,522.50
29/11/52	7,000.00
24/12/52	92,796.85
22/1/53	47,029.00
11/2/53	75,835.00
17/2/53	8,000.00
5/3/53	82,546.50
13/4/53	74,360.00
18/5/53	168,137.35
29/6/53	96,698.00
21/7/53	34,167.00
4/8/53	60,360.00
4/8/53	4,500.00
27/8/53	1,900.00
15/9/53	111,777.16
12/11/53	1,250.00
20/11/53	51,120.64
	<hr/> \$1,000,000.00 <hr/>

(7) I shall do no such thing. The honourable gentleman has that information as much at his disposal and as much at his finger tips as I have it at mine. Any information already available to him we are not called upon to give. Furthermore we have no such intention. That information is just as readily available to my honourable friend as it is to me. It is public information. All he has to do is to look up the Statutes where he will find all of them except those yet to come before this House, and will



come before the House in this session in the Government's own time, and at the time of the Government's own choosing. The answer is that we will do it at the moment of our own choosing in regard to those which have not yet become statutory and have passed into law. Those that we propose to ask the House to enact we propose to ask when it pleases us to do so.

(8) The \$25,000 is part of the cost of the site that was borne by the Government, the part of the cost of some fifty acres at the Octagon with a building attached which was bought as the site for CMIC. The \$25,000 is that part of the cost borne by the Government. The Government bore half the cost and the company bore the other half. We did that in the case of Atlantic Gloves and in the case of United Cotton Mills and we did it in a number of other cases. We made, as a government, a contribution to the cost of acquiring the site.

The number of men employed with the company is not information to which the House is entitled, and in giving the answer I want it understood very clearly I do not admit to the House the right to the information, which at the same time I gladly give. The number is 220 men. What the figure was at the end of last year I do not know. It was somewhere around 140 or 150 people, I presume.

#### Orders of The Day

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority":

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak briefly to the debate on this Bill before the House I wish at the outset to congratulate the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries

who so capably introduced this legislation by way of a well-delivered address. I speak on behalf of a great district on the northeast coast of Newfoundland, a district composed of men whose ancestors derived a meagre existence from the waters of the Atlantic for centuries. I speak on behalf of a cross section of a generation who through sheer necessity, and indeed for reasons of survival have been engrossed in the fishing industry from boyhood. I speak on behalf of a number of working men, men who are looking today with solemn expectancy to the Liberal Government for some encouraging news with respect to the future state of the industry on which they depend as they have depended so long for so little returns.

I listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure to the very lengthy and comprehensive speech which was presented to this Legislature by the Honourable the Premier a few days ago, when he discussed the affairs of Newfoundland fishermen from the days when their staple food consisted of hard tack and their wardrobe contained one suit of clothes. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that those days will never again return to this province, and that the fishermen themselves will never be confronted with such memorial events. I think his synopsis of these dreadful years has served to remind this House of the justification for the legislation which we are now considering. That speech, Mr. Speaker, will long be remembered by those of us who sat and listened. I would predict that if it were put in book form it would find great publicity across the entire Dominion of Canada.

I have read this Bill through, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, and

since it was tabled in this House. It's principle, as I see it, is to create a Fisheries Authority entrusted with the task of raising large sums for the development and modernization of one of our greatest natural resources. The Authority is composed of three men, in whom I have utmost confidence. Mr. Dustan, Chairman of the Authority, and former banker, is a man with whom I am personally acquainted. He is an individual of experience and talents. It was my privilege to do business with him when he managed a branch of the Bank of Nova Scotia in St. John's. It is my belief that his knowledge of banking and his mercantile experience will prove of inestimable value to the authority in the work that it is to undertake.

Mr. Ross Young was, I understand, a very valued employee of Crosbie and Company, Limited. It is my opinion that the selection of Mr. Young as a member of that board was a very sound one indeed. His comprehension and familiarity with fishery matters generally has already been recognized and accepted beyond question, and he will no doubt be looked upon as a great adviser in this reorganization programme.

Mr. Winsor is a man whom I have not had the pleasure of meeting. But from what I gather, he has spent many years in this particular field, and should bring to the authority a measure of wisdom and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, these are men who possess skill, knowledge and excellent qualifications. I am convinced of their sincerity and absolute integrity. They were selected from possible dozens of other good men. They are entrusted with a man-size job, and on

their decisions will depend the success or failure of an undertaking the preparation of which involved expert advice and long and careful reasoning.

We must industrialize our fisheries. They must not, they dare not be misdirected. We must concentrate on a new pattern with vigor and energy. Newfoundland must go ahead. It must come into its own. In order that the province might advance our first consideration must be to develop our fisheries. It is a programme in which we all must share, and it is our opportunity to do something of lasting value for the benefit of all, not only the fishermen, but Newfoundland as a whole. I personally feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have a tremendous asset in our fisheries, an asset that cannot be underestimated, an asset that was given to us by the Good Lord Himself.

It is customary, Sir, when times are prosperous for the Government to formulate plans to take care of any possible recession. Our interest at the present time is in fishery modernization. It is true that we have other interests as well, other interests in other industries, but we are now in the process of tackling the greatest problem that could confront any elected government of Newfoundland. We are tackling something that has often meant a series of set backs to our predecessors, and whether we succeed or fail I am confident that the people of Newfoundland will at least give us credit for conducting a supreme and all-out effort on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, some reference was made by the Premier in the course of his lengthy address, and later commented on by my honourable friend and colleague, the honourable mem-

ber for Placentia West. It was the fact that Newfoundland lacked the services of skilled technicians and craftsmen, the type of men who will assume such a prominent role in the carrying out of plans to erect the various fish plants along the coast. The reason for this is, of course, very obvious. We just do not possess sufficient training facilities for such men. But, Mr. Speaker, we have today a vocational training school. It is my opinion that the Federal Government could, and very well should, establish a reserve training school such as was provided by the Royal Navy on the old H.M.S. Briton or Calypso, I think as she was known, a ship that occupied a berth in St. John's Harbour for some years past. A scheme such as this, in my opinion, would, Mr. Speaker, apart from providing naval training, give men courses in radiology and mechanics as well as various other branches of engineering.

This fishery policy, Mr. Speaker, is founded not alone on the present wishes of the fishermen of Newfoundland, indeed the main concern of the fishermen throughout the province at the present time is the establishment of a guaranteed price for salt codfish of the 1954 production, a price that will be considered satisfactory to the fishermen themselves. There is not a member in this House, Mr. Speaker, who would rather see the fishermen win that guarantee more than I. I sincerely hope that they will succeed not only this year but as long as they decide to catch and cure their product. I have stated before and will repeat now, that I visualize a very dim future for the old salt codfish industry. I am a son of a man who spent upward of from ten to fifteen years as president of a great fisher-

men's union, an organization that at one time elected ten men to the House of Assembly. That was during the period from 1913 to 1928. The combination was known as the "Coaker Block". History, Mr. Speaker, records the activity of that combination. It has long since judged it on its merits. My father, Mr. Speaker, sat in this House for some years as a member of that Coaker Block. Sometime later he was called upon to reorganize the union and to carry on its work on behalf of the fishermen who were responsible for its former greatness. During these crucial years which followed, Mr. Speaker, my father sunk just about everything in his annual effort to obtain and establish a better price for salt codfish both of Labrador and Shore production. He was called upon time and time again to make available his services to the fishermen, for which he received no salary or remuneration of any kind.

The problem today, Mr. Speaker, is identically the same as in the days when Coaker and later my father represented the fishermen, the same methods of curing are used today as then, and there is very little change in the marketing system. So, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries today are operated basically on the same scale as thirty years ago or even further back than that. I have discussed the salt codfishery with my father on many occasions since his retirement through illness from public life. It is his contention that the salt codfishery as an industry will never again occupy such a prominent place in the economy of Newfoundland.

Up to the time when this legislation was introduced, Mr. Speaker, the Government had done everything

possible to assist the fishermen of Newfoundland. I doubt whether their efforts could have been duplicated by any government up to that time. It would be simply absurd for any fair-minded individual to say that the fishermen were neglected or overlooked by this administration. And I feel that with the passing of this legislation the Government will have completed its duties towards the fishermen and their families. I think that in a country such as this, a policy of this nature would recommend itself to the people without the benefit of publicity of any kind. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that Father Time will decide whether we have moved too fast or too slowly, too soon or too late, or whether we should have let the matter rest without taking any action whatsoever.

To my mind no industrial development programme could have succeeded without a complete and thorough modernization of our one great, natural, God given industry. In ancient and in semi-modern times to maintain our very existence the country could only thrive and advance if our fisheries enjoyed a measure of prosperity. But today, Mr. Speaker, times have changed. We are living in a new and modern age. The fishery is no longer our primary source of revenue, and many of our fishermen have forsaken the fishing boat for other and more gainful employment on shore. The Labrador fishery, Mr. Speaker, was once a very flourishing one. Today it has virtually faded into oblivion. Why? Because the bottom has virtually dropped out of the market. Let us therefore, rescue the shore fishery, and let us do something about it now before it is too late. But there can be only one solution, and that solution is the one

we are now considering. I predict great success for this plan which will be adopted in the very near future. I do so because I have complete and absolute confidence in the men who were responsible for its creation and in the men whose responsibility it will be to carry it through. My Premier and his Cabinet have done much for the general good and success of our fisheries and our fishermen since assuming office in 1949. I doubt if there is a man today, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland who has the general ability to attempt and carry out the work of our Premier. No man in our history has ever faced a challenge with such boldness and determination.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very heavy piece of legislation. It involves an expenditure of many millions of dollars. It would be well worthwhile for this House to spend many hours in consideration of it. It is an outstanding Bill which should not alone be considered from a political viewpoint. Only time will decide the wisdom or fallacy of our actions. But as one who was born in the midst of a great generation of fishermen, I personally support and accept any proposals put forward which would bring about the conditions so desired by every person of mature knowledge with regard to our natural industry. I visualize a great future, Mr. Speaker, for the fresh fish industry. If properly organized, it could be one of the greatest means of livelihood ever to befall a country such as this. There was always a market for fresh codfish, and indications are that it will remain so for many, many years to come. If some countries of the world, Mr. Speaker, had access to such an abundance of codfish there would be less starvation and want in Europe today, and it goes without

saying that Europe would have such a fishery fully cultivated.

The frozen fish industry, Mr. Speaker, as I have just said, is bound to become a great one. I predict that markets will be made available in every country of the free world for this product principally because of the general demand from all quarters for new fishing grounds and a greater variety of eatable fish. So far, in this country, Mr. Speaker, we have confined ourselves to a very small number of species but it is well known that we have a great variety of food fish which remain to swim unmolested in our waters. The possibilities of the fresh fish trade are unlimited. There can be no doubt of the potentiality of marketing fresh fish nor of our ability to secure markets.

Too long, Mr. Speaker, have our fishermen been forced to exist on the bare necessities of life; too long have they been taken advantage of by those who would profit by their loss; too long have our fishermen been forced to exist on the bare necessities of life; too long have they been trampled upon. Let us now give them a break! Let us provide a future to which they might look with confidence! Let us brighten their hopes and fulfill their cherished dreams! Let us now see to it that they are given their just reward!

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I am put in a very difficult position this afternoon in having to follow the last speaker. The speeches on this side of the House have all been of a very high order. The standard was set up by my honourable friend, the Minister of Fisheries, when he spoke to the second reading of this Bill. The Minister of Fisheries, Mr.

Speaker, in my mind, is one of the greatest orators in Canada at this time. I have heard some of the men who are supposed to be some of our greatest orators, and I have heard no one who surpasses him, and few who measure up to him.

The Premier's style of speaking is different altogether. He speaks from his heart.

MR. BROWNE: Has even the Premier—

MR. COURAGE: It is nothing to laugh at. It would be better if more members spoke from their hearts, better for Newfoundland if more members had hearts like the Premier's.

Mr. Speaker, the man who has just spoken is a young man in his mid-twenties. He has just made a great speech. It is difficult for me to follow him. I speak this afternoon because I stand here as a representative of the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage Bay, a district which is not too well known to too many in this House. I have something to say of conditions past and present that may be peculiar to that district. The District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage, Mr. Speaker, is an old district. It sent a member to this House in 1832. Those of us who studied the Gallic Wars will remember the first words: "All Gaul is divided into three parts." The District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage may be conveniently divided into three parts. There is Bay D'Espoir, which is probably unique in Newfoundland. It is an inland sea with a climate, a foliage, a way of life very different from that of the rough headlands of Hermitage Bay, from which it is sheltered. Hermitage Bay

is the second part. That has an in-shore fishery, but it can't really be called inshore because the fishermen have to go out a considerable distance to catch cod. Some of them go off in their boats for as much as ten and twelve miles. They land their fish, and up to a short time ago, they made their fish on the flakes. There was some banking but it was not so important as the bank fishery of Fortune Bay.

I am not going to speak very much about Bay D'Espoir and Hermitage Bay, because the main problem of the fishery today in the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage is not in Bay D'Espoir and Hermitage Bay. They have their problems, and I shall discuss them too. I will have more to say about these two parts of the district which I have the honour to represent when I speak in the budget debate. Now I am going to concern myself principally with Fortune Bay.

Mr. Speaker, when the Premier spoke a few days ago, I believe it was on the last day he spoke that he produced a map showing some statistics. He gave out the total catch of salt codfish in the various districts around Newfoundland. White Bay and Fogo, I believe, were the leaders.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Ferryland and St. Mary's were first.

**MR. COURAGE:** But there was one statistic that struck me somewhat forcibly, and I may have forgotten the others. The catch in Fortune Bay and Hermitage, 7,200 quintals. Mr. Speaker, that is one of the saddest statistics I have ever heard—7,200 quintals. Why Captain Jack Mills in one year landed as much fish as that in English Harbour West.

Any one banker in any one year landed as much fish as that. What has happened to the fishery? In Hermitage Bay, of course, they catch their fish and sell it to the fish plant at Gaultois. That is a good thing. But in Fortune Bay where the fleet of bankers once operated, dozens of them in my boyhood, the bank fishery has disappeared, and the fish are no longer being caught.

Where are the fishermen?

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say very much about the bank fishery. As Kipling saw it when he wrote "Captains Courageous" it may have been a romantic and a gallant and an attractive way of life. But viewed as I see it (and I am related to fishermen. I had an uncle who sailed in fishing vessels, yes, and an uncle who drowned in a fishing vessel) the bank fishery was anything but romantic. It was the most uncomfortable way of earning a living that has ever been devised. It was the most uncomfortable way of existing that has been known to men since the days of the galley slaves, and it disappeared for exactly the same reason. Men were driven to be galley slaves. They were condemned criminals driven to the galley as slaves, were driven to work by a whip. To one who saw a Roman Galley coming up through the Mediterranean, with its oars flashing in the sun, proudly breasting the seas of the Mediterranean and passing onward through the pillars of Heracles, the Roman Galley no doubt looked to be romantic and a wonderful sight, a beautiful sight, but what was at its core? What made it go through the water? Men! The blood, the sweat, the misery of men, whipped on, and if they fainted they were revived again by the whip. The galley slave



has passed away because men could no longer tolerate such a spectacle. And to the bankers men were driven by a whip, the whip of poverty. And when times became a little better the bank fishery too disappeared. Now I am not going to launch a tirade against those who skippered the vessels or the owners because it was not their fault. It is just the system that I am speaking about.

In 1930 I taught school in Fortune Bay in a place with about seventy-five families where everybody almost to a man went out in these bankers. They left their homes in January or early February, and not in August or July when the sun was shining, and they fished all the year round up to the late fall. They went out on the Grand Banks in March when the water is pretty cold and when the sea is very rough. They were put out in little dories over the side and rowed away to where the gear was anchored, hauled back that gear, put the codfish in the boat and came back aboard the vessel and got something to eat, then split the codfish, often by the light of a torch. Then they had to bait up that gear. Then they had to go out again the next morning in their little dories and once more catch some fish. They did that day after day, day in and day out, many times Sundays and Mondays, many times it was from Monday until Wednesday night before they got any sleep. I have heard men tell me that they have stood splitting fish until they began to cut their hands. They literally fell asleep at the splitting table because human endurance can only stand so much before it must give in. They went on day after day. By and by the caplin struck in and the captain said: You have been good boys and have landed a few thousand quintals of fish: Now

we will go down on the Labrador. So they got ready and they went down on the Labrador and they fished on the Labrador and got back about the latter part of October and sometimes as late as November.

That was the history of what took place in the bank fishery. Then after they had gotten a bit of firewood these men would have to take up herring fishing or turbot fishing because they had not made enough in the banker to enable them to live during the winter. What had they come home with? They had come home, Mr. Speaker, with a dirty clothes bag. How much did they get for working from January to late October? These men had earned what? Two hundred dollars was fair. Three hundred dollars was good. A man who made four hundred had reason to be congratulated by all his neighbours. I have known many men who never made two hundred dollars for a whole year fishing. When they went fishing the first thing they had to do in February was to get oil clothes, rubber boots and probably warm pants and sweaters. They had to take up these things, and their families had to live on the prospect of what they would earn until they got back.

That was the system known as banking in Newfoundland. That was the romantic and attractive bank fishery. Is it any wonder that is disappeared? Is it any wonder that it is gone? But, Mr. Speaker, that is not all. It is no coincidence that in my district of Fortune Bay and Hermitage we have more widows for our population than anywhere else in Newfoundland. It is no coincidence at all. It is another fruit of the bank fishery. Every year there were men who did not return. Every year there was a father who never

came back to his family. Mr. Speaker, sometimes whole schooners disappeared. The husband of my aunt went down with his schooner and with all his crew. There were many other people that I knew well who never came back. I have had, not once or twice, but far too often the unhappy task, because there was no clergyman in the place where I taught, the unhappy task of breaking the news to a family that a father would not come back any more. I have had that to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the committee which prepared this report were not able to visit Fortune Bay. Twice I heard that they were going to visit Fortune Bay, and each time something prevented them from doing so. Because up there the bank fishery has departed and nothing else has taken its place, and there are hard times in Fortune Bay today. I hope—I hope that this report, and this Authority which we are setting up have not come too late. Because, Mr. Speaker, I have at this moment on my desk letters and telegrams and a list containing the names of a hundred men who are looking for work, and I can't find work for them. I have haunted the unemployment insurance office. I have telephoned them repeatedly. I tackled everybody who has anything to do with Seven Islands, and I confess I can't find work of these men. They are looking for it. They want work. That is one thing that society owes men. It may not owe them certain things that some people expect, but society does owe a man a chance to earn a living. I hope that we are not too late with this thing, because I am sure, and that is why I am speaking so honestly and plainly, that many honourable members do not know the urgency of the problem in Fortune Bay. It is not in Burin, not in For-

tune, not in Grand Bank, but from Harbour Breton and down around to St. Bernard's.

Now I said I had the names of a hundred men who are looking for work, but that is only a small number of the population, the male population of Fortune Bay. The sad thing about it is that these letters are for the most part from fishermen, and fishermen younger than myself. The reason for that is this—the reason for this is that the fishermen of Fortune Bay are today catching fish, but they are not catching them in Fortune Bay, and in many cases they are not catching them in Newfoundland. The men of Fortune Bay are recognized as the best deep-sea fishermen in Newfoundland or for that matter in the world. I challenge anybody to deny that statement. They are the best deep-sea fishermen in Newfoundland. There are good fishermen in Placentia Bay, too. I am speaking of men who go out on the Grand Banks, who man the bankers, who go to Lunenburg, fishing out of Gloucester, out of Fair Haven, out of Boston, Newfoundlanders. Honourable members should not look surprised. I have relatives there myself. Only last year a dragger went down somewhere off Boston. She was skippered by my cousin. She went down with all hands. My own father fished out of the Bering Straits, out of Seattle, San Francisco, and out of many other places. Fortune Bay men have always gone out of Fortune Bay when they wanted to earn a really good living for their families. That has been going on for far too long, because I am afraid that they are not going to come back. They are fishing in Lunenburg, Sydney, and from all around Nova Scotia, men from Fortune Bay, the best fishermen in New-

foundland, because they can't make a living in Fortune Bay. That is the problem, to attract these men, to hold them there. They are fishing here in St. John's. Go aboard the trawlers in St. John's and Harbour Grace and you will find that men from Fortune Bay are fishing there. That is why I said this is a sad statistic. These men are catching fish but it is not for Fortune Bay, and it is not for Newfoundland in many cases.

Mr. Speaker, we have all said enough in this House to indicate to anybody that the need is there for a fishery development programme. No one will dispute that. No one can dispute that who knows anything at all about Newfoundland—The need is there. On the South Coast there are a great many harbours of the type that the Premier described in his speech. Several of them came to my mind as he spoke where houses could be built, streets could be laid out, harbours where the fleet of fishing vessels could lie safely at anchor, that are free from ice all the year around, and from which fishermen can fish all the year around. And we have the men, as I have just said in these rambling remarks of mine, we have the men there to man these boats. I could name quite a number of such places. Rencontre East for one and St. Jacques for another, English Harbour West and certainly Harbour Breton, Bay L'Argent and St. Bernard's. My honourable friend reminds me there are many of them. It is difficult to name them all in Fortune Bay which is within reach and access of the Grand Banks, which is so well known that even the Russians have heard it and have come over here to fish. Mr. Speaker, these places need someone to come in with the knowhow that the Premier spoke of, with a little capital and to go to

this Fishery Authority and get the necessary loan to start a fish plant or some fishery development. My honourable friend from Bonavista South said there are fish swimming in our waters that nobody is catching. I had an instance of that last fall when I went from Coomb's Cove to Little Bay West, a distance which in a motor boat took me about forty-five minutes. During all of that time we steamed through thousands and thousands of mackerel, and nobody was catching them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that note will be taken of what I have said concerning the harbours in Fortune Bay. They are excellent for fishery development and they have excellent people. The fact is that whoever goes there in this day and age and starts a fishery development will not only benefit himself but will benefit the people—or to put it the other way around—will not only benefit the people but will benefit himself. Many of these places in Fortune Bay are suitable.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit down without speaking about roads—We need roads. Some people have the idea, Mr. Speaker, that you can't build roads in Fortune Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will have to tie his roads in with fishery development, otherwise he will be out of order in speaking of roads.

MR. COURAGE: I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I say, with all due deference, that roads are an intrinsic part of fishery development, or of development of anything in Newfoundland. Roads must exist for the people to carry on the fishery, for people to walk over, to go to church, and to go from place to place.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member might argue that church bells are equally important—I don't think.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, one million dollars could be spent on road development in Fortune Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the honourable member to discuss roads.

MR. COURAGE: And, sir, the same is true of St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is out of order.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, may I talk about cake?

MR. SPEAKER: Fish cakes, yes.

MR. COURAGE: There has come about somehow or other amongst certain people a fallacy which I call the "Have your cakes and eat it" fallacy. It is that sort of thinking where people said Confederation would be a wonderful thing if it came to Newfoundland. I agree with Confederation, but I don't like the way it came about. There are people who say such things. And there are people who say about the fishery—We must have fishery development but don't like the way the Government is going about it. Let us have a look at the way the Government is going about it: They are setting up a body of men called the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority. And this board of three men, all experienced men, is given the job of receiving and examining proposals and suggestions which come into the Government or which come in to them; undertake research and investigations of potential markets and enforcing agreements made even before the passing of this Act between the Government of New-

foundland and persons to assist in the development of the fisheries. They are to co-ordinate the work of the several departments of the Newfoundland Government which relates to the development of the fisheries. They are to assist persons directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and to assist in the operation of such enterprises as are of experimental character, etc. In other words they are to carry the burden of assisting those people in Newfoundland who have plans for the development of the fisheries. I cannot see what is wrong with that. It is not nationalization. Nationalization would mean that the Government would take over and own these fish plants. That, Mr. Speaker, is what nationalization means; the Government would step in and take over and own this industry. That is not going to happen. There is no industry in God's world which lends itself so little to nationalization as the fishing industry of Newfoundland.

It is not socialization, Mr. Speaker. Socialization means that the fishermen would own the plants and the boats and equipment in common. That is not intended. What is intended is that the fishermen should own their own boats, and the enterprisers, the businessmen of the fisheries should take over and own their own plants. That is not socialization but it is industrialization. It means that the fishermen of Newfoundland would catch more fish, that they would catch them by more modern methods, and that he would process them by more modern methods. But it is to be individual enterprise. Along with industrialization it is to be individual enterprise. It may not be as individualistic as the fisheries of today, nevertheless, indiv-

idual enterprise where fishermen and owners alike can earn a good living.

Mr. Speaker, I have said here before in this House that there is a great need for modernization. I have said here before that a good catch for a fisherman today is seventy quintals of fish. If two men go out in a boat and catch 120 quintals of codfish, that is a good catch. But seventy quintals of fish, even if the price were \$20 a quintal, when these fishermen subtract the cost of operations, is not enough to give them a decent standard of living. It cannot be done. What we have to do is to enable the fishermen to catch more fish. In the world today millions of people are hungry, millions of people are starving. The average calorie consumption of food is only 1,150 which is only three hundred and fifty calories above the amount upon which the human body can exist. Fish is a very rich protein food. Something must be done to speed up and modernize the distribution of fish. That is where we fall down, in the distribution. Maybe some of this fish can be made available to people who are hungry, because it is only people who are hungry who are going to eat our fish. It is a sad thing that I should have to say so. I like codfish because I am accustomed to it. But take codfish and serve it to somebody who is not used to it, and he won't like it. There are many, many people here in St. John's and the industrial towns who turn up their noses at codfish. They go to Church and say: "Please God let our fishermen get lots of fish, let our fishery harvest be bountiful, but, God, don't expect me to eat it."

We must put our fish up in such attractive packages that people will want to eat it. The Premier ex-

plained here during his speech how that is being done at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, during the Confederation campaign, a friend of mine in Hermitage Bay, a fisherman, received a newspaper. On the front page of the newspaper was a map of Newfoundland, and across that map of Newfoundland was written "Where once our Fathers Stood we Stand." Now he looked at that in a different way than I would have looked at it, and he immediately wired back to the person who sent out that newspaper and said: "I don't want to stand where my father stood. I want to stand in a better place. My father died of beri-beri due to malnutrition. He stood all his life in the bow of a dory. He could not even afford an engine. He worked all his life for somebody else. I had to bury him when he died. He starved to death from malnutrition, a victim of beri-beri. I don't want to stand where my father stood nor do I want my children to stand where I am standing."

Mr. Speaker, this is a wise measure. This is a great Bill. The honourable member for White Bay referred to it as a war measure. It is. It is a challenge to all the people of Newfoundland. The responsibility for the success or failure of this measure does not depend on the Government; it will not depend on the Fisheries Authority as much as it will depend on the fishermen of Newfoundland. We must, every one of us make an all-out effort. Again the call goes out for leadership. I said in this House once before that there is need for leadership, for our young men of good education to come into this fisheries programme, to start at the very beginning of the fishery business

and to learn it step by step. There is a great chance for them right at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, early this spring we buried a good Fortune Bay man, the late Senator Vincent P. Burke. He was a good Fortune Bay man. I knew him well. He told me that he had once become very angry with a man who was at that time the leader—he might not have been the Leader of the Opposition—but a man who was at that time very much opposed to the Memorial University. Dr. Burke became very angry with him because he said to Dr. Burke: "It is the height of folly to think of educating fishermen's children." Now to one who knew Dr. Burke it is apparent he could not have said a worse thing to him. Mr. Speaker, it is not the height of folly to educate fishermen's children. It is the height of wisdom to educate fishermen's children. Because a well educated province, a well educated country, is the salvation of that country.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a little book called the Newfoundland Story.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable member a question? Could he clarify more or less the incident he mentioned where some Leader of the Opposition at some time or another objected to educating fishermen's children?

MR. COURAGE: I think I said at the time the University was being built or soon after. It was many years before the present Leader of the Opposition had attained his eminence, Mr. Speaker. It was many years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, that clears it up.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the last speaker said that the Premier was attacking this problem with energy and with initiative, or words to that effect. In 1949 I wrote a little article about him in a Newfoundland magazine. I am going to quote now what I said: "Many people have asked the question: Who is that man Smallwood? What sort of fellow is he? Well I will answer that question:

"Joseph R. Smallwood is a fighter. He is a fighter for the cause of the Newfoundland people of whom Shelly might have been thinking when he wrote: 'The seeds he sows another reaps, the wealth he finds another keeps, the robe he weaves another wears.'" That was written long before the Premier had become Premier, although he had attained a certain eminence. It is true today. It is true that he is fighting for the Newfoundland fishermen. And we invite everyone on whatever side of the House he sits to help us in this crusade. Mr. Speaker, people will ask, can we afford to do what we are doing? I would ask, can we afford not to do what we are doing?

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority." I want, Sir, first to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Fisheries for his outstanding speech in outlining the fishery programme.

Mr. Speaker, although I am speaking this afternoon on this subject there is really not a great deal for me to speak about after listening to the great and historical speech delivered in this Chamber by the Honourable



the Premier. Nevertheless, Sir, I will endeavour to occupy this Chamber for a few brief moments.

Mr. Speaker, the first stage of development in Newfoundland, as I see it, is completed. Jobs have been made available to the skilled workers in this country. Here in the great industrialized centres of the country the skilled workers can find an outlet to develop their specialized skills, mechanics, bookkeepers, tradesmen will find a livelihood, economic security and personal happiness and satisfaction. Sir, God created men, but he created them with vastly different ambitions. Mr. Speaker, not all men are fishermen born and not all men are farmers. Many fishermen today are round pegs in square holes. But heretofore they had to stay in the fishing boats because Newfoundland could not offer them outlets for their basic qualifications because of its lack of development.

The second stage of the development programme of the Government of Newfoundland has commenced. The best authorities on the fisheries, the forests and the agriculture that North America can produce have been called together to devise and blueprint and make plans on which this Government will base its policy for years to come. Already, Sir, we have a great fishery programme in operation and we in the Government are committed to carry out this programme and we are committed without any reservations. We believe to a man that it provides the answer to all the dreams that we have had as private citizens for the many years that we have lived amongst our friends and fellow countrymen in this land of ours.

Newfoundland, Sir, has been a country of frustration. It might be said that we are the most frustrated people of peoples, as we stand upon our great coastline looking upon our wealth of fishery resources without the means to exploit that wealth, and without the capital resources available to ordinary men. Sir, we must do those things which we know from our experience and knowledge we are in a better position to do than any other country on the face of the globe. We believe, Sir, this great development programme for the fisheries of Newfoundland will fulfill our destiny as a people and as a country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn to the second stage of this Government's development programme—this comprises, Sir, forestry, agriculture and fishery: First let us take agriculture, and I speak, Sir, with special reference to Trinity South whose good people I am most honoured to represent here in this House. The agricultural resources of Trinity South are considerable. Programmes for the development of the blueberries and sheep raising are now being carried out. Sir, we are awaiting with impatience the report of the Royal Commission on Agriculture and on Forestry. When these reports are received by the Government the full potentials in the field of forestry and agriculture will be developed. Farming, Sir, may not be as important to Newfoundland as it is to Prince Edward Island. But various specialized aspects of agriculture can, and will, I predict, become very valuable to Newfoundland and will contribute something to its economy, particularly the prospects of the blueberry industry and the prospects of sheep raising,

which, Sir, can be one of the greatest industries today in Trinity South.

Then again, Sir, I must not leave out that great fur-bearing animal known as the mink. That, Sir, could be one of the greatest industries in the history of Newfoundland and can be produced especially with the suitable food that we have in Trinity South to supply these little, small creatures which give many a fur coat to beautiful women. We could have that industry there, Sir, not sealskins but mink. These very small fur-bearing animals could be raised in the district which I represent due to the fact that we have a pot-head industry at Dildo, which is ideal, Sir, as food for these animals. I feel confident that this Government will, before very long, see that there is such an industry in this district I represent, due to the fact that we do not have to go elsewhere to procure the food which these animals require. There is no place on the North American Continent with such prospects, as I see it, for mink raising. Many of the people of the District of Trinity South could find a good livelihood in these industries, naturally established through government assistance provided through the loan boards which have been set up. This Government, to my mind, Sir, has become the economic channel of our primary producers, and the loan boards, Mr. Speaker, a new policy in its present form in Newfoundland, is probably one of the greatest steps ever taken by any government in Newfoundland. This Government, of which we can be proud, is the only government to put forth such loans in order to assist the people, and Sir, it also leads towards the liberation of our primary producers.

In forestry, Sir, I know we have a few saw mills in Trinity South, and many of our people make a living from the production of lumber, fish boxes and berry boxes. But I know, Sir, that the forestry industry of Trinity South is not so prosperous looking as are the prospects for mink raising there. The forestry development programme of this Government, Sir, will be of great assistance to this industry and will, I predict, provide a better living for mill owners than heretofore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries, which I feel sure my honourable friends on the opposite side will be fed to the teeth with by the time every member on this side has had something to say about fishery development. They will say "For God's sake don't mention fish."

Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, are our life's blood—

MR. HOLLETT: Politically speaking—

MR. BUTTON: Our present and our future, Sir, is the fishery. I think, Sir, I speak for every member of this Government and in fact for everyone in Newfoundland when I say that this legislation, which was blue printed and adopted, this policy of fishery development and is now about to pass into an Act, is fifty years, Sir, overdue. As I see it we are proud and privileged to be part of the Government that has undertaken this great issue.

Sir, speaking for the fishery itself, it is time to do so. In my career as a private citizen, as a student of the history of the fisheries of Newfoundland and being aware of the shortcomings of the administrations up

to date, I never thought that I, Max Button, would be privileged to be a member of the Government that would undertake to tackle a problem of the magnitude of this development of that great industry, known to all as the fisheries of Newfoundland. I am in agreement with the policy, but I must say, Sir, that I disagree with locations selected for the development. Why Sir? Because, of course, none of them are in Trinity South—not yet. Let me tell you about the fisheries of Trinity South about which not very many members in this House know anything, except the Premier who I would say is the only one.

Now, Sir, Trinity South is located on the northeast coast of Newfoundland. Trinity South and Trinity North are the only places on that great northeast coast where twelve months fishery is carried on. Trinity South and Trinity North, sir (I am taking up for the honourable member for Trinity North) are the only places on the northeast coast from which it is possible to ship for twelve months of the year. That is within the past few years. I know that the honourable member for Placentia West thinks Placentia and St. Mary's Bay are the only bays. Trinity South, Sir, and Trinity North produce the greatest variety of commercial fish of any place in Newfoundland. It is, Sir, second only to Bay of Islands in the value of its herring fishery. It is the biggest producer of turbot of any bay in Newfoundland. It has the biggest and only whaling operation in Newfoundland and Labrador today. Some people may call it potheads, but that is a small whale. It produces as much lobster as any bay in the country. It produces as much salmon as any bay in this country. It is part and parcel of the great codfishery of the north-

east coast, but provides a longer fishing season for cod than any bay on the northeast coast. And, Sir, this may amaze some of the people, perhaps even here in this House, it also produces caplin in the month of April and in the month of September. It has a longer fishing season for these fish than any part of the whole island of Newfoundland. It is a larger producer of canned mussels than any other bay in Newfoundland. It is the largest producer of mackerel by 100% than any other bay in Newfoundland. It has greater resources of squid than any other bay in Newfoundland. It has the best indication of commercial shrimp than any other bay in Newfoundland. It has, Sir, resources of scallop in commercial quantities. And, Mr. Speaker, it is located within seven miles of the deep-water fishing grounds, from the great newly discovered fishing grounds. It is twenty-five miles distance from Cape Bonavista. It is forty miles distance from Badger's Quay, thirty miles from Joe Batt's Arm, and it is twenty miles distance from Twillingate. And that great new source is twenty-seven miles from LaScie and fifty miles distance from St. Anthony. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this great new resource of fish so much in demand in the world markets today is so close that our fishermen in Trinity Bay are better placed than any location on this great northeast coast to fish these great new grounds. All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is just to look at the chart of Trinity Bay, which I am doubtful if any member in this House here today except the Premier has looked at, except my honourable friend from Trinity North. You will see by looking at this chart that the hundred fathoms outlined as the Banks of Newfoundland is over two hundred miles from St. John's.

It is three hundred and fifty miles from Trepassey, and it is one quarter of a mile from Grate's Cove. This fishing ground is one quarter of a mile from Grate's Point, and, Sir, around the Baccalieu reef the RCAF have in recent years reported as high as forty trawlers of foreign origin fishing within thirty miles of the Baccalieu Island in the spring as well as in the fall. That is something, Sir, to consider.

Mr. Speaker, Trinity Bay's resources are unparalleled in Newfoundland. Only neglect has failed to give this great bay its place in the sunshine in the fisheries of the country. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the great deep sea bank fishery was originated in Trinity Bay, that the original sea dogs were bred in Trinity Bay; and it was from these great deep sea fishermen that the banking fleets of the southwest coast learned their trade. These great men, Sir, were fishing the Flemish Cape, and the Greenland Grounds fifty years ago and landing their fish in Trinity Bay, and were shipping them where possible throughout the whole year, except probably a few months. Now with the warming up of our coastal areas in the past few years it is even better today.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, about the other advantages unique to Trinity South, which I feel sure will interest the honourable member from Placentia West. From Chapel Arm in Trinity South on the northeast coast one can drive five miles by road to Long Harbour in Placentia Bay on the southwest coast, and from Bellevue in Trinity South on the northeast coast one can drive five miles, Sir, to Pinchgut, Sir, in Placentia Bay on the southwest coast. It is on the very narrow isthmus crossing from Trinity

Bay to Placentia Bay. Mr. Speaker, I can travel from Sunnyside which is the end of my district in Trinity South on the northeast coast, to Comeby-Chance in Placentia Bay on the southwest coast in twenty minutes, a distance of approximately three miles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as an area for fishery development no district in the whole of Newfoundland, particularly on the northeast coast can challenge Trinity South.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. BUTTON: Now, Sir, I don't know if this is yet the crucial moment or not, but it is a big and a crucial moment in my life. Some of the people in the District of Trinity South have been wondering what Button is doing all the time. Some of them may be disappointed because they did not see me probably too often, although I have a good record for visiting my district. It is as good a record as any honourable member in this House, if not better. During the winter months I was absent from Newfoundland. I visited Boston, New York and Montreal. While there I went into the fishing industry to see what prospects there were in inducing some person to come to the District of Trinity South as a private enterprise, to operate a fresh fish plant. The answer I received was that it might be considered. But, Sir since then I have made contacts here with our Newfoundland firms, and I am happy to say that one of the greatest firms of Newfoundland, one of the greatest and one of the most reliable and respected fishery firms in Newfoundland has decided to erect a fresh fish filleting plant and cold storage plant for blueberries, salmon, squid, herring, lobster and whatever they can take. They have decided with the help of this

Government and the approval of the Fishery Development Authority that they would erect a fish plant in Heart's Content. Now, Sir, when I received that answer I can assure you I was a happy man. And I feel sure that the great Liberal Government which I represent will go out hand in hand with me to see that this great firm, one of the greatest in Newfoundland, will be given every consideration that is possible. I feel confident, Sir, that the Premier will be at my back in this respect. Because, Sir, that fish plant, if erected in Heart's Content, which really is in the centre of my district, in a certain aspect will serve the following places: Lead Cove, Sibley's Cove, Brownsdale, New Melbourne, New Chelsea, Hant's Harbour, Winterton, New Perlican, Heart's Desire, Heart's Delight, Islington, Cayendish, Whiteway and Green's Harbour. Also it will serve all the fishing industries in the southwest arm of Random in the District of the honourable member for Trinity North, Butter Cove, Gooseberry Cove, Southport, St. Jones Within and all the settlements from Random Island where we have one of the greatest herring fisheries in Newfoundland, if we had the proper equipment and the right kind of boats, with echo sounding, etc., which I feel sure will be coming in the near future. It can only come, Sir, through this great Fishery Development Authority. I feel that the people whom I represent will be proud to know that so great a Newfoundland, so great a fish merchant, as I should say is on Water Street, but is a real fishery merchant, who does not go to the golf course or sit around in lounges, but who is one of the great fish merchants who has spent more money than any New-

foundlander in Newfoundland today on the fisheries is interested.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is he? Is this a guessing contest?

MR. BUTTON: That, sir, is the \$64 question. I feel sure the honourable members on the other side will be pleased to know that is my secret. It will be worth more than \$64 in the end. This of course has to meet with the approval of the Fisheries Development Authority. It will take time to find a location and for the planning of such a plant. But the reason I say Heart's Content, Sir, for such a plant is this: We have a good government wharf, electricity, plenty of fresh water, and it is open all the year around. Sir, if that were not so the A.N.D. Company would not have been shipping paper from there for quite a number of years, and they should be there today. They would be except they had to please a number of people in St. John's.

I feel sure that Trinity South with its unparalleled resources presents the best case for development of any area on the whole northeast coast of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, Trinity Bay men as a rule fish longer than any other fishermen in Newfoundland—weather permitting, they are always fishing. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the people of St. John's during the months of March and April had the privilege of eating fresh turbot, which to my recollection is the first time in the history of Newfoundland that fresh turbot had been sold here in St. John's in that time of the year. It was all from Trinity Bay.

Sir, as I said a few minutes ago in connection with the honourable member-for Placentia West, although he has a few fish plants up there in Placentia West, probably he feels that any further fish plants should be built in Placentia Bay. I feel sometimes that any more fish plants, Sir, which will be built in the next few years in the bottom of Placentia Bay, such as Long Harbour, will have to come to Trinity Bay, for its resources in the supply of fish. I have had great faith, Mr. Speaker, in Trinity South, and in the whole of Trinity Bay, not only Trinity South but Trinity North, and a feeling that it has been neglected all through past governments. I have a feeling that all the resources that are required in Newfoundland are there, especially when it comes to the fishing industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what I consider to be of fundamental value in this programme of fishery development which is taking place. You and I, Sir, like all Newfoundlanders are home-loving people. I think that I am safe in saying that the very basis of Newfoundland life is the love of our homes and our wives and our children—(your children but not mine, as I have none). The love of places in which we have our roots, the places where our grandfathers and their grandfathers before them lived and raised their families and worked and worshipped. Countless generations of our forebearers have passed down to us our way of life which is Newfoundland. You and I Sir, do not want, if we can help it, to spend six months away from our wives and our children working at Goose Bay, in Greenland, or the air bases or Seven Islands, in order to support our families. We, Sir, should like to work and live in

the place where we have our roots and with which we are familiar and with our families and with our children. You know, Sir, Newfoundlanders even today will work, if employment is available at home, for half the wages they receive elsewhere. They will work for just half provided they can go home at night, that they can stay with their families and watch their children growing up. That is the life of a Newfoundlander. That is the life that he requires. We are going to try, Sir, in this Government to give our Newfoundlanders that privilege. We, Sir, are family men. I am not, but probably most of you people here are, and no doubt you love your families. And then Mr. Speaker, this is Newfoundland: Personally I have no patience with people, and with a great many people, who say that Newfoundlanders won't stick to their jobs for more than six months without wanting to go home and see their families. Traditionally, Sir, we Newfoundlanders have been forced to leave our homes and our loved ones to make a living. We have been forced to go away, Sir, for long periods of time. Probably because of this we have learned as a race to work for six months of the year, and spend, Sir, the other six months at home with our families, cutting fuel, mending our fences, repairing and building our homes, and, Sir, enjoying the only true happiness in this six months of the year. Half a lifetime, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you going to have a maypole there?

MR. BUTTON: A maypole is always on the honourable gentleman's mind. If I can live long enough I will arrange, Sir, a maypole for the honourable gentleman.



Mr. Speaker, half a lifetime is spent by our Newfoundlanders away from home in order that they may make a living for their families. This, Sir, we do as a race due to the fact that other countries have developed more industries and industrialized their country. But if we in this Government try to do that, try to industrialize, we are all wrong. But, Sir, I feel sure that after this session is over the honourable members on the opposite side will say: let us industrialize Newfoundland, develop it, modernize it. I think, Sir, that the fundamental benefits to be gained from the Smallwood Government, the great development plan for fisheries is a creation of prosperous fishing communities. As already stated in this House on several occasions by the Honourable the Premier, prosperous fishing communities around the coast of Newfoundland in which our people can live and work throughout the year, in modern communities providing services, education and social amenities such as modern houses and modern working conditions is the answer. Why cannot the fishermen of Newfoundland have their electricity, their hot and cold water the same as the rich man in Newfoundland? Why not have them the same as the rich man in any other country? They are entitled to it more so than anyone because they are the salt of this earth. They will live under those conditions, and as already stated they will have the privileges of living in economic dignity. I am proud, as a member of this Government, to be a part of this great revolutionary programme which is taking place here in this honourable Chamber today and will be for weeks to come. It is one of the greatest programmes that ever Newfoundland will see. It is only because we have had

such a man sent to us, as I see it by the will of God, who can put forth such a programme for the God-forsaken people of this country. It is only a man, Sir, who has the interest of the people, of the fishermen, the poorer class in this country, at heart such as the Premier has—I am not giving him a bed of roses, but I have known him for quite a while, and his one and only aim in life is to see that each and every Newfoundland fisherman especially will also have a decent standard of living and live the same as other people in the world today.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the Provincial Parks Act has two changes from the parent Act. The first change is that we desire to have Section 4 of the Act changed in such a way that we could bring in under our control these small picnic sites we are establishing around the province in particular. We are trying to have these places, familiar, I think, to every motorist, where we have established a fire place, cleared around the ground and put a table and a shelter from the rain over the table, and in other ways attempted to provide some amenities for the picnicking and travelling motoring public, and at the same time help in the prevention of fires which might originate from picnickers or camp fires. Now the wording then is changed to bring in recreational and picnicking sites. In other words technically these will become provincial parks. It is not intended to call them by that

name, but technically, and it thereby gives us authority to control and otherwise look after these sites.

The other amendment is that we are able to appoint officers who may look after more than one park. The original Act makes it appear that we had the authority to appoint officers for each park. I presume what was in the mind of the framers of this Act, which was before my time, was that we would have very large provincial parks, as we undoubtedly shall, parks like the Big Falls Area and others, and that we would need at least one person for these parks, caretakers or something similar. However by bringing these smaller sites under our control and authority we do not want to be in a position where we must appoint one person to look after each one of the smaller sites. So that the section is being re-worded so we could have one person, for example, responsible for the five, six or seven picnic sites on the Avalon Peninsula.

These are the two changes, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading of this Bill.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I am in favour, as I think we all are in favour of this. I was about to ask the Honourable Minister if he could tell us just how many provincial parks exist at the present time in Newfoundland? I take it, it is the policy of the Government to try and create others. But if he would enumerate them? I think the amendment is very useful and I support it.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, would the Minister tell us, I wonder, how many of these sites exist along the roads on the Avalon Peninsula. I don't remember seeing any except on the road near Brigus. Are there some

on the Salmonier Line and on the road down through St. Mary's Bay and Placentia Bay? There is not very much I want to say. Certainly there is no reason to make any opposition to this Bill which seems to me to be necessary and desirable. But I don't know if there are very many of them. In fact I don't know of any provincial park. I think the idea is to call these location parks in order to give the officials powers of administering them. In replying perhaps the Honourable Minister could give us some idea as to what he has in mind as to just what the jurisdiction will be.

**DR. ROWE:** Mr. Speaker, I have just realized that I think it is time to state that this whole parks programme for the province is one in which we visualize something like three different categories. First of all we visualize the large, real provincial park, a park which deserves the name of "Provincial Park." I presume the first one in that category will be the Humber Area, which, as this House probably knows, was passed back to the Crown by Bowaters in this past year. I feel safe in saying that will become in the near future a provincial park by proclamation. In time there will no doubt be several such area parks which will comprise several square miles in area, of outstanding natural attractions, and of a kind similar to what we have in the Big Falls.

Secondly, we hope in time, but this has not been gone into very thoroughly as yet, we hope to have a second category which will enable us to give some attention to other attractive sites around the province, nothing so ambitious as provincial parks in the Big Falls category, but smaller sites which might very well be given proper

attention; a theoretical case would be Bellevue Sands in Trinity Bay. I say that is only a theoretical example. I believe that area anyway is owned privately—or say, Jean de Bay down in Placentia Bay or one or two places down on the Southern Shore, a smaller site which would be an attraction, and would accommodate, say, a hundred cars.

The third category is the one for which this amendment is principally designed, small picnic sites which on Sundays, holidays or any time in the summertime look after three or four cars. As a very good example there is that one at Seal Cove River, which I feel sure every member of the House has seen when going out of town. There are others, also. Now one of the honourable members opposite asked me just how many there are of those. Actually I am surprised that he has not seen more of them, not that I have seen too many myself. Right now there are upwards of one hundred of those in the province. During the slack season of the year (I am giving this information but I am not sure it is required) we have had some of our forest fire patrolmen do work of that kind, making tables and making these fire places. This past year I submitted a plan to the Government which was approved last fall, whereby we would go into that more extensively, because we felt it was both necessary for the public and was at the same time doing a great deal to prevent the spread of fires originating from that source. So we had these men during the slack season at work making these tables, etc. We have at the present time at Whitbourne a large number, upward of one hundred of these fire places and tables which are right now being shipped to various parts of the east coast. I

mention the east coast because apart from the fact that a great bulk of our population is concentrated on Avalon there is also this fact which might be overlooked at times, the interior and the west part of Newfoundland is under the control, from the standpoint of forest fire protection, of the Forest Fire Association of Newfoundland, and that organization has been doing a similar work in the interior of the West Coast. I saw some of these myself last year as I motored from Grand Falls down to Corner Brook. In fact they are more elaborate in certain ways than the ones we are supplying here. Incidentally we have only recently announced where these locations would be. Just as an example, there are four between the Goulds and Ferryland and there is quite a number of them on the Hodgewater Line. We are putting a few out on the road leading across the Heart's Content barrens. On the Salmonier Line there are quite a number, seven or eight, I believe. And there are quite a number on the road from Whitbourne out towards Clarenville, and some six, seven or eight between Clarenville and Bonavista.

I think I have answered the questions of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. If I have not I shall be glad to answer them in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move that all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred. And I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 8:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

May 14th, 1952.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already informed the House that this forenoon the Honourable the Attorney General acting on behalf of the Government instituted further legal proceedings or instituted legal proceedings against Dr. Alfred Valdmanis for the recovery of the sum of two hundred and seventy thousand dollars, an amount that is alleged was collected by Dr. Valdmanis from the German Manufacturing concern known as MIAG in connection with the contract that that firm had in the building of the cement plant at Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, so that the House will understand thoroughly what I have said, may I say briefly again what I have said: I have already informed this House of the arrest of Dr. Alfred Valdmanis and of the charges made against him by me personally. I have now to inform the House that this forenoon the Honourable the Attorney General acting on behalf of the Government, instituted civil proceedings against Dr. Valdmanis for the recovery of an amount of two hundred and seventy thousand dollars, which amount is alleged to have been collected by Dr. Valdmanis from the German firm known as MIAG, the firm which had the contract from the Government to construct, install and erect the machinery of the cement mill.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney

General): Mr. Speaker, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that this afternoon my colleague the Premier, and the Leader of the House will be proceeding to British Columbia. Dr. Smallwood is going to British Columbia to receive from that university a doctor's degree. The University of British Columbia will be the second of our Canadian Universities to so honour our Premier.

We always think in the most kindly way, Mr. Speaker, of British Columbia and of everything from British Columbia. We have, as the House knows, not only the clerk's table but that beautiful mace which was the gift of that province to us when we entered union. I think that I am voicing the feelings of the House when I say of our Premier that he has our sincere congratulations that he is thus being honoured by this university. I understand there are only two persons being so honoured at that convocation, the Governor General of Canada and our own Premier. I am quite sure we will all unite in wishing him a happy landing, a very pleasant visit and a safe return as Dr. Smallwood or Dr. Dr. Smallwood, as they call men in Europe when they have their second degree. I hope he will return having enjoyed some rest. I may say that while he is in British Columbia our Premier is to address a huge gathering. So many individual clubs had asked him to speak that it was manifestly impossible for him to address them all individually, so that I understand they have all agreed to get together and have one joint gathering. We know that on that occasion, as on all others the Premier will do himself and the province he represents, honour.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, for our part on this side of the House, at the present time I rise to express to the honourable the Premier our hearty congratulations on this new honour which is to be conferred upon him. We do hope that he will have a pleasant voyage both going and coming. When he comes back a double-barrel doctor; Doctor, Doctor as the Attorney General says, we shall still be able to call him "Joe" outside the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And inside

MR. HOLLETT: We will be able to call him more than that inside the House. Outside we all have that privilege, I think. I don't mind how many doctors you confer upon him, I don't think you can take away that right. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier will be the first to admit that the honour being conferred upon him is definitely a mark of honour and respect from the far western province to the far eastern province. In that light as well as being an honour to the Premier I am quite sure we are all grateful to the Province of British Columbia for this honour upon the Newfoundland Premier.

We do hope, sir, when he comes back that the Doctor Doctor will be in good fighting trim. We are sorry that he has intimated to us that he has more or less almost reached the end of his political life and is thinking of retirement. We hope that when he comes back, Sir, he will have renewed strength and energy politically, and probably be prepared to remain with us in this House for some considerable while longer. I am sure, Sir, we all join with the Government in wishing him God speed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful for the very kind way in which the Honourable the Attorney General and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have referred to this incident, and to the honourable members of the House for the very kind way in which they have received these remarks. I appreciate that very deeply. I realize very vividly that this is a distinction which is being conferred upon the people and province of Newfoundland. They cannot, I suppose, offer an honorary doctorate of law to every Newfoundlander or even to every member of this House. That would have the tendency of cheapening the distinction somewhat. So that they select one person as the recipient, and when he receives it, I think, it is intended to be an indication of the regard of that province for the people and particularly the Legislature of this province.

I had a note passed to me while the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking. It was passed to me by the Honourable Minister of Finance, giving me a piece of sound advice which I intend to follow. He said to be sure to get myself a new suit of clothes. I promise that if I don't get a new suit I will at least have this one pressed. I will try to uphold Newfoundland's good name by looking as tidy as possible on that occasion.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer back to a statement of the Honourable the Premier on opening of the House, I wonder if the Premier or the Attorney General could enlighten me on this matter of a civil action against Dr. Alfred Valdiman. It appears that this money, which the doctor is supposed to have absconded came from MIAG. I take it then

the action might very well be a civil action taken by MIAG and not by the Attorney General. I wonder if that might not be explained. Apparently the money has not been taken from the Newfoundland Government. Therefore, I can not see why the Attorney General is mixed up in it. Probably that can be explained, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CURTIS: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we have looked into the matter of the law and my department is satisfied that under the circumstances of this case the amount in question is due not to MIAG but to the Government of Newfoundland. I might say also, in ratification of what the Honourable the Premier said earlier, this two hundred and seventy thousand dollars does not of course cover the entire amount involved in the Valdmanis charges, and that it is quite likely subsequent proceedings will follow.

#### **Presenting Petitions**

None.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Notice of Motion**

None.

#### **Notice of Question**

(87) MR. BROWNE (St. John's West): To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. How many prosecutions for the sale or distribution of salacious or indecent literature have been taken in Newfoundland during the past two years?

2. Give the dates when such prosecutions were held together with the

names of the defendants and the results of each case, if any.

#### **Answers to Questions**

##### **Question No. 84:**

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker in connection with question No. 84 asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, on today's Order Paper, the answer handed to me by the Treasury is as follows:

(1), (2) and (3). The documents requested by the Hon. Member are available in the Department of Finance in microfilmed and original form in respect of the period from 1st December, 1950, to date. They are now being gathered together and may, in due course, be examined at that Department during normal working hours. The Department will inform the Hon. Member when all relevant items have been assembled.

(4) The statement requested by the Hon. Member is now being prepared but it should be noted that its preparation may take some time. For the period 1st April, 1949 to 30th November, 1950 (i.e. prior to the setting up of the Government's central accounting system), the required information is available only from the various Departments. For the period 1st December, 1950, to 31st March, 1952, it will be necessary to check a large number of Vote Ledger Cards in order to extract therefrom references to payments to W. J. Lundrigan, Ltd. From 1st April, 1952, the information is more or less readily available.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier would allow me to ask a question in regard to this microfilm. We have seen some up there. It is not much avail to see them on the screen unless



we can take a copy of them. Is it possible to take a copy without infringing on anybody's rights?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, I would say that when the microfilms are thrown open to any member of this House that carries with it the right, surely, to copy it. Obviously if he were shown the originals he would have a right to copy them and similarly a right to copy the microfilms.

**Question No. 85:**

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is that the documents requested are now being gathered together in the Department of Finance and may in due course be viewed at that department during normal working hours. The department will inform the honourable member when the required items are assembled. So that the honourable and learned gentleman will hear directly from the Treasury when they have them all there and available for him.

**Question No 86:**

MR. SMALLWOOD: I found a note on my desk, left there by somebody, to the effect that the reply to this question is being brought along to the House by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply. If it might stand over until we have a chance to confer in the matter.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): The answer to that question is being prepared, Mr. Speaker.

**Orders of the Day**

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority"—adjourned debate.

HON. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to recall, that this Bill was introduced to the House, and extended remarks were made particularly by the Premier; all of which was done in comprehensive, competent and compelling terms. My object in taking part in the discussion of this Bill is to fasten my comments and observations upon one particular phase in the terms of reference of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee. The terms of reference which have already been recited in this House a number of times were:

(1) To examine into the fisheries resources available to the Province of Newfoundland with a view to the fullest utilization of known resources and discovery and development of others.

(2) To examine into the economy of existing methods of fishing and other methods which may be applicable. To examine into existing methods of processing and other methods which may be applicable.

These undertakings are for the purpose of effecting increased utilization of fishery resources through methods of fishing and processing based on sound, scientific and social considerations.

This afternoon, Sir, for a few minutes I should like to concentrate during my few remarks in as simple and straightforward way as I can upon the phrase "Social Consideration." I continue to defend and expound in a very simple way, as simply at least as I can, an emphasis which I believe is integral to this Bill, i.e., the part of the fishermen themselves in the effective operation of this Bill as law. I do not want, Sir, in thus stressing social considerations, to set up people

against dollars. There is no necessary conflict nor incompatibility between the two. There is no reason why dollars and people should not go along together. My purpose is to stress the human aspect of this all important bill. My conviction is, and has been expressed on other public occasions, that magnificent as these plans are, and as vital as the fisheries development is to Newfoundland, nevertheless, all these plans might very well be frustrated or at least hampered if the fishermen themselves, if our people themselves, do not support, co-operate with, and throw themselves into the spirit which is written into the letter and purpose of this bill. I doubt whether I can impress the House as deeply as I feel it myself that there we have something which is very vital in this bill, i.e., as I see it, the principle of the bill is not least of all in announcing a basic change in the operations of our fisheries, not least of all in so doing to foreshadow a change which must come about in the attitudes of our people. If I may say so without punning, there is in this bill foreshadowed nothing less than a second chance, for it visualizes not merely a change in the mode of our fisheries from static to a more dynamic mold but visualizes a change in the attitude of people from an individualized basis to a more co-operative and community basis. It is certainly so written into the Fisheries Development Committee's Report and, as far as it can be written, it is written into the Bill. That is to say that the Bill before us, in the order to be effectively worked out in the communities concerned, involves a change from a somewhat rigid individualistic way of doing their fishing business to a community basis, and to a basis which involves shared responsibility.

If there has been anything approaching a revolution in the clauses of this bill, the revolution is connected with not only a change in the operations of the industry, I say, but the revolution is involved again in the change of attitudes in the people. That is what I wish to consider for a few minutes this afternoon, Sir, something of these social considerations which were felt to be important enough away back in 1951 to be a relevant, integral part of the terms of reference of the committee then even before they went to work. For here, Sir we are now about to express in law our convictions that there must be a change in the attitude from individualism to a more corporate shared responsibility in the vital business that Newfoundland has to do, or one of the vital businesses, that is fisheries. You see, Sir, we have been individualistic, and we have boasted about it, and rightly so. We have not only been individualistic with all the good things that individualism can bring, but we have even been ruggedly individualistic. At least we have characterized ourselves as ruggedly individualistic, and it has been considered part and parcel of our good way of living to be paddling our own canoe. These little black fishing boats which we find plying our waters all day and late at night over our stormy bays, as gallant in their own way as the little boats of Britain, these little black boats with their one man or two men or three men have been, over the years, Sir, symbols of our will to go it alone all down through the stormy course of our generations. I speak from first-hand experience, Sir, because before my parents made up their minds that there should be a book rather than a codfish in my hand, I had taken a

very direct part as a boy in the fishing business over across Conception Bay. I knew what it was at nine years of age to be rounding the corner of a trap and trying to lift up the leads so that we could draw it up, with a southeast lop coming out of Carbon-car Harbour. I was under the doctor's care for a number of years as the result of a sprained back. I say that to indicate that we are talking here about something which is not academic, something which has to do with the life-blood of people as people. I know that our work as fishermen was an individual piece of work. Every fisherman that I know marked his gear. It was his gear. His mark was on the ledge, the place where he moored his little boat. It was his ledge in the cliff. It was his little skiff in its own appointed place, his property, Sir, in a sense as sacred and individual as the family plot in the cemetery, and just as inalienable. Those old methods of going it alone helped to introduce the attitude which was so wide-spread—every man for himself. Indeed the motto of one of the great fishing organizations, the historic "FPU", was "To Every Man His Own." Now, Sir, there was much desirable about that tenacious, dogged individualism. But it also carried with it liabilities. Going it alone might have had some relevance for the generations past in the simplest life, but new occasions demand new attitudes, and I am saying now, as a word of caution, that we must very well reckon with what we are up against in trying to implement legislation so vital, so basic as this, when one of the features of its success will be whether the people will be with it or against it. Because the attitude of one man, especially if he be a sea-lawyer in any

small community can defeat or help to defeat the vital purpose of this bill. So that I say, Sir, the human factor is not least of all, though subtle, though intangible, is yet a relevant part of the operation of this Bill as a part of our future way of life.

I say the human factor is vital. Sometimes it might rest with the fisherman himself or the fishermen in a community as to where a fish plant or any concentrated operation will go ahead there and go ahead successfully. Sometimes it might rest with the merchant or the plant owner as to how he gets in there, so to speak, as to how he impinges upon the people, especially if he comes from the outside. Sometimes this human factor will be a very important business for the Fisheries Development Authority itself; and it is not a matter for criticism that they should have sufficient staff. It would be a matter for great lamentation if they had no adequate staff. The danger is that they might become a disconcentrated corporation here in St. John's with no liaison out there in the communities. It is going to be a very important consideration, Sir, that the Fishery Authority here in St. John's be not identified with St. John's as such but rather that they use every means to keep in touch with the fishermen and to learn their ways and to adopt their methods to every particular place where an operation of any account is to go ahead.

So, Sir, I think, with those things in mind, although it comes late in the terms of reference it is not less relevant than the first. Social considerations are very vital, because, as I say, these may make or break very largely the whole programme. What I have been saying is that here we are confronted with not only dollars and what dollars can do but confront-

ed also with what men can do or will not do. It is a change of attitude we are concerned with here from that way to this way. I am suggesting now, Sir, as a word of caution, in as much as I think I know something of the working of men's minds, that here we should not expect too ready a responsibility, too ready a universal responsibility. It may be a case even right here where vital matters affecting people are involved. Nevertheless, although their livelihood depends on it, even here we may have to exercise patience. For instance, may I give three or four examples? In the carrying out of the committee's report and the implementation of this bill in some places there will be required a great centralization of population. That is to say that places may have to be moved. I will not say wiped out as that is not the proper way to express it, but they may in the course of time disappear. Now any administration which has had anything to do with moving people in the past (I think of the experience of the Commission of Government) or of having people moved, some of their experiences have been unfortunate because they have not taken into consideration the present life habits of people. Many people for instance were moved from St. John's out to Markland only to find themselves back in the same streets a few years later, because of factors, because of life habits, which we in this House know so well. They were transplanted from their roots. I believe it was done possibly without too much consideration for their habits or for their way of life. We know what happened. So that I say just the process of being moved, even if it is to earn their own living away from their own roots, even from the rootless rocks, is going to be an ex-

perience, surely, which will not be without a shock. For they have hung on tenaciously to these rocks over the years, and they are part and parcel of their way of life. Even if they go out like Abraham, not knowing where they go, but hoping to some more promised land, nevertheless the moving itself, the way they will do it, how it will be done, will be just as important as having it done at all. That is a social consideration.

This legislation, Sir, has a great deal to say in the latter part about expropriation. From Clause 27 on almost to the end of the Bill, for pages, they are seeking here powers of expropriation of people's property. It is going to be expropriation, possibly, of ordinary fishermen's property. Now what I have just said about the barren rock applies here. Property may have to be expropriated, holdings of property by people over the generations with or without title or deeds. It is theirs. How that is done will be a very important consideration. There are places where in some cases it will be necessary to set up a local organization, in order that there might be some local authority, some little group that the Authority here in St. John's can work through rather than through individual fishermen, fifty or a hundred of them. Some of our communities have not found it easy going to develop local organizations, for one reason or another. Yet, it will be very important that there will be some conscious sign that people accept self-responsibility if this Bill is to have a good effect in some communities. That is another social consideration.

In the fourth place there is the matter of adult education. I could make all my remarks, Sir, this afternoon, if

I had the time, to what I have in mind now, adult education: And there is certainly a large place provided for adult education in the fisheries development committee's report. I have not in mind just a matter of "A", "B", "C", I have not in mind just the matter of learning to read and write; I have not in mind a matter of office of a government at St. John's. What I have in mind is something far more lively, far more dynamic, far more at the cross-roads than that, Sir. What I have in mind is the unfortunate picture over the years of communities going on, going on and going on without any too great positive attempt on the part of the communities themselves to take part in their own rehabilitation. It was not so in Britain. There the workers had educational associations. How is it that the ordinary labourer in Britain is so informed about a wide variety of topics? Why is the labour situation in Britain more contained and more civilized probably than in any other part of the world? Why are the people so politically well educated? It is largely through the educational classes, educated classes of people giving their leadership voluntarily in the communities, teaching the people through debates and through discussion and through cultural associations of various kinds. But there has been a vast vacuum in Newfoundland, and too often there has been a despairing, disappointing picture of leaders, so called, living in communities who over the years have not done all they should as leaders, to come out of their shells, so to speak, and give voluntary leadership for the general lifting up of the people's basic education. Because we have not had that kind of thing going on in Newfoundland I think we have missed out a great deal, so that there is a yawning

gulf between the learned, so called, and the unlearned. When we think of education we think of going to college or going to a university. It should not be so, Sir, and it should not be a matter to be turned back on the government as another government responsibility. I give a word to Newfoundland; as I see it this afternoon there is a compelling, there is a very urgent, responsibility which exists now as it has done all down through the years, and not less so now, because the opportunity and because the need are so great, I say, there is a great opportunity now, late as it is, for the local communities to harness whatever power they can to help our people see what adult responsibilities are in the present day.

As I see it, Sir, there is an increasing proportion of our people, not equipped to take adult responsibility. It is a complaint that I will apply to a wider variety of areas than Newfoundland. It is, I think, unfortunate that so great a proportion and possibly an increasing proportion of adult people are coming to adulthood without having the proper equipment for adult living, and can't help falling a prey to pressure groups, as they are not able to take full adult responsibility as they should. I don't see anything that can guarantee much more the solidity and the strength of democracy than that the ordinary man should be respected enough that the leaders in our community, or the businessmen as the case may be, might take a full share of their responsibility in sharing their experiences with their fellowmen. So that I say: In Newfoundland at this moment I would rank pretty close to the front, as one of our vital needs the need for a dynamic and local level adult education. The irony of the situation is that here

is something that will affect the livelihood of so many thousands of our people, and from the point of view of adult responsibility we are not ready for it. That is another social consideration, Sir.

Now I come to develop another point, and it has to do generally with adult attitude, especially our fishermen's attitude toward fish as such. I say, Sir, that over the years (and when I say it as one who comes from a fishing family, and know it at first hand) our fishermen have not for one reason or another looked upon fish as essentially an article of food. The tendency has been for them to look upon fish as something to be sold. I recall as a boy when the famous Coaker Regulations were promulgated in Newfoundland. I did not know their significance then, and probably I did not calculate them all right nor may not even yet, but I believe they were very significant. I think that basically they were a good thing. But I can recall, Sir, as these regulations became known, one of them which was that we should clean the napes and fins of the black film. Well I remember two crews working side by side on the same landing heaving up their fish on the same gallery. One crew was an F.P.U. follower and worked assiduously to clean the fish of all the black film. The one that was not a Coaker crew took no pains at all. I happened to know because my people were one of the crews. Now, here is an important feature of this Bill, Sir, that a basic change is suggested here with regard to the catching and curing of fish, namely that in this Bill it is indicated that if these plans go through the catcher will not necessarily be the curer. There is no ritual, there is nothing in the reality of things that says that the fishermen who catch fish

should be also the person who cures it. I have said on other occasions what must be obvious to anybody who sees what goes on in July in the fishing centres, when you find fishermen agog, excited, especially when the fish are close to the rocks, and the little traps and big traps are catching them in great quantities and bringing them ashore. They are lively and enthusiastic and good to talk to. But when August comes and the stores are filled with salt bulk fish—now they must think of washing it out and going through all the different processes indicated. Hear and see them in the middle of August and see if they are lively, optimistic and cheerful and aggressive looking people. Now they must sit around and watch the face of the sky. Newfoundlanders, Sir, are famous for and part of our tradition in looking at the sky. When I went to Toronto as a student and began to talk to people about what a fine day this is, they did not know what I was talking about. But for our fishermen it is a part of their way of life to be looking at the weather. From August to October and sometimes until the snow comes they are there waiting to complete the job started in July. The old tradition was that fish killers were to be fish curers. But there is nothing, I say, which says that must be so.

As a matter of fact the people who catch and process the most fish must be, other things being equal, less careful because they have not the time to cure the fish. I have seen fish on the culling board at the merchants, the fish of the fish-killers, not nearly as good in quality as the fish of the little trawlers who had possibly only ten or fifteen or twenty quintals to sell. So I say, Sir, here we are faced with this question of trying to change



the attitude of our people now with regard to this factor of regarding fish as what it is, genuinely, an article of food. This bill, I repeat, foreshadows a new condition of things where fishermen will be released from the business of curing very largely and set apart for what they are best fitted to do, i.e., to catch fish. I would suggest that possibly one of the ways to dramatize this Bill would be for the Fisheries Development Authority to set up a system of films whereby it could be shown to our people just how much they are part and parcel of a very human thing, to help feed people in other parts of the world, especially now when standards of living have risen to that point at which people are very, very particular as to what they eat and how it is to be eaten.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could ask the honourable minister a question? If people are confined to catching fish they will have to catch very much more to make as much money as they do now when they make it themselves.

DR. POTTLE: I am not suggesting, Sir, that they will live completely on what they catch any more than they are doing now. It is not foreshadowed that people will be able to live for twelve months.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know what is foreshadowed but they will not be able to live for twelve months on two or three months' work.

DR. POTTLE: I come now, Sir, to say a few words particularly about the Bay de Verde area; I have been gratified since this discussion began that Bay de Verde is included within the northeast coast for the purpose of fisheries development. I want to say a few words about that district,

Sir, insofar as my remarks pertain to fishery development. I represent that district, which is a dual district, the District of Carbonear and the old District of Bay de Verde. Anyone who has watched the development of the trend of population in that area for the past twenty years or so will see what is happening. At the Carbonear end the population has increased until now Carbonear is one of the very largest towns in Newfoundland, comparing favourably with the very largest areas of specialised industries from the standpoint of population. With the two local industries which are there, Saunders and Howell and W. J. Moores, together with the other new industries which we hope will get on their feet solidly before very long, it should continue to be a quite prosperous town. Many people are moving in there from the shore, and I think the prospects of Carbonear are very bright. As you move down the shore the population thins very considerably, and as you go farther north, as the case may be, from Freshwater—(Freshwater was an area which many years ago contributed at least as many people as professionals as probably any other place its size in Newfoundland. The same holds true for the Blackhead area which is sprinkled with names which have adorned many of the professions or most of them)—to-day it is a series of little, practically deserted villages. In Northern Bay and Gull Island people have deserted the fishery just the same, until now they depend mostly upon Goose Bay. Seven Islands or Gander or other places of concentrated employment. As you look down the shore in the middle of July you will find it practically deserted of boats, while fifteen years ago it was lined with heavy engined boats and small boats as well. For

many miles down that shore now, Sir, there is not a boat to be seen even in the prime of the summer season. I have had more than one man in my office looking for work last summer, who the year before had three traps in the water.

When you came to Bay de Verde area there is another trend that is again towards concentration of population. That is an area where the people have stayed put, so to speak, for a number of reasons. They are in the great majority, part of the traditional stock of fishermen in Newfoundland. Within recent years around the Old Perlican, Grate's Cove, Red Head Cove, Daniel's Cove, Bay de Verde area shore facilities have been improved, such as breakwaters, large and small; and not least of all there is this reliable factor that there is a body of fish continually around these shores, so that probably nine seasons out of ten there are a lot of fish to be caught. Not least of all, Sir, and again I say: one solid fact is that you have fishermen there who are as devoted to the fishing industry as you will find in most parts of Newfoundland. They will remain there, Sir, by choice, even though they do not enjoy as high a standard of living as they themselves would like or their friends would wish for them. They are referred to on page 266 of the Fishery Development Committee's Report.

"Nor is the problem met capable of ready solution by allowing the exodus to continue. Many, particularly married people, have their roots firmly in the settlements which have for years been established along the coast and on the islands nearby. They have not the skills to procure employment in other industries, if avenues of em-

ployment were open, and they have not the means to move with their equipment to other parts of the coast to engage in the fishery near processing plants."

These remarks, sir, apply very directly and relevantly to the people of the Bay de Verde area. The fishery development report indicates that there will be various kinds of organization set in motion to carry out the processing of fish and modernization of the fishing industry. In some places, I say, there will be large scale centralization. But that is not all. In some cases centralization will not apply and cannot be carried out. There are provisions made, therefore, for a sort of intermediate development, and that is spoken of in the report I have just referred to. I may quote here:

"There are a few large settlements along the coast which have limited waterfront facilities and have been established in coves or small harbours against a background of high rocks limiting expansion and making the provision of roads, water and sewerage and other services difficult and costly."

The words I have just read describe Bay de Verde very exactly. There we have a large fish producing centre with a history of continuous success.

"These settlements are unsuitable for establishment of large plants for centralization of the operations and of the population of an area, yet their production of fish is such that abandonment of homes and premises and resettlement of the people in other areas is most unlikely."

The Fishery Development Committee recognized this factor that there are people in certain communities who are going to stay there. On paper worth while as it might seem, almost

essential as it might seem to move these people out, nevertheless you have one stubborn social factor, (and it is about social factors I am talking this afternoon, Sir) you have one stubborn social factor, and that is that these people are going to stay there with their children.

"In some of these settlements the precipitous approach to the sea and the limited extent of the waterfront has caused crowding. There is inadequate space for sun-drying and the fishing premises are in a most unsatisfactory condition. The Committee considers that the remedy in these cases lies in a scheme for centralization of operations on a scale between that for a large area development and that for minor centralizations."

Well, sir, I am glad to say that the report of that Fisheries Development Committee has not fallen on deaf ears as far as Bay de Verde is concerned, and that it has been included within the overall plan of development.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to ask a question? Is it not a fact that there is a fish plant of some sort in Bay de Verde at the moment.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, Mr. Moores operates one there on a limited scale for just freezing. I am glad to give here now certain details of what the Government has approved funds for, which of course will have to be voted by this House. If it passes this House in the course of time, I am told, there will be two block freezers at Bay de Verde, a filleting machine and other equipment necessary for a complete block freezing filleting operation.

I should like the radio stations, if they will, to take note of what I am saying for the people of Bay de Verde,

and if I may say so, for the DOSCO News, or, as the people out there call it "The Gospel News," because that is the only way at this time of the year for me to get to the places there what I should like to say, not only by way of an announcement but by way of other things I want to say in a few moments.

The plan of operation there is intended to cover five months at least, from June to October inclusive, and at a production rate of two hundred and forty dry quintals a day, or processing equivalent to two hundred and forty dry quintals a day during these five months. The two block freezers capacity will take in nearly twenty-four thousand quintals. These figures show that, except for the trap fishery, the proposed plant will permit a large increase in the fishery during the season, because at the present time it is estimated that in the classes represented by this operation in Bay de Verde, Red Head Cove, Lead Cove and places alongside production is under fifteen thousand. So that it will be an increase from fifteen thousand to nearly twenty-four thousand.

Now the Federal Department of Public Works will be making necessary repairs to the breakwater, and I understand the work will begin there on the 1st of June. That will require probably four months to complete. The site of the plant will most likely be at the base of the breakwater which runs out obliquely from the shore.

Now one feature about Bay de Verde, Sir, is the congestion of the people in that settlement. There has been a considerable increase in population over the years, but the possibility of manoeuvring there is very small so that the people had to

centrate and build their houses very close to one another. Now how the plant will be placed there, how one can manoeuvre towards the plant by proper roads and with plenty of room to manoeuvre around the plant site itself will be a question that will call for consideration as far as getting the necessary property is concerned.

Now least of all there will be concern also for a fresh water supply for the plant. I have on another occasion expressed to this House my very great concern about the most undesirable water supply which is endured by the population of Bay de Verde. I understand there is probably but one other area in Newfoundland where anything like it exists. But I am quite sure the majority of this House do not appreciate the distressing and very unfortunate conditions which exist at Bay de Verde with regard to the supply of water. The people there are as impressed with it and are as worried over it as anybody else. Now for this plant to operate there it will be necessary to supply fresh water. That will bring up the whole question of the problem of the inadequate supply for the place as a whole.

I want to say these few things before I close;

I had hoped that as these plans developed the people of Bay de Verde and the section around that area will give every co-operation they can towards the carrying into effect of whatever plans may be adopted there for the development of the fisheries. An opportunity has come to that important area of the North Shore of Conception Bay which even the most hopeful of them even might not have anticipated even five years ago but is now in the making. I repeat: I hope that in every individual and organized

way, whether it be a responsibility for the community or any section of the community, I hope that whoever's responsibility it is, that as individuals and as a community they will give every degree of co-operation and lean over backwards, if necessary, in order to insure that one chance they have of enlivening their prospects of getting a livelihood from the fisheries and in order that this prospect will not fail. In the second place I would hope that the enterpriser, the operator, the entrepreneur who goes in there, whoever he might be, will adapt himself and will deal in a human, kindly, business-like way with these people.

Prime Minister Nehru at Bombay told us when speaking with a group of us a few years ago that if you want to know the Indian you must approach him gently and kindly. (He did not mean the North American Indian. He meant the civilized Indian of India). There is a way of approaching our Newfoundland people whereby we can bring the best out in them. I hope that whoever undertakes this business there will elicit from our good, kindly, people only the best that they can give in co-operation and in any other way. If I may say so, I am sure I echo the thoughts of my colleague in fisheries when I say that I hope that his and our responsible body, the Fisheries Development Authority, will likewise do all they can to accept the local needs, the local conditions in the local field, their social considerations, so that one link in the chain won't break, the chance that the people will be lead through the Fisheries Development Authority itself to get the most out of this plan that can be gotten. I hope, too, that whatever development there be they will develop in such a way that those people now who have already invested a good deal over

there (I could name the firms) will be able to continue so that the investment they have made there over the years will not be jeopardized in any way.

Sir, these are part of my simple views, these social matters, and I undertook to explain them in this way because I thought it might be quite proper while we are thinking of dollars and cents not to forget that a vital feature of this legislation is that it affects people, and people can frustrate or they can expedite, they can help it or they can hinder it, they can make it good or make it sour as the case may be. That was certainly in the minds of the Fisheries Development Committee when they said: In the view of the Committee the most important section of the industry is comprised of the thousands of individual fishermen engaged in catching, and curing fish.

The plea I am making this afternoon is that they are the cornerstone of all this. Not only are they the receivers in many respects but they are the givers. They have a contribution to make in their own right which no man can substitute for, no man can take away, and no man can surplant.

My last illustration takes me back to India again. When we were there a five-year plan for India was discussed in the House of all the people, the central parliament at Delhi. Around far and near there was widespread hunger, and there still is desolation, destitution, diseases, pestilence that we shall never know, pray God, in the Western Hemisphere, and there was a five-year plan that had developed over the years. It took a long time to develop it. It was not done overnight. Even while people were dying like animals there, the parlia-

mentarians were studying what to do just the same as Britain studied what to do when the blitz was on as to how social security might be developed for Britain. So in India the chief factor is time. In a letter from the High Commissioner of India to Canada some months ago he said: It is a question of time whether India can hold out until the results of the five-year plan get working. That also is the question in my mind, Sir. Good as this thing is, vital as it is for Newfoundland, has it come time enough? Or rather will the people hold on there? Will the people still remain fishing until the returns that should ensue from this Bill will be seen out there, until something develops and happens out there that they can see with their own eyes and that it is not just a promise? Time is the essence of the matter. It could be, Sir, that vital as this is it might be a matter of too little and too late. The Government have seen to it, after study and careful thought that our resources that we shall apply will not be too little whether they are applied this year or in the years to follow. We have tried to see to it in collaboration with the Federal Government, we have started to see to it at any rate, that the resources we shall apply to the great problem facing Newfoundland shall not be too little. It is very largely now up to the people themselves to see to it that it is also not too late.

House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. G. NORMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the present bill before the House I am placed in a rather embarrassing position having to follow the Honourable Minister of Welfare and to speak after his having delivered such an able address, and

again after hearing so much about the North East Coast, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay and Bay de Verde. I was wondering if the district of Burgeo and Lapoile was still a district of the province.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, every district cannot be looked after at one time, and I am sure that they will be all taken care of in the not too distant future. Newfoundland has been a province of Canada for just five years, and the present government has been in power from that day to this. They have introduced some pretty remarkable legislation in that period of time. In fact, from what I have heard and read, they have introduced more good legislation into this House in the past five years than any other government ever did since we got representative government back in 1892. I do not hesitate, however, to say that this present legislation is the biggest for this first five years of Confederation, and I doubt whether there can be anything else so big in the next five.

I have been in this House for the past three sessions, and I have spoken at least once in every session. Anytime I have spoken the fishery has been the main topic of my remarks. I have lost no opportunity to discuss the fishery in this House. I regard it as a great honour and a great privilege to have the opportunity to take part in this great debate on a great subject.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier passed some remarks about the conditions of our fishermen and their families in the past. I knew about the conditions of some of our fishermen and families during the past, through no fault of their own, probably the least said the better. I

have travelled along every coast and in all the districts in this country including Labrador in schooner and steamer. As a purser and wireless operator on the coastal boats I have travelled the Southwest Coast, the West Coast, Notre Dame Bay, Green Bay, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay. I have heard some fishermen say it was better they were never born, because conditions were so bad at the time. One only has to consider the circumstances and conditions of our men, women and children and to travel to the Labrador on our coastal steamers and schooners. However, let us forget that—the past—and try and think of changes and improvement of conditions for the future.

I have heard some honourable gentlemen say that some of the best fishermen were in their districts. I would say, we have good, hardworking fishermen in all our districts. I have travelled in all of them and know the fishermen. I would not single out any district in the country for all I think the fishermen of the District of Burgeo and Lapoile go through the same hardship in frost and stormy weather as any district in the country.

MR. HOLLETT: More.

MR. NORMAN: The Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives introduced this bill into the House with a speech which was a solid pleasure to hear. The honourable minister always speaks well, and it is always a great satisfaction to listen to him. He excelled himself in the speech he made when he introduced this present bill. The Honourable the Premier also excelled himself. For five days he spoke on this great topic of fisheries development,



and every day he had a fresh, new approach to it. I think it was very easy for every member of this House to see his earnestness and sincerity. I don't think there was much doubt as to the deep interest he has in the topic. The Premier has travelled throughout this Province, to all parts of it. He knows Newfoundland almost like the palm of his hand. That is why he realizes so clearly the wonderful importance of fishery development.

Every single settlement in my district, with the exception of Channel and Port aux Basques, is a fishing settlement, and not only a fishing settlement but exclusively a fishing settlement. You can travel along scores and hundreds of miles of the coast of the Burgeo-LaPoile District and see nothing at all except fishing settlements. Practically every man you see is a fisherman. If by chance you meet up with a man who is not a fisherman now, ten chances to one, he was a fisherman last year or the year before. The district that I have the honour to represent, in this House is a fishing district, first, last, and always. If the fisheries die my district would die. When the fishery goes down my district goes down. When the fishery goes up my district goes up. I said a moment ago that every settlement in my district is a fishing settlement with the exception of Channel and Port aux Basques. That is true, although Channel and Port aux Basques are no longer what is called a big or important fishing centre, fishing is not something that is unknown to us there. In the quarter of a century I have lived at Channel-Port aux Basques I have seen tens of thousands of quintals of codfish brought ashore; I have seen great numbers of salmon brought in; I have seen great numbers of lob-

ster brought ashore, and I have seen fishermen come from other parts of our coast to fish there for the season. I have seen fishermen commence their fishing season in the month of November. I have seen them fish through the fall and winter until April of the following year. Many a time I have seen these boats come in low in the water with the ice that coated them in freezing weather. More than once we had to send a coastal boat out to search for and find the missing boat, more than once I have seen families bereaved.

Mr. Speaker, only a fool would utter a word against development in other fields, for example, development of our forests, development of our minerals, development of our water powers. These are good things and we cannot have too much development in them. The government are to be praised for their endeavours in these directions. At the same time I hold and I always held that no real prosperity is possible in Newfoundland if you do not have a prosperous fishery and prosperous fishermen. You can go into one district after another in Newfoundland and find the people depending mostly on fisheries. You can travel north for hundreds of miles and scarcely ever pass out of a fishing settlement. You can travel for hundreds of miles eastward or westward or southward and experience the same situation. We must never forget that Newfoundland is very largely a fishing country or a fishing province. The fishery is still our mainstay, still the mainspring of our very existence. I am delighted that this Government is going in for fishery development with such vim. I think it is only fair to say that this is only what we would expect from any government led by the present premier.

I am very glad that our fishermen, especially our younger fishermen have so many encouraging words directed at them in this debate. I know that this encouragement was badly needed. Goodness knows! our fishermen have not had very much to encourage them in the past years. It is most encouraging and stimulating for our fishermen to know that great efforts are to be made to make the fishery greater and sounder and more prosperous. At the same time I think it would be only fair to utter a word of caution.

I do not think that every project is bound to be a success. I think it is pretty certain that a number of them will fail or fall short of what we may hope for them. I do not think for one moment that we should be discouraged by the fact. It would be foolish and childish to expect absolute success all along the line. I think the Government might just as well make up their minds right now that they will be ridiculed for their mistakes far more than they will be praised for their successes. Unless I am greatly mistaken this is not going to dishearten the Government one little bit. I am quite sure they will press on with this great programme, and I am quite sure that all the fishermen of Newfoundland will be at their backs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I consider myself lucky to be a member of the House and to have the privilege of debating and passing this bill to launch Newfoundland upon the greatest fishery development programme we have ever seen in all our history.

MR. G. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate. Motion carried.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the bill. This Bill is designed to improve the present legislation relating to the Welfare of Children, taking into consideration development within the Department of Public Welfare within recent date, or within the last year or so, which makes at least some of these amendments necessary.

There are in this Bill five proposed amendments. The first amendment has to do with the commitment of children either temporarily or permanently to official care. In the present Welfare of Children Act, courts adjudging a child to be a juvenile delinquent may take one of several courses. One of these courses is to commit the child temporarily or permanently to the care and custody of the Director of Child Welfare. He, if he deems it desirable, may place the child in a training school. Now, Sir, since the legislation was passed we have set up a Division of Correction within the Department of Public Welfare; and the administration of the training school comes now under that director and not under the Director of Child Welfare. It is therefore necessary to take into consideration that administrative change, and because of that and because we believe a child should be committed temporarily or permanently not to the head of any one division in the department but to the minister of the department representing the State. That is for these two reasons (1) because there is a change in structure and (2) because we believe that when a child is committed it ought to be committed to the State and not to a person. Therefore it is changed here to read that the child would be committed temporarily or permanently to the care and custody of the minister.

Now the second amendment has to do with awarding compensation. The present law allows compensation to the extent of only \$50, the court is given wider discretion in raising it to \$200 and this clause gives wider discretion now and raises the sum to \$200.

The third amendment is a verbal amendment of no significance. In the drafting of the Act the word "Relieving Officer" was retained and that is now incorrect and should be changed to "Welfare Officer."

The next amendment has to do with the laying of complaints and proceedings of complaints. This amendment relates to Section 92 where the words "Relieving Officer" was retained instead of the word "Welfare Officer." Because the word "Relieving Officer" was retained certain magistrates felt that Welfare Officers had not the authority to proceed and carry on with complaints originally made to the director. In order to clear up that difficulty and to leave no misunderstanding whatsoever it is now authorized in this proposed amendment that the welfare officer be given such authority.

The fifth and closing amendment had to do with the repayment of unexpended balances which lie in the hands of the Director of Child Welfare as a result of (1) affiliations agreements made by the courts where funds are ordered by the court to be paid and (2) funds which are ordered under private agreements.

Now under present legislation the director is authorized to repay these amounts which are unexpended, such as these amounts which have been ordered by the court and are expended because the child dies or is adopted. But we have no authority to repay

to the putative father funds collected under private agreements. There is no logical distinction between the two, and it asks here that authority be given so that the director will have the necessary authority to repay unexpended amounts in the case of private agreements, as well as in affiliation orders by the court in cases where the children concerned are adopted or die.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker am I to read into the amendment here that it provides for the increase of awards of reasonable compensation which is presently \$50 to \$200? The only point that has occurred to me here is that \$200 does not necessarily cover all the possibilities of injuries or damages that could be suffered by a person. I have in mind frankly, a case that came to my own attention not too long ago, where a young lady employed at Pepperrell Airforce Base received injuries as a result of being struck by a motorcar tire rolled down over the hill by two young children. The result was that she ended up in hospital and spent some six weeks. In the meantime due to the circumstances of her employment at Pepperrell where they don't pay when an employee is not working the total loss involved was something of the order of, I think, a thousand dollars. Under the law as it exists today she is absolutely without recompense except to the tune of \$50. I don't know if this is the time or possibly in committee, but it does seem if we are going to open the gates to an increase of the amount of liability we should be consistent and make it to come in line with damages which would reasonably be incurred. Here is a case where

a person has no recourse except to the tune of \$50.

The other point I would like to mention is this business of agreements the minister referred to where no provision is made in the event of death or adoption for the return of money paid in accordance with the private agreement. Is that a lump sum payment? Usually when an agreement is drafted provisions are made for that eventuality. With that one enquiry, Mr. Speaker, I must say the rest of the amendment seems to be in order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to deal with the last clause first: When the agreement is made between the mother of the child and the putative father—it seems to me that is going to be very difficult to carry out in cases where this money has been actually paid over. I presume there are cases to the minister's knowledge where the money was actually paid over to the mother. In such cases it seems to me it would be very difficult to do anything further about it. However there is one point involved in this bill upon which I would like the minister to give us some information when he replies: It refers to the first amendment which commits the child permanently or temporarily to the custody and care of the minister. The "Care and custody of the director" is now taken out and is made "Care and custody of the minister." It always seems to me to be one of the last things that should be done, and I feel the minister agrees with me on this, to take children out of the custody of their parents and place them in the custody of somebody who is only interested usually in the amount of money he is getting for looking after them. I would like to know how many cases are there like that in this

province at the present time. I hope that the number is not great. Some of them have been brought to my attention because it often happens that when the parents are considered to be unsuitable to look after their children there may be five or six in family and then they are all taken away—The minister himself has told us of a locality where ninety-five per cent of the children should be taken away from the custody of their parents, so I presume there have been many cases in that settlement. He has told us also of the report of a welfare officer on the matter. We have not seen that report, and would like to hear if there are many cases where children had to be taken away from their parents because of these reasons. I have come across several cases here in the city, and I know that conditions are pretty bad when the government steps in and takes the children away from the parents. But usually the fact that the children have been taken away has a good effect upon the parents and makes them better. At least they indicate to me when they come to see me that they are now determined to do all that is necessary to carry out their proper responsibilities as parents.

The mere fact that they are poor, it seems to me, is not justification, and if condition in the homes where the children are residing are not all they should be, nevertheless, it seems to me, that is not the way to handle the situation. I would like to know, therefore, Mr. Speaker, how many cases there are where children have been taken away from their parents.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to say very much on this Bill, except to say that I believe it applies chiefly to delinquent children. In this particular section which is be-

ing amended I would like for the minister to advise us just what procedure it is his intention to adopt when the children or the child are temporarily or permanently committed to his care and custody? Are they to be passed over to the director of corrections of what is to be done with them? Before when they were taken over the director of child welfare apparently has certain agents which he could invoke in order to take care of these children. Would it be the idea of the minister to utilize these same agencies which have been set up, if such have been set up, to take care of these children?

My honourable colleague referred to a child, I think it was a child, that let loose a tire on top of a hill to roll down over the hill. I don't think such a child comes within the scope of this. I would not call such a child a delinquent. It is just what my honourable friend would have done himself when he was a boy, I suspect. Of course when the child crippled some one that is different. Most children want to roll things down over a hill, snowballs and all sorts of things. I want to repeat something I said yesterday. With all due respect to the Minister of Health and his department the remarks I made yesterday were meant for the Honourable Minister of Welfare. I made a mistake of thinking that health and welfare come under the Minister of Health and not Welfare. I want to say now that the department under the present Minister of Welfare, in my opinion, is working very efficiently. They have as a matter of fact on several occasions done work which it was my duty to refer to them and ask for their aid for certain poor people in some branch of their department. I received courtesy always and where it was possible under

the Act to lend some assistance they did so without any hesitation. I would like that to be passed on to the department of the honourable minister.

On the other hand I would like to have an answer to that particular question about the disposal of delinquent children being passed over to the minister rather than to the director. Mr. Speaker, we certainly do not oppose the principle of this bill.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other honourable members who wish to address themselves to this bill, I have taken note of the comments made in the first instance by the honourable member for St. John's East, where he, I presume, in agreeing with the principle of compensation, suggests that the amount is not sufficient. I respect his view. We raised it to two hundred dollars.

MR. HIGGINS: Two hundred dollars is not enough.

DR. POTTLE: If you agree with the principle we could perhaps discuss it in committee the actual amount.

Now, I am not so sure in replying to the comment of the honourable member for St. John's West that there are any cases where funds are actually passed over to the mother. The funds are passed into the hands of the Division of Child Welfare on a monthly basis to be spent for the child on a monthly basis. I don't know of any cases where the funds are passed over to the mother. On the amount of the cases I cannot advise the honourable member now but in as much as he is familiar with the workings of the juvenile court from his own practical experience, we would be glad if he wished to consult with the staff there and get a fuller picture than he would

have as a result of my giving the number here in the House, which might be misconstrued. I agree that it is most undesirable to have children taken from their parents and from their homes, but it is only done as a last recourse, and we are not the initiators, the court takes that step. That is the function of the court and we come in only when the court has issued a judgment to say that the court decides the children should be taken over from there. I may go a bit further and say we may advise the court as to what to do, but we do not rush in to take children away from their parents for very good and practical reasons. As the honourable members know we are talking now of delinquent children. When we were operating the old boys' home and training school at Bell Island we accommodated over sixty boys there. When we built the new institution at Whitbourne, when plans were laid for that institution even though Newfoundland's population was increasing and even though a greater number of people were living in larger areas, because in larger areas you have by and large more delinquency, nevertheless even though Newfoundland's population was increasing and social conditions in certain areas were not improving, we built that structure to accommodate only forty boys, indicating that our trend was away from the institutional care to foster homes care. The thought is that if a boy or girl must be taken away from home to try and put him or her in another home, and not necessarily and strictly to an institution although it is the place for some boys. But I want to say we are looking forward to less rather than more, indicating what our thought is.

Now the honourable member is still right when he says that poverty is no

reason that we should take a child from its parents. That is one of our principles. That point indeed is no reason whatever for taking the child away from its own parents. Indeed the mothers' allowance both in Newfoundland and elsewhere is designed to do that preventative job of allowing a child to stay in his own home. That is one of the most effective results, the most positive outcome of a mother's allowance. Where children years ago had to be taken away from their homes now they can be kept in their homes.

Now the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised a point as to what happens to a child committed to the minister. What happens, Sir, is that he looks around at the facilities in his department. It may be the Director of Child Welfare he needs or it may be the Director of Corrections. In other words, once a child is committed to the Department of Public Welfare the minister is able to take advantage of whatever resources therein, the facilities of the director of Child Welfare are foster homes, or the facilities of the Director of Corrections which are training schools. After consultations the minister decides whether it is better to place the child in a training school or whether he should be placed in a foster home.

I would like to thank the honourable leader of the Opposition for the compliment paid to the staff of the department and I shall be happy to pass the word of commendation along to the staff.

I move the second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion bill read a second time.  
Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.



Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, there are three proposed amendments in this Bill. The first one has to do with that section in the original corrections Act which involved a possible transfer of a boy or girl from a training school to an adult correctional institution. Now, that, Sir, is a drastic step, the transfer of a boy or girl from a training school to a penitentiary. The present section of the Corrections Act provides that the Attorney General may, upon the request of the authority (that is youth guidance authority) direct the removal of any juvenile lawfully committed to a juvenile training school to a school for adults if the training required is the training in that adult school rather than in the juvenile school. As I say, it is a drastic step. So that in order to help the Attorney General and give him something to work on it is here proposed that before he takes any such step, and so that he be better advised, a psychiatric report should come to the Attorney General from a psychiatrist. That would assist him to decide as to what steps he should take, because some children are very sensitive while others are not so sensitive. Under this amendment he would be given the benefit of this extra information.

The second amendment, Sir, is very much more relevant and in view of the business of the House today, the minister may submit to a training school any juvenile delinquent permanently or temporarily under the custody of the Welfare of Children Act. The Welfare of Children Act as amended would provide for the minister to be responsible for the child permanently or temporarily given into

his care while this Bill gives the minister the discretion to place the child in a training school if that is the proper course to take. That is to say the minister looks about in his department and sees what facilities he has for the proper placing of the child.

The third amendment has to do with Section 15; as it stands the present section provides for the Minister of Public Welfare to make an examination into the personal and family history of the juvenile who is supposed to have committed the delinquency. Under Newfoundland conditions it takes a long time for these reports to get to the proper law enforcing bodies so it was thought necessary to cut out the sub-clause so that the hearings in court could be held more promptly.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have examined this Bill and have compared it with the original and there are some questions I would like to ask again while we are on the second reading, to which the minister might reply at the close of the debate.

I was wondering how far this provision has been put into effect at the present time. He has told us that under the last section he has found it necessary under Newfoundland conditions to dispense with a review of the family and the personal history of the juvenile delinquent, and with the social history of the family as well. Has he found it necessary to establish a Youth Guidance Authority and Director of Corrections and would he be good enough to tell us who they are and have they on the staff a psychiatrist? I take it it is one of the doctors attached to the hospital for

mental diseases who is assigned part time to attend to work of this kind. I would like to know how long this has been in operation and whether it has been a practical measure? It seems to me it would be very difficult if the provisions of the main Act had to be called upon.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I don't know how far the Department of Public Welfare goes with regard to the proper examination into the history socially and otherwise of such delinquents. In this particular amendment here the Minister is seeking an amendment which would give authority to have a juvenile examined by a psychiatrist registered in Newfoundland. It seems to me it might properly be more advisable to have the parents of such juveniles examined by a psychiatrist. From all I have read on the subject the delinquency of the child relates back somewhat to the kind of persons who are looking after him whether it be the parents or foster parents or what not. I suppose we are all more or less delinquent at times in our youth. Even there perhaps that relates back to something in our parents, who knows? I think if the Minister went after the matter in the proper way he probably would look into the background and history of the parent and family, and perhaps have this newly appointed psychiatrist who does the work pay a visit to the family of the delinquent children. I think perhaps the Minister would not mind if I referred that remark of mine to a remark he made here some time ago relative to delinquency not only of children but of parents in a certain area in this country, at least I don't know if it were a certain area nor where it was or whether it was the whole country the Minister was then

referring to. Unless the place was mentioned of course I am not in a position to say. Certainly there would be an ample field for a psychiatrist such as the Government has to exercise his psychiatry and find out just how close a relationship exists between the parent and the children with regard to delinquency. The Minister certainly would not be able to claim that there are no files for investigation. I don't know whether the Minister would be able to inform us as to whether or not his department has been able to have the psychiatrist visit this particular area and find out the cause of the waywardness of the grownups in such a community, and what is the cause of their delinquency and their departure from the usually accepted conduct of human beings. Surely there is a place where a psychiatrist would have ample opportunity to exercise the knowledge which he has of human beings and their character and characteristics. I am wondering therefore if the Minister would consent to have entered there in this particular section some clause that would relate to examination of parents of delinquents rather than to the children themselves.

I think it is rather frightening for a child of say from eight or ten to twelve or five or six as the case may be to be brought before a psychiatrist. You know, hard looking individuals as are some of these psychiatrists, even the name is hard, and some of them very stern individuals. They try to get at the basic cause of everything. I would say it would not have a good effect upon a child to have that child examined by a psychiatrist. But if that psychiatrist would apply his genius to the conduct of the parent then I think you would perhaps find

out why the child is delinquent and could probably apply that knowledge to something that would cure the trouble.

Certainly apart from that remark about having the children go before a psychiatrist I don't think there is very much, Sir, to object to in this amendment. The original Act is good. But I think the Minister will have to be careful how he handles even delinquent children, at any rate if he is not careful he may have that condition which the honourable Minister described in a certain area popping up all over the country. If children are not properly treated when very young and small, I don't know what would be the result. I don't know what the minister would think of having parents of these children examined by a psychiatrist.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply as adequately as I can to certain points raised by certain honourable members of the opposition.

The honourable member for St. John's West asked about the constitution of the Youth Guidance Authority. That Authority, Sir, has been set up in the proper way under the authority of this Act, or the original Act, and is composed of the Director of Corrections as Chairman, the Director of Child Welfare, ex officio, who takes the place of the Chairman if the regular Chairman is absent; the Principal of the Training School for Boys and the Principal of the Training School for Girls, and Mr. J. A. Clancy, the administrative officer of the Department of Public Welfare. The Authority, I might say, from all I can gather are doing their work very well indeed. They hold weekly meetings up there.

Now, when the same honourable

member refers to the question of the social history not being required, I should not wish it to be understood that we do not require the social history. I am only saying we should not make it obligatory under all circumstances. The truth of the matter is that we will make them available in every circumstance we can, as we have made a special point of doing, because we regard it as one of the chief factors in helping a judge or magistrate to make up his mind as to what to do. But to make it obligatory under all circumstances would defeat some of our purposes. This is required administratively just the same.

Now on the question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition: He raised a point which this House cannot settle regarding the culpability of parents. Nobody can settle that question, Sir. Under these circumstances all I can say, from the point of view of our position, we certainly regard parents as being directly involved in delinquencies. We have not probably come to the point in Newfoundland where we are prepared to go as far as the honourable Leader of the Opposition suggests. We can only go so far in these matters. We have come a long way, I believe, from the days when we believed the solution was to locate the child and bring him to the justice of the courts. The primary problem now—We know that the delinquency of a child is only the reflection of something else. What we can do beyond what we are doing now is really a vexing problem. In certain states they have adult courts where they fine the parents directly and impose other sanctions on them. For our part what we try to do is this: We admit that any delinquency involved almost inevitably involves the home. It is the child however who

commits the delinquency act so that what we try to do is that we bring the delinquent to account but in doing so we also require the parents to accept all the responsibility they can. For instance they must appear before the magistrate or family court judge. And while we have a delinquent in our care, we support the home, we build up the home in whatever way we can by visits to them and by their visits to us. We have not arrived at the time where we bring direct sanction against parents under the Welfare of Children Act. But, as I say, we do involve the homes in our point of view without actually applying sanction against them.

Now with regard to psychiatric services for parents: Let me say that these services in Newfoundland are very limited, and they are being called upon more and more in the treatment of morbid and difficult cases such as some difficult prisoners, and there are not nearly enough psychiatrists in Newfoundland for the demands made upon them. But it is a point that we recognize that psychiatric services and not definite judgment is sometimes the thing required.

Now, I think I should clear up the point that was in the mind of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and rightly so. First of all psychiatry is not nearly so terrible as it sounds, and the modern psychiatrist is a very friendly doctor who makes a child normally feel at home. This clause, however, has nothing to do with the small children, but with grown-up children in the boy's or girl's home who is the subject of a transfer from a juvenile institution to an adult institution. It does not involve a little boy but a boy probably up to seventeen years of age who has become so diffi-

cult in the training school that the services of the training school are probably not strict enough, and possibly a little more drastic treatment is required, not only for the individual boy's or girl's sake but for the sake of the other boys or girls of the training school who are disturbed on his behalf. It is not the young children we are here concerned with. What will happen in all these cases is that we will ask the Attorney General to consider only those grown-up institutional children who are really giving us a too difficult time in the ordinary institution such as the training school. In a debate of this kind we can not solve the difficulty or say how these children should be dealt with.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, before you put the question I wonder if I may ask the minister a question? Who is the Director of Corrections?

**DR. POTTLE:** Mr. Walter C. Walling, who is from B.C. and a B.A. from the University of British Columbia.

On motion bill read a second time.  
Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second reading of the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

**HON. F. W. ROWE** (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if the House will remember, in the early days of the present session I introduced a bill here, an amendment to the Mines and Quarries Act which was subsequently given second reading. But we found it necessary to bring in another amendment to the Mines and Quarries Act, and the House was kind enough to give me permission to withdraw that bill and

to submit another incorporating the two amendments.

The present Bill therefore of which I am now moving second reading, has two amendments. The one which I have already explained I will refer to very briefly, i.e., the third section of this Bill. The preposition "on" which was in the parent Bill is being removed and the preposition "for" is being put in (for every forty acres of land). I have explained that if the holder of a mining claim is, although of a checker board design divided in forty acres squares, not deliberately but technically the parent legislation required that the holder of that claim should perform a certain amount of required work, twenty-five days' work, on every forty acres, which was not of course the intention. In fact after preliminary exploration work is done only certain blocks will require any extensive time or money. Consequently the preposition "on" is removed and the preposition "for" is substituted, for every forty acres of land. That, of course, in no way invalidates the spirit of the parent legislation, the total amount of work and the total expenditure would be the same as before.

The second and new amendment which has not previously come before the House is to Section 38 of the, or at least relates to that section of the parent Act which is found in Vol. 3 of the Consolidated Statutes, page 2118.

These sections give the minister certain discretionary powers where necessary.

He could extend that time at his discretion where necessary.

MR. HOLLETT: For how long?

DR. ROWE: For a reasonable time. However the minister's discretion was confined to death, where performance of the work has been delayed because of pending proceedings or the death or incapacity through illness of the permit holder. Under these conditions then the minister would recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that the time be extended for the performance of the work. We have found in actual practice that these conditions are not enough particularly when you get down on the Labrador. As a matter of fact we had instances last year as a result of which we are recommending that a wider discretionary power be given to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Actually we had a company who were unable to fulfill the letter of the law not through any neglect or omission on their own part, but because of a number of factors beyond their control they could not get their engineers down there in time—things, Mr. Speaker, which you could ordinarily call "Acts of God". We ask therefore that this clause be inserted to extend the powers so that in addition to death and incapacity through illness: "That where the performance of the work is delayed by any cause whatsoever other than that mentioned in paragraph (a) of the subsection, whether the cause is of the kind mentioned in that paragraph or not, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has approved the extension of such period."

The rest of the Bill is just a copy of the parent Act.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we have not had an opportunity to study the parent Act. It seems to me here

again we are delegating too much authority and power into the hands of the minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by the amendment suggested here, I really think if an extension of time were required in any one year, it would be quite reasonable for the minister to grant it, and then the matter could be reported to the House and the authority sought for any further extension. As it stands now the minister or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council could extend the time to any period, for instance from three years to six years or seven or ten years or for as long as they remain in power. I feel if there is to be a House of Assembly in this Province some of these matters ought to be brought before it. Several Acts have been brought in now, Mr. Speaker, which have a tendency to pass over to the minister and to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council powers which should really come from this House, and be voted by the House. If we vote for this now we give the minister and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the authority at any time in the future to extend the mining privileges of any corporation away beyond the time set out in that agreement. "If it seems reasonable," Who is to say when anything is reasonable to any man—It could be made reasonable. I am not casting any reflection on the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or upon the honourable minister, but such things have happened in other countries and could very well happen here. I don't think we ought to allow the minister nor the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to have the power to extend these periods beyond the time. They could come before the House, explain the situation and seek through the Legislature

the proper authority for the extension of the time.

I have no further objections to it, but I do voice that complaint, Mr. Speaker. We are living in an age, or have just come through an age when dictatorial governments have been set up just by starting the way we are starting, in some of these things, here by delegating the authority of this House to certain individuals. In certain Acts before us now we are delegating authority which only the people's representatives should have to other authorities, and in this Act are going to delegate this to the reasonableness of any minister. Now there are times when any minister becomes unreasonable, and they can be made unreasonable, if you want to put it that way. As to the general principle, Sir, I say I am casting no reflections anywhere, but it is the general principle we ought to consider in this Bill as in other Bills, and we should not be too flippant in voting away those rights which are the inalienable rights of the people's representatives, and that is the thing we are doing here.

That is all I have to say on the matter, Sir. I don't favour that particular point.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak on this matter, I can appreciate the point made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, however none of that discretion already exists in mining legislation, and if the honourable member will read the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act which is a rather long piece of legislation which has I believe 42 pages of closely written words, all through it, I think he will find the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has far wider powers than anything



envisaged in this particular amendment here. As I see it, if we are to have a minister and a Lieutenant-Governor in Council the House must delegate powers to them. I suppose in any democracy we always face the possibility of the mis-use of powers that are delegated to the government by the elected house of representatives. In this case here I think it would be very silly if the minister of the government had to come back to the House every time and wait until they get the sanction of or the approval of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not suggest that.

DR. ROWE: I believe the honourable member suggested that the House should have to approve any act of that kind or it should come before the House at the next session.

MR. BROWNE: Report to the House.

DR. ROWE: However, I would merely make this point: If you are going to refuse to give the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that discretionary power then I think we would have to go over practically all the legislation we have to deprive the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of far greater powers than we have envisaged here.

MR. HOLLETT: Quote some of them.

DR. ROWE: I refer my friend to the Crown Lands and Quarries Act. If he would read through even the Crown Lands itself—That was not done by this government nor in my time. The powers there conferred on the minister and on the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, he will find, are there infinitely greater and out of all proportion to anything envisaged

here. For instance the power of granting or leasing of land, which has far-reaching powers. It is theoretically possible, in fact, for the minister to give away all the land that is in the province.

MR. HOLLETT: It has been done. You have done it.

DR. ROWE: It is theoretically possible, but no minister has ever done it. I appreciate the point, but I don't see it, if in a government the Lieutenant-Governor in Council cannot be trusted with that amount of power then it should not be in power at all, it should be out and be kept there.

If there are any other points, I think, Mr. Speaker, they might come up in committee. In the meantime my honourable friends will have the chance to look up the parent act. I move the second reading of the bill.

On motion bill read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

So ordered.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, May 17, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

MONDAY, May 17th, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Presenting Petitions

None.

**Presenting Reports of Standing and  
Select Committees**

None.

**Giving Notice of Motion**

None.

**Giving Notice of Questions**

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Welfare to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Into how many foster homes have the Government placed children? Where are these homes located?

2. How many male and female children have the Government placed in those foster homes? What is the total number at present being cared for?

3. What is the amount paid each month, in respect of each child?

4. How many male and female adults are supported in boarding houses by the Government at the present time?

5. State number and location of these boarding houses.

6. What is the amount paid each month in respect of each adult?

7. Do the Government prescribe the diet to be supplied the children and adults in these foster homes and boarding homes?

8. Are regular inspections made, if so, how often and by whom?

9. Are these foster homes and boarding houses visited regularly by a medical officer? Give details.

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What progress has been made in the construction of bridges on the Trans-Canada Highway? State the number of bridges completed, the number of bridges under construction, the type of each bridge, concrete or steel, the dimension and cost of each bridge, also state if this work has been contracted for or is being done by the Department of Public Works.

2. How many local road committees were operating in the Provincial District of St. John's East during the past year, where are these committees located and what amount was allotted to each committee?

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance or other appropriate Minister to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. From what person or persons was the land purchased for the site of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Co. Ltd. buildings? What was the total acreage purchased and what was the amount paid for same?

2. Give an itemized statement with vouchers of the amount of \$1,497.17 travelling expenses incurred by Mr. Chester Dawe in the United States of America during January 9th to January 18th, 1951 in re-ordering machinery for the Birch Plant and in re-seeking markets for birch products. Has this amount yet been paid by Mr. Dawe?

3. Give detailed account of all travelling expenses paid to Mr. Chester Dawe on account of Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd., giving dates and amounts involved on each separate trip.

4. What was the total amount of monies paid to P. B. Yates Machine

Ltd. for machinery for Nfld. Hardwoods Ltd? List machines bought and amount paid for each machine.

5. How many men are presently employed at this plant? What is the total amount paid out in wages each week?

### Answers to Questions

Question No. 87—

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): The honourable member is not here, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps that question might be asked when he is present.

Question No. 86—

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part is none and to the second part the answer is no.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if before we go on I could draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that some nine questions I have asked have not been answered.

Question No. 85—

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): The answer is being prepared, Mr. Speaker. I did not know there were any questions outstanding.

### Orders of the Day

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

Adjourned debate:

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, this is May 17th. It is one day I am glad to be alive. Twelve days ago, May 5, in the Year of Our Lord 1954, was probably one of the greatest days in the History of Newfoundland. We

have seen some very difficult days in this little island. We have seen heroic days and days of disaster and we have seen days of great rejoicing, and days of great poverty, almost starvation. We have had two generations which through malnutrition have just about succumbed to tuberculosis. All these days we have seen, all these days we have passed through, some of it is history, some of it we are still living with. But of all the days through which we have passed I do not think that any day in the whole history of Newfoundland was as important to Newfoundland nor as important to the future of Newfoundland as the day when the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives introduced into this House a Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority."

I am happy, Sir, to be on this side of the House to support a Government and an administration which at this time has brought in this measure. Since Confederation we have seen many bombshells dropped into the social and economic life of Newfoundland. They have been dropped and they have been felt by thousands of people but yet have gone unnoticed by many thousands more, in our island homes. What is being dropped by this Bill is a load of dynamite. The fact that it is being introduced by the same government that has dared to introduce an economic development programme through the establishment of these new industries which we have—a government which has dared to carry on welfare services as far as they have carried them, gives us reason to believe that the plans are well-laid, that it is not something that has been thrown up to somebody as a bit of political alibi.

Now, sir, it is difficult to raise new points in this debate, still it is something we can continue to talk about for many weeks, yet the ground has been covered pretty well by previous speakers, and it is difficult to know where to begin. I don't want to cover too much of the ground already covered by other speakers. I would like to forget, Sir, the past four hundred years of the history of Newfoundland, if I could. We have talked a lot about fish stages, we have talked about unsanitary stages and about the poverty of the fishermen; and we have tried in some small measure to visualize what the future might hold for the fishing industry of Newfoundland. But I do not think that we have gone far enough in trying to build up our hopes and our dreams, I don't think we have gone far enough in trying to help the fishermen to understand just where this legislation is likely to carry them, in other words, what it is going to mean to them.

What I would like to do, sir, in the few minutes which I am going to take up is to try and reason it out (if I might call it that) with the House, in order that I might build up a picture which I believe to be true. Before I do that, Sir, I want to just say a few words, and I am going to read them from a memorandum which I did prepare once on the fisheries:

#### *The Indictment of History*

"Most picturesque, indeed, was the description of the Newfoundland fishery possibilities some 450 years ago—'More valuable than the mines of Peru:' I am not conversant with what the mines of Peru have produced in the past four and a half centuries but I do feel that our heritage, our contributions to a western

way of life as distinct from that of the South Americas as well as our present hopes and aspirations have supported the prophecy made 450 years ago. It is not impossible that I numbered myself among the few—a number steadily decreasing—whose faith in the future possibilities and attractions of our fisheries remains unshaken. My faith, however, has often been shaken by the lack of imagination, vision and social conscience in those in whom Dame Fortune placed her trust for sound direction, management, energy and vigour. No primary industry anywhere in the world has suffered as much from lack of leadership as the fishing industry of Newfoundland. No class of primary producers anywhere in the world has been so misled and misused for selfish political and commercial ends as the fishermen of Newfoundland. This is not the indictment of the member for Fogo, who has been for the past few years alternately, "a Communist," "a Socialist," "a hauler-up of boats" and "man who caused the shortage of salt," etc. It is the indictment of history to be seen in 75% of our fishing communities and on the faces of 90% of our fishermen and best illustrated by the statement of a few indisputable facts.

About six years ago I first became conscious of what was happening to our potential labour force in the fishery, especially on the north east coast. Since the end of World War I, Newfoundland has lost two generations of fishermen—included in these two generations have been the most ambitious and most energetic of our youth. Lost to Newfoundland fisheries are the many thousands who immigrated to the U.S.A. and Canada in the early 20's as well as 'the babes of World War I'—5,000 veterans of

World War II who never returned to their former vocation, the fishery. A war within the next few years of half the duration of the two wars within the past forty years would so tend to deplete the workers available for the fishery that our fisheries could not exist for a further ten years even on the scale it is today. In case this should seem a bit too pessimistic we shall examine a case in point. I was born at Pools Island, Bonavista Bay, 1918. I first entered school at the age of six in 1924. Our one room school contained approximately 50 children ranging in age from 6 to 20. Pools Island was a fair fishing community and the livelihood—such as it was—was obtained from the fishery. I have vague recollections of what was the end of the “bully boats” and fishing on the Funks and Flowers Island, indeed, boats as good and as capable of the range as the much admired present day long liners. Were my great-grandfather alive—he died in 1935—he could have assumed charge of a long liner with little or no technical training in operation. He was typical of his generation of fishermen; but what has happened to the fifty children who were at school in Pools Island in 1924? To my knowledge not even one of the males is a fisherman and not one of the females married a man whose vocation is today a fisherman, and on Pools Island today we may have three men—no more—whose chief source of income lies in the fishery. What has happened to Pools Island has happened to Greenspond, Safe Harbour, Badger's Quay, Wesleyville, Pound Cove, Brookfield and Newtown—in short the whole of Bonavista North, with the possible exception of that highly productive fishing area of Cape Freels. As a matter of fact, the only fishing communities which exist

today, as fishing communities, on the whole north east coast are communities which are highly productive: Cape Freels, Seldom, Joe Batt's Arm, Tilting, La Scie, etc. and even in these communities the age of those actively engaged in the fishery will eliminate the whole industry within twenty years unless sound, quick, remedial action is forthcoming. It would be an error of the first magnitude to think that the generation in our schools today are going to be workers in our fishing industry unless things change quickly. Children are being discouraged by all the means at the disposal of both parents and schools; by parents because they have known only futility of endeavour and by teachers indirectly because most of our teachers are badly equipped sons and daughters of dissatisfied fishermen. Over and above these two facts the expanding Canadian industrial economy is beckoning to youth, and children of today will leave our unattractive outport fishing communities as flies leave a molasses puncheon when the bung is drawn. To me two courses of action now remain open and both are extremes. We can continue the road we are now going and desert our fishing banks to the Europeans, New Englanders, and Nova Scotians or commence immediately the reorganization, resettlement and revitalization necessary to a sound fisheries policy. Such policy cannot be handed out piecemeal as political appetizers because time has already passed us by and at most I cannot visualize more than ten years in which to complete the policy programme. It is obvious, of course, that what I have stated thus far primarily refers to the north east coast and here I have to make an observation the truth of which is probably open to some doubt. The

problem as I see it is primarily concerned with the coastal area from Bonavista North to Bonne Bay and that the problem of the south and south west coast is more technological in concept than that of the north east coast, although many parallels can be drawn.

*The Problem of the N.E. Coast is Stated*

During the past few years I have developed a feeling that the problem of the north east coast has been oversimplified in that publicity has focused attention only on the development of long liners, improved gear production and experiments prior to the erection of suitable shore facilities. It would seem to me that the technical problem, as I shall later show, is not nearly as acute as the present social and economic problem. It has been my misfortune to have read statements by supposedly intelligent people warning us against disturbing the "peaceful isolation" in which some 70,000 people live. The grumbings and dissatisfaction expressed by these people with regard to roads, mails and medical services are not as peaceful as the picturesque isolation by any measure. Nor in this age is the summer calmness of the sea a substitute for even a dusty road. It is most strongly suggested that a study of the north east coast is not a job for academicians who wax eloquent in the solitude and humidity of July nor for commercial pirates who grow rich on monopoly. The solution and programme of rehabilitation if there is to be such can only be formulated by able men whose heritage is not too far removed from the sea. Men who understand more than the cold statistics of fish income and numbers. Men who will realize that human

beings are involved and not merely industrial units. Men who will see the job through even though they might feel it a waste of time and effort in that the North American Continent is headed for a mental asylum anyway—70,000 Newfoundland fisherfolk cannot prevent such a catastrophe! What then, are the immediate social and economic problems to be faced? As I see it, there are two simple problems which can be solved within a very short time from the raising of the curtain. The most pressing problem facing shore fishermen today is the disposal of their catch. It is a most ridiculous situation in which the fishermen find themselves—having to stay ashore in the first place to cure fish and then having to sit sometimes for months, until some buyer sees fit to stroll along the highway of this Atlantic and leisurely purchase the fish lying in unsanitary stages for months. The consequences of this historic debate are so numerous that no attempt is necessary to enumerate them beyond to point up the two most serious consequences:

(1) Fishermen know that their ability to cure fish is strictly limited by weather and number of helpers in the family and the evil result of this has been that little or no effort has been made to improve methods of catching or finding new grounds. The inshore fishermen of the N.E. Coast can catch at least 50% more fish than they and their families can cure, so why even try to produce more or improve equipment? Long liners, new grounds and improved production are sound propositions only when shore facilities are equal to the task of handling the catch and not necessarily when, as a result of an experiment, improved methods are



shown to be commercially feasible. In one year a thousand long liners can be built on the N.E. Coast but under present circumstances it would be better to build a thousand row-boats.

(2) Our fishermen have continued to live in isolation because they saw no community which offered anything better than the community in which they lived. Academicians have tried repeatedly to have us see a serenity and a soulful attachment to family, relatives and home in all this isolation, whereas the truth of the matter is that the immobility and inertia inherent in the Newfoundland fisheries is the century old curse of this Island. Isolation is both a consequence and a problem in itself. It would seem therefore, that, while political appetizers are being concocted, fire extinguishers designed for trap boats, half-hearted experiments leisurely pursued, long wearied debates on principles ensue and this, the Newfoundland specimen is being examined for everything from tooth decay to fertility—we might as well commence now to find a solution to the co-related problems of isolation and shore facilities. None of the other important *Experiments* enumerated above will lose their importance because we happen to start doing something about conditions which we know to be important to the economy of the Province."

That as I have said in 1951, Sir, and as I have read here to this House is a result of four hundred years of the fisheries in Newfoundland. I have no more to say about fishing stages, no more to say about boats, motor boats and gasoline engines, no more to say about lounge lizards after this is finished with, and as

surely as night follows day, Sir, it is on the way out.

Now there were a few points which were raised by the Opposition which I want to deal with. I made some notes as they were going along.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Sir, wandered on through his address to this House looking for the principle in this Bill. He found it in the last few moments of his speech when he told of the community in which he was born, no longer existing. That is the principle of this Bill. There are many communities in Newfoundland which barely exist. There are hundreds of communities in Newfoundland which are not going to exist very much longer. That is the principle of this Bill. He thought, Sir, that the appointment of two of the members of the Authority should not have been made because they had been connected with fish companies.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I must rise—I did not say honourable members should not be appointed. I made no objections to any appointment.

MR. JANES: I understood the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Sir, to have said he did not think Mr. Dustan and Mr. Young should have been appointed to the Authority because they had been at one time or another working with fishery companies. If he did not say that, Sir, I retract the statement.

However, I think, sir, in the Fisheries Authority, irrespective of whom they might have worked for before, I think they are as good as we are going to get in this Province.

The Honourable Leader was highly

concerned because he thought the Authority could assist the industry either directly or indirectly on their own initiative, and because they could do so it was equivalent to a Crown Corporation. The Honourable Leader knows this is not a Crown Corporation, Sir, just as well as I do, and just as well as this House knows.

Then to climax his speech he called it nationalization. Now if I know anything of the political history of Canada or of the world for that matter, I know no "Tory" is going to vote for nationalization. I presume, Sir, that when the debate on this Bill is finally finished, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is going to vote against that measure—going to vote against it. How else is he going to reconcile his thoughts with the fact that it is nationalization, as he said, and as the Leader of the Tory Opposition, how can he then vote for nationalization in Newfoundland?

MR. HOLLETT: Nationalization might be a good thing.

MR. JANES: The Tories tell us nationalization is a good thing?

MR. HOLLETT: Who told you I was a Tory? What is a Tory? Would you know one if you saw one?

MR. JANES: Why don't you go over there as an independent and move down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Let us cease this private conversation. It takes from the dignity of the debate and adds nothing to the furtherance or to decide for the Bill or against it. Will the honourable member continue his speech.

MR. JANES: The Honourable Leader also thought, Sir, that the Government were hedging for the past

five years on the fisheries development programme.

MR. HOLLETT: I said no such thing.

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I made a note as the honourable member spoke. At least he left me with that impression. I took it down verbatim or nearly so. He said the Government were hedging and the fishery development report was hedging. If the programme which is being put into effect in 1954 is hedging let us have more of it. The Government is not hedging. The Fishery Development Committee's report took as long as it did because it is a report of first-class importance to the fishing industry of Newfoundland and to the fishermen of Newfoundland. If the report had taken ten years, and more time had been permitted, more time allowed for the Government to examine it and had not come as soon as it did but perhaps had taken another five years to produce it might have made the report twice as good as it is.

Then, Sir, we had the magnificent spectacle of the honourable member for St. John's East, (the member who wears the mustache) tell us it was not nationalization but socialization. There is no debating these things, Mr. Speaker, we had the honourable members in this House tell us Brinco was Bunco, the machinery plant property was bolted together, to be carried off to Ontario when they were ready. They now tell us this fishery development authority is socialization of the fisheries. Do we have to say more. When the honourable member is not distressing he is highly amusing.

The other member for St. John's West, the legal member, did try, Sir, to inject into his thoughts something

which would give us something to think about.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not interrupting the honourable member with his remarks, but there comes a time when certain references may be overdone. Any honourable member of Parliament who holds her Majesty's Commission in the House therefore takes the title of Honourable and Gallant. Any member of Parliament who is a member of a bar association is a lawyer, his title is Honourable and Learned Member. Therefore there is no difficulty whatsoever in referring to the Opposition. There is the honourable member for St. John's East and there is the honourable and learned member for St. John's East. It is really quite simple. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. JANES: The honourable and learned member for St. John's West, Sir, could not see anything to criticize in the fishing industry of Newfoundland. He could not see any crisis, and because there was no crisis in the fishing industry of Newfoundland we could very well begin at the bottom and build up again co-operative structures, co-operative associations and organizations to have them run our fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody more in sympathy with that than I am myself. But I have seen it tried. I have reason to believe that I know some of the reasons why it is not a practical suggestion. I do not think the time is ripe for it. The fishermen, Sir, have plenty to do without either the government or anybody else burdening them with the cost of fishing plants and shore facilities necessary to the carrying out of the processing of

fish. There is the fishing industry, or there can be in the fishing industry the same division as we find in any other industry. First we have the producer, then the processor who uses the plant and shore facilities and thirdly those who market the thing which has been produced by the primary producer and the processor. These are three separate functions. Why they cannot apply to the fisheries of Newfoundland as they can apply to the fisheries of any other country or apply to any other industry we have here is something I do not understand.

At the moment we have the fisherman in the unfortunate position of being the producer and not only is he the producer but also the processor, and there his activity stops. There is plenty of room in the fishing industry for the development of co-operation. They will have their hands full, Sir, in trying to build their boats, trying to get the bounties, which are very liberal. Even with financial assistance which might be forthcoming from the Government they are going to have their hands full to build the boats. And if they should run out of things to do they can form a co-operative consumers' society, they can build their credit union organizations for the marketing of lobster where they don't need any financial organization, and a society for the marketing of salmon, where no finances are necessary, but when it comes to the long haul of producing codfish, which needs heavy financing, it is no place for a fisherman to be, not at the moment. He has his hands full, as I said before, in trying to build his boat, organize his consumers' society and credit union association for the marketing of lobster and salmon, but not for the establishment of a million dollar fish plant.

That is something about which he knows nothing, something that he could not enter into at all, and it is only folly for us to say: build at the bottom and build your fishermen up. This is not the time. There might come a time, but that time is not now.

The curing of fish was not slavery, so he said. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have seen our fishermen in iron collars in former years, and the golden collar, which I understand is slavery, trying to take fifty quintals of fish, put it on a flake and try and make it, and keep it, and hold on to it, for starvation wages, for five cents an hour. If that is not slavery, I would like to know what slavery is. It is slavery and it always has been slavery. Down through its history the whole industry has been slavery, as we have known it on the north east coast. If this thing is desirable, if as the Premier said, he wants us all happily dancing around the maypole and if he would like to keep things as they are, that is generally,—I know that the honourable members want to see progress—but if he does not want to lose the things peculiarly Newfoundland's in all this, if he wants to hold on to these, how does he expect that the fishermen are going to feed their families, how are they going to build their homes, and how are they going to provide their families with clothing? Who is going to educate them? He cannot do it on the fish flakes. The day is passed when a fisherman could feed his family by catching his fish, salting and carrying it to the flakes and drying it and then waiting for someone to stroll along and buy it. I remember in November, 1952, the fishermen on Indian Island and Seldom waiting for someone to come from Port Union, Bonavista, St. John's to buy their fish, which had been ready since Septem-

ber. For two months they could not leave home to earn a dollar or take a pick and shovel and go on the road. They had to sit there on that water-side and wait for someone to stroll along the highway of the Atlantic and take the fish out of their stages. Well, it is over, finished, they will sit there no longer, and my blessing to them.

Now, Sir, whatever we have gone through in the past, however ugly it might have been, however peculiarly Newfoundland it might have been it is over. Our past is behind us. What we have to think of is the future. I think, Sir, there was an editorial in the "Daily News" on the day on which this Fishery Bill was introduced into this House. I will read part of it to the House:

"... The objectives are far-reaching. The ultimate aim is not alone a highly mechanized and efficient operation but also the establishment of new kinds of communities. Centralization of fishing activities and facilities is to be combined with the development of modern fishing towns. The objectives are therefore social and economic.

The economic side is of primary importance. The resources of our adjacent waters represent our greatest supply of raw material of industrial worth. For about four centuries they constituted the main support of first a visiting and then a permanent population. But in primary industry more than dry salted fish has there been more uncertainty during the present century and the events of the 1930's brought major changes disadvantageous to Newfoundland.

It was in these grim days of world depression that the policy of self-sufficiency replaced that of free-trading in

its broad sense. Portugal, Spain and Italy, always producing countries on a small scale, were forced for lack of foreign currencies to invest more heavily in domestic fisheries.

In 1919, admittedly an exceptional year, our exports to Europe were: Greece, 140,000 qtls.; Italy, 212,000; Spain, 270,000; Portugal, 550,000; and in the same year we shipped 310,000 qtls. to Brazil. That was a total of about 1,500,000 quintals or double last year's output. World consumption has not declined but Portugal is catching most of its own requirements and the remaining European countries and Brazil have been compelled by currency difficulties to buy most of their needs from countries with which barter deals can be negotiated or whose currencies are easier to obtain than dollars.

These are difficulties that the new policy cannot overcome. It is recognized that in prevailing world trading conditions, there is a limit to the amount of salt cod we can sell at remunerative prices. It seems to follow that one of the first aims of the new policy is to share the proceeds of what we can sell among a smaller number of producers and processors so that individual earnings will be much higher. In the course of putting this idea into effect a division of labour becomes important. Some men will do nothing but catch fish. Others will handle it on shore.

But diversification of handling methods is also important. The major centres will be equipped for both salting and filleting. They will have fish meal plants. The end product will be considered in relation to the circumstances when each load of fish is put ashore. It may be doubtful if maximum efficiency in handling can use-

fully reduce the costs of producing a quintal of dry salted fish. The value to the producer will come in increased individual productivity."

Now the question has been asked not only in this House but outside it many times: "If you are trying to industrialize the fishery what are you going to do with all the fishermen who will have nothing to do? Someone suggested that 2,500 fishermen can catch as much fish as our twenty thousand can, even in our best days.

MR. HOLLETT: That was Sir Albert Walsh in the fishery report.

MR. JAMES: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the fishing industry, and unless we close our eyes and our thoughts to the fact that there is going to be certain dislocations we are never going to do anything in the fishing industry. Nothing will ever be done because of this problem of twenty thousand people, and wondering what you are going to do with them. But what we have to do, Sir, is this. We have to face up to the fact that there is a problem in the fishing industry of Newfoundland. We have to tackle that problem as we would tackle any other industry in Newfoundland. If in the process there is some dislocation, if you are left with certain people unemployed, what in the name of reason have these unemployed people got to do with the fishery of Newfoundland? Nothing whatsoever. Supposing because of certain improvements in the mines at Bell Island that a certain number of workers are laid off and without jobs, does that condemn the mining industry on Bell Island? Of course it does not. What we are talking about in this legislation and what we have been trying to say all through this debate is that there is a problem



in the fishing industry. It is no longer an industry. You have to face up to that problem, and have to recognize it. We have to bring the fishery up to a standard that is acceptable in the modern world, and if in the process of doing that there is some dislocation of people employed in the fishery that is a separate problem altogether and has nothing whatever to do with the fishing industry. In the fishing industry what they have tried to do is to take the father, son, daughter, mother and employ the whole lot of them in the fishery and the old man ended up in the fall with not enough to pay for the food he ate during the summer. I cannot continue. As I say, there are two separate problems involved, the problem of industrializing and mechanizing the fishing industry of Newfoundland and another problem, to find employment for the people who are likely to be unemployed at some time or another because of the industrialization programme of the fishing industry.

Now, Sir, touching on the District of Fogo, if I may: The honourable member for White Bay and myself had a little debate the other day as to which was the largest producing district in Newfoundland. He thought the figures for White Bay were not complete because of the fact that certain production at St. Anthony was not included. When you look at the map which had been produced by the Honourable the Premier you will find that the Cape Freels area is not included. If I included Cape Freels and St. Anthony, I think that Fogo District would be the largest fish producing district in the whole island of Newfoundland. We have, Sir, over seventy or eighty thousand quintals of fish being produced down there. Now, Sir, if the honourable members

of the Opposition would not get seasick, I would like to take them for a trip around Fogo District. The water is a bit rough at Cape Freels, but if we can get around there—

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Use the road, and drive around.

MR. JANES: I am going to tell them about that road, Sir. Fogo, Cape Freels, Lumsden North and Lumsden South, are very fine fishing communities. Then we have Deadman's Bay there, and farther up the shore is Musgrave Harbour. It has already been announced that there will be built at Badger's Quay a fish plant. We are very fortunate, Sir, at this time, that we have the roads, thirty miles and probably thirty-five miles of roads being constructed between Valleyfield and Musgrave Harbour. There is one thing about Fogo which is rather unusual. We have no small communities as such. We have no population scattered about. They are in large communities. We have four to five communities down there with over a thousand people each in them. We have Musgrave Harbour with over a thousand people. The bulk of these people are fishermen. But by the time this plan is ready to go into production—in Valleyfield we are already ahead of the game by having thirty-five miles of road cutting across Cape Freels connecting Lumsden North and South, Deadman's Bay and Musgrave Harbour. In that area alone we have some fifteen or sixteen thousand quintals of fish or more, in that little area alone, which is only thirty miles from the plant in Valleyfield, which opens up all sorts of possibilities for us. Coming along the shore we come to Carmanville, which is not a fish producing area any more. It had at one



time though a number of Labrador schooners. Then Gander Bay: The people there don't fish any longer. But we hope, Sir, to have the road built from Gander to Carmanville, to start it this year. That is an important link as far as the fisheries are concerned because it is only one hour's run away from Carmanville to Fogo Island and Change Islands by small boat. We have a growing town in Gander, five thousand now, that can eat our salmon, lobster and in season we will have there a small market right at our doorstep for a certain amount of fresh fish, which can be landed there from the fishermen coming in in the morning and can be in Gander within four hours, or before dinner, if we want to do so. So that I think this road which is being constructed from Carmanville to Gander will provide an outlet and play a big part in the development of the fisheries in Fogo District. Not only that, but give us a real link with Gander.

Then, Sir, we come to Change Islands. It has already been announced that there is to be a plant put into operation at Change Islands this year. I think that plant will probably be in production sometime late this summer, but it might not be ready for the trap season, but might come in on the tail end of it. But it will certainly be available for the fall fishery. The plant at Change Islands will carry two plate freezers and a filleting machine. These two plate freezers are capable of putting up 108,000 pounds of round fish per twenty hour day. That is the equivalent, Sir, of 240 quintals per day. Now banking on a fishing season down there with the fishermen able to get out 120 days, we should be able to put up somewhere in the vicinity of twenty thousand quintals of fish. In 1953 we had

one hundred fishing days, and our fishermen produced 95,000 quintals of fish. With this development at Change Islands, making allowance for any difficulties arising, there is no reason why the fishermen of Change Islands in 1954, cannot produce twice as much fish as they are producing today, and have that fish taken from them from the knife, with no more curing, no more fish flakes, and allow them to fish. I believe, Sir, they can almost fish. I believe, sir, they can almost do it. I don't know. It has not been tried. I am not committed completely to the thought that our shore fishermen can produce twice as much fish as they are now producing, but I do feel they can produce 25% more fish than what they are now producing. But we have the satisfaction of knowing the plant at Change Islands will take twice the production of Change Islands alone for the year 1953, and to pick up the lag, if there should be any. We have the small communities of Cape Island and Hare Bay and Herring Neck quite near also.

The Joe Batts Arm effort, I might say, Sir, was made to get that plant into operation last year, but circumstances developed which could not be helped by anybody. It was not the fault of the Government nor the company. There were things that happened from time to time and nothing anybody could do about it. But I am assured, Sir, that in Joe Batts Arm we are also putting two freezers and a filleting machine. The catch last year in Joe Batts Arm and Barr'd Island, where another thirteen or fourteen hundred people live, in one hundred days totalled seventeen thousand quintals of fish. With the block freezers there the people of Joe Batts Arm and Barr'd Island can produce twice as much fish as they

are producing now, providing they can catch it. Only this morning I was informed by the operator there that they are putting in a new additional building measuring 134 feet where they intend to carry out an experiment in salt codfish operations. If it works out well they will be able to take more fish from the fishermen than they can handle in the two plate freezers. Certainly if this experiment is successful it will serve both Joe Batts Arm and Barr'd Island and Tilting, because it is the intention to bring fish from Tilting by truck to the Joe Batts Arm plant, which is only three miles by road across there. With the development at Joe Batts Arm to handle both the frozen fish and salt codfish, I think, we will be well on the way to seeing the type of development which fishermen want. The fishermen down there don't play around with the thing. They don't go out and catch a few fish for the winter and go off to the woods. The people of Fogo Island must live off the fishery. It is the only employment they have. They are fishermen. The same thing applies to the people of Change Islands, they are fishermen, people who lived by the fishery either Shore or Labrador for generations.

At Seldom, Sir, the Government is there constructing a plant along the basis of a community idea, and it will be purely a salt codfish operation. Seldom is one of the most amazing fishing communities in the whole of Newfoundland. It is a community of three or four hundred people who produce anywhere from ten to twelve thousand quintals of fish a year. I have seen their fish rotting in the stages. The fishermen have gone out, taken it from the trap or hook, brought it in, got it salted and put it

up in their stages, and the summer just was not long enough for these fishermen to cure that fish. God himself did not give us enough sunshine to cure the fish which they catch at Seldom. Consequently their fish was not always good. The catch was big, the quality poor. We have the same thing existing at Lumsden, fishermen going out, filling their stages, salting their fish and finding it is impossible to cure it because there is not enough sunshine, not enough time, not enough hours in the day for that fish to be cured.

At Seldom an experimental plant is being built. The plant will contain pickling vats, proper cold storage for the holding of fish in proper temperatures and salt storage space. With these developments—for Cape Freels and Musgrave Harbour, and Tilting by road to the plant at Valleyfield; the plants at Change Islands and Joe Batts Arm and Seldom we only have one other community left in the whole of Fogo area, and that is Fogo itself, where we do not have a lot of fishermen. We have some but not a lot. Most of the people there are engaged in the summer months by two mercantile firms which operate there. With the coming of the plant at Change Islands and Joe Batt's Arm this situation must change, and there is the possibility that more people from the town of Fogo itself will go back to their fishing boats again. There is already a small cannery there operated by Earle Sons & Company. What the intentions of the company are, I do not know, but of a certainty, Sir, unless the two mercantile firms which are there now don't begin to do something about relieving the situation in Fogo—the fishing in that area will be a failure. One has

a small cannery—but unless these two firms are prepared to do something I am going to be knocking on the door of the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives looking for something for Fogo. Then with Fogo will come a rounding out in Fogo District for fishery development.

We have there Musgrave Harbour with over a thousand people; Change Islands, a thousand people; Joe Batts Arm and Barr'd Island with twelve or fourteen hundred and Seldom four or five hundred including Stag Harbour and if the Minister of Public Works would only build a road to Stag Harbour, they would be able to bring their fish in to Seldom. We have a few small communities down there; Wild Cove is quite near Seldom. I see no reason for these people to be living in Wild Cove. There are only four or five families down there, and they should get out and settle in Seldom. We have a few other small coves. We did have a Cape Cove, but I don't think there is anybody living there now.

Fortunately, Sir, at this time we find that in the District of Fogo we have the concentration of population in good fishing communities, and I hope the development at Change Islands and Joe Batts Arm and Seldom will put us ahead of the game. This, as I say, leaves only Fogo itself to be looked after, and the deal will be cast for better or for worse. Whether the people are going to stay on the island and continue where they are I do not know. I don't think it is a question that even needs to be argued. I don't think it is important in communities of that size whether they are to remain on these islands or move off to be centralized. The important thing, as far as we are concerned, Sir, is to get the shore facilities down

there so that our fishermen can dispose of their catch and spend their time fishing as they want to spend it. The day might come, and is probably not too far distant, when the fishermen will come to the realization that they are using their motor boats, gasoline engines and traps and trawls to maximum advantage and with these motor boats, gasoline engines, traps and trawls they cannot catch any more fish than they are catching. By this time their income will have improved over and above what it is now, but they are going to be in the position of finding it as easy to spend two thousand dollars in 1955-56 as they found it to spend four or five hundred dollars in 1952-53 nor will they be more content, nor perhaps should they be. Only then, Sir, are they justified in disposing of the capital which they have invested in their fishing premises and in their boats and traps and trawls, and shutting up and going to look for something else, a long liner, a dragger or whatever it might be. But I will say this, Sir, their sons not only on the northeast coast but on every coast in Newfoundland and in every cove in Newfoundland, on every island in Newfoundland, have passed the stage where they are tied to the rocky coves because of immobility. As soon as that day comes, Sir, there comes a parting of the ways, and what the fishermen of Newfoundland will do I do not know, whether they will continue to live in the communities in which they now are or pack up and say; why should we sit down here—yet, I am making a fine lot of money—yes I have an old tin lizzie by the door, but where am I going for a drive on Sunday afternoon, where am I going for a picnic, where can my children go? There is going to come a parting of the ways, Sir, and

what the fishermen will do, Sir, whether they will continue to live in the communities in which these developments are taking place today or not is something which we cannot decide. Sufficient is it, as far as we are concerned in Fogo District, that we have our plant which is being erected at this moment in a community where the catch of fish is good, and where the catch of fish can be extended; where we do not suffer the complete isolation of the smaller communities. In the larger communities in the District, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is sufficient for us to know that these shore facilities are going there and that the people will have the opportunity to develop the fisheries around our shore. If in ten or twenty years time the motor boat has given place to the long liner and draggers, if in that time people are wanting to move elsewhere, that will be their business. I don't think, Sir, that we can decide that any one place today is the strategic spot where this will happen or that will happen. We can make it happen. Sometimes I sort of feel that probably we should, but I am not going to debate that point now.

**MR. HOLLETT:** You are doing that at La Scie.

**MR. JANES:** We are not doing it at La Scie. There is nobody being forced into La Scie. The honourable member cannot tell me about that community. Over and above that La Scie is a fine fishing community, a very fine fishing community.

But, Sir, this programme has been launched. The load of dynamite that I spoke of at the beginning of this address has been dropped into the economy of Newfoundland. And

mind you, it is a load of dynamite. Just as surely as we sit here today it is a load of dynamite. It is going to change, Sir, the face of Newfoundland, for the people either one way or the other. It will be a terrific failure, and there will be nothing left or it is going to be a great success, and in ten years' time we will be coming back here praising the 5th day of May, 1954 when this legislation was introduced into this House. I have faith in the fisheries of Newfoundland, Sir. I have just as much faith in the fisheries of Newfoundland as I have in any other industry in the Dominion of Canada. The other day in the same issue of the Daily News as I have already mentioned, I picked up this statement, and I am only going to change one word or two, just so as the House can hear what it sounds like: "You may recall last fall I spoke of the possible future of "Fishtown" and foretold the day when flour would go around the stage head. Believe you me the day is a lot closer now than it was then. I also spoke of better roads, of running water in our town, that also is closer to arrival. On these things really depend the security of the company, for without that, security will not exist for the community; and as we improve our production and lower our cost we will be in a better position to sell more and more fish in the competitive foreign markets, in fact able to sell against any competition presently existing or maybe likely to exist. We still have a long way to go but we will do it. So my friends and fellow workers once again I express pleasure and appreciation of our staff and union and men and with "Fishtown" here, I suggest we all adopt this change for the community. Let us clean up our plants. Let us give "Fishtown" a new look, because we

are going to have many visitors here from time to time. "Fishtown" can be a very important factor in a community."

Is there anything wrong with that? Are the economics of fish any different from the economics of mining. That message is to the miners of Bell Island, substituting "Fishtown," for "Iron and Steel" substituting "Food." The economy of mining is the same as the economy of the fishery, and the theory is all the same. When he speaks of competition he means competition. When he speaks of competitive world markets for minerals we know we also have them for fisheries. Yet, Mr. Dickey, the Manager of Wabana can issue this message to the people of Bell Island. I believe, Sir, the time is not too distant when we will have the managers of fish plants in Newfoundland issue messages like that to the people, to the fishermen, to keep the plant geared to the worker who works in the plant, to the administrative staff who operate the plant. Why not? Is not food as important in this world as iron and steel?

It is in that faith, Sir, the faith that food is as important as iron and steel, it is in the faith that the primary producer and workers in the fishing industry can have as good a life and earn as good a wage in that industry as they do in similar industries, not necessarily mining. In other words all we are looking for for the fishermen and all they are looking for for themselves is something that will take them out of the starvation bracket and the crisis, although the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West did not see its existence, the crisis is here, it has been with us for centuries, although it is a little more pronounced today

because people are a little more informed, a little more free. And if I live on Fogo Island and I want to get off that island I can do it today without going to a relieving officer and asking for a pass. For years there was no other way for a small number of people to get off that island except to go to the relieving officer and ask for a pass. If I want to leave Fogo and go to Corner Brook or Grand Falls, if I want to move off Fogo and cross the Gulf I can do it, and I don't have to get an extra ration before I go. That is why the crisis in the fishing industry today is more acute, it was always there, but the changes in social and economic conditions over the past five years have made that crisis more acute than ever it was.

Because we have faith in the fishing industry of Newfoundland, because we believe there can be a future for the fishermen of Newfoundland although generations of fishermen, our forefathers, might have starved to death at it, in spite of that, although they died of "TB" and malnutrition, in spite of that, in spite of all that, we have reached that stage in our history where there can be a future. It is my firm belief, Sir, that this legislation which we are here debating now to set up this Fishery Authority and to give them the money and the powers to do what needs to be done is going to bring the day to the fisheries of Newfoundland that generations of fishermen have looked for in vain. We blamed Coaker. We blamed Morine. We blamed every man who ever came into this House, but they were helpless. Most of the time they were helpless. But that is not the situation today. We don't have to feel hopeless and helpless. We don't have to feel helpless about



the fact that there might be twenty or thirty thousand people to be relocated and rehabilitated. We don't have to feel that way about it. I think the province is big enough, the Dominion of Canada is big enough to face up to this problem, and for that reason, Sir, I support this legislation.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am hoping to speak in this debate this afternoon. I was wondering if it would be in order to have a recess of ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Would honourable members please return to the Chamber when they hear the buzzer. Sometimes I wish I had the authority to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring the police officers to do that. The House will recess, however.

Sitting resumed.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what I have to say today will not be, I am sure, either startling or very profound. My knowledge of the fisheries of Newfoundland is not as intimate as that possessed by some of my colleagues here, and my contacts within recent years have not been so very much directly with the fishing industry. However, like all other Newfoundlanders I have some ideas on it. Before I do elaborate on these ideas I should like to express my congratulations to those members of the House who have spoken in this debate. I feel that the standard of debate was extremely high, and the material in the speeches in some strange way seemed to be free of any boring repetition. I sat here and listened, I think, to every word that the Premier gave in that ten or twelve hour marathon of his, and I listened to all the other speeches. In no case did I find myself losing interest in what

was being said. I dare say there are people who might say that this House has been occupying valuable time in needless repetition about the fisheries. I do not believe that has been so. It seems to me that we have derived a great deal of valuable information from this debate. I would refer only to one, the speech made here by the honourable member who sits to my immediate left, the representative of the district of Trinity South. I visited every community in his district and spent some considerable time in some of them. Yet I must confess that I heard a great deal about Trinity Bay that was new to me, and helped me to see the thing in a different light. Then again that ten or twelve hour speech made by the Premier enabled me, and I feel certain all the House, to see the fisheries in its proper perspective against all our history and our cultural, economic, racial and geographic background. So that, apart from any intrinsic value of the debate, I feel that we are all like the Ancient Mariner, wiser if not sadder men.

As I listened to the various speakers one thing that struck me was the fact that no person who spoke in this House seemed to be able to speak with perfect objectivity and an unbiased approach. That, I feel, is understandable. It is indicative of the background of us all here that not one of us who has spoken so far has been able to divorce himself personally from the problem of the fisheries. That is true of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who went back to his boyhood days in Burin and spoke about his family who played some part in the south-coast fisheries. The honourable and learned member for St. John's West went back to his boyhood days in



Quidi Vidi. The honourable member for Bonavista South spoke of his father's connection with the fishing industry. The honourable member for Fortune Bay and Hermtage went back to his boyhood associations and the associations of his relatives with the bank and other fisheries. The Honourable Minister of Public Welfare went back to the Bay de Verde District. He spent his boyhood days there and he spoke of his relations and connections with the fishery. That struck me, as I listened, as a rather significant fact. Everyone of us here in this House feels a personal connection, and I suppose a personal responsibility for the fisheries and for fishery development.

I was born and lived in a place for thirteen years. I was thirteen years old, Mr. Speaker, before I saw my first quintal of codfish. I suppose I am one of very few Newfoundlanders who can say that. I did not see my first quintal of codfish until I visited Seldom-Come-By, from which my great-grandfather came. Yet I have to repeat a statement which I made here earlier: I am as much a product of the Newfoundland fishery as any person in this House or in this Province. When I was at a university (I am going to digress a moment) we had in one of our psychology classes something which I dare say some members of the House are familiar with, i.e. the Rachis Tests. These were psychological tests based on impressions one got from looking at say an ink blot, someone splashed on paper and passed to a person and asked that person to give his impression, thereby, gaining some insight into the person's character, which was revealed in the spontaneous impression that he had when he saw the ink blot. They tell me, in fact I

have seen it, it is practised very extensively. That is one way of trying to get at the bottom of a person's personality, one method they used to try and get some insight into a person's subconscious thinking. Another method was to give a word and ask the person's immediate reaction, given without thinking. For instance the word "water," and from what he responded immediately they would form opinions. I suggest, Sir, that if a psychiatrist were listening to our speeches here in this House he would know a great deal of our background. I feel that here is one place where the lack of the purely scientific, purely objective approach in attitude is not a defect. It is a desirable thing and shows all our inward relationship, our intimate connection with the fisheries, and our sense of responsibility.

In spite of the fact that I was almost a man before I saw a quintal of fish, and although I never had any direct personal contact with the fishery, yet the fishery of Newfoundland is as much a part of me as is almost any other association I had. If you say "fishery" to me what does it mean? It may mean that at one time my great-grandfather leaving Trinity and going down and founding that very settlement the honourable member mentioned, Seldom-Come-By in 1820, and incidentally, I am told, it was his progeny who became the greatest fish killers in Newfoundland. It means to me that on another occasion my paternal grandmother sitting down in Seldom-Come-By waiting for her husband, who left Seldom-Come-By in a schooner, after a successful fishery in Labrador, to come up and get his winter's supply, and the picture of her waiting and waiting for him to come back, and

waiting in vain because neither he nor any member of his crew nor his vessel were ever heard of afterwards. It means to me that same paternal grandmother leaving Seldom-Come-By in the middle of December and walking from Seldom-Come-By along that footpath to see the magistrate at Fogo to get the widow's portion, the indian meal and molasses she was entitled to, and bringing that back herself across the island, eleven or twelve miles. She did it only once, Mr. Speaker. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, it means to me my maternal grandfather, after years of fishing at Joe Batts Arm, again in my honourable friend's district, turning his back on it and going with three other friends and settling in the Bay at a place called Burntville, now the Town of Lewisporte. It means to me my own father, before I was born, for thirty odd years going down to the Labrador, some years getting fish some years not, shipwrecked twice, once at Cape Harrison and on another occasion in a snowstorm, climbing up, I am told, to do something to sails during that snowstorm and spending a month afterwards in hospital with two frostbitten hands.

Every person in this House has a background somewhat similar. We cannot divorce ourselves from the fishery even though we have never seen a quintal of fish in our lives, we are still part and parcel of the fishery. So, Mr. Speaker, that is one reason why all who speak on the fishery in this House are speaking personally on it. Almost every member who spoke has gone back into his boyhood or into his experiences or the experiences of his father or of his relatives somewhere, because the fisheries have been carried on in Newfoundland as a vital and integral part

of our very nature. Then again when you say the word "fisheries" to me perhaps it brings to my mind what I saw in the depression years in 1932-33 on the west coast, I saw six hundred fishermen gathered together in one spot, sending a telegram (I was there when it happened) to the Government asking that they be given relief. All the merchants were just about out of supplies. That was in 1932-33, the year before the Commission of Government, and these men sent a telegram saying that unless they be given relief they would have to break into the stores in Bonne Bay to get food for themselves and their families. I think, Mr. Speaker, of the years I spent in Wesleyville, one of the great centres of the Labrador fishery. When I went there, there were twenty-two schooners from seventy to one hundred and thirty tons going down to the Labrador. When I left it four years afterwards there were perhaps half that number. Today I don't believe there is a single one. I remember the frustration, the sense of utter frustration all these men had, the Whitley's, Hill's and Roberts' and Kean's and others, when they came back in the fall. I was teaching their children, going into their homes, and I remember the utter frustration that they had when coming home with the gunwales in the water, and getting prices for their fish that did not in some cases half pay their bills, and many of them having to look forward to relief.

Then mention the fisheries again and I see my own constituents on the Labrador last year and the year before. I travelled amongst them in almost every place of the one hundred and eight communities that are there. I don't think I visited that many.

There were a few I did not get to, but I visited almost every place. When I went in there in June and July, what was the question asked me? "Sir, what do you think the price of fish is going to be this year? Is it going to be as good as last year? Is there any chance that it might be a little better?" These are the impressions, the picture brought to my mind when somebody mentions the fishery to me.

Now, we have here before us a Bill based on a report. It has been stated and argued that this Bill diverges from the report. I will come to that later. This Bill we have here is the essence in principle of the fisheries report and the studies being conducted by the committee, and by the Government, I suppose, generally during the past two or three years. One man cannot speak for a government. One man can only speak for himself, unless he happens to be the head of the Government. I can say that as far as my own approach to this whole problem in the past three or four years, anyway I could throw my weight, anything I could do, I did. One position to take would be to say: Let the fisheries alone. Do nothing about it whatsoever. Let those who are in it stay in their poverty and frustration and disappointment, with all their hopes deferred and with all their resentment. Let them stay in it. That was one choice which was up to me to advocate in the councils of the Government, just as it was up to my colleagues.

Now there are two basic objections to that, Mr. Speaker. One is, from a purely political viewpoint, any government that does that—and history shows this statement to be true—any government that does that will, in the

course of time, be booted out. That has happened over and over again. There is hardly a man whose portrait is down there on that wall whose administration was not kicked out basically because they could not handle the fishery problem. That was the basic reason. Often there were other reasons more apparent, more obvious, but the basic reason for their being kicked out was their failure to cope with the fishery problem. So that, looking at it from a purely political standpoint as a member of the government; if we did nothing for the fisheries, and just let it go on, all we could look forward to in the course of time—we might stand two or three years—but eventually we would be kicked out on that issue. Just as soon as a general depression or even a recession sets in then the people would focus their resentment on the government in power. That has always happened, so that from a purely narrow, political standpoint that approach is wrong.

Then there is a still stronger reason, Mr. Speaker, why any government should not adopt the *laissez faire* approach. That reason is humanitarian. In spite of the mistakes it is supposed to have made, this Government, I think, can claim that it has shown interest in the welfare of the ordinary people of the Province. I think that is a fair statement to make, and no doubt it has a humanitarian approach. No government could ever sit back and do nothing about a problem of such magnitude as the fisheries problem.

There was another choice that confronted us even in the past year, and we did something about it. That was a choice again which confronted all other administrations, and from time to time some action was taken. That is to let things go on until they get

so serious that the thing is split wide open, or step in and take some action. Even in my own time I can recall that in 1930 there was some guarantee of supplies, some subsidies and rebates on salt. Last fall we had to do that very thing. We had to step in and give advance payments of a dollar fifty a quintal over and above the offered price. Any government that has been in power any length of time has had to do just that. There again, and nobody knows that better than this present Government, that is only a salve being put on a deep-set malignancy. That is a palliative, and a palliative cannot take the place of surgery.

The third choice open to the Government was to tackle the problem wholesale, to tackle it with imagination, with energy and with courage, knowing that what is being done or will be done may very well not succeed. That is the calculated risk this Government has taken, and taken with the approbation of the great majority of our people irrespective of their political affiliations. They may disagree in detail; they may think it should not be La Scie or Valleyfield or that it should not be Quirpon, but in principle, I believe, that the steps taken by this Government have the approval and approbation of the vast majority of our people. Although there has been some criticism against it, most of this dealt with by previous speakers—I refer to them very briefly, because as a matter of fact most of the criticisms have been very trifling anyway. There was no criticism that could be called serious. As to "Socialization" and "Nationalization" I think these statements are just for the sake of saying something about them.

Sir, at this point I want to repeat again: I think it is a serious mistake for any person in this Assembly to be

bandying around words like "Socialistic" and "Communism" not only in this debate—I know we can all think of examples in the world today where every liberal movement or every new thing or every constructive idea was labeled, no matter how humane, how sincere it was, it was labeled by the arch-conservative, not in the derogative sense now, but labeled, and when the real thing came along it was found that they had cried "wolf" too often by bandying these words around. We are living in too serious a time to be bandying around unnecessarily words like "Nationalistic" and particularly, of course, "Communitic" and associated labels. I don't think we need to be sticking tags on most of these things.

This is an honest attempt by the present Government, with the support of the people, to try and cope with these most serious problems. I don't think I should refer in any detail to these little criticisms of the honourable members on the opposite side. The honourable and learned member for St. John's West drew attention to socialistic housing in this Bill. This Bill does not ever intend to socialize housing. All that this Government has ever done (and I think that is true of the Government and in fact for most of the governments across the Nation insofar as housing is concerned) was to try and do what private enterprise was unable to do, that was to try to enable people who would not otherwise get housing to get such housing and to become owners of them in the shortest possible time—That is all. That is all, and that is what is envisaged in this legislation here. I am going to enunciate a principle here which has probably been enunciated before, but I am going to put it in my own words. I am sure the Premier has

drawn attention to it: No matter how often we bandy around words like "Nationalization" and "Socialization," etc., the fact remains that in every country in the civilized world there is one principle and that is: if some operation of development is necessary in the public interest and private enterprise is unable or unwilling to assume responsibility for that development, then the Government has the right and the duty to step in and do that. Now that has actually faced governments in this province over and over again. I don't need to remind the House that at one time mails were delivered by private enterprise in Newfoundland. I don't need to remind this House that the coastal service, freight and mail were private enterprise. But private enterprise could not do it and operate at a profit and the Government had to step in. We have the same thing in regard to our railway in 1922 or 1923 when the private enterprise could no longer carry on and the Government had to take over and operate it. Nobody then cried "Socialistic" or "Nationalistic" or anything else. As a matter of fact I am going to remind this House in the country in the world where private enterprise has reached its highest point, the United States of America, where the emphasis is all upon private enterprise, yet in 1930, in fact 1940, the Government with the approval of the great majority of the people had to engage in socialistic development in Kentucky and on other great power developments. I don't think any government goes into it because it wants to do so. I think governments go into these things because they are forced to do it, as we are going into it.

I heard another criticism about the location of some of these industries,

and I think some of the arguments had been derived from the fishery report, like the criticism of going ahead in places which are ice-bound for several months of the year. I am not going to try and answer that argument in detail, but I am going to say this: It seems to me that if two hundred and fifty or two hundred years ago somebody had gone up the St. Lawrence River and had gone ashore at a spot there and said: "Right here will be one of the world's greatest ports," the critic would have said, "But you know this river is frozen over and you cannot get up here for four or five months of the year in the bad winter. This place can never become a great seaport." I dare say that was said. Ice and the cessation of navigation usually present great difficulties, nevertheless, I understand, on the Quebec side of the Labrador and on the north shore of that area stretching from inside Seven Islands right on out to Blanc Sablon. I understand, development of one kind or another is going ahead there although it is closed by ice for longer periods than La Scie or Quirpon or Seldom. The honourable member reminds me that Seldom is very rarely closed. As a matter of fact I have an idea that too often we place too much stress on this matter of navigation closing. I think in some ways we are a victim of habit. I found some years ago, and I think my predecessor representing Labrador found also that one reason why the coastal service closes down in October in Labrador was due to the idea that that was the time in the year to close them down because the climate in the winter necessitated that. Since it has been found that vessels can operate not only in southern Labrador but even in the northern Labrador right up to December. The



fact is that in this past December, ships left Goose Bay, of all places, and came out to Lake Melville in the month of December.

One other criticism which has been made, and I think it has been hinted at from both sides of the House, is that the programme envisaged by the report and by the Bill will affect only certain parts of the Province and will leave others, which you may call sore spots, virtually untouched. They have been cited, as a matter of fact. I don't mind saying here that when I was discussing with certain people the implications of this programme one of the first things I said, as you might expect me to say, was "What about Labrador?" I am sure that is the first reaction of my honourable friend sitting here, "What about Trinity South?" "What about the stretch of coast from Rose Blanche over to Bay d'Espoir?" etc. That is something to be expected. After all we are politicians and we represent districts, and naturally we have to show some concern for these districts. Nevertheless I feel there is a danger that we might overdo that. I will only ask one question here, or suggest a question: If by some chance the Corner Brook mill closed down tomorrow would it affect Bay of Islands and the Humber centres only, or would it affect, let us say, Trepassey or Ferryland or Cartwright? Would it affect St. John's here? We all know that the answer to that question is that it would. And of course the other way around if we can get an industry going, say a new mine this year, no matter where it is, whether it is over in Bay of Islands or in Tilting, it is a very elementary principle that no matter where it is it will affect for good our entire economy. All our people would in

one way or another eventually benefit whether they lived at Rose Blanche or on the Horse Islands.

There is just one other thing in passing, which I want to make reference to, Mr. Speaker: I have found a tendency in people to speak somewhat loosely about the Labrador fishery. I think that most people when speaking about the Labrador fishery (I realize this is digressing from the main theme but I am doing it deliberately, Sir) when people mention the Labrador fishery they are thinking of the fishery our people carried on for so many years in schooners going down there. They seem to forget entirely that Labrador in its own right has a great fishery. I have heard here in this House comparisons made from time to time about the people of their district, who are among the best fishermen or depend most on the fishery, etc. If that can be said of any district, I suppose it is true of all districts or some parts of them, nevertheless, if there is any part of the Province of Newfoundland where the people depend almost one hundred per cent on the fishery it is in the Straits of Belle Isle, on the Labrador side. Hundreds of people in that area have never done a thing in their lives except to fish. However, in the last year or two many of them have been changing their mode of living. I will come to that later. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, no matter how disappointed we might be individually and politically from time to time at the fact that this district and that district is not included immediately in the scheme of things, the fact remains that what is good for one area of this province will be for the good of all areas in the province. The Government, as I see it, has selected the



most logical spots for experimental development, and I have not the slightest shadow of doubt that should these developments meet with a measure of success then they will be extended to include other areas not now included.

I have heard here the honourable and learned member for St. John's West look backward a bit. He looked backwards, I thought, with nostalgia. If we could only get back to what it was when he was a boy. The Premier put it a little more strongly, but I think that is a true criticism to make of what the honourable gentleman had to say here—he seemed to be looking back with nostalgia, almost like some of our sailing captains look back to the days of sails and say; "These steamers, what do they amount to? If only we could get back the sailing days." Or like they tell me, on some parts of the Mainland, people used to look back with nostalgia to the days when they had their horse and cart and used old dobbin and hitched her on to the cart. People look back to these days and think, these are the days, the happy days. We all do that. I went back to my own home, where I spent the best part of twenty years, a couple of years ago. I went back for two or three days to Lewisporte, one of our fastest growing settlements—everywhere you go is a hive of industry. Once everything you knew there was sleepy and quiet, but now nobody has time anymore to talk to you. I could not help looking back with a little regret to the time I spent there as a boy when everything was so quiet and peaceful. They were not tearing roads to pieces to put down mains and you did not have to jump off the road to get away from huge trucks. But I think

we have to resign ourselves to the fact that whether we want to or not we cannot go back. It sounds simple to say but some people never get it in their minds. We have to go ahead and move with the times.

The honourable and learned member for St. John's West talked about and contrasted the lot of the women who worked out in the field and on the flakes and stages to the lot of the women in the factories. I recall as a boy visiting Seldom-Come-By and seeing the women out there hauling barrels of fish. I remember seeing one woman cry because of the ache in her shoulder. I have visited a few of those so-called factories that our honourable friend referred to, Job's factory on the Southside, and some years ago I was in the Fishery Products factory in Burin and the year before last, I think it was, I was in the fish plant that was down in Englee in Canada Bay, and I saw the girls and women there working. I could not help feeling that their's was a lot better than that of the women I had seen in Seldom-Come-By thirty years ago. I did not see any slave-driving going on there. I could hear music in the distance, and all the girls seemed to be happy and pleased. I went into the stores at Englee and was amazed at the stock and the variety of goods there in such a small place. The storekeeper told me he did not have that a few years ago but with women and girls making the money they do they want these things, and if we do not stock it here they send to Eatons or Simpsons and get it from there. Our people are rapidly undergoing a revolution. I don't know how many people realize that in 1949 when I first went down in Public Welfare I was told over and over again by older, experienced

people in that department that men in certain places, once they had relief because they could not go away to work, were forever satisfied to stay there and get relief. As it happens, Mr. Speaker, one of these places which I remember very well in 1949 was a settlement in Labrador, and I was told that the men there would not go away anywhere even if they found work for them. I don't suppose there is a member in the House today who does not regard as his greatest problem, how to find work for his constituents who are keeping after him for work. From that very settlement—I won't name it—from that settlement only this spring I received message after message saying: "Can you get me work at Seven Islands, Goose Bay, on the railway, at the iron mines, anywhere? I will take work anywhere." These messages are from the very spot where they told me that a few years ago you could not get men to go away to work, and that they were quite happy on relief. That may have been true then but today, I don't believe there is any sizable body of men in any community, no matter how remote or isolated, who are satisfied to stay at home and get relief, if they can get work at Goose Bay, Labrador, the railway, Gander or anywhere else. I don't believe that such a condition exists. But, Sir, it existed a few years ago in certain parts of the province. There is a physical, sociological and economic revolution going on in Newfoundland. Our people, boys and girls, young men and young women and older people too, most of them are living better than they ever lived before. That is revealed in a variety of ways.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, some years ago, in the days of Commission

of Government, a certain area was reported on in Newfoundland by a group of specialists in nutrition and psychology and related things. One of the things mentioned in the report was the fact that there seemed to be an inaptitude, a lassitude in some of our people, and the responses, the reactions of the average person seemed to be slower than normal. One of my honourable colleagues mentioned the other day about beriberi. I know that in a number of places in Newfoundland where people were accused of being lazy—too lazy to work—there were plenty who were without work, and they did not feel like working because of the accumulated effects of malnutrition and near starvation. They did not feel like working, but did not know what was wrong with them.

But after months and years of better food and improved environment no normal man wanted to stay at home on relief. I said there has been a great revolution throughout our Province, and that it has been brought about by a number of factors. That revolution has taken place, and is taking place today. That revolution, that changed outlook in our people, is physical and mental, and it is one of the things that augur well for the success of this new fishery development.

Other countries, Mr. Speaker, from time to time have had to institute revolutions. I don't need to remind this House of what Denmark did, the people and Government of Denmark together, in the latter part of the 19th century, which made that country, small and poor in natural resources, one of the most prosperous in the world. I don't need to remind this House what the industrial revolution did in a few years in heavy in-

dustry. I don't need to remind this House what the Japanese people and government were to do not too many years ago with regard to the textile industry, how they revolutionized it overnight. And I am not suggesting that we should use the methods used in Japan and Denmark. We have to find our own solutions and work out our own salvation. People and governments from time to time have met problems similar to ours and have grappled with them and have been able to solve them, and that I think we can do. As a government we could not sit back and allow things to go on as they have for years. We have taken this step, Mr. Speaker, for good or ill, and I submit that we had to take this step. My prayer is that this programme will meet with success. I say that with all sincerity whether I am in politics one year or thirty. And I believe I am voicing what every member of this House feels, on both sides, and the people on the outside too. Here is a great experiment that may cost a hundred million dollars. Nevertheless it is worth trying, the risk is worth taking. I pray for its success, and I believe that it will succeed.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurances."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill designed really to provide that all insurance policies issued in Newfoundland should have the same statutory provisions.

At the moment all the Board companies doing business here have used what they call their own conditions that they have prepared and adopted for their own purpose. But other

companies are doing business here other than the Board companies listed are doing, through several agencies. There are other companies, I believe, that they are not on what we call the board or not members of the Board of Insurance Underwriters.

The main effect of the Bill before the House is to provide uniformity of conditions, and these statutory conditions will be in all policies. I don't think I need to labour the matter at this juncture, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps there might be some questions that may be required to be answered in committee, if so, I would be glad to answer them on that occasion.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Community Councils Act":

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, since the passing of the parent Act in 1952 authorizing the creation of community councils we have found from experience, the need for amendments in that Act, for instance the community councils elected were given certain powers of making regulations, but they were not given any powers to exercise control in seeing the regulations were carried out. Consequently one of the first things in this proposed Bill is to try and remedy that lack.

The new amendment in the Bill naturally follows in order to bring the subsequent sections into agreement with the amendment made in the first section. Other provisions in

these amendments provide for the appointment of the auditors; some regulations affecting the holding of office, particularly of the new councils. But the second important thing in this Bill is the matter of taxes:

At the present time the community councils are authorized to collect a business tax, but that is arranged entirely on an arbitrary basis. This amendment here wipes out that arbitrary assessment and places upon the Bill a standardized formula, so that it makes it easier for the councils to make the assessments, and not under the arbitrary conditions found under the old system.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if under Section 20 the auditors which he proposes to appoint would be civil servants?

MR. HEFFERTON: They would probably come under the Auditor General's Division. Practically all our auditing is done at the present time under the Auditor General's staff, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act":

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the House will be aware, I think that all the insurance companies doing business in Canada have an organization which is composed primarily of the superintendents of insurance for each province. This organization of superintendents of insurance had a meeting, its annual

meeting, last September at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. We were represented there by our superintendent, Mr. Walter Marshall, or rather by his deputy Mr. J. Channing, as Mr. Marshall was unable to leave the Province at the time.

At that meeting the superintendents, who have with them the representatives of all the insurance underwriters for both fire and automobile casualties, made certain recommendations to the various provinces with respect to automobile insurance. Apparently one of the points worrying them was the extent to which a motor vehicle's liability policy should cover liability for loss or damage arising in cases where mechanical equipment or apparatus is joined on or attached to the automobile or trailer. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, having seen going through the streets some such automobiles having attached to them compressors and other attachments.

The object of this amendment is to provide for the matter of insurance of such vehicles. This matter was discussed at that meeting and all the provinces were asked to approve legislation covering these points; loss or damage due to the operations of a mobile crane; the truck being stationary during the operating of welding or spray painting; or similar apparatus.

I don't think the House is really very much interested, Mr. Speaker, in the minute details. But the recommendation made was that the Automobile Insurance Act be amended by adding clause (g).

"For loss or damage arising from the ownership, use or operation of any machinery or apparatus, including its equipment, mounted on or attached to

the automobile with a separate power or heating unit, while at the site of the use or operation or such machinery or apparatus."

There is also another minor amendment under Clause 3, which I might say is uniform throughout Canada.

MR. HIGGINS: That is the amendment to Section 24? Would the Honourable the Attorney General tell us what that amendment means? It means nothing to me.

MR. CURTIS: There are times, Mr. Speaker, when I would like to refer these Bills to the Department to which they relate. I could have given the answer a couple of weeks ago as to just what it is all about, but this order has been on the Order Paper so long: It simply involves the uniformity factor, and there will be no difficulty there. I think it deals with unfair allocations and duplication in adjusting cases.

MR. HIGGINS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we could wait for the committee stage.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Speaker, the distinction here is between a car that is damaged in collision and a car which carries equipment which is also insured and there is a division of liability under the Contributory Negligence Act.

Then, Mr. Speaker, it comes under the heading of uncertainty of coverage: Conditions of the old form of standard automobile policies provided for automobiles licensed in the name of the driver. Underwriters recognized that there would be some difficulty in handling claims unless automobile coverage became universal. Apparently the object of the section is to deal with such cases as the "Hertz Drive Yourself Service" automobiles.

However, the report says the difficulty has arisen in the past eighteen months, since the adoption of the new policies, and it is far greater than anyone expected. Apparently the position should be reversed and insurance as it refers to such automobiles should be primarily covered.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the distinction here is between a car that is damaged in collision, and which is insured, and a car which perhaps caused the collision and which is also insured; and there is a division of the liability under the "Contributory to Negligence Act." However, these are highly technical matters and I don't think they interest the House. They certainly do not interest me. I certainly agree, Sir, that it is of the utmost importance to have all the laws of all the provinces uniform so that if a stranger comes here we may know that his insurance is the same as the insurance policies on other cars here. As long as the insurance policies are the same I don't think we need worry.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: I appreciate the feelings of the Honourable the Attorney General that we should have uniformity and when a stranger comes here be able to read his policy and understand it. I am not much interested in the Bill either, but must say that I want to know all about it. With all due respect to the Honourable the Attorney General I must say his explanation has not clarified things for this side of the House. Unfortunately the Premier is absent. Perhaps we will be able to see it in Committee, Sir.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.



Second reading of Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Ltd."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the House will be glad to know there is no trouble about this Bill.

In 1929, Mr. Speaker, the government of the day made an agreement with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company with respect to taxation of ore at Bell Island. It will be remembered that at that time the House ratified a twenty year agreement, which agreement expired in 1949. That agreement exempted the company on Bell Island from any and all taxation, including income tax, and prescribed that in lieu thereof there should be a tax, I think, of ten cents a ton on the first million five hundred tons and three per cent on the excess. This taxation was enforced in 1929 and expired in 1949. In 1950 we collected for the year 1949, \$114,167.24. But the House will remember that we signed an agreement with the Federal Government which provided for the collection of income tax by the Federal Government. Income tax, therefore, was no longer collected by the Provincial Government of Newfoundland. That meant, Mr. Speaker, that we could no longer collect income tax from the Bell Island Company. At the same time we were permitted to impose a mining tax, and we did impose a mining tax of five per cent on the profits of the company.

Now everything went very well, Mr. Speaker, for the first year, because in the first year they did not come under the tax because they had an agreement with the government to pay the

royalty of ten cents and three cents. But since 1952 we have made no collections from this company whatsoever. In spite of the fact that very, very considerable tonnage of ore was produced and shipped we found that the taxation of 5% was completely inadequate, and that we had gotten no returns whatsoever that were worth while from the company. So that in that year we passed a special Act making the tax a 25% tax on their net profits. With that taxation we did get in the year 1951 an amount of \$156,000, but for the year 1952 we were able to collect nothing, and for the year 1953 we were able to collect nothing, because in 1952 the company filed a statement showing a loss of \$257,000 and in the year 1953 a statement showing a loss of \$36,000. As long as that company, Mr. Speaker, filed reports showing a loss our taxation, whether it be 5% mining tax or 25%, is not worth collecting.

So that we have been forced to reconsider the whole situation of the taxation of this company. We are running into some difficulties with Ottawa because of our rights being limited under the Tax Rental Agreement, as the House knows. But we do think that, if we renewed the agreement as it was in 1929, Ottawa would permit us to collect it in lieu of the mining tax, as the Mining Tax Act is not a satisfactory Act to collect under. You really need to be an expert to know how to analyze these company statements. Certainly, in the case of Bell Island the case is aggravated by the fact that when we took office all these companies were consolidated and both Sydney, Bell Island and other operating companies were all one. Since union they have split up their companies again, and it makes it pos-



sible from now on to collect from them.

But in 1950 when we found the old Act had expired we were asked by the company if we could give them an extended agreement. We refused to do so and elected rather to try and collect under the Mining Tax Act. However, in spite of the fact that we increased the amount of the taxation under that Act to 25% we got no satisfactory returns. So that we felt the time had come when perhaps we ought to look over the situation again.

The object of this Act, therefore, is to authorize the Government to enter into an agreement, which agreement, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, is retroactive to the date of the expiration of the old agreement, and goes back to 1950, and will provide for payment for the years 1952 and 1953, and from now on at the old rate that was in existence, with, however, this improvement, that whereas the old rate was ten cents a ton on the first million and three cents a ton on the excess, the new agreement calls for ten cents a ton on the first million and a half and eight cents a ton on the excess. Now the agreement calls for an increase in their operations from a million and a half, which was their capacity then, up to two and a half million which is to be their new capacity. We are releasing them from all taxation, but of course in our release from taxation we are not releasing them from income tax because our income tax is assigned to the Federal Government. So that I consider, Mr. Speaker, and I think the House will understand that this new agreement is much superior to the old agreement, inasmuch as these companies are now although still paying income tax, paying the same taxation to us as they

had paid in the old days when we exempted them from income tax.

Now I notice the hour is late, and I do not want to bring back members. So that, perhaps at this juncture I might move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 18, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motion

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

#### Notice of Question

MR. W. J. BROWNE: To ask the Acting Minister of Economic Development or the Minister of Finance, to

lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. Were tenders called for the supply of machinery to be installed in

(a) The Gypsum Plant.

(b) The Cement Plant.

2. If tenders were called and received, lay copies of them on the table.

3. If tenders were not called for the supply of machinery or equipment for these buildings why were they not called?

4. If tenders were not called were contracts in writing entered into by the Government for the supply of machinery? If so, table copies of the contracts in each case.

5. Were tenders called for the construction of :

(a) The Gypsum Plant.

(b) The Cement Plant.

6. If tenders were called for the construction of the said plants or either of them, table copies of tenders received.

7. If tenders were not called for the construction of the said plants or either of them, who drew the plans for the buildings, who drafted the specifications, and who estimated the cost of the building?

8. What was the estimate and what was the actual cost of each building?

9. What was the duty paid value of all machinery in each plant?

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Acting Minister of Economic Development or the Minister of Finance, to lay on the table of the House the following information :

1. How much money has been supplied to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd. as working capital since it began operations?

2. Has this Company accounted for the expenditure of this working capital to the Government at any time?

3. Has the Auditor General the right or duty to inspect the books of accounts of the said Company on behalf of the Government?

4. Has any money been advanced to the Company since Jan. 1, 1954, for any purpose? If so, give date and amount and purpose.

5. What security, if any, has been given the Government for such advances?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 88—Stand.

Question No. 89—Stand.

Question No. 90—Answer being prepared.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have referred to Question No. 75 to the Department concerned.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's West asked a question, No. 87. He was not here when it was called and I did not answer it. I may say, that I am getting the information, but as far as I know we have had no prosecutions. Not because my department does not desire to prosecute such cases, but frankly, we find it very difficult to decide just what items should be prosecuted and what items should not. Several times, the police have, on my instructions, brought in

samples of literature. On one occasion at least I committed this literature to a friend of mine who is a clergyman, and the reply I got from him with respect to the items I handed him on that occasion was that two of the books were pretty good reading. The worst thing about them was the cover. The third one, he said was just pure trash. The difficulty, is to know who is to judge in what cases we should prosecute. We could, of course, have censorship, but I understand no one wants that. On the other hand I would like to assure my honourable friend that if any particular case is brought to the attention of the department we will be very happy to prosecute. The fact that we have had no such prosecutions is not due to the lack of desire, but is entirely due to not being able to satisfy ourselves that in any case that has come to our knowledge we could obtain a conviction.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplement-

ary question? Has anyone complained to the Attorney General?

**MR. CURTIS:** I did get a complaint which came from this clergyman himself who is connected with educational institutions in the city and the complaint that reached him was that these things were being sold in certain schools. I immediately sent for the police to go up and search the place. They found nothing that would justify action. So, no prosecutions have taken place.

**MR. J. HIGGINS:** Mr. Speaker, if I may—were there not persons prosecuted last year for selling some pencils around Conception Bay area?

**MR. CURTIS:** I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was some prosecution, now that I think of it. I did indicate that I did not know of any and that I would ask the police and the R.C.M.P. to find out the correct answer, if there were any that I did not remember. Now that my honourable friend has mentioned it, I do have some recollection of that.

Question No. 78—Answer tabled by Mr. Keough:

**Question:** How many liners have been built during the past fiscal year? Who are the owners? How much was paid by way of bounty on the hull and how much on the engine of each vessel?

**Answer:** Six long liners were completed in 1953-54 the details of which are supplied in Schedule A attached hereto. Nine additional long liners are under construction, the details of which may be found in Schedule B. Four draggers were also completed which, while not classed as long liners are designed to operate also as long liners. Details of these vessels are to be found in Schedule C.

**Question:** Have any other vessels been built for which a bounty was paid? If so give the name of the owner, state kind of vessel, amount of bounty together with loan, if any, made on each vessel.

**Answer:** During the year under review one general fishing vessel and one vessel for general trading were completed. The details requested on these vessels are to be found in Schedule D.

In the various stages of construction are two vessels classed as draggers and nine fishing vessels of the ordinary type which are not classed as long liners or draggers. The details requested are supplied in Schedule E.

Also under construction are six general trading vessels for which the details are to be found in Schedule F.

Question: What amount of loan is carried by each owner? Is there a mortgage on the vessel for the loan in each case?

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Loan	Mortgage
"Brooklyn"	W. C. Hancock sold to Peter Hackett	Woods Island	6,750	Yes
"William Frank"	Gerald Hayley	Bonavista	2,200	Yes
"Donald Diane"	Mel R. Power	Portugal Cove South	13,600	Yes
"Tommie L. Vincent"	Raymond and Bramwell Vincent	Newtown, B.B.	6,843	Yes
"Doris and Lydia"	Arthur L. Sturge	Valleyfield	11,200	Yes
Permit No. 27-53	Ralph Moss	Princeton	3,500	Yes
"Chesley Abbott"	Howard P. Lake	Fortune	14,681	Yes
"Veteran Explorer"	Wallace Smith	St. John's	33,750	Yes
"Mercedes"	Wilson Evans	English Hr.	27,135	Yes
"Fortune Bay"	Reginald Buffett	Fortune	26,364	Yes
"Miss Beaumont"	Ralph Burton	Port Anson	3,000	Yes
Permit No. 2-52	Frank Collins	St. John's	11,291	No
"Island No. 10"	James Ellsworth	Carmanville	2,363	Yes

In the case of Permit No. 2-52, Frank Collins, this vessel has been assigned to the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives. The Department is presently negotiating the sale of this vessel through the Fisheries Loan Board.

# **SCHEDULE "A"**

**List of Long Liners on which Bounty Payments were completed during the Fiscal Year 1953-54**

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Total Bounty Paid on Hull	Bounty Paid on Diesel Engine	Paid 1953-54
"Wilson M."	Harold Moulard	Bonavista, B.B.	\$1,750.00	(not fitted with diesel)	\$ 700.00
"Brooklyn"	William C. Hancock	Brooklyn, B.B.	1,960.00	\$ 700.00	1,960.00
"Gertrude Flemming"	James Flemming	Bonavista, B.B.	1,890.00	1,900.00	2,740.00
"William Frank"	Gerald Hayley	Bonavista, B.B.	1,190.00	600.00	1,160.00
"Don and Diane"	Michael R. Power	Portugal Cove South Ferryland District	3,060.00	1,400.00	2,885.00
"Tommie L. Vincent"	Raymond and Bramwell Vincent	Newtown, B.B.	3,150.00	1,400.00	3,875.00

# **SCHEDULE "B"**

**List of Long Liners not ready for Final Bounty Payments during Fiscal Year 195-54**

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Bounty Payments Made on Hull	Paid in 1953-54
"Bright Eye II"	Clyde Little	Bonavista, B.B.	\$1,570.00	\$ 525.00
"Jennie R"	John Russell	Bonavista, B.B.	1,365.00	1,365.00
"Doris and Lydia"	Arthur L. Sturge	Valleyfield, B.B.	2,025.00	1,350.00
"Barbara and Darlene H"	Ralph Hicks	Bonavista, B.B.	1,687.50	562.50
Permit No. 16-52	James Justinean Philpott	Cottle's Island, N.D. Bay	875.00	875.00
Permit No. 25-52	Frank Ayles	Bonavista, B.B.	875.00	437.50
Permit No. 27-53	Ralph Moss	Princeton, B.B.	875.00	437.50
Permit No. 26-53	Heber John Keel	Bonavista, B.B.	1,260.00	1,260.00
Permit No. 35-53	William M. Lane	Summerville, B.B.	1,260.00	1,260.00

## SCHEDULE "C"

List of Dragger Type Vessel, fitted as Long Liners, on which Bounty Payments were completed during the Fiscal Year 1953-54

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Total Bounty Paid on Hull	Bounty Paid on Diesel Engine	Paid 1953-54
"Chesley Abbott"	Howard Patten Lake	Fortune, F.B.	\$3,690.00	\$2,100.00	\$5,790.00
"Veteran Explorer"	Wallace Smith	St. John's	5,220.00	1,500.00	6,720.00

List of Dragger Type Vessels, fitted as Danish Seiners, can be fitted as Long Loners if owners wish it, on which Bounty Payments were completed during the Fiscal Year 1953-54

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Total Bounty Paid on Hull	Bounty Paid on Diesel Engine	Paid 1953-54
"Mercedes"	Wilson Evans	English Hr. West, F.B.	\$3,690.00	\$1,500.00	\$2,760.00
"Fortune Bay"	Reginald Buffett	Fortune, F.B.	4,140.00	2,600.00	6,740.00

## SCHEDULE "D"

Fishing Vessels other than Long Liners or Dragger Type Vessels on which Final Bounty Payments were completed during the Fiscal Year 1953-54

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Total Bounty Paid on Hull	Bounty Paid on Diesel Engine	Paid 1953-54
"Miss Beaumont"	Ralph Burton	Port Anson, Norte Dame Bay	\$1,820.00	\$ 700.00	\$1,586.00

General Trade Vessel on which Final Bounty Payments were completed during the Fiscal Year 1953-54

Name of Vessel	Owner	Address	Total Bounty Paid on Hull	Bounty Paid on Diesel Engine	Paid 1953-54
"Bongate"	John Bradley	Bonavista, B.B.	\$1,160.00	\$ 520.00	\$1,680.00



**SCHEDULE "E"**

**List of Dragger Type Vessels not ready for Final Bounty payments during the Fiscal Year 1953-54**

Vessel	Owner	Address	Bounty Payments Made on Vessel	Paid in 1953-54
Permit No. 2-52	Frank Collins	St. John's	\$2,050.00	.....
Permit No. 37-54	Eli R. Grandy	Garnish, F.B.	1,305.00	\$1,305.00

**List of Fishing Vessels other than Long Liners or Dragger Type Vessels not ready for Final Bounty Payments during Fiscal Year 1953-54**

Vessel	Owner	Address	Bounty Payments Made on Vessel	Paid in 1953-54
Permit No. 700	William Burton	Little Hr. West, P.B.	\$ 654.00	.....
Permit No. 764	Kenneth Rideout	Cottle's Island, N.D.B.	210.00	.....
Permit No. 761	Hiram Hounsell	Jackson's Arm, White Bay	700.00	\$ 700.00
Permit No. 29-53	Gerard M. Kelly	Beau Bois, Placentia Bay	770.00	770.00
Permit No. 682	Kenneth Power	North Harbour, St. Mary's Bay	746.00	.....
Permit No. 716	Joseph W. Vokey	Little Harbour, T.B.	1,620.00	.....
Permit No. 15-52	J. H. Marshall	St. Margaret's Bay, St. Barbe Dist.	420.00	.....
"Island No. 10"	James Ellsworth	Carmanville	735.00	.....
Permit No. 697	James McQue	Bar Haven, P.B.	560.00	.....

**SCHEDULE "F"**

**List of General Trade Vessels not ready for Final Bounty Payments during the Fiscal Year 1953-54**

Vessel	Owner	Address	Bounty Payments Made on Vessel	Paid in 1953-54
"Laura Spencer"	Frank Bond	Bay L'Argent, F.B.	\$1,320.00	.....
"Miss Vera"	Reginald Weir	Little Bay Islands	787.50	\$ 787.50
Permit No. 590	H. S. Sansford	St. Anthony	160.00	.....
Permit No. 715	Stewart Blanchard	Bonne Bay	2,680.00	.....
Permit No. 8-52	William Goosney	Bonne Bay	140.00	.....
Permit No. 31-53	J. & P. Croke	St. Brendan's, B.B.	600.00	60.00

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I addressed a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works a short while ago, asking if any work had been started. I wonder if it has been brought to his attention, as he was not here when I asked the question?

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): The answer was given yesterday, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the honourable gentleman did not hear, or that he would like me to repeat it.

MR. BROWNE: I was not here.

MR. SPENCER: I can simply say that I have not the question with me. I remember that the answer to the first part was, none.

MR. BROWNE: If the answer were tabled, that is enough.

MR. SPENCER: No it was a verbal answer.

Question No. 83: (1) The answer is none. (2) Of course, if the answer is, no, in the first part of the question, there is no further answer required for the second part.

### Orders of the Day

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority": (Adjourned debate).

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this Bill my first wish is to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives on the manner in which he introduced this bill. I think I may claim to have had a longer acquaintanceship with the honourable minister, and I hope a friendship, than anyone else in this House. We were

at school together and we played football together. I know it is rather hard to concede that today. He has fallen into more flesh than I have, and than he had then. It is always a pleasure to hear the Honourable Minister when he speaks in this House. His introduction of this bill was a very clear and very lucid presentation. Indeed it is a pity that the time occupied by the Honourable Minister was so short in comparison with the remarks of subsequent speakers. I refer in particular, of course, to the marathon address of the Honourable Premier; because whilst the Minister did keep his feet on the ground, or in the water, whatever it is proper to use as a reference; in debating this subject the Premier took off into the wild blue, and he brought us everywhere. He came down to earth only occasionally just long enough to rap these numbskulls on Water Street, so that at times it was rather difficult for those of us on this side of the House, with the limited intelligence with which we have been credited, to follow just what was going on.

I can say quite definitely, speaking for the Opposition, that we have just as much interest in the fisheries as any honourable member in this House. Through some strange reasoning one would get the impression that members on the government side of the House seemed to think that we of the Opposition are not interested in fishermen or maybe that is just a matter of good political cackle, i.e., it is good policy to suggest that that crowd in the Opposition don't care about the fishermen; that the fishermen are the peculiar province and peculiar interest of the Government alone. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that thought

is perhaps quite fair to our honourable friends opposite. I don't think that they really intended to convey that impression. Anybody who got that idea would not be doing himself justice. But I would point out Sir, that we of the Opposition, whose minds are not taken up with such things as real estate and other mundane matters are quite interested in this plan. We don't propose to brush it off with cursory discussion. It is a bit unfortunate that all the time during this debate the impression seemed to be given that St. John's is a separate place from the rest of the country; that those people in St. John's are so benighted that it is good enough for them to be represented solely by the gentlemen who sit to my right here, and to your honour's right. That is not quite fair, Mr. Speaker.

This Bill is a very important bill to the whole of Newfoundland. Whatever one may in the heat of political debate say, you cannot take St. John's away from the rest of the country. Indeed St. John's is a very important part of the country, and St. John's is just as much vitally interested in the development of the fisheries as any district represented by any of my honourable friends opposite, and I do not exclude Fogo. So that I do say, Sir, that it is unfortunate that sometimes the suggestion creeps in that St. John's is not interested, and that the Opposition is not interested. The Opposition is very interested. This question of the fishery is not one that is not new. This question has plagued every government since we have had Responsible Government. Is this Bill the answer to it? I don't know. The fishery question is possibly the hardest and most intricate question that has

ever been discussed in this country (I suppose in the absence of the Premier it is all right to say "country.")

The Bill itself, one gathers, is a by-product of the Walsh Report. Now when the Honourable the Premier was speaking I think at some stage in every one of the five days when he did speak, he referred to the Walsh Report as "That great document." Indeed Mr. Speaker, long before this debate last year, those of us who were in the House will remember the most elaborate introduction, the extravagant description that the Premier gave of the Walsh Report. I remember quite clearly now his explaining to us how he had to go away and lock himself up so that he could read it undisturbed; and he warned everybody that it was not a document which could be easily understood. I doubt it very much if a Philadelphia Lawyer would understand it. I am quite frank enough to admit that I know of at least one St. John's Lawyer who does not pretend to have taken in all the implications. But one would get the impression from the build-up that was given this thing that never before had there been an investigation into the fishery problem. Whilst I don't lay claim, Mr. Speaker, to being a very keen student of history, even very little research would let any one know that as far back as 1880 there was a fishery development committee. Their report is still on file. That report was at the time not a particularly optimistic one. The principal thing, if one could follow the reports of it as given in the papers of the day, the principal findings of that committee were a restatement of the fundamental principle that the quantity of production must be tied up to the de-

mands of the market. Now that principle is fundamental in any form of economic enterprise. It is so fundamental that even I can understand it myself, Mr. Speaker. And I propose later on in my few remarks to revert to the question of marketing. Sir, that was in 1880. Now in 1937 there was another committee, headed by the late Honourable Mr. Justice Kent, which did a lot of investigating. It is a very fortunate thing, for the Government of this country that we have judges of the Supreme Court, because, it seems that every time a particularly thorny problem comes up there seems to be a judge of the Supreme Court available. I can well understand why it is that the Government has such reverence and respect for the "Lordship" but the Kent Report itself recommended a modernization of the system of production. It made what at that time was regarded as rather advanced thinking when it made the suggestion that the future of the fisheries might probably be in fresh fish rather than in salt fish.

Now the Kent Report, like the Walsh Report, was a very exhaustive study of the situation as it then was. I don't propose to go into it, but, as I understand the report, it seemed the basic thought they got out of their investigations, was that the days of the salt codfishery, the great days of the salt codfishery, if one could call it that, seemed to have been on the decline; and that the future lay in fresh rather than in salt fish. It was subsequent to the publication of the Kent Report that the first real exporting of fresh fish began. Now the Kent Report was published in 1937. There was then some implementation of the proposals contained in that report, but nothing was done

in a large way until sometime in the late season of 1943, when the Commission of Government, which had been in power since 1934, began to look to the fishery as a possible aid to Britain during the war.

In 1944 Commissioner P. D. H. Dunne announced in a broadcast speech the Commission of Government's Scheme for the fisheries. Mr. Dunne was the gentleman, who amongst other things, introduced a brand that is still in popular demand; i.e., a very popular brand of rum. But Mr. Dunne is remembered for other things than his "Trouters' Special," Mr. Speaker, because it was Mr. Dunne who brought forth this scheme, which in very many particulars might be said to have the advance copy of the Walsh Report. There are recommendations in the Walsh Report that are almost word for word, at least thought for thought, as found in the Dunne Report. Mr. Dunne suggested a fishery development programme which would be centred around fresh fish. He suggested locating these centres in some fifteen places around the Island. It is true he did not name the places such as La Scie, Quirpon, but he named other places. It is peculiar enough that in these very places he had in mind, and for which he had the same type of development in mind, i.e., they were going to have wharves and plants, and they were going to be made into townships, very much along the lines spoken of by the Premier.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable gentleman tell us what year Mr. Dunne made these suggestions?

MR. HIGGINS: In 1944, in a

radio address. I think it was January 21. I am not sure of the exact date, but I know the year was 1944.

Indeed when one goes back to the Dunne Report and to its proposals the similarity in thinking is so very marked that one almost wonders if the present Fishery Development Authority is not really the Dunne Plan dressed up in post-war verbage. It is true that Mr. Dunne, at the time he made his announcement over the radio, was not an elected member of the people. He was a civil servant. He had a secure position. He did not have to go back to the people and say; "Well, this is our plan. It is a good plan, and we want you to re-elect us because it is a good plan." No, Mr. Dunne was secure. Mr. Dunne could afford to say, we the Commission of Government have examined this problem. This is our considered opinion, and this is what we are going to do. Mr. Dunne, as I said, could afford to outline his scheme in very blunt, (very stilted, at times) language. The people of 1944 were not privileged to have the Dunne Scheme outlined with the colour, and imagination that has accompanied the presentation of the Walsh Report and this particular Bill into the House. But, I say, Mr. Speaker, that when one compares the two plans the basic principles are remarkably similar. Now that brings me to a point.

The Premier, in one portion of his address, wandered, having told us all the wonders that were going to be done, then he dropped down on the lower level and became almost conservative in his thinking for a moment. I say conservatively with a small "c," and he said, "Of course it may be that this plan has come too late, maybe this plan should have been

brought in five years ago, and if it should be found now that it is too late it is only fate catching up with Newfoundland." Now, Mr. Speaker I take it that when this Government took over in 1949 from the Commission of Government that it had available to it all the information which the Commission of Government had garnered during its years of office. It had available to it the very report of which I am speaking now, the Dunne Report. If that scheme were sound in 1944, if that ground work were available to the present Government in 1949, if the points that I have outlined in the Dunne Report were in fact there and were known to the government in 1949, how can the Government now turn around and say—we could not go ahead before; we did not have the information. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that any impartial observer will find in the Dunne Report these very things I have said existed in it, these very suggestions of centralization of the people into some fifteen places around the country the same suggestion of the development of these places into townships. The Government said—"we did not know it before and could not have done it before, and if it is too late don't blame us." I say, Mr. Speaker, that excuse is not sound and does not hold water.

If these proposals were in the Dunne Report, and I say they were, then the Government had them available to them. If they did not think they were worthwhile why are they now suddenly so valuable in 1954? That is a very moot question. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be forced to the conclusion that the Walsh Report, and I say this without reflecting in any way upon the gentlemen who comprise that

committee, surely we are not going to be forced to conclude that the Walsh Report is merely an elaborate re-examination of the same question answered by the Dunne Report with a few additions meeting problems that have come up since? Is the answer, Mr. Speaker, that the Government had this information in 1949, but that the Government was so obsessed with economic development that it merely postponed the question of fishery development? Is that the explanation? May I suggest, that may very well be the answer to the question, because if these facts were known to the Government, if these proposals were available to the Government, and they were, I suggest that they might well have been put into operation on a limited scale long before there was any necessity for convening the Walsh Committee.

When we look back and find the feverish flurry of activity that went on in the early years of this Government's life, when we find that everybody was told that the country was going to be re-shaped, that there were going to be increases all over the place, it is very easy for one to think that the fisheries were in fact neglected, although the means for their assistance were available, or the suggestions for them and their improvement were available, because the Government was not interested in the fisheries but was interested in economic development. On that point, Mr. Speaker, somewhere, I don't hope to try and find out just at what stage, the Premier said various things because he was talking so long, but somewhere in his speech he did express misgivings as to whether the Government would be able to get the men to go back fishing now. Well that feeling may be very well rooted in the Premier's mind because cer-

tain it is that in the first few years when economic development was the theme, the fisheries were certainly put into the background, and the people were encouraged to forget the fisheries.

Now I don't want to resurrect old sores, because they apply equally on both sides of the House, I am told, but there can be no doubt that certain people at certain times during the early years of this Government's life did say to their people—you are better off on the land, working in the factories or working in new jobs, and that was the general feeling. There was no one member who said that. That was the general impression that was given to our people—forget the fishery—go out and make your quick buck—go to Goose Bay. Go to Seven Islands. Get your cash wages. Don't be kidding yourself, depending on a price in the fall. Mr. Speaker, that philosophy was deliberately fostered among our people. Now the Government expresses misgivings. The Government may well express these misgivings, because the Government has largely created that type of thinking.

Now to get back to Mr. Dunne and his proposals: Mr. Dunne expressed his ideas in recommending the setting up of these fifteen central ports and what they would have. Mind you we must not forget that Mr. Dunne was not interested in sentiment. He was not interested in traditions of Newfoundland. He was simply a civil servant sent out here to run this crowd of blacks or blue noses or whatnots. He was sent out from London to run this country as cheaply as he could. Well, one of Mr. Dunne's ideas was that quickly they should get these people into ten or a dozen or fifteen centralized places, allowing



them to cut the expense of maintaining services to small settlements. They would have to give them one post office instead of a half dozen post offices and a half dozen postmasters in half a dozen places—get them all into one place and cut down our expenses.

That same idea is still sound today. The thing about it is this—and I will later come to a point made by the honourable member for White Bay—the only thing about that, Mr. Dunne's thinking was predicted solely on the blueprint that he had drawn up for himself. It did not take into account the feelings or desires or home ties of our people. It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, to say: "You shall go from your own place and live somewhere else because you are going to be better off." You cannot dispose of the human element quite as easily as that, Mr. Speaker. You have to take into consideration that the Newfoundlanders are cross grained enough to say that this is where our family lived for the past hundred years and this is where I am going to live. If you get that situation repeated in too many places your whole scheme is seriously affected. So that it is not simply a matter of proving to yourself by a set of figures that such and such is the most desirable scheme. You have got to settle it to the people's satisfaction. And I do say, Mr. Speaker, that not the least of the difficulties in this new scheme is going to be to convince our people that they will be better off by moving out of the place where they have lived, and where their fathers and grandfathers lived all down through the years, and move them into some place where they will have electric light and sewerage and bowling alleys and beer parlours. They

can be just cross-grained enough, Mr. Speaker, not to want it. They may be satisfied with the way things are going. These are imponderables which of course it is really pointless to discuss at this stage, other than to revert to them as things that unfortunately will have to be considered as we go along.

Now, Mr. Dunne, in connection with these ports, envisaged frozen fish, frozen fillets, filleting plants as the main product of that type of fishery. These plants would be geared to use all sorts of fish in season. In other words, Mr. Dunne said, you will get cod at such and such a time, and other fish at such and such a time. Mr. Dunne used that in just ordinary parlance. Today the Premier describes that type of thing as an in-balanced operation. Now that is what I mean, Sir, when I say that one is tempted to wonder if the Walsh Report and the advocacy of it in this House by the members of the Government is not really the old Dunne Report dressed up in 1954 wording, because Mr. Dunne had exactly the same idea as the Premier, but he would never in his wildest dream refer to it as an in-balanced operation. The principle is the same. The idea is the same. It is just in the way that it is expressed that it is different. Mr. Dunne in his talk hazarded the point that the inshore fishery alone would not provide a steady supply of all kinds of fish for these plants. His idea was that some of the fishermen were going to take up deep sea fishing. Now he did not, and probably was not advanced enough, he did not speak of Danish Seiners or long liners. His idea was draggers.

Now basically, and I run the risk of the Minister later mowing me

down, but basically the principle was the same whether they got their fish by way of dragnets or by way of Danish Seiners. That is immaterial. The idea was that the yield of the inshore fishery would not of itself be sufficient, and would have to be supplemented by deep sea fishing. Then, Mr. Speaker, he went on to discuss the financial angle of the operation.

Now it must be borne in mind that this was ten years ago, in 1944. Mr. Dunne's figure was not fifty nor a hundred million. Mr. Dunne, as I said, was an English Civil Servant, a conservative fellow. He said; "I believe this thing could be done, could be financed for an outlay of fifteen million dollars." But here is where we come to the radical difference between Mr. Dunne's type of thinking and that which prevails in today's Liberal Government. Mr. Dunne, a cautious fellow, suggested that the government would only put up about four million and the remainder would come from private enterprise. If anybody were to suggest that today, I imagine the Government would look at him much as though he were cracked, because this Government, does not believe in private enterprise. All it wants is a fellow to come along with the scheme and say, we will give you the money. No objections. Dole it out to you, my son, and the crazier the scheme the better. I imagine if any of our friends in the Government were to read Mr. Dunne's report and see that on the money angle he said that we can do it for fifteen million by government assistance or investment is going to be limited to slightly more than 25%, they would say that it is a good thing we got clear of the Commission of Government. That man must have been

cracked. He wanted people to spend their own money—that is not good government. Certainly not, we have to be elected. Ask the people to invest their own money? No, the government will do it for you. There is no doubt about it, Sir, Mr. Dunne would be a minor leaguer in today's operations. Anyway, Mr. Dunne's scheme did have an effect on the production of fresh fish for export. I am afraid I have not got the statistics, but I do know that the production of fresh fish jumped tremendously between 1943-44 and 1948. I have no doubt that my honourable friend, the Minister of Fisheries, has got these figures, but subject to correction by him, I would venture to say that the export of fresh fish at least doubled in that period between 1943 and 1948. It went on to say, some ten million pounds to at least twenty million—these figures are approximate. But in that period from 1944 to 1949 the Commission of Government made about three million dollars worth of loans to companies interested in fresh fishery development. And since 1949, here again I speak subject to correction, the present Government spent approximately the same amount and maybe slightly more, but certainly nothing in excess of five million dollars. But now we are being committed, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have been committed since June 1953 to this new scheme for the fisheries. This scheme which places high limits on the authority of the fishery development group itself, I think they have the right to borrow up to twenty-five million dollars. That is undoubtedly a very much larger sum than we have or that the Government has previously committed itself to for any form of aid to the fisheries. In-

deed the only thing quite like it was the amount of money that the Government extended in creation of new industries. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the fishery.

As I say, we would all like to see the fisheries resuscitated, indeed it is not a matter of liking, we can't afford not to see them. But if the criterion of the success of this venture is going to be the measure of success that attends the ten million dollar expenditure in economic development then I say that the Premier's estimate of a fifty-fifty prospect of success is generous. One does not want to flog a dead horse, but certain it is that twenty million dollars that went into economic development has not yet manifested itself by way of any steady return. We are told that the Premier himself is quite satisfied that in time all these industries will be a success. I hope so, Sir, but in the meantime with that money gone we are now faced with the prospect of committing another amount. We have been told that twenty-five million dollars is by no means the end of the amount that is going to be spent on this scheme, and that it may reach a hundred million over a period of years. I do say, Mr. Speaker, that to expend that amount of money on that type of thing without more thorough investigation seems to me to be following the rather peculiar precedent of the economic development. It has just occurred to me, I was reading an old paper the other night which was referring to government assistance. I think that was from a paper known as the "Evening Telegram" which is published in St. John's. It is not required reading for this House, I understand, but away back on the 17th of May 1929, Dr. Campbell, M.H.A. introduced a Bill for a fran-

chise for a company known as the Newfoundland Wool and Silk Mills. One of the promoters was E. Collishaw. It stated that the mill will employ three hundred persons. The government is to put up a guarantee up to twelve thousand dollars a year for the next fifteen years. We have been told, Sir, that everything that happened in this country happened under the tenure of office of the Liberal Government—that was economic development in these far off days of 1929.

MR. CURTIS: And it was a Liberal Government.

MR. HIGGINS: I don't know what happened to Mr. Collishaw. History has recorded it. But I won't go into that. But in these days the Liberal Government is prepared to finance anybody on any kind of wild-cat scheme. However, I have strayed from my point, Sir.

Now, I don't propose, because at the outset I stated my lack of qualifications. I hope and trust that they have not been proven too clearly as yet, but I don't propose to attempt to analyse all the implications of this Bill. But there are certain aspects of the legislation which are novel, the powers to expropriate land are covered in section 27 and section 28 and section 29, and they certainly are rather sweeping. Section 27 proposes that whenever the Authority deems it necessary to acquire any land for the purpose of carrying on any undertaking under this act for any purpose incidental or related thereto, or for the purpose of assisting or encouraging the establishment or development of any fishing enterprise by any persons or for any purpose incidental or related thereto, and the owner of the land refuses to accept the sum tend-

ered by the Authority for the land or for any other reason the Authority deems it advisable to do so, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may expropriate the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, as I say, a very sweeping power. It is almost, and my honourable friend the Attorney General or any honourable member of the Government will agree with me, that type of verbage is what you find in a company. In other words, if the Fisheries Authority or any person who is interested and gets the ear of the Fisheries Authority decides La Scie is going to be a big place and wants to put up a beer parlour and goes to the Authority and says; Bill Smith got a place down there and he and his family have been there for the last fifty years. But I think a beer parlour would be a nice adjunct to the development of the town. The Authority could go to Bill Smith and say:

"Here is a hundred dollars. We are taking your house." And the foolish fellow says: "No. I don't want to give up my house." "It does not matter whether you want to or not, we are taking it."

MR. CURTIS: Surely my honourable friend does not sincerely think that he would as a lawyer advise anybody that his right to take the property for a beer parlour could be brought under that section.

MR. HIGGINS: I say, with this Government, maybe it would be brought under any section, I make no apology. That power is in that Act for any purpose related to the development of any area. And we have been told that part of the things to be provided for all is the amenities of civilization for this town. And

amenities, according to declared policy of this Government, provide provision of amusement centres, places of recreation. I do say I have sufficient faith in, shall we say the discretion of the Government, that I don't think they would take a man's house to make room for a beer parlour. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, the power is there. However, that is only one part of section 28. It goes on to show how the person is notified. And then under Section 29, "The Authority shall make compensation to the owner of any land expropriated under this Act or to the owner of any land used or injuriously affected by expropriation for all damages necessarily resulting from the exercise of the powers given under subsections (1) and (2) of Section 28 and in all cases any advantage which the owner may derive or likely to derive directly or indirectly from the contemplated work and operations shall be taken into account in reduction of the compensation."

(2) The amount of compensation to be paid shall be ascertained by the Board of Assessors which shall consist of three persons one of whom shall be the chairman of the Board, who shall be appointed by the Authority, and the other two of whom shall be appointed, one by the Authority and the other by the owner of the land, and if the owner refuses or neglects to appoint an assessor within thirty days after being required by the Authority in writing so to do, or if the owner cannot be found or is incapable of appointing an assessor, the Authority may appoint the third as assessor."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, they are setting up this business to assess the compensation a man is entitled to. The Chairman is appointed by the

Authority and one member is appointed by the Authority and one is the owner's representative.

MR. CURTIS: Is that not much better than what happened in the case of Pepperrell?

MR. HIGGINS: I don't know of any one complaint at Fort Pepperrell. Although they were named by the Government of Newfoundland and not by the people expropriating. The Government of Newfoundland expropriated and were getting paid back. They did name the three people. But in those days the Government of Newfoundland was not creating the Authority taking over there.

MR. SPEAKER: If I might break in on the conversation which has developed: I might suggest this point might be more properly taken up in the committee stage.

MR. HIGGINS: But, Mr. Speaker, I am enjoying myself. You would not spoil that? As I say, and I won't labour this point, the authority given here is too sweeping. The position here is that the people who are doing the expropriation are appointing two of the appraisers. The findings of the board presumably will be made by a majority finding, so that the owner of the land may find himself in the position that he does lose his property without his side of the question being considered, and, sub-section 6, Sir, provides:

"The assessors are deemed to be assessors and not arbitrators and their finding or the finding of any two of them shall be deemed to be the award of the Board of Assessors and is final in all cases."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, I suggest, a very sweeping authority and

a one-sided authority. That, Sir, brings me to the question of compensation, and what I regard as a very important contribution to this debate on this subject made by the honourable member for White Bay. Indeed that honourable gentleman—I am sorry he is not in the House today—but it struck me that his words of caution to the Government would entitle him to that place, which of course he is always welcome to accept, on this side of the House. Because, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for White Bay made certain points (and I have clipped the press report out so that I would not be too far astray. But I never heard him yet complain of being misquoted. I take it I am on fairly safe grounds in referring to the speech he was reported to have made). He did make five suggestions to the Government, of items which he felt should be considered very seriously in the course of the administration of the Authority. The first one was the matter of compensation for abandoned property. In other words if people are shifted from one location to another—when I say shifted I don't mean shifted in the sense that the Acadians were driven out—but if people are induced, put it that way, whether by the pull of gravity or the lure of the machine, to go somewhere, what compensation, (and I did use the word induced not seduced) what compensation are they to be given for the property they have given up; now that is apart altogether from the question of land that is taken. As I understood the honourable gentleman he was referring to people who left their homes, left everything there, so to speak, other than their movable property, and moved, say, to La Scie. Are you going to compensate that man for

what he has given up, the land he has tilled, the house he has lived in?

The second point he made was—what happens if a man gets settled in this new place and settles his family and then before he can re-establish himself and pay off what he owes he dies? These are, I think, the two most important points. He did refer to other things; he felt that the Government should investigate this matter more thoroughly and come up with a better odds that fifty-fifty. He thought they should try and gear the percentage of the chances of success a little more heavily in favour of the scheme.

His fourth point was of course not acceptable to some other learned members. He suggested that he would rather see it at St. Anthony rather than at Quirpon for it was a bigger centre.

Fifthly he made what can only be generally accepted as a most reasonable suggestion, i.e., that during the time that this Authority is learning how to work the fishermen be not allowed to starve, and that some measure of price support will have to be continued.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these points are very well made, and they are points that deserve the serious attention of the Government. With the type of development that is envisaged there are a lot of complications that can set in. It is all very fine for the Government to say we are going at such and such a place to set up an unbalanced operation. Is that going to mean that fishermen who have just done shore fishing all their lives are going to be told you can no longer fish solely in the inshore fishery, you must be prepared to go

out in trawlers or long liners or something else? It is not too easy, Mr. Speaker, to change the habits of a lifetime. And I predict that the Government is going to find some difficulty in making its blueprint be entirely acceptable to the fishermen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one section of this Bill which to me is more important than any of the others i.e., sub-section (c) of paragraph 13.

"The Authority shall investigate existing and potential markets and marketing methods for produce of the fisheries and, where necessary, undertake such research and promotion as it deems desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to these products."

That, Mr. Speaker, I feel is the most pressing job that this Authority will have to tackle. All the other things are important, but without markets where are we? We can spend millions on experiments of one kind or another. We can build all these model towns. We may invent or devise artificial fish driers that will produce fish just as good as the uncured product. We can do all these things, but unless we can profitably sell what we produce, what will it all be worth? Mr. Speaker, we are right back to the question posed by the Fishery Development Committee of 1880. We must realize the fact that the quantity of production must be geared to the market demands.

Mr. Dunne—and I finally found Mr. Dunne's Speech. It was a radio address delivered by Hon. P. D. H. Dunne, O.B.E., Commissioner for Natural Resources, Jan. 21, 1944. The source is the Legislative Library of Newfoundland. I shall read the first paragraph: "The purpose of this



address is to lay before the people of Newfoundland the proposals of the Government for dealing with the re-organization of the fisheries in the postwar period."

MR. SPENCER: Is there nothing as to why they did not implement the policy?

MR. HIGGINS: There was some suggestion Mr. Dunne was speaking for himself. This little thing, Sir, which I cannot table because it belongs to the library, now purports to be the proposals of the Commission of Government, and as such, I take it, can be regarded as the considered opinion of that body at that time. The gentleman says in his pamphlet:

"We must avoid the lazy assumption that all requires to be done is to set up a vast organization for producing certain kinds of fishery products and that then Newfoundland's troubles will vanish. In fish production, processing and distribution many things can be done, but if they are to be of permanent value these must be done economically and at a price which will enable the product to be sold at competitive prices in the foreign markets, and at a profit." Now that principle was recognized by Mr. Dunne. But, as I said, it was only a re-statement of the principle of the first fishery development committee of 1880.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do say that, in my incompetent opinion (I don't profess to be competent to express an informed opinion on the fisheries. I might, like Bill Rodgers, only know what I see in the papers) for what it is worth, markets come first. The economy of any industry must be based on what the markets want, and on our ability to supply the demand

with profit to the fishermen. It does appear that at the present time the filleting industry may be reaching the point where production capacity will be equalled by any presently foreseeable demand. As far as the salt codfishery is concerned, I believe that we can sell more salt codfish, but only if existing exchange restrictions are abolished or moderated by certain consumer countries. Now, as I say, I am not sufficiently versed in the intricacies of exchange. I do think, however, that the Honourable Minister of Fisheries will agree with the statement that, in the present condition of international exchange, our foreign markets for salt codfish are seriously restricted. The likelihood of our increasing our sales of salt codfish in these markets is conditional on a moderation of the exchange conditions presently in existence. Then again these markets will only open up to us if we can supply a standardized product at lower prices. That is, we must reduce our cost of production before we can make larger sales, and we must give a standardized product.

To get back to the fresh fish filleting industry: Up to the present time, although the Government has assisted many firms by way of loans, the greater part of the financing has been done by private enterprise. Now I am not going into the "Breaded Sticks" field because breaded sticks are a very recent development and the extent of government assistance there is not known, but we do have reason to think that it has been substantial. In the filleting industry the government has helped but private enterprise has largely gone ahead as well. Now in this field the Government can be of real assistance in the question of exploration of outlets and

combined with that in a study of kinds of fish food presently being accepted by our consumer countries, and the prospects of introducing new fishery products into these countries.

Now, the Premier did say, and say very properly and reasonably that one of the things which this Fishery Authority would set up would be some form of laboratory. I think he did not overestimate the necessity of and the importance of that. I don't attempt to emulate his flights of fancy in his description of it, but I do say that one of the primary tasks which this Fishery Development Authority should undertake is the provision of or the acquisition of first class industrial chemists who can experiment with every possible aspect of the utilization of fish as a basic raw material. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is just as well for us to face up to the situation as it exists in this country today with employment only on defence projects and employment in construction on a large scale is definitely declining. It is going to decline. It is not too long ago that we saw in the papers and heard over the radio that down at Pepperrell there is going to be a cut back in the number of people employed, and Pepperrell and the American Bases generally have been a major source of employment. Most of these people have come from the fishery and are people who were formerly employed in the fishery and went on to construction work and defence work because it meant the ready dollar. It meant the cash money at the end of the week instead of waiting until the fishery wound up in the fall. As these jobs close thousands and thousands of our people will be left with no alternative but to go back to the fishery. In the meantime while this

thing is getting underway you will have to adopt various expediences, maybe price support or maybe a variety of things. But it seems to me that market research and exchange moderations are the only safe road to follow for a cure of the fishery problem, and they are vital factors in the success of this programme.

Now, there are other aspects of this thing, Mr. Speaker, such as the question of remuneration of the members of the Authority. These are things that may properly be debated in committee. I don't agree with a lot of things that were said by the Premier. I don't agree with his remarks on the fish merchants, I think that may be very good politics but it is very poor statesmanship, it is only dividing our small community into two camps, because we must not lose sight of the fact that this country is only a little dot out in the Atlantic. It is not a huge country where you can afford to say, as he has done, that east is one and west another. We are all together and unless we do go along together, Sir, we have no hope. I cannot see the common sense of setting one place or one district of the community against the other. I can't see the necessity of singling out these unfortunates as doing nothing but going to Bally Haly and going to cocktail parties. I have never missed a cocktail party, to which I have been invited in recent years, and any one I go to, Sir, I am up to my hips in cabinet ministers. But I don't think that is anything against their character, they are just the same fine people all the time. I don't think this fact that one attends cocktail parties can be regarded as a yardstick by which to assess one's contribution to the community as a whole.

In closing, Sir, I would just refer to

a broadcast I heard the other night over that fine, fair radio station CJON. It was on Sunday past at 9:00 o'clock when Mr. Max Lane met the press. The press consisting of two gentlemen, Mr. Don Jamieson, who is known to us all; and Mr. Jeff Stirling. Certain questions were put and Mr. Lane was asked what he thought of the Fishery Development Authority. He said, I hope it will succeed, we all do.

He was asked, what did he think of the prospects of success, and he very properly and very wisely refused to commit himself, but he did say that his people (and by his people he meant the Federation of Fishermen) were willing to give their support to the thought behind the Fishery Development Bill. He did, however, express the hope that time would be taken to consider all the problems of the fishery. He said, "You know sometimes we rush into schemes. I would like to see the Fishery Development Authority act on its own rather than act as a medium whereby people may be able to get money for their own schemes. Some schemes look grand on paper but I have seen such schemes and when they are tried out they are miserable."

Mr. Speaker, that is the approach that we all, I submit, must take to these questions of the Fishery Authority. This is not a time for rushing madly into this, building here and building there, slapping out money hand over fist. This is a time to make haste slowly. This is the time, Sir, I do suggest with all respect for experimentation, the money that is going to be spent in the implementation of this thing is money that has to be borrowed. We have not the money to pay for it. The Government has not. They have got to borrow it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the light of our earlier experience in investing money (and I use "investing" now charitably) in investing money in economic development I do say that before this Government asks this House to be a party to raising more money to be spent in fishery development we should have some assurance that it is going to be money that will be spent not in one glorious spree but money that will be spent wisely in the experimentation and in the organization generally of this thing; money that will only be spent on a large scale when the investigations of the Authority have shown a guaranteed chance of success. When I say guaranteed I mean a chance better than fifty-fifty. Fifty-fifty may be the gambler's chance. Fifty-fifty is too reminiscent of "Make or Break," "Survive or Perish." We cannot afford to spend money in a pursuit of that philosophy.

I do say, Mr. Speaker, there are in this Bill many, very many good things. We of the Opposition can support the principle of the Bill with reservations along the lines that we have all intimated.

I do finally, Sir, congratulate the Minister again on what to me at least was the most lucid presentation and discussion of the whole topic. I assure him that on this side of the House we wish him well in his endeavours. As long as we are satisfied he is proceeding conservatively we will be with him.

MR. I. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the honourable member for St. John's East, and it gives me very much pleasure to adjourn the debate.

Motion carried.

Second reading of Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with the Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of this debate yesterday I had nearly completed the remarks that I had in mind to make, but I might briefly recapitulate:

First, the agreement made in 1929 was for twenty years and expired in 1949. That agreement provided for payment by the company of ten cents a ton on the first million tons of ore produced and for three cents a ton on the excess of one million tons. That agreement gave the company exemption from income tax and also gave the company exemption from all other taxation, and limited the contributions of the company to the community of Bell Island, to ten thousand dollars taxation in the case of their having a town council, and provided for the payment of four thousand dollars a year to the Department of Public Works for road improvement.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we had the tax agreement which Newfoundland signed with Ottawa in 1949. Under that agreement we were unable to continue to collect a royalty from the Bell Island Company and we were limited to a tax known as the Mining Tax Act. That tax was originally a tax of five per cent. We endeavoured as far as we could to secure the right from the Federal Government to continue to collect a royalty from the Bell Island Operation but in that we were not successful because the Tax Agreement which we had signed had

to be similar to that signed between Ottawa and all the other provinces, and any amendment on one would automatically open the door for the amendment of every other tax agreement.

Unfortunately in the tax agreement royalties were limited to royalties payable with respect to mines which were still owned by the Government and leased to the operators. In the case of Bell Island the company owned it freehold, and therefore, royalties could not be collected.

When, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we did put in a Mining Tax Act of five per cent, we found that as a result of the 1950 operation of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company that their taxation based on a five per cent income basis brought in less than \$31,000 actually \$30,264.00. At the Session of the House of Assembly which took place in 1951 we increased the Mining Tax Act retroactively from five per cent to twenty-five per cent, putting however a ceiling saying that in no case should the Dominion Iron and Steel Company be called upon to pay more than ten cents for the first million and a half tons and eight cents for the additional tonnage. As a result in that year instead of collecting thirty thousand dollars we collected in all \$105,000 and the amount was subsequently paid by the company. In the year 1951 the company's obligation to the Newfoundland Government was, under this Mining Tax Act, \$156,000 and that amount was paid early in 1952. But for the years 1952 and 1953 we collected nothing because the company during these two years lost between two hundred and fifty thousand and three hundred thousand dollars.

Under the proposed legislation now

the agreement we propose will be retroactive, and one of the first amounts due under that agreement will be a payment of \$350,000 by the company, representing the years 1952 and 1953. In other words we will receive not only ten cents for the first million and a half tons and eight cents for the excess tonnage during the present year, but we will receive it for the years 1952 and 1953.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is not desirous for us at this moment to sign this agreement, and therefore, the Bill before the House enables the government to sign it, and the government will only sign it when it has received final authority from Ottawa. We need that authority because, if this is a taxation which they will not permit us to collect under the Tax Rental Agreement it is no good to us, because if we collect the tax, they will only deduct the equivalent amount from the amount payable to us under that agreement. On the other hand the company will not sign it unless the company in its turn is assured that it will be allowed to deduct the amount paid to us as an operating expense of the company.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think I can safely recommend this legislation to the House, and I move the second reading of this bill.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I have been told there is no reason why we should have any objection to this, except in so far as the minister has just explained, we are not sure whether we are allowed to collect such a tax. It seems to me a rather strange thing to ask the House to give authority to enter into an agreement under some scheme whereby we know not whether we have the right to enter into such a scheme.

I see no objection to giving the government authority to collect money from this company especially in view of the fact that they have been able to get away without taxes for the last couple of years. That brings me back in memory to the taxation which was originally supposed to go on the development of the iron ore in Labrador. I think there the stipulation was that we were to receive five per cent of the net profits. In the first instance it was ten cents a ton and later it was amended by the Commission of Government to five per cent of the net profit. I have almost continuously tried to point out that it is almost impossible to collect money on such a taxation as that five per cent on the net profit from any company digging out of the ground. It is the steel companies who make the big profits afterwards. If we had some way of getting five per cent from the steel companies we could probably get some revenue.

In this case I think the effort to obtain a certain number of cents per ton is certainly right. I don't think any of us have any objection to getting what money we can. On the other hand we have to remember that the company itself manifested last year that it could not pay any taxation without upsetting the company and consequently upsetting the earning power of two thousand men employed there. Therefore, the government would have to use a little caution.

It has been drawn to my attention by the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West that we are asked to make this retroactive to the 1st of January, 1950, which fact, I believe, the minister has already pointed out, and that we would thus collect two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand dollars.

Personally I see nothing wrong with it. The only objection I have is that the government seems to have asked the House to give them authority to do something which they know not whether they have the authority to do. That is rather strange. What I mean is that we are giving them the authority to do something which may be impossible for them to even attempt. That is the only objection I have to this Bill. I support the general principle.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the Attorney General introduced the Bill and only heard part of what he had to say. Having read the provisions of the Bill coupled with the fact that it is retroactive and there is some talk about the company having an expenditure of six million dollars during the next two or three years, I would like the Attorney General when he replies to tell us if there has been any negotiation with this company along these lines, or whether this whole thing is going to be put up to them with an ultimatum, saying, this is what we want you to sign and you have to sign it. Does the company know anything about this at all? You see the way legislation is brought in here and not published in the press; the ordinary public has not any idea of the bills going through the House at all, and I don't think there is any organized body to study the legislation that is being brought before the House, and nobody knows, no matter what his interest is in a particular bill—

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member has a right at this time to criticize the procedure of the House.

MR. BROWNE: Why not, Mr. Speaker? I think that is my privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on the second reading of a bill, however.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I am criticizing this particular measure, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly the measure, not the method.

MR. BROWNE: Well, if it is correct that the company knows nothing about that agreement, and there has been no negotiations, how can we go to the company and say to them: Here is a measure we want to be retroactive to over four years.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member knows very well that is not the point I was referring to. Continue your speech!

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was only making a comparison to the way this bill was introduced. I did not hear the minister say, and I understood the company concerned may not be consulted regarding the provisions.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I object to the honourable member talking out of turn. He was not here when I spoke, and I said the company had been asking for this legislation since 1950, I said that they have been asking for this agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly. If the honourable member were not present he has no right to infer certain things he did not hear.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker if the Attorney General advises us now this has been negotiated—But I understood, or drew the conclusion that it had not been consulted at all—If it has been then, of course, what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said, should go without saying.



DR. ROWE: There is one point, Mr. Speaker, which perhaps I might contribute to this debate: That five per cent profit is an excellent thing when everybody is making a profit, and especially during the early years of the Korean war when most of the mining companies were making a profit. Last year, I believe, for a while the bottom went out of the metal market, and most of the mining companies last year, especially the last six months, had deficits, not only in Newfoundland but everywhere, some of them very heavy. As a matter of fact that was true to such an extent that I did hear of a number of mines that had to close down in British Columbia, that is a number of marginal mines that had been operating at a small profit during the early part of the Korean War, and in fact during the course of the Korean War, closed down across Canada—especially in the base metals, because the bottom went right out of the base metal markets. I am not sure, but I don't think any operators in Newfoundland showed any profit at all during the last six months, and I think that is true right across Canada.

As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition pointed out, if we could get at the people who manufacture the lead, zinc, etc., then we would have something.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Honourable the Attorney General to say that the company has been requesting this type of legislation? Are we to understand that they are familiar with this Bill?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry my honourable friend was not here when I was speaking because I did say that immediately after the expiration of the twenty-year agreement

in 1949 the company got after us to renew the agreement and that we were not prepared to renew it, as we did not know exactly where we were under the Tax Rental Agreement, and we felt that there might be some objections to our collecting the tax. We put on the Mining Tax Act thinking that would do the trick, but it did not. We even increased the amount in the Act from five to twenty-five per cent so that we could get money out of them, but that did not do it. So we have come back to the position where we want to get that money—We feel that a mine that is taking millions of tons of ore out of our territory every year should pay a taxation. With this agreement worked as it is now that can be achieved. In fact it has been intimated to us that agreement will be acceptable but we have not that as yet copperfastened, we have not got it from the Federal Government in black and white, and we do not want to sign anything or have anything signed in black and white until we know exactly where we get off. I think possibly in view of the fact that this is not an income tax we are collecting but a royalty which is in lieu of all taxes, on these grounds we may be able to get it from Ottawa—that is in view of the fact that it is a payment in lieu of any taxation. So that we are keeping our fingers crossed. Just as soon as we hear from Ottawa, and if this House gives it approval, we will execute this agreement, but we will not execute it until we are sure, Mr. Speaker. We do not want to have to wait until next year because the company will naturally only want to sign and pass us three hundred thousand dollars if they are sure we are authorized to act.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this bill.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bills:

(1) "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

(2) "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

(3) "An Act to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

(4) "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with the British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons."

(Honourable Member for Green Bay Chairman of Committee:)

"An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read:

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I should like the minister to explain to the committee what is intended under paragraph 3, sub-section 2:

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): I take it, Mr. Chairman, that is this reference to "All persons in an Area." If in a certain area a firm in this area having an apprenticeship agreement, that agreement is set up by an employer and employees committee—then any person in that plant, other than a registered apprentice, would have to have a certification of qualifications, and no such person would be employed in that plant other than an apprentice or a certified person. It does not mean that people working in these plants, etc., will now be certified or apprentices, but nobody would be hired on there unless they are given a permit by the Board or by the advisory committee. I may

say in every industry where we have an apprenticeship agreement we have an advisory board in that industry chosen from the employees and the employer. These are the ones who set up these and suggested these recommendations, etc., and they have all gone over this so often they are more familiar with it actually than I am, but that is the purpose there, Mr. Chairman—It applies in any area or any plant where they have an apprenticeship agreement, other than those who are operating there and those with a permit and those who have gone through an apprenticeship training, persons would not be employed unless they had a permit to do so.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, that is not quite clear to me. The minister's explanation has it to mean an area.—Just what does an area mean? Does it mean an area like the City of St. John's or a town in which any trade operated? If for instance St. John's, Corner Brook and Grand Falls are designated as areas and certified for and certain designated trades could operate, does it mean that after the passing of this section that a tradesman such as a carpenter would have to have a permit from the Board to go to work, or does it not? What does it mean?

MR. BALLAM: The only reason for "Area" being here is so that it would not apply generally throughout the country. If, for instance, the motor or plumbing or electrical trade is designated, well it could be a designated trade in the Area of St. John's, if you like, but need not be a designated trade in Clarenville, unless they so wished. The honourable member mentioned carpenters and whether carpenters could go to work. That depends entirely on whether they have

an apprenticeship agreement in this particular industry either in construction work or any defence plant, then if they have an agreement these signing companies would stand by it. If there is no agreement, and there need not be in construction, it is mostly done by plants, well then it would not apply. The area is only so that you may apply it in designated trades here and not do it down in another part where they have not an apprenticeship agreement.

MR. FOGWILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied, because if we go on under this same section we find in (m) that the Board may by permit exempt from agreement any persons engaged in designated trades when regulations made under paragraph (1) come into force. In other words when a person is a tradesman working in a certain area he would have to receive a permit to go to work. Further on in that section which we are going to come to, you have a clause which provides for the issue of permits and cancellation of permits. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the government is attempting now to provide legislation whereby any person in a trade designated by a said trade apprenticeship board in any area designated such a person would have to receive a permit to go to work under this amending Act, otherwise he could not be employed, because it definitely states "requiring all persons in that area other than registered apprentices to receive a permit." In other words a man can't go to work without a certificate and has to get a permit. He will be exempted from that Act by the issue of a permit by the Board.

MR. BAILAM: Mr. Chairman, I think that is already done now by the plumbing and electrical trades in St.

John's. And if any other trade like the carpenters trade, if they choose themselves to select an employers' and employees' committee, and if that becomes a designated trade, and it is their wish their company be so, well I don't see—it is not something that is new or uncommon. It is the same probably across the Dominion and it is being recommended to us by the Board and by the advisory committees, and I don't see what further we need to go on. I don't see what my honourable friend is thinking about. We are not going to prevent anybody from working on a job nor from getting a job because he is not an apprentice. If he is through his apprenticeship, he may be in a particular trade where it would be required that he have a permit showing his ability, if you like.

MR. FOGWILL: It does not follow if they had an apprenticeship that makes them competent because of the fact that they served an apprenticeship. There are just as many good electricians, plumbers and carpenters who have served no time.

Mr. Chairman, apparently what the government is trying to do is to assure that nobody with the exception of those already working at a designated trade will be issued permits under this amending act, and that from then on nobody else will be able to work at it under this amending section, or a section that we will come to later, limiting the permits to the tradesmen. I am sure no tradesmen in this country asked for that. It is absolutely ridiculous that they should have asked the government to limit their employment. I don't know who the government was advised by under this amending act. If a tradesman comes to me to do work, I want to choose my own man whether he has

a permit from the Minister of Labour or an apprenticeship, I don't care, if he is able to do the work to my satisfaction.

MR. BALLAM: There is nothing to prevent him. If you went to the electrical trade here in St. John's you will find that. Probably the other trades might like the same thing.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, who issues a certificate of qualifications?

MR. BALLAM: In every designated trade they have their boards set up who work in conjunction with the apprenticeship board of the government. They have a board at Bowaters and an apprenticeship system on which they have gone in with us, and they have an advisory board in the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. They have the same in Canadian Machinery Industries Corp., an advisory board set up by the employers and employees. In the matter of the vehicle repair trade there is the same thing and the carpentry and plumbing and electrical apprenticeship advisory committee. These are boards selected by them individually who through our Director of Apprenticeship and our instructors would advise on these things.

MR. HOLLETT: In any case, Mr. Chairman, a young boy, who is not an apprentice and goes to any designated areas in this country or any area as it says here "All persons in any area other than registered apprentices and persons who receive a permit under Section 27A." And "prohibits the employment of persons who do not hold such a certificate." It seems to me you are putting a hardship on a man say from Burin, if you like.

MR. BALLAM: It seems to me a man can't get a job unless he has a certificate of qualifications. There is no board there to give him such a certificate. I am wondering if the thing is quite clear there—my honourable friend from St. John's East knows more about it than I do.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, this is amending Section 9 of the Apprenticeship Act, and Section 9, I think, is concerned with the powers of the board. In other words this section here deals with apprenticeship boards. And the apprenticeship board will decide whether or not a person will be allowed to work unless he has a certificate, or a permit from the board.

MR. BALLAM: The board is not going to say, you can't go to work. I don't think we are looking at it in its proper perspective at all. It is merely that the board "May" do all that.

MR. HOLLETT: Make regulations?

MR. BALLAM: Yes, the board or on recommendation of the board the Lieutenant Governor in Council may do all these things. I may say that when first I had a look at it myself I was a little bit concerned, but I don't think now that there is anything to worry about.

MR. FOGWILL: I don't think I am satisfied with this "May" business. They "May" do this and they "May" do that. The fact remains they have the power to do it under this section. They have the power here to see to it that a person will not receive employment unless he has a permit or a certificate from the board, which they will issue. I think between the two of you you will make a hash of it.

MR. BALLAM: Under this it gives the board power to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I don't think they will suggest anything to prevent Tom Jones or anybody else from getting a job. It always has to be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council who may make regulations providing for this and that and something else, if and when.

MR. HOLLETT: Why should the Honourable Minister ask for authority to make regulations to prohibit John Jones from getting work.

MR. BALLAM: I am certainly not doing that.

MR. HOLLETT: But you are asking authority to do just that, prevent John Jones from doing just that.

MR. BALLAM: I beg your pardon! I do not like these words. The Minister is asking nothing of the kind. It merely asks an amending bill which will give the board more power to make regulations to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council asks for the authority, but I am not looking for it. Don't worry about that. You are just trying to make something out of it actually.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, we are trying to make something out of it. I must read that section again. I say the Minister is asking us to give him authority to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that he make recommendations to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that John Jones can't get a job. That is exactly what you are doing, and that is what I said in the first place, and I say it again—you are just doing that.

MR. FOGWILL: Dictatorship. Mr.

Chairman, I am still not satisfied with this section. I think the section should come out, or the Minister should let it stand.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Chairman, I don't see why it should stand, we have gone through all this before.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member for St. John's East, who is after all familiar with this, requests this section stand over, I think he ought to be granted that courtesy, Sir. Surely it is important.

MR. BALLAM: Let the whole thing stand over as far as I am concerned, but I don't see the point.

MR. CURTIS: Why do you want it to stand. Do you want to consider it again?

MR. HOLLETT: I believe the honourable member for St. John's West would like to look into his objections again.

MR. FOGWILL: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the section should come out altogether. I don't think it is for the best interest of the people concerned anyway. I certainly do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister was well advised by any reputable group of tradesmen in St. John's or elsewhere in the Island on such a clause as this.

MR. BALLAM: Take that out and we might as well tear up the amendment.

MR. FOGWILL: I make my objections to it.

MR. BALLAM: To what point?

MR. FOGWILL: To (3).

Section 2 stand. Section 3 carried. Section 4 read.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to explain to the committee the new Section 27A. What it means and what can be done by the director of apprenticeship under this new section.

MR. BALLAM: Well in a designated trade, if there is an agreement of apprenticeship, except for boys who may be home from college during the summer time or something of that nature, any young person engaged in these particular places, between the age of fifteen and twenty-one should enter into an agreement of apprenticeship unless he is outside of these age groups or unless for some reason the board should issue a permit for persons in that age group. Otherwise the idea is to try in the designated trades the plan of getting all the young people who start in these to take advantage of our apprenticeship training, so that they would become skilled tradesmen after the apprenticeship stage. Otherwise you could have people engaging all kinds of boys just with the idea of getting cheap help, if you like, and never achieving the idea and principles of apprenticeship training. This is merely to try and enforce the idea of bringing the Act within the scope of apprenticeship training, and that is only in the designated trades where they agree to have it and where there is an agreement made. There is nothing wrong with that. There is an agreement made, you understand, in every one of these plants between the management and their union and the apprenticeship board. It is their agreement, and they certainly know what they are doing.

MR. BROWNE: What are the designated trades at the present time?

MR. BALLAM: We have several

designated trades, as I just told you a few minutes ago.

MR. BROWNE: You mentioned there about students in the summer-time being occupied.

MR. BALLAM: Yes, they may be employed without signing an apprenticeship agreement.

MR. BROWNE: Only for three months?

MR. BALLAM: That is as long as they will be at home in the summer-time. I also said that if for some other reason, they will be taken on under permit.

MR. BROWNE: Does that apply to surveyors?

MR. BALLAM: I don't think that would be a designated trade. It is not as yet at any rate. It is a profession.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, under this section, if in a place where there is a designated trade an agreement concerning the training of apprentices, does that mean a young man of twenty years of age would not be allowed to work in that place where there is a designated trade for a period of any more than three months out of any year unless permitted to do so by the director, or unless he is an apprentice? Does it mean he cannot work unless he has a permit to do so?

MR. BALLAM: He would be given a permit.

MR. FOGWILL: But it does not say he would. It says, he may be. It comes under the authority of the Director of Apprenticeship. That means the Director of Apprenticeship although a fine man as I know, can



interfere with the ordinary life of a young man of twenty.

MR. BALLAM: The Director of Apprenticeship has this authority in between times when the board is not sitting, and everything that he does can be reported back to the board. It says here: Any person who feels aggrieved thereby may within sixty days of the exercise of the power or duty review the matter—May take their grievance back to the board.

MR. FOGWILL: In the meantime the young fellow loses two months work. Why give anyone this power, Mr. Chairman? That is the trouble, nobody should have it.

MR. BALLAM: Why have anything at all?

MR. FOGWILL: That can be described as limitation of employment and restrictions.

MR. BALLAM: That is not a restriction. It is permissive—we may do this and we may do that, if and when the advisory committee and the board and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council say so and not until then.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I must agree with my honourable friend on my left here.

MR. BALLAM: Of course.

MR. HOLLETT: As I see it the minister here has an awful lot of power. He may, or at least on his advice this John Jones may get a permit to go to work, and if he does get a permissive slip then the Lieutenant-Governor in Council is going to tell him how much money he is to make per hour. Sir, it seems to me this is a screwy legislation.

MR. BALLAM: Well now, I know you are just trying to get a rise out

of me, and when you said you knew nothing at all about it I am sure we agreed with you.—You understand, all of this is done by agreement. Section 27A and 27B all come under Section 27 of this Act which states that the "Minister may from time to time with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council enter into such agreements." All of these things are done by agreement with the parties.

MR. FOGWILL: It does not say that anywhere in the Act.

MR. BALLAM: You cannot start an apprenticeship scheme in any plant without an agreement.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable minister could tell us what effect this has on people who have taken a course of training in vocational schools where some of them serve, I believe six months. Do they become fully qualified then to work as full-fledged trained men?

MR. BALLAM: No, they are not full-fledged, and could not be after six months vocational training. That just gets them into a trade and gives them some basic training, but they must go on and spend more time in a trade before they become full-fledged trained men. My honourable friend will tell you that is just to give them basic training.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the honourable minister tell us from whom these recommendations came for these amendments?

MR. BALLAM: From the board through my department, and were taken from other agreements, etc., and made so that the apprenticeship division could go ahead and proceed properly. I have myself gone through them

and I can see nothing in them other than permissive.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Board?

MR. BALLAM: Dr. Frecker.

MR. FOGWILL: Who are the members?

MR. BALLAM: I don't know if I recall the names of the members. Dr. McCarter, Architect, is the employers' representative. J. R. Broadbent is also an employers' representative. He is the technical instructor with Bowaters in their vocational training school out there. A. Rowe who is in the paper mill at Grand Falls; J. Gillingham who is here in town. F. Templeman, B.S., Ed., Department of Education and the Superintendent of the vocational school, and G. Dwyer and W. J. May. These are the ones who recommend these things here.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the honourable minister tell us if these men are under pay, and if so, what is their salary?

MR. BALLAM: Oh, my! You are having a grand bit of fun! This advisory committee is not under pay. The apprenticeship board, those who are not civil servants, get a per diem rate. But I don't see what that has to do with this amendment. There are members of the board who are civil servants and members who are not. The latter are paid a per diem as laid down in the Act which we passed here last year.

Clause carried. On motion the committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again tomorrow. Ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders of the day do

stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

---

THURSDAY, May 20, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by the residents of Victoria Cove in Gander Bay. The petition requests that a road be constructed between Victoria Cove in Gander Bay and Horwood in Dog Bay.

I might say, Sir, for the benefit of the House, that some work has already been done on this road. It is cut through, the rocks being blasted out, and it has been ditched part of the way. This road, Sir, connecting Victoria Cove and Horwood is very important to the people living down there and will probably be the means eventually of connecting them with the road coming out from Lewisporte and give them transportation from Lewisporte. They are on the north side of Gander Bay and therefore cannot be connected with any road coming through the south of Gander River.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition, and request that it be tabled in the House and forwarded to the department concerned.

On motion petition received and referred to the department concerned.

### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House a report of the local roads committee work for the past year 1953-54. I shall not go into much detail but do crave permission of the House for a few moments to describe briefly what work is undertaken by these committees. We feel in the Department of Public Works that a very great effort is really being made particularly in the outlying settlements of the Island more remote from the larger centres, where it is true we get far greater results from the local road committees than from around the larger and more thickly populated centres.

During the past year, 1953-54, six hundred and two committees were operating, an increase of nearly forty from the previous year and twenty-four from the year 1951-52. Twenty-five hundred persons served on these committees, and gave their services free during the year; 449 committees were authorized to carry out repair programmes, and this compared with 434 in the previous year. The total value of work undertaken by these committees was \$387,598, the Department of Public Works providing out of that sum \$222,341 and the balance of \$165,157 was in cash donations and/or free labour.

I would like to pause for a moment there, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to mention this business of cash donations: One of the greatest difficulties facing the local roads committees in the past has been that where men undertake to do work on this fifty-fifty basis, these people who actually perform the work are about the only

people who contribute in some of these communities, hence this idea of cash donations, which incidentally was arranged by our predecessors, the Commission of Government, who brought this idea into effect to provide an opportunity for businessmen and others who ordinarily would not do any part on this fifty-fifty basis other than through a cash contribution. So that the opportunity is there for these people to play their part. That is why cash donations are referred to there by the chairman and/or his group of the committee. Returns are made to our department, the Department of Public Works. The cash is sent in to us, and we deposit it to the consolidated revenue fund, and of course they get their regular grant. I feel it is necessary for the House to understand that is how people who are not going to work with a pick and shovel, if you like, can do their part in helping along the local road committees.

Very concise figures are given throughout this report. For honourable members and those who wish to obtain a copy I have sufficient on hand. Honourable members will see that it is laid out in districts, the various members of committees concerned, the total expenditure by the department and the sum or value of free labour and contributions.

I don't think I need go any further to delay the House on this, Mr. Speaker, but I stress the point that it is very important that we have these local road committees. Were it not for the operations of these six hundred or more committees, in many of the outlying places in Newfoundland our people and their community roads would of necessity suffer. I believe the House will understand that it is a physical impossibility with the rev-

enue available in our province to take care of road work in all the numerous communities we have, and I need not mention the six thousand miles of coast line and the twelve hundred communities, as we all know the story. Were it not for the operations of these local road committees many of these small communities would suffer considerably on account of their roads. We in Public Works are very proud of the efforts of these people. They do a grand job, and as long as the Government permits us, it is the policy of the department to assist local communities in the fullest measure possible.

I would like also to pay special tribute to many of the magistrates around the island, and I have in mind the year 1952 when we had a very serious layoff of men and a lack of labour along the southwest coast due to a slump in the fisheries, and special work had to be provided to take care of quite a section along the district of Burgeo and LaPoile. The honourable member for Burgeo and LaPoile went, together with the magistrate, through the district and compiled statistics for us enabling us to set out allocations whereby a very fine job was done. When that report came in it was my privilege to add a comment on the report of the magistrate in that district. I think the magistrate in that district has done a very noble piece of work, and I was privileged to call the Justice Department to convey to the Attorney General the appreciation of the Department of Public Works for the work that gentleman had undertaken. It was really commendable and something well worth while.

Mr. Speaker, without further delay I would ask the pages to have these copies distributed to the honourable

members and to the press, as far as they will go, and I think there are sufficient for all. I commend them to the serious perusal of the members of the House.

### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Attorney General to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Is he aware that discrimination exists in rates of pay of Departmental Chief Clerks, employed on the Newfoundland division, Atlantic Region, of the Canadian National Railways?

2. Will the Attorney General bring this matter to the attention of the Management of the Newfoundland Division of the Canadian National Railways so that this question may be rectified, and the rates of pay of all Chief Clerks affected be adjusted to the basis of the highest rate paid Chief Clerks on the Newfoundland Division, and the adjustment be retroactive to the date the highest rate was established.

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What are the items referred to in Paragraph 39 of the Auditor General's Report for 1951-52 where it was observed that "Goods other than those ordinarily sold by Chester Dawe Ltd. were supplied" to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Ltd.?

2. Give names and serial numbers or other identification marks of items referred to together with names of manufacturers and prices for each item.

## Answers to Questions

Question No. 91 :

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the answers to Questions No. 91 and No. 92 are being prepared. Actually I do not propose to answer them but to refer them to the Minister himself, who ought to be here if not tomorrow then the next day.

Question No. 89 :

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the Table of the House the answer to Question No. 89 asked by the honourable member for St. John's East.

Question 1. What progress has been made in the construction of Bridges on the Trans-Canada Highway, state the number of Bridges completed, the number of Bridges under construction, the type of each Bridge, concrete or steel, the dimension and cost of each Bridge, also state if this work has been contracted for or is being done by the Department of Public Works?

Answer: 23 Bridges have been completed, 20 being constructed by the Department of Public Works and 3 under contract. 1 bridge being constructed under contract not yet completed.

## Bridges built by Department of Public Works :

Location	Type	Dimensions		Cost
		Length	Width	
Salmon Pond .....	concrete	15'	30'	\$ 9,189
Salmon River .....	"	2-36'	27'	20,453
Island Lake .....	"	8'	30'	2,967
Lake O'Brien .....	"	8'	30'	4,701
Eel Brook .....	"	36'	27'	10,791
Middle Brook East .....	"	18'	30'	35,697
Pharaoh .....	"	15'	30'	10,155
Bundell's Brook .....	"	15'	30'	6,718
Middle Brook West .....	"	36'	27'	11,320
Jumpers Brook .....	"	2-36'	27'	27,888
Corner Brook Stream .....	"	36'	27'	8,154
Camp 14 Brook .....	"	10'	30'	7,179
Pinch Gut Brook .....	"	2-36'	27'	14,718
Camp 22 Brook .....	"	18'	30'	6,013
Campbell's Brook .....	"	36'	27'	7,875
Cooper's Brook .....	"	36'	27'	9,486
McDougall's Brook .....	"	36'	27'	21,939
Big Pond .....	"	36'	27'	8,243
Sta 710-58 .....	"	36'	27'	15,237
Cold Brook .....	"	36'	27'	20,534

## Bridges built under Contract :

Gander River .....	concrete	418'	24'	438,051
Grand Bay .....	"	165'	27'	123,924
South Branch .....	"	240'	24'	172,891

## Bridge being built under Contract :

North Branch .....	concrete	160'	24'	181,000 (estimated)
--------------------	----------	------	-----	------------------------

Question 2: How many local road Committees were operating in the Provincial District of St. John's East during the past year, where are these Committees located and what amount was allotted to each Committee?

Answer: (i) Six.

(ii) Flatrock .....	\$ 500
Middle Cove .....	200
Outer Cove .....	420
Pouch Cove .....	1,000
Shoe Cove .....	150
Torbay .....	1,250

#### Giving Notice of Motion:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

#### Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, I would like to ask the acting Premier if any consideration has been given to a petition sent to the Government some time ago regarding the holding of a plebiscite in Mount Pearl-Kilbride Area regarding the Old Mill operating there?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, apart from hearing there was a petition I have no recollection of its having come before Cabinet, but I did miss the last meeting. However, if the honourable member will renew his question I may be able to answer it on tomorrow and if not on the next day.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Fisheries Development Authority";

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the honourable members

on the opposite side are somewhat similar in position to two or three members on this side of the House inasmuch as they do not represent constituencies which in the main are depending directly upon the fishing industry. On the other hand, most of these on this side of the House represent constituencies in which the main industry and the main standby of the people in these constituencies are dependent directly upon the fishery in its various aspects and particularly is that true in the large number who are dependent upon one or another phase of the salt fish industry. For that reason, Sir, apart from any seeming strangeness which people may attribute to this particular debate in the House of Assembly there is every reason why those of us who represent fishing constituencies, as we may call them, should take particular interest in this Bill, and contribute what we can towards the understanding of what we mean to do. Apart from that particular interest which we may have in the particular legislation which we are now considering, the fishing industry although it no longer holds first place in the export value of our goods to other countries is yet an industry which contributes some twenty-five per cent of our total export value, is great enough to warrant the



interest of all of us. And I believe that all of us on both sides of the House are for that reason genuinely interested in the success of this particular measure.

Not only do the fisheries contribute 25% of our total export value, but more people are directly or indirectly concerned with the success or failure of the fisheries in this province than are dependent on any other industry. For that reason then the field is more universally appealing to us in this province than even the mining and paper industries, our other two main and staple products.

When we come down to the principle of the Bill, which we are arguing, I think it can be expressed in a very few words: All that we are trying to do is to try and bring about conditions in the fishing industry which will ensure to these people engaged in it and directly dependent upon it a higher standard of living than they have been hitherto enjoying, and bigger returns for the work in which they are engaged. With that statement I feel that no one here, whether he may object to some of the methods or not, can argue against the principle of this Bill.

I am particularly happy at this time to endorse some of the statements made by my colleagues from Trinity South. Since we represent opposite sides of the same bay and common fishing grounds I should be particularly interested to countenance the facts which he gave to substantiate his appeal for more attention to the potentialities of the Trinity Bay fisheries. I do not want to expound on the facts which he stated here the other day, but he had evidence from which he reasoned well that the fishing potentialities of Trinity Bay,

in its variety of fish and the proximity of the fishing grounds and other favourable factors are indeed very great. It has very much indeed to commend it.

For that reason it was of some little disappointment to us during recent months to know that the main efforts or the early attempt to recreate the fisheries on a paying basis should have overlooked the potentialities of that great bay. To some extent since then, however, the position has changed. In the last issue of the "Fishermen's Advocate" published at Port Union, there was an article describing how Fishery Products had recently purchased a site at Catalina with every intention of erecting, and carrying on a fishing industry at that centre as soon as work can be completed. That will be of particular interest and concern to some of the great fishing settlements of Trinity Bay; Little Catalina, is one of the greatest fishing pools (if you like) of the codfishery but yet cursed with the fact (I cannot say enjoys) that it suffers from one of the worst climatic conditions in the country. The atmospheric conditions and humidity are such that fish drying is extremely difficult. I don't know of any parallel in the province. It is so much so that I find invariably the fishermen of Little Catalina writing finis to their fishery immediately at the end of the trapping season. They do well invariably with six hundred quintals of fish per crew and then find it takes all their time to cure it and frequently have to send their fish over to other settlements for that purpose. Any action that would take care of that production will be of immense importance to the people of that area.

The argument has been advanced

that it is strange that this Government should at this time, some five years after taking office, give so much attention to the fishing industry, and not at all in accordance with the action which this Government has taken during the last five years. In my opinion this Bill before us today cannot be construed in any way as something put forward to cover up the alleged failures of the economic policy. I am not going to argue the success or otherwise of the industries which we have started, at this particular juncture, but I am going to contend that this Bill, which we are trying to pilot through the House at the present time carries with it something which is an intrinsic part of the overall pattern which we set up in the year 1949. I have already remarked on other occasions that in September of 1949 with the devaluation of the sterling the Government of this province received a sharp reminder of the weakness of our economic policy because we were dependent entirely upon primary products, and any curtailments of demand in the markets might inevitably carry a recession in business and work conditions in our Province of Newfoundland. That sharp reminder helped largely to focus the attention of the Government at that time upon trying to provide alternative measures to iron out some of the difficulties under which we were suffering, and have always suffered. The fishery policy was not forgotten, and indeed there has been evidence in this House repeatedly through the years of the Government's concern in trying to do things to help our primary producers. In fact it has already been stated that some seven million dollars has been spent during the last five years in order to help out the fisheries in

Newfoundland. Ridicule has already been leveled upon one unhappy venture that the Government made in its early days when it tried to bring about some change in the herring fishery. But many of us are yet convinced that the herring fishery still remains a great potentiality in the fishing ventures of this Province.

Now, the honourable and learned member for St. John's East in a report, brought forward the idea that the policy or rather the findings and recommendations in the Walsh Committee's Report were largely drawn from or patterned upon the Report of the Commissioner, P. D. H. Dunne in 1944. I am very well sure that the members of the Walsh Committee, particularly the honourable chairman himself, is very well aware of the attempts that have been made at different times in the past in order to try and analyze the problems of the fisheries, and so seek for some improvements. I am quite sure the honourable chairman was not ignorant of the fact that a report had been made in 1880. I am absolutely sure he was also familiar with the findings of the "Kent Report" in 1937, and the writings and publications of Mr. Dunne's Report in January 1944. It was done by a man with whom Sir Albert Walsh (or Mr. Albert Walsh at that time) was associated in some fashion, and consequently the setting up of the commission in 1949 came at a time when these things had already been done, and would certainly not be ignored by a committee set up in order to make a thorough survey of conditions, as it were, and bring forward recommendations for the guidance of the Government. It is quite true there is a difference between the two, in spite of what the honourable member for

St. John's East said yesterday, and this difference goes much beyond the mere difference in the amount of money allocated for the plan Mr. Dunne put forward. As a matter of fact there is no particular significance between the amount of fifteen millions put forward at that time and the amount of money which is estimated might be regarded for the full implementation of the Walsh recommendations today.

Mr. Dunne came here in a peculiarly interesting position. He was a member of an appointed Government who were not concerned at all about votes, and therefore were not particularly troubled by the voters, and the economic position was entirely different from what faces us today or has faced us since restoration of Responsible Government. They came during the life of the Commission of Government and during the early years they had aid from Britain, and the policy which Mr. Dunne put forward was one in which he did not figure that the entire money would be found by the Government. As a matter of fact he gave a certain percentage which he thought should be used, and during the next four or five years something was done to implement some of the things advocated in the report which Mr. Dunne had made. But when we are facing the same problem we realize Mr. Dunne's report may have been based upon insufficient data in the first place. He had been out here a comparatively short time and had gotten together perhaps information gathered at different times, including the information in the Amulree Report, and considered the problem as it was at that time, when he brought forward a report which seemed to him to possess a certain solution to the

problem as he saw it. Conditions in 1949 had changed somewhat from conditions in 1944 and conditions in 1954 are entirely different again, and that is one of the important things we want to remember.

Two years ago one of our larger fishing firms was approached by a delegation of people from a certain settlement on the northeast coast, and the firm was asked whether they would consider the possibility of a fish plant in their particular area. The reply was, no. They gave at that time certain reasons why they thought the plant was not feasible at that time. Today the situation has been entirely reversed, largely because of something which happened during the last twelve or fifteen months. Mention has already been made in this House of Assembly of the tremendous growth in the sale of fish products, due to the advanced technological processes, brought into use and put on the markets last year, breaded fish and fish sticks. In the last issue of "Time" for example there was a short item by one firm in Seattle saying it had increased sales enormously simply by processing and putting on the market these new fish sticks. They are selling them at the rate of something over seven million pounds per year. In another journal last week there was a descriptive article which gave some of the phenomenal circumstances which attended the processing and marketing of the new fish sticks now on the market.

Now a few days ago one or more of the honourable members of the Opposition referred to a meeting which is scheduled for the 27th of this month, at which time one of the matters to be discussed will be the matter of increased tariffs on

fresh fish going into the United States of America. Some fear was expressed that at this meeting President Eisenhower might possibly increase the tariff on such products. If that were so, I think all of us who have followed this particular line of reasoning in the last few years, felt that was not the first attempt. An attempt was made two years ago and failed, and there is a certain amount of trepidation over the possible outcome of this particular conference. Judging from the article in the "Monetary Journal" corroborated by other information which we are able to gather there seems to be some evidence today to lead us to believe that the situation which confronted the New England fisheries at the time they presented their report to President Eisenhower had radically changed, and we have heard certain things to indicate that some interests in the industry, most anxious at that time for increased protection for their products, are now hoping that no increase will be granted because now, through the new process, they see a means of augmenting their basic supplies in order that they may increase their processed article.

In the course of this debate reference was made to different names. Some people called it "Nationalization" some "Socialization" and "Statism" and what not. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am not at all interested in what it is called if it achieves the main purpose for which this Bill was introduced. If this Bill can bring about a revolutionized and revitalized industry in the fishery, assuring to the people engaged therein, higher returns for their product, then I say the end will be achieved, and that is what we set out to do—it does not matter what we call it. I am

sure it will not matter to the fishermen whether it is socialism or socialization. Personally I cannot see that it is any of the things which I have mentioned, because the actual carrying out of this policy, although it is financed in some ways by certain Government assistance, yet the success of this thing will depend largely upon private enterprise and the co-operation of the people in the various centres affected.

The honourable member for White Bay and the honourable member for St. John's East referred to certain things which had to be borne in mind, and which, according to their opinions, would have to be borne in mind for the success of this particular venture, and they mentioned particularly the matter of compensation, and the difficulties of centralization. Anyone who has kept tabs on events in Newfoundland for the last fifty years must have been conscious of the movement which has been going on down through the years, the movement from smaller isolated places to larger centres. I am going to speak of two areas in particular because I know them very well indeed.

In my early days there were twenty-four families or more living on small islands, Bennett's Island, Flower Island and Cobbler's Island in Bonavista Bay. They all moved out some fifty years ago. Last year some twenty-five families moved from Pinchard's Island to the mainland. The year before that some thirty families moved from Cape Island to either Newtown or to Cape Freels. There you have a complete dissemination, a complete depletion in certain places in order that people might move into other larger centres. In the area of Salvage during the last thirty years some twenty or thirty families moved from

Sailor's Island, three or four families from Wild Bight and three or four families from Hare Island, all to larger centres, and in no instance was there any mention of compensation. As a matter of fact the idea of compensation for such people leaving their homes raises an issue of far-reaching importance, and one which does not come within the ambit of this Bill we are discussing at the present time. If we go back further and look at what happened in Grand Falls in 1908 and in Corner Brook in 1929 and onward we see where many hundreds of families moved from different places around Newfoundland and made new homes in the place of their adoption, and in no place was there any mention of compensation for the home they left. They did ask for one thing, and in most places they obtained it, and that was an assurance of employment in the place of their adoption. That is the central thing, Sir, in the idea we have in mind. When we speak of centralization we are not thinking of forcing evacuation of centres, but I believe we can set up conditions in any one or half dozen places where the people in the smaller centres will be driven by forces outside, and changing economic circumstances will inevitably bring them into these larger centres because they will be drawn by social circumstances, they will be drawn by reasons pertaining to health and welfare, mail services and the many different things which help today to make a person, not an isolated individual unit, but part and parcel of a group of citizens. Give them only the assurance that they will secure work for a reasonable time of the year and at wages that will give them a reasonable standard of living and inevitably you are going to get

that depletion of former places and congregation into larger centres.

Now, it is natural that certain members, thinking of their own constituencies, should argue for certain plans and certain parts of this programme within the areas in which their particular concerns are centred. I take second place to no one in hoping that certain expansions will occur in my own constituency of Trinity North. But I feel, when looking at this thing, we should be rational and objective enough to forget for a moment the particular claims of any one particular place and to look upon this as it will affect all the province as a whole. When it was decided to decrease, for instance, the number of places as mentioned in the Dunne Report to the number of places which are earmarked in our present policy for fishery development we were conscious of that fact, we were conscious of the fact that after a thorough investigation and survey certain things had been given far more consideration than had been given by Mr. Dunne himself.

The selection of any one place for development is dependent upon a great number of factors, as any student of economics should understand: The availability or otherwise of a labour supply in the place itself might be offset by others coming in from the outside, but the natural facilities must be there in the beginning; harbour facilities, implemented perhaps by dredging operations; water supply suitable for industrial purposes and for domestic consumption is something which is of extreme importance; the availability of land should people come in and settle. These and many other factors all had to be considered before any decision



could be taken upon what places should constitute the most favourable area for development of the fishery policy.

One of the questions asked by the honourable member for St. John's West was: Why should the Fishery Development Authority take chances on the northeast coast where they were subject to a short season and other disadvantages because of its position and not concentrate on places on the southeast or southwest coast where there is a fishing season all the year around? In one sense that question is more than rhetorical in that he did not bring it out that our problem down through the years has been not with the places which are open the majority of the year around and where fishing can be carried on all the year around, but with those places where the season is short and in the past the attempts to make a successful fishery plan operate on the northeast coast had been doomed to failure largely because of the shortness of the season. This new Bill, Sir, takes advantage of advances made in the last year or so. The entire setup is completely different. We are not depending entirely on the two or three months of actual operation of the fishing operations, but on a number of factors not the least of which is that we can have facilities on that part of the coast where it is possible to store products until they are required in the market. That can be done only because of the new process which has come in the fishing industry.

One of the many questions which have been troubling us in discussing this fishery policy is the main one of whether increased production will give to the fishermen the returns which we feel will be adequate to

give them a decent living. It is natural enough that there should be some difference of opinion on this particular matter. On the other hand, even if it is possible for a man to catch a hundred quintals of fish and find the returns from that hundred quintals are enough to provide him with a decent living for eight months of the year, by the same measure a hundred and fifty quintals of fish would allow him to carry on for twelve months. But overproduction is only one factor. Then there is another question raised by the honourable member for St. John's East, when he referred to marketing conditions under exchange restrictions. The honourable and learned member for St. John's West asked another question—why it was that we had allowed the salt codfish markets of the Mediterranean to disappear so quickly? I was rather surprised, as a matter of fact, that he should have raised that question at all, because anyone who studied the matter objectively at all, anyone who has thought about the collapse of European currency immediately after the cessation of hostilities in World War II, must have been conscious of two facts: (1) The resources of England had been seriously depleted by her sale of overseas investments and (2) The Mediterranean countries are a part of the Sterling area, and what affects one affects all. In all these countries and particularly so in the Mediterranean countries, the dollar reserves had gone down to practically nil, and for a period of years they were unable to bring in imports from abroad except from those countries with which they were monetarily allied. There was another situation which had arisen after the cessation of war and that was the subsidizing of



native fisheries by certain of the Mediterranean countries. They subsidized their own fleets in order that they might conserve and raise their dollar reserves. That was the reason why our saltfish markets disappeared.

If we go to the other side of the world we see something of the same thing applies in a different way. Brazil, which was a very big customer for our fish put on tariff restrictions and for a time prohibited entirely the importation of our fish. It was only during the last twelve months or so that there has been any change there. Happily for us perhaps the picture in Brazil looks a little brighter. Recently the coffee and cocoa beans, the two chief products of Brazil, have been in short supply and have risen to a very high price, so that Brazil has been able to build up their dollar reserve and, as a matter of fact, had a favourable balance of trade, so that she will increase the quota of imports including, I hope, our saltfish during the coming year. Something of the same sort has happened in the Sterling area and the reserves in England are much greater than at any time since the war. The dollar reserves of some of the Mediterranean countries have reached a position where it is possible for them to do trading outside the Sterling area. Only a fortnight ago the International Bank placed at the disposal of the British Government certain funds as a reserve not to be actually used but as a buffer to be used should it decide to change its present system or raise the value of the pound. All these things, of course, are tied in with the exchange restrictions which were mentioned by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East.

Now there are many other ways, of

course, in which this Bill of ours and its successful operation may be affected by the trading policy and the monetary policy of the markets in which we are trying to sell. There are certain things which Canada can do at the present time. Within the past twelve months or so there have been movements when, at a certain level, feelings have not been too happy between the United States and Canada. You had a particular instance of that in the tariff question of late last fall, and you had another question which came up in March 1954. As a matter of fact the latter one brought about the question of retaliation being advanced by certain members of the Canadian Press. To overcome the trading situation of the day, and to make it possible for our fish and other products to become a little more marketable, Canada must do certain things; and all of them have arguments which can be advanced in their favour and against them. There is, for instance, a reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada. There is the trade alliance by which Canada would become a part of the Sterling area. Now both of these things have been tried. There was a reciprocal agreement between Canada and the United States a hundred years ago, but equally so you had the tariff laws in 1930 when Canada was hit very badly by Government restrictions imposed by the United States. You have the Roosevelt Treaty of the last few years, and the whole problem is so difficult that to think that we can put our fish into markets just by saying so is ignoring all the laws of supply and demand.

The most reasonable thing advocated today by many is a lower rate of exchange between Canada and

the United States. But although our rate of exchange carries with it two things, one of which people try to avoid; the first thing is a lower rate of interest on money and the second is an extra supply of money which brings about inflation. These things are so important, and I bring them in now because I feel they are part and parcel of any development which we may attempt in order to carry out our fishery development policy. They may not be important to the fishermen at large, or so he may think, but it is necessary to understand that ten dollars is not sufficient for the price of fish, yet there may be many strong economic reasons why eleven dollars a quintal cannot be given. From the market angle there may be ways of overcoming that. Governments of the past have been known to subsidize the industry. We, ourselves, last fall supplied the deficiency payments on fish purchased and produced in Newfoundland. That policy, of course, can be carried out. There are subsidies carried out on many things even by the Canadian Government. Last year Prince Edward Island pledged itself to fifteen cents a bushel on their potato crop. But the whole question of subsidies, of course, is somewhat outside the ambit of this particular Bill.

When we come back to the Bill itself, we find that with the principle of the Bill, with the purpose for which it was originated and intended, that is trying to stabilize our fishery, trying to put them on a basis which will give sufficient returns to the people engaged in them, and trying to take people out of some of the small, isolated places and placing them in larger centres thereby offering to them certain services they cannot enjoy under the circumstances

in which they now live, against these purposes, I feel sure, there is no argument to be put forward. Therefore to this purpose, Sir, and to the principle of bigger development of Newfoundland, which includes a fishery policy as an intrinsic part of the over-all policy devised by this Government, I give my heart-felt support. And I support the second reading of this Bill.

On motion House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, on entering into this debate on the fisheries I realize that quite a good deal has been said, particularly on the Government side of the House, so much so that one sees now and then reports in the papers and over the radio to the effect that the members of the Government are being boring and repetitious because of the fact that all that could have been said on the Fisheries Bill must have been said by the Honourable the Premier in his twelve-and-a-half hour address. But, Sir, I feel that the principle of this Bill is so vast, so all-encircling of this Island, that it is almost impossible to exhaust what can be said, then I feel, it is important that, even though one may be repetitious, one may be repetitious because it can stand repetition. In fact the latest speaker from the Opposition, the honourable and learned member for St. John's East, I think yesterday afternoon, emphasized that fact when he referred to the Commission of Inquiry into the Fisheries of 1880 and 1937 and to the Dunne Radio Address in 1944, each having a little more to say. When he referred to these things showing that they had already been discussed and inquired into, he was perfectly correct. The only thing he fell short in

was that he did not mention ten per cent of the commissions of inquiry which had been appointed to deal with the fisheries of Newfoundland. That in itself, Mr. Speaker, shows the all-importance of this subject.

Now, Sir, you cannot, I suggest, read and study this Bill without having read and studied the Walsh Report, at least you cannot read and study it intelligently otherwise. And I am sure, Sir, one cannot read, study and digest that Walsh Report without reliving the history of the fisheries of Newfoundland. It was natural, therefore, for so many of the members to relive that history through their speeches to this House on the principle of that Bill. Even Commissioner Dunne, in that same radio address to which the honourable and learned member for St. John's East referred yesterday, said that as far as he was concerned the fisheries were the life and death of Newfoundland. Even in the limited sphere which he proposed in that address in 1944, (even that which was very limited; and I shall refer to it in a moment) he said that if even that failed we might as well get out of Newfoundland. If it were a success, he said, Newfoundland would be greater. That is what he stated in his little radio address in 1944. It shows therefore the very great importance of this Bill and why I said it can bear repetition and never, never be exhaustively dealt with.

During the past two weeks on this debate we have heard, I would say, from the Premier an excellent history of the fishing industry of Newfoundland, and his hopes for the future of that industry. From other honourable members we have heard of the problems in their respective districts, and from the Honourable Minister of

Welfare we have heard the social problems involved in the carrying out of this Bill. From the Opposition we have also had some suggestions, particularly from the latest member to speak. Generally speaking, though, I cannot refrain from saying that from them we have heard the general idea of nationalization. My honourable colleague said a short time ago that industrialization, socialism, statism; and I would go further and say criticism and pessimism, and I suppose as it is fairly natural in debate of any importance, there was at times during the debate name-calling from one side of the House to the other. I have no intention, Sir, in indulging in name-calling from one member to another nor even in telling the Water Street merchants what I think of them. In fact I have no intention whatever of talking about what great fishermen we have in Port de Grave. But many reasons have been advanced not only during this debate but during the past hundreds of years as to why the fishermen of Newfoundland have never been able to make a living. I believe that the various reasons given during the years may be summarized, at least this is the way I put them as reasons that have been given:

(1) Our exports in fish until recent years were mostly cod, and that mostly in the form of salt dried. That was exported to countries too poor, except during war years, to pay very much for it.

(2) Fishermen have been blamed for not washing, not salting and generally not taking care as far as the cure of the fish was concerned.

(3) Merchants have been accused of gypping the fishermen both in the cull and in the price.

(4) The in-between or semi-merchants have been accused of putting rocks in the centre of catches.

(5) Fishermen claim that it was due partly to lack of good drying weather and on the other part the merchants.

(6) The merchants, on the other hand, claimed that the failure was due partly to the fishermen and partly to the weather between the time they bought it and the time they delivered it to the market in the Mediterranean, and partly to lack of Government interest in the matter.

Now following these accusations (I won't mention others) or at least intertwined with these we have had scores of Royal Commission reports during the hundreds of years of our fisheries, and then in 1944 we have had the radio address of Commissioner Dunne, which actually was only an address in the form of a Bill such as we are presenting here today, and was the result of the report brought in by a commission which had been appointed by the Commission of Government. Then the next thing you had this Government coming into being in 1949 and refusing to do anything about any overall policy of the fisheries until they had received a report from an investigating committee. That investigating result is now well known as the "Walsh Report."

While on that point of the "Walsh Report," Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to some of the remarks made by the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East yesterday. He, from what I understood from him, disposed of the "Walsh Report" of 1953 merely as a rephrasing of the Dunne Radio Speech of 1944. In fact I believe his exact words were

that the Walsh Report was a dressed up post war verbage of the 1944 Dunne Radio Speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned this is the only name-calling I shall do during my few minutes addressing this House on this Bill. I just cannot refrain from saying that that statement to me is senseless, idiotic, ignorant and inconsistent. It shows on the part of the Opposition a complete ignorance of the fisheries of 1953 and of 1944 and as of 1949, and even more so of today.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order: I wish to state the point of order thusly: If the honourable member is referring to members of the Opposition as being ignorant I am afraid I shall have to ask him to withdraw the statement, also the term "idiotic."

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, you will remember I said the statement was senseless and idiotic. I said nothing about any person.

MR. SPEAKER: It would, of course, be utterly unparliamentary to refer to any member in that way.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the difference.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I shall go on to prove the statement I have made about the statement as uttered by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East. He compares the radio address of Commissioner Dunne of 1944, consisting of eleven pages with the three hundred and twenty-six pages of the Walsh Report of 1953. He compares that Dunne Report which consists of approximately seven thousand words to the Walsh Report of 1953 which consists of approximately one hun-

dred and seven thousand words. The Walsh Report was made after some two years of intense study by merchants, fish-killing captains, the former chairman of the Newfoundland Fisheries Board, and some two or three other gentlemen with the present Chief Justice as Chairman. He ridicules that two years of intensive study, resulting from a large representative number of the outports all around the coast of Newfoundland, as well as the reading of reports of other royal commissions which had been appointed for this very thing during the past hundreds of years. The opportunity which that Walsh Committee had and took of visiting outport merchants and St. John's merchants, going into their books which apparently were given to the committee quite voluntarily, after visiting stage after stage all around the coast of Newfoundland and talking to the fishermen themselves in order to get their ideas on their problems, produced his Report.

MR. BROWNE: All around the coast?

MR. MERCER: I did not say every settlement, I said various settlements.

MR. JANES: On the northeast coast?

MR. MERCER: More than on the northeast coast. A commission which had that opportunity and took two years to do it, and took three hundred and twenty-six pages to report on it, to compare that with a report of a committee appointed in 1943 who stayed in St. John's for two or three months, and made a report on one phase of the fishing industry in Newfoundland. The Dunne Address distinctly states it is only the fresh fish industry alone on which he is reporting. That Walsh Committee is on the

whole fishing industry, salt cured and fresh frozen, pickled and everything else, all sorts.

Now in the event that the honourable gentlemen opposite are a little bit worried about the Walsh Committee, let me read (if I may, Mr. Speaker) a couple of paragraphs or quotations in the foreword of the Walsh Committee Report:

"The members of the Committee represent the fishermen of Newfoundland, the fish processors and exporters, the Department of Fisheries of Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives of Newfoundland.

The Government assumed responsibility for providing personnel to undertake such investigations and obtain such information as the Committee might require. We thus have had at our disposal the services of expert research staff, provided by several departments of the Federal Government and by the Provincial Government, who have carried out a number of special surveys and studies on our behalf. These include reports on the working conditions and income position of fishermen, the location and extent of fishery resources, the nature of the markets for fish products, catching methods and equipment, processing plants and techniques, costs of production and distribution and the like. In some cases, the Committee and their investigators sought the assistance of specialists outside the Government service. For example, an official of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations visited Newfoundland on our invitation to supply special information on fishing craft and gear.

The Government of Newfoundland also set up an inter-departmental committee to co-ordinate the assembly of



information for the Committee's use from the various Provincial agencies.

At the Committee's invitation, the fishing industry and trade in Newfoundland appointed advisory groups or "working parties" who were helpful in facilitating the investigational work.

Some of the investigations involved detailed examination of premises and of confidential records. In general, the operators concerned freely permitted such examination and assigned members of their staff to assist our investigators. Their co-operation has been most valuable.

In April, 1951, the Committee interviewed a number of delegates to a convention in St. John's of fishermen from all parts of Newfoundland. These men were able to communicate to us a direct appreciation of the individual fisherman's problems.

During the summer of 1951, the Committee visited some fifty fishing settlements around the coast of Newfoundland for the purpose of obtaining first-hand knowledge of local conditions. It was not practicable to visit every settlement, and to do so would have involved a duplication of the work of our research staff.

Following a recommendation by the Committee, a detailed survey of the coastal settlements of Newfoundland was begun in July 1952, by a group seconded by government departments for the purpose of being representative of fisheries, agriculture, forestry and (harbour) engineering. A preliminary reconnaissance of some ninety settlements on the northeast coast and south coast already had been completed and the results have been received. These contain much useful information on the development possibilities of our fishing ports, large and small."

MR. BROWNE: And the next paragraph?

MR. MERCER: I can read it all. Would the honourable and learned gentleman like me to read it all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would like for honourable gentlemen to address the Chair.

MR. MERCER: No, Mr. Speaker, the next paragraph is perhaps more explanatory and greater proof of my statement with regard to the statement of the honourable and learned member being idiotic and certainly inconsistent. That is the next paragraph to which the honourable and learned member for St. John's West now wishes me to refer:

"Notwithstanding the quantity of information which government departments and the industry have made available to the Committee, their work has been handicapped by the lack of precise knowledge on many important questions."

Yet, Mr. Speaker, one of the statements in the speech of the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East was that we had sufficient information in 1949—from an eleven page radio address of a Commissioner in 1944—to carry on and do the same thing we are doing today.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable gentleman a question: He speaks of the intense work of this Walsh Committee during the past two years. Does he know how intensive the work of the Committee itself actually was. There is nothing in the foreword about it.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, I was not on the Committee. I did not attend any of their meetings. I was not asked to attend any of their meetings.



I cannot say, therefore, how intensive it was. I can only accept the word of the gentlemen who composed that Committee. I know I am speaking on it from their word, and I accept their word. Now the gentlemen who composed that Committee, Mr. Speaker, were Sir Albert Walsh, R. Gushue, H. A. Dawe, G. Groves, Clive Planta, Hazen Russell, Capt. Clarence C. Williams, and P. Lloyd Soper, the Lawyer and Executive Secretary. I can only take their word that they did do an intensive survey.

MR. BROWNE: Where is their word for that?

MR. MERCER: In this great big book, this report.

Sir, the Dunne Report of 1944 was the result of a sub-committee to the general committee appointed by the Commission of Government to look into the natural resources of this country. His report was based on the sub-committee's report and dealt solely with fresh fish and not at all with salt fish. In that report, as the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East said, Commissioner Dunne in 1944 was prepared to have the Government invest four million dollars out of ten million which he thought would be necessary—four to ten—ten million dollars. The Government was prepared to put up four out of ten or maybe it was four out of fifteen. Now I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if that same Commissioner Dunne was here today, in 1954, instead of 1944, that even he would agree that ten to fifteen millions dollars in 1944 today would mean twenty to thirty million dollars; and he was dealing wholly and solely with fresh fish, whereas this Bill based on the Walsh Report is dealing not only with fresh frozen fish but is trying to find the answer for

the crippled salt fish industry, which may mean many millions of dollars more. Therefore, when this Bill says that the authority should be allowed to borrow up to twenty-five million dollars it is not too far out of line with the thinking of Commissioner Dunne in 1944.

The honourable and learned gentleman also stated that this Government should have started this Fishery Bill, which is before the House now, in 1949. If I remember correctly, he said, because of Commissioner Dunne's Radio Address in 1949 the Government had all the evidence about the fisheries of Newfoundland which they now have as a result of the Walsh Report. He said, Mr. Speaker, that the Dunne Radio Address was based upon an investigation of fresh fish only, and if the honourable and learned gentleman had read that report fully he would have seen that Commissioner Dunne at that time said in that address: "We are going into an unexplored field." Up to 1944, you will remember, Mr. Speaker, we had little or no fresh frozen fish industry in Newfoundland. It was a completely new thing which private enterprise had started and the Government decided, well, let us look into it and see if this is the cure-all for Newfoundland's ills in the fishing industry. So they put in this Committee. Now, we then had no fresh frozen fish industry, we were just starting; Mr. Dunne was quite convinced of that fact, and quite openly said in that same address: "We are going into an unexplored field." He did not know, Mr. Speaker, if ten million or one hundred million would be required even for the fresh fish industry alone. Therefore to compare that—since 1944 a lot of merchants in this country have gained a terrific amount of experience and information,

and a lot of heartaches. Some made profits and some met losses in the fresh frozen fish industry. But they have gained a lot of experience, and they know a lot more in 1953 than they knew in 1943 and 1944 when they first started out. When you take a Royal Commission in 1953 with the advantage of hearing from and having the help and co-operation of all these people who had had their heartaches from 1943 to 1953 in the fresh frozen fisheries, and going out and talking with fishermen themselves, to compare the Dunne Radio Address of 1944 with a report such as we have here today I personally think, Mr. Speaker, is idiotic, senseless and shows ignorance of the fisheries.

MR. BROWNE: In those days do you not think he talked to the fishermen just as now?

MR. MERCER: Did you not also look at the reports filed to see if they went around, went down on the stages and talked with the fishermen; to see if they went to the merchants and said, "show me your books?" It was never done before.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable gentleman—they had representatives of the Salt Codfish Association and NAFEL, and they were composed of men in the fish trade.

MR. MERCER: But that was not the subject of a Royal Commission or report. In fact here in this Walsh Report you have representatives of the Salt Codfishery Association and representatives of NAFEL on that commission.

MR. BROWNE: You had that from Dunne too.

MR. MERCER: No, you did not, at least I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: And on the Newfoundland Fisheries Board—Gushue was the head of it.

MR. MERCER: Now, Mr. Speaker, what the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East forgot was this: He forgot the Dunne Report was on fresh fish only. He forgot that Dunne was talking at a time when the fresh frozen fish industry was just barely beginning in this country, and when we had no experience with it. He forgot to compare the report from which Dunne made his radio address and the work which they did in the two or three months sitting in St. John's, he forgot to compare the work of that committee with the Walsh Committee, going all over the country to get information and having various sub-committees on various other phases of the fish trade involving the whole picture of the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

And, Mr. Speaker, supposing it could be shown that there was a similar committee in 1943, suppose it was exactly the same set-up in 1943 as in 1953 and they both brought in a report, and went to just as many places, surely it must be obvious, Mr. Speaker, to anybody with an open mind that you would still require an investigation to be made in 1953, or in 1949 for that matter, because there were a great many changes which took place in world conditions from 1943 to 1949: A war ended in Germany and in Japan. You had the United Nations being formed. Even if none of these things happened, we had no experience, no know-how in the fresh frozen fish industry in Newfoundland in 1943 as compared with 1949, and to go further afield for something very important to the fresh frozen fish industry, you did not have the accomplishments

of science with regard to refrigeration in 1943 as you had in 1949. Therefore it would have been impossible for any government in 1949 to base a programme for rehabilitation of the fisheries on a 1944 report. That to me, Mr. Speaker, is so simple that I am quite satisfied that every member of the Opposition realizes that, including the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. They are just as satisfied of that as everybody in the country and as we are over here, but of course they must say something against the programme now being proposed by this Government.

I say also, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East was inconsistent. He said this Government knew as much in 1949 as they do now, because of the Dunne Report of 1944, and therefore they should have got going then. But he ended up by saying that the Government should go very slowly with this programme and should not spend too much because we don't know enough yet about the industry. Now how inconsistent is that?

We do know this, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen of Newfoundland (and I don't think anybody will disagree with this) have always been on the starvation end of the scale, and some merchants have been on the same end of it, while some merchants on the other hand have been on the wealthy end of the stick. We all know these facts. We all know that there have been numerous investigating committees and Royal Commissions. We all know that most of the reports have been filed and forgotten about officially; by any government very few reports have been acted upon at all. The only one I know of is the Dunne

Report which was acted upon half-heartedly between 1944 and 1948. We now have a great deal more information about how much fish we have around this coast, we have not very much more information about how much salt we should use per quintal of fish. We have not got any more information about how many days the sun is going to shine.

MR. HOLLETT: You should have that.

MR. MERCER: But we have got more information about artificial drying of salt fish. Perhaps we have not got very much more information, and there may not be a great deal more to get than we already have of the markets to which our salt codfish goes. But one of our great difficulties has been the cure. We now have more scientific knowledge on artificial drying and curing, and certainly we have more scientific knowledge on refrigeration and the means and methods of putting up fresh frozen fish, and far more information during the past year or two on the markets for which that fish is destined, within the United States particularly. Now having had that, and the only way we could have gotten it was from some sort of a report whether a Walsh Report or Browne Report or whatever kind of report, the only way was to appoint a commission to spend a couple of years and go out and get the information, and having done that we now bring in this Bill.

This Bill may not cure all sickness of the Newfoundland fishery. This Bill does not say that we have to put a plant at LaScie. I have heard several objections to LaScie maybe being the wrong place for a plant. That I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the geog-

raphy or the climate or how many weeks or months in the year there may be ice. But I do say this: We are not concerned in this Bill or in this debate on the principle whether it is LaScie or Quirpon or Joe Batts Arm or Burgeo or Port-au-Port or anywhere else in the island. That is a matter of administration. If they put a plant at LaScie and it does not work all the year around that is not the fault of the principle of this Bill. The principle of this Bill is this: We have, without any argument at all, a fishing industry which is our biggest industry from an economic point of view and from the point of view of employment and it may be many generations, if ever, before it will be replaced from its present position of employing so many people as compared with other industries. We know it is not bringing in as much money, but we now want to try and make it bring in money. No government, no private industry has in the past been able to do anything about that situation. Now let us say that private industry has done its best and every government in the past has done its best—yet they have not made one iota of difference to that salt fish industry. Now if they have done their best, why is that?

Now this Bill says that from the investigations of this Walsh Committee, and that is from representatives of the fishermen, of the merchants and of two governments, it is claimed that you can put curing stations, drying stations for salt fish in certain places of this country, and it is claimed you can put fresh frozen fish plants and filleting plants in a number of places or in some places where you have curing and drying of salt fish so that you can work the two together in combination, co-operating with each other, but that it is going to require the expen-

diture of millions and millions of dollars. Now who is going to do it?

We asked private enterprise and private enterprise says: "Look at what it is going to cost. You cannot even look at a fresh frozen fish plant under a million or two million dollars." We have not got the private individuals and private companies in this country to put the money into it.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? You said a few moments ago the fresh frozen fish industry amounted to nothing in 1944. Do you realize that thirteen fresh frozen fish plants have been established, new ones since 1943?

MR. MERCER: If the honourable gentleman will go back again to where he got that information and look a little further, and then go back and report on the number of pounds of fish which were exported by these fourteen plants in 1943 or 1944 as compared with today, and then see if he will agree with me when I say the fresh frozen fish industry in 1943 was little or nothing compared with today.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the honourable member a question? Does he realize that in 1944 we shipped twenty-three million, six hundred thousand pounds of frozen fillets out of this country? May I also ask him how much in pounds we shipped out last year?

MR. MERCER: I don't know. But I do know this much: He will find that what was shipped out in 1943 or 1944 as compared with 1953 will be less than ten per cent.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense.

MR. MERCER: Now, as I said here, the Opposition seems to place

great stress on Mr. Dunne's Report of 1944. Mr. Dunne in 1944 said; "If this policy which this Commission of Government is trying to put into effect in Newfoundland now, if it fails, this business of trying to make fifteen or twenty centres where we can build filleting plants and fresh frozen fish plants etc., if that fails, regardless of the salt codfish industry, we might as well all pack up and leave Newfoundland." Newfoundland is gone. If it is a success, he says, "We are all right, we are going to be a great country." Here we are today, quite a bit further ahead in other fields than we were when Mr. Dunne spoke in 1944, and so we are trying now to bring in this fishery plan. Personally I don't care if the Commission of Government did start the fresh fish industry or whether it was private enterprise. I believe private enterprise did first of all start and then Commission of Government came in and started lending money because they could not carry on. But just as the Commission of Government in 1944 had to lend money to private enterprise so today, if you want to continue with the fresh frozen fish industry, other than to a couple on the Southside or a couple of others, the Government must lend the money as private enterprise has not got the money. Personally I think, Mr. Speaker, that if our merchants in Newfoundland had the money they would go into the thing. But they have not got the money. They just have not got that basic capital. So that this Bill proposes that the Government should invite private enterprise to take advantage of the fact that the Government is ready to loan money to build fresh fish plants in various parts of Newfoundland.

Now if the administration or the committee in charge of the administration of this Act, after it becomes law, puts a plant in a place not economically feasible, that may well be done. They may put a plant in one place where it is very successful and into another place where it is not. That has nothing absolutely to do with the principle of this Bill.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the greatest, if not the greatest and most important pieces of legislation ever to come before this House. It is a piece of legislation in which, I hope and pray, we shall have not only the co-operation and good-will of the Opposition but also the co-operation and good-will of the fishermen and the merchants. We should, and in my opinion, must have the co-operation of every person be he fisherman, processor or merchant or government, and that includes both the Federal and the Newfoundland Government, but be he fisherman, processor or merchant or government we must have his co-operation and good-will. And I sincerely hope and trust we shall have the co-operation of every one of them in the carrying out and in the administration of this Act when it becomes law in order to make it a success.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole on sundry Bills. Leave has already been granted for this committee to sit again. I shall now leave the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Sub-sections (2) to (6) of Section 3 of The Slum Clearance Act, chapter 86 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as enacted by the Act No. 28 of 1953, are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(2) Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Minister may make an agreement on behalf of Her Majesty with any co-operative society registered under The Co-operative Societies Act undertaking jointly with the society a project for the construction of

(a) houses to be conveyed upon the completion of the construction project to members of the society together with such land as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may prescribe; or

(b) houses for the use of members of the society, and for the acquisition of land for either of those purposes; and subject to this section every such agreement may contain any terms and conditions prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

(3) Any moneys required to be furnished by Her Majesty under an agreement referred to in sub-section (2) shall be advanced only by way of loan and the advance shall not exceed a sum equal to seventy-five per centum of the estimated cost of the joint housing project which is the subject of the agreement and may not be made until the society has given proof satisfactory to the Lieutenant Governor in Council of its ability to furnish the balance of that cost.

(4) Every advance made by Her Majesty in pursuance of an agreement made under sub-section (2) shall be repaid

(a) where the advance was made in respect of the construction of houses referred to in paragraph (a) of that sub-section, before the expiration of two years from the date of the advance and of such additional period as may be prescribed by the Minister; and

(b) where the advance was made in respect of houses referred to in paragraph (b) of that sub-section, before the expiration of twenty-five years from the date of the advance.

(5) Repayment of the amount advanced in pursuance of an agreement made under sub-section (2) and interest thereon shall be secured by mortgage, but the Lieutenant Governor in Council may prescribe other security in lieu of or in addition to a mortgage.

(6) Her Majesty has all the powers necessary to enable her to carry out any of the terms of any agreement made under this section."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to explain to us at this time just what happens when these housing groups are formed. I understand they study for a considerable time, a year or so, and save up some money. But I also understand they don't have a great amount of capital, and in fact are not in a position to buy out the land. Now where does the Provincial Government come into the picture?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, each of the members of the co-operative group is supposed to have a certain amount, and as the honourable and learned member suggests, provided approval has been given by



the Lieutenant Governor in Council to the application made to the Government, the Government is in a position to advance to them an amount so that they are able to go ahead with the first step of the building. That is continued until they reach the stage where they can receive a maximum loan of somewhere around seven thousand.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but when does the Government first lend them money? Do they have to have a building lot, because if they have a building lot they can get a loan from the housing corporation at that stage?

MR. HEFFERTON: They have to have a minimum amount of money themselves before they can.

MR. BROWNE: What is the minimum?

MR. HEFFERTON: Off-hand I could not tell you.

MR. BROWNE: Can you tell us now, does this section vary from last year, or does it just carry on, as the Attorney General told us a little while ago, and repeats sections of the previous Act. Is there any difference in this section and last years?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, quite a difference, as I have just pointed out. They will receive all their mortgages from the Government before any return can be received from C. M. & H., under this amendment they all receive a certain percentage from the Government—in other words—at the present time if we were to build say ten houses, the Government would be forced to advance, as we have been doing, seventy thousand dollars, that is \$7,000 per unit, a normal figure. In the meantime the co-operative individually would have had to put in some \$30,000 of it either as labour or

money or both. Now then seventy thousand dollars would have to be advanced by the Government before they could get anything back from C.M. & H. But under this amendment it is possible that the Government may advance, say, thirty thousand and the co-operative ten thousand, but instead of advancing it the Government puts in a claim to C.M. & H. and this C.M. & H. pays it back to them and then pays so much to the co-operative group.

MR. BROWNE: It gets reimbursed, so to speak.

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, exactly the same.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, that seems to me a lot better plan than we had before. But I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if, in respect to their own labour, is there a value put on it related to the amount of their own labour they put into building the homes?

MR. HEFFERTON: Just the same as if they were ordinary carpenters.

MR. FOGWILL: A minimum flat rate?

MR. HEFFERTON: There again I am sorry I cannot answer in detail, but I believe it is the current rate received by carpenters and possibly by electricians—where they are qualified and have permission to do the work they get electricians' rates.

MR. FOGWILL: Their own labour then would be valued at the current rate of carpenters' hourly pay?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right. And the accounts are kept by members of the group authorized to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, in regard to sub-section 4, I wonder if the Minister would explain that.

MR. HEFFERTON: That happens to be the provision under which the house is built.

MR. HOLLETT: Has the man to whom the house built belongs to pay that back in two years?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, he is given a mortgage and he has twenty-five years under a mortgage plan to pay off, which is done under an amortized plan, monthly payments. The advance made to the co-operative groups is made in two years, but the Government has to receive the advances from C.M. & H. and the whole thing must be carried to a certain stage where he can get a mortgage within two years of the date of building. There are two years allowed in which to build the house.

MR. FOGWILL: It has to be put up in two years?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: Who repays the advance which must be made before the two years expires. I may have this wrong but I am just trying to get to the bottom of it.

MR. HEFFERTON: C.M. & H. repays all advances made by the Government to the co-operatives within the period of two years.

Section 2 carried.

Section 3 read:

3. The said Act is further amended by inserting therein immediately after Section 3 as Section 3A the following:

"3A. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Minister may make an agreement with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation undertaking to act, and may act under the agreement, as

agent of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the purpose of carrying out any project for the construction of houses and for any purpose in connection therewith or incidental thereto."

MR. BROWNE: I think this is the section which gives powers to the Central Mortgage and Housing. There is really no change in the previous section at all, but this is the one which gives the power to do that. Why does the Minister find that necessary, would the Minister tell us?

MR. HEFFERTON: It is necessary to make this change here because the Central Mortgage and Housing are satisfied now to do this but in the first place they would not do it. It is an entirely different arrangement. In the first place they would not make any advance until all the work was completed. This is a completely new agreement.

Clause 3 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I am especially in order when I refer to this, but it has been brought to my attention in connection with some of these houses built under this measure here, the assessor or whoever makes up the rental amount added to the earnings of the men the amount which he receives by reason of the children coming under the family allowance regulations. This brings up the rental to be paid on these houses. It seems to me that was not the intention of the family allowance in the first place. Family allowances are for the benefit of the children to buy clothes and shoes and not to pay rent on houses. But it is here added in to the earnings of the householder in order to arrive at an assessment for rent. I

wonder if the Minister would give us his opinion on that?

MR. HEFFERTON: I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is speaking of something entirely different from the purpose of this Bill, because this is a case where the person is building the house himself and enters voluntarily into an agreement by which it is amortized over a number of years. The family allowance has nothing to do with it, not a thing in the world. The only possible way it could have anything to do with it is that when an applicant forms a group and makes application to us, we have to concern ourselves with all his earnings in order to find out if he is in a position to qualify.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have read the rental agreements which the applicant for the house has to sign, and there it definitely states that family allowance payments will be taken into consideration when arriving at the amount of rental a person will have to pay per month. That is an agreement which emanates from the office of the Honourable Minister, and I read it.

MR. HEFFERTON: The amount of money the co-operatives pay is approximately the same. They borrow seven thousand dollars, they pay seven thousand dollars, and on the same basis, the only difference being the amount which the individual is able to put in in the beginning, that is all.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Minister tell me how they arrive at the amount which each householder has to pay under the Slum Clearance Act?

MR. HEFFERTON: Co-operatives?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not quite

sure whether it is on a co-operative basis or not, but it is under the housing scheme.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is a different thing.

MR. HOLLETT: I have seen the agreement.

MR. HEFFERTON: I know. But it is a little different. We are talking about something affecting the house building scheme, but not co-operative housing. The same principles do not apply.

May I say for the information of the honourable and learned member for St. John's, this particular Bill is a misnomer and is something that has been under consideration for some time between our own department and the Department of the Attorney General. I believe it is our purpose during the coming year to look at the whole thing, if possible, and bring in a new Bill, and —

MR. BROWNE: I was surprised to learn you were dealing with co-operative housing because I don't see any relationship between them and slum clearance. I have before me the original Act, chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes and it certainly seems to apply in assessment of land in areas adjacent to development areas. This has to do with where you improve land by bringing water and sewerage and laying culverts and gutters. I have in mind a particular instance at the junction of Empire Avenue and Newtown Road where an assessment was made by your predecessor in office. I am aware of the fact that many of these housing groups, co-operative groups are situated outside of the developed areas. Unfortunately they have to go elsewhere as there are not

enough developed land areas within the town to satisfy the number of groups looking for land at the present time, and they have to go out to other sections. Therefore this particular section you are dealing with now has no relation to that at all, only in those areas where there is this service. Is that correct?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: In that case when assessment has been made and has not been satisfied then the man files in the Registrar of Deeds something in the nature of a charge or mortgage so that anybody who goes to buy the property will find out in the record of John Jones or John Smith that he did not pay his assessment. I think that is the purpose?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Has the Minister any knowledge of any people who have not paid that assessment, who are connected with the co-operative societies or who have given reason for the inclusion into this Bill of this particular clause?

MR. HEFFERTON: I cannot give the honourable and learned member for St. John's West a decided answer on that subject. But there is such a case in an area not connected with St. John's at all at the present time, but a co-operative housing group.

MR. BROWNE: I see.

Clauses 4 and 5 read and carried.

Motion is the committee report having passed the Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an

Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twenty-first day of May, 1953."

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Schedule read:

#### SCHEDULE

THIS AGREEMENT is made the day of 1954 BETWEEN HIS HONOR COLONEL THE HONOURABLE SIR LEONARD CECIL OUTERBRIDGE, C.B.E., D.S.O., LL.D., Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland in Council (hereinafter called "the Government" which expression shall wherever the context so admits mean the Government for the time being of the said Province) of the first part BRITISH NEWFOUNDLAND CORPORATION LIMITED a company incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland (hereinafter called "the Corporation" which expression shall wherever the context so admits include the Corporation its subsidiaries and assigns) of the second part and N. M. ROTHSCHILD & SONS of New Court, St. Swithin's Lane in the City of London (hereinafter called "Rothschilds") of the third part SUPPLEMENTAL to an Agreement made between the parties hereto and dated the 21st day of May 1953 (hereinafter called "the Principal Agreement").

#### WHEREAS:

A. Pursuant to the terms of the Principal Agreement the Corporation has since its incorporation in April 1953 carried out operations for the exploration and investigation of the natural resources of Newfoundland and Labrador for the purpose of enabling it to select the areas in respect of

which it wishes to exercise its option to take exploration leases pursuant to Clause 3 of the Principal Agreement.

B. Pursuant to the terms of Clause 3 of the Principal Agreement such option is exercisable by the Corporation at any time on or before 31st March 1954.

C. It has not been possible to complete before 31st March 1954 the study and evaluation of the reports prepared as a result of the said operations for exploration and investigation carried out by the Corporation and it has been agreed between the parties hereto that it would be to the benefit of all parties if such study and evaluation were completed before the Corporation was required to exercise its said option and accordingly it has been agreed that the said date on or before which such option is exercisable shall be postponed until 31st December 1954 and the Principal Agreement shall be amended in manner hereinafter appearing.

NOW THIS DEED WITNESSETH as follows :

1. The provisions of the Principal Agreement shall be amended in manner following

(a) By the deletion of the words "31st March 1954" in the second line of Clause 3 of the Principal Agreement and the substitution therefor of "31st December 1954."

(b) By the deletion of the words "31st March 1954" in the first line of sub-clause (a) of Clause 8 of the Principal Agreement and the substitution therefor of "31st December 1954."

2. Save as hereinafter expressly provided all the provisions contained in

the Principal Agreement shall continue in full force and effect.

3. This Agreement is conditional upon its being approved and confirmed by the Legislature of Newfoundland.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in Council has caused the Great Seal of the Province of Newfoundland to be affixed hereto and has signed these presents and N. M. Rothschild & Sons has executed these presents and the Common Seal of British Newfoundland Corporation Limited has hereunto been affixed the day and year first above written.

By His Honour's command.

Minister of Provincial Affairs.

SIGNED, SEALED and DELIVERED  
by N. M. Rothchild & Sons in the  
presence of :

THE COMMON SEAL of British  
Newfoundland Corporation Limited  
has hereunto been affixed in  
the presence of :

MR. HOLLETT : Mr. Chairman, there is something I wish to inquire about there : The Corporation has since its incorporation in April 1953 carried out operations for the exploration and investigation of the natural resources—now that is a positive statement of which we have no knowledge. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would advise us just how much investigation has been carried on by this firm?

MR. CURTIS : I think, Mr. Chairman, a full report has been given to the House by the Honourable the Premier. As I remember it was also published in the paper. I think they spent last year three hundred thou-

sand dollars or some such sum. Perhaps the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources may know more about it?

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, this agreement would be invalid. They have to, I believe, spend \$300,000. They have gone over the minimum amount they had to spend, but I don't recall the exact figures. As the Honourable the Attorney General said, the Premier did table the figures here in answer to a question. I know that BRINCO have more than fulfilled the terms of their agreement, and that is on record.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not doubting the Honourable Minister's word at all. It is all very well to get up and say, we know they have gone over their contract, but that is not proof to this House. Who know it? Is it the Premier who knows it or the Attorney General or the Minister of Mines and Resources, and how, and if you know, what have you got? I would like to have that information as, I know, would the people in Newfoundland generally. I think you could give us a little more detail than that. It is not sufficient to satisfy me, no.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman should refer to some answers tabled here by the Premier with regard to BRINCO. If my memory serves me correctly there were a number of questions asked about BRINCO, and I am quite certain the honourable member would find this information in the answers filed by the Premier. I am speaking from memory, but that is my understanding. These questions were asked here anyway.

MR. CURTIS: My feeling is, Mr.

Chairman, that the House has been told. I have not got the figures in my mind. But my understanding is that they spent over three hundred thousand dollars, and there was some definite statement made in the House. However, I can assure the honourable member that very substantial investigations have been made, far in advance of those required under the agreement. If I am right I think the agreement calls for an expenditure of a million dollars in five years, and they have in the last year spent more than their one-fifth of that sum.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised the point is, I did not see last year's report, but I saw something the other evening when I called for a certain person at one of the local hotels and discovered that there were some thirty-two young men from one or other of our districts who had already been flown in that day to work for BRINCO in Labrador. I was delighted to hear it. As I say, that is the only evidence that I have seen or any concrete evidence that BRINCO is doing anything at all. But I was delighted to see thirty-two young men—I was sorry to see them leaving the Southern Shore which is one of the great fishing places. In one way I was glad and in another sorry. These were good fishermen, good men, who had to go down to the Labrador to work for BRINCO. I don't know whether I should say this, Mr. Chairman, but it was suggested to me by some of these men that they would rather go fishing if they could get what they were going to get by working for BRINCO, and that is unemployment insurance for lack of work next fall. I believe that is something in which the Government should activate itself largely. I think you can bring in all the



fishery authority acts you like and all the regulations you like, but unless you envisage and bring into effect some scheme of unemployment insurance for fishermen all around Newfoundland then they are all going to have to go to Labrador and work for BRINCO or some other company. That is the reason I raised this point, and not by way of criticizing the Government for anything. I just wanted to say that. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if he has received any report which could be made available to the House at this time?

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the BRINCO Agreement unlike some others was with the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and was not an agreement such as the Falconbridge Agreement, which was between our Department of Mines and Resources and that Company, and which specified they would furnish reports to the Minister; in this case it is the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

In the second place, there is the very closest liaison in operation between our department and BRINCO. I would say that there is hardly a day passes that BRINCO's officers and men are not in our department for this information and that. And at times they have given us information which we were looking for and did not have. BRINCO has never yet refused any information we have requested from them, but we have not received from them any formal report. They have not been in operation for a year yet, and I doubt if there has been any time for them to submit a formal report of an annual nature on the work they have done

so far. But in every possible way they have certainly gone far beyond the letter of their agreement insofar as my dealings with them is concerned. But I would again emphasize their agreement is with the Government itself.

Motion is the committee rise and report having passed this Bill without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Slum Clearance Act" without amendment.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there may be an error in that Slum Clearance Bill and I would like to have it recommitted. Instead of having this report received I would like to ask leave to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. BROWNE: We could recommit it on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Providing the amendment is nominal.

MR. CURTIS: We passed an amendment last year that the House has the right to refer a Bill back after third reading. I think, Mr. Speaker.

On motion report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twenty-first day

of May 1953," and have passed the Bill without amendment.

Report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

First reading:

Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 21, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Labour to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. Is the Minister aware that a work stoppage is in progress, in a majority of city garages, for the past three weeks?

2. If so, what action is the Minister or his Department taking, in trying to solve this problem, which is causing great inconvenience to the general public, much loss of wages to the workers concerned as well, as interrupting the normal operations of those engaged in the car service business.

3. Did the Garage Workers' Union make application for the services of a Conciliation Board, if so, why was a Board not appointed? Give full details.

MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister for Economic Development to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. How much money, if any was paid to architects for

(a) drawing plans

(b) making specifications

(c) supervising the construction for each of the buildings erected by or for the Government in its industrial development programme? Give the names of industry, name of architect, and amount paid him.

2. Were any tenders called for the construction of any of the said buildings? If so give the names of persons tendering with amount of each tender and the name of the one who was successful.

3. If tenders were not called state the reasons why they were not called and the basis on which construction was conducted.

4. Were sub-contracts given for

(a) electrical wiring

(b) heating

(c) plumbing

in connection with the construction of the said buildings?

5. Were tenders called for these sub-contracts? If so, give the names of persons tendering, with the amount of each tender, and the name of the successful one.

6. On what basis was sub-contract issued in each case?

7. What was the amount paid to each sub-contractor or person doing the electric wiring, heating and plumbing in each building?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 93:

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that there was any discrimination in the rates of pay. But I might say for the information of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the matter is between the railway and its employees and the Terms of Union, and has been all more or less handled by my colleague, the Premier, and I feel quite sure that when he arrives here, by next sitting, he will be able to give the member the information.

Question No. 94:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the answer is being prepared.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General has had time to get the answers to Question No. 34 asked on April 2nd. That is over six weeks ago now.

MR. CURTIS: I think that answer has been prepared. I thought it was tabled. I might say we have been very busy in my department.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): The answer to Question No. 88 is being prepared, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are entered upon I should like to ask if it is correct that the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are guarding night and day the person of Dr. Valdmanis, and if so, by what arrangement, for a person who has been arrested under a civil process in the Supreme Court?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I might say that no arrangements have been made except that the RCMP agreed to do it. There is no financial arrangement.

MR. BROWNE: Are not the RCMP engaged to do criminal work in places outside the City of St. John's? Have they any jurisdiction in matters concerning the Supreme Court?

MR. CURTIS: In reply I might say to my honourable and learned friend that it is true the RCMP are under contract to serve those portions of Newfoundland outside St. John's, but in view of the fact that the prisoner in question was arrested by the RCMP and that they are interested in a criminal charge already outstanding against him, we felt it advisable that they might continue, and they look upon him as their prisoner really.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on that point, I understood that the prisoner had given security for his appearance. Now I understand from the Honourable the Attorney General that the RCMP regard him as their prisoner. Perhaps it is insolence on

my part, but I wonder why—I don't wish to defend the prisoner or say anything against him. At the moment I think we ought to guard ourselves in this country against what appears to me almost something touching things we have heard about happening way, way behind a certain curtain, which we have heard people talking about—I don't know where.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the honourable member, I refuse to discuss the matter any more in the House while the case is pending.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

### Orders of the Day

Third reading of a Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

### First readings:

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members of the House of Assembly."

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, before you put the next motion I should like to inform the House that I have had this Bill printed and I have arranged to have it distributed immediately so that honourable mem-

bers may have it as approved reading for the long week-end coming up. It is a long Bill, and I don't think the publishers of the Sunday newspapers would complain if we studied the Bill on Sunday so that we may be ready to introduce it at the next sitting.

MR. BROWNE: Arising out of that statement, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Attorney General if this Bill follows along the line of the one we have, or whether it follows any other approved by the committee on uniformity of legislation. Could the Honourable the Attorney General give us any indication as to what the Bill follows?

MR. CURTIS: I might say, there is obviously no uniformity on this Legislation, otherwise we would find ourselves in the position of British Columbia, and consequently everybody would vote three times. I might say the Bill follows the pattern of our old Bill plus the improvements of the Federal Bill. We think from the committee's report it is a good one and I am sure, embraces the best features of all their Bills, adapted to our circumstances.

Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority":

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this Bill I should first of all like to congratulate the previous speakers, in particular the Honourable Minister who introduced the Bill. I remember hearing him speak, I think it was in 1945, for the Rotary Club, and I am glad to find his basic thinking along the lines of fishery development and fishery

policy is much the same now as it was then; that it was in dire need of reorganization and that the reorganization meant not only the procuring of larger quantities of fish and the matter of higher returns of the social and sociological conditions of our people.

As Newfoundlanders we are very proud of our long historic past and of our great traditions. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that most of our traditions are connected with the sea, with seamen and with fishermen. In a country such as Newfoundland bounded by the ocean it would be rather surprising if that were not so. Our livelihood has depended upon the fisheries, and the fisheries have certainly been the most discussed subject in the history of the country and province. I say, this is only natural because the success or failure of the fisheries is the measure of the prosperity or otherwise of our people.

Today with the population of the globe on the increase, and with the sources of food gradually declining our fisheries will become more and more important not only to us but to the world in general. Unlike agriculture both vegetable and animal the fisheries provide a source of food which is practically inexhaustible. It is almost a "toil not neither do they spin," but just have the fish, the fish from the water, and of course it is true that by conservation and other means, fish such as salmon or lobster or shrimp or some of the more expensive types of fish can be increased or conserved, but the great bulk of our fishing goes on and on without much interference from man. Fortunately for us in Newfoundland we have fish in plentiful supply. And with such great wealth on our doorstep we should take every precaution

to see that they are managed to the best possible advantage to the people of the province. I am sure that we all agree that up to the present time there has been much room for improvement in the way that our fisheries have been managed, in the way that the fish have been cured and in the way that they have been marketed.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, who was to blame for this mis-management. I hardly think the fishermen themselves can be blamed because over the years, despite their adverse circumstances, despite their lack of proper equipment, catching equipment and handling equipment, they have managed to produce a fairly large number of codfish. I do not like to blame the merchants too much. I think they have always had their problems; the problem of the salt codfishery becoming a thing of the past, and at the same time the problem of their own old equipment, Labrador fishing schooners and traps and other gear becoming worn out at the same time as the fisheries slumped. I would possibly lay some of the blame on the Government. I do not mean this Government of course, I mean governments of the past, because, while I do not subscribe to the idea that governments should have their finger in every pie and conduct the complete welfare state, I do think that in such matters as the fishery which affects every person in this province, not only the fishermen but people who live in Grand Falls and Corner Brook and in St. John's, indeed every man, woman and child in Newfoundland, if such things which have such a great effect upon our people have not been handled properly then governments should at least take some regulatory action to

see that these mistakes and these neglects are rectified.

This present Bill will, I believe, be a beginning towards regulating our fisheries. I believe this Bill is designed not merely for the economic improvements of our fisheries (and I mean by economic, the fact that a fisherman in one year makes one thousand dollars and in the next year makes two thousand dollars) it is designed to assist far more than the barely economic end of the fisheries. I think it concerns itself with the social conditions as well as the economic. Actually I cannot see how one can be saved without the other. I think that while we have these hundreds of small communities scattered amongst the rocks and in the coves of our coastline, even if the fishermen were making ten thousand dollars per person per year we would still have the need for a Bill such as this. If we had that happy state the clause covering the borrowing or raising of those millions of dollars could possibly be eliminated, and in that case we could finance our own development programme. But while we have people living in those small communities who can never attain any great improved living conditions, there is need for such a Bill.

This problem, Mr. Speaker, is not only the problem of fish itself. It is the problem of people, and the implementation of the clauses of this Bill will affect not only our fishermen, the people who actively and actually engage in taking the fish from the water, but also the families, children, wives and mothers, and most particularly the children and grandchildren of our fishermen. It is with the lives and living standards of people that this Bill deals.

The purely technical problem of

increasing the amount of fish produced in Newfoundland is not a difficult one. For instance two or three years ago, I think, there was an English boat in Harbour Grace, actually an English fish plant. I think her name was the "Fair Free," and I believe one that came later was the "Fair Try." About two years ago the "Fair Free" was here, and I think the "Fair Try" was meant to be an improvement on the "Fair Free." But the matter of increasing the volume of fish produced is simple because it means only the construction of four or ten or twenty or one hundred "Fair Frees" and we would have the volume of fish we need.

MR. BROWNE: At £1,000,000 each.

MR. MORGAN: That, as I say, could be done simply by having enough money. That also could result in Newfoundland becoming an uninhabited island where we would not have to worry about social problems or economic problems as far as the people of Newfoundland were concerned, because Newfoundlanders would no longer be Newfoundlanders as they would have to leave Newfoundland.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that there is any intention on the part of the Government nor on the part of the Fisheries Authority to have our fishermen become slaves of the factory whistle, whether that whistle is in a factory on the land or a factory which is afloat.

The problem of Newfoundland is, I think, intensified on the northeast coast. I will refer mainly to the District of Green Bay because I happen to know that district very well. In the District of Green Bay we have and we have had the problem of reorganization of the fisheries thrust



upon us for the past four or five years. Up to 1945 most of the fish produced in Green Bay was caught either up on the French Shore in the White Bay District, or Straits of Belle Isle and the Labrador. With the abandonment and almost complete failure of that fishery, from the point of returns to the fishermen, we had the problem of resettlement and re-organization right on our doorstep. For instance, in 1934 the firm of James Strong Limited, just one firm of a number in Green Bay District, packed some forty-seven thousand quintals of codfish. In the year 1953 that same firm packed less than ten thousand quintals. Mr. Speaker, the important question to me is; what happened to the people who produced the forty-seven thousand quintals of fish in between that forty-seven thousand and the ten thousand? Unfortunately most of them are no longer fishing. Many of them have left the district and have gone to work in Corner Brook and Grand Falls and latterly at Goose and some at Gander and some have gone to the Mainland. A whole generation of fishermen have left the district, and we are left at the present time in that central part of the district, which was concerned primarily with the Labrador and French Shore Fishery, with communities with half the population gone, and in a great many cases these have been the younger and more active men.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these men did not leave the fishery voluntarily. They were and are good fishermen. But they were driven from the fishery because of the fact that they just could not make a living. They could not make enough to provide the ordinary necessities of life for themselves and their families. Unlike,

say, the District of Bonavista North and to some extent the District of Fogo, the fisheries in Green Bay were carried on through schooners which were owned by merchants. On the north side of Bonavista Bay and some parts of Fogo District and possibly Twillingate District, this did not seem to be so. In these districts we had a large number of people operating their own vessels. In the District of Green Bay we had a number of large firms who owned the vessels. Immediately then that the fisheries had to be abandoned the fishermen themselves were left not only without a job but without means of producing a livelihood. The merchants themselves were also caught in the same dilemma because they did not have the capital and probably in some cases did not have too much of a desire to modernize and to re-adjust themselves to changing conditions. They found that in the bottom of the trough they were left with badly outworn gear and with a number of old hulls which were past the stage where they could be repaired. I say that in the central section of the District of Green Bay the people as a whole have had their own economic problems and have solved them by leaving the district, thus making the district worse through their loss.

This particular area, Mr. Speaker, has a particular problem. It is the problem of the large number of scattered communities with the best and the great part of their population gone. Under the Fishery Authority I can see such an excellent harbour as Robert's Arm being developed as a townsite, with a road linking it to the Trans-Canada Highway, with acres and acres of good arable land, with a plentiful water supply, with docking facilities to take

care of all fish that could be or will be produced in that central area. As a result of this improvement in some such particular port, which may not be Robert's Arm, I can see a great many of our people today living on the rocks and islands moving into these central areas. And in a great many cases, Mr. Speaker, they will not be requesting compensation for leaving their stages and flakes and their homes on these islands because they have been moving around in the past two or three years, and no longer are they satisfied to live in these small communities where they can never have proper medical care, where they can never have proper schools for their children, and where they can never look forward to having electricity and running water. Now these things are becoming more important in the lives of our people. I think it is a good sign that our people are looking for improvement and development. And our people in the central part of the District of Green Bay are more than anxious to move, and will gladly move as soon as some place is offered which will provide them with these amenities and also at the same time provide them with the means of gaining a livelihood.

On the north side of the District of Green Bay the problem is different. There for hundreds of years people have lived and gained a livelihood through shore fishing. I doubt if there were twenty people who left the area between Nipper's Harbour and Shoe Cove during the war years to go to work on any of the bases. Most of them stayed there, and they kept their fishing gear in good order. They have excellent boats. I may say I was rather surprised a few days ago, as a matter of fact I could

hardly believe it myself, when I was told that the average earnings per fisherman in that section last year was something in the vicinity of \$2,400, which is much higher than the average for Newfoundland.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): All from the fishery?

MR. MORGAN: All from the fishery. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on and clarify that. Evidently most of us when we speak of fish think of codfish, and when we think of codfish we think of dried, salt codfish. In the Nipper's Harbour area some eighteen thousand quintals of salt dried codfish was produced in 1953. This was handled by two firms, L. J. Noble & Sons and the Fishermen's Union Trading Co. However, in addition to this eighteen thousand quintals of salt codfish, some hundreds of thousands of pounds of fresh salmon were exported directly to the United States. I understand that in Nipper's Harbour alone some fifteen hundred barrels of Turbot were produced last year, bringing a return, I would say, directly to the fishermen of some thirty thousand dollars. In addition to salmon, turbot and cod, there is a fairly active lobster, live lobster fishery. Coupled with that we have, I would say, one of the most prolific mackerel grounds in Newfoundland. I remember in my own experience going down in a boat in Green Bay and driving for miles by the edge or through the centre of a school of mackerel that were practically on the surface of the water. Then of course, we have a reasonably substantial seal fishery. All of these taken together have meant that these people, from the standpoint of dollars and cents, have been able to make a fair living. However,

they still have the problems of living where they are still scattered in small communities which are isolated and where it is practically impossible because of the mountainous contour of the country to build even roads connecting these small communities. They have also become dissatisfied because of the things which they cannot get, and knowing there are so many things which they cannot get.

I have visions, Mr. Speaker, of Nipper's Harbour playing its part in this development programme. To go back to the turbot fishery alone, last year some fifteen hundred barrels were produced. Some four hundred of those were disposed of on the west-coast of Newfoundland. I think another four hundred barrels in Nova Scotia and another four hundred barrels around New Brunswick. Of the other three hundred barrels I am informed that two hundred of them went sour because of the lack of proper storage facilities. The turbot fishery could begin at the beginning of June but for this lack of proper storage facilities. The fishermen just cannot commence fishing for turbot until the weather cools off in October or November and December. In that one thing alone if facilities could be provided in Nipper's Harbour, if only cold room or some type of refrigerated warehouse whereby the people could start catching turbot along say from the beginning of June to the end of the season, I am sure that they could increase the cash returns to the fishermen by at least another hundred thousand dollars per year.

Mr. Speaker, here I speak of men who have been and who are today good shore fishermen. I also know that these people are anxious and willing to participate in any development programme. I think I men-

tioned in this House before that a committee from Nipper's Harbour approached me over a year ago and told me that they were willing to raise twenty-five thousand dollars and more if necessary if something could be done to provide proper landing facilities there for their codfish and for their turbot and salmon and halibut. They are anxious and they are willing to play their part. And I believe this development programme is something which will fill that need.

Now this report of Commissioner Dunne has been up for some discussion. So far, however, I don't think anyone has mentioned one of the most important points, at least insofar as I see it, that is his plan of having the fishermen participate in the ownership of the plants and of the means of production. I believe his plan was that the Government would buy common shares in these companies and the companies would agree that the fishermen could buy out these shares at the cost. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, should be and will be a part of the pattern of this development programme. We have a great many people in Newfoundland today who have a great interest in the fisheries, and we have in Newfoundland people who like fishing, people who would not go at anything else if there was the possibility at all of making a livelihood fishing. These people will be anxious to play some part and acquire some ownership in these plants and so regard them as theirs. I think, Mr. Speaker, that point is one which should be very seriously considered by the fishermen and also by the Fisheries Authority. I think the honourable and learned member for St. John's West mentioned the point and the place of

co-operatives in this scheme. Like him I am very much interested in the co-operative movement, and I always have been. I feel sure that in this scheme there must be provisions made for the inclusion of our co-operative societies who wish to participate. Particularly do I think this will be true in the case of the LaScie development.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take a little personal pride in the LaScie scheme. Unfortunately LaScie is outside my district by about two miles, and I do not want to encroach upon any other member's territory, even if there is a Redistribution Bill coming up. But I happen to have the honour of having held the first co-operative meeting in LaScie sometime in the fall of 1944. I was in that area four years, and I watched that little spark fanned from a meeting of some forty or fifty fishermen first into a credit society and then into a buying club. Their next venture was to buy an oil plant, a cod oil plant. After that they went into the retail business and latterly they have come into the fish business. They have come, in ten years from the first meeting, to one of the largest, and I would certainly say, the most successful co-operatives in Newfoundland. I would like to think that this evidence of their sincerity, this evidence that they can work together, this evidence that they are anxious to improve their community—I like to think that had something to do with LaScie being included in this first section of the development programme.

I know LaScie very well. I know the people. I am interested in LaScie not only because of my personal associations but also because of the fact that it will benefit the northern section of my district, say from Shoe

Cove, Tilt Cove and these small settlements there which I hope some day will be connected by road to LaScie, and over which they can ship their fish into that port, and also that later on they will be connected to the Trans-Canada Highway and be able to take advantage of some of the local markets in Newfoundland for their specialized products such as salmon and turbot and lobster.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very sadly disappointed if in the LaScie development there is not some provision made for the co-operatives to play their part in the development of the community.

Mr. Speaker, our people in Newfoundland today demand much better living conditions than they have ever had. I am inclined to agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition about the happy times which we have had in the past in our small communities, and I am not too anxious to see some of these communities disappear completely. We have them in Green Bay, fairly prosperous, growing communities such as Paradise, which really lives up to its name. It is a large harbour dotted with small spruce-clad islands. It has acres and acres of practically flat rolling land where people can make a living. I think of Rattling Brook nestled under the Needle Ridge where most of the people are farmers, and most of them fairly prosperous.

MR. BROWNE: Watch out for the Maypole now.

MR. MORGAN: They are fairly prosperous and fairly happy, and I would hate to see such communities disappear. But there are so many communities where people are not so happy, where they can never develop

to the prosperous point, the land is just not there. They are living in rocks and coves where the land is just not there whereby they can develop and where they can build a community. They, Mr. Speaker, as well as myself are looking forward with hope and with enthusiasm to what this Authority can do. It is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of this Bill, if implemented, will do much to make Newfoundland a better place in which to live, a place of which we can be justly proud and a place wherein all our people will be happy, will be contented and will be prosperous.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate on second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority" adjourned until tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills:

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps before we enter upon the next order I should say: The remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in reference to Valdmanis might be misunderstood by the public if I do not make an explanation. I understand his remarks to mean that the holding of Dr. Valdmanis, as he is now being held, suggests that we in Newfoundland are treating him as if he were behind the iron curtain. I think that is a most unfair remark.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I said nothing about "iron curtain."

MR. CURTIS: The Honourable Leader referred to a "curtain." There is only one that he could have been referring to, the "iron curtain." I am afraid I cannot have his remarks

go to the country without some statement, as they may tend to further mislead the public along the lines that have been used by the press and by the radio since Valdmanis was first arrested. The honourable members will appreciate that since the arrest of Valdmanis there has been a certain campaign of propaganda inspired by those who are responsible for his defense. The object of that campaign is clearly to arouse sympathy for Dr. Valdmanis, and apparently the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with others has swallowed the bait, hook, line and sinker.

The proceedings taken in these cases, both criminal and civil, are in every respect normal. Dr. Valdmanis is today being held by the Sheriff under the direct supervision of the Judge of the Supreme Court. I may explain to the House, and through the House to the public at large, that bail in criminal proceedings permits the accused to leave the province; it permits the accused to leave the country, and it obligates only that the accused shall appear for trial as and when called upon.

My department was not prepared to accept the bail that the magistrate accepted to insure the return to Newfoundland of that accused, had he been free to leave. Civil proceedings were strictly in accordance with the provisions of the Judicature Act of 1904 which was brought forward in the Consolidated Statutes of 1916 and again in the Revised Statutes of 1953. These proceedings are normal in every respect. I am endeavouring only to recover back for the Government of Newfoundland moneys which we say belong to the people of this country. There is no persecution, although that word has been used. There is no persecution of Dr. Vald-



manis. Indeed the same people calling "persecution" today would be most offensive in their references to us did we fail to take the very steps that we are taking.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect any applause for what I shall say (if I may say anything) —

MR. SPEAKER: Let me say at this point that there can be no debate. A question was asked at the beginning of the sitting to which a reply was given. In the opinion of the Chair the question ought not to have been asked. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made a comment, but did not ask a question. The Honourable the Attorney General, after careful consideration, replied. He addressed no comment to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition but merely stated the position of the Government in a highly delicate matter on which it would be highly irregular to have a debate.

There is no motion before the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of privilege? The point of privilege is this:

I am, according to the Honourable the Attorney General, supposed to have swallowed some sort of bait, hook, line and sinker. I believe the inference was that sympathy was endeavoured to be aroused by somebody, and that I had swallowed the bait. I just rise, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to make my position clear with regard to the individual. My position today is as it was a year ago or two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is making a speech. He must not add anything further to what he has said. He has made his point

clear. Why not let the matter rest there?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I cannot allow the Honourable the Attorney General to give the country the opinion that I am now backing Valdmanis.

MR. CURTIS: You referred to a curtain.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is persistent in misunderstanding what the Chair says: I am trying to preserve the honour and dignity of the House. The honourable member, to begin with, is entirely out of order, there being no debate permitted on questions, and no statement should be made on questions. It is entirely out of order.

I allowed the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to clear himself of some point that might be misunderstood, that is, that he had not "swallowed" some "bait." Therefore let him resume his seat; and get on with the business. However, he did refer to "curtain." He can, if he wishes, have Hansard read back. However, he did not say "Iron Curtain."

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it is quite fair to this side of the House for any member to insinuate we are trying to make politics out of this unfortunate affair. I want to say right now—if I am allowed—my position now is the same as it was a year ago.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SPEAKER: There is no debate!

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to one observation in that question I asked which should not have been asked; surely we can ask questions of the Minister?



MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member was allowed to ask his question, and received his answer. He should not enter into debate with the Chair.

Order.

Committee of the whole on sundry Bills:

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act":

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. (1) Section 9 of The Apprenticeship Act, Chapter 261 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is renumbered as sub-section (1) and amended by adding thereto as paragraphs (k), (l) and (m) the following:

"(k) may by resolution delegate to the Director any of the powers or duties vested in it by paragraphs (b) to (i) and Section 27A and in like manner may revoke any delegation so made;

(l) may in respect of a designated trade, upon recommendation of the Minister and with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, make regulations

- (i) providing for examinations for and the issuance, renewal, replacement, suspension and cancellation of certificates of qualification,
- (ii) providing for the issuance, renewal, replacement, suspension and cancellation of permits;
- (iii) requiring all persons in any area other than registered apprentices and persons who receive a

permit under Section 27A to hold a certificate of qualification and prohibiting the employment of persons who do not hold such a certificate; and

(iv) prescribing the terms and conditions under which certificates of qualification and permits may be issued;

(m) may by permit exempt from the operation of sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph (l) any person who is engaged in the designated trade when regulations made under paragraph (l) come into force."

(2) The said section is further amended by adding thereto as sub-section (2) the following:

"(2) Whenever any power or duty is exercised by the Director pursuant to paragraph (k) of sub-section (1) the Board

- (a) may on its own initiative, and
- (b) shall at the request of any person who feels aggrieved thereby made within sixty days of the exercise of the power or duty review the matter and shall either confirm the action of the Director or act de novo in the matter as if the power or duty concerned had not been delegated to the Director."

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in paragraph (k) where the powers of the Board may be delegated to the Director. I have no objections at all to the powers exclusive of the duties of the board being delegated to the Director, but I think these powers should be rightly left within the powers of the Board and should not be delegated to any one person. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that section should be struck out, and that it should remain entirely within the

powers of the Board, and not delegate too much responsibility to any one person. It is a responsibility, I think, which should remain upon the shoulders of the Board and on the board alone. Therefore I move that the words in the third line be stricken out.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, which section are we referring to now.

MR. FOGWILL: Under (k)—third line.

MR. BALLAM: I might say for the information of the House that all of these amendments have been passed with the exception of 3 which is the only section that was allowed to stand over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say that all of section 2 was permitted to stand. We did not pass any part of section 2 at all. The Bill has been passed except for that clause. The honourable member for St. John's East has just made an amendment to (k) third line—and Section 27 be deleted.

MR. BALLAM: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that would change the whole idea of the amendment, I am not quite willing to accept it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the Honourable Minister did not quite get the tenor of the remarks. I would like to read (k) or to see him re-read it:

"(k) may by resolution delegate to the Director any of the powers or duties vested in it by paragraphs (b) to (i) and Section 27A and in like manner may revoke any delegation so made;"

Now the honourable member thinks,

and I think, that the powers given under 27A should be employed by the Board and not by the Director. I think my honourable friend on my left believes that the authority should be vested in the Board and not in the hands of one man who would have to take it upon himself to say to John Jones, you cannot work. Whereas if the Board made a decision then of course there is nothing you can do about it, but if the Director makes a decision then, of course, it is a hardship upon the Director himself. Under 27A the Board issues the permit. I don't know if I have made it any clearer.

MR. BALLAM: This deals with section 2 (1) The Board may in respect of a designated trade, upon recommendation of the Minister and with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, make regulations. My honourable friend is assuming all this is done, and these powers are delegated and all the rest of it, but that is not so. It may be done upon the recommendation of the Board and the Minister, and with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is reading the wrong section. We are dealing with section 2—amendment to section 9. The Minister is on another section altogether.

The section is—2—The Board may by permit exempt from the operation of sub-paragraph (1) any person who is engaged in the designated trade when recommendations made under paragraph 1 come into force.

MR. BALLAM: Now to fully understand and realize the implications of the above provisions one has

to be fully acquainted with the set-up to deal with apprenticeship matters. The Apprenticeship Board is comprised of representatives of employees, employers, two government departments, education and labour. The Board has been established and the Board has appointed several advisory committees upon whom the Board depends to advise it in respect of apprenticeship matters in each trade or private plants. These advisory committees are composed of representatives of employers and employees and it is now, and will be their advice upon which the apprenticeship programme of the province will be formed.

In order to provide the type of service necessary to a successful trade training in this province the Board has deemed it advisable to make certain recommendations to the Government, and the amendment in this Bill, in effect, represents these recommendations. It will be readily seen that this legislation is enabling, and recommendations made by the Board, with of course the advice of the trade, can be confined to any area or plant and can only be made effective providing it has the approval of both the Minister and the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Now this has been the advice of the Board through their machinery set up for the proper functioning of this Bill, and I don't see any reason for complaint. It comes from the trades themselves, and we hope in order to further the work of the Board to implement their work by this amendment.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not quite see the position. I am inclined to feel there is something in the suggestion of the honourable member for St. John's East. I think that the speakers

are talking at cross-purposes about different sections. Would the Honourable Minister tell us why that Board should not still issue the permits and why it should want to delegate that authority to a Director?

MR. BALLAM: They delegate the power to a Director so that he may carry on the work. The Board meets only about three months or maybe four or five months. During that time they want to give the powers to the Director so that he can carry on the work. When the Board meets again, if there is anything that the Director has done in the meantime that is not according to Hoyle, to use an old expression, it may be referred to the Board, and they may review the thing. It is to carry on the work.

MR. CURTIS: That seems a reasonable explanation.

MR. FOGWILL: Yes, that is reasonable now that the Minister has made an explanation. Well, how much work would be entailed in that, which would be handed over to the Director? How many people are involved? How many permits will have to be issued? Has the Minister any idea how many permits will be involved in this?

MR. BALLAM: Perhaps none.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member who has made the amendment wish to have it put?

MR. FOGWILL: I am not going to withdraw the amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: I do not see why he should withdraw it. The principle of the thing seems to me that the House is asked to give authority to the Government to do certain things. The Government says

we will give so much authority to the Minister, and the Minister says we will give so much authority to the Board, and the Board says we will pass it over to the Director.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the clause as amended.

Amendment not carried.

Committee passed the Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act":

Clause 1 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why there should be a fifteen page document here. For instance on page 1, sub-section 3, the only amendment is "Where" instead of "When" still they quote five or six lines there in order to do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition suggest we just call the numbers on this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. Sub-section (5) of Section 18 of the said Act, as enacted by the Act No. 23 of 1953, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(5) When an account for payment of medical aid is not received by the Board within six months after the medical aid has been rendered, the Board may refuse to pay the account or if in its opinion the circumstances so warrant may pay the whole or such portion of the account as it thinks fit."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does this clause carry?

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chairman, not until we get an explanation of that "Where" and "When." I wonder did the Government think they would be short of legislation to bring into the House and do something like this. I wonder if the Minister could tell us why the change was made, otherwise let it stand.

DR. POTTLE: "When" refers to a point of time. "Where" refers to circumstances, and time is not essential here. It is the circumstances—at any rate that is my guess.

MR. CURTIS: That was a deliberate change made by my department.

MR. BROWNE: May I make a suggestion? Make it "wherever."

MR. CURTIS: The change was made by the draftsmen in my department and was a deliberate change. I do not think it is important.

Clause 3 carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. There shall be inserted in the said Act immediately after Section 28 as Section 28A and 28B the following:

"28A. Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Board may acquire by purchase, gift or otherwise property of all kinds and may erect such buildings as it deems necessary for its purposes, and may with like approval sell, lease or deal in any other manner with its property.

28B. (1) Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Board may make regulations with respect to the establishment of a pen-

sion fund for the members, officers and employees of the Board and authorize contributions to be made to the fund, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations providing for

- (a) the amount of the contributions to be made to the fund by the Board, its members and officers and employees;
- (b) the persons to whom payments may be made out of the fund; and
- (c) the terms and conditions upon which payments may be made out of the fund.

(2) Contributions made to the fund by the Board under sub-section (1) and the costs and expenses of administering the fund are payable out of the accident fund."

MR. HOLLETT: There are a couple of points there which strike me, in 28A: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council the Board may acquire by purchase, gift or otherwise." Could we cut out the word "gift" I do not like the idea of gifts being necessary to the Workmen's Compensation Board. They have a delicate job to carry out.

MR. CURTIS: The Government may give them a gift.

MR. HOLLETT: That would not be a gift. The Government never gave any gifts yet. They always demand a pound of flesh. I don't think any board should be put in the position by the House of receiving gifts. Now none of us have any objections to any of these members of the Board being pensioned at all, but we do think that any pension scheme set up should have the approval of

the House and not of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think the stage we are arriving at is any board, you set up a lot of boards, and any of these boards can look around and say we propose to do this—raise money, pay money, get pensions for ourselves, this scheme or that, let the Lieutenant Governor in Council approve, and the House of Assembly is never asked whether it approves of it or not. I think you have opportunity there for two great scandals, casting no aspersions on the members of the Board, but we are passing legislation not only for today but for the future. I don't think we should in the first instance allow a board set up by this Government to receive gifts from anybody. And I think if they are to be pensioned that a pension scheme should be approved by the House and then at least everybody knows about it. These are two points of which the Government should take due cognizance before they pass it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of other observations to make. I notice in 28A at the end it says: "... and may with like approval sell, lease or deal in any other manner with its property."

Now I presume that means that the board may give the property away as well, but I am referring especially to the words "Board's property," I don't see how it can be regarded as property of its own. The Workmen's Compensation Board has been set up, I take it, with Government assistance, and collects funds through assessments made upon employers. Is that money then the property of the Board or is it held in trust for the benefit of the workmen, or can it be regarded as property of the Board, or the property

of Her Majesty. How is it going to be defined? It seems to me to be important particularly when the Board is just getting on its feet, and it should not feel too free to deal with property that comes into its possession. Now I realize the Board has had pretty steep assessments on employers and has built up a fund very rapidly and very fortunately has had no serious actions concerned with disaster or anything of that kind. Money has come in very rapidly and it is in a very nice financial position today. I think it should have restrictions placed upon its actions, and it should not be entitled to regard the property in its possession as its own.

Now the next observation I have to make is that a pension fund for a Board that is carrying on duties under an Act passed here by the Legislature should be approved by the House of Assembly before it goes into effect. It is the Board that is going to draw up these recommendations and submit them to the Government and they come into effect if the Government approves, and the Legislature has nothing to say about it at all. That is a function which the Government is performing on which the House of Assembly has nothing to say, and there is no appeal therefore to the House of Assembly in any fashion regarding the way the Board spends its money or what kind of contribution is made to the establishment of this particular fund. It seems to me it is taking money out of industry and has a trust in regard to that, and I think the members of the House of Assembly should have some concern in regard to the pension scheme to be introduced.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Chairman, if there is no money available in the fund for payment of compensation

which becomes due the Lieutenant Governor in Council may direct that the money be advanced . . . In that case the money has to be repaid to the Minister at his request. It goes to say that the Legislature at least have some responsibility. They may have to vote funds to the Board, to pay injured workmen. It seems to me, therefore, the Legislature should maintain control to a certain extent at any rate in this Compensation Board. They have, I understand, done a good job, indeed they certainly have done a good job by way of collecting money from employers. They have collected over three million dollars. They paid out in compensation a million and invested in Newfoundland Government Bonds another million and in Canadian Government Bonds. They are now "cock of the walk." They have two million dollars, so that they decide they are going to set up a pension scheme, and they are going to do that on their own with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We think that ought to be with the approval of the Legislature. I do think we are letting ourselves in for something if we don't do something about that. The Board of course has to file an annual report and at that time it would report just what the arrangements were.

**MR. BALLAM:** But if we wait for the Legislature to meet they won't have a pension scheme for another whole year. They are not ready to bring it into the House now. I may say the Lieutenant Governor in Council does not want to take responsibility for doing it, but here is a Board set up which is not a Board paid by the Government and is therefore not under any civil service pension scheme, and has to work out



one of its own, and this Act enables them to work out one and submit it to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and if approved it becomes law.

Now then with respect of this permission to buy, sell and lease, I understand the position is that the Workmen's Compensation Board are now paying quite a high rent and their quarters are not suitable, and they may wish to be in a position to invest some of their money in housing themselves. That is the reason for this clause. They have the right to buy land, the right to lease or obtain it by gift from the Government, to put a building on it, and this clause gives them the right to deal with it, because it gives them the right to rent, sub-let, or sell part of the property they don't need, and otherwise deal in real estate in a perfectly normal manner. I don't think my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West is correct when he says they don't own this property, they hold it in trust. Of course they hold it in trust, but they are acting as a Board, and I think that money that has come into their possession is money belonging to the Board as against which they have certain obligations. I don't think that there is anything at all in the position that they should not be allowed to look upon what they have as their own. It is not theirs personally. It does not belong to the members. It belongs to the Board. The members are only here today and gone tomorrow. I may say that we are advised that there is hardly need for this particular amendment at all, because the Board has the power from time to time to invest their funds in any manner whatsoever.

MR. HOLLETT: In pensions?

MR. BALLAM: We are not talking about pensions. We are talking about the building for their own use, and for them to rent part of it. It is quite a normal thing, and is covered under the Act. We could read it into the Act, but we thought it better to be specific about it and have the amendment.

As regard the pensions, I don't think there is anybody here going to anticipate, in the Government at any rate, that the mere fact that we allow this Board to have a pension scheme for themselves is going to create a scandal. I do not like these words. The honourable member for St. John's West said we had two points here that could be cause for major scandals.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, there is a chance of graft there.

MR. BALLAM: No, not with a well-run organization like this—such insinuations are not very good.

MR. HOLLETT: There are no insinuations.

MR. BALLAM: Such suggestions are not good, and I am surprised at my honourable friend for making them, giving them ideas.

MR. CURTIS: Putting ideas into their heads.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I know it is to be carried, but my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour, must remember that if we pass this section we are giving this Board (and I don't give a hang who they are!) this House is giving that Board the authority to take the money which they have taken from the employers and use it to set up a pension scheme for themselves. The House is doing that. They are going to bring

in a scheme which will probably be a fair scheme of pensions, I am not casting any reflections on any person, but this is one of the most ridiculous things ever brought in, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council could be expected to recommend it, let it go. They have done some funny things, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, they have done some most peculiar things in the past. I don't want to mention any of them now, Sir, but I do say that we, as a House, have no right whatsoever to delegate this authority to a Board, no right whatsoever to give any board the right to collect money from the despised merchants, if you like, on Water Street, and set themselves up as pensioners of these Water Street merchants.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): They delegated that power to the Library Board.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know who has authority. I do know it is not right, Sir, for this Government to legislate authority to any board either to receive gifts from the hated merchants on Water Street, if you like, and they could do a lot under that. Yes there are plenty of chances for graft. Nor should they be allowed to set up a pension scheme for themselves with money collected from the same "Lounge lizards." Mr. Speaker, I am not in favour of this and the Opposition is not in favour. Yes, we are in favour of these men getting pensions, but I do think it must be recommended by the Legislature and not by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. They have too much authority now, a lot more than they should have. I think the Government ought to see that point and meet us half-way on the matter.

I could go on talking about this,

Sir, but I think the Honourable the Attorney General would like to recess for some purpose or other unknown to me at the moment. I will say nothing further on it.

House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before we recessed we were speaking on Section 4 of the Bill. The Honourable Minister drew attention to the fact that I made some observation to the effect that the Board is collecting assessments from employers, and unless the Legislature has some power to exercise supervision over this then it is just a matter for the Government. Now when this Board was set up originally the appointments made were political. If these men had been recruited from the civil service and set up in the ordinary way I don't think there could be the same objection. However—in regard to the next section; is there any reason why regulations could not be drafted and attached to this Bill, in the Schedule, as otherwise we have no idea of it at all. I think the matter is now pretty well advanced. I think the report stated they had a staff committee energetically engaged in examining various contributory pension schemes with a view to adopting one most suitable for the Board's needs. Now would this be a suitable time to give some indication to the House as to what sort of pension scheme the Board has in mind? Apparently the Board is the one to work it out and put it to the Government. Surely it should at least be indicated to the House what kind of pension scheme they are going to have. Now, Sir, I feel the House should be informed fully of the Pension Plan and also with regard to the building—the Minister says they have power now to invest money,

but I don't think they have the power to go and build. They have power to invest the money in a trust fund. Is it the desire of the Government that they should have a separate building to themselves? The tendency today is to have one large central building where for instance there is one joint heating system. Several small buildings require separate heating systems and watchmen, more than one large building, thus the overhead is higher. This money does not come out of the Government, I grant you that, and there is no reason why they should worry too much about it. But at the same time it seems to me there should be some supervision to see the Board conducts itself modestly in regard to its pension scheme. Nine thousand dollars is the rent now being paid, and it seems to me a good round sum to pay for premises such as they occupy. No doubt they could get a building somewhere in the vicinity of two hundred or two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. But I do not think the Board should feel that it is entitled to the last word when it comes to recommending buildings. It should be taken into consideration in the whole picture of government buildings. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Government to put up a government building, but it certainly seems to me to be desirable, rather than to have government departments scattered all over the city. They should be united. And there is no reason why the Workmen's Compensation Board should not find quarters in such a building, and pay rent to the Government.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Chairman, before you put that clause, I just want to say I would like the Minister of Labour to take the few words

which I have spoken in the spirit in which they were spoken. Certainly I do not want him to get the idea I was imputing any dishonesty or danger of dishonesty to his Board. Far from it. I do think we ought to be heard from on this side of the House on this matter because I do think it is wrong. I have been trying to think of some similar case where a board appointed by the Crown has the right to figure out its own pension scheme, particularly when the moneys for that pension scheme have to be paid by assessment from employers. In other words you are assessing the employers not only to pay compensation where a workman is injured, but you are assessing the employer for pensions for the Board which is set up by the Government. In other words the Government sets up a Board and says to it; the employers are going to pay you your pensions. I don't think that is right, Mr. Chairman. That is all I am going to say on that.

I do notice that since we recessed a plane has flown in from Western Canada and has brought back the Premier. I feel it my duty to say we are glad to see him back, and we are glad to see him looking so well, and we are glad to see he has a new suit on, for that matter. I would say on behalf of the Opposition that I am glad to see him back, because it has been rather quiet for the last few days.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, has the Minister any idea now what sort of pension scheme the Board is likely to introduce?

**MR. BALLAM:** Mr. Chairman, the Board, as it says in its report, is inquiring into various pension schemes in order to find one that may be

suitable and which would be later presented to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, who I am sure are sufficiently competent to say whether it is the right kind of scheme. All the Boards across the Dominion have pension schemes and I am sure my honourable friend is not worried about the fact that they would have to be paid from the assessment from the merchants etc.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see it.

MR. BALLAM: Is it not so that you are getting a pension, and that must come from somebody, it is assessed from the people.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I see that.

MR. BALLAM: So that this is nothing new, and there is nothing ulterior about it, like my honourable friend mentioned about the recess: He thought we were up to no good, just because the Attorney General suggested we would have a recess in order to give our stenographer a little rest, and there was nothing ulterior about it at all. I can assure my honourable friend there is nothing ulterior about this—I think he was only joking anyhow.

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything else, but now that my honourable friend has mentioned about my pension, I hope he is not going to try and take it away, like one honourable gentleman did in the House. I may say, again, any pension I have received from this Government is by way of employment by the Government for twenty-five years, and my appointment was not political like your Board, like the Workmen's Compensation Board—that is purely and simply a political appointment. Of course the scheme is not set up

yet for these pensions, but I do say this House ought to know what the scheme is before we give them authority to go ahead and do it. I stand on that, and I am prepared to stand by it. Surely a Government cannot allow everybody to go out and settle their own pension rates, particularly when the money for that comes by way of assessment. I think I am right—as a matter of fact, I am right, Sir!

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister think this scheme is likely to go into effect before the House meets again?

MR. BALLAM: I have no idea.

MR. BROWNE: There is no reason why it could not be attached to the Act as a Schedule so that when recommendations are passed, the House could have something to say about them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, do you mean to say that the Honourable Minister of Labour has no idea at all when this comes into effect, and he is the Minister who has brought in the Bill? Surely he is acquainted with some of the facts essential for the setting up of the scheme? I don't like answers like that to any member on this side—he has no idea—don't know—don't care—that sort of thing. I don't want to hear that, and the people don't want to hear that. I think we should have some explanation.

MR. BALLAM: This legislation is merely enabling legislation.

Clause carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. Sub-section (1) of Section 34 of the said Act, as enacted by the Act

No. 23 of 1953, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(1) The Board may

- (a) invest any funds arising under any of the provisions of this Part and any other moneys under its control in securities authorized by the laws of Newfoundland for the investment of trust funds and approved by the Minister of Finance and, subject to the like approval, sell any securities and re-invest the proceeds in securities so authorized and approved by this Act;

- (b) place any of its funds and moneys on deposit in a bank or banks approved by the Minister of Finance."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this clause is really the same as last year, but I would just like to make one observation—"The Board may place any of its funds or moneys. . ." I take it, it all depends on how that is carried out. It is not very wise to have too much money in the banks like that when good interest could be earned if invested.

MR. BALLAM: This section is merely a copy of an Act passed last year. I don't think we can debate it.

MR. BROWNE: Yes we can.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, definitely.

MR. BALLAM: In any case it is merely a copy of what was passed last year.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6 read:

6. (1) Section 43 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"43. (1) Where permanent partial disability results from the injury, the impairment of earning capacity of the workman shall be estimated from the nature and degree of the injury, and the compensation shall be a weekly or other periodical payment during the lifetime of the workman, or such other period as the Board may fix, of a sum proportionate to such impairment not exceeding in any case the like proportion of sixty-six and two-thirds per centum of his average weekly earnings ascertained in the manner provided by Section 42.

(2) Where the impairment of the earning capacity of the workman does not exceed ten per centum of his earning capacity, instead of such weekly or other periodical payment the Board shall, unless in the opinion of the Board it would not be to the advantage of the workman to do so, direct that such lump sum as may be deemed to be the equivalent of it shall be paid to the workman.

(3) The Board may compile a rating schedule of percentages of impairment of earning capacity for specified injuries or mutilations that may be used as a guide in determining the compensation payable in permanent partial disability cases.

(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of sub-section (1), where the amount which the workman was earning before the accident has not been diminished, the Board may pay compensation in any case where the workman has suffered a permanent injury which, in the opinion of the Board, is capable of impairing his earning capacity.

(5) Where the Board deems it more equitable, the Board may award

compensation for permanent partial disability having regard to the difference between the average weekly earnings of the workman before the accident and the average amount which he is earning or is able to earn in some suitable occupation after the accident, and the compensation may be a weekly or other periodical payment of sixty-six and two-thirds per cent of such difference, and regard shall be had to the workman's fitness to continue in the employment in which he was injured or to adapt himself to some other suitable occupation."

MR. BROWNE: I believe that Nos. 1, 3 and 5 are new, and Nos. 2 and 4 are the same as last year. Now in regard to No. 3, is the Minister in a position to say if this is being done at the present time. That, I remember very well was done in some of the States of the United States particularly in the State of New York, so much for one joint of a finger, so much for two fingers etc. With each additional injury the compensation came up. Can you say if that is being done at the present time. In regard to the other sections they seem to be very reasonable and I have no objections.

I don't know if honourable members can follow the section we are dealing with now, Section 1 of 48 of the Revised Statutes while in the Act which was passed last year it referred to Section 40 of the Act.

MR. BALLAM: Yes, they had to be renumbered to fit into the consolidation.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, the honourable members can pretty well treat the 1953 Act as having never been passed. The idea of the drafted amendment now is to

treat the amendments of the Revised Statutes as they are set up—so forget the 1953 amendment altogether and treat these as amendments to the Revised Statutes. In other words you can forget everything that came before—in other words you can rip that amendment out of your 1953 Acts—I think it is clear as day.

Clauses 6-9 read and carried.

Motion is the Committee report having passed the Bill without amendment. Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

Clauses 1 through 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 2A the following as Section 2B:

"2B. No person shall operate a public service vehicle on any highway without holding a certificate issued by the Board allowing the vehicle to operate."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think I raised the point the other day, I don't think there is any provision in the main Act for issue of a certificate.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable and learned friend brought that matter up on second reading. I checked on the matter and find it is provided for in the rules and regulations. There is no reference in the Act but the reference to the certificate here is covered in the regulations, so that it is perfectly all right.

Clause 4 carried.

Clauses 5 and 6 read and carried.



Motion is the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment. Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill  
"An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. The said Act is further amended by inserting therein immediately after Section 13 as Sections 13A and 13B the following:

"13A. (1) Notwithstanding The Local Government Act, the Minister of Health may by order declare any area which he shall define in the order, within or without a municipality, to be a restricted area.

(2) The Minister of Health shall publish or cause to be published in The Newfoundland Gazette and in a newspaper published or circulating in the area to which the order applies any order made under sub-section (1) and the order shall come into effect from the date stated in the order or, if none is stated, then from the date of publication in The Newfoundland Gazette.

(3) No person shall erect or construct or cause to be erected or constructed any building or sewerage facilities in a restricted area except under and in accordance with the terms and conditions attached to or to which is subject a permit issued under this section by the Minister of Health.

(4) The Minister of Health may issue permits for the erection or construction of buildings or sewerage facilities in a restricted area and may attach to each permit such conditions as he deems fit and may prescribe

other terms and conditions to which each permit shall be subject and may attach and prescribe different terms and conditions in respect of different restricted areas or in respect of different permits in the same restricted area in different circumstances.

(5) The owner and the builder or maker shall at all times during the erection and construction of any building or sewerage facilities under a permit granted under sub-section (2) affix and keep affixed in a conspicuous position upon or adjacent to the erection or construction a placard which the Minister shall furnish, reading "Permit granted by Minister of Health," with the date on which the permit was granted.

(6) Any person who commits a breach of any of the provisions of this section or fails to comply with any of the terms and conditions attached to or to which is subject any permit issued under this section is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or in default of payment to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if we could stop at this section and discuss 13A. Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering how this is going to affect places where people are going to build where there is no serviced land? I do not know who is looking after this Bill at the present time, nor to whom I can address my questions. There are a good many people who are building outside this area. Are they likely to have their property depreciated by orders coming from the Minister of Health?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply):

I don't know if I could give any answer or not. In the ordinary course of events, in any area in which there is some danger of setting up conditions that would impair the health of the people themselves, then the Minister of Health is in a position to say that area is restricted and disallow or prohibit building—whether that affects the property is immaterial to the people concerned.

MR. BROWNE: But it is material to the people investing money. Let's suppose twelve people buy a piece of land to put houses on it, and the Minister should come along and say each septic tank should be one hundred and fifty feet apart, in other words it is a restricted area—should not the people know that before it happens? The Minister has the power here, but there is nobody who knows what it is going to be. I can assure the Minister of Municipal Affairs that it is getting very difficult now to purchase land, there are so many people, so many boards and so many things you have to bear in mind when you are buying a piece of land—you have to figure out how many rules and regulations there are. I tell you it is not good Government, it seems to me, when you don't know beforehand what you have to face. But I don't know how that can be resolved.

MR. HEFFERTON: I don't know whether the honourable member is referring to areas within the vicinity of St. John's or not. If he is referring to areas within the vicinity of St. John's, and these areas come under regulations administered by the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply, there should be no particular beef, because people know themselves that within certain areas they are not able to build unless in accordance

with certain regulations which they can easily obtain from our department. That has been known now for a couple of years and we have repeated them even when people re-apply to us for a sub-division of property, and that sub-division is not allowed unless in accordance with certain laws and regulations laid down. In accordance with certain laws and regulations laid down in the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply, they are unable even under existing regulations to issue a permit until the land itself, the building site, has been looked over by the health officer and he has given approval, at which time then we issue a permit.

MR. BROWNE: What is the meaning of "Municipality" here? Does it refer to the City of St. John's?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, it refers to any area where there is a municipality. For instance in the last six months we had rather serious trouble with a town council area on the west coast where we had a conflict between the regulations laid down by the municipal council in that particular area and the medical health officer. Certain permits had been granted, as a matter of fact, by the town council itself, and they were stopped by the medical health officer because they were creating a hazard to the health of the people. That is why this amendment is made to the Public Health Act here, in order that we may clear up the conflict under different legislation, between the Local Government Act and the Act as administered by the Minister of Health. Now we put the authority squarely on the health authorities.

MR. BROWNE: Well it does apply to St. John's then and to every municipal area?

Mr. Chairman, do I understand the Minister to say the reason for this is that on the west coast there is a dispute between the council and the Minister of Health's officer. Is this the reason for this legislation; to give the Minister power where the rules of the medical health officer could not be enforced, or was not being enforced?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, that is right.

MR. BROWNE: Why were they not enforced? There are provisions under the law to see that the local government concerned should do these things themselves, and they can be forced to do them. Why not do it that way instead of taking away the power from them?

MR. HEFFERTON: I am under the disadvantage that I am not able to hear very well. I am not piloting this particular Bill through the House, I just happened to know something about it because of consultations between our department and the Department of Health.

MR. BROWNE: May I restate the question?

Why does not the local governments in the area, the councils concerned, enforce the rules and regulations or at least be made to enforce what are reasonable rules and regulations given by the medical health officer?

MR. HEFFERTON: May I say first of all that the regulations under the Health and Welfare Act precede by a long period the regulations which were brought into law by the Local Government Act. But I believe I am stating the case correctly when I say that the subsequent law more or

less takes precedence, and to some extent at least, but it is not so in this particular case, they run counter to the health regulations. Therefore to make the matter clear and to avoid that conflict between what the local councils think should be so and what the medical health officers know is proper we are making the amendment to bring about uniformity between existing legislation. Does that answer the honourable and learned member?

MR. BROWNE: Not completely, but you are doing very well.

Clause carried.

Motion is the committee report having passed the Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill  
"An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. The St. John's Municipal Council shall have the power to borrow by way of loan upon the credit of the City by the issue and sale of bonds of the City a sum not exceeding Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000.00) at an interest rate not exceeding five per centum per annum.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I understand not all of this money is needed for the stadium. I understand only four hundred thousand dollars is needed for the stadium, plus the one hundred thousand dollars to be given to the Government to reimburse them for their free of interest loan; and two hundred thou-

sand dollars is for some other purpose.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I am able to answer that probably better than anyone in the House. The original committee or organization estimated and the estimate of the Municipal Council commitment was about four hundred thousand dollars, but on going into the matter further it was discovered, much to the misgiving of the council, that four hundred thousand dollars would not be sufficient to complete the work, and that the figure was nearer six hundred thousand dollars, because of course there is not only to be included the financing of the building itself but certain work to the grounds immediately adjoining, and there was, of course, the one hundred thousand dollar loan which had been advanced by the Government, which therefore calls for provisions for repayment. So that the city instead of needing four hundred plus a hundred needed six or nearly six hundred thousand dollars, and that has to come out of the taxpayers some way in the next few years. The amount is required.

Clause 2 carried.

Clauses 3 to 8 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is just one question before we pass the Bill: Perhaps my honourable and learned friend from St. John's East might be able to answer the question. In whom will the title rest in connection with this property now?

MR. HIGGINS: The Municipal Council. I might say, Sir, the House may not be aware, originally when the Stadium Council were going to operate themselves the Municipal

Council agreed to give them a lease of the property, but when they found it had to be a municipal operated stadium the title will actually rest in the City. I believe there is another Bill coming before the House later appointing a committee.

Motion is the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendments.

Motion is the Committee rise and report having passed these Bills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act," without amendments.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

The Committee reports having passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act" without amendments.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

The Committee reports having passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Motor Carrier Act," without amendment.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

The Committee reports having passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act," without amendment.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium in the City of St. John's."

Passed without amendment. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all further Orders of the Day to stand deferred, and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25th., at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 25, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege:

In today's issue of the "Daily News," in the editorial column, there is an article which states:

"... we are a little surprised, however, to discover the member for Trinity South describing the opinions of an Opposition member on fishery policy as 'ignorant, idiotic and senseless.'"

Mr. Speaker, I feel sure there must be an error on the part of the "Daily News" editor who put that there. I would like to have a correction made, Sir, because I was absent from this House, and I did not make any such statement. I should like to have that correction made, Sir, and I lay this paper on the Table of the House.

#### **Presenting Petitions**

None.

#### **Presenting Report of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Question**

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and

Co-operatives to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What was the total quantity of fresh frozen fish, in pounds, produced in Newfoundland in the years 1949 to 1953 inclusive?

2. What was the total quantity of fresh frozen fish, in pounds, exported from Newfoundland during the same period?

3. How many plants for the freezing and storing of fresh fish fillets, were in operation in the years 1949 to 1953 inclusive, where are these plants located, and what is the maximum daily production rate and storage capacity of each plant?

4. How many plants for the freezing and storing of fresh fish fillets are presently in construction, where are these plants located, and what is the proposed maximum, daily production rate and storage capacity in each such plant?

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to lay on the Table of the House the following information:

1. What was the extent of Electrical, Plumbing, and Heating repairs (improvements and new installations) made in all Public Buildings, Hospitals and Institutions, during the fiscal year 1953-1954?

2. Were tenders called for such work, if so, table details.

3. Who were the individuals, firms, companies or persons performing this work?

4. What was the amount paid to each individual, firm, company or person concerned?

MR. FOGWILL: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to

lay on the Table of the House the following information :

1. What is the position of the Provincial Debt, as at April 1, 1954? Answer to include : The total amount of interest paid as of April 1, 1954 and the total amount credited to each sinking fund in respect of the 1940-1965 War Loan, 1942-1957 and 1943-1958 Victory Loans and the 1952-1964 Development Loan.

2. What amount of interest did the Government pay in respect of bank overdrafts and/or temporary bank loans during the 1953-1954 fiscal year. Answer to include date and interest rate, etc.

3. Did the Government negotiate any loans with the Industrial Development Loan Board, the Co-operative Development Loan Board, or the Fisheries Loan Board, during the 1953-1954 fiscal year, if so, state the amount borrowed, the rate of interest and the amount of interest paid in each case?

4. Did the Government of Newfoundland receive from the Government of Canada, the \$1.12 per quintal price support payment, in respect of the 1953 production and sale of salt cod, if so, state the amount and the date when this money was received?

MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

Details of the expenditure incurred under the special vote provided for those attending the Coronation ceremonies last year.

MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

How many inspectors have been appointed for the purposes of the Social Security Assessment Act? When were they appointed? Who are they? How many prosecutions have been taken under this Act? How many convictions have been registered? Give Magistrates before whom prosecutions were taken indicating number of prosecutions before each Magistrate? Where are the Inspectors located?

MR. BROWNE : To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the following information :

What amount of money has been paid to Ministers on account of travelling expenses since April 1, 1954? Give names of Ministers, date and amount of payment and dates of trip in each case.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 95 : Answer being prepared.

Question No. 96 :

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister) : (1) the only industries to which the question in fact applies are the cement mill at Corner Brook and the Gypsum Plaster Board and Plaster Lathe Mill at the same place, and the Birch Veneer Plywood Flooring and Door Plant at Donovans :

In connection with the cement plant, all architectural and engineering work for the plant was done by the builders, MIAG, (the firm of MIAG in Germany). They have their own construction department and their own engineering and architectural departments in Brunswick, Germany, who designed the plant and installed it. They also designed the building which was constructed by William J. Lundrigan, Limited, under



the supervision of MIAG. Both firms were under the supervision of the Government's own engineer in the person of Ernest Leja. With regard to the Gypsum Plant the same observation applies, except that in that case the parent or major firm was that of Benno Schilde, Bad Hersfeld, Hessen, Germany. They had the contract to manufacture the plant, install and erect it. William J. Lundrigan, Limited, had the contract to erect the building. The designing and the engineering for all was done by the firm of Benno Schilde in their own engineering department at Bad Hersfeld, Hessen, Germany. Again the contract was supervised on behalf of the Government by the Government's engineer for that purpose, Mr. Leja.

At the third plant, at Donovans, the basic architecture was done by the firm from whom the Government, through Chester Dawe (not Chester Dawe, Limited) purchased the machinery that went into the plant. The Cole people of the United States, Preston Woodwork Machinery of Preston, Ontario, and Yates. These three famous firms in plywood and the wood industry generally provided the basic plans for the mill at no cost to the Government nor indeed to Mr. Dawe. Mr. Dawe himself personally adapted this plant to the site chosen for the birch industry. In conformity with ideas of his own gathered by him on the occasion of many visits to similar plants in many parts of Canada and the United States the actual physical changes made in the plans and designs were effected, at Mr. Dawe's request, by Thomas Lench, a local architect who was paid a sum of \$11,875.00 for his professional services.

The Government believes that be-

cause of the fact no architect was engaged to design the plant and to receive the normal fee of about five per cent for his services, and again because no supervising architect was engaged to receive anything from one-half per cent to six and a half per cent fee, the savings resulting were at least \$120,000 to the Government.

(2) It is necessary here to break the reply down into two sections: (1) The Cement Mill and (2) the Gypsum Plant at Corner Brook: The Director General of Economic Development, Dr. Alfred Valdmanis, negotiated with a number of firms in England, in Canada, and in the United States and in Germany. He named several firms to the Government at the time, I remember one in particular, Allis Chalmers, whose representative came to see me in my office. I believe the Attorney General was present on that occasion, I would not be certain whether Dr. Valdmanis was there or not. I remember the prices quoted were considerably in excess of the prices charged by MIAG. I remember quite vividly that the lowest price which could be obtained anywhere in the world, as far as we knew at that time, was the price obtained from MIAG. Allis Chalmers is a very famous firm in the United States and in Canada as well. What happened was that the contract was negotiated by Dr. Valdmanis and signed by me as Minister of Economic Development.

The same thing applied in the case of the Gypsum Plant. There again we were assured by Dr. Valdmanis that the price at which Benno Schilde agreed to build the plant and install and erect it, and get it into operation to the point of satisfactory production, was the lowest price obtainable.

Again he named firms whom he had approached with that in view. In that case also the contract was negotiated by Dr. Valdmanis and signed by me as Minister of Economic Development.

MR. BROWNE: I take it no actual tenders were called at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there were none for either of the plants. I would say that it would have been more than slightly unusual if it had been done. I have yet to see in any paper published in North America an advertisement calling for tenders for the construction of a factory. I have yet, in the last five years since I have been personally concerned in the matter, to see one in the "Financial Post" or the "Financial Times" or in any daily paper calling for tenders for the building of machinery, the installation and erection and the organization to the point of satisfactory operation.

96 (4) For these connected with the two plants at Corner Brook the answer is—No.

In connection with the Birch Plant the answer is—Yes.

The electrical installations were made by Snows Iron and Electrical Works of St. John's, and the price paid was \$72,000.

Plumbing, heating and boilers were sub-contracted to William Tiller, Limited, and the price paid was \$120,000. Both were cost, plus 10% contracts. The contracts covered all buildings. There were five buildings; two main buildings and three others. The contract in each case covered installations in all buildings where installations were made.

No tenders were called.

These sub-contracts were negotiated on behalf of the Government by Chester Dawe (not Chester Dawe, Limited).

Question No. 94: (1) and (2):

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the foggiest notion what it is all about. I can only give the answer without knowing what it really is: The answer given to me by the Treasury is: There are identification marks on bills rendered to Chester Dawe Limited, but bills rendered by Chester Dawe to Chester Dawe Limited do not contain identification marks.

That may mean something to my honourable friends opposite. I might as well say that I do not understand it. If the honourable member should need more information on it, he could table the question and I shall pass it along to the Treasury, and certainly remit to him whatever information the Treasury gives me.

Question No. 91:

(1) The answer is; yes they were, that is, in the sense I have just described in answer to an earlier question.

(2) I am afraid they would be in the possession of Dr. Valdmanis.

(3) For the reasons I have given they were called in the sense I have spoken of.

(4) The answer is that they were, and they have already been tabled, and they are available to the House. Therefore, I must decline to table them at this moment, because they have been tabled here long ago.

(5) That too has been tabled here long ago in this House.

Question No. 92 :

(1) The answer is \$1,005,090 cash and \$1,500,000 guaranteed bank loan, of which \$350,000 has been retired.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes.

(4) No. Therefore the second part of the question does not arise.

The security of the operation is the security we have for any advances made. All but three shares have been handed to the Government as security. There are twenty-five thousand dollars worth of shares.

Question No. 90 :

(1) Fifteen acres were bought from the Misses Leslie for \$18,000. A smaller piece in addition to that was bought from the Estate of J. Dunne for \$3,750. That was sold by Mr. Dawe, who bought it, to the Government who subsequently sold it to Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited. Is that clear.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Are you tabling that. We don't get any Hansard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am fulfilling my duty in answering the questions, and I am answering them slowly and distinctly at dictation speed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: These questions directed to the Minister ask the Minister to lay upon the Table of the House that material. That is not being laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order: Laying on the Table of the House means to answer the questions. In my view it always meant so in this

House. If my honourable friend wants to be so technical about it; a Minister discharges his full duty when answering the question either orally or in writing or handing it in to the page without a word to be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, we are laboring here under difficulties. As Mr. Speaker will realize we have no Hansard. I remember distinctly asking for a Hansard about three weeks ago of just one honourable gentleman's speech and I have not been able to get that yet. That is three or four weeks ago. Now there are important answers tabled today from the view of the Government and the public and are being answered verbally. I say, sir, that if the thing is going to be answered verbally at least we ought to be sure the Hansard shows this. I can make that request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 90 (2) Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what that means, but I am quite sure what (3) means, and I have no intention of answering it. What Newfoundland Hardwoods paid Mr. Dawe or any other employee for travelling, I think, is of no concern to this House whatsoever.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, once more on a point of order: The Premier only a few minutes ago stated the Government owned twenty-five thousand shares and that all the other shareholders only had three shares, does not the Government think with that amount of interest in the company . . .

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me—I did not say the Government owned all but three. The honourable gentleman has misquoted me completely five minutes after, and he could not misquote me more than he has done.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if I have misquoted the honourable gentleman, that is what I understood the answer was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You understood quite incorrectly. We hold all but the three, I said.

MR. BROWNE: Who owns them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mrs. Chester Dawe, Chester Dawe and his counsel, Mr. Mercer. The Government holds the shares as security, all except three shares, but we don't own them, we hold them.

MR. BROWNE: Well, who owns the assets of Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The shareholders, Chester Dawe Limited, Mrs. Chester Dawe and Mr. R. C. B. Mercer, in short, Mr. Chester Dawe, the other two being qualified shareholders. The assets of Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited are owned exclusively by these shareholders.

MR. BROWNE: Worse than I thought.

MR. HOLLETT: Where does the Government fit in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government owns the plant, all the property. There is no mystery about that. The honourable and learned gentleman need not look surprised at the news. It is three years old, and well known in this House. The Government owns the whole property, all of it, the land, the machinery, the building, everything there except the inventory which is owned by Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, which is a private company.

Now as I say, the answer to (2) is that the Government paid nothing to

Mr. Dawe for travelling expenses, and the answer to (3) is that it is the business of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited as to what money they paid Mr. Dawe for any travelling, or for that matter any employee or officer of the company. I do not think it is the concern of the House. It is not anyway in my view, and I propose to act according to my views unless this House orders me to do otherwise—This House, I say—it is not my fault but rather perhaps the fault of the honourable members of the Opposition that the majority of this House are on this side. But when I say "this House" remember we are of this House on this side. We form part of this House, and I say if this House orders me I will do it. My honourable friends must not moan or cry or wail or shed too many tears because they are in the minority. That is what the Newfoundland people did. I did not do that.

(4) The answer is that it is a long list, and I table it. If it were not long I would read it out and give the information orally at dictation speed so that the honourable members or anyone concerned could take it down.

(5) I would suggest that my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, ask Mr. Chester Dawe, the President of the Company. He might or might not be willing to give the information.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must say a word, if I may, on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman permitted to say a word or merely to ask a supplementary question?

MR. SPEAKER: He may ask a question, yes. It may not be debated.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, today I shall not ask the question I intended to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further answers to questions?

Question No. 88:

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE: (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to question No. 88, asked by Mr. Fogwill, May 18, 1954:

1. Into how many foster homes have the Government placed children? Where are these homes located?

Answer.—301.

#### Location of Foster Homes

Bay Bulls (Calvert, Burnt Cove, near Tor's Cove, Witless Bay).

Belleoram (Great Harbour).

Bell Island.

Bonavista (Lower Amherst Cove, Middle Amherst Cove, Port Union, Upper Amherst Cove, Newman's Cove, Birchy Cove).

Bonne Bay (Norris Point, Woody Point, Rocky Harbour).

Brigus (Georgetown, Chapel's Cove, Hr. Main, Conception Harbour, James Cove, Colliers).

Carbonear (Crocker's Cove).

Carmanville (Doting Cove).

Cartwright (Fox Harbour, Labrador).

Clarenceville.

Corner Brook (Curling, Petries, Humbermouth, Nicholasville, Deer Lake, Little Harbour, Deer Harbour).

Green's Harbour (Whitbourne, New Harbour, Dildo South, Blake-town, Whiteway, Islington, Heart's Desire).

Grand Bank (Fortune).

Grand Falls (Botwood, Peter's Arm, Bishop's Falls, Northern Arm, Windsor, Point Leamington, Southern Arm).

Harbour Buffett (Merashreen, Davis Cove).

Harbour Grace (Riverhead, Bristol's Hope).

Lewisport (Campbellton).

Milltown (Cul-de-Sac, Rencontre).

North West River, Labrador.

Old Perlican (Grate's Cove, New Chelsea).

Placentia (Ship Cove, Townside, St. Bride's, Patrick's Cove, Bond's Path, Dunville).

Port aux Basques (Channel).

Ramea (Francois).

Renews (Trepassey, Portugal Cove, South, Long Beach).

St. George's (Flat Bay, Aguathuna).

St. John's (St. Phillip's, Manuels, Portugal Cove Rd., The Goulds, Thorburn Rd., Horse Cove Line, Kelligrews, Petty Hr., Higgins Line, Mount Pearl, Long Pond Manuels, Southside, Quidi Vidi Village).

St. Mary's (St. Stephens).

Sunnyside (Hillview, South Port).

Stephenville (Lourdes, Port au Port).

Torrey (Portugal Cove).

Trinity (Plate Cove West, King's Cove, Open Hall, Hodge's Cove).

Wesleyville (Safe Hr., Valley Field).

Western Bay (Lower Island Cove, Adam's Cove, Job's Cove, Burnt Point).

2. How many male and female children have the Government placed in those foster homes, what is the total number at present being cared for?

Answer: From April 1st., 1953, to March 31st, 1954, number of placements was 135, of which 83 were girls and 52 were boys. The total number being cared for on March 31st, 1954 was 557, of whom 255 were girls and 302 boys.

3. What is the amount paid each month, in respect of each child?

Answer: (a) \$24 per month for normal children up to 12 years of age.

(b) \$26 per month for children between the ages of 12 and 16.

(c) \$30 per month for a child over 16 years of age.

(d) Special rates for handicapped and mentally defective children range from \$31.50 to \$60.00.

4. How many male and female adults are supported in boarding homes by the Government at the present time?

Answer:

	Licensed Homes	Private Homes
Male .....	78	27
Female .....	108	19
	<hr/> 186	<hr/> 46

5. State the number and location of these boarding homes.

Answer: Licensed Boarding Homes are located as follows:

St. John's .....	2
The Goulds .....	4
Tor's Cove .....	1
Chamberlains .....	1
Long Pond, Manuels .....	1
Middle Bight, Kelligrews .....	1
Holyrood .....	1
Brigus .....	1
Flatrock, Carbonear .....	1
Placentia .....	2
Total .....	<hr/> 15

6. What is the amount paid each month in respect of each adult?

Answer. The rates in Licensed Boarding Homes are as follows:

\$54 monthly ambulatory patients.

\$69 monthly bed patients.

In private homes the rate varies; the maximum being \$45 monthly except in the case of bed patients when an additional \$10 or \$15 may be granted.

7. Do the Government prescribe the diet to be supplied the children and adults in these foster homes and boarding homes?

Answer. In licensed boarding homes there is a prescribed diet followed, recommended by a dietician from the Department of Health.

In foster homes the children share the family diet.

8. Are regular inspections made, if so, how often and by whom?

Answer. Visits to foster homes are the responsibility of the Welfare Officers for the districts. There are no specific intervals set down for such



visits but the aim is to have babies visited once every two weeks, children of pre-school age once every month, and those of school age about once every two months. In all cases closer follow-up is required if the children are in poor physical condition or have other special difficulties. In short, the frequency of the visits depends on the needs of the child and the type of home. From a practical point of view the number of visits also depends on the exigencies of the other services for which the Welfare Officer is responsible. Our services have not yet developed to the extent that our visits to foster homes for offering encouragement to foster parents and foster children, etc., are entirely satisfactory but the various Welfare Officers are reporting at least once yearly on the foster homes and foster children in their districts.

The licensed boarding homes in St. John's, the Goulds, and as far as Middle Bight, Kelligrews are visited by Mrs. M. E. Ward, Welfare Worker, regularly. Most are visited once weekly and others bi-weekly. The remaining homes are visited by the Welfare Officers in the respective areas.

9. Are these foster homes and boarding houses visited regularly by a medical officer? Give details.

Answers. A plan for free medical attention and free medicine for foster children has been worked out with the Department of Health and has been in operation for some years.

When a foster home is licensed the Division of Child Welfare sends the foster parents a circular on the matters of medical attention and medicine. Moreover the Department of Health has sent doctors a circular relative to medical care of children in their districts.

If special services such as hospitalization, eye-glasses, dental attention, etc., are recommended by a doctor the Division of Child Welfare arranges transportation and escort and pays for them.

Foster parents are really substitute parents and to all intents and purposes are given wide scope to use their own discretion, under the general supervision of the Department of Public Welfare, in obtaining medical services for foster children.

District nurses from the Department of Health visit the homes in and near St. John's two or three times weekly. The services of a medical doctor are always available from the General Hospital, and availed of quite frequently. The services of Medical Health Officers in other areas are readily given whenever the need arises.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association," and a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

#### Orders of the Day

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority";

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will close the debate.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, as no other honourable member apparently wishes to speak, I will now in accordance with your suggestion bring the discussion on second reading of this Bill to a close. Bring

to a close what I think I may justly call the greatest debate of this sitting of the House.

During the past several weeks honourable members have had the opportunity of expressing themselves on many phases of the fisheries, and in particular upon the problems of fishery development. I want to thank the House for the time and attention that it gave to this measure, and for having seen fit to debate this important Bill at the great length that it did.

In bringing this debate to a close it is not my intention to introduce any new matter other than such as may arise from some comments I wish to make upon several points that were made during the course of the debate. These points can serve me as useful pegs upon which to hang some further information which I think the House should have, and which the House might like to have.

Now, first of all I should like to refer to the fact that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was apparently puzzled as to what the principle of this Bill is. The House will recall that for quite some little time he carried on a sort of debate with himself as to just what the principle of the Bill is. What is the principle? That after hedging five years the Government was going to do something about the fisheries. Was the principle that the fisheries were going to be taken out of the hands of the incompetents? Was the idea behind the Bill, maybe, to replace NAFEL? If by any chance the principle of the Bill was to make it possible for fishermen to come by higher standards of living, a decent standard of living, then, of course, the Opposition were all for it.

As I say, the Leader of the Opposi-

tion for quite some time carried on a vest-pocket debate with himself as to the principle of the Bill. I don't know if he came to any conclusions. If he did, he did not tell the House what they were.

Now I must say that I did not attempt any specific definition as to what the principle of the Bill is when introducing it, because it did not occur to me that anybody would have any difficulty in deciding for himself just what the principle is. However, not only the Honourable Leader of the Opposition but one or two others seemed to have been in difficulty on that, Sir, so that now I am going to undertake to attempt my own definition as to what the principle of the Bill is:

It will be readily recalled that in 1951 the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland set up a fishery development committee with certain specific terms of reference, that have already been quoted twice during the course of this debate, and which I do not intend to repeat at this time. In due course that committee reported. Its report was tabled in this House last April. It is, I think, a matter of public knowledge that subsequently the Government adopted that report in principle and decided to proceed with its implementation. So that, if the principle of this Bill must be spelled out, I would say it is this: that a revolutionary re-organization of our fisheries along the lines suggested and indicated in the report of the Fisheries Development Committee should take place, and that the purpose of this Bill then is to create the specific instrument, the Fisheries Development Authority, with the powers and duties set forth in the Bill, to take charge of the implementation

of that report, wherein development comes under the jurisdiction of the province.

There was another point made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that I should like to comment on. The honourable gentleman remarked (and these were his words) "This Act has nothing to do with the Walsh Report." Now naturally I would take it that the honourable gentleman had a good long and careful look at the report of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee, and he found therein no reference to a Bill such as this and in particular no reference to setting up a Fishery Development Authority. If that is what he meant by that remark he is quite correct. In the report of the Fisheries Development Committee there is no recommendation anywhere that there should be set up a Fisheries Development Authority. What the report does recommend is that there should be set up a standing joint committee. The recommendation is made upon the final page of the report, and is made in these words:

"For the full and successful implementation of this programme of development co-ordination of the work of the two Governments and those engaged in the industry is essential. The features requiring action by governments will be within the responsibility of their appropriate departments. To secure co-ordination of the activities of the Governments and their respective departments and the departments of each Government amongst themselves, and co-ordination of the activities of those engaged in the industry with the Government, it is recommended that a standing joint committee be created at once."

That is the recommendation. Then

the report goes on to say what it thinks the duties of that standing joint committee should be. Now merely because the report was accepted in principle it does not follow that all of the details will have to be implemented. Actually when the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland sat down to discuss the implementation of the board's recommendations, in their discussion of this particular section with reference to a joint committee, an alternative arrangement was agreed upon. The alternative arrangement was this: It envisaged the setting up by the Federal Government of an inter-departmental committee that would consist of the Deputy Ministers or the senior officers or officials of the departments at the federal level most immediately concerned with fishery development in Newfoundland, on the understanding that where the federal department is not immediately concerned but is bound to be concerned from time to time, the Deputy Minister or senior officials from each department should be drawn in to participate in the discussions of the inter-departmental committee at the federal level to make representations of the fishery development in Newfoundland to the Federal Cabinet.

At the provincial level the Government of Newfoundland decided to set up such an instrument as is envisioned in this Bill. Now this Fisheries Development Authority then is of this Government's own design. The Federal Government has had nothing to do with it, has had no part in suggesting it. As a matter of fact since the Fisheries Development Authority is to be concerned with fisheries development wherein it falls within the jurisdiction of the province, the Federal Government would be very care-

ful to have nothing to say about the instrument set up for that purpose. However, it is only right that I should go on to say that the Federal Government has, of course, formally recognized the Fisheries Development Authority as the instrument for development at the provincial level. Just to expand that last point I have just made, I may add that not only have the Federal Government given formal recognition to the Fisheries Development Authority at the provincial level to implement fishery development, but I can add that the Federal Government are very much impressed not only with the idea of having set up a provincial authority, but they are impressed also with the personnel who constitute that development committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition appeared to be troubled about the powers that this Bill proposes to invest in the Authority. In particular he appears to be troubled about the financial implications of their powers. He seemed to think that the Authority in its own right could borrow up to twenty-five million dollars and then proceed to spend that twenty-five million dollars without a by-your-leave to anybody, provided it was spent on fishery development; and he spoke of some sort of an assurance of protection. The construction that I placed upon that was that he wanted some sort of assurance or protection that the Fisheries Development Authority would not run hog-wild and spend twenty-five million dollars of the province's money without reference to anybody or very much concern as to how they spent it.

First of all let me say something about this twenty-five million dollar business: I have seen it stated in

the press, and I have heard other people say so, although I have not heard it said in this House, that still quite a number of people seem to be under the impression that the Fisheries Development Programme herewith proposed is a twenty-five million dollar programme. Now I have been wondering just where or how that idea got started. It is true that the Bill proposed to authorize the Authority to borrow up to twenty-five million dollars. But that is merely the limit of what may be outstanding at any one time. And over the course of ten or fifteen years the Authority may borrow thirty or forty or fifty millions, provided that the repayments it makes in the meantime keeps the amount outstanding at any time at twenty-five million dollars or below twenty-five million dollars. Then of course there is another point to be taken into consideration; the Government at any time can come back to the Legislature and request that the ceiling of twenty-five million dollars placed upon the borrowing powers of the Authority be upped. Another factor is that in addition to the borrowing that the Authority may do in any one year for development purposes every year this House is going to be asked to vote moneys for the carrying on of the Authority's work. There again it is not impossible that over a period of ten or fifteen years the House may be asked to vote say, thirty, forty or fifty million dollars out of current revenue for the purpose of fishery development, which the Fishery Development Authority will have authority to spend in addition to such borrowing as it may do. So that it will be seen that to say that this is a twenty-five million dollar programme may well be far off the mark. My guess would be that twenty-

five million dollars would not be half enough, and may be perhaps quarter enough. But who can say with certainty what it may be. Estimates of the total costs of the programme at this stage of the game can be purely and unconditionally crystal ball.

I was speaking of the borrowing which the Bill proposes to vest in the Authority, but precisely the situation is that that Authority is going to have such power only as granted by this Legislature or as it comes by it through the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The Authority in its own right won't be able to hire a staff, but has to ask permission. The Authority will be able to spend only such moneys as are voted to it in this Legislature, and will be unable to make loans without authority. The Authority will not be able to borrow without the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and will not be able to expropriate without the sanction of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Indeed, if I may say this without being vulgar, the Authority would hardly be able to go to the washroom unless the Chairman comes in to me and puts up his hand and I then go into the Cabinet as their spokesman. To my mind it is quite doubtful that the Bill vests sufficient authority in the Authority. I would not be at all surprised if at some future date the Government will have to return to this Legislature and ask that the Authority be granted more powers that it may exercise in its own right.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition in the course of his remarks set up a couple of straw men to shoot at, and he scared up a boogy or two, which I took, and I imagine everyone else took, with a grain of salt, but I should make some mention

of them in passing. He spoke of triplication: The Fisheries Research Board and the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives, and the Fisheries Development Authority, which were three bodies all set up to do the same thing or much the same thing, therefore, he said, triplication is involved or will be involved. Now I have no intention of going into at this moment what the functions of the Fisheries Board are but I will have a word to say about what the functions are not; and they are not concerned with the erection of a plant in LaScie, they are not to be concerned with other aspects of community organization in Quirpon or Merasheen, and they are not to be concerned with other concerns of fishery development which fall within civil and property rights. In any case the Fisheries Research Board is a Federal organization and no Federal agency would presume to skip over into fishery development nor into the field within provincial jurisdiction which is to be the particular concern of the Fisheries Development Authority. With regard to the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives I have already said that a department of government should not undertake this work because the action it calls for is beyond and outside of the scope of what is usually undertaken by governments through its departments, and I do not intend to go over that again.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition foresaw the Authority resulting in a great increase in civil servants. Actually there is to be no increase in civil servants, as the Bill itself provides in Section 12, subsection 2 that no person employed by the Authority becomes by reason of such employment only, an officer or



servant of Her Majesty. Actually the members of the Authority's permanent staff do not necessarily be great because much of the work will be done by hiring the necessary staff on an as-you-go-along basis and their employment will terminate with the cessation of that project; or the hiring of staff in connection with a project which will not be a continuous project as far as the experiments and Authority are concerned, but will be a continuous project in its own right, and the cost of that staff will be borne by the project as such and not by the Authority.

Then finally the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised the boogy of expropriation. They, according to what he said, meaning the Authority, will be able to expropriate anything.

Its expropriation powers which we propose to give under this Bill are not new, they are already provided for under several Acts that have been passed by this Legislature. Similar powers are invested in the Minister under the Public Works Act, the Industries Acts, the Urban and Rural Planning Act. They are not powers that are new but rather powers such as have already been given by this Legislature, and in this instance, they are not given to any particular individual such as the Minister to exercise but to the Authority who will have to seek permission from the Lieutenant Governor in Council before they can be exercised. So much for that.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made mention of some other matters that I could refer to. In particular he had something to say about nationalization. But the Premier has already swarmed all over that one, so that there will be no

need for my going into it. So that I will pass on to the remarks of his colleague, that is his colleague from St. John's East who is unlearned in the law. Now I should not say that, because a man has not a Q.C. after his name it does not necessarily mean he is unlearned in the law, but I should say; his colleague from St. John's East who has not been admitted to the bar.

Actually with that honourable gentleman's remarks I have no great quarrel or with few of them. Indeed he pointed to one or two matters that should receive careful study and that have received careful study for quite some time. Of course his remarks about "Socialization" I did not take too seriously and I don't think that anybody else took them too seriously, as I don't think the honourable gentleman himself took them too seriously. But there was one remark of his which I feel I should take issue with. He was speaking of the "CCF" and he remarked that the "CCF" or "Liberals in a Hurry"—and he went on to say that he thought that the Liberals in Newfoundland had caught up with the "CCF." Well in saying that I think the honourable gentleman did us a great injustice. Actually we have never been that far behind as to have to catch up. True it is that the CCF never did and do not stand a chance of a snowball in you know where of catching up with the Liberals in Newfoundland, not mind you now in those things in the CCF programme which made for socialization, but rather in the promulgation of all endeavours calculated to make for the common people a rich and full inheritance of the good and bountiful life within the framework of our traditional liberty.

The honourable and learned mem-



ber for St. John's West began his remarks by wondering about and being concerned about the role that the co-operative movement might be expected to play in fishery development. I think that the proper and correct thing to say to him in reply, is that this will depend upon the co-operative movement itself. When the honourable and learned member speaks of the co-operative movement he and I are on common ground. It is well known that he has long been associated in co-operative circles in this province, and that he has in his own right made quite a contribution to the spread of the co-operative idea. For my own part I practically cut my eye teeth on the co-operative movement, and I gave ten whole years of my life to its active promotion, every month of every year, every day of every month and almost every hour of every day. During that time I organized study clubs and credit unions and buying clubs and co-operative stores and co-operative markets for lobsters and God only knows what else. During that time I probably participated to a greater extent than I should have in co-operative store management and have done the auditing of co-operative accounts until blue in the face and bleary in the eyes. I know all the implications and recognize the tremendous significance the co-operative movement can have for the greater welfare of our fishermen.

Now the Premier during the course of his remarks said that not during the course of a lifetime associated with the co-operative movement had he been able to put his finger on just exactly why it was so difficult to put the co-operative movement across more effectively than it has been put across in Newfoundland. And he

doubted if I, during my association with the co-operative movement, had been able to put my finger upon the cause of that. In saying that he was of course quite right. But I think that I can put my finger upon part of the cause of why the co-operative movement in Newfoundland has not invaded the field of production to the extent that possibly it might have—Credit Unions and co-operative stores, these are all right and they have their impact. But what of the people who are primary producers? What they are looking for most in a movement is something that would assure them of greater returns for their productive efforts? The co-operative movement in Newfoundland has not been particularly effective in fish.

Now I should go on to add that this fisheries development programme will provide a great opportunity for the co-operative movement to become effective in fish. We obviously could not write the co-operative movement into this Bill any more than we can turn around tomorrow morning and direct the Fisheries Development Authority to deal only through co-operatives. In presenting legislation, the Government has to be careful to present legislation of general application, and the Government has to be concerned in all its actions with the wish of all the people. And it just so happens in Newfoundland that there are people who are not partial to the co-operative movement. Nevertheless the opportunity will be there in the fisheries development programme for the co-operative movement to become, as I said, quite effective in fish.

The House will recall that in introducing this Bill I made mention of nine projects that the Fisheries De-

velopment Authority have in hand to proceed with this year. Six of these projects are projects that have been agreed to specifically and in detail by the Canadian Government, the other three we are working out in this Government with local concerns.

Now of the total of six projects that have been agreed on with the Government of Canada four of these are community projects. The places where these projects are proceeding were selected because amongst other reasons good co-operative organizations are functioning therein, and because the people have built up a sort of habit and tradition of working together. These places are Quirpon, Seldom, Merasheen and LaScie. I will come back to that point in a moment but I am going to divert for a short while to review what the plans are for these places this year, because during the course of the debate there seems to have been some little confusion as to just exactly what and how much is going to be proceeded with.

Now at Quirpon the project is to be an experimental project in community co-operatives, and it is proposed to replace the present system of production and individual fishermen's stages and flakes by establishing a small-scale salt fish plant, pickling vats, cold storage, bait and salt stores and with centralized flakes. The aim will be to improve the fishermen's production and to produce higher quality salt fish. It is hoped, and the plan is, that this project will be ultimately community owned. The estimated cost of Quirpon is as follows: It is estimated that the Federal Government will have an investment therein that will cost them in the vicinity of one hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars; and it will cost the

Provincial Government one hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars.

With regard to Seldom the project is to be similar in nature to that at Quirpon, except that the operation is to be tested on a somewhat larger scale. The reason for this being that the season there is longer and the fishery is greater. The salt fish plant at Seldom will include pickling vats, cold storage, salt storage, natural drying flakes and a bait depot. There also it is hoped to replace the existing handling and processing facilities of individual producers in the settlement and possibly the near vicinity. The cost of that project is estimated to be, for the Federal Government, one hundred and eighty thousand dollars and for the Provincial Government one hundred and eighty thousand dollars, that is for work this year.

At LaScie the project is to be a full scale community development. It will include in its initial stages, a salt fish plant with a dryer, mechanized drying flakes, salt storage, cold storage, pickling vats and a bait depot. When conditions warrant there will be a fresh fish plant and a fishmeal plant will be erected, and a housing development including water and sewerage will be part of the second phase of this programme. It is estimated that the cost for LaScie for the coming year will be for the Provincial Government seven hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars and for the Federal Government eight hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

For Valleyfield the project is to be a Federal Government experiment in large scale centralization of the handling and artificial drying of salt fish. One important aspect of this project will be to determine the feasibility of

transporting light salted fish in salt bulk or other semi-finished stages by road or water from outlying areas for finishing at Valleyfield. It is anticipated that subsequently a fishmeal plant and facilities for fuel oil storage and a haul-out for larger fishing craft will be included in the Valleyfield project.

The Valleyfield project is estimated to cost \$750,000, and is, as I said, a project completely for the Federal Government.

At Merasheen the project for that settlement is to be a small plant for centralized handling and processing of cod, herring and mackerel. The salt fish plant there will include a small dryer, a bait storage plant, salt storage and pickling vats and mechanized flakes or centralized flakes, as conditions may warrant. The estimated costs there are, Provincial Government fifty-five thousand dollars and Federal Government ten thousand dollars.

At Bay de Verde the Federal Government will provide the necessary marine works at an estimated cost of one hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars.

For the moment I just want to make some mention of mechanized flakes: It will be recalled that the Premier spoke of these during his remarks, and in particular he made complimentary reference to the very fine work that is being done in the modernization of salt codfishing technique and curing technique by Donald Andrews of Andrews Labrador Fisheries. For my own part I not only go along with everything the Premier said, but I should like to add that in the short time that he has had to work out his ideas, which has only been the last five years, with

some assistance from the Government, in the short time he has had to put his ideas into practice, Donald Andrews has made a most significant contribution to the modernization of the salt codfishery processing techniques in Newfoundland, more than all the rest of the industry put together has done for the last hundred years or probably longer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Andrews fathered this idea of mechanical flakes. Last year my department made some money available to him to put his flake into operation. Now it was too late last fall when that flake was ready to do any exact costing, but from the costing that we were able to do, which could not be accurate because the time was too short, it would seem that as compared with hand spreading, mechanical flakes are going to cut the cost of the spreading operation in half.

Now during the coming season the necessary steps are being taken to see that this operation will be properly costed, so that we would know by the end of the season whether that would be so or not, that is whether the use of the mechanical flakes as compared with hand spreading will cut the spreading operation costs in half.

The other projects that the Fisheries Development Authority have in hand for this year have, with one or two exceptions, been already mentioned in the House during the course of this debate. These include a project for Bay de Verde, Joe Batts Arm and for Twillingate. What is envisaged in all cases are plants that will have installed therein facilities for the production of block frozen fish. They will all have installed

plate freezers and modern filleting machines. They will be all plants of a capacity of one hundred and eighty thousand pounds of round fish per twenty hour day. That will make them plants of at least a capacity of thirty thousand or the equivalent of thirty thousand dried quintals. Actually they will have a capacity in excess of that, but from the figures compiled by the Fisheries Development Authority that is all that these plants may safely count upon from the fisheries production in these areas except at the high peak of the trap fishing season in July when the production of several of these plants will be in excess of what these block freezing plants will be able to handle.

I should add, and I believe it was added by the Premier that there is also to be one for Fogo.

The project envisaged for Joe Batts Arm will be inclusive of an experimental salt fish plant in different forms; that traditional form for which at the moment there appears to be quite a good market, and if this works out, there is no reason why the project at Joe Batts Arm may not be developed to the point where the load at the peak of the trap fishery may be taken over and processed in this form.

The plant envisaged for Twillingate is to have attached to it in addition a fishmeal plant that will be able to draw upon the area from St. Anthony to Greenspond for its supply of offal to be converted into fish meals.

There is one other project that the Fishery Development Authority has decided to proceed with since I spoke to the House in introducing this Bill. That is a project for the Catalina-Port

Union area which is to be a similar project to that envisaged for Bay de Verde, Joe Batts Arm and these other places. In other words a project for the production of block frozen fish in the same capacity of one hundred and eighty thousand pounds (round figures) for a twenty hour day, and inclusive of two plate freezers and one Baader filleting machine.

There is one other point I wish to make on that matter: According to the calculation which is being made of these estimated costs of the projects for this year both Federal and Provincial, our estimate is that on these six that have been agreed, in other words the projects at Quirpon, Seldom, LaScie, Merasheen, Valleyfield and Bay de Verde, in which there is a definite undertaking on the part of the Federal Government to participate with us, we estimate a total cost this year of roughly three million three hundred thousand dollars broken down into Federal \$2,200,000 and Provincial \$1,100,000. Normally I would not give these figures until the Estimates come down, but I have been moved to mention them this afternoon because of the item that appeared in the "Daily News" this morning with regard to the omission of specific estimates from the Federal vote for the projects to be proceeded with in 1954. I may say that we knew before that item appeared, after and before that assurance was given by the Secretary of State that there was no doubt of the necessary money being forthcoming at the Federal level to proceed with these projects. As the House will have noted, the Secretary of State gave further assurance this morning that they would be forthcoming. Indeed since the "Daily News" appeared I, myself, have been in touch with

Ottawa on another matter, but happened to mention this particular matter, and I received further assurance that there was no doubt of the necessary expenditures being available at the Federal level to provide for our proceeding with all fishery development projects we have planned for this year.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if honourable members are tired of hearing me talking, but I am getting a bit tired of myself at the moment, so that I would move a short recess.

The House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, when we recessed I was just about to come back to a point I had made earlier, that the fishery development programme would provide an opportunity for the co-operative movement to become quite efficient in the fishery, and it will provide such an opportunity through the medium of the community organizations that are to be established in connection with a number of fishery development projects for this year, and will be established in connection with a number of fishery development projects in each year from now on. In instances where it is decided that a fishery project should be a community project it is intended that there shall be a formal organization of all the people in the community who are interested in participating in the effort. That formal organization will, in the beginning, be in the form of a corporation or a registered company. The reason why it has been decided that the formal set-up of the organization should be thus is because it will be necessary in the beginning for the Fisheries Development Authority to retain a certain measure of control. The House will appreciate

that it will not be possible, and that it is not possible, to pull a man out of the stern of a dory and make him the manager of a modern fish plant. So that in the beginning, management certainly will have to be acceptable to the Fisheries Development Authority. Indeed in the interest of these community organizations in their formative years it is quite likely that the Fisheries Development Authority will have to be responsible for the management by moving management in to train likely local persons. But the day will come when local personnel in the community will have been trained, and when the organization will have repaid its loan to the Government or have given evidence of satisfactory earnings to indicate that it will be able to repay its loan to the Government over a period of time, and at that stage then there will be no reason why the community, if it so desires, cannot transform its organization into a fully feldged co-operative, because in actual fact that community for some time before will actually have been functioning to all intents and purposes as a co-operative. For instance such things are planned as would, with regard to capital structure, provide that the membership may acquire interest in the capital assets of the organization, not only by way of cash investments and by way of labour or capital credit for the labour they may contribute generally in providing the original buildings and stores, but also that provision will be made so that they may be able to acquire interest in capital assets of the organization by way of and in proportion to their patronage, so that they will be quite familiar with co-operative techniques and there will be no reason why, at the



point where the Fisheries Development Authority will be ready to withdraw from the picture, the community organization and the people in the community, if they so desire, would not be able to transform their set-up into one that would be completely co-operative.

The honourable and learned member for St. John's West at another stage in his remarks was wondering how large this northeast coast is going to loom in the fisheries development programme. I may tell him that he is not the only member of the House who has been wondering exactly the same thing. There are members on this side who have had a little bit of concern as to just how large the northeast coast was going to loom in this programme. Now I may tell him that the northeast coast will certainly get the lion's share of attention. The reason for that is because the crux of the salt fish problem is down on the northeast coast, but other areas will come in for their share of attention in time. We cannot get around to everything in the first year. But as an indication of the over-all attention we are giving to the problem of the fishery development I would like to have a word to say about the surveys that have been conducted preparatory to development taking place. On the recommendations of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland jointly carried out a reconnaissance survey in the summer of 1952 of the more important fishing communities along the northeast coast and part of the south coast of the province. While the emphasis was placed on the existing fisheries of existing communities, factual information was

also compiled on harbour facilities, sanitation, and the social aspects of community living. Now during that 1952 reconnaissance, surveys were carried out and during the summer of 1953 these surveys were continued along the southwest coast and the west coast of the province. Reconnaissance surveys were conducted in fifty-five communities.

Now a reconnaissance survey may be said, I suppose, to be a quick look at a likely place for development. And these reconnaissance surveys pointed up the likely places for development, and are followed by full-scale surveys in detail usually. In the subsequent year, 1953, we went back for a second look and to do a full-scale survey in thirteen communities. These communities were, LaScie, Fortune Harbour, Twillingate, Bay de Verde, St. Anthony, Lewisporte, Badger's Quay, Valleyfield, Fogo, Old Perlican, Bonavista, Merasheen, Harbour Breton and Woody Island. Now these full-scale surveys in addition to giving a general description of the area, dealt with the geography, community characteristics, access of land, town planning, harbour facilities, water and sewerage systems and estimates of costs. The programme of carrying on with these surveys will continue this year. During the last week, as a matter of fact, the Federal Government's representative, who came to St. John's for the purpose, and the Fisheries Development Authority have agreed upon the list of places where surveys are to be done this year. I don't know whether I am at liberty—I should imagine that I am not at liberty to give the House the names of these places. But I can say that before 1954 ends surveys are planned in sixteen places. The member for Green Bay who was particu-



larly interested in Nipper's Harbour, and if I recollect correctly, an understanding was already given by the Premier earlier this year or last year, that Nipper's Harbour would be well to the fore, and at the top of the priority list for development. The member for Green Bay will be glad to know that Nipper's Harbour is well up on the list for surveys this year. I mention that one because there is practically a commitment.

MR. BROWNE: Why not give them all?

MR. KEOUGH: I should like to very much.

The full list is: Nipper's Harbour, Marystown, Burin, Fortune, Grand Bank, Carnish, Belleoram, Trepassey, Fermeuse, Bay Bulls, Cape Broyle, Ferryland, Conche, Englee, Moreton's Harbour and Port au Port Bay.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would allow a question: Would he again give us the nature of the surveys to be made in these places, please.

MR. KEOUGH: The type of survey that is contemplated for these places will fall into two categories, that is, a full and complete survey and a limited survey. When an area gets a full and complete survey it may be held that we are looking into that particular area having in mind a full scale community development. When a place receives a limited survey then we are possibly looking at that place not for a full scale development but for one or other of the intermediate, small scale developments as envisaged by the Fisheries Development Report. The full scale survey then covers such things as a general description of the area, hu-

man, geographic, communications, economy, agriculture, use of land, town planning, harbour facilities, water and sewerage systems and the estimate of costs. The limited survey is inclusive of such things as a brief description of the agriculture of the area, use of land, harbour facilities, water locations and potentials, and an estimate of the costs.

Now I was going to remark that it will be observed from the list of places that I said were to be surveyed this year, that it is intended to survey places in which fish plants have already been established. The reason behind surveying such places is to provide the necessary information upon which community development may materialize from there on.

The honourable member for St. John's West wondered why he had not heard from me regarding the project of the fishermen's wharf for St. John's which was announced last fall as a project in which the Federal Government would likely be participating. If I remember correctly, the Premier explained at that time that the difficulty is that no site is available. Well I can confirm that. I can say that the Fisheries Development Authority have been trying to obtain a site for quite some time. It will have to be a waterfront site at which point a fishermen's wharf would have to be constructed, and upon which the Province has undertaken to put certain marketing facilities. All the investigations of the Authority have, up to now, resulted in nothing. There are possibly some places that could be acquired by expropriation, but it is extremely doubtful if in these several instances expropriation would not involve certainly inconvenience and possibly hardship to people presently carrying

out operations on that waterfront. But I add this, within the past week the Authority has made a contact and there is now some prospect that a suitable site can be acquired in St. John's. In that event there is no reason why the fishermen's wharf and provincial market facilities could not be proceeded with this year.

**MR. BROWNE:** May I ask the Minister a question? Have they considered the wharf which the Federal authorities own themselves?

**MR. KEOUGH:** Mr. Speaker, the Authority did, but I think were of the opinion that the property there was a little too far west. That property has been considered. I doubt very much if it would be available in any case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn for a brief moment to the honourable and learned member for St. John's East. For a fellow who on his own admission knows only what he reads in the newspapers the honourable and learned member for St. John's East does pretty well. There have been times when I have been inclined to think of him as the ablest politician on the opposite side of the House. Certainly during the course of this debate he came forward as probably the ablest political debater. His main argument was that the Walsh Report is nothing more than a repeat performance of the Dunne Proposals of 1944, that is if you add ten years and a hundred thousand words. In order words the fisheries reorganization plan now being put forward was put forward ten years ago, and the Government has had that plan for the last five years but has done nothing about it, and has been stalling around and wasting its energies upon economic development,

and in the meantime doing nothing about fishery development. Now it is a good argument, mind you, if you can make it stick. But I have been wondering in the first place whether the honourable and learned member has actually read the Dunne Proposals, and I concluded he did. Then I was wondering if he had read the report of the Fisheries Development Committee. I do not know about that one, but I presume he has. So having taken it for granted he has done both of these things—he put forward a good argument, if it can be made to stick. But in essence what were the Dunne Proposals?

First of all, Mr. Dunne came to the conclusion we were stuck with the salt codfishery and cannot do anything about that. He certainly had nothing to suggest about it. But he thought there was a possibility of doing something with the fresh fish industry. There was a possibility that they might be able to do something with the fishery in fifteen centres. So then the Fishery Board said; "All right, let us try and put fresh fish plants in these fifteen centres, with draggers to service them." But, incidentally did not make it a point that there should be built around these plants modern centralized towns and communities such as are envisaged in the report of the Fisheries Development Committee. Finally, Mr. Dunne said this: "Each central fishery operation would be carried on with a view to the production of frozen fish as the main product." You know that sentence is the key to the difference between the Walsh Report and the Dunne Proposals, because with that sentence the Commissioners wrote off the northeast coast and left it to stew in its own juice, and made it quite clear

that the policy of the Commission of Government with regard to the north-east coast was "Root, dig or die." Because Mr. Dunne's plan was fifteen new centres based upon the production of frozen fish, and in Mr. Dunne's day, in the days of his proposals, frozen fish production on the north-east coast was uneconomical. Therefore, Mr. Dunne's proposal was to leave the northeast coast, I say, to stew in its own juice. That is the essential difference between the Dunne Proposals and the plan now proposed. The Walsh Committee faced up to the problem of the north-east coast, and made specific recommendations to deal with it. I grant you these specific recommendations had been made easier by the advent of block freezing. But had they not faced up to the problem, and had they not made proposals to deal with it, then that report would not have been acceptable to this Government. The Walsh Report is a rounded out proposal for the development of the fisheries in all its phases while the Dunne Proposals are not and are primarily and essentially confined to fifteen centres and based upon fresh frozen fish.

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of other notes here, but I think I will let them go. Before I finish, however, I feel that I should say a brief word on behalf of the vicinity that represents one side of the triangle. When I say that I have in mind that geographically Newfoundland is set down in the North Atlantic roughly in the shape of an isosceles triangle. I have in mind that the west coast comprises one side of that triangle, and that west coast is represented in this House by three members. Now there has not been much mention of the west coast during the course of

this debate, as far as the members of the House are concerned. First of all Mr. Speaker was in no position to speak, and the Minister of Labour elected that, if there is to be talk on fishery development on the west coast, the man to talk about it was the Minister of Fisheries. For my part I have been practically precluded from talking west coast during this debate because I am the Minister of Fisheries, and it occurred to me that it would not sit too well with members of the House if I were to begin beating the drums about my own district on fishery matters. And if I did begin pounding the table at the Government about the need to do something on the west coast in fishery development about all I would be likely to achieve would be the curt comment: "Why not do something about it yourself, Fisheries are your portfolio—your baby."

Then of course actually there is another, the main reason why in this debate there has been no considerable mention of the west coast area while a number of other areas in this debate have been our immediate and overwhelming concern. These are the areas concerned with salt fish and depending completely on it. However, the fact that we have not talked much about the west coast does not mean we have not been thinking about it, and that it does not figure in our plan for development. We are quite aware of the great potentials of the west coast and in its exotic variety of fish and indeed in practically all varieties known in our waters except cod. As far as cod is concerned that is not to be overlooked either. I must say for my own part that the only place where I have stood on the shore in Newfoundland and jigged codfish is in Port au Port

Bay. We have got the west coast in mind in our development plan. As a matter of fact we have already conducted a reconnaissance survey of some forty communities on the west coast from St. Barbe down to my own district of St. Georges-Port au Port. As I have already announced; Port au Port Bay area is in our list for this year for a full-scale survey, I thought I should make mention of that in passing, in order to reassure my colleagues in the House and also to reassure anybody from the west coast who may have been following the debate, to let them know that the west coast will figure in our plan for fishery development to the extent that its potentialities warrant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House longer in voting upon this measure. Before taking my seat there is one thing more I would wish to add: I dare to hope that the passing of this Bill will mark a long stride in the realization of a dream that I have long been dreaming. I was born, Mr. Speaker, with the smell of salt codfish in my nostrils. I was born on the Southside of St. John's Harbour, on the fishing room of my maternal grandfather. I grew up never very far from the salt water, and I made more quintals of salt cod with my own two hands than many a later day fishery expert ever saw. I came very early, Mr. Speaker, to know our fishermen's peculiar problems. All my life I have had my eyes fixed upon the far vision that some day somehow the fishermen of Newfoundland will come by a greater portion than has been their historic portion and a larger place in the sun. Whatever I may have been able to do in my own time to that end I have done. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is part of what must come about to

achieve such circumstances for our fishermen, and it has been the greatest satisfaction of my life to have had the high honour of introducing it to this House on behalf of this Government. I know that we will have the good wishes of all men of good will that we shall succeed in this great endeavour upon which we are embarking, that we shall accomplish this task to which we have set our hands. Certainly no other undertaking of like dimension and of similar shape has ever before been attempted in this island, and the like is not going to be attempted again in our time. If we fail then history will at least write of us that we made a great effort, and if we succeed—if we succeed—then will this generation of men merit of history the verdict that Walter Whitman put into these words:

"In the dust of which they were made there was also fire, lighted now and then by a great wind from the sky."

Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Although, Mr. Speaker, there are quite a number of amendments in this particular Bill many of them have no particular importance, but are consequent upon three or four major changes in the parent Act which we think necessary in the light of our experiences during the last four or five years.

Under the parent Act the word "chairman" is used: But during the past three or four years there has been a definite plea put forward that the chairmen of the councils should now be known as mayors. Now the first and biggest single change in the amending Bill is the one dealing with Section 3 providing for (1) the creation of the municipalities. Under the present procedure as laid down in the Act, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply insures that the Government becomes cognizant of the feelings of the people in a particular area in various ways, possibly by voting, and we act on that. A notice of intention is published in the Gazette for three weeks, and during that three weeks people in the area are given an opportunity of protesting or commenting upon the proposed action. As a result of the comments received, whether for or against, a decision is taken to incorporate a particular area, but if the comments received are in the majority against the incorporation the matter is dropped. We have had several instances of that occurring during the last two or three years. Now if the protests received are from a minority then the matter is proceeded with forthwith. Under the amendment before us today there is a change. The change calls for a petition signed by not less than half of the adult residents in an area that they are in favour of incorporation, then, if such a petition is received, it takes the place of the existing notice of intentions. Consequently, as the majority are in favour of it then the Lieutenant Governor in Council may go ahead and proceed with the necessary incorporation.

Under the present Act there is room for the organization of local-improve-

ment districts even in unincorporated areas. In the programme which will be coming up during the next few years particularly in the case of fishery development, we can here see the need for careful planning in certain selected areas. So that this new amendment makes provision for the creation of a local organization where certain services may be required and may be a necessary part of the improvements to be made in any such areas.

Another principle involved here is one of procedure: Under the present Act the first council is selected and at the end of two years lots are cast and half the councillors retire but are eligible for re-election and an election is held to fill the vacancies. Under the amendment as proposed here we propose to do away with that two years and the whole slate of councillors will be elected at the same time every four years. Something the same as the procedure which has been adopted and which has been in vogue in the St. John's Municipal Council for some time. That change is advocated by us because during the last two or three years we have found several instances where at different times difficulties have arisen in trying to carry on the work of the council. We believe that if the councillors were elected all on the same day then it would result in much smoother continuity of the work.

Several of the other amendments, of course, are consequent upon these I have just mentioned.

On the request from the Federation of Municipalities their year is being changed, and the end of the year for the councils instead of being March 31, as it now is, will become the end of the calendar year, December 31.



That request has come to us because, in the opinion of the councils, with which we heartily agree, the calendar year is much more practical than the present existing year.

Under the Local Government Act provision is made for the councils to open a bank account. In the last three or four years several councils have become not only administrators of the local areas but also trustees of various public utilities, and some provision is also made here so that they may open one or more accounts in banks. In other words keep their public utilities accounts separate from their municipal account. That is an important measure because grants given by the Government are based upon the municipal collections and are not upon moneys which they receive from the services of public utilities.

Again if we go down a little further we come to Clause 20. We have made provisions there whereby a council, if it so desires, may adopt a national building code in any particular area, in order that any building for which it has regulatory control may be based upon some building system. We do not think for one moment this particular provision will have general application for there are many areas where there is no particular need of it. But we have had that request from one or two councils, particularly Corner Brook Area, that provisions should be made in the Local Government Act whereby they may be able to put in such a provision. At the present time, under the Local Government Act, municipalities have control over the local roads and they provide maintenance. A provision here in this new Bill vests all streets and roads

other than highways in the town councils.

The amendment makes provision for the maintenance of fire brigades. Under the present Act there can be voluntary fire brigades in any particular local area, but no provision is made for the maintenance of the fire brigade. Now we made some departure from that a year ago when we made a special definite grant to Corner Brook Area to provide certain fire services, and to pledge people for taking care of the fire apparatus and such. Provision is made here again enabling all municipalities if in a position to do so, to maintain and pay a fire brigade. It also makes provision for them to enter into agreement with other parties. For instance it is possible that some municipalities might be situated near a United States Army Base or something of that nature, so that we make it possible for the town council to make an agreement with the base authorities to carry out joint operations in the protection of property and the maintenance of a fire brigade,

It also gives municipalities authority to establish electrical plants and install transmission lines both within and without the limits of the municipal area. That again is because a request has been received from different councils to that effect.

Provision is also made whereby an electrical code may be used and insisted upon by the council. Again this is a necessary part of fire protection in many of the larger municipal areas.

There is some nuisance at the present time in the arbitrary rate of the property tax and business tax. We have had half a dozen instances during the last two or three years of



councils or members of certain local areas refusing to pay business taxation because, to give one reason alone, certain people refused to submit their accounts to the municipal council revealing their private business, in order that councils may be able to levy a certain basic taxation based on gross profit or turn-over of the business concerned. Therefore we made provision here that assessment has to be carried out by any municipal area and, of course, the tax levied on assessment whatever that assessment might be. Already some six or seven of the various councils have that assessment, and carry out a property tax and not a business tax, and other councils have made similar requests to us.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is very little in that Bill to which anybody on this side of the House could be opposed. The amendments there, Mr. Speaker, are one of the inevitable results of our entering into Union with Canada.

MR. HEFFERTON: They antedated it.

MR. HOLLETT: The amendments, I said, which have been made in the Local Government Act are an inevitable result of our entering into Union with Canada, the power to tax income and the power to tax business and the power to tax various things to carry on the work of the councils in the communities. Well there is nothing in particular wrong with that. If we are going to organize our larger settlements into municipalities that has to be done. I say, therefore, it was a natural result of our entry into Union with Canada. I do not

say that in any detrimental way, but merely make that as a statement of fact.

I have not had the opportunity to study this very carefully, but I do hope there is something in the Act which would prevent the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the Premier or even the Minister from nullifying any town council, which has been done in the past; and I am speaking of the Town of Bonavista, which, as we all know, was an incorporated town, incorporated according to law, even though I am told they did go around with tin cans to collect the ballots of the people in their homes. I do not know if that is correct or not. At any rate they were duly incorporated and councillors were elected and the council was carrying on its duties. But suddenly on the eve of a certain election, if I remember correctly, there was in that town an uprising, an upsurge of feeling against the council and the councillors, and they demanded there and then that Bonavista be no longer a municipality. They wished to be, I would say decontaminated—that is a word used here quite often—but they demanded that the council be withdrawn and that they no longer be a municipality or else—well they were not given the opportunity to prove whether or not it would be “or else” because promptly this Government promised a plebiscite to the people, as soon as the elections were over, to decide whether or not they wished to continue as an incorporated town. The plebiscite was, I believe, granted after the election, and I believe the majority favoured doing away with the town council in that Municipality of Bonavista.

One would have thought probably the first thing a council would have

done in such an area, where the people had voted against it in that way, would have been to immediately resign, and then, of course, the whole thing would have been over. But they did not do that. I think perhaps I had better not make any remarks on that—they did not do that at any rate, and are still in office there now although the large majority of the people, the householders in that community, have voted that they do not wish their town to be a municipality. It is rather an awkward situation brought about, I maintain, Mr. Speaker, by mere political expediency on the part of this present Government. Whether or not the people obtained a town council in some way which was not legal, or whether they obtained it against their will or what not, they did have a town council, and they had a municipality set up under the provisions of the Act. Legally set up councillors were elected. Yet this Government says: "Very well, if you don't like the town council you have one and got it legally, there is not much we can do. But we will see about it after the elections. What we will do after the elections is have a plebiscite to see just what you want." All right the Government promised them so they waited. They got the plebiscite and they voted largely against the municipality. Then, as I said, the councillors, correctly or incorrectly as the case may be, just stood by their guns and said; "No, we don't resign and get out. We will stay here. We are the duly elected town council and are going to stay here until our term expires."

I take it there is something in this Act to remedy that. I don't know if it is this amendment. But I hope there is something there to remedy it.

At any rate it seems to me to be a very awkward situation which the Government itself created by taking away from a centre the very town council which they had placed there, at least that the people had placed there according to the Act.

I just raise the point hoping that there is something in this Act which can prevent such a procedure again. I do think that once people decide they are to be a municipality or to have a town council, no other body, such as this Assembly or any Government should set up machinery whereby the whole council and the whole municipality would be cut out of being, as was done in this particular case.

We all believe, Sir, that town councils are the right and proper thing in large areas. I remember living in Grand Falls for several years, and I saw there the workings of the town council of Windsor. It was, I believe, one of the first set up, if not the first—I believe it was the first set up—and I may say, Sir, that they had to contend with exactly the same kind of thing that the council in Bonavista had to contend with. But after a very short time when we, the people, discovered—and I say "we the people" advisedly—because people generally all over the world are the same when it comes to taxation—but when we the people began to discover this council had a right to tax or put on water rates etc., we began to get sore over the whole thing, and the council was cursed at, sworn at and everything else. But they stuck to their guns. Some of them are no longer there. But they did make improvements, Mr. Speaker, in spite of some of the organized opposition. Today, I believe, the Town Council of Windsor is one of the strongest town

councils in Newfoundland doing a good job in that area. They have not all the amenities you will find in other communities. They have not the industries there that other communities have. As you know, Sir, Windsor grew up as a result of the paper industry in Grand Falls. Many people went to Grand Falls for work and did not get it so they squatted outside and eventually there grew up the Town of Windsor. That situation is still there in a sense, but the Town Council is doing a good job there in Windsor, and I say, all the credit is due to the men who have put up with all sorts of, in some cases, abuse, but stuck to their guns and are making improvements in the Town of Windsor. So I say, there is nothing in this Act which we of the Opposition, as far as the principle is concerned, could oppose. It is not that we are always looking for something to oppose, but if there were anything there contrary to the principle which we as a party believe in, it is our duty to say so.

We support the Bill, Sir, although we may disapprove of some of the sections, but we do support the principle of the Bill.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, it is certainly interesting to see the progress that is being made in the development of the organization of municipalities in Newfoundland and that a Bill of this nature can be introduced. There can be no doubt about the desirability to have municipalities established as widely as possible, and the different classes referred to here; city councils, town councils, local government boards etc.

There are two or three things in the Bill to which I take exception or which I regret to see. There are

two alterations which the Minister announced in the method of electing councillors and extending their term to four years. I think it would be preferable if the elections were held every year, because the object in view is to train local people to have their own affairs taken care of, and if a council is elected for four years then the majority of the citizens are likely to become indifferent with such a long period between elections, and not take the active interest they should take. In England and in Canada the elections take place every year. I am not sure what the provision was before, whether a portion should retire every two years, but if continuity is desired then it could be arranged by having a percentage retire every year so that there should be an election every year. I think four years is too long.

Then in regard to the question of taxation. I am not sure if it is desirable to have a provision permitting the councils to make an estimate of the value of the magnitude of the business done by people. It seems to me they could make a great many mistakes. I remember one very prominent businessman who was a member of another place for many years who had a very small little office on Water Street, but did a very big business. Anyone looking at him standing in the doorway of his premises would never estimate how much he was worth, and could not tell from looking at his business there. So that it would be a difficult task, I think, for any council to be able to estimate with any degree of accuracy, any reliability, the magnitude of a man's business. Besides, a man might be doing a roaring trade and not making any money. I think the fairest taxation is based upon the

man's income. The next sub-section though gives them all the powers they need on the assessed value of the profit.

I am not sure whether that first provision to which I referred has been advanced because of what the Minister said of the difficulty of getting people to come forward and tell what their income is. There are such things also as sales taxes. There are places where they have sales taxes in the United States. I believe in the City of New York there is a federal sales tax and a city sales tax as well on the one item. I don't know how far this provision has been in effect, but it seems to me to be in advance of anything in effect here in St. John's. Maybe they have been introduced in connection with the Housing Corporation, for example, the extension of water and sewerage is going to be carried on, and it seems to me if a person has a piece of land to be developed and a street to be put through it, then the cost of making the street, putting down water and sewerage mains and the cost of putting in curbs and gutters are all particular cases which should be paid by the owners of the property adjoining in proportion to the frontage along which the facilities will pass. That provision is laid down here, and I must commend the Government for introducing it. I don't know whether it is in effect except in regard to housing development. It was a great surprise to many owners of property in the neighbourhood of St. John's when they found out that they were being charged with the full value of improvements. But there is an improvement here, and a sensible one, to allow that payment to be made over a period of years, up to fifteen years, because it is

extremely difficult for most people in a development of that kind to be able to put the money down right away, and I don't think it would be fair that they should have to put it all down at one time. I remember many years ago introducing to Mr. Jonas Barter when he was a member of the council a whole series of forms used in a certain Township along these lines, dealing with these things; curbs, gutters, pavements, sidewalks, paved streets, electric lights and all the facilities. There was a rate charged for each one of them depending upon the cost of raising the money and the cost of doing the work. That seems to me the best way. These are powers which I hope will be used very frequently and very soon in Newfoundland.

MR. HEFFERTON: If there is no one else who wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments.

First of all, in answer to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, there are no provisions here for the dismissal of a council.

Now the honourable and learned member for St. John's West made two or three comments which I will answer briefly. First of all, whether one member should retire each year or whether they should retire half of them every two years or be elected in a group every four years are questions on which we have had considerable experience during the past three or four years, and the consensus of opinion seems to be that the best way out is to adopt the principle which has proved (and I believe the honourable and learned member for St. John's East will bear me out) quite practical and reasonable in St. John's even though St. John's deals

with a bigger area and has had a charter very much longer. That seems to be the consensus of opinion we gathered and we made the amendment along these lines.

In the matter of taxation we still feel a little bit wary about saying to the councils; you have to impose a property tax. I said on introducing the Bill that five or six councils in Newfoundland have made application to put on a property tax. We have an assessor who has been trained and become a well qualified assessor, and he is lent to municipal authorities on their request to go out and make property assessments for them, on the basis of which a tax is approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. We propose to increase the number who will be desirous of using the property tax instead of the business tax, but we don't want to put it down here as law that every council is to be forced to do so. Therefore, I say, this is enabling rather than mandatory. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move all further Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 26, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question

None.

#### Answers to Questions

Questions Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101 and 102—Stand.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer here to a question asked by my honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's West: The only comment I have to make on filing this information is that lists have already been published every year since 1949. If we are going to repeat year by year and year after year fees paid lawyers, ad infinitum, we will soon get no one to act for us at all.

Reply to Question No. 34, asked by the member for St. John's West, Mr. W. J. Browne:

Question No. 34: What amount of money has been paid to legal firms since April 1, 1949? Give the amount or amounts paid to each firm with the name of the matter for which such amount or amounts was paid.

## Answer :

Aug. 26, 1949	W. R. Kent	\$ 1,050.00	Drafting legislation.
Apr. 13, 1950	Cook, Bartlett and Soper	250.00	Defending Counsel, Rex vs. Dwyer.
Apr. 27, 1950	E. J. Phelan, Q.C.	3,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Mar. 31, 1953	E. J. Phalen, Q.C.	1,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Apr. 27, 1950	Eric Cook, Q.C.	3,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Mar. 31, 1953	Eric Cook, Q.C.	1,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Apr. 27, 1950	Donald Dawe, Q.C.	3,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Mar. 31, 1953	Donald Dawe, Q.C.	1,500.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Apr. 27, 1950	Gerald G. Tessier	1,750.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Mar. 31, 1953	Gerald G. Tessier	750.00	Consolidated Statutes.
Nov. 3, 1950	Barry & Parsons	100.00	Prosecutions under Vegetable Grading Act at Corner Brook.
Apr. 29, 1950	Myles P. Murray	1,500.00	Alcoholic Liquors Act, Public Utilities Act, Mothers' Allowance Act, Fisheries Loan Board Act, Co-operative Loan Board Act, Industrial Development Loan Board Act, District Courts Act.
July 22, 1950	Myles P. Murray	300.00	Amendments to Alcoholic Liquors Act, and advice to Board.
Jan. 24, 1951	Myles P. Murray	314.08	Amendments to Alcoholic Liquors Act, and advice to Board.
July 4, 1951	Myles P. Murray	150.00	Rex vs. Gerald Snow.
July 17, 1950	Ewart, Scott, Kelly & Burke-Robertson, Ottawa	29.70	Opinion in re Judgment in Bowater's Nfld. Pulp & Paper Mills case.
Mar. 9, 1951	Ewart, Scott, Kelly & Burke-Robertson, Ottawa	77.55	Opinion in re Judgment in Transportation case.
Apr. 25, 1951	Ewart, Scott, Kelly & Burke-Robertson, Ottawa	75.00	Opinion in re Harvey Estates.
Sept. 21, 1953	Ewart, Scott, Kelly & Burke-Robertson, Ottawa	169.50	Opinion in re Election Act.
Mar. 28, 1951	Mercer, Mifflin & O'Dea	461.25	Defending Counsel, Rex vs. Beaton.
Mar. 1, 1951	Nathaniel Noel	583.25	Defending Counsel Rex vs. Hiscock.



Dec. 3, 1951	Nathaniel Noel	181.90	Defending Counsel re Cecil White (Appeal).
Oct. 3, 1953	John G. Higgins, Q.C.	406.20	Dispute between the Town Council of Placentia and the Town of Freshwater regarding the use of the water supply at Larkin's Pond.
Jan. 3, 1953	Hon. P. J. Lewis, Q.C.	2,500.00	Mental Hospital Inquiry.
Jan. 3, 1953	Charles E. Hunt, Q.C.	1,750.00	Mental Hospital Inquiry.
Jan. 3, 1953	Gerald G. Tessier	1,000.00	Mental Hospital Inquiry.
June 30, 1951	Hon. P. J. Lewis, Q.C.	30,000.00	Royal Commission on Transportation and the Transportation Board (Rates) Case.
Feb. 1, 1954	James E. Nurse, Services to Dec. 31, 1953	125.00	M/C. 19-'53 Retained by Dept. Attorney General at an annual fee of \$250.00 for services in connection with head-noting etc., of judgments of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland for inclusion in the Maritime Provinces Reports.
Mar. 3, 1954	McKoy & Lewis	250.00	Professional Services rendered from June 1st to June 7th, 1951.
		<hr/>	
		\$58,773.43	
		<hr/>	

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister has the answer to No. 87 in regard to indecent literature?

MR. CURTIS: No, I will try and have it tomorrow. I have asked the RCMP and the police for that information.

Question No. 95: Answer tabled by Honourable Minister of Labour.

The following information is supplied by the Honourable Minister of Labour in reply to Question No. 95 asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's East (Mr. Fogwill) on the Order Paper of 25 May, 1954:

Question 1: Is the Minister aware that a work stoppage is in progress, in a majority of City Garages, for the past three weeks?

Question 2: If so, what action is the Minister or his Department taking, in trying to solve this problem, which is causing great inconvenience to the general public, much loss of wages to the workers concerned as well as interrupting the normal operations of those engaged in the car service business?

Question 3: Did the Garage Workers' Union make application for the service of a conciliation board, if so, why was a Board not appointed, give full details?

Answer to 1 and 2: Continued efforts have been made by the Department to arrange a joint meeting of the parties. A number of meetings have been held with the parties individually since the strike began, the latest meeting being held on the day this question was tabled.

Answer to 3: The Union requested the appointment of a conciliation

board. Originally the Union had requested the appointment of a conciliation officer and an officer was appointed to assist the parties when their first efforts at negotiations had failed. The dispute became stalemated when the Newfoundland Motor Trade Association took the stand it was not prepared to go beyond the terms of its previous agreement while the Union was unwilling to reduce its original proposals. Further efforts to conciliate the dispute appeared fruitless in view of the uncompromising stand by both sides and it was felt that the appointment of a conciliation board was not warranted at the time. This view has since been confirmed by the parties.

### Orders of The Day

Third readings:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, may I make a little explanation on that? A few days ago when in committee stage of the Bill, I asked that it be held for a while for time to check one particular section of which I was not sure at the time, because when the original Act was drafted reference was made there to a section of the Housing Act. Now since that time the Housing Act has been redrafted and renumbered and certain amendments put into that section, and section 25 was renumbered. However, I found that earlier in this session we had passed an Interpretations Act which allowed for certain changes to be made, without making special provisions in the amendment. So that the Bill then remains as it was.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, do

I understand now that you can make a change of that kind in the Bill without coming before the House?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, may-be I could explain: The Slum Clearance Act as published in the Revised Statutes refers to sections such and such of such and such an Act. That Act has since been amended and what was, say, section 48, is now section 108. Well we don't need to amend our Act because under the provisions of the Interpretations Act, which we passed this year, a reference to an Act which has been amended, carried on to the amendment, so that the position is quite clear now. My honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, thought that in view of the fact that the Slum Clearance Act is published in the Revised Statutes, and since it refers to a certain section of the National Housing Act, and since that section referred to has been amended, then perhaps the amendment ought to be brought forward in our Act. I would point out that under the provisions of the Interpretations Act the reference to this section which is no longer there now automatically goes on to the new section substituted for it in the new Act. Does my honourable friend know what I mean?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but does the Attorney General not think that the Honourable Minister's intention to recommit this Bill so that the new section could be put in is better? There is no hurry about it, is there?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the third reading might be deferred so that we can consider it. I might say I am inclined to favour it myself.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion now is this order be deferred.

On motion third reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act" deferred.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Third reading of Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance."

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, let me state as simply as I can the main principle involved in this

Bill, which is to integrate into one single, unified, comprehensive scheme our present system of Mothers' Allowances, Dependents' Allowances and various other sundry benefits.

When we became a Department of Public Welfare in 1949 we automatically became entitled to certain universal social welfare benefits which were largely Federal in origin; the most notable of which was Family Allowances. But along with these benefits to which we became entitled automatically there were other benefits which we as a Province felt we ought to initiate as a province in order to meet with special needs amongst our people, our dependent class of people; and seek in thus doing to bring our social services more nearly up to a level with those enjoyed by other provinces. When we undertook that project we had to devise some way by which the families of widows, where there was no breadwinner, could be cared for and so the Mothers' Allowances Act was devised to meet a wide variety of social welfare needs where dependent children were involved in families having no living nor effective head of the household. That is the way it has been done in the Canadian pattern, that is by passing a Mothers' Allowances Act. However, when that was done there was still a large field of various needs lying somewhere, let us say between Mothers' Allowances and the Old Age Pension groups. These needs we combined under one general heading called "Dependents' Allowances." These allowances were not spelled out in the Act but they did in fact, under a general provision, provide for such needs as convalescing TB patients and their families and a wide variety of incapacitated or other persons needing rehabilita-

tion through financial and other means. That widespread category of people such as those I have described, we take within the boundary of the Act which we have come to call "The Dependents' Allowances Act."

To begin carving out the field in that way was a very obvious way to begin. It was the usual way, I say, for any department to start. Instead of getting its aims, in a sense, around the whole problem under one definition—We did not know how to define the problem under one definition and so we carved the field up into various little fields.

Now, Sir, as time went on we began to see, as other states have seen, weaknesses in that system. There turned out to be, as we expected, overlapping. There turned out to be inconsistencies between one set of allowances and another. Here would be three people in the one family where there is a Mothers' Allowance getting "X" plus "Y" dollars possibly. And we have not been able, from the point of view of good welfare, to be able to explain to people at large why it is that one group of three should be getting "X" dollars while another group of three apparently in similar circumstances but in a different age group are getting "X" plus "Y" dollars.

Furthermore from the point of view of administration, that is, from the point of view of trying to manage this thing from headquarters and of applying it through to the welfare officers in the field, it may turn out that a welfare officer may have to go to a family three different times, whereas properly speaking he should possibly only have to go once. In other words in order to qualify, people now may have to go three times (1) for Mothers' Allowances because there happens to

be a widow in the family (2) for Dependents' Allowances because there happens to be a chronically sick adult in the family, not necessarily a direct member of the first family and (3) they may have to go again for Old Age Pensions for other members of the family.

Now, think, from the point of view of good welfare administration, if we have a staff who understand what it is all about, and we believe we have, and an all-round department organization, we now have come to the stage where we feel we can do this: We can think in terms of the whole question of different allowances being very well tied together more effectively, because we believe, as our society believes, that the family is a unit. But we do not make it a unit when we go three times to investigate when we ought more reasonably to be going but once. There is one thing that any good system of allowances, whatever you call them, ought to satisfy, whether you call them Mothers' Allowances or Dependents' Allowances they ought to be consistent from one place to another. That is to say they ought to be consistent from one area to another very much as that area is similar to another area. Sometimes, I admit, you have to make a difference between urban and rural areas, but that can be dealt with in the regulations. Here we are concerned with the main principle of trying to make this more consistent, and trying to tie together in a single package various allowances which now have different names. I am afraid also they have other weaknesses. They don't give as they ought to to people having the same need and living in the same circumstances and who ought to receive similar benefits. It is very difficult to do this when you have different systems of allowances all ad-

ministered under different statutes and all spelled out by different regulations.

Now we have taken certain steps, Mr. Speaker, to prepare for what we think is a forward move. We do not think we ought to be precipitated in making this move, and I can assure the House that we will not be. That is to say this Act will not come actually into force until we are sure that it can be administered with at least some reasonable degree of success. We can only go so fast in pushing social measures. We in Public Welfare have been, for the purpose of welfare, in a sense conservative. That is to say, we have not pushed, I think, our welfare measures precipitately upon the people because there is danger in that.

Now what have we done?

Well, at Headquarters, as I have already said, we have a Mothers' Allowance Act and a Dependents' Allowances Act. These two Acts are now administered by the one Chairman, and that one Chairman will be the director of the Act of this Legislature which we now propose. He has in fact one staff. We have made them interchangeable so that if they are examining Mothers' Allowances they can turn right over in the same hour and examine Dependents' Allowances. The analysts in the department for Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances are interchangeable.

In the field we have been training our welfare officers to prepare for this Bill, amongst other things of course, in the last two or three years. Two years ago the University of Toronto conducted a summer school for just Newfoundland Welfare people. Last year they came down to us. And amongst the various items on the

agenda for the six weeks' training was the implication of such general assistance as we find in this Bill. They are at least, I say, Sir, reasonably prepared for a step of this kind.

As it is now, Sir, our classification of persons to be helped under our various statutes are very inclusive. I venture to say as a matter of sober record that our Mothers' Allowances Act covers a wider variety of mothers (that is what we call in the vernacular, widows) than any other similar provincial statute across Canada. But I have to add that our scale of allowances are smaller than in some, in fact, in most of the other provinces. One picture of the need in Newfoundland in this one field alone, the field of Mothers' Allowances, can be grasped from a single table which is being put out by the Department of National Health and Welfare for the year ending March 31, 1951. Now that may sound a long while ago but the figures are still maintained, in the same proportion. If we take all the provinces and note in each province the number of families receiving family allowances and out of these take the number of families that are getting Mothers' Allowances, and compare Newfoundland with every other province, what happens? Like "Abo Ben Adam," Sir, Newfoundland leads all the rest. Out of every one hundred families receiving family allowances in Newfoundland a little over six receives Mothers' Allowances. In Prince Edward Island it is 1.7; Nova Scotia 2.2; New Brunswick 2.5; Quebec 2.6; Ontario 1.2; Manitoba .8; Saskatchewan 2.3; Alberta 1.1. I will not mention British Columbia because British Columbia has a general assistance Act such as we are providing here, which includes most allowances, so that it is not comparable. In other

words, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, it has anywhere from two and a half to seven-tenths and more families on Mothers' Allowances than any other province, on the basis of families receiving family allowances, which can be taken as a cross section of population. Now what does that mean? I could spend some time in describing what that means, but I shall come to that a little later on, not only in regard to Mothers' Allowances but in regard to other needs as well.

In this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we have given a broad definition to social assistance. It includes financial assistance, and it includes assistance in kind, maybe clothing; it includes institutional nursing, board or for home care and it includes non-financial service like advice given by our staff and by others. It includes provisions for a variety of emergencies such as arise out of dangers sustained through fire, storms, floods or other like causes. It includes also assistance towards repairs and renovations to homes of destitute people; burial of needy persons and transportation of indigent sick, destitute or stranded persons; finally, generally speaking, any other form of assistance necessary, in our opinion, to relieve distress. So that therein is indicated the scope of what we think might come under social assistance.

We have a unique situation in Newfoundland vis-a-vis the other provinces because in the other provinces the municipalities share some of the costs of provincial social services within the province. Here the municipalities do not subscribe to any share of welfare costs. It is the central, that is the Newfoundland Government, which has to meet the great bulk of the cost, sharing the cost to some extent with church groups and bodies, community



associations and services of various kinds which commit themselves to special projects. But there is no municipal sharing in Newfoundland. Now looking at this picture through the eyes of the Government, focused through the eyes of the Department of Public Welfare, we are in much the same position as British Columbia was some years ago, we having the same kind of distribution of population, a lot of people in a few places and the remainder in scattered communities over a wide area. I say, Newfoundland in that situation had to take a new look at its allowances just as British Columbia looked at its allowances years ago through the eyes of three very capable persons, the late Dr. Cassidy of Toronto and California, Dr. George Davidson, now Deputy Minister of National Welfare, and the late Dr. George Weir, then Minister of Education. These three great spirits decided to propose to the Government that instead of having these various classifications of allowances there should be a general assistance plan for British Columbia. So it came to pass. Today possibly one of the foremost pieces of legislation on the books, as far as Public Welfare is concerned, on this side of the water and indeed one could go further afield, is the Social Assistance Act of British Columbia. All I am saying here is that we are doing much the same. It does not mean to say that a good system is going to cost any more. We will still be limited by the revenues we produce. But we still want a good system. Whether it will cost more is another matter, but being good does not mean that it is proportionately more costly. We think that even with the distribution of the people we have, with the Government away out here at the south-

east tip of the island, off centre, we still think that by decentralizing our authority through the welfare officers, and there are fifty of them, we can still speak to the people with the voice of welfare right on the spot, and through these agencies interpret to the people, and with every other agency there that has an educational and social responsibility out there, interpret to the people what we are trying to do, and to get the people to understand it in such a way that it will become part and parcel of their thinking too.

What our feeling is on this side of the House, I think can be expressed in this way: What is the best for Newfoundland? Whatever that is in welfare we shall try to do it, within our means. There will not be any new staff needed just because of this Bill. If any new staff is needed it will only be because of the ordinary extensions of the services. For instance there may be concentrations of people in fewer areas and the unit cost of administration goes up as it does in other fields, or because we are planning to improve our standards or review our supervision. Only because of these general needs will the staff be increased. I want to assure the House it will not be increased just by the passing of this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come now to the question which is contained in Clause 9: This Bill does not cover the able-bodied unemployed. I wish I could say to the House this afternoon that it did. At the very beginning I tried to express an ideal that people in the same kind of need anywhere in Newfoundland ought to get the same kind of treatment. I want to be frank with the House and say, from the point of view of sound, ideal social welfare, I see no good

reason why the man who is unemployed and cannot get, with all his efforts, any work, but is ready and willing to work but no man will hire him—from the point of view of good social welfare, I say, I don't see why that man should not be treated in the same way as a widowed family.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Why is he not?

DR. POTTLE: Well, I said also that we can only go so fast in these matters. This is an instance I am now giving of where we are going along cautiously and feeling our way. Newfoundland has had a long tradition of relief giving, and it would be so very easy, especially during a recession if it should hit us, or worse still a depression—we can very well understand what might very well happen, especially in some of our areas where working people would not be eligible for unemployment insurance. The situation might very well get out of hand. Again I trust to the interpreters of what I say to be responsible in their interpretations. Ideally there should be a way of meeting these needs at the same level as we are meeting the needs of the people who will come under this Bill. There was a time, and there are still people who think today, when a man is unemployed he is so largely through his own fault. I have known administrators in this field to say that because a man is unemployed it is his own fault. I think, Sir, that represents a false view of the situation, because many people are thrown out of work through no fault of their own. We are living in a day where unemployment more than ever is the result not of provincial affairs so much as because of what happens in national and international policies, so that any great or even

medium catastrophe coming over the United States, about which we had very little to do, would certainly affect us directly. If our society were at that level in its thinking where in thought and in deed men realized they were their brother's keeper, we could put the able-bodied unemployed under this Bill and take the consequences. I hope that I shall live long enough to see this come under this Bill or some such Bill. There is still a tendency at large to make it a bit tough for the man who is without work. We boast of our independence, but, as Roosevelt said; "The totally independent man is as much of a myth as the man of the stone age." None of us, Mr. Speaker, is independent in the absolute sense. We are very much dependent in many aspects. And the man who is unemployed is dependent in one sense when even we are dependent in another sense.

As I said, this spreading problem of unemployment is not a local matter, and a man may be just as much a victim of unemployment and the need for being helped as a result of that circumstance as a family is in need of help because the bread-winner has been taken away. But I am practising what I earlier preached and that is that we can go so fast, and I hope we shall not be accused of going beyond where the public can go along with us pretty wholeheartedly. We have not been asleep in regard to this problem, nevertheless, Sir. Ever since we became a province in 1949 in every statement I have made for one, on this matter, to the Federal Government and to the Canadian Welfare Council, which is the national body to take briefs to the Government from the public on these matters; in every statement I have had an opportunity to make on these matters, I

have tried to impress upon the Government of Canada, with possibly a piccolo voice from this far end, nevertheless I have made it, that special regard should be had by the Government of Canada for this peculiar problem of unemployment, let us say, especially as it affects Newfoundland, which is an example in the extreme form of the other provinces especially the Maritime Provinces. I may say it now—I quoted earlier, figures that showed that Newfoundland had a higher proportion of need in Mothers' Allowances than any other province, and was away out in front—I can go through this report here, Sir, as I have done on other occasions and show that in every area of need, Newfoundland is in the forefront. Whether it is in Old Age Assistance, Old Age Pensions, totally and permanently disabled or Mothers' Allowances, we have the greatest proportion in these various fields of any province. It looks as if we are showing up in these figures a generation at least, and probably many generations of need, accumulated and aggregated across the years. The ravages of malnutrition, of disease, of low living standards forced upon our people by conditions over which they had no control have taken their toll in all these ways that I have mentioned.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could ask the Honourable Minister of Welfare if in these figures that he gives showing the percentage of Mothers' Allowances and Family Allowances, have these been segregated to show similar percentages for rural and urban areas, because Newfoundland is like a great, big rural area compared to some of them.

DR. POTTLE: They are not separated into urban and rural areas. They are taken as a big, large block.

One thing we could do, of course, is to see what the problem is for Newfoundland within itself. That would be a very good example, I think, of the point I am trying to make.

Our thought has been, Sir—well let me put it this way—every new arrangement we make with the Federal Government on a means test basis means that Newfoundland has to spend that much more proportionately in that special field, because we have a disproportionate number of people qualifying in that particular field. My thought would be that instead of having to match dollar for dollar, as the case may be, we might be given a block vote proportionate to our needs, which would be administered by the Provincial Government in such a way that it would be applied in those fields where it was needed most. I shall not extend that argument now, Sir, but I can say, not merely because we have been protesting, but I think it is our voice that is being taken up in other quarters, and the Government of Canada is being constantly made aware of its responsibility for providing some special means of assistance in this whole field of unemployment. If we could wipe this question of unemployment relief off we should have no fears for the integrity of our welfare services, I may be frank with the House in saying that for this administration or for any other administration the one thing we have to watch is that a good welfare system does not overnight become jeopardized by the possibility that we may have to pay out many many more dollars probably than we can afford in this field of unemployment relief. That is why we have been putting it to the Federal Government that inasmuch as

unemployment is nationally more than provincially determined they should therefore, go back to the earlier position of 1940 odd and accept responsibility, as they ought to, constitutionally for this problem.

Now, before I close, Sir, I would like to say that in the field of public welfare in Newfoundland now, as far as our allowance system is concerned, with the exceptions which I have just mentioned, our house is just about in order as we see things today. That does not mean to say that everything is done. That does not mean to say that we have covered every need as it ought to be covered. There are still problems to be solved in the welfare field, and I have mentioned this relief situation as one important case in point. But as we see things at the present time, and as we see our revenues at the present time, and our staff at the present time, we believe that our house is not too badly in order for doing for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders what we think ought to be done in this particular way. We have come a long way since 1949. We have now, I believe, a smart working technical operation in the Department of Public Welfare. But more important still is the fact that we have been trying our best right on the local ground to interpret to our people as we go from door to door what welfare measures are all about. Sometimes we have been accused of being too strict, sometimes of being too lenient. But we have to work through human agencies, and as long as you do you are bound sometimes to fall on one side of the line or other. With our spacious districts, our sparse populations over a great area, we must lay hold of every agency of good will we can. In their own place

they can do a more effective job than we can because they sit where the people sit, whether they be teachers, doctors, clergy or other leaders in the local field. They can in their own respective places do a better job in the field of public welfare by helping to cultivate the right attitude amongst our people.

I am especially concerned, Sir, that our health and welfare facilities go hand in hand. It is easy enough to raise a critical voice again. If I had anything to say about our ways of looking at this problem up to now it might be that our health and our welfare have not gone in hand in hand as much as they should. Sometimes unfortunately we have had to treat through health many problems which have originated as welfare problems. We have had so much lost ground to regain, as in other fields of Newfoundland's social effort, and if it seems that now we are giving so much attention to social welfare, to the lifting up of those who are fallen, to brighten the lives of those whose faces have been set to the wall. If we seem to be giving out a little bit of sustenance to those who have been dispossessed and possibly outside, too often, our pale of consideration, it is only because, as I say, we are trying to catch up so much lost ground in so short a time.

The figures I have quoted here this afternoon, and figures I could quote from other sources indicate, in fact, how much lost ground we have to recapture. If we have had any success, Sir, it is because in the large climate of government fields in this matter we have been left as a Department of Public Welfare, under the general direction and advice of the Government to develop as we have thought best for Newfoundland, and

that is a very happy and liberal atmosphere in which to work. I believe we have been successful in the selection of our staff. With all human frailties coming into the picture, and we are well aware of those, we have, by and large, and even more so, a staff with at least the required integrity for doing the things that are committed to them, which is present at every level. It is timely for me to say that it has been an enlarging and inspiring experience to be a part of this development all along the way.

Here we are witnessing a march of great events involving great human concerns for so many of our people. In this forward march the Bill now before the House represents a signal milestone. It represents our conviction and our confidence in the conviction that one of the central concerns of any enlightened government must be here, there and everywhere its people, especially the needy people.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker,

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare on a great many occasions make speeches in debates on matters connected with his department, and I believe, Sir, that I have a fair idea of where the Minister's ideals lie in respect to social assistance. Of course, Sir, the Minister did speak a few moments ago about malnutrition. I do not know if he meant that there was any great amount of malnutrition amongst those of our population today or whether he was speaking of the past.

DR. POTTLE: The past.

MR. FOGWILL: Because I believe he was speaking of the past. I am

glad he said so, because after becoming a Province of the Dominion of Canada or just prior to becoming a Province of the Dominion of Canada the people of Newfoundland were told on so many occasions, so many times, that they would never see another hungry child in Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, I hope there never will be.

I did note, Mr. Speaker, a little note of concern in the Minister's remarks in relation to the expenditures of his department for current relief. Now, Sir, I believe that that is one thing that the Minister has in mind always, although we may not at the present time be reaching it, however, sometimes we must reach a maximum of what this Province can pay in the way of social assistance. There must be a point, Mr. Speaker, where the burden on the taxpayer becomes greater than he is able to bear.

The Welfare Department, Mr. Speaker, is one of the largest spending departments of the Government. In fact, Sir, during the last five years, looking at figures in the Auditor General's Report and in the estimates of expenditure for the year just ended, the Department of Public Welfare spent forty-two million dollars in the five year period. That, Sir, in relation to all the money which was taken in in current revenue during this same period was 28% of the total. We took in, Mr. Speaker, in 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and up to 1954, in current revenue approximately \$150,000,000. This included, Mr. Speaker, the moneys received from the Federal Government for their share of social welfare in this Province. The Welfare Department, as I said, Mr. Speaker, spent forty-two million dollars in five years. There was an offset of revenue



amounting to twelve million, which brought their net expenditure to possibly twenty-nine million dollars in the five years. I would like to point out too, Sir, that in 1949 the expenditure for salaries in the Department amounted to approximately three hundred thousand dollars. The estimate for salaries in 1953-54 is just up to six hundred thousand dollars and in 1954-55 is just up to seven hundred thousand dollars. The total amount paid in salaries during the given years was \$2,200,000. You will see, therefore, Sir, that the Department of Public Welfare is one of the largest spending departments we have. Sometime, Sir, we must reach that point where welfare payments cannot be increased.

I agree in principle with the Bill whereby the two pieces of legislation dealing with the Dependents' and Widows' Allowances will be repealed and all these needing public assistance, as outlined by the Minister, will be put under the one heading. I believe, Sir, it will be the means of perhaps more close or a better administration of the department. While I am on my feet I would like to say that at first when this social legislation was brought into operation there was quite a period between the time people made application for assistance and the time when they received it. I know of several people who had to wait quite a long time to get their social assistance collected. But I do believe that is now cleared up and I don't think it takes quite so much time as it did before.

However, Sir, I would like to ask the Minister before I close, if his department is considering participating in the new legislation which was just introduced at Ottawa in connection

with the pensions for disability, or would the pensions for disability come before this House at the present time?

I think that is all I have to say. I support the Bill in principle. I believe it will tend to a better administration of social welfare payments. There is one other point, Sir, which I hope will never be evidenced in Newfoundland, that is when we have so many people receiving social welfare payments from the Government I trust it will never take away their independence and that their dependence on the Government won't make them feel afraid to vote or should have any fear of doing anything that would injure the Government in office. Because, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it has been brought to my notice, not on one occasion but on many occasions particularly in the case of several old people whom I know very well who have been receiving old age pensions, and several of them have expressed the fear to me that if they did not exercise their opinion in a certain way they would lose their old age pension. Now nobody wants that kind of fear brought into this land of ours where a person who is in the unfortunate position of being forced to seek public assistance from the Department of Public Welfare should have to do it but be in fear of threat from some one in the Government he might lose that assistance if he did not exercise his opinion and his own rights so as to do certain things at certain times.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have very little to say at this time on this particular Bill. I would like, however, to make a general comment that this Bill is the realization of one of the things that I



personally looked forward to, and, I think I can say, worked for for a long period of time. The fact that this legislation is introduced at this particular time should not leave the impression that it is something that the Government and particularly the Minister of Public Welfare have just only now come to realize the necessity for. I very well recall, and I am sure the Honourable Minister concerned won't mind my making this reference, he has emphasized to me over and over since 1949 our need for just such a measure here. I very well recall too, Sir, that in the several visits that he made on behalf of welfare to the various parts of the Mainland, particularly to Saskatchewan and to Ontario, and talking with welfare authorities there, including such men as the Honourable Minister referred to, particularly that greatest man in welfare in North America and in the world the late Dr. Cassidy, whose untimely death occurred the year before last, how he frequently emphasized our particular and our unique opportunity here in Newfoundland, unique in the sense that we had an old tradition, an old foundation of cultural attributes which belong to us and us alone but that in this sense we were now beginning a new era particularly in social welfare reform. In fact we could almost say we were initiating social welfare in Newfoundland now for the first time. No one knows better than I what social welfare we did have before that, both immediately prior to Confederation and back into the past centuries. I don't need to remind the honourable members we had some social welfare back in 1860 when my grandmother became a widow and walked across Fogo Island for indian meal and

molasses—that was social welfare at the time.

I repeat, the need for this is not something which has just suddenly come into the mind of the Minister and of the Government. It is something that has been pressing here, I think, ever since 1949, but it is agreed by all who studied the matter that in 1949 we were not ready for a generalized system of public welfare in Newfoundland, and there are reasons for that, which have been referred to by the Honourable Minister on a number of historical occasions. I am very happy, although I am no longer connected with the department, that the Honourable Minister has now found it possible to introduce this Bill here which puts us on a par with all the other provinces of Canada qualitatively, and I believe puts us ahead of several other provinces.

I would like to refer, if I may, to one or two comments made by my honourable friend on the other side who has just spoken. He mentioned the fact that the cost in 1949 was one figure and that the cost today is a much higher figure. That, I think is to be expected. Apart from anything else, salaries themselves are presently nearly, I think, doubled since 1949, in certain areas at any rate. But there is another important point, which I believe must have escaped the mind and attention of the honourable gentleman who just spoke, that is, during the Commission of Government a good deal of social welfare, such as it was of the day, was handled out in the field by the ranger force. There were, I believe at one time upward of sixty rangers and perhaps sixty-five. I am not sure of the actual number, but what I am getting at is that this work was done by the rangers and no charge

was shown under the Public Health and Welfare Department's estimates for that work. It was done as a part of the responsibilities of the ranger force. For example, the relief administered in Labrador, St. Barbe, White Bay or on the south coast, in fact, in most of the rural areas of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador was done by the ranger force.

There is also another point to which I think it is worthwhile to refer: At that time, prior to 1949, certain areas of Newfoundland were discriminated against. Now I don't know whether that was done deliberately or not, and it is not my place to say, but the fact remains they were discriminated against—certain areas had far more relieving officers, for example and far more other services of welfare or semi-welfare than did other areas. In order to make a more equitable system, apart from any other consideration, for our people it was necessary to extend the number of people who were involved in social welfare.

My honourable friend also referred to a statement—as a matter of fact it was the first time I had ever heard it—made around about the time of the Confederation campaign or around about then; that there would never be a hungry child again in Newfoundland. I take it the statement was probably made by the Honourable the Premier, but I don't know.

MR. FOGWILL: It was made by the Premier, yes, thousands of times.

DR. ROWE: It was the first time I ever heard it. As a matter of fact I say this, and I am not afraid to go on record as having said it: There has not been a hungry child insofar as this Government could prevent such a child from being hungry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend spoke about the fact that apparently a mild form of blackmail has been used somewhere along the line to tell people that if they wished to retain their Old Age Pensions they should vote a certain way. That may or may not be so, I do not know. Assuming that it is so, it is still no worse than the fact that thousands of our people were urged to vote a certain way on the grounds that Old Age Pensions and certain other welfare measures were only a farce anyway, and that they would never become a reality. I would also say that it is no worse than the fact that—and we have documentary record of this—people were told over and over again that if they voted for Confederation and this Government, and if Old Age Pensions did come in force, and if they applied for these Old Age Pensions in all probability they would lose their land and homes when they died. Now that is a matter of record. Let us keep the record straight. That was done over and over again by people who should know better. And I am able to say now through official knowledge of that matter that there were many people in Newfoundland who in some cases suffered hardships for as much as two years since April 1, 1949, because they in their simplicity, and because they had accepted the statements made by people whom they considered to be their friends, refused to apply for the Old Age Pensions.

There is just one other thought: The honourable gentleman who just spoke, referred to the danger of people losing their independence through welfare measures. I have always felt that is a real possibility. However, as I have gained new experience I have come to worry less

and less about that. I recall—in fact I believe I mentioned this here before. I do not think I am out of order in repeating it—I recall in 1930 being in a settlement where men were compelled to go on relief amounting to a few cents a day, I believe six or seven cents, and were also compelled to go out and work on bridges and roads to get that money. I recall a businessman telling me, in this particular place (and I am in a position to add that the statement has been made by others) that these people, these men on relief were too lazy to work anywhere. If they could get remunerative work they would try to get out of it. I recall in the Spring of 1941 coming back here and going down to Quidi Vidi to get work for the few weeks I had before going back to the University. I remember seeing the queue down there longer than anything I have ever seen outside a theatre. I remember seeing that queue there shortly after daylight in the morning. I remember going down there and seeing men by the hundreds who had slept on the ground that night so that they might be in their place to get a job next morning at forty cents an hour.

MR. BROWNE: Where was that?

DR. ROWE: Right here at Quidi Vidi.

MR. HOLLETT: They stayed all night?

MR. ROWE: Yes, they stayed all night.

MR. HOLLETT: Were you out all night?

DR. ROWE: The honourable gentleman can check that if he wishes. I have heard it said also over and

over that the people in Newfoundland never want to go away from home. And it was said if they had the Old Age Pensions and Dependents' Allowances etc. coming into their homes, and these added to the Family Allowances and the little bit of fish they could jig they never would want to go away from home again. I spent the first half hour after this gentleman next to me, Mr. Speaker, came in this afternoon trying to provide ways and means whereby this gentleman who is a liaison officer with the iron mines of Canada could procure work for scores and scores of men down on the Labrador, who are applying to me by every means in their power saying; get me a job at Seven Islands or anywhere under the sun. If I can get work for a reasonable rate I will go anywhere and take it. That is how much our welfare allowances have undermined the initiative and energy and enterprise of our people. They have done nothing of the kind. I realize there is always a danger there, but they have not done it. I would like to make it clear that the honourable gentleman who spoke ahead of me did not say that that had happened in Newfoundland.

MR. FOGWILL: There were supposed to be three jobs for every one man, you know.

DR. ROWE: The fact of the matter is that the welfare measures this Government have introduced have been most moderate. We have not tried to go to the extremes that they have in some parts of the world in matters of welfare. We have tried to meet the needs wherever we have found them insofar as possible. I will say that nobody can administer a huge welfare service without having some abuses. Nobody in the world

has ever devised any means of paying out, let us say, ten million dollars for Family Allowances every year or five or six million dollars for Old Age Pensions without having some abuses of that somewhere. Nobody has ever been able to devise a means of preventing that any more than the most efficient commercial organization in the world like one of the great departmental stores on the Mainland has been able to devise a means to eliminate all dishonesty amongst its employees. They have never been able to devise a means of preventing dishonest customers from stealing and pilfering goods. So also nobody has been able to find any way of eliminating all the possible opportunities for abuse in the administration of social benefits. I will say this, in my opinion, and I have done a good deal of reading and study and inquiry into this, in my opinion we have here in Newfoundland a minimum of abuse, a minimum of dishonesty in the administering of the various social measures both Federal and Provincial. I think that is attributable to the honesty of the Newfoundland people and also to the efficiency of the various departments of welfare both Federal and Provincial here in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I give my wholehearted support to this Bill, and I congratulate the Honourable Minister who has just brought it in.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, both of the honourable gentlemen from the other side of the House who have spoken to this measure this afternoon have for a good while been very closely in touch with the Department of Public Welfare. The Minister himself has had a long and intimate and direct concern with the administration of the law regarding

public welfare. The Minister of Natural Resources was for a time a very good Deputy-Minister with the Department of Health and Welfare. Now, Sir, this very important explanation was given to the House by the Minister when he introduced this Bill to enable the House generally to consider the question of poverty, unemployment and the methods by which these were alleviated. There is no doubt about it, it is an old problem. As the previous speaker said, there is nothing new about those measures. This is a consolidation, an amalgamation of two very beneficial Acts which were passed in the early stage of the present Government; Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances. I don't see how any government coming into power as this Government did in 1949 could have done anything else than introduce both of these measures. I think that was a natural follow up. There were indications in 1949 that whatever government came into office should do that very thing, and thus bring the social welfare in this Province up to the level of the other provinces, such as the Maritime Provinces which were not so well endowed by Providence with natural resources as some of the other Provinces in Canada.

Now I do think that the Minister might have referred to able-bodied relief. He did not mention sick-relief at all, although I think it was included in some of his references. But as regards widows and orphans although we had no statutes on our statute books up to 1949 specifically dealing with Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances, nevertheless as long as I can remember, and I am sure for a long time before that, widows and orphans have been re-

ceiving special consideration from governments. In fact since the first poor law was introduced in England in 1601 which made state assistance necessary for the poor, all governments have had to do that. Then Belvedere, for instance, was built by Bishop Flemming over a hundred years ago, and to this day continues to do, I think, fine work, better than any government could possibly do. In the past, children who have been bereft of one or two parents and widows in the same manner, although they have not received any special institutional care have received allowances small though it might have been. Now it is being brought up to the standard of the Maritime Provinces by our legislation. The Minister of Natural Resources says we are equal to them in social services and in some respects, he thought, we are far ahead of our legislation. But I could not help comparing that observation with the one made by the Minister of Public Welfare when he said that in every area of need, Newfoundland is in the fore. In other words, there is a necessity upon the Government to have more legislation or to certainly be aware of having legislation dealing with the great needs of Newfoundland in that respect. Here, when I mention Belvedere, I should also mention other orphanages such as Mount Cashel where the Christian Brothers labour so well as they have laboured for generations in bringing up boys who are a credit to them and to the country; and the Church of England Orphanage and the United Church Orphanage, they have done, I think, inestimable good.

Now the causes of poverty and the causes which require attention from the Government are sometimes un-

preventable, unavoidable; the death of a bread-winner in the family, the father of a family, and then if there is no life insurance or no method of pension to go to the family, they are in need. Always such families have been the object of sympathetic concern by their neighbours and attention from the Government. Similarly in cases of disease and serious accident, which constitutes unavoidable misfortune where there is no insurance and where the dependents are not otherwise provided for—but there are other causes for poverty and other causes for unemployment.

Then again, as the Minister well knows, there is such a thing as improvidence and wasteful living and drinking. Here I think I should make a special reference to the emphasis in this country that is being placed during the past five years on material standards and raising the standard of living and incidentally in causing people to demand greater luxuries and living more extravagantly perhaps than they are entitled to or are able to. The provisions of financial corporations to enable people to get loans easily, and the ease with which a man can get a motor car today often puts a man in a position where he cannot meet his obligations and falls into debt and many fall into unemployment as well as a result. But I think one of the causes which have been generally recognized as probably the most serious social disease is the misfortune of people who are addicted to drinking. And I think while this Government on a technical and mechanical basis has done remarkably well in the administration of public welfare, it has not, it seems to me, given the attention that should be given to the educational methods which would make our people



more frugal and more thrifty, and I hesitate to say it, but, perhaps more industrious.

I got an answer the other day that the number of beer parlours in this country dropped in 1952 and 1953, but it seems to me, we have just as many outlets through which we are selling beer or can expect more beer to be sold. If more beer is to be sold then there is to be more money wasted. Now there were people here not long ago in the neighbourhood of St. John's who protested against the erection of a tavern in their neighbourhood. What happened to their appeal? It was not allowed to be brought in here, and it was sent to the Government. We have heard nothing from it since except an acknowledgement, and the Attorney General had not even heard of it. But if we want people to keep off relief we must get them to save and be frugal.

There is a need, so it seems to me, for sickness and accident insurance. I know that matter has been discussed elsewhere, and I believe this time it is going to get national attention from the Government. It was promised, I believe, as far back as the election of 1945, by MacKenzie King. It was astonishing to me the other day to learn from a poor client of mine who had the misfortune of having judgment against him for four or five hundred dollars and having been sick for three months, received no wages in the meantime—an employee of the CNR. I learned a CNR employee when sick does not get any wages. Who then is going to look after this chap and his family? That could happen to any employee of the CNR. There is nothing there to make it a part of the welfare scheme. I might say the Railway employees have a

welfare organization, but this man, unfortunately, did not belong to it.

Now in regard to administration: I am sorry it is necessary for me to jump from one subject to another, but I have not had the long experience which the Minister had in dealing with this subject, and the opportunity to prepare the various speeches. But I will speak of things as they come to my mind. In regard to the administration, it seems to me that a poor person in the city has a better opportunity than a person living in an outport of having his needs attended to promptly. I have had numerous cases of people coming to me from districts with which I have at one time been connected asking if I could get them relief, get them in hospital, see about Old Age Pensions. Just imagine now, Mr. Speaker, for a letter to come to me from Cape Shore, St. Brides or Branch area, I have to see someone and then there is some excuse, such as the welfare officer is in another part of the district. It seems to me it is at the local level the thing should be handled, and I recommend to the Minister that he take whatever steps he can to see that these complaints of need are investigated as promptly as possible. From reports that have come to me it seems that these officials are not always fulfilling their duties as they should be done in a truly charitable sense. I am sure it must be the experience of anyone who has gone to an outport district frequently to go into homes where there is a person so sick that you almost become ill looking at him, and you ask: "What are you doing here?" I remember one case of a person in a very advanced stage who was brought to this particular community only to be told; "You can't leave her here." "Why not?" "No hospital" or



the welfare officer said there was not a bed. That person was in a terrible condition. I went in and saw the doctor, and the doctor said he would look after her. Then not long ago I met someone from the locality and asked how so-and-so got on? I was told she was fine. She went into the hospital and got cleared up. There was a case of a person suffering and having to stay there as if she was not a human at all, and there was no attention being paid her. Now it seems to me welfare officers who have not got that spark of christian charity to appreciate suffering when they see it should not stay in their job. Now I know that is maybe from lack of common sense, but the person who is hungry is the person who should get food, and the person who is sick should get prompt attention and the hungrier they are or the sicker, the quicker they should get that attention because that is when they need it.

If we try to analyse poverty and the need for supplying social assistance I think we have to look at the problem from a different angle. When the Minister was speaking he quoted figures prepared by the Department of National Welfare, I believe, which showed that Newfoundland had a greater percentage of persons receiving Mothers' Allowances compared to those in other provinces in relation to the number of people receiving Family Allowances. Now I consider that Newfoundland is like a great rural adjunct of the populous cities of Canada, and thousands of our people who have left Newfoundland can be found today in Montreal and Toronto and Winnipeg and other large cities on the Mainland. In that way they have left us with the aged and with the incapacitated and disabled and the widows and people who

are anchored here and can't leave. That is why our percentage is higher in every department in which public assistance is given. Well, how are you going to get around that? I know, Mr. Speaker, the Government is very anxious to win the good esteem of everybody. I am not sure they are anxious to win the good esteem of certain people carrying on business on Water Street, but they are certainly anxious to win the good esteem of people outside and the great bulk of the voters of Newfoundland, not only by actual administration of the Department of Public Welfare, but by the positive things they do to eliminate the need for public welfare. Yet what do we find during the five years that this Government has been in power? Where is that valuable improvement which was designed, it would seem, to benefit the poor person more than any other person in the country? Where is the Co-operative movement today? Does anybody know where it is? It seems to have fallen between two stools while we are waiting for Memorial University College to take it over and establish an extension department. The Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives seems to have washed its hands of it, and the Government has no responsibility for it now. The other day the Premier said he could not understand why it was but it seemed to him the co-operative movement for some reason or other did not seem to be very successful in Newfoundland. Why? As far as the Government is concerned, I think, they are looking too much for a quick solution to the problems. These problems are not capable of quick solution. They must be looked at from the long view, and you must build up by education from the ground, and train

people in the ways and means to help themselves. "God helps those who help themselves."

I have talked long enough with Dr. Coady and Dr. Tomkins of Antigonish Co-operative movement to know how abject the people were in the different parts of Nova Scotia when these men started their co-operative movement over thirty years ago. The fishermen of Canso and other parts of Nova Scotia were just as backward as the fishermen in the outports of Newfoundland. But by pattern, by study and by perseverance these fishermen were taught to help themselves, to study their problems and eventually to solve them, and they have solved them to a degree that has won the admiration of the world. And where are we who began not very long after them, and had the benefit of the inspiration of men like Tomkins and Coady, and the benefit of having men trained in Antigonish? Where are we today? Are we much further ahead of them? Have we progressed in the same direction? No, we have not. But why have we not? It seems to me you are going to have this problem of unemployment and poverty in increasing degrees unless the Government recognizes what they are. You are not going to solve them by big ventures and talking in a big fashion. That is not the way. But it is started by education, planting the seed, helping development and by keeping to the pattern and training. It may be a long time but it will eventually flower like a tree and bear fruit. That is the way these things have to be done, and it seems to me it has not been done. I know from personal experience how the people of this community or part of Newfoundland can be helped if we had a co-operative credit society.

However, I am sure there must be men on the other side of the House who have visitors to their offices too asking; "I wonder if you could lend me the money to get as far as Corner Brook? I have a job there." Or "I wonder if you could lend me \$20 to get my license for my car, or lend me fifty dollars for a parcel coming from Eatons?" I have had people come to my office and talk like that. I ask; "Are you in a credit society?" Why are there not more credit societies to enable people to escape the loan sharks extracting an interest of 2% a month on unpaid bills? Why are there not? Is it because the Minister of Co-operatives and Fisheries has gone to sleep on the job, and is not doing the things he should be doing, building up the country in that fashion, which is the solution for a country such as ours.

Honourable members on the other side have spoken about having electric lights and telephones and other social amenities in their homes in the outports. Of course they should have them. These are the things they should have to make life more bearable in the outports and then people would stay there and not crowd the cities looking for employment. Anytime there is any kind of work, men come in and their families come in, and they board up their homes in the outports and these people live under crowded conditions in the city, and are eventually out of employment and are down looking for relief. We got to look at the problem from that side. If I may be pardoned for referring to this personal matter again—when I was in Ottawa I could not understand for the life of me, with all the hundreds of millions of dollars being given out by Central Mortgage and Housing which was go-

ing to people to build homes in cities and big towns, what about the people in Portugal Cove, Ferryland and Cape Broyle who were not eligible for homes? That is one of the beneficial things of the LaSclie movement and other places. At last they are going to qualify to get a loan from Central Mortgage and Housing co-operatively. That is one thing the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives deserves credit for, and the Government with which he is associated. I thought all through these years when that money was being poured out the people in Seldom-Come-By, Joe Batts Arm should qualify just as much as people living in larger centres for loans from the central Government in that way. If a man loses his horse, for instance, what does he do? He writes to his member saying, I lost my lovely horse, what can you do about it? I can't do anything about the ground now. I cannot go to town. If there is no credit society in the place for him to go—I think a man that loses his horse like that is in a desperate situation, and I think the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources who has the care now of the agricultural development of this country should sometimes give a thought to the problems like that. I don't know whether there is insurance for horses which are destroyed, but there are provisions for loans, and much hardship could be alleviated by helping a person who has suffered such a loss to enable him to get a new one.

There is, it seems to me yet another problem in this country: It seems to me that a lot of money is being thrown away every day. As the honourable gentlemen who listen to that programme on the radio "Know Your Newfoundland" realize very well. The person is given some sort of a

number and whether it is solved or not, and the chances are about one in twenty thousand of ever getting it right, yet people are sending in letters from all over Newfoundland costing postage. The Federal Government will benefit by that. Then it is costing for paper. But what is more important, a lot of people, hour after hour, are listening to these gambling programmes, and many of them are ridiculous, and it does not matter whether you get the right answer or not, you may not be picked. I wonder how much money is being spent on "Lifebuoy" soap or something like that because one must have four coupons in order to qualify for the prize. Even if you get the right answer and do not send in the requested number of coupons you don't get anything at all.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that special measures should be taken, in this country to develop the country by the provision of roads across the country. Everyone feels that if we had a cross-country road it would be the means of inducing thousands of tourists to come here, who would spend a large amount of money, and in that way bring employment for hundreds of our people. They are not doing anything like that that would give steady employment such as would the tourist trade, which brings hundreds of millions of dollars to Canada, and could be a means here of reducing this expenditure for public assistance.

I want to refer to another matter in connection with the Minister of Mines and Resources: Very often—and it has been done in other countries at any rate—people have allotments which they till in the summer-time and grow a lot of produce, and help out the family in that way.

That takes a lot off the Government it seems to me. I don't know if the Government has given any consideration to these questions of land allotments. They were conducted here during the war. Perhaps it is cheaper today to buy produce produced and dumped from the neighbouring Provinces of Canada. It can be bought very cheaply. But I think in addition to providing produce, people would gain a good deal in health by working at their gardens in the summer time. I remember over twenty years ago the Alderdice Government with the stadium at their disposal were able to hold exhibitions at St. John's and Conception Harbour and Bell Island and probably other places as well to encourage people to grow things. I remember in the stadium when visiting these exhibitions seeing the huge pumpkins and the tobacco plants raised in this country, and all the fine things exhibited. I would suggest as a positive constructive measure to the Government that they give more thought to that question than they have done in the past.

The problem of casual labour seems to me to be the chief cause of poverty, and anything which will give steady employment or occupy people for the principal portion of the year would be a constructive measure.

We are all anxious to see the standard of living improved. We are all anxious to see the standard of education improved. Education, organization and a high standard of living go together. Now what are we going to educate people for? Not necessarily for luxuries. I think it was the Premier the other day who spoke, I don't say offensively at all, but he did not seem to be satisfied

with the standard set by Pope Leo XIII when he talked about working people living in frugal comfort. I don't think any of the working people he was talking about but were satisfied to live in frugal comfort. Everyone feels today he should have a very much higher standard of living, not merely frugal comfort and certainly all the comforts of life, but have them in substantial abundance. But there is a difference between living a good comfortable existence and in having luxuries. Now luxuries often lead people to extravagance, and the road to extravagance is the road to unhappiness and dislocation. I think it is a road we ought to avoid—talking about roads reminds me of the statement the Premier made the other day when speaking to the press in British Columbia, and it was also made by the Minister of Finance last year in his budget speech, when he said: "In 1949 there was one motorcar for every sixteen persons and now there is one for every five." Well we certainly have more than a third more motorcars, but have we a third less relief? While the figures have gone down since 1949 they are a little on the up just now, and things in the future may not be so good as they were during the past couple of years. I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that they are endeavouring to do a good job in administering public relief. I must say the officials are courteous and attentive in the City here. But I have made these complaints about things that happened outside the City of St. John's—they may not be done deliberately, but it seems to me cases of that kind ought to be brought to the attention of higher officials in St. John's.

The Bill as an amalgamation does not deal with able-bodied relief, but

nevertheless it is interesting to see a combination of the two Bills such as the Minister has explained to us. I had to read it very carefully to see what it meant. It is compact and well drafted. I don't know whether the Minister is responsible for it, but I think it is an importation. It seems to me to be an excellent Bill although I do not know who is responsible for its drafting, but I have a suspicion it came from another province such as British Columbia.

MR. CURTIS: No, it is our own.

MR. BROWNE: Well I must congratulate the Minister on the job he has done in that respect.

Finally, Sir, I would like to say this in reply to what the Minister said about our statistics showing up the ravages of generations. Let us hope, Sir, that in the administration of this new Bill, and if the Government will take into consideration this suggestion which I have hesitatingly advanced to them this afternoon about providing us with a better co-operative movement than we have seen in the past, then these statistics, as far as Newfoundland is concerned, will begin to show a better trend for the future.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 8:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 27, 1954.

The House met at three of the

clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

None.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day I wonder if I could be permitted to tell the House of the death in New York City of a man who has been a great friend to Newfoundland for the past two or three years. I refer to Mr. Littleton B. P. Gould of New York City.

Mr. Gould entered hospital two or three weeks ago. I had a letter from him written from the hospital that I received about a week ago. In that letter he was quite cheerful. He told me that he had to undergo an operation, but he evidenced no fear or foreboding that I could detect in the letter. He, however, succumbed to the effects of the operation, and passed away on the twentieth of the present month, which I think was Thursday of last week.

Mr. Gould was a gentleman who was extremely well known in certain circles in New York City. He was known personally to virtually all of the bankers and financiers of importance in Manhattan. He was known as a club man, a man about town, and he was very prominent indeed in the Harvard Club of New York. I have myself been present when he was called by his first name or by the

diminutive of his first name "Litt" by great bankers and great financiers of New York. I have been present in the Harvard Club as his guest in New York when men who are quite distinguished in American life called him from various parts of the room and came over to the table to shake hands with him.

Mr. Gould devoted himself quite ardently in the past three years to promoting and advancing the interests of Newfoundland insofar as he was capable of doing so. He was one of the first directors of NALCO. Indeed with the Attorney General and myself, Mr. Gould played a very important part in lining up the great firm of Harriman Ripley as one of the original parties in the NALCO project. Indeed Mr. Ripley himself and Mr. Gould had a rather intimate relationship in that the son of one of them was married to the daughter of the other. They were therefore on very intimate terms. I think that perhaps because of that particular relationship, Mr. Gould was able to introduce Mr. Ripley so affectionately to us.

His son wrote me a letter, which I received last night, to say that his father had died. His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has also received a letter to the same effect.

Mr. Gould was a very religious man. He was what I would call a good christian, a very devout and prominent member of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, where he was quite prominent and highly respected. I believe he was personally well acquainted with His Lordship, the Bishop of Newfoundland with whom, I understand, he maintained a correspondence extending over a period of years.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland has lost a sincere friend, and in some ways a valuable one in the death of Mr. Gould. I think that note might be taken in this way, rather informally, in this House of the death of a good friend of this province.

#### Orders of the Day

Second reading of a Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance": (Adjourned Debate)

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before making any comment on the Bill, I would like to join with the Honourable the Premier and the Government on behalf of the Opposition in an expression of our regret upon the passing of Mr. Littleton P. B. Gould who, as the Premier has pointed out, was prominently connected with Newfoundland during the last two or three years. We are all very sorry to hear of his sudden demise. I have not had the pleasure of meeting him, but I knew that he was a great financier and promoter of companies etc. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, to hear of his death.

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say very much concerning this Bill, "An Act Respecting Social Assistance," because I had already spoken, I believe, on several occasions with reference to the Mothers' Allowances Act and the Dependents' Allowances Act, although I do not believe I was here when these Acts were introduced into the House. But I do remember on several occasions that I complimented the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare and indeed the Government, rather strangely possibly, on their forethought in bringing in these two measures. These two measures, I maintain, have done more than any



other Acts that I know of to alleviate suffering, sickness, hardships and poverty in places where it hurt most and where it causes the most misery, mental misery probably more than anything else. We all know—any of us who have anything to do with relief—and I, myself, Mr. Speaker, have had to do with relief in rather a big way when I was a magistrate and also acting as a relieving officer in the Burin area. I have seen the fishermen's families bereaved of a breadwinner and little children deprived of clothing and food because of the fact that the parent went down beneath the waves in an endeavour to support his family. I have seen dependents of incapacitated and sick men suffering untold misery indeed. Sir, I remember one case which stands out, I believe, more vividly than any other case that I have seen. I was on my way one time from Burin to Lamaline or at least on my way back from Lamaline back to Burin when I suddenly had a visitor who said I should go to a place further up the shore and see a family there. I, with the police officer, there went to see this family, Sir. I went into the home where I found the father and the mother were in bed. They were, in my opinion, in almost the last stages of tuberculosis. The mother was poorly clad. The condition of one or two of the children I will not describe, they were indescribable. I made some inquiries. The mother of that family told me that she had nothing to eat. I said; "You have something, surely?" She answered; "No, Sir, we have not a thing in the house." I told the constable to take that information down. Even in those days, Sir, we hardly ever got families who had reached the state

where they had nothing at all in the house.

She opened the cupboard door and said; "Here is the cupboard." That was the one time I saw the cupboard was bare. There was nothing, absolutely nothing whatsoever in that house, and the dole order was not due for several days or a week. I believe there were no neighbours in the neighbourhood in a position to alleviate the misery of this family. I firmly trust and hope I shall not live to see such misery again.

Needless to say, Sir, we immediately tried to relieve that family. We immediately also, in addition to that, wired into the department. And I will say that the department at that time although not flush with money like the present Department of Public Welfare, they were not flush at all with the funds to finance these things—they immediately ordered that this family be taken care of in a special way. So we can see, Sir, that not only neighbours but also all governments have been, I believe, most anxious to prevent that sort of thing and having found any cases of that nature, to alleviate the condition.

I do, nevertheless, Sir, congratulate the Minister on bringing in these two Bills, Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances, and I have done so before, and, as I have said, I congratulate the Government on implementing these two Bills.

In the present Act before us, Sir, I see no great change. It is more, I believe, a consolidation of the two Bills, the Mothers' Allowances and the Dependents' Allowances Acts. That is to say this Act respecting social assistance is very little different whatsoever. The people under the

same conditions receive assistance just as they did under the Mothers' Allowances Act and the Dependents' Allowances Act. The only big change that I see in the Act is that they have here appointed a Director of Social Assistance now. Under the other Acts, as I remember, Sir, there were two boards set up consisting of anywhere from three to five members. In the case of the Dependents' Allowances Act there had to be a lady on that board. That to my mind, Sir, was a very good arrangement. You had anywhere from three to five on that board, and it could not be less than three. That board could decide just what the relief was and what the family concerned could get, and what families should get relief. The Government has now taken away these boards by the repeal of these two Acts, and have put in their place one director. I am not going to use the word "Autocratic" or the word "Dictatorial" nor anything of that nature, but I do say in all such cases, in any Government or in any country, where the implementation of a Bill of this nature, and one which can have such effect on the lives of so many people, to place the implementation of the Act into the hands of one sole individual is, I think, inviting a little possible trouble. Now I am not describing this director, whoever he may be, as a dictator, but we do know that when one individual is weighed down with too much responsibility he is apt to become impatient and possibly not give every case which comes before him the due consideration which it deserves. However, I think that the department, under its able head, will not allow such a thing to happen.

This Bill, Sir, is a good Bill. The only regrets I have about it is that yesterday the Honourable Minister of

Mines and Resources had to take occasion to apparently make politics out of the poverty, I call it; making politics out of poverty. I think this Bill brought into this House is a good Bill, received with good will, and one which should be carried out. Unfortunately one honourable member should have to raise the matter of politics in discussing the Bill. As I say, it is unfortunate that politics had to be raised in this matter—if it is not politics I don't know what it was. I do remember the Minister stated certain things which he said he had a record of being said, I believe, away back in years gone by about dire threats to the people of Newfoundland if they should vote this way or vote that way. Well, Mr. Speaker, we must fight the devil with his own fire from this side of the House. I can look across this House now, Sir, and see individuals who did in the 1951 election intimate to certain constituents that it would be rather dangerous to vote for the PC's because the people, the constituents might lose Old Age Pensions and Family Allowances. I can look across the House, Sir, and see individuals who hinted that to their constituents. I say that, Sir, in reply to anything which the Minister did say yesterday when speaking on this Act. As a matter of fact, Sir, I fear that there was one remark which the Minister made yesterday, the Minister of Public Welfare, or the Minister of Mines and Resources when he was Deputy Minister of Public Welfare, I recall, Sir, his being on the air for about two years every week telling the people of Labrador and of Newfoundland of all the benefits which his department, the Department of Public Welfare, were to heap upon the suffering people. That went on for

two years, Sir, as a matter of fact right up to the time when he went before the people and asked them to exercise their franchise on his behalf. I sometimes wonder, Sir—after all he was a valuable man in that department at that time as Deputy Minister—and I often wonder how, in the name of goodness the Department of Public Welfare manages to get along without such a valuable man at the present time. I must not be unfair, but I sometimes wonder if the Honourable Minister does not himself wonder sometimes how they get along without him. Possibly that is the reason which he ascribed to this Bill here. They had two Acts which they are now going to make one. It is impossible perhaps to carry out the provisions of the two Acts so that they made them into one Act because of the loss of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I must refer to some figures which were given me in reply to a question sometime ago. I find that for Mothers' Allowances for the first eleven months of 1953-54 some one and a quarter million dollars was paid out by the Government and for Dependents' Allowances one million one hundred and forty-six thousand dollars; sick relief three hundred thousand and Old Age Assistance one million, eight hundred and three thousand; a total of four million six hundred and fifty-nine thousand; almost four and three-quarter million dollars paid out under these two Acts, Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances and with regard to sick relief and Old Age Assistance etc., altogether there was some four and three quarter million dollars paid out. The way the Minister talked yesterday, and I don't refer to the Minister of Public Welfare, but to the Minis-

ter of Mines and Resources, it almost appeared here that he and other members on the other side of the House dug right down in their jeans, Mr. Speaker, and collected four and three-quarter million dollars for relief of people destitute of fathers and destitute in other ways. I have to point out, Sir, that it was the people themselves, these very people themselves, who were probably helped by this fund, it was these people who dug down into their jeans and pulled out this money to help relieve their own misery. The people—because the people of Newfoundland, Sir, are not only the people in this House, not only the people living in luxury and in wealth, but they are all the people, the poor, the destitute, the mothers who have no breadwinner and the children who have no father etc. All these people are the ones who have supplied the money which paid for these allowances. As proof of that, Sir, from what I can find last year, 1953-54, there were practically six million dollars collected under the "SSA," Social Security Assistance Act, that 3% tax the Government levied and called the "SSA," but it was a 3% tax, Mr. Speaker, and the people of all of Newfoundland were the ones who supplied the money, and supplied six millions to pay four and three-quarter millions on these. What happened to the other million and a quarter is something the Government will tell us later. But I strongly suspect, Mr. Speaker, that some of it went, Sir, to other, shall I say, industries.

Now the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare gave some figures yesterday which were rather disturbing to say the least. He told us that there were about seven times as many per one hundred thousand re-

ceiving these various allowances, about seven times as many as in certain other provinces of Canada. Now that is a very disturbing statement, Sir. I have no doubt as to the accuracy of his statement, but we ought to ask ourselves why it is. My honourable and learned friend from St. John's West gave yesterday one reason when he suggested that conditions in the country during the past number of years had been such that many of the younger people had left the land of their birth and gone to greener pastures in other lands and set up housekeeping there, and left behind the old folks. There are undoubtedly a good many cases of that kind. We do know, Sir, that there are other reasons as well. There are many more widows in this Newfoundland of ours than there are, say, in British Columbia or in Alberta and other provinces. We have many more widows by reason of the fact that: They go down to the sea in ships and do business in deep waters—and very often, Mr. Speaker, they do not return. Hence up around the district of my honourable friend from Fortune Bay you will find, I believe, more widows perhaps than in any other part of the country, not because it is Fortune Bay but because the men folks have in times past and up to the present time earned their livelihood by fighting the dangers of the deep. Consequently there are more widows and more orphans, more dependents, and I am quite sure my honourable friend will bear me out on that. We find that, Sir, in many places around our coast.

That brings me to the fisheries, Sir, and perhaps it is very timely that the Honourable Minister has brought in this Bill now just after we had so much talk concerning the setting up

of the Fisheries Authority, because Sir, we are fishermen, because we always have been and always will be a fishing country. That, in my opinion, is the one reason why we have so much need for such a Bill as this, the Social Assistance Bill. I do not wish to say much about the fishery at the moment, Sir, but I do know that I was informed only yesterday or the day before of thirty men being laid off at Burin from the fish plant there. That, Sir, shows how uncertain is the occupation to which so many of our people have set themselves—thirty men laid off in a fresh fish plant, which we have been told was the solution, the saviour of the southwest coast. We don't need to worry much about the southwest coast. That opinion was expressed here in this House by members of the Government—we don't need to worry so much about that. Their only worry was the northwest coast. I want to point out, Sir, that we do have to worry, and we have to worry very much. While I grant they have better opportunities of making—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: Is the honourable gentleman in order reviving the debate closed here the other day? Is that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Hardly. The honourable member was commenting on a statement made in a previous debate.

MR. HOLLETT: I do remember Sir, I will not be speaking five days on this, and I will not roam afar, all over the field of human endeavour, but I do want to point out that one of the reasons why we have to pay out seven times more than the average per one hundred thousand people than the other provinces is because

our people are engaged in the precarious occupation of the fishery. Even now, Sir, on the northeast coast, fishermen are on strike. What is going to happen to the families of these people?

I would say to the Government now that the best thing they have done since they came into office was the payment of \$1.50 a quintal which they gave to the fishermen last year. That, Sir, relieved the necessity of application to the Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances. That helped greatly. I am proud that the Government did that. I hope that if the occasion arises again they will only be too happy to do it. But I want to point out that they are going to have a heavy call on this particular Act respecting social assistance, and with ten thousand fishermen on strike last month, there were ten thousand unemployed people in this country. It is true, Sir, that for a while these people did get unemployment insurance. But there comes a time when unemployment insurance stops, and immediately it stops then, Sir, there will be a call either on this Act or for able-bodied relief. Ten thousand fishermen on strike. Ten thousand labourers out of work. I would be unkind if I said—"Three jobs for every man."

Something else was spoken of yesterday, Sir, to account for the large numbers who have to be assisted by this Act. That, Sir, I believe, was mentioned by my honourable friend from St. John's West—the amount of rum and whiskey and beer and gin sold by the controllers all across the country, in twice as many taverns, with twice as many outlets as we had last year. Unfortunately the honourable member was right when he said that was one of the causes.

If I may, I would like to refer to section 9 of the Act where it says that social assistance shall not be granted under this Act or the regulations thereof to a person whose only claim to social assistance is on account of his being unemployed. We are bound to ask ourselves why. This is a Social Assistance Act, and whilst I do agree with the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare when he said yesterday that he believed that all able-bodied relief should be taken care of by the Federal Government—I agree with him on that. We have to admit that such is not the case, and until such time as it is somebody will have to look after the man who is unemployed, who has lost his job, who has a wife and family and small children perhaps and perhaps larger children and perhaps no children at all, but who has no job and no food. Somebody has to look out for him. I ask, therefore, why not assist him under this Act?

Sometime ago, Sir, I asked another question with regard to relief, and I found that, I think it was at the beginning of this year, there were some fifteen hundred and fifty families in Newfoundland on relief, and they received, Sir, during that month some \$45,126. On an average, Sir, that was \$30 per family for the month or one dollar per family per day—one dollar per family per day—I wonder if the Government is proud of that figure? Take an average family of five persons, Mr. Speaker, that is twenty cents per person per day. In other words this great Liberal Government, during January of 1954, this year of Our Lord 1954, assisted people who were able-bodied and on relief to the extent of slightly less than twenty cents per person per day. Is that great Liberal Government, which the Hon-



ourable Minister of Mines and Resources defined, and not only defined, but praised to the skies yesterday, proud of that? Slightly less than twenty cents per person per day. Oh I know there are people who would say it is better than six cents per day. I wonder is it? I wonder, Sir, if slightly less than twenty cents per person per day is better now than six cents a day in those days when that relief was doled out? I sometimes doubt it, Sir. We have to remember, Sir, that the duty of the Government is to keep abreast of the age in all matters, particularly in the western world along the lines of this Bill, that is, social assistance. Did the Government keep abreast of the times when it tried to feed an able-bodied man, his wife and his children with less than twenty cents per person per day? We must remember too, Sir, that that twenty cents was given out by means of an order on a merchant. The merchant, Sir, undoubtedly took at least 40%, six cents, which brings it down to fourteen cents, and the Government itself, Sir, undoubtedly on many of the articles bought by that twenty cents, took its pound of flesh, one cent, to help out in social security. I again ask myself and again ask you, Sir, if that twenty cents per person per day is very much ahead of six cents per day in the bad old days? I doubt it very much. Now I am not forgetting that there is such a thing as Family Allowances, and I am not forgetting that where these apply in certain families, that the Family Allowances also did help the child. But that, Sir, did not come out of this Government, that came from the Federal Government. And we boasting of surpluses! I believe we are supposed to have a surplus of six million dollars. At any rate on

the Social Security Assessment, our 3% tax, we had a surplus of one and a quarter million. It would be much better, Sir, if those in need who were hungry, it would have been better if the Government had increased the order to much better than twenty cents per person per day. Especially, Sir, we must remember, and I hope the Government will bear with me if I remind them, that they themselves spent over four hundred thousand dollars in travelling expenses last year. The Honourable the Premier complained that Dr. Valdmanis got away with over five hundred thousand dollars in just two industries. We know that some five hundred thousand dollars were lost in regard to the Icelandic Boats. Sir, I myself can quote scores of places where, in my opinion, money was wasted right and left. Over a million dollars, Sir, and I don't say this was wasted, was spent as working capital for the birch plant. Twenty million dollars, Sir, altogether, during the last three or four years have been spent for the new industries.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is now discussing a budget speech which has not yet been made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. It seems to me the honourable gentleman is discussing everything that he could properly discuss in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and whatever else he might fail to discuss in that debate but could discuss on the debate on the budget, and following that what he might discuss on some particular resolution. That honourable gentleman is wandering all over the world, and he is completely out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already



given the ruling. The honourable member will resume his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, am I out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already told the honourable member he was discussing the budget speech which has not yet been made. This is hardly time to discuss the finance of this province.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I raise the question of the inadequacy of relief I surely ought to be entitled to show why better relief has not been paid or forthcoming, and I quoted these figures to show why, in my opinion, these people who were receiving relief did not get better relief. I was going to quote some more figures, Sir, but if I am out of order then I shall have to stop.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the argument is very very far-fetched.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be, Sir, but a hungry child is not far-fetched, a hungry child and a hungry parent. If I show that the Government has wasted money—they are today paying salaries of \$25,000 when some of that money should be applied to relief of children who are hungry.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is entirely out of order. It is certainly not parliamentary to take the ruling of the Chair and twist it into an item of debate. I am not at all concerned with the honourable members who sit on my left. I am sure they are able to answer the honourable member when their turn comes to speak in this debate. To include Mr. Speaker in the debate is entirely out of order. I merely pointed out that the honourable member has no right in this debate to discuss the expenditure and finance

of the Government, the expenditure in the Department of Welfare, yes, but to cover the whole gamut of provincial expenditure is very far-fetched indeed. Will the honourable member continue his speech. The honourable member will have ample opportunity of saying all this in the debate on the budget speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision, Sir. But I am wondering how the man on the bill of Cape St. George, if there happened to be one of these who received able-bodied relief, how he managed on one dollar per day for himself and his wife and three children, how he manages on twenty cents for himself? Did he have three meals a day and a roof over his head? I wonder if he had on twenty cents a day?

Mr. Speaker, there are certain sections in this Bill which we shall take up in committee, but I say again that it is a good Bill. It is a good Bill because it is merely a consolidation of the Mothers' Allowances and the Dependents' Allowances Acts, and I believe, Sir, that these two Acts have been implemented in a fair and just way by the Department of Public Welfare. I have had occasion to bring a good many cases before that department's officials, and I will say here, Sir, that they have acted fairly and squarely and that, where it was possible under the Act, they have assisted. I compliment the Minister and his staff on their carrying out of these two Acts, and I do hope, Sir, that this Act, under the supervision of the director, whoever he may be, will be carried out in the same manner as have the other two Acts. But I do maintain, Sir, that the Government ought to give consideration to the possibility of assisting the able-

bodied in a more generous manner, and not to lay down the law here as they have done in this Act that it does not apply to a person whose only claim to Social Assistance is on account of his being unemployed. I do hope, Sir, that rather they will come back to Section 6 on page 7 which says that it may be given to any person on behalf of himself and his family if in the opinion of the director, social assistance is necessary for the proper maintenance or rehabilitation of that person or his family. That section is humane. That section is one which does credit to the Minister and his department and the framers of this Act. I do hope that when the Government finds families who are destitute by reason of the fact that no work can be found by any member of the family that they will apply that section rather than that the director should say: "Look here, my boy, we cannot help you under this Act, such and such a section says so, and therefore we cannot help you." I do hope that the Government, as I believe the Government has tried to do, Sir, in the past, will give help where help is needed.

We support this Bill, Sir, and I congratulate the Minister on his speech in bringing in the Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have heard political speeches in and out of this House, many of them good, some bad and some indifferent. But one of the most contemptible of all political speeches I have ever heard anywhere at any time by any one was the one to which I have just listened.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I shall have to rise to a point of order there—if I made a contemptible speech—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Contemptible and political, I said.

MR. HOLLETT: I ask the Honourable Premier to retract. It is a pity he was not here yesterday to listen to the Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think I need ask the honourable member to retract, but as to the way it was used, I do deplore the use of that word and hardly think it ought to be used.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I heard the honourable gentleman speak in this same chamber as a member of the National Convention. I was a member and he was a member. I sat across from where I sit now. He sat almost immediately behind me, so that I had a good opportunity of hearing every word he ever uttered in the National Convention. I have also heard him on the radio in the great fight for Confederation, in which I fought against him. I heard him discuss Family Allowances which he has the temerity to mention here today. I heard him discuss Family Allowances. It was not he who called them immoral. It was he who called them—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—is the Premier entitled to bring up the National Convention now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order I hold I am entirely in order to bring up the National Convention, the House of Parliament in Westminster or the House of Commons anywhere, except those debates which have already taken place and have been concluded in this present session of this House of Assembly.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague on my right rose to a point of order and asked for a decision of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Any honourable member may speak to a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. I am now addressing myself to that point of order. And I say this in regard to that point of order raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West: I am entitled to quote from remarks made by my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, when a member of the National Convention in exactly the same way as he is entitled to quote from remarks I made as leader of Confederation in the National Convention and out of the National Convention. That is exactly what I am doing, and my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, discussed Family Allowances, which he had the temerity to mention here today. He should be the one member of this present House who should never mention Family Allowances. He is the gentleman who did not call them immoral but a "bluff," a "fraud," in other words, "A cod."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege: I never did call Family Allowances a "bluff" and I do demand—I won't put it that way—but I do ask the Honourable Premier to take that statement back. I never did call Family Allowances a "bluff" and if he is going to quote me he ought to produce the document.

MR. SPEAKER: These are allegations of fact which cannot be proven or disproved one way or the other and

does not constitute a point of privilege.

MR. HOLLETT: My point is that that was not an allegation of fact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a statement of fact by me, Mr. Speaker, I state as a fact that I, with my own ears, these two good ears, when sitting not more than four feet from the honourable gentleman in this very chamber, heard the honourable member describe Family Allowances as a "bluff." I make that statement now.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege or order, I don't know what you would call it—but that was never said by me, Sir, and the man who says that, Sir, I must say is not telling the truth to the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have been told in this Chamber in the present session that what I said was a lie, and that I was a "damn liar" and out of forebearance I did not prove my case which could have been so easily done at that time. Out of Christian forebearance—but I will not be told I am a liar. I will not be told that what I said was a lie supposing I have to bring the evidence, which I can so easily do and as I could have done some few weeks ago so easily, and in fact did do and then dropped it, as everybody present knows. Now, Your Honour, not only did my honourable friend describe Family Allowances as a bluff, but he also had a description for Old Age Pensions. He is one of the honourable gentlemen, not the only one, but he is one of those who said that it might be true that there would be Old Age Pensions paid at the rate of \$30 a month, as it was then, but if

so the Government of Canada would take a fisherman's boat from him and would take his house from him and would take his garden from him, and would take his land from him and would take any bit of property he had because the Government was to give him the Old Age Pensions. Then that same honourable gentleman to-day again has the temerity to talk about Old Age Pensions.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I believe I did say such things or I might have said it as did others at that time. As everyone knows it is a fact that the Federal Government could do such a thing, and so they could under this Act. I suppose I can read an Act. I was not allowed to say certain things here and I stopped, I was told I was roaming all over the world. Is the Honourable the Premier allowed to wander afield when I may not do so? That is my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order—I hold I am allowed to answer anything the honourable gentleman has said. I am in order in answering what he has said.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I speak on that point of order? The honourable gentleman says that if the Leader of the Opposition is out of order in mentioning something he is entitled to answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said no such thing, Mr. Speaker—to a point of order—the honourable and learned gentleman is pleased again today to misquote me. He seems to be incapable now as he was a day or two ago to hear me and then three minutes later quote me correctly. What he might do in three days or three years

I shudder to think. I did not say I was in order. I said I was no more out of order in answering what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said than he was in saying it.

MR. BROWNE: You did not say that. No, you did not. You said you will answer it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So much for the memory of the honourable and learned gentleman. When he has been in this House a little longer and has a little more experience of my memory he won't often challenge it. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition denied that he said that. He also denied or would deny, no doubt, that he called the people of Newfoundland too lazy to work, although I heard him say it in this very chamber.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise again, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course he denies it.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly I deny it. Mr. Speaker, I never said any such thing, and the man who said that I did is a contemptible liar and a crook. I say that, Sir. I never said such a thing, and I will deny it emphatically. I will have no more to say.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are at least two hundred thousand Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, who heard the honourable gentleman on the radio saying that Newfoundlanders were too lazy to work.

MR. SPEAKER: We are very closely bordering on the point of grave disorder. An honourable member in replying to another honourable member is quoting something he says was said in a speech made in another

place before ever this House convened. The point is; can you quote from those speeches? Every honourable member knows, of course he can if (1) he has a memory for quotations (2) lacking that, from any newspaper or book that has been written he may quote from or any speech that has ever been made in any part of the world as long as it has not been made in this House during this present session, as long as it is not pertaining to that. In the course of making these so-called quotations another honourable member says he did not say it. I ask the House, how is the Chair to decide who said what or when. The honourable member may say he did not say it. Very well, why not let it go at that. Better still to keep away from personalities and opprobrious words.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, could I speak for one moment to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: There have been so many so-called points of order I can't see which one the honourable member wishes to speak to.

MR. FOGWILL: The one, Mr. Speaker where he was accused of saying the Newfoundland people were too lazy to work. On that point I want to say this: I sat in at every meeting of the National Convention, every meeting. The present Leader of the Opposition was Mr. Hollett in the Convention, and he never said at any time that the Newfoundland people were too lazy to work, that is, not to my knowledge, and I believe that is correct. That is not recorded anywhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would give the exact words.

MR. SPEAKER: May I say something more. The honourable gentleman in speaking to the point of order reminded me of the accused who offered to bring any number of witnesses to say they did not see him do a certain thing. This has become a little ridiculous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, here is what happened: I remember as though it were yesterday or this forenoon because it burned itself on my memory as it did on the memory of hundreds of thousands of Newfoundlanders as it was the dirtiest and foulest insult ever offered to the Newfoundland people. Here is what happened: I was speaking—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am a human being.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are going to hear it though.

MR. HOLLETT: Not from you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, from me, and now. You are going to hear it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have never offered any dirty nor foul insults to the Newfoundland people. I deny this thing completely and irrespective of anything—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, a mere denial is not a point of order. He is taking my time. I have the floor. Mr. Speaker, I was at that time commenting on a situation that I thought existed in Newfoundland at that time, and I said that there was unemployment in Newfoundland, whereupon the honourable gentleman who is now Leader of the Opposition, and who, as his colleagues said, was then Mr. Hollett, the member for Grand Falls in the National Conven-

tion, Mr. Hollett said; There was lots of work if they were not too lazy to work.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of privilege: I claim the right, Sir, to correct the honourable gentleman, and I remember just as well as he does.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To correct me? Is that in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the honourable gentleman is in order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am going on speaking until the honourable gentleman rises to a point of order. He is merely contradicting me.

MR. HOLLETT: I have the floor and I am staying there.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take the floor, and both honourable gentlemen must resume their seats. I have already pointed out that one honourable member may say that this was said or done and another may contradict it if he feels himself misquoted. I rule this debate and this milling over the debates of the National Convention out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, has repeated today in his speech what he said on another occasion in this House, although today I was glad to know that he qualified it somewhat and that was this: He congratulated the Minister of Public Welfare upon having brought in legislation before the House. Then, unlike earlier occasions, he added, indeed he congratulated the Government. Now I want to say this, Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General is equally responsible with the Minister of Public Welfare for this Act.

The Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives is equally responsible for this Act which the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare as are the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply and the Minister of Public Works. Every Minister of this Cabinet is co-equal in his responsibility for this Act. This is not an Act of the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable Minister of Public Welfare might be in this House until he grows long whiskers and no Act of his will pass this Chamber unless the Government adopts that Act and sponsors it and introduces it as a Government measure. This is not a "Pottle" Act. This is not a "Minister of Public Welfare" Act. This is an Act of the Smallwood Administration of Her Majesty's Government in this Province. If my honourable friends opposite have any vague idea in the back of their minds that they can somehow get credit for this Act or take credit from the Government by giving it to one member of the Government, then again they are making one more mistake to add to their 928 of this present session, making it 928 plus.

The honourable gentleman referred to making politics out of poverty. In answer to that I say—yes, yes, indeed, the best politics is poverty—bread and butter politics, belly politics. The kind I deal in—bread and butter politics, poverty politics. I came up from the ranks of poverty myself and know something about it—Poverty—Bread and Butter Politics—Belly Politics—that is the politics of this Government. I am not ashamed of it. We glory in it. We are the champions of the down-trodden in Newfoundland, the toiling masses of Newfoundland. Where were the champions before we came into office? To this moment and ever since we came into



office we have paid out twenty-six and a half million dollars in social security in five years, twenty-six and a half million dollars we paid out of the Treasury, and that is net. Old Age Pensions for Newfoundland paid from the Treasury, Old Age Assistance paid from the Newfoundland Treasury, Dependents' Allowances from the Newfoundland Treasury, Widowed Mothers' Allowances from the Newfoundland Treasury, and children's allowances from the same. In the five years a total of twenty-six million five hundred thousand dollars, and we are proud of it. It is not enough. We would be prouder if it were double that, but that is more in five years than all the Governments of Newfoundland since Newfoundland was Newfoundland paid out from the beginning to the day we came in. Then the Leader of the Opposition, who said what he said about Family Allowances, who said what he said about Old Age Pensions, dares to get up here today and talk about social security.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, Sir. Have I to dare to get up and speak?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Certainly a man may dare to make an argument the honourable gentleman dared to make, the intellectual baseness, and effrontery, intellectual argument, he of all men dared, the representative of the Tory Party of Canada who fought Family Allowances, the Leader of the party in this Province who tried to deprive the people of Newfoundland of Family Allowances, Old Age Pensions, improved Veterans' Allowances, improved salaries and wages for railway men and all the other manifest benefits of Confederation, who fought almost to the last ditch

to deprive the people of Newfoundland of the benefits of Confederation in that great political fight, and deprive by lies and deceit, of course, and yet is prepared—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** When a group of men tried to persuade people by means of lies and deceit—let us recite some of them, Mr. Speaker: I said if we got Confederation there would be Family Allowances. I said it many times. What did its opponents say? They said it was not true, it was a lie, a bluff. Then what else did they say? When they finally were forced into admitting that there was such a thing as Family Allowances what did they say when forced to admit that and when forced to abandon their argument that it was only a bluff, all nonsense, not true, they then had to fall back on their second line of defence which was: Well, yes, it is true the Government of Canada pays that but only to those who are born in Canada, therefore no Newfoundland child could or would get it. But they overlooked something, and they hoped that the Newfoundland people would overlook it—the minute we became a province we were all born in Canada. Even if we were born out of Canada we were born in Canada as soon as Newfoundland because a part of Canada. So when the line of defence had to be abandoned, which it did, because in a few weeks I made mincemeat of it—

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege, simply to deny that. It is emphatically wrong. No member of the Opposition even thought that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was common knowledge to hundreds of thousands of our people. To deny it now is so pathetic. The people will soon get where they won't believe a word that is said by people who deny what everybody knows they said. It is common knowledge. They abandoned—you don't like it do you? You don't like it.

MR. HOLLETT: You will blow a gasket.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend blew a gasket in the last two elections, and there they are. It must hurt sometimes. They get a couple of their colleagues in here. Once or twice this whole session they have had all five present, but you usually look over there and see two or three. If we see five we get half scared and it looks like the House is crowded when all five are there. Why? Because, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland remember so well, so vividly what these same men said, all three of them, and the two who are not here—all three of them on the radio—and one man from the beginning did it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I object to what the honourable gentleman who leads that party today on the other side of the House has said. He is not telling the truth—does not know anything about what I said—if he thinks he knows I will ask him to state specifically.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier get up here and say that I said certain things about Family Allowances and Old Age Pensions

which are absolutely untrue. He knows perfectly well I was advocating Family Allowances long before they had them in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps the honourable gentleman is the father of Family Allowances in the same way as he is the father of the Fishermen's Federation?

MR. BROWNE: I want a showdown, Mr. Speaker, this man thinks he can run the House as he runs his party. I was advocating Family Allowances to the Commission of Government in 1939.

MR. SPEAKER: When both honourable members begin to shout, how can I hear what any one member is saying? The honourable member has no right to make a speech. These are allegations of facts—and again these things cannot be settled.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, what are we to do?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why don't you go up and hit the speaker?

MR. HOLLETT: Shut up!

MR. SPEAKER: I think this session has seen more impertinence and breaches of good manners than any other in the history of Newfoundland.

I am on my feet, and no honourable member may speak while I am standing.

I have sat here with great patience and heard words used which are out of order in any parliament under the sun, to say nothing as to any parliament under the Commonwealth. I have heard words used here twice today—honourable members calling each other liars, and using words scurrilous in the extreme—getting up and referring to other honourable

members as—"This man" and "That man"—has all sense of decorum left this House? Asking me to rule on things which were said in political campaigns, to defend political parties, when honourable members know full well that no political party has any right to defence in this House—only honourable members themselves have that right. I will not be jockeyed into this position again! I will leave the Chair if it happens again! If any honourable gentleman wishes to make a point of order, or if he wishes to deny a statement he has a perfect right to do so, certainly. Let the matter rest there—you cannot carry on with: "You did say this" and "I did not say that."

I will now ask the honourable member who has the floor to keep away from the National Convention. Why must he rehash all this political debate which occurred in previous elections. It is not the time nor the place for it.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling. But I would point out that on yesterday the honourable member for St. John's West started this. He began it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That is quite true, yes.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** I do not propose while there is a House and while Your Honour will allow me and the House sustain me to allow the honourable member for St. John's West to make the statement he made and have it go on unanswered.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He was answered by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** But by me! By me, the Leader of this adminis-

tration, the Leader of the House. And when the honourable member makes the statement he made yesterday he is going to be answered by me. He said yesterday, and he quoted me that in a statement I had made in the great fight for Confederation that—"Never would there be a hungry child in Newfoundland again." True! I said that. And it is true there has not been a hungry child. If there has been a hungry child, if there has been, it is because it has not been brought to our attention. We don't allow any child to go hungry in Newfoundland. We do not allow it. But, if I were talking about making politics out of poverty, I said: "We admit that that is the only politics we know, the politics that are based on the past poverty of the island and people of Newfoundland—bread and butter politics, Mr. Speaker."

I was also talking about Family Allowances, and I said that those who attacked Family Allowances, said at first that they were a bluff, there was no such thing, I had invented them. They were a figment of my imagination—Smallwood lies—Smallwood bluff—when I proved that they were not a bluff, that it was not a lie, then they fell back on their second line of defence, and that was this: It was true, yes—it was true all right that the Canadian Government paid the Family Allowances but they paid them only to children born in Canada—therefore they went on to argue that Family Allowances would not be paid to Newfoundland children since they had not been born in Canada.

**MR. FOGWILL:** Who said that?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** In deference to His Honour's ruling I will say;

"They—the leading opponents of Confederation."

MR. FOGWILL: That is not us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will defer to His Honour—I will still accede to His Honour's request. Having been driven from that and having been shown that the moment Newfoundland became a Province of Canada we would all be Canadians even if we had not been born in Canada, and we would be entitled to Family Allowances, they then fell back on a new defence, the third line. What was that?

It was this: Yes, you will up to sixteen get the Family Allowance. But as soon as a child is sixteen he starts to pay them all back again to the Canadian Government. After this argument went the length and breadth of this island of Newfoundland and the coast of Labrador as well, I had to battle that down and demolish that line of defence. Then they fell back on the dirtiest one of all—their final line of defence—yes, it is true there will be Family Allowances. We have to admit that. We have to admit it will be paid to children in Newfoundland, as they will become Canadian children. We have to admit it. It is not true they will have to begin paying back when they are sixteen. But here is the biggest catch in Family Allowances: As soon as a child becomes sixteen, if he is a boy, he is conscripted and forced to put on a uniform in the Canadian Army. That is the argument that went up and down the island of Newfoundland. It may be funny today, but it was not funny six or seven years ago when the fight was on. It was a dirty and filthy lie, and it is a dirty and filthy lie today,

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order?

If the Honourable the Premier is attributing that idea or statement to any member on this side of the House I would like for him to retract it, because nobody on this side ever suggested such a thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, that was Family Allowances. Now we come to Old Age Pensions. I remember well the point being raised. I remember well the famous debate on the Old Age Pensions. For two long months I had to pilot the debate, advocating and explaining Confederation, and the famous 28 dictators meantime trying to misrepresent and defeat me, but I downed them. I remember turning to one gentleman from Ferryland, Mr. Dick Goodridge, who then represented the district, and surprisingly, because he was a decent gentleman at heart, and a decent man, he supported me and backed me in a crucial part of the argument. The argument was this:

Well, yes, it is true. We cannot deny that Old Age Pensions are paid. If you are seventy years of age you get it, and you will get \$30 a month. That is true. But before you can get it you have to sign a paper, sign a document and hand it over to the Canadian Government, and in that document you have to sign your name to this: That you give to the Government of Canada all your property, and when you die the Canadian Government will take your property from you and sell it off, and out of the cash they will get for your property, as far as the cash will allow them to do it, they will pay themselves back for the Old Age Pensions they gave you.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable gentleman a question relevant to this point? Is not his own Government today collecting from people in Newfoundland moneys which have not been properly paid out, or have been received contrary to the terms of the Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to understand the nature of that request. I suppose I am in order in repeating the question. If I am wrong the honourable and learned gentleman may correct me. The question he now asks is not—Are the Government of Newfoundland now collecting back money which was properly paid in Old Age Pensions—lawfully, legally and rightfully paid, but—Are the Government of Newfoundland collecting back moneys which were wrongfully paid out to somebody who has misrepresented the facts or evaded the law. The answer to that is, yes. If we know of such cases, then we collect such moneys back.

MR. BROWNE: Are there any such?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not that the Minister knows of. But if there should be any because of someone lying or committing perjury as to his or her age as to any point he or she is supposed to answer, or if it is shown that there is fraud, what else would we do but to get back moneys. The Act itself provides that we get back money wrongfully paid out. We are presently trying to get back a lot of money wrongfully taken from the Government of Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have been in power for five years. We are now entering our sixth year. We have paid out in social security benefits twenty-six and a half million dollars,

and in this our sixth year we will pay out five millions more. That will be thirty-one and a half million dollars at the end of this coming financial year. That is not good enough but it is the greatest in the whole history of Newfoundland, and relatively it is the greatest of all the Provinces of Canada. I think the Newfoundland Government, the Newfoundland House of Assembly leads the ten provinces; we are in the very vanguard of social reform, in the very vanguard of generosity compared with our means to be generous. We are far more generous than Ontario, than Alberta, than Saskatchewan, socialized Saskatchewan, and far more generous than wealthy British Columbia and fabulously rich Ontario, far more generous than these, in relation to our capacity to be generous. A higher proportion of our total expenditure as a Government is paid out under this heading than the proportion of any other Province of Canada, indeed, I believe, than the Government of Canada itself.

Now I sometimes think that it might be a good thing if the Liberal Government went out of office, the Liberal Government of Newfoundland went out of office and let the "Tories" in for, say, five years. I think that would be a good thing because, Mr. Speaker, in this past five years that we have been in we have brought so much, so very much social security benefits to those who needed it, we have done so much for education, we have done so much for public health, we have done so much for Economic Development, in this five years more than all the Governments of Newfoundland in any fifty years you like to take. We have done these things so much in these last five years that I sometimes wonder if

the Newfoundland people are in danger of listening to the Leader of the Opposition and the ex-judge, in danger of listening to them and in danger of accepting their political philosophy. Maybe it would be better if the Liberal Government walked out tomorrow. Maybe it would be better if we did not even go back to them, if we did not even ask the people to re-elect us again. Maybe it would be better if we said to the people—look, we have been in five years. That is an awful long time. The "Tories" are telling us that we are a pack of scoundrels, a pack of crooks, a pack of fools, a pack of inefficients, a pack of incompetents. They are telling us that. Maybe it would be a good thing if they went in for five years and you got a taste of "Tory" rule. Maybe the people of Newfoundland have been getting so many breaks from Confederation that they are now at the point of taking them for granted. Maybe they need to be reminded that all these benefits came through the Liberal Party, through Liberalism, the Liberal Party who fought like tigers to bring them to them, and the Tory Party who fought like tigers to prevent them. Is that forgotten? Is it forgotten?

MR. HOLLETT: Is that in this Bill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As much as all the things talked about on the other side especially by the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West. It is just as much in the Bill as the things he talked about yesterday.

I was particularly interested when the Honourable Leader of the Opposition expressed his wonderment that the Department of Public Welfare could get along at all since the

present Minister of Mines and Resources had ceased to be the Deputy Minister down there. By the same token I sometimes wonder, and it puzzles me, how the magistracy gets along without the present Honourable Leader of the Opposition. How do they manage? How does the Bench get along? How does the judiciary get along without the distinguished and learned gentleman from St. John's West? Why has not justice simply broken down, the Bench both magisterial and the one that is slightly higher, about half an inch higher than the Lower Court, the one occupied by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that could handle up to two hundred dollars—

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: How about the piggeries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It takes real brains to run a piggery, I can assure my honourable friend. On hundreds of occasions when I cleaned out the pig pens I learned a lesson of humanity.

MR. BROWNE: You don't seem to know it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is an excellent judge of humility. I noticed that particularly in his conduct in the House of Commons. I noticed his humility there especially on those occasions when Canada's great Minister of External Affairs—

MR. SPEAKER: We are becoming personal again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly Your Honour, and I am being personal because the honourable gentleman referred to piggeries.



MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I was provoked into making that remark. The Premier was making unnecessary references to both the Leader of the Opposition and myself. Surely the honourable gentleman cannot have it both ways. If he is going to make these references he must expect some reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the Honourable Leader of the Opposition expresses his wonderment as to how the Department of Public Welfare is now able to get along since the then Deputy Minister and present Minister of Mines and Resources ceased to be Deputy Minister, then am I supposed to remain silent?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the honourable gentleman is disappointed again as he has been many times in the past. If there is ever a time when the honourable gentleman is able to silence me it will be a frosty Friday.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the only hope the honourable gentleman really has of sitting on this side is in my blood pressure, heart condition or liver condition or lung condition. He is interested personally in every organ of my body, because his only hope of sitting on this side is in some functional disorder of mine. And I remember an occasion in this Chamber when I lead the debate on Confederation, I remember many private bets going on as to how much longer I would last. I fooled them, and at this time I was never in better health than I am today. And if the honourable member is waiting on my health he is going to have, with the help of God, a long wait, because I never felt better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely

sorry that the honourable member for St. John's West, the ex-judge, saw fit yesterday, and that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition saw fit today to indulge in a series of insulting personal remarks.

MR. HOLLETT: And the Honourable the Premier, today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable the Premier today is giving back two to five hundred per cent more than the honourable gentlemen opposite were able to send, and will do that every time and is able to do it any time he feels like it, and can stay within the Rules of the House. The honourable member for St. John's East indulged yesterday in some remarks about what happened during Confederation. He is smarting under that. I understand there was a time when the honourable gentleman was like me in one regard, and was a strong confederate. I am told that the honourable member, during lunch hour at the machine shop at the Railway where he was a respected and very valuable man, and he would during the lunch hour, regale them by the hour and by the day and by the week about the benefits and advantages of Confederation. He was then a strong confederate, so I am told.

MR. FOGWILL: That is not true, Mr. Speaker—to a point of privilege—I have taken part in many debates sometimes for and sometimes against, as the Premier himself has on a number of occasions. Anywhere where men talk we sometimes talk for a thing and sometimes against it. But for the Premier to say I was an ardent confederate, he is not telling the truth.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I accept the

statement of the honourable gentleman. I can only say it was common talk during the National Convention that the honourable gentleman was an ardent confederate, and talked confederation until he was elected to the National Convention, whereupon he became one of the strongest, I won't say bitterest, opponents in the National Convention.

He yesterday saw fit to indulge in certain personal remarks aimed at me. I was not present. I dare say he would have said them if I had been present, but I was not present. Then yesterday the honourable and learned member for St. John's West aimed certain remarks at my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, and because he was not present, I dare say the honourable and brave member—

MR. BROWNE: I think the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives was present.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Yes, but I was not in my seat, I was down there.

MR. BROWNE: There was nothing to prevent his reply, nothing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, I stand corrected on that point. The fact remains that the honourable and learned member for St. John's West directed certain personal insults at the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives.

MR. BROWNE: I did not direct any personal insults. I understood the Premier was not present.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What I understand is that the honourable and learned gentleman referred to my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and

Co-operatives, who happens to be one of the ablest, one of the sincerest, one of the cleanest, most decent, most loyal friends I have in this life. In the beginning when it took men of real guts to stand out and be a confederate he was one here in this Chamber. I understand that my honourable and learned friend said here yesterday that he was asleep on the job, or words to that effect; a man who works early and late, night and day, Sunday and Monday, of absolute integrity and absolute sincerity and a very able man.

Today the Honourable Leader of the Opposition offered a gratuitous insult, I hold, to the Minister of Mines and Resources when he wondered how the Department of Public Welfare can get along since he left it. Is it any wonder that I should reply vehemently, that I should reply in terms of some warmth or even heat, because, let me say this—for any part I played in making Newfoundland a Province of Canada I thank God for it and for the strength I had to devote to it. I thank God, the same God that the honourable gentleman prayed to to prevent Confederation I prayed to to bring it about. For the part I played and the strength I had I thank God today, and there are hundreds of thousands of Newfoundlanders tonight who will thank God for the day we became a Province of Canada. We are not ashamed of Confederation, and any time my honourable friends opposite want a fight on it I will give it to them.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, are we to have a debate on Confederation. If we are we can go into it. We don't want to do it, but the Honourable the Premier is asking for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They did not

mention the word "Confederation" therefore they have not referred to Confederation. Never again a hungry child—but they made no reference to Confederation because they did not mention the word. I say; anytime you want another fight on Confederation we will give it. We have licked them before and we can do it again. We trimmed them, and what a trimming that was. There never was a trimming like it in Newfoundland before. We fought against them, we outmaneuvered them, we outpointed, we outboxed, we outfaced, we out-talked and we trimmed them. And I think we can do that anytime we want with one hand behind our backs. I think we can trim that crowd. When it comes to Confederation we are proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting the Bill which my colleague has piloted through this House, and which all my colleagues have considered so carefully in Cabinet, and which we have adopted. With all my supporters in this House, the private members who have considered it in caucus and who have supported it again in this House, with the kindness and humanness of everyone on this side of the House, I support this Bill. It is our Bill. If the Opposition wish to support it we welcome their support. If they like to oppose it they can oppose it and be blessed in doing it, but it is our Bill, and we ask the House to support it.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Might we now have a recess, Mr. Speaker?

On motion House recessed for ten minutes.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker,

I wish to take up a few points of the number that were raised by the members of the Opposition. I have listed as many as ten, and to these I shall refer somewhat briefly but I hope adequately for the present purpose.

The honourable member for St. John's East raised a question as to whether the Government planned to share with the Government of Canada as to the proposals with reference to permanently and totally disabled persons. I would remind the House that the legislation is now before the Commons at Ottawa, and as to what is going to be our attitude I think I have already expressed it. I believe the Government's view will be that we would examine the legislation when it is ready for examination, we would consider its merits or otherwise, and on the basis of two points we would discuss whether or not we should take part on a fifty-fifty basis with Canada. These two points would be (1) whether by entering into agreement we would give a better welfare system of benefits to the people in Newfoundland who would be concerned, probably as many as from three to five hundred who are already, I say, receiving assistance under the Dependents' Act and (2) could we afford to do so, not only by way of what it would itself involve, as there would be a saving actually, but rather by signing would there be other benefits? Would it be good welfare service, and would we be able to afford it?

The second point I wish to refer to has to do with a point which was by implication raised by the honourable member for St. John's East, that is, that some people were afraid of losing their Old Age Pensions because of pressure that might be brought to bear on them because of the way in

which they thought. Frankly I have no idea what the honourable member was speaking about. We did, in fact, as I recall, refer to Old Age Pensions and Old Age Pensions as given, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of right universally, to all persons in Canada of seventy years and over who can prove their age. And I can't see how their feelings would interfere. If any other implications are intended, as Minister of the Department concerned that is as to provincial benefits, I have absolutely no knowledge of it or what the honourable member was referring to.

Now I may say that I was glad to receive the support yesterday of my colleague from Mines and Resources, who has been in a large measure identified with the measure and with the progress which led up to this Bill.

Now, going on to some other points, Sir, the third point I wish to make has to do with the question raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West when he said that the present Bill should have included sick relief. In fact it does in the definition of social assistance, even if it could not be considered to come in under the first or the third section, as the case may be. It would inevitably come in under sub-paragraph 7 "generally any form of assistance necessary in the opinion of the Minister to relieve destitution and suffering or to rehabilitate any person." In fact it is specifically intended that sick relief will come under this Bill.

The fourth point I wish to make has to do with the point raised by the same honourable member in which he eulogized the place of voluntary charitable institutions especially churches and of institutions fostered and sponsored by church

charity. I can heartily agree with all the remarks he has made. It has been our tradition, and will continue to be our tradition to work wholeheartedly in collaboration with these, if for no other reason than that they can do, in their own way, a service which a state organization is not qualified by any means to do. Public Welfare at its best is really a co-operative enterprise between both kinds of bodies, each with its own respective span, as the case may be. He drew something to our attention in which he was interested and I was a bit concerned, i.e. it appears that some welfare officials outside the City of St. John's, I may say, in his view, were not dealing promptly with certain cases of urgency, i.e. chronic illness and sudden and severe illness. Well I have one or two things to say there: Our welfare districts are large districts. By saying that I don't mean that is excusing the welfare officer completely. He is out there, I was going to say, in an advisory position, he represents the department and he has to take the responsibility for a wide variety of—last fall, and this is a unique thing that would never happen, I suppose, in any other Province of Canada, but it is an illustration of how deeply the welfare officer is identified with the total welfare of a community—our welfare officers last fall undertook responsibility for collecting fish receipts from our fishermen, and paid them on the spot, a welfare undertaking which was unorthodox for the Nation of Canada and yet had, I said, very, very worthwhile significance for our people. Now I say that to indicate that the variety of their duties is very considerable. That is not to excuse them. And I would say that, if any elected member of any district has

any knowledge of any such, shall we say delinquency or neglect or delay, he should let us know at the earliest possible moment. When I say that it is not to excuse the community from bringing to the proper attention needs of that kind, because it very well may happen that a welfare officer may get to a certain section of his district and the moment he leaves a very urgent case might very well arise. It is not always easy to meet these needs, and it would be a good thing if the communities took even more responsibility than they do. I saw this morning on my desk a letter written by a lodge in a certain community backing up the efforts of the welfare officers to get a very needy person in an institution. Now that is a very worthy undertaking. The welfare officers can only do so much, the institutions can only do so much. There are only so many beds whether in the infirmary or the mental hospital or any other hospital. Accommodations although increasing are nevertheless limited at any given time, and these points need to be understood.

The next point is intended to answer the question of the same honourable member in complimenting the Government on evolving this Bill and those who framed it. I may say that it was, or the substance of it was set out by the Department of Public Welfare, but it was the law officers of the Attorney General's office who put it into proper shape, in legal shape. So that it is a joint enterprise between the departments that I have just mentioned.

Now there is just this point I might refer to in closing the debate. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to that change in doing away with the voluntary boards under the two Acts concerned, and appointing

instead a director of social assistance. I gather he felt that was a retrograde step. I can say we have looked over that point quite thoughtfully and we got all the best advice we could, without leaning too much in any one direction on this question of whether it is advisable to have a voluntary board on that matter on the statutes or not—and we have been working with these boards for five years, and they have given excellent service—what happens, however, is that after the first year or so of operations the business of the board becomes routine, and it is very difficult to maintain the interest of people at large in routine matters. But let me say there are other ways in which the public reaction can be tested on matters of public welfare, and I think I am not being too presumptuous when I say that we in Newfoundland, and in the Government, and the Department of Public Welfare in Newfoundland have never been at least willingly too far off from the public feelings in these matters. Every now and then we call together a meeting of citizens, just on our own, because we believe that the Government has this view, and we try to express it, and we sit down together and hammer out points of common interest in public welfare. My view would be that if we have framed a Department of Public Welfare Act, as it is our intention to do, I would recommend to the Government that we provide for a public welfare board which would be made up voluntarily of representative citizens, whether their duties be executive or advisory, who would nevertheless be a sounding board for public welfare feelings in the community at large. But our experience with these smaller boards is, as I say, they start off enthusiastically, but it is very dif-



difficult to keep up their interest after the first few years have passed. When we introduce a Bill here having the effect ultimately of doing away with these boards, let me say it has been a matter of great satisfaction to us that so many people, because the membership has changed, so many people have volunteered and given freely of their services on these boards. We have acknowledged their contributions at various times, and I am glad to do so again.

I noted that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition ran into some inconsistency in the next part where he said: "Why not assist the unemployed under this Bill?" I will come back to that question later. The inconsistency to which I referred is of this order: He was critical of the cost of public welfare, or at least of relief and other forms of benefits, but at the same time he was critical of the low rates of relief.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think I was critical of the costs—I mentioned the costs.

DR. POTTLE: I know that members on the other side have been critical of the cost. I raise the point now, if you took the whole stand of the Opposition, they run into the same kind of inconsistency that one is likely to run into in these matters. That is to say we like to keep down costs, but when we see a low rate we like to step it up. Now we cannot have it both ways, and I am making no great defence for present relief rates. They have been stepped up considerably, but as I say, it is a question of how much we can afford. And the Premier has read figures to show how deeply we have already involved ourselves in welfare expenditure, which I am bound to say is

money well invested—twenty-six and a half million dollars read out and another five million dollars for this year proposed represents funds as well distributed, I think, across the border as any twenty-six million dollars or any five million dollars, as the case may be, that we may have spent in any public way.

Now to come back to the point of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition; when he asked why not assist the unemployed under this Act. I shall not give any answer to satisfy him I am sure, but was as frank as anyone might be in introducing a Bill of this kind yesterday when I spoke, and I add this now: This Bill merely integrates what we already have. This Bill sets up allowances which we think will go on for some time, maybe for three or six months before they are reviewed. You cannot put a recipient on a list one day, or five thousand of them, and take him off the next. Once they go on there is a tendency for them to stay on until some reviewable time, some time of reckoning comes. The regulations will provide for the intervals at which these social assistance grants will be reviewed. That is a big administrative job. In other words the people who will come under this Bill are chronics, particularly those who have some special needs and who will go on indefinitely for some time, maybe three, four, five or six months. In other words their condition, as far as we can see for medical advice or otherwise will continue. Now you cannot apply that to relief. A man may be on relief today because he is unemployed and may get a job tomorrow. In other words, unemployed people are, shall we say, incapacitated for a short period. We have to deal with them in a somewhat different



fashion. Now that is one reason it is not included here. Whether it is the best reason or the reason that will satisfy the Honourable Leader of the Opposition—what I mean to say is that there are difficulties, and that is one of them. Ultimately and from the point of view of basic social need with a man genuinely out of work we try every means to get him work. I think it is the responsibility of the state to see it is provided and the statutes of Newfoundland do in fact say so by law. It is the only state in Canada and probably the only state in the western world that by legislation commits itself to help the unemployed. It is entered in our Health and Welfare Statutes of 1931 and we have fulfilled the bond, so they are being assisted. But the special problems that they represent require that our unemployment problems be treated in a slightly different way. There is, and I shall be quite frank again, probably another reason. I have never discussed this fully with the Government, but I think I can afford to say that now because the Government knows our point of view on this—as long as we keep the unemployed outside of a scheme like this, (I am not saying we shall) but we may have a better chance of going up to the Federal Government with these people as a special problem, but if they were classed with five or six thousand families of this kind, or more, then it would be more difficult to untangle them again. But as long as they remain separate we can always say to the Federal Government that they are our special problem and we are trying to deal with it in a special way. But once we put it on the Statute that requires us to put them under payments month by month by month then we are not in the same position,

shall we say, to deal with them as a special problem. Now I have spoken quite frankly because the House would expect me to deal frankly with it in this matter, because it is a basic Newfoundland issue.

There is just one other point, Sir, I wish to make before I close, and that is with regard to the use of the word "dole": We used to speak of the insane asylum and the lunatic asylum and we used to speak of the poorhouse. These names are going out and not because it is just a fad. We now speak of the Mental Hospital or Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases and not the lunatic asylum, not because it sounds better but because we have learned better. When people were sent to the Mental Hospital, or asylum as it was called years ago, they were regarded as expendable, they were done for. Today I suppose the turnover is anywhere from seventy to ninety per cent going back to the community again. In the same way with dole, the tendency has been to look upon this matter of relief—dole it out—do it reluctantly—you don't want to have to do it, but have to face the sorry business sometime sooner or later—you do it with your eyes closed—don't want to see the sorry thing, but there it is—now, Sir, I plead that in our more civilized thinking today, we should think of this matter not as a "dole" but as a right. Because we live together this way we create problems for one another, and by living this way there are human problems. Unemployment is a human problem just as war is a human problem. Therefore it must be solved in humane ways. I hope that we might take possibly a little more enlightened and a little more modern, in the best sense, attitude towards this question of relief. It is

not a dole just reluctantly, niggardly measured out. It is rather society's absolute obligation to see to it that people who are in need, for whatever reason, may exist, and that we do our best within our resources to meet that need.

The last thing I have to say, Sir, is to recall that the principle of this Bill is to integrate the present Mothers' Allowances Act and the Dependents' Allowances Act. It represents a stage of progress whereby we hope to render a more effective service to certain needy classes of our people.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly":

HON. MYLES P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, and perhaps in doing so I might not be out of place in making a few observations as to the Act which it supersedes, the Election Act of 1913, which is completely repealed by the last clause of this Bill.

The Election Act of 1913 itself, Sir, goes back to the English Balloting Act of 1872 which was introduced into the House of Commons in 1872 and enacted into law the same year. A few years later, in 1880 a Balloting Act very closely modelled on the English Act, making some allowances for geographical conditions in Newfoundland, passed in the House of Assembly here. That was the Act which governed the Franchise of Electors and

Election of Members to the House of Assembly up to 1913 when another Act was passed, also very closely modelled on the English Balloting Act of 1872. That Act was passed in 1913 and has remained much the same ever since. So that our Election Franchise giving franchise to our electors and governing the election of members to the House of Assembly has remained static for a period of about forty years in basic principle. A variety of cautions led up to this, Sir, one of the greatest, I suppose, being that during a large part of this forty year period the Commission of Government was in power and there were no elections whatsoever in Newfoundland and consequently all legislation dealing with elections would remain dormant. But in other parts of the world where Election Acts obtained they were in constant use, and, because of this use, a great volume of experience grew up and a great many anomalies came to light, and a great many cases were taken before court for interpretation of the various sections of the Act, which were given and subsequently remained law, and are embodied in various Election Acts of the other provinces and of the Federal Act itself.

So, Sir, as it will be seen from this, it is not too much to say that our old Election Act of 1913 has become a little outdated, and the purpose of this new measure is, as far as we can, having regard for our peculiar geographic and climatic conditions, to incorporate the experiences that other provinces have gained having to do with elections, and to bring these into our Act to make our Election Act more in keeping with modern times, and to reap the benefits of what improvements could be observed from the experiences of the other provinces.

That, Sir, is the purpose of bringing in this Bill, to bring our old 1913 Election Act up to date as far as it is possible.

Now the principle of the Bill is the same as the principle of every Balloting Act, that is every modern Balloting Act at least, to give universal suffrage to every resident of the province. The principle of the Bill, I suppose, could be stated in Clause 3 of the Bill itself. Every man and woman is qualified to vote who is the full age of 21 years, is a Canadian citizen or other British subject. Has been ordinarily resident in the province for twelve months immediately preceding the date of the issue of the writ of election, and was ordinarily resident in the electoral district at the date of the issue of the writ of election. That, I say, Sir, could be the principle of the Bill, coupled with the secret ballot, with of course the object to protect voters from intimidation. But, Sir, I think myself, or I would anticipate that most of the discussion on this Bill would come in the Committee of the Whole stage because, as I say, the principle of the Bill is almost outlined in Clause 3 of the Bill itself. All the subsequent clauses, and there are up to 120, are procedure, and set out how the main object of the Bill will be accomplished. But perhaps, Sir, it might not be out of place and perhaps aid the passage of the Bill through Committee if I go through the headings of the Bill in question, even though, as I say, they do not affect the principle, and are matters of procedure rather than principle.

Clauses 5 to 30 in this Bill have to do entirely with the preparation, revision and compilation of lists of electors. Here, Sir, we have followed the system which has been in vogue

up to the present day, and the reason that is so is because that is the system which lends itself best to our peculiar geographic conditions. The fact that Labrador returns a member to the House has given rise to a great many problems. In the main they are geographical problems such as I believe no other province of Canada has to face. I have been told, Sir, that there are actually only about two months of the year when proper provisions can be made for elections in Labrador. I happen to know myself of a friend of mine who was going around with ballot boxes and election material during one of the Federal Elections. He was a flying officer during the war and had something like two thousand operational hours. He told me he was actually in greater peril of his life in those two months trying to distribute material than he was during his operational period overseas. The perils of fog there, ice, difficulty of landing and all that sort of thing makes it very difficult, and because of all these considerations we have gone back to our own system, which has been in vogue ever since the ballot boxes, of compiling the lists of electors. That is shown here under clause 5. "Subject to Section 30, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall before an election is commenced cause lists of electors for the province to be prepared, revised and compiled in accordance with this Act. That list which is taken in accordance with the Act is valid for one year afterwards." Under the Federal system, as honourable members will know, once an election writ is issued, a certain number of days are declared and an election list is prepared and has to be taken within the period, and a certain day is set after which no names can be put on the list. But

under this system the list is compiled and is revised and taken up and is valid a year afterwards in order to satisfy the things which go back to the old system of the sub-list where a man who comes in and can give proof of bona fide residence and wishing to vote can of course do so, and his name is put on a special voters list. Clauses 5 through 30, Sir, are taken up with procedures in taking this list. The compiling officers are appointed or designated by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to supervise the thing on a province-wide scale. In all cases this compiling officer afterwards becomes the Chief Electoral Officer.

In Clause 6, Sir, you will see another improvement—I suggest it is an improvement—that is that polling divisions are not to contain more than two hundred and fifty electors. That comes from a matter of practical experience. We have been informed that is as many voters as a deputy returning officer and polling booth can competently handle. Another innovation is the division into urban balloting divisions and rural polling divisions. That is purely a matter of experience, I think. Each balloting booth is designated by number. If houses are numbered in the vicinity it is to apply to sections of population over five thousand, and electors are designated numerically and a number assigned to them, and geographically, i.e. by their position. In the rural polling divisions, electors are designated alphabetically and by occupation. The compiling officer appoints revising justices who in turn appoint enumerators. These enumerators prepare the list of electors by making a house to house visitation, which is also an innovation, and the lists the enumerators make are displayed in the polling divisions under Clause 11,

and the final lists are sent in to the reviewing officer who makes such amendments as he considers necessary. Clauses 18 to 30 have to do mostly with courts of revision which go around holding courts of revision in order to insure that every elector is included on the list of electors. So, Sir, as I say, from Clause 5 to Clause 30 the clauses deal absolutely and entirely with compilation and revision of lists of electors.

The next main body of the Bill, Sir, deals with the procedure under which an election is set in motion. As you can see under Clause 1 an election is commenced by a proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council where he issues a writ of election and fixes the date under which the writ will be issued. This is the same procedure as in our Act of 1913. Of course in every general election the same polling day is set for every district.

Sub-clause 4 of Clause 31 might be found interesting. It is a new departure and makes special provision for the electoral districts of St. Barbe and White Bay and Labrador, due again entirely to climatic conditions. We have had, as the House knows, during one election already to defer the election. No procedure, I think, was set up for that. This clarifies the position that in either the district of St. Barbe, White Bay or Labrador an election may be deferred. But when an election is deferred it shall be held on a date not later than twelve months from the date on which the election was deferred. That clarification is something, I think, which our geography demands.

Clause 32 provides for the Chief Electoral Officer, who of course has general supervision of elections on a

province-wide scale, and in the following clauses provision is made for defining the powers of the Electoral Officer and for the appointment of his staff. Provisions are made for the appointment of returning officers under Clause 36. There is nothing particularly unusual about that, and the following three clauses have to do with purely routine matters.

Clause 41 deals with the qualifications of candidates, and is very simple. A candidate has to be a person who is qualified as an elector in an electoral district; has resided in Newfoundland for a period of twelve months; and is not in any way disqualified by this or any other Act for election to or from sitting in the House of Assembly. That is to be read in connection with Clause 3 which sets out qualifications of electors.

Clauses 42, 43 and 44 have to do with the nomination of a candidate; procedure at nominations. The only point there I would like to draw attention of the House to is the fact that it is not necessary for a candidate to appear in person on nomination day, and if he fulfils the necessary formalities he may have his nomination anytime after the writ of election is issued.

Clause No. 46 deals with the withdrawal of candidates, and is not unusual.

Clause No. 47 deals with the death of a candidate, and differs from the 1913 Act. Under the 1913 Act if a candidate died after nomination day the other candidate was elected automatically by acclamation. Now provisions are made under the sub-clause in this new section so that the new nominations shall take place not more than thirty days and not less than

twenty days after the death of a candidate.

Clause 48 deals with acclamations. The honourable member for St. John's West is quite familiar with that procedure. Granting of a poll is provided for under Clause 49.

Clause 51 has to do with the polling stations. It is a purely routine provision except that it might be interesting to call attention to sub-clause 5 which says: "The poll shall be opened at eight o'clock in the forenoon and kept open until the hour of eight o'clock in the evening of the same day. That applies generally all over the island. Under the new Act all votes will be counted in the booth rooms.

Clause 52 has to do with establishing polling stations outside the electoral districts. That is a well-known practice here in Newfoundland where in the Fall of the year a great number of people from other districts are in St. John's and polling stations were set up where people could vote outside their own district.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I could ask the Minister how often that is carried out? It is not a well-known practice?

MR. MURRAY: It is an established practice. I do know myself I have seen booths in the Institute and I have also known it to happen in Bell Island where people were working there from Harbour Main and Harbour Grace.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could assist the Minister: In every general election from 1932 back, or back at least fifty years it has been done without a single exception on the occasion of every general election, but not in every district.



MR. MURRAY: There is nothing unusual, Sir, about Clauses 53 and 54 and merely provides for the appointment of deputy returning officers and poll clerks and other election officers.

Clause 56 covers persons not qualified to act as election officers. This is for obvious reasons listed in the Bill. Clause 57 is routine and deals with construction of ballot boxes. But in Clause 58 I see something a little new. Here we make provisions for ballot papers and their form. As I have said, under the new Act the biggest departure we have made from the old Act is in the counting of ballots in the booth rooms. The reason for this will be obvious, I think. Everyone knows that, for instance in the United States when there is an election the count is received here by midnight. Here it takes a week to count. If the American votes were counted at the same rate it would take almost a century to get the returns. So that we think, Sir, in order to expedite the counting, it should be done in the booths, as is done under the Federal system. Of course that being so extra precautions have to be taken, and some of these precautions have to do with the printing and composition of the ballot paper and the numbering. Each ballot paper shall have a counterfoil and a stub, which is a change from the old system which merely provided for the counterfoil and single ballot. The form of the new proposed ballot can be seen in Form 30 of the Schedule, which is identically the same as that provided under the Federal system.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I might adjourn the debate. I am about half way through the clauses.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

#### First readings:

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Hon. the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House until Friday at 3:00 of the clock I should like to say on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Finance that it is his intention to bring down the Budget on Monday next. It is his intention, I believe, on tomorrow to give notice to that effect.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 28, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.



**Notice of Motion**

None.

**Notice of Questions**

(103) MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What was the total cost of converting for Danish seining the schooner "Kean Bros"?

2. Did this vessel operate as a Danish Seiner and for what period, and what was the cost of such operation?

3. Is the "Kean Bros." now in operation and if not why not?

4. Are the two converted long liners, the "Hubert G. Smith" and the Tucker schooner now operating as long liners, and what was the total cost of conversion and operation of these two vessels to date?

**Answers to Questions**

Question No. 97: Answer being prepared.

**Orders of the Day**

Second reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly": (Adjourned Debate).

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker when the debate was adjourned yesterday I was trying to give a synopsis of the highlights of this Bill, and I believe I got as far as Clause 58. I was then saying, Sir, that in view of the fact that the most radical departure from

the old Act as compared with this one is the counting of the ballots in the booths therefore Clauses 58 and 59 become important clauses. Under the old system, Sir, all ballots were sent in, as members will be aware, from central stations by the returning officer and the ballots then were only handled and counted by the returning officer. Under the new system which this bill proposes to set up, ballots of course are counted in the booths themselves and they are subject to scrutiny not alone by the deputy returning officer and poll clerk but also they are scrutinized both as to back and front by the agents of each candidate in the booths, and consequently much greater precautions have to be taken with the new form of ballot than with the old. Under the Federal system once a ballot goes into the ballot box it is lost forever to scrutiny and no one thereafter can ever tell how that person voted once the ballot is dropped in the box. That is the reason, Sir, for the over-elaborate precautions, I may say, of the formation of the new ballot, the type of paper is laid down by statute, the number of the counterfoil and the name of the printer, and great detail is gone into, as I say, as to the set-up of the ballot for this particular reason.

Clause 59, Sir, is a penalty clause which sets up penalties for anyone who tries to interfere illegally with the ballots themselves, and each one of these provisions arises as a result of previous experience, and they are designed, Sir, to prevent an illegal practice known in earlier years as the "Tasmania Dodge." This was a method whereby a conspirer who had hired voters to vote for his candidate could insure he was getting a return for his money.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Has anyone tried that here?

MR. MURRAY: Perish the thought, Sir, that any thing like that could happen here. Mr. Speaker, in the light of these few observations I think clauses 58 and 59 may perhaps take on new meaning. Clause 60 is merely administrative and has to do with the supplying of election material to the deputy returning officer, and there is nothing there worthy of comment. Clause 61 is also administrative designating who may be present at the polls. In view of the fact that the votes are to be counted in the booth room this clause becomes of some considerable importance, and it is established that each candidate may have one agent acting for him while the poll is being taken on polling day, and also to be present at the count. Then of course, under sub-clause 3, an agent may be appointed, a written authority given to the returning officer. Under sub-clause 4 a deputy-returning officer, a poll clerk or agent may vote at the polling station where he is actually engaged during polling day. Under the old Act they must all vote in their own polling booths.

Then Clause 64 may be of interest. "(1) Before the opening of the poll, on polling day, the deputy returning officer shall, at the polling station and in full view of the candidate or their agents, affix uniformly his initial in the space provided for that purpose on the back of every ballot paper supplied to him by the returning officer, and the initials of the deputy returning officer shall be affixed with a blacklead pencil but the ballot papers shall not then be detached from the books in which such ballot papers have been bound or stitched."

"Uniformly," Sir, and "blacklead" are the words of importance there. It is actually laid down that they must be initialled uniformly in blacklead, rather than in ink, to assure secrecy.

Under Clause 65, I don't think there is anything noteworthy there except under sub-clause 4 which defines with more preciseness the rule as to residence obtaining in the old Act of 1913. The rules here are laid down under sub-clause 4 with some considerable preciseness. Sub-clause 5 covers where polling stations are set up outside the electoral district, and of course it offers provision that only electors from particular districts may vote there and any plural voting is made an offence.

I don't think there is anything worth discussing under Clauses 66 and 67. That can be discussed in Committee of the Whole. Clause 68 has to do with secrecy, provisions which, I would say, are common to every ballot Act, and merely provide that deputies, poll clerks and any persons in the polling booths shall be bound to secrecy. Under Clause 69 we find the manner of voting, and these are routine provisions. Sub-clause 5 of Clause 69 makes provisions for second voters, that is where a voter having the same name as some other voter who voted previously, so common in our outports, may be entitled to vote on taking an oath. Sub-clause 8 makes provision for a blind voter, who may be accompanied by his wife or a friend who may be permitted to go into the booth with him, and record his vote for him. Sub-clause 12 is one that has arisen in the light of experience:

"If at the hour of the closing of the poll there are electors in the

polling station who are qualified to vote and have not been able to do so since their arrival at the polling station, the poll shall be kept open a sufficient time to enable them to vote but no one not actually present on or inside the outer door of the polling station at the hour of closing shall be allowed to vote even if the poll is still open when he arrives. In several places particularly here in St. John's this was a subject of controversy. Sub-clause 13 is also another point of interest, that is to establish polling booths in hospitals and sanatoria and during the taking of the poll the ballot boxes may be taken from place to place, which is a provision with which every one should fall in line.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, while on that subject I wonder if there are any qualifications of electors in a sanitorium, say.

**MR. MURRAY:** Yes. They retain the right to vote for their own district. Suppose a patient from a hospital from Ferryland is in the Sanitorium on election day, a polling booth can be set up there and the patient may vote as a resident of Ferryland District.

**MR. BROWNE:** There is more to it than that. We will go into it in committee.

**MR. MURRAY:** Clause 70 merely defines the duties of a poll clerk, and is purely routine. Clause 71 covers time to employees for voting. That means that the booths close at 8:00 o'clock, and a person normally gets off at 6:00 o'clock, but may be allowed off at 5:00 so that he can have three consecutive hours for voting. There are other provisions whereby the employer may stagger the time at which

employees may vote. I don't think this clause will be controversial at all.

Clauses 72 and 73 have to do with peace and good order at elections and the ordinary provisions which, I think, every election Act contains.

Clause 73 (3) forbids the use of loud speakers, bunting, ensigns, banners, standard or set of colours or any other flag to any person with intent that it shall be carried, worn or used on automobiles trucks or other vehicles, as political propaganda on the day immediately preceding polling at an election, or before the closing of the polls on polling day."

I don't know, Sir, but future legislation may cut out the use of powder on election day and elections may become very pale; but these provisions are taken from the English Act, and the English are inclined to take their pleasures rather sadly.

Counting and reporting the vote, Sir, is one of the most outstanding features of this Bill, and the provisions made for the counting of the votes in the booth room and under this Clause 74 is the clause under which it is actually set up. You will see in sub-clause (f) Sir, that the deputy returning officer, having gone through a certain routine will then open a ballot box and empty the contents thereof on a table and count the number of votes cast for each candidate on one of the tally sheets supplied, giving full opportunity to those present to examine each ballot paper, and the poll clerk and at least three witnesses shall each be supplied with a tally sheet upon which he may keep his own score as each vote is called out by the deputy returning officer. That is the manner in which the vote is recorded in the booth.

Sub-clause 2 (d), Sir, if that clause had been in the old 1913 Act I might have looked ten years younger at the present time, and have more hair on my head. It has to do with the rejection of ballots and says: A ballot shall be rejected—upon which there is any writing or mark by which the elector could be identified, but no ballot shall be rejected on account of any such writing, number or mark placed thereon by the deputy returning officer. That is a provision straight out of the Federal Act.

Sub-clause (3) deals with counter-foils not detached from ballots and sub-clause (4) the omission of the deputy returning officer to affix his initials. I may say each of these have been covered by cases which came before the Court, and the ruling was established by cases before the Court and we are now giving it statutory form.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything else worthy of comment until we come to sub-clause 12 which gives the procedure during the actual count in the booth room: "A statement of the count from time to time during the counting of the votes as prescribed by the chief electoral officer where it is possible to do so and the chief electoral officer so directs; and a preliminary statement of the poll as soon as available after the votes have been counted. And the returning officer shall by any such method of communication and as soon as possible after they are received forward all such statements received by him to the chief electoral officer.

The results are telephoned from the various booths, and then of course, all the election documents and statements of the poll are put in bolted boxes and mailed in to the

returning officer who in turn, and in due course, makes the actual final return, under Sub-clause (2) of Clause 75:

"After all the ballot boxes have been received, the returning officer at the place, day and hour fixed in the Public Notice posted up in accordance with Section 38 of the official addition of the votes, and in the presence of the election clerk and of the candidates or their agents who are present, shall open the ballot boxes, and from the official statements of the poll therein contained, add together the number of votes given for each candidate." The returning officer, of course, has previously advised by telephone or telegraphic communications the returns from the various booths.

I don't think Sir, there is anything I need comment on under Clause 76. Even though the country at large is fully aware of the result of an election by telephone or telegraph days before the final return is made, on the 12th day afterwards the returning officer makes his official return. It is left over for twelve days afterwards in order to give people opportunity to apply for a recount. You will see under Clause 80: Ten days afterwards provision is made for a recount. Clauses 78 and 90 have to do with recounts and is completely procedural, and lays down recount procedure and the procedure of the Judge.

The next clauses on which I should comment are Clause 97 and 98: Clause 98 says: "The Chief electoral officer shall deliver to the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs all of the documents transmitted to him by returning officers in accordance with Section 78, and Clause 97 puts a limitation on actions, which must be

brought up within one year after the course of action arises.

Clause 98 has to do with the custody of the ballot boxes and election documents within one year after the elections, after which period, of course, they are burned. Under this section the Deputy Minister of Provincial Affairs is set up as the responsible individual, whereas formerly it was the Minister. Perhaps that is to take it altogether away from the area of politics. Clause 99 has to do merely with the fees of election officials, which may be set from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think Clause 100 is self-explanatory. Executory Contracts Void. The next sections from 101 to 106 have to do with offenses under the Act, bribery, treating undue influence etc. They are identical with such provisions in the Act of 1913 and are common to all Election Acts that I have any knowledge of.

Clauses 107 and 108 give power to the Deputy Returning Officer to administer oaths where necessary, and 108 is contained in every election Act and is called a safeguard clause which says: An election shall not be declared invalid by reason of any irregularity on the part of the returning officer, or any irregularity in any of the proceedings preliminary to the poll; lack of qualification in an election officer; lack of qualification in any person signing a nomination paper received by the returning officer under this Act; a failure to hold a poll at any place appointed for holding a poll; non-compliance with the provisions of this Act as to the taking of the poll or the counting of the votes or as to the limitations of time; failure to open or close a poll on the hour prescribed in this Act; or any mistake in the use of the

forms contained in the Schedule, if it is shown to the satisfaction of the tribunal having cognizance of the question that the election was conducted in accordance with the principles laid down in this Act and that such irregularity, failure, non-compliance or mistake did not materially affect the result of the election.

Clause 115 will be of interest to all members of the House, I think, Mr. Speaker, as it has to do with the hiring of conveyances on polling day. It says here: Every candidate who himself or by any other person on his behalf and every other person who hires or promises to pay or pays for a conveyance to carry a voter to or near or from or on the way to or from a polling place, or pays the travelling or other expenses of a voter in going to or returning from a polling place, and every person who for valuable consideration provides or furnishes a conveyance knowing that it is to be used to carry a voter other than the hirer, to or near or from or on the way to or from a polling place is guilty of a corrupt practice. Then (2) for the purposes of this section, "conveyance" includes an automobile, a horse, team, carriage, cab, vehicle, boat or vessel.

I think that is a measure which most members or candidates in a campaign will be in fear of. I remember the Premier saying last year, that especially since Confederation the number of vehicles have decreased from twenty per person to five per person. Where there was only one vehicle at one time per twenty persons now there is one for every five persons. So on polling day it seems, Sir, that there are five hired for every one person by the unfortunate candidate.



The next clause I would comment on is Clause 119. This is permissive and a candidate may or may not appoint an agent to handle his bills and expenditures. Under the Federal Act, I think it is compulsory. Here a candidate may or may not, or he may be his own agent if he wishes. Clauses 120 to 126 have to do with controverted elections and these too are merely procedural, and show how actions may be set up by way of petition and such petition tried by the Judge of the Supreme Court.

Advance polls are a new provision in this Province: The Lieutenant Governor in Council may order that an advance poll shall be held in any election for the purpose of receiving the votes of members of the Armed Forces of Canada, fishermen, sailors, persons employed on a railway, vessel, airplane or other means of transportation, and travellers, whose employment is such as to necessitate their absence from time to time from their ordinary place or residence, or who have reasons to believe that they will be absent upon the day fixed for polling at such election, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council may fix the number of advanced polls to be held in any electoral district, the places at and, subject to this section, the days upon and the hours during which the advance polls shall be held, and where an advance poll is so ordered to be held, it shall be held in accordance with this section.

(2) Advance polls may be held on any or all of the seven working days immediately preceding the ordinary polling day.

That was in the Act under which the referendum was held, but it was not in our old Act of 1913. It is again permissive and says it may or

may not be put into use by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

Clauses 158 down to Clause 165 are merely miscellaneous provisions having mostly to do with the powers of the chief electoral officer. And of course the final section in the Act repeals the old Act of 1913 and the List of Electors Act, 1953.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to give the House a synopsis of the Bill, to give its highlights. I know the Bill itself will be of interest to every member of the House, and of course every member will want to know these measures as thoroughly as possible. It is a Bill, Sir, that has taken a great deal of time and thought in its drafting, and a real endeavour is being made now, aided by the wealth of experience obtained by other provinces as well as in the national field, and we have endeavoured, Sir, to incorporate the best we have found in all the various Acts, having regard to our own peculiar geographic and climatic conditions. I do not think there is much controversial matter in the Bill, it is merely to insure secrecy, good order and decorum at elections. These, I would say, are the main principles of the Bill. I have no doubt the House will want to discuss it thoroughly, and I would suggest, as the matter of principle is not at stake, the best place to discuss it would be in the Committee of the Whole stage.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the last observation of the honourable Minister that there is no occasion to make any prolonged address on this motion. I believe the introduction of this measure gives the House an opportunity to speak



generally on the whole business of elections of members to the House of Assembly, because that is what the Bill is.

Now, Sir, before I deal with a few remarks I have to make, I would like to refer to some observations made by the Minister who just sat down. He did not tell us about the things that were dropped from the old Act of 1913. He did not tell us that the residents in the Home for the Aged and Infirm are now given power to vote again. And he did not tell us of certain changes to which I will refer later. It seems to me that this Bill, or any Bill of this kind, should have been introduced in the first session after 1949, and here we are at the end of May 1954, and this Government of the Premier has been in office since April 1949.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: The honourable gentleman has committed, I suggest, an atrocious breach of good manners in referring to this Government as the "Premier's Government." This is the Queen's Government." This is the Premier's Administration of the Queen's Government, but this is not the Premier's Government. It is the Queen's Government.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the honourable, and how should I say, learned gentleman, since he has received another doctorate lately. I must thank the honourable and learned Premier for correcting me on a very important point that I was dealing with. I am sure glad to know this is Her Majesty's Government. I am sure she should be proud of it if she could be here and see the things that go on.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

the honourable and learned gentleman is now compounding a most atrocious offense against Her Majesty the Queen in an expression of Her Majesty's Opinion of Her Majesty's Government—a highly offensive, particularly offensive comment to people of any patriotic sentiment, people who hold great reverence for the person of the Queen.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to have mentioned the name of Her Majesty at the same time as I mentioned the name of the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I ask the honourable gentleman to take that back. If he is to speak I ask that he observe the rules of this House thoroughly or not utter one word—let him take it back before he proceeds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BROWNE: I have nothing to apologize for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I demand—

MR. SPEAKER: If both honourable gentlemen continue the argument the Chair is in a difficult position and cannot rule on any remark. The honourable member ought not to have made that remark. That is, the remark of the honourable gentleman in which he said; he was sorry for mentioning Her Majesty's name in connection with the Government of this province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For that, Mr. Speaker—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't choose to give any apology. I refuse to give any apology.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move in

that case that the honourable member be expelled from the House until he does offer an apology.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept that motion. The honourable member ought not to have made the reference he did make to Her Majesty in a debate and he ought not to have made the remark he did about Her Majesty and Her Majesty's Government in this province. I must uphold that point.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Apologize!

MR. BROWNE: I refuse to apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I am only concerned with the reference to Her Majesty. Anything else that has been said is of no importance—I must insist on that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if by mentioning the Name of Her Majesty this afternoon I was out of order I regret that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Apologize — never mind regretting it—

MR. HOLLETT: Shut up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Apologize!

MR. BROWNE: I will have to say something to the Premier that he might want me to apologize for—but I regret, if it was out of order, having mentioned the Name of Her Majesty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not satisfactory. Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman made an offensive reference by linking the name of Her Majesty to this Government in a way offensive to both.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable the Premier will allow! The Chair has ears and can hear without prejudice—please do not confuse the issue any more. Let us begin again: I said, and I say to the honourable member—forgetting anything else—any reference made to Her Majesty in debate is sadly out of order. That is point No. 1. Next, the honourable member mentioned Her Majesty's Name in derogatory connection with the Government of this province to influence debate. That is out of order. The remarks ought not to have been made, and must be withdrawn. There is nothing personal in that.

MR. BROWNE: All right Mr. Speaker, I bow to your ruling.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: He bows to your ruling, but—does the honourable gentleman withdraw his remarks, and retract?

MR. SPEAKER: I assume the remarks are withdrawn.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, has given his ruling, and I must accept his ruling in this matter.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I am sorry! I am sorry! Suppose the House closes—suppose Your Honour has to leave the Chair. I am sorry, but I am not satisfied. The honourable gentleman has calmly announced that he must accept Your Honour's ruling. That does not satisfy me—of course he must bow to Your Honour's ruling. But what I ask is that he retract that statement.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I took it that Your Honour's ruling was that I should not have mentioned

the name of Her Majesty in connection with the Government of this Province—whatever the form necessary to satisfy Your Honour's ruling I fulfil it.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is again offending—I have no words for that—it is tantamount to saying that the Chair echoes the sentiments expressed by the honourable member. I did not say that, I can have Hansard to bear out my ruling. I said; "the remarks which the honourable member made in connection with Her Majesty and the Government of this Province, the remarks which he made, ought not to have been made and must be withdrawn." That is what I said.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remarks. I trust that is satisfactory to everybody. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that this Bill, or a Bill of this kind, should have been introduced five years ago, at the first opportunity, because there was no voter's list taken since 1947, and it was provided in the Terms of Union that the Voter's Lists which were taken in 1947 were to serve until another voter's list had been taken by the Government—but the Government never even took any voter's list since that time. In the meantime there was the election to the National Convention, two referenda, the general election of 1949, the general election of 1951 and two by-elections. The Government in all that time used the same voter's list taken in 1947; and the situation—

MR. MURRAY: Excuse me! Is the honourable member trying to imply that because of that any voter was disfranchised in either of the two referendum or in either of the two general elections?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would say hundreds were disfranchised.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think you can prove it.

MR. BROWNE: Just a moment—allow me to develop this. It is really important. There is the same provision in this Bill now before the House that a voter's list be taken under this Bill, and that it be good for five years. I don't know if that was what the honourable member said yesterday—it is not what I understood him to say—so that a voter's list taken under this Bill, prior to another general election is good for another five years. I want to tell my honourable friend that in portions of my district I compared the list of living people, or the list of residents, with the voter's list and I found that fifty per cent had either died or left the district. Now if anybody in this House can tell me it is good enough to have an election with half the names on the list not residents of the settlement in which the voting is taking place, and another goodly portion has become of age to vote since the list had previously been taken, if he thinks that is good enough, I think reasonable people will not agree with that.

MR. MURRAY: Surprises me! Of course the honourable member is well aware all such people actually could vote by having their names put on a supplementary list?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in the City of St. John's I know that there were many people unable to vote because of the terrible amount of time which was taken up by clearing voters to put them on such a supplementary list. Two hundred and fifty

I would say was the average, but sometimes there were more than that. The City of St. John's had changed considerably in the intervening time between 1947 and 1951. Considerable people had moved in from different sections. I remember very well in 1952 going into a booth in the Gaiety Theatre and hearing one of the deputy returning officers saying to the voter: Hold up your right hand and answer these questions. That was in the 1952 by-election when my honourable friend was elected. "Where were you living in 1947?" That was the question asked. Now if he had to ask everyone who came in that particular question to find out if he were eligible to vote in that particular booth you can see how time would be occupied, and as a result a great many people were disfranchised. It is true, to my own knowledge, that they were not able to get through the people, as many of them left it rather late before they went to vote. There is a provision in this Bill which stated that if people come to the booths in time, but are in a queue and not able to get into the booths they cannot vote at all if the time has passed. I think the provision in the law previously was that the lists were only good for one year. That is a very much better provision than the one in here today. We should expect this Bill to be an improvement on the 1913 Act, but it certainly is not an improvement in that respect. I don't know if that is an oversight on the Minister's part, but yesterday when he referred to the improvements in this Bill he gave a little historical summary of the development of the election Act, and he stated that it had been static since 1913, or for forty years. He seemed to have forgotten the provision in 1925 whereby women

became entitled for the first time to vote. That was introduced by the Monroe Government. In that year women over twenty-five were permitted to vote, and the provision was incorporated in the Terms of Union that women over the age of twenty-one were entitled to vote, although that was over-looked when the revised statutes were presented last year.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, might I just correct my honourable friend, because it possibly was overlooked, because the committee was appointed to consolidate the Newfoundland Statutes, and they might, I agree, have included that.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I think it would have been proper to do that. Now my honourable friend also referred to the continuing provision of taking sub-lists of voters, and if I understood him correctly, he said that was not in the Federal Act—that is what I understood him to say—it is in the Federal Act for rural divisions. In the rural divisions a person whose name is not on the list of voters can be sworn in in the same manner.

Then another point he referred to was the point of deferred elections. Now the only deferred election that I can remember in this country was the election in Labrador, in the general election of 1951, and there was a provision in the Terms of Union that the election might be deferred there. But I have never heard of an election requiring to be deferred in the District of St. Barbe nor in the District of White Bay, and I see no reason why it should be included here. I think it would be generally admitted that in an election or in a by-election which takes place after a general election the scales are generally

weighed in favour of the Government. It would be, I think, certainly unfair, and would not give the best results, if several districts may have the elections deferred. Under the provisions here three elections in three districts may be deferred.

Now I also note some change in the qualifications for electors and in the qualifications for candidates. The Minister says that any one can become a candidate who is over the age of twenty-one years and is a Canadian citizen residing here for twelve months. But it is not a very surprising thing how few people in this country are interested in becoming candidates, and I think we all ought to consider why it is that so few people venture into the political field. If we look around the House today, I think, we will agree that there is one important section of the community of Newfoundland that is not represented here today—I hold no brief for that important section of the community, but I feel that a House of Assembly which is representative of Newfoundland should certainly have in it some representation of trade and industry and commerce. This country is a trading country, we depend upon trade. Before Confederation we were regarded as one of the greatest trading countries of the world, because we depended so much on the sale of goods abroad to purchase so many of our needs. This House is a representative body, and it should represent as far as possible every important section of the community. Of course I am not overlooking my honourable friend, the Minister of Education here who has been held up to us as a very worthy representative of industry—nevertheless, I feel that this House, which is concerned with legislation dealing with the imposition of tax-

ation and the spending of large amounts of money, is the poorer and the loser because it has not got within its walls men with wide business experience.

MR. MURRAY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman would excuse me a moment? That point he has just raised under clause 41 of the Bill—he is talking about qualifications—is the honourable member going to suggest an amendment that anyone who is a qualified elector may be a candidate, but that ten or twelve merchants shall be nominated?

MR. BROWNE: My honourable friend knows very well I am not suggesting that, if my honourable friend has the intelligence for which I have always given him credit—and I did intend to say at the beginning Sir, but due to the little storm that arose I was unable to praise him for this Bill. I was afraid by so doing I might arouse the enmity of other members of the Government were I to praise him for any part in either preparing or producing this measure here.

I certainly am not speaking of some clause which ought to be included in the Bill whereby any particular section of the community should be represented, but I think it goes a little deeper. Why is it that people of that kind are so few in the House of Assembly today? Why is it there are so few candidates of that kind? Why is it that men with experience who have taken such a prominent part in social activities outside won't come forward and venture themselves to serve in the House of Assembly, which is the highest form of service, apart from the military, that a man can give to his country?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are too busy becoming millionaires.

MR. BROWNE: My honourable friend, the Premier, is always ready with an answer. I thank him very much for his information, but I would venture to give my opinion now that he has given his: I venture to say that the abuse poured upon the heads of these people, and some of them innocent enough, some of them venerable and mellowed with age, men who have given service to this country in many forms, this abuse deters men of that kind from venturing into the political arena. You need to have not only a thick hide and stout heart, but you need to have, I think, a sense of dedication, to face what members of the House of Assembly, especially in Opposition, have to face today. I have never known of any other House, or of this House of Assembly at any other time in its history, where men had to face the same things they have to face today.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interject that this line of argument is not at all pertinent to the Bill. The honourable member is now criticizing the House.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is dealing with the granting of franchise of electors—

MR. J. R. COURAGE: It is not dealing with abuse when a member comes forward and says we ought not to be here, but somebody else, because we don't have any sense of dedication. Is that what the honourable member meant?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if that is a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COURAGE: It is a point of order. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the

honourable member is casting reflections on us over here by the way he is talking.

MR. BROWNE: Not on the honourable gentleman. I will give the honourable member due credit for although he may not know a potato is a plant, I certainly think he is a man who would not give vulgar abuse to anybody.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: That last remark was unworthy of the honourable gentleman. In the first place he refers to a debate long since gone and in the second place the honourable gentleman now speaking never at any time said a potato was not a plant. He did doubt at one time that a potato was a hothouse plant, or, I forget what it was now, a nursery plant. I don't think that should have come into this debate at all, and I think the debate is degenerating.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable gentleman, who is the deputy-speaker of the House, entitled to get up and give his opinion? He can rise to a point of order but not certainly—

MR. SPEAKER: It was the honourable member who raised the potatoes.

MR. BROWNE: It is degenerating into a debate on agriculture. However, Mr. Speaker, the point is that public life is degenerating. That is my opinion. And I make the statement here today, that I am sure it must be the wish of every one who has the welfare of this country at heart to see men come forward with a sense of dedication to public service to serve in this House of Assembly. This is, as I have said, the highest



civic duty that a man can perform in this country. We have now a movement towards the development and the increase of municipal government, and that should be a training ground to bring people into this House of Assembly, where their previous experience would be of great advantage to us.

Will this Bill, or the climate in which this Bill is put into effect, bring about the result that more people will take more interest in public life? Will more people go to the polls? Will more people wish to become candidates? I put these questions because we have had so many elections in recent years that voting has fallen off. There is no doubt about it that voting has fallen off. We had a very high percentage of people voting in the referenda but that number has fallen off and in the recent Federal Election in some places only 33% of the people voted.

MR. MURRAY: Too one-sided.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I don't know whether that is the explanation. But you don't have to go outside the District of St. John's. I know of a place in the District of St. John's West where only forty people out of I think, about one hundred and eighty had voted. I met a group of men and asked them how the voting went. They said they did not know. They did not take any interest in it, and they did not vote. I asked them why. They told me they did not think there was anyone good enough to vote for on one side or the other. Only about 25% of the people had voted, and that was a place where it was very easy for them to go to the polls in the Federal Election. It was not due to the fact that many were away, and the fact that the election

took place in the summertime made no difference. I was talking to the actual men who did not vote and did not take any interest in the voting at that particular time. I think that is worthwhile giving some thought to at this time. It is the only opportunity we have. It seems to me that while they do not vote in the federal elections there is very much more time given to informing the electors about issues than there is in a provincial election. This Bill makes no change in the time between the issue of the writ for the election and the date of the election, twenty-one days minimum, and I believe that was the time which was taken in 1951, I am not sure about that, but I believe it was a snap election called by the Government, and within 21 days the elections had to be held. Now I submit that is not sufficient time for a candidate on either side to get around and visit all the settlements in the district which he hopes to represent. I think there should be plenty of time given for a candidate to get around and be able to visit as many people as he can, and also to be able to speak to all the people without having to hold three or four meetings a day, as sometimes he has had to do. I think, therefore, the time should be extended, if not to six weeks then certainly to five weeks.

The ordinary members perhaps listening to the Minister might be inclined to think that this Bill is only a matter of form. I think it is more than that. We ought, I think, to appreciate that this question of voting is a great privilege, and it is only within the last hundred years that men and women have received this privilege in all the history of mankind. In the races from which we came, they have only received that

privilege on such a wide scale in recent years. In Australia the government thought so much about the matter that they compelled people to vote. There a person is liable to a fine if he does not vote. I believe some other countries have also adopted that principle.

Now, there is another section of the Bill which I think is not so fully set out as in the original Bill, and that is the question of undue influence and corrupt practices. I don't think it is as fully set out as in the original Act. I spent some time last night comparing them, and it seems to me there were some important provisions which were omitted. But I am going to say something now which perhaps might anger some honourable members. I am going to speak about the undue influence, and it is a silent undue influence that is exercised, and I am going to refer to a section of the Act which has been omitted, deliberately as far as I can see, Section 151 of the Old Act—no person in the employ of any Department of the Government or employed on any Public Works shall be eligible to hold office in connection with any election nor to act as a candidate's agent.

Now what have we found? In this country we have found civil servants acting as agents for government candidates both in the Federal and the Provincial elections, and I brought that matter here before, and now I think is the time it should be dealt with, and I think the Premier should take notice of this observation; if he is anxious to see elections conducted fairly he must be just as fair to one side as he is to the other. Now I am going to tell him, and I may have told him before, I was walking along down Duckworth Street one day during the Federal Elections and I met

a friend, and went to shake hands with him. He said; all right I have two for you, but I don't want to be seen talking to you, because there are people watching me. Now, why should a friend of mine whom I have known all my life be ashamed to be seen speaking to me in front of a public building? Because he was afraid the employees might report it to the Government, or some influential person in the Government. Why should he have this fear? I don't know.

MR. SPENCER: Neither do I.

MR. BROWNE: Civil servants should take an interest in public affairs as well as anybody else, should be encouraged to talk and go to public meetings for both sides without feeling they were in fear of being penalized. But I think we must draw the line when public servants are allowed to go out and speak in favour of one candidate or another. Of course there is only one he can speak in favour of and that is the government candidate; or to go into the booth— and members in the employ of the Department of Public Works have done that. I will give the names if anybody wants them. They have done that, and employees in other government departments, government employees, have gone into the booths and brought candidates around and went around to the different polls acting as agents of candidates contrary to the law in this country. I think we should have some official pronouncement from the Premier on so important a matter. It is unfair. The government of the country is the government for everybody, and I deserve just as much justice from the government as any one else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I would just like to make one

observation, probably not a practical one, but at the same time it seems to me, while we might talk generally about the provisions of this Bill, the Bill itself is a technical Bill, and as the Minister said, it can be best dealt with in committee. I know we have no such committees here in this House but it is really a matter for a small committee to sit around a table and talk about the various clauses and go through it in that fashion, because there is a great deal of detail, and there is a certain amount of detail it is going to be very difficult to examine when the matter is being considered in a larger committee.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have covered all the points that I have to make on this matter. There is only one further observation I will make before I sit down, and it is this: I think we should recommend that the position which the House of Assembly is going to take in the history of Newfoundland will largely depend upon the fair manner in which the law is carried out. It is not sufficient just to have the mere performance, we must also have the spirit that is embodied in that Act. It is desirable to have as many people as possible to record their votes, and do so without any influence whatsoever being brought to bear upon them. It is desirable that people should hear both sides of the questions, and then, according to their conscience, just the same as if they were on a jury, go into the booth and mark their ballot according to their conscience. Now very often I am sure honourable members on the other side as well as on this side have said that from public platforms but perhaps not altogether thinking or imagining that the voter would vote against them, but I feel that looking at the thing

in the long run it is certainly desirable that a person should be defeated rather than that he should take any illegal or corrupt steps to procure his election. All of us, if we are called upon to face an election should try to carry out the spirit which is behind this Act and not merely see that the forms are fulfilled.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much listening to my honourable friend, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, and I am surprised that in a Bill of this magnitude which has taken so long to prepare, it has taken so long for people otherwise busy to draft, I am surprised that there are so few things in it that he has been able to criticize. Why, Mr. Speaker, I think I could criticize more things in this Bill myself, and I have had some hand in preparing it. He had referred to a clause that has been omitted and said he did not believe that it had been omitted intentionally or by any instructions from any member of the Government. It was done in the due course of preparing the Bill and if it was omitted it was not intentional or on instructions from anyone in the Government. It was omitted it was just through an oversight or because it was not considered necessary. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I will not say it was not omitted, but frankly I cannot find it now.

My honourable friend talked about the list of electors. You would think to hear him talking that hundreds and hundreds of people were disfranchised during the past number of elections because we did not have a new list of electors. Taking, Sir, a list of electors is not at all as important in a provincial election as it is in a Federal Election because we have the supplementary list of voters and

we are retaining them. It is true it takes time, but I doubt if my honourable and learned friend can put his hand on one hundred people in the whole country who lost their vote because the returning officer did not have time to ask and register their name and permit them to vote. I might say in these elections the returning officers opened additional booths in such places so as to facilitate the elections, and as I say, I doubt very much he can show in very considerable numbers where people have lost their vote because of their being no list or from the fact that half the people on the list were dead. What harm did that do? Unless my honourable friend can show they voted. Perhaps half of them were dead, but that did not spoil the other half from voting and did not spoil the new electors, those who had become twenty-one since the list was compiled, and thereby lose their franchise. I think if you were to have an election today on the present voters list, provided you had sufficient booths, you would get a fair election.

MR. BROWNE: You could not do it.

MR. CURTIS: I suppose my honourable friend thinks that every time we have an election we should take a list of voters. If he thinks that this Government is going to take a list of electors every time there is to be an election he has got another think coming, and he will have to wait until he gets on this side of the House, because it is not our intention to waste public money by having lists of electors taken every time an election comes up. How many lists of electors would we have had in St. John's West since 1949? We had two federal elections since 1949, two pro-

vincial elections and three by-elections. Why we would be doing nothing else in St. John's West but taking lists of electors. If my honourable friend thinks a list of electors a year old is out of date, I think, he is exaggerating. What happens is you have provisions for a revised list and that fills up your vacancies, and that gives you an opportunity to take in those who have moved into the district and those who became twenty-one since the last election. Surely, he is not serious in suggesting that we should have a new list of electors every time there is an election.

MR. BROWNE: That is the law.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, that may have been the law, as my honourable friend says, but every government every particular time there was an election, passed a special Act saying: that for the purpose of the election being held this year the old election list shall be valid. My honourable friend probably passed an Act like that himself during the Monroe Government when a list of electors was used that was invalid in Port de Grave and also kept the booths open until 8:00 o'clock in the night although the Act said they had to be closed at four o'clock. They had to come back after the election and pass a special Act validating the election because it used a list not allowed and kept the booths open longer than they were supposed to be open. That was all right. That was Toryism. That was bringing one of the merchants into the House. That was all right.

I don't suggest this Bill before the House will bring forward one more voter than those who voted before this. It is simply an attempt to bring our election Act up to date. It com-

prises all the good features of our old election Act. Some of it is taken from the Federal Act and some of it is new and some features are from other provincial Acts. It is a good Act and I think it is a sensible Act. I commend it to the House. It will not get one more voter, as I said, and it will not get the Water Street merchants to run, as my honourable colleague says, those who are selling waffle irons are not going to leave that and go looking for votes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They can do it but won't.

MR. CURTIS: I can remember the "City Club Government." They could get a government all right, an executive, but could not get one of them to go to the country.

MR. BROWNE: I was never a member of the City Club. Were you?

MR. CURTIS: No, I was not. My colleague called them lounge lizards. But Mr. Speaker, this Bill will not bring merchants from Water Street into the House. If I thought it would I would not vote for it. They got in the House in the old days, sure. They sat over opposite where they got a little old age pension of two hundred a year, which was more than the old age pensioners got in these days, and were just able to block anything that did not suit them. They are welcome to come. They are welcome to come on this side of the House. And remember those of us on this side of the House get just as much abuse as those on the other side. If my honourable friend had been here during the past four years and heard what we had to hear on this side of the House he would not envy us the position. The predecessor of the present Honourable Leader of

the Opposition—what he did not say about us individually and collectively both inside and outside the House? We had to put up with it and a lot more than the honourable members on the other side had to put up with this year.

MR. HOLLETT: We don't do that now.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps they have lost their pep,—but they are beginning to get it back. Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend suggested this will not get more votes. It will not. It is not to compel electors to vote, I admit that. I don't know if the honourable gentleman would like to write into this Bill a clause saying that any man who does not exercise his franchise should go to jail. He would not. I may say this; the Government will be happy to consider any reasonable amendments to this Bill.

My honourable friend says that the twenty-one days should be increased. Twenty-one days is enough. It was enough in the 1913 Act, enough in 1919, 1923 and 1924. It was enough until now, and yet, although everything else has speeded up, although we have—

MR. BROWNE: May I point out to my honourable friend that was a minimum provision, as he knows, and was not used in that way except, as far as I know, in 1951.

MR. CURTIS: I am not prepared, Sir, to go back and count up the days between the nominations and the polls in the past. But I will say that the Act called for twenty-one days. It is a minimum and we may grant more, but surely in these days of speed when we have planes, when we have speedier communications we are not going to extend the time—what next?



My honourable friend said he had difficulty because some of his best friends were afraid to speak to him during the campaign. Those friends must have had a guilty conscience, because there has been no government since I have heard of politics, and that memory goes back forty-five or fifty years, there has been no government since my day that treated its opponents who were civil servants with such consideration as this Government has treated them. We have not fired one man since we were elected because of his political views, and some of them had many nasty ones. We have not fired one of them. Some of them who knew they were Tories, knew they were not fit to stay in their jobs, came to the Premier asking that they not be fired, because they knew they should have been fired.

MR. BROWNE: What about the men working now for your party in elections?

MR. CURTIS: They have not been fired either. We give both a free hand. We fire nobody. We came back and found men opposing us in our own offices, and we have not used the axe on one of them, but my honourable friend remembers when his government came in they fired five or six civil servants and appointed other fellows.

MR. BROWNE: I must say I don't recall that.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps my honourable friend remembers Halfyard—they fired five or six one year.

MR. BROWNE: Previous governments had done the same thing.

MR. CURTIS: This Government has not. This Government has tried

to be honest and fair with the civil servants and have not penalized one that I know of because of politics.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And we are the first such Government in Newfoundland's history.

MR. CURTIS: Now, Sir, there is nothing else that my honourable friend said to which I need to reply, and if he has I have forgotten it, and he will perhaps refer to it in the committee stage. All I can say is that I think this Bill before us is a good Bill, a fair Bill based largely on our present Act which has worked for the last fifty years. I have great satisfaction in supporting this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say three or four words on this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest first, if the honourable member is going to make a somewhat lengthy speech ! ! !

MR. SMALLWOOD: I won't speak more than a few minutes. I should like first of all to express a word of commendation to Mr. Short, the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, who is responsible in the first instance in drafting the Bill that is now before us. Mr. Short has been the Chief Electoral Officer in connection with the election of members to the National Convention. He was then the Chief Electoral Officer in each of the two referenda that took place in Newfoundland. He was the Electoral Officer or whatever is the title under the 1913 Act for the provincial general election and he was the same in the second provincial election. He, therefore, has had more experience with conducting the official side of elections in Newfoundland than any other man in Newfoundland.



For that reason I invited him to make the first draft of a new election Act some three to four years ago. He made a particular study of the Canadian Elections Act. He had many personal conferences with the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada. He also brought into Newfoundland copies of the provincial Acts all across Canada. Having done that he then asked the Attorney General to invite Mr. Myles P. Murray, who was then in the practice of law, to take over the rather tremendous job of putting all these ideas into legal shape. The Bill as it stands is principally the handiwork of the present Solicitor-General and Minister of Provincial Affairs, than whom no man is more capable of explaining every section and every clause and every line and every word of the present Bill. I felt that in connection with this very ponderous Bill and this very important one that the House should know that the credit lies primarily with Mr. Short and the present Solicitor General and Minister of Provincial Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with two points only raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. One was in connection with his touching appeal, the somewhat elegant appeal, for more merchants in this Chamber. He is, of course, as entitled to his views as I am to mine or as any other member of the House is to his. If he feels that there should be more merchants here he has a right so to feel. If I feel that we have had far too many merchants in the Chamber, then I am entitled to that view, and that happens to be my view. Newfoundland in the last five years, with a House of Assembly that contained not even one fish merchant, has made more progress than she ever did in any

twenty-five years before. If we had today a few fish merchants occupying seats in this House we would not have gone ahead. I will even go a step further and say this, with all due deference to my honourable and learned friend the member for St. John's West, and to my honourable and learned friend the Attorney General, and to my honourable and learned friend the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, and my honourable and learned friend, the Deputy-Speaker, and my honourable and learned friend, the member for Port de Grave, with all due deference to them; we have made the progress we did during the last five years largely because we have had fewer lawyers in the House in the last five years than perhaps in any five years in the history of the House of Assembly. Why for the first three years the only lawyers we had were the Attorney General and the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. J. G. Higgins, one on each side of the House. I always felt somehow that was a comfortable and happy state of affairs. But I noticed that since we have a section of lawyers in this House things have gone right for scarcely one day since that happened.

There is another point raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, i.e. about the twenty-one day period not being long enough between the calling of an election, the issue of the official proclamation and the polling day. Twenty-one days is not time enough, he says, and it should be at least five weeks, and then he went on to give his reasons. The reasons were good but they were not good reasons for extending the period beyond twenty-one days, but they were good reasons for something else altogether. His

reasons were that a candidate ought to have the opportunity to canvass his district, to make a speech in every part of his district, and instead of having to make two, three or four speeches a day, to do it somewhat more comfortably and make say one or two a day. Now that is not a good argument for increasing the number of constituencies physically and geographically speaking. I do not desire to anticipate legislation that will come before the House later in the year—although this present Bill does not deal with the matter. I think we may well anticipate legislation which will deal with the matter of the size and number of constituencies, and the way to make it more feasible, more practical, for candidates to be able, within the time at their disposal, to cover their constituencies. It is not necessary to increase the time but rather to decrease the size of the constituencies. The honourable member for Labrador, the Minister of Mines and Resources, represents a constituency of a hundred and ten thousand square miles, almost three times the size of the whole Island of Newfoundland, and with a coastline of sixteen or seventeen hundred miles. How is it possible for one man, if you gave him three months from the proclamation to the polling day or if you gave him four months or if you gave him five months of the year, what five months of the year could he pick during which he could go to every nook and corner of that hundred and ten thousand square miles where people live, and hold a meeting and conduct a proper canvass and make himself personally known to all the voters and the voters personally well known to him? How many months would be required or how many weeks to do that? Take the District

of White Bay, how long would be necessary for a man to canvass all of White Bay? How long would be necessary to canvass Your Honour's own district, the great Coast of St. Barbe? The cure would lie rather in increasing the number of constituencies and thereby decreasing their size and increasing the number of members of this House, always with the powerful hope that that won't involve us in having present a number of fish merchants in this Chamber. We are getting along very well indeed without them. I can understand the yearnings of my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West for a few fish merchants or other merchants in here. I can understand that there is a sort of fellow-feeling. The Tory Party was always the party of Water Street, always the Merchants' Party, the Mercantile Party from the dawn of our history in Newfoundland. The Mercantile Party were always Tories, and the Tories always were the Mercantile Party. Most of the premiers they produced were Water Street Merchants, most of the cabinet ministers they produced were Water Street Merchants. I am not going to say there was never a merchant in the Liberal Party, there were too many of them. But by and large, on the average, over a period of our history it is the simple truth and historical fact that the Liberal Party were the party of the masses and the Tory Party were the party of the classes, and there was always that wide gulf, the gulf was there—it was there, the gulf between the masses and the classes. Toryism was the party of the classes, Liberalism was the party of the masses. That is Newfoundland's history from the birth of the Tory Party and the birth of the Liberal

Party in 1831. So that I can well understand my honourable friends opposite. I hope that when the Leader of the Tory Party speaks that he will not repudiate the sentiments of his newly acquired follower, and say the party is really not anxious to have some merchants in here in this House of Assembly, unless this is an effort to hurt the Liberal Party. Maybe what they want to do is to get some merchants in here on the Liberal side. Maybe they don't mean getting some merchants in on their side of the House. There is one final point, Mr. Speaker, and then I am through. The honourable member for St. John's West made the statement that he is as much entitled as any member of the House or any person, I think he said, in Newfoundland to be treated justly and fairly. I think that is what he said. I think he said something like this: "I am as much entitled to be treated fairly and justly as any other member." Now I doubt that anyone is going to deny that. I think we must admit the truth of that. That is true. But I hope by the same token that he is not going to suggest that he is not receiving it. When the honourable member lost his seat in the House of Commons last fall it was this side of the House that made it possible for him to find a new seat, the one he has now. We did not deal with him unfairly then.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member will remember the point was civil servants canvassing and taking part in elections.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not talking about civil servants. The honourable gentleman is not a civil servant. When the honourable gentleman claimed that he was entitled to be treated as fairly as any other

member I don't think he was talking about civil servants.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt the honourable the Premier? Will the police officer remove from the gallery the person on his right carrying on a conversation. Please continue the speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say he has no reason to grumble. He has his seat. He was defeated in the three provincial districts that constitute the federal district. He was defeated in St. John's West by a substantial majority. He was defeated in Ferryland by a substantial majority. He was defeated in the District of Placentia-St. Mary's and in the riding on the whole he was defeated by around a thousand votes.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think the Premier is stating facts now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, of course, he was defeated in the riding at large by a majority of a thousand votes—having been defeated we then virtually invited him in to this House. The Leader of the Opposition is going to deal with that, and perhaps try to show that that is not so. Perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition after recess is going to chew me up and spit me out on the floor, chew me alive, and show that is not the truth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: What a mouthful to put under my tongue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some tongue.

MR. HOLLETT: Some mouthful.

MR. SPEAKER: Such exchange of pleasantries is not amusing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps he is going to show the Government were afraid to contest the honourable gentleman whom we had gone out and defeated a few weeks before in all three of the districts that made up the riding. Maybe he thinks we were afraid of them. They are not big enough yet to have caught on to why we brought him into the House, and not bright enough to understand why. Time will tell them. It is not for nothing that we always win. We win because two and three and four and five years earlier, we plan to win. That is why the honourable gentleman is over on the other side now. Mr. Speaker might we have a recess now?

MR. HOLLETT: After that?

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable members are willing the House will recess for ten minutes.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to prolong the debate. I would like at the outset to congratulate the honourable Minister who introduced this Bill in the capable manner in which he introduced it, and indeed for the Bill itself. I consider it, on the whole, a very excellent Bill. It has cut out considerable redundancy in the old 1913 Act. And when I say 1913 I am reminded that the Honourable Minister must have been a very small boy, if he was a boy at all at that time. That is a long time ago, 41 years ago. I would say, therefore, it is an honour to be put in the position of introducing this Bill to this Honourable House. I would also like to couple with the remarks of the Premier my personal appreciation of the way in which ex-magistrate Short has handled all the elections down through the years since 1949 and including 1949—I be-

lieve he was there then. I have had something to do with Mr. Short on a couple of occasions during elections, and I must say I always found him fair and square and above board and always a credit to the magistracy, and I am sure he has been a credit to the office which he now fills. On various occasions during a couple of elections I had to go to him, in fact I had to go to him on one occasion when a ballot box went astray somewhere, and we found him most reasonable and sympathetic. I would consider the Government very fortunate and very lucky in having a man like Magistrate Short to fill the job which he has so ably filled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Honourable Minister that probably the best place to discuss this Bill is in Committee of the Whole. As a matter of fact I am not sure that a Bill of this kind should not be brought in through Committee of the Whole where it would give everybody ample opportunity in the first instance to discuss the various sections. But I do agree that in Committee of the Whole is the proper time to bring up the various sections which are very important, every one of them. Each one of these sections concerns the franchise of people who have to make up their minds every once in a while, and quite often since 1949, as to what they are going to do with regard to certain candidates who come before them. I do not intend to say very much on this Bill but will bring up certain points in Committee of the Whole. The principle of course in this Bill is the new method of counting the ballots, and a very excellent one, that is to say, when the polling and necessary formalities are gone through, the deputy in the presence of the candidates or their agents or two

or three citizens opens the ballot boxes, counts the ballot for John Jones and Bill Smith and immediately takes down the telephone or wires, as the case might be, the electoral officer and says, "Hollett had ten thousand votes and Browne ten thousand five hundred," I think it was, and that the Liberal candidates in St. John's West had a little less than that, and the electoral officer immediately knows the whole thing. But it applies to the count from the deputy to the returning officer particularly in the outports where it is going to be a great aid, and we are going to know probably on the same day just what this country is going to have to put up with from the point of view of parties for the next five years. I hope it is five years and not three as is the custom of the present Government. I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to last through three years on our previous election. We have had various threats of closing the House, and I think even members of the Government have been threatened with suspension and a new crowd gathered in to go to the country. I believe someone said that here one day.

We may be able to get on with this business and get this Act passed, at any rate, before the election. We know the election is coming pretty soon, therefore, we think we ought to get the Act passed as soon as possible. I know the election has to take place this year. The Premier said so. Therefore I say we ought not to waste too much time in discussing the various sections at this time, probably when we get into Committee of the Whole the Honourable Premier will tell us just what date we are going to have this election, and then we will hasten the thing. I understand the Honour-

able the Premier told a Liberal Party last night that not one single soul in the world but himself knows when we are going to have this election. Is not that strange? Nobody except the Premier himself knows when we are going to have an election this year, but he knows. He knows. He is so mysterious now. The Premier knows. The Premier and he alone knows what date we are going to have that election. I do hope in the magnanimous spirit that he has for us in Opposition that he will some day inform us when he is to have an election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell you now. Start getting ready.

MR. HOLLETT: We are getting ready fast. I knew the Premier would bite to that one. Well we are getting ready. We only go slow on this side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the trouble and why you only have three over there.

MR. HOLLETT: Because, Mr. Speaker, the affairs of the country should be handled, I think, with caution, let us not be too fast. Not "Develop or Perish." We should think things over, think before we decide, even when we are going to have another election.

This a good Act, there is no question about it. It is an excellent Act. There are certain things I shall have to say in Committee of the Whole, which it is not necessary to enlarge upon at the present time. I made a few notes but I believe I will scrap all these. But I want to get back to something I said about elections in St. John's West. Supposedly there was to be a by-election this year or

last year. The Honourable the Premier said here a few moments ago that they gave us a gift on this side of the House when they allowed my honourable and learned friend on my right to come into this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not "allowed."

MR. HOLLETT: Oh yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Expedited.

MR. HOLLETT: That was the word which aroused my temporary ire. Why? Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the foolhardiness of the Premier or the Government in inviting my honourable and learned friend here to become a member of this House on the opposite side—it is rather silly I should say.

MR. CURTIS: Should we have said "condoled," Mr. Speaker?

MR. HOLLETT: Should have said "condoled." As to what the Premier said, Mr. Speaker, far from inviting my honourable and learned friend into this House, I want to tell you now, Sir, as we are about to bring up this Election Act, far from inviting my honourable and learned friend, the members and the cabinet members of the Government did their utmost, Sir, to see that there would be no by-election—that there would be no election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How come?

MR. HOLLETT: And if there is any member on the Opposite side of the House who wishes me to tell him the truth about that I may be disposed to do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I for one would like to hear it. Let us have it. Tell us, and shame the Devil.

MR. HOLLETT: I should hate to have the opposite side more split up than it is at the moment. The Devil is not here—he is out this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: I say, Sir, and can prove it, that an attempt was made to induce this side of the House to consent that there would be no election in St. John's West to fill the vacancy which existed there. I say that I can prove it. So that the Honourable the Premier, when he states that they invited my honourable and learned friend to the Opposition in the House, he is all wet. He simply did not know what went on in his party. Imagine the honourable the Premier not knowing what goes on in his party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I even know what is going on in that party let alone this one.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable the Premier thinks he knows.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is that nothing goes on but—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Premier is in very great danger. I wish he would not forget the fact that he is just human and come down to earth occasionally with us poor humans and talk a language which we could understand on the Opposition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That would be imbecilic.

MR. HOLLETT: We are only Newfoundlanders. But I repeat Sir, and repeat emphatically that the Government did its best to see that no by-election took place last fall in St. John's West, and I could go



further, but Sir there are certain things which we must respect. But if it comes to the point I can always prove what I have said. So far from inviting the honourable and learned member on my right to come into this House they did their utmost, I say, Sir, to keep him out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did our utmost to keep him out—sure—we did not even contest it.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Premier does not want me to tell him why he did not contest it, why he did not want a candidate or a contest up there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I would like to know that.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to know it this evening. But I can tell him why he did not contest it, there were certain things that happened since, Sir, not so long ago, which would indicate not only to the House but to the whole country at large why the Government did not want an election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman want me to tell him now, as one friend to another—since the honourable gentleman came in, whatever else he is or is not, he has put some life in that side of the House, and at last we have two parties. We did not have two parties before. That is a good reason for bringing him in. Think up an answer, don't always be promising. He is going to get mad one of these days because he is being prompted by the gentleman on his right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do your own thinking.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest, although it is in a spirit of levity that the House ought not to get too personal. I would remind honourable members on both sides that might tend to generate heat.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not very hot here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I might say, as I was saying a moment or so ago, when the honourable the Premier was telling me something he did not actually tell me anything whatsoever. I was about to tell him why they allowed our honourable friend to come into this House. According to them why they did not have any by-election is rather silly, and the whole world knows why they did not want an election, the whole world knows why. And the honourable the Premier need not try to bluff out of it by getting up and saying that he allowed the honourable gentleman on my right to come in here to help us poor souls out. It is a great errand they have given him, Sir. I hope he lives up to it, that he helps us and makes this side of the House very interesting for the Government. After all they must have somebody at which to swear and curse and call all sorts of things.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Swearing and cursing.

MR. HOLLETT: We reply occasionally, we have to, with regard to the merchants, the lovely merchants the Honourable the Premier loves to talk about. He spoke about lawyers too. I see four at the moment. And I would say now every one of these last year represented at least a dozen merchants, and some of them five and six fish merchants in St. John's. Sure they represent fish merchants. I would say to them—you have not the fish merchants but you have their

lawyers which is better still. Some of these fish merchants, Sir, have received from this Government loans amounting to millions of dollars, and some of the lawyers on the opposite side represent some of these merchants—does that answer it?

MR. CURTIS: Would my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, allow me to suggest that the lawyers on his side of the House are representing their clients too.

MR. HOLLETT: I am talking about the other side of the House. I don't know that they represent any fish merchants, but I do know that the lawyers on the opposite side do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they represent fish merchants in this House do they represent their clients, the two lawyers on his side?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, is that a point of order? I would say the lawyers on the opposite side represent practically every fish merchant in St. John's, particularly those who got loans from the Government. Deny it if they can.

MR. SPEAKER: If I may suggest to the honourable member, the debate was on the Election Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I realize that very well, but there were some fishy smells brought in here this evening under the Election Act, and fish merchants and lawyers were talked about by the Honourable the Premier. They not only represent the fish merchants but practically every new industry that was brought in here. Now I don't know the difference between a merchant and a lawyer who has a plant or a merchant, if you like, who has a beer parlour. There are lawyers on the opposite

side Sir, who are merchants although it might not be a fish. They are in companies selling other things, liquor, and there are lawyers on the other side of the House who represent them, and if you are to despise the fish merchants then you despise every merchant in the country. What is a fish merchant any more than any other merchant? And if my honourable friend did say that trade and commerce should be better represented in this House I see nothing wrong with it. He probably forgot that every merchant in St. John's is represented here in the House by a lawyer, and perhaps he represents some of them himself, I don't know.

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I am glad you said that, that answers the Attorney General. But to get on with the fish merchants—the honourable the Premier said that the Tory Governments in the past were made up of fish merchants all down through the ages. It is a wonder this House of Assembly does not smell to high heaven of bad fish, lots of bad fish here at the moment, bad fish—they are here—and fish is the word, "fish." They make me sick, turning class against class, creed against creed, some of the members on the opposite side of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—the honourable gentleman will retract that statement, or name the member on this side of the House who has set creed against creed. Name him or retract the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: That is an accusation. I don't think those words should have been used. I ask the honourable member to retract them.

I don't think they should have been used.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I surely do not have to name any member?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Retract—we have all been accused.

MR. SPEAKER: To say "Put creed against creed" does not seem to be—

MR. HOLLETT: I probably should not have said that. I should have said keel against keel, i.e., a fishing keel. I retract that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member will proceed with the debate. I might suggest that the debate might follow the Bill rather more closely.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I shall endeavour to do that. But I do detest the tactics of certain individuals of the Government who continually want to make politics out of every piece of legislation which is brought into this House this year. This is an election Act and they want to make politics out of that. They want to unload the merchants on us, and I will ask the Honourable the Premier, where are our merchants? The Government, Sir, has every merchant in the country; every merchant in the country comes under the thumb of the Government, and yet they go out and cry to High Heaven to poor people about these damnable merchants. Yet when they come in here they set up beer parlours, do this and that, and cater to the merchants all along Water Street, and all outside and every where else, and then they go on the air and say they detest these merchants—politics, detestable to me, Sir.

This Election Act, Sir, should not

be made an article of political argument. I don't see why the Government needs to make any politics out of this thing, anyway they don't go to the country before November. They meant to go in June, I think, but that is off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't be too sure. Twenty-one days it says in the Act. Don't be too sure.

MR. HOLLETT: Be prepared! It is possible they might have to put it off until late November on account of the section there which allows a deferred election in Labrador, St. Barbe and White Bay. It is rather strange, I did hear the Premier state he was going to boat around the Island this summer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may be just propaganda.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope he does not get off his course, that is the only thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope the honourable gentleman does not.

MR. HOLLETT: I get back again though. He has that lovely fashion of interrupting. Mr. Speaker, that was one thing in the Bill I was going to refer to. I do not see, like my honourable friend on my right, why there should be any reason for deferring an election in St. Barbe and in White Bay. If they can do so in White Bay, why not in Green Bay, and why not in Fogo, what is the difference? Certainly if the election can be held in Green Bay and Fogo it could be held in White Bay or held in St. Barbe District. As my honourable friend has pointed out, Sir, the results of the election will now be known the night of the poll and the voters in White Bay, Labra-

dor and St. Barbe will therefore go to the polls knowing the exact situation of the Government at that particular time. I don't see any reason why that it is right and proper to defer an election, as a matter of law. There could be something, things arise, the death of a returning officer or something whereby the election should be deferred, but as a general thing I don't think it is the right thing to do.

Now, Sir, I don't wish to say very much at this point. There are certain sections, which need some comment, but I do wish to say that this is a Bill which is well thought out in many ways—now something else comes to my mind—I think you will find it on Form 30, the ballot paper. John Jones, Bonavista, fisherman—I believe in the old Act (the Minister might correct me if I am wrong) that the surname of the candidate was there in big block letters, and under that was the name of the candidate in full. I don't see why the change is being made now. Perhaps the Minister might be able to tell us later. For instance on that one you will see Joseph R. Smallwood, possibly in big block letters, and underneath "Joseph R. Smallwood"—

**MR. SMALLWOOD :** "Winner."

**MR. HOLLETT :** He could do it under the Act. It could be a motion. He has done a lot of things. I know. I think that is one thing that might be corrected. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a good Bill. With a few faults we will point out later, and I want again to congratulate the Honourable Minister who brought in the Bill. I have nothing further to say.

**MR. F. FOGWILL :** Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two observations. First I would like to say I am entirely in accord with the Hon-

ourable the Premier in his remarks in respect to Mr. Short who conducted the elections on several occasions. I wish to say that in that connection I found him very fair, very just and always prepared to help the candidate on any problem that might arise at that time. I would like to take this opportunity too, Sir, to say something in respect to the returning officer for St. John's East in the 1951 elections in the person of Mr. Proudfoot who now occupies the Chair at the Table. I found him the same kind of gentleman as Mr. Short and he conducted the election in a very fair and just manner, particularly in regard to the ballots. It was all done very fair.

Now the old Election Act is forty years old or thereabouts. And it is possible that it may be a long time before another Election Act will be brought into this House. At any time perhaps none of us will be here. Meanwhile we consider it a privilege to have the opportunity today to make some remarks in connection with an Act which provides for the election of representatives to this House under a free and secret ballot. Because, Sir, when we realize that there are so many people in this world who have not the privilege that we have—in fact, Sir, I believe there are over one-third of the world's population today who cannot elect a government as we do. There are over seven million people, occupying over twelve million square miles of this earth's surface who have not the right to do what we are doing today. That is one reason why I appreciate all the more the privilege of having this opportunity this afternoon to make these short observations on what we are about to do. This Act possibly may not be classed as one of the most

important Acts brought into this House—we have had certain Bills brought in here which have become law, and they have been hailed with great gusto and with words of superlative adjectives—"The best one," "The greatest in Newfoundland's History" etc. But this Act, I believe, in its own right is the most important we shall ever bring into this Assembly because it provides the means by which we come here ourselves. And in saying that Sir, when we do come here, the Legislature meets and passes the laws of the land. I would like also to make this observation, Mr. Speaker—this House is not above the law. Whatever law is made in this House we must abide by it ourselves. And I don't like to hear at any time any suggestion from any one in this House or outside that this Assembly is far above the law.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody ever said that.

MR. FOGWILL: I don't know, Sir, if anybody said that. I read a quotation in one of the newspapers that somebody in this House said it. I am not going into details and cause another argument this afternoon, and I have no intention of doing it. I would suggest, Sir, that this Bill is not a party measure, it is not a part of government policy, and when the members go into committee I would suggest to all members that they will not find it necessary to toe the party line or be governed by party discipline, and that every member in committee deal with the several clauses as they come before the committee and express his own opinion without any fear of any discipline on party lines. Now, Sir, with these few remarks I have said all I have to say. In respect to the next election, I don't know when it is going to come, next

month, the month after next, next year or the year after next, and I am not particularly interested when it does come, because I believe the good people of this Island can be counted upon to go to the polls and freely and secretly express their opinions and elect the members for this House of Assembly. This is what this Act purports to do, and I think, under this, all the people concerned with elections have all the protection, and I mean the electoral officers and returning officers, election clerks and poll clerks, I believe everyone has protection, as well as all the rest of the citizens, and I believe the good sense of the Newfoundland people can be counted upon to do what in their opinion they think is right when the time comes to do it.

I support the Bill, Mr. Speaker. In Committee we can deal with the various clauses, as there are a few there with which the Opposition are not in accord, but as members of the Committee we will object to them. Thank you very much.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, if no other member wishes to speak in this debate I would like to say a few words by way of closing up the debate. First of all I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for the personal praise he has given me, which I am afraid is largely undeserved. This Bill is a good Bill and we think it is largely due to the tremendous practical knowledge of Mr. Short who did make the first rough draft, as the Premier has announced. It is due in a very large measure to the terrifically tremendous amount of work which has been done on it by the law officers of the Crown, particularly Mr. Greene and Mr. McCarthy. Both to my knowledge have been down there night after night,

and as all members can see, this Bill contains a tremendous amount of detail, and yet when it goes into Committee of the Whole, in spite of the fact it has been done and redone, I am sure other things will come to light. I am glad, Sir, that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition thinks it is a good Bill. We welcome his practical suggestions, and he has already brought our attention to a point which I believe has some merit, and we can discuss it further when we go into Committee of the Whole, when I assure him it will be given consideration.

The same idea, I think, was expressed by the honourable member for St. John's East. While we think to a certain extent it is a party measure, we are all very anxious to get the benefit of the experience of the members opposite and will appreciate it very much in Committee of the Whole.

The points made, Sir, by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, I think, have been fully covered by the Honourable the Attorney General, and by the Honourable the Premier. I think they have been pretty thoroughly covered. The fact that a list of electors has not been taken for such a long period certainly had no bearing whatsoever on the two referenda because they were held immediately after the list was taken. I cannot imagine, Sir, I do not think it is possible, that many people at any rate, and I doubt if any, were disfranchised in view of the fact that so many polling stations were set up, and in view of the fact that the old system permitted the taking of supplementary lists. I am sorry if the honourable and learned member for St. John's West misunderstood me, but I thought I made it quite clear in dealing with Clause 30, that the list of

electors presently prepared and printed may be used as an official list of electors at any election held before the expiration of twelve months from the date. What I thought I said was that the main provision in the clause there provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may from time to time, if he sees fit, order otherwise. Obviously such a provision is expedient—by-elections may be held from time to time, and I doubt if any great hardship could be experienced by anyone, and possibly a great deal of money could be saved by permitting the Lieutenant Governor in Council to keep the list of electors valid.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? If a list is taken, say for a general election, according to this Act it is good for five years?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, if necessary.

MR. BROWNE: Then it may be good for ten. You may not order another election for five years after.

MR. MURRAY: Now dealing with Clause 31 (4), Sir, I can assure the honourable members opposite that there is nothing sinister in this provision. It is a provision put in the Bill by Mr. Short in the light of practical experience. Mr. Short has time and time again pointed out there are only two months of the year, July and August, when it is really a practical matter to hold elections in Labrador, and unless this provision were put in it would be tantamount to having no elections held in Newfoundland except in July and August. In the light of his experience also the same provision has been made applicable also to White Bay and St. Barbe District, as he pointed out that during long periods in the year it would



be impossible to get election material around either by boat or plane, as it would have been during the last two months in the Districts of White Bay and St. Barbe.

MR. BROWNE: Yet that is where we are going to put the fish plants, in that District of White Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A salt fish plant.

MR. MURRAY: The honourable member for St. John's West also has deplored the fact that more members from trade and commerce are not in the House at the present time. He brought that up apropos of the qualifications of electors. I don't know why, Sir? I don't know if he has any amendment to propose that perhaps we should make it obligatory or compulsory that certain people should be members of the House of Assembly. I don't know if that is what he had in mind. I ask the rhetorical question, why are not more of these people coming forward? I am certainly unable to answer that question. Perhaps the Premier has given the explanation when he said they were too busily engaged otherwise making money. Possibly one way to induce them in, would be to raise the monetary returns—apart from that I would say the point is completely irrelevant.

There is just one other point, Sir, that the honourable and learned member for St. John's West made. He stated that he noticed some omissions from the old Election Act, and that people who are residents of a home for the Aged and Infirm are no longer disfranchised. That is quite correct. I did not mention it specifically, and I did not think it necessary to do so. Our view on this side of the House in such matters is quite well known. They were expressed here very ably

by the Minister who brought in the Social Assistance Act and by the Premier in support of it. Our social views are expressed in this clause here on qualifications, which says, only persons who are inmates committed to hospitals for Mental Diseases or people actually in jail are debarred from voting. It is not the Liberal Policy to defranchise people because they are poor and barred up until the end of their days. As I said it was omitted deliberately and designedly, in line with our well known principles in this party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

On motion Bill read a second time—ordered to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act," and I do so at the request of the St. John's City Council and for my part on behalf of the Government.

There are three or four amendments which the St. John's Municipal Council feels it is desirable to have enacted in order that they might take action under the sections.

The first amendment aims at reducing the cost of improvements to owners whose property abuts on two streets. Under the present Act a person may be liable for any improvements which are effected upon both, and the proposed amendment here is that the property would be liable for any improvements made on one frontage plus a proportion of the

other and that portion being limited to eighty feet.

The second amendment deals with the enforcement of regulations dealing with electrical installations and water installation within the buildings adjacent to the St. John's City Limits. As the House is aware this limit is one mile outside, where there is some sort of nominal control, and this Act would allow them to enforce any regulations in that extra mile.

The House is also aware that the stadium building is in the course of erection, and that that building is on property which has been granted to it by the Municipal Council of St. John's. This amendment section (5) makes provision for the Council's action in granting that particular property for a stadium site.

It also makes provision for the imposition of a poll tax in order that it might in the course of time defray and pay off the bond issue of seven hundred thousand dollars, which was authorized here only a few days ago.

Another amendment in the proposed Bill, Sir, gives the Municipal Council authority to collect a water tax based upon rental values and allows them to do so without the necessity of having to appeal to the Public Utilities Board to determine their charges.

Another section allows the Municipal Council to levy a license fee upon certain forms of entertainment, over and above those being done at the present time, for instance, Juke Boxes. It also authorizes the Municipal Council to increase the poll tax under the present Act to twenty dollars and change the date when such taxation power was to be put into effect by the Council of St. John's.

Another provision allows the St.

John's Municipal Council to lay additional water pipes for protection against fire, and also for supplying water supplies to ships at various premises.

There is another amendment, a matter of procedure really. The House is aware that at the present time the audited accounts of the Municipality must be presented to the Legislature before it can be published in the papers. The Council has pointed out that it is quite possible the House might not be in session, and closed before the accounts of the previous year were fully audited, and consequently there could be no publication until the next session of the House. The amendment asks that when the accounts are audited publication may be given with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. These are the amendments, Sir, except that there is one other, and that is one which enables the Council to recover from lessors or leasees any cost incurred by the demolition of buildings that have been condemned more or less for the purpose of security.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, as we did not get the Bill until this afternoon, would the honourable minister allow a postponement?

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, before the motion to adjourn if, on behalf of the Minister of Finance I give notice that he will on tomorrow, Monday, ask leave to move the Committee into Supply and to give notice that he will on tomorrow ask

leave to move the House into a Committee on Ways and Means for the purpose of the Budget.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 of the clock. I do so at this hour, sir, because I understand Mr. Speaker would like to have a short session of the Parliamentary Association in his office.

House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock.

---

May 31, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: A certain sentence appearing in the Saturday edition of the "Daily News" of this city compels me to take an unusual step:

I will first of all ask the Clerk to read the sentence to which I refer:

MR. CLERK: Quotation taken from the "Daily News", May 29, 1954: "However the Speaker ruled it out of order to use Her Majesty's Name in connection with the Premier's Government."

MR. SPEAKER: I want to say that this scandalous statement compels me to take this step. I must ask the House to do what it can to regain the loss of dignity this House and Province must have suffered by this misquotation of a ruling given by me.

I will say this: if I or any other speaker made a statement like that the only defense could be an appeal of insanity. I ask the House and all intelligent people to ponder this—What opinion must a foreign reader of that newspaper have formed of this

province when he reads that the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly utters such a stupid and thoroughly insulting ruling—insulting both to the House and to the Province and to all intelligent persons.

The damage to my personal reputation I pass over, and I ask the House to do so also. But, the damage done to this Province of Newfoundland is one which disturbs me greatly. When I speak from this Chair I do not speak to the galleries nor to the press but only to the honourable members. I am not desirous of being quoted in the newspapers, and I view with displeasure any comment about me, whether favourable or otherwise.

I will ask honourable members not to refer to the debate which gave rise to this unfortunate occurrence as no good purpose can be served by it. I will tell the honourable members the exact words I used, and I have here Hansard of that day, and I quote: "The remark which the honourable member made in connection with Her Majesty and the Government of this Province ought not to have been made." Three times I repeated these words.

Of course, the alleged ruling as it appeared in the press must have been accidental. I cannot conceive of anybody letting it pass other than as an accident. But I do think the House ought to ask the paper concerned to correct that terrible misquotation, which brings discredit on the entire Province.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my agreement with the point which Your Honour has made on this particular occasion of which Your Honour is the victim. On other occasions other members of this House,

on both sides, have been victims. A quite recent case occurred, I think it was on the same date—on Friday the Honourable Member for St. John's East made an allusion to someone having claimed to be above the law. I asked him who had made such a claim. But the honourable member did not see fit to say who had claimed to be above the law. Yet that did not prevent a radio station from stating that the Premier had said that the Government was above the law.

If I had said that the Government is above the law I would have been a madman or a fool or a criminal—a madman, a fool or a criminal—yes, thousands of my fellow countrymen are today under the impression, because they heard it on the radio, through twisted and incompetent reporting of a speech which an honourable member made. I ended up the victim of being thought by thousands and perhaps scores of thousands of my fellow countrymen of having made the mad claim in this House that the Government is above the law. I never said anything like it. I never said anything that all the powers on earth could stretch into meaning anything like that—that the Government is above the law.

There seems to be getting abroad in Newfoundland in recent weeks a feeling that you have no liberty, you have no freedom if you can't in a newspaper or on a radio station say what you like about anybody on anything, including the lawmakers of the land—that if you can't malign and slander and misrepresent them, say they said this and that, and that they said things quite different from what they actually said—if you can't do that, then you have no freedom, and if anybody complains, he is making an attack upon the freedom of the press.

Mr. Speaker, I say deliberately: it might be far better (I say it might—the matter is arguable) if never a word appeared in print or was spoken on the radio about any of the proceedings of this Chamber if the remarks of honourable members continue to be misquoted, misreported, wrongly reported or erroneously reported so as to make black white and white black, so as to attribute to one man the thing for which somebody else altogether was to blame. It might be far better if there were no reporting whatsoever of the proceedings of this House in future—and if newspaper men and radio men by any chance feel that we are such publicity hunters that we must have the publicity that they are able to give us—if by any chance any radio man or newspaper man has any such feeling—I say, speaking for myself alone, personally, if my name never again appeared in print or is heard on the radio—never again—I will shed no tears. That is how interested I am in publicity.

But I would suggest to Your Honour this thought: If the newspapers and radio stations continue to misreport, not continuously because nobody will be silly enough to say that it is continuous or even that it is deliberate, but the fact that it is not continuous the fact that it is not deliberate, the fact that it is not intentional does not make it any better for the man who is misreported, when he is misreported. I say, if that continues it might become desirable for this House to exclude newspapers and radio stations both from the House unless they will broadcast exactly verbatim, word for word, what is said—that might become necessary—far better that no report go out than that a false report go out.

Now I say that as a man who has

spent his entire life, up to five or six years ago, his entire life at newspaper and radio work—his entire life—there are very few men alive in Newfoundland today who have worked as long and as long ago as a newspaperman and as a radio man. I have, to say the least, as much regard, as much appreciation of the almost sacred character of freedom of the press as any man. But, freedom of the press I suggest, does not carry with it the right to misreport a member of this Legislature, nor the right to let the political prejudices of the writer dictate what he or she writes. It does not carry that right with it because the public has a clear right to get an objective report, and when a man turns on his radio in the privacy of his own home he has the right to feel he is getting an objective and not a slanted, not a loaded, report. I am afraid that more than once that is exactly what he is getting in the reports of this House.

MR. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I ought to say just one word, sir, in connection with the statement which you yourself made relative to the misquotation in the Daily News on Saturday, I believe it was.

I do agree with you that it was most unfortunate that error was made by the reporter. Any of us here who sat in the House, or any member, would know immediately that it was a mistake, that no Speaker in the British Commonwealth of Nations could ever make such a ruling. I remember seeing it myself and just laughed at it, and I remember turning to the person who was with me when I read it and saying—I suspect that there will be something said about that—That was the remark I made. It was unfortunate, Sir, I do say however that I think at that time when your ruling was given

there was a bit of a turmoil in this House, and some excuse at least can be made for any reporters who did not get the correct ruling. I say that not in defense of the press and radio because I myself have been misquoted as often as anybody else in this House—but I do believe it is not done deliberately. It is done purely accidentally. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you would give that same forbearance, which I know you will, to the press and radio as you have oftentimes given to us here on this side of the House, and also to the Members of the Government.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motions and Questions

None.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 103—Stand.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER: Item 20, Honourable Minister of Finance to move the House into Committee of Ways and Means:

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): In the year that ended on March 31st, the excess of revenue over expenditure was two and three-quarter million dollars. The precise figure was \$2,740,512. This was the fourth consecutive year of budget surpluses since Confederation.

Revenue for the year was just over \$36 million—\$36,091,888. Expendi-

ture amounted to just over 33¼ million—\$33,351,376.

Newfoundland's record in surplus budgeting has been quite remarkable for the past fourteen years. In these fourteen years—nine of them before Confederation, five of them since—we had a surplus twelve times, a deficit only twice. The figures, in thousands of dollars, are as follows:

Year	Surplus	Deficit
1940-41	\$ 394,000	
1941-42	7,216,000	
1942-43	3,690,000	
1943-44	5,660,000	
1944-45	7,033,000	
1945-46	4,330,000	
1946-47	108,000	
1947-48		\$ 311,000
1948-49	1,167,000	
Total pre-Confederation	29,598,000	\$ 311,000
1949-50		\$3,736,000
1950-51	649,000	
1951-52	1,698,000	
1952-53	6,743,000	
1953-54	2,741,000	
	<u>\$11,831,000</u>	<u>\$3,736,000</u>

Total for 14 years \$41,429,000.

This means that within this period of fourteen years there has been a nett surplus on current account of \$37,382,000. It is as impressive a showing as that of almost any Province of Canada for the same period.

In our first year as a Province of Canada we suffered a deficit in our current account financing. This was due to the fact that literally overnight

(on the night of March 31st, 1949) we lost the great bulk of our traditional sources of revenue; all our customs import duties, excise duties, excise taxes, personal and corporation income taxes and the like; and the fact that it had to be almost a year after the fact of Union with Canada before we were able to institute new taxes in conformity with the taxing powers of a Province under the British North America Act.

I am happy to invite attention to a fact that is well known to the House and to the whole Province, namely, the continuation of the phenomenal prosperity that began to sweep across the face of Newfoundland some three or four years ago. This is prosperity the like of which was never known in Newfoundland before. It has brought our people to a level of well-being that we have not known in the past. I estimate that our people will pocket, in 1954, from all sources, the satisfactory sum of two-hundred-and-thirty million dollars. This is over twenty million dollars more than I estimated they would pocket in 1953. It is forty-six million dollars more than they received in 1952, and it is seventy-five million dollars more than they pocketed in 1951. In short, our people will have advanced, in four short years, from a total income of \$155 million in 1951 to \$230 million in 1954.

I give now a table showing the various sources of this income, broken down into classifications of industry or employment. The table covers the years 1951, 1952, 1953 and the present year, 1954. I shall read the details for the present year only:



Source	1951	1952	1953	1954
Paper, pulp, wood .....	\$28,100,000	\$34,500,000	\$39,661,000	\$43,350,000
Defence .....	16,000,000	21,898,000	24,533,000	25,000,000
Transportation .....	12,000,000	13,423,000	15,500,000	16,500,000
Government of Canada .....	9,800,000	11,000,000	13,000,000	15,000,000
Government of Nfld. ....	9,871,000	10,700,000	12,000,000	14,000,000
Mining .....	9,000,000	9,986,000	12,168,000	13,365,000
Shops and Offices .....	9,500,000	10,500,000	12,000,000	12,500,000
Fisheries .....	10,105,000	9,805,000	10,000,000	12,000,000
Family Allowances .....	10,224,000	10,614,000	11,200,000	12,000,000
Manufacturing .....	4,976,000	6,586,000	7,486,000	8,800,000
Old Age Pensions .....	5,000,000	7,000,000	8,377,000	7,500,000
Construction, general .....	5,000,000	7,000,000	8,000,000	6,000,000
Frozen Fish Ind. ....	2,760,000	3,590,000	5,356,000	6,000,000
Dividends, Interest, etc. ....	2,500,000	3,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Unemployment Insurance .....	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,000,000	5,000,000
Aviation .....	3,210,000	3,578,000	4,104,000	4,500,000
Motor Vehicle Trade .....	1,914,000	2,049,000	2,922,000	3,461,000
Stevedoring .....	2,400,000	2,500,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
Municipalities, Broadcasting, Private Hospitals .....	1,829,000	2,173,000	2,597,000	2,650,000
Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances .....	3,011,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000
Road Work .....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,350,000
Veterans' Dept. ....	1,363,000	1,084,000	1,903,000	2,074,000
Old Age Assistance .....		2,000,000	1,860,000	1,850,000
Miscellaneous .....	3,000,000	4,000,000	5,000,000	6,000,000
	<u>\$155,554,000</u>	<u>183,577,000</u>	<u>210,767,000</u>	<u>230,000,000</u>

There are a few observations that need to be made about some of the items that make up this table. The eighth item from the top is Fisheries, \$12 million. This item excludes all forms of frozen fish, which is shown separately. Unemployment Insurance is shown at \$5 million, which appears to be an increase of \$4 over last year. In actual fact, last year's estimate of \$1 million was far too low. The amount actually paid out for the year was \$4,300,000. Paradoxical as it may seem, these are encouraging figures. They do not indicate great unemployment, but rather a high degree of employment. Very large numbers of men obtained enough

seasonal employment in the summer months to qualify themselves for employment insurance in the winter and early spring. If the figure had been much lower it would have meant large numbers of men remaining idle throughout most of the busy season of the year. My forecast shows that I expect an even larger number of men obtaining employment of an insurable character this year, with the certainty of drawing unemployment payments resulting from this seasonal employment.

I invite attention to the figures for the paper, pulp and wood industry of our Province. They have risen

from \$28 million four years ago to \$43 million this year. Another very encouraging figure is that for mining. In the same four years it has risen from \$9 million to \$13 million. Again, manufacturing shows a most

encouraging growth, from \$5 million to nearly \$9 this year.

If we take the paper, pulp and wood industry, together with mining, manufacturing, and fisheries both salted and frozen, we get figures that cannot help but impress us:

1951	1952	1953	1954
\$54,941,000	\$64,466,000	\$74,315,000	\$83,515,000

From \$55 million to \$83 million in four years is striking progress indeed in our basic industries.

As I have been dealing in figures that touch on the economic position of our Province it might be useful if I gave here a brief description of this Government's policy in the whole matter of Newfoundland's economy. Opponents of the Government have been successful in at least one of their efforts: they have succeeded in distorting that policy into a totally unrecognizable caricature of the reality.

It is to the eternal credit of this Government that from the moment it came into power five years ago it was able to evade entanglement in the age-old romanticism and economic nonsense that had passed for economic policy in government circles. It is to their eternal credit that they were able to go straight as an arrow to the vital truths of economic common-sense.

This Government adopted a policy of development. This was not a policy of industrialism, although it included industrialism. It was not a policy of agricultural development, although this also was included. The Government's belief, to which it has adhered with utter tenacity, is that development must proceed along every economic front: it must include development of our minerals, of our

water-powers, of our timber, of our soil, of our fisheries. It must include the building of factories. It must include the building of roads and bridges to enable people and goods to move quickly and economically. It must include the building of schools to give the Province a well-educated people and vocational schools to give us skilled tradesmen. It must include the building of hospitals and clinics and hospital boats and air ambulances to raise the standard of physical health.

Development must advance on all fronts in a grand assault upon the ramparts of poverty.

The problem was an economic one, and the solution had to be economic too.

Here is the impressive record of this Government from the first day of Confederation five years ago:

1. We instituted the greatest program of economic survey Newfoundland has ever seen. This included the retention of great companies to make water-power surveys, timber surveys and mineral surveys. This whole program was conducted on a far-flung scale, and has cost over a million dollars up to this time.

2. We organized the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, popularly

known as NALCO. This is a quite unique organization in North America, combining in its shareholders a number of private enterprise interests together with the Government of the Province. NALCO was formed to promote an energetic campaign of prospecting and survey over large areas of the Province entrusted to the Corporation, and to bring private enterprise groups into the Province to engage in such prospecting. NALCO has already spent, and procured the spending of many hundreds of thousands of dollars on these purposes in the past three years, and some very promising finds have resulted. The biggest of these is the great iron-ore discovery in the Lake Wabush section of Labrador.

3. We instigated the organization of the great British Newfoundland Corporation, popularly known as BRINCO. This new body is in the direct line of the great development bodies of the British Colonial Empire of great days now, for the most part, no more. It is the brain-child of the Premier of Newfoundland, it enlisted the enthusiastic personal intervention of the Prime Minister of England, Sir Winston Churchill, and its birth was brought about by the historic House of Rothschild. It is made up of more than twenty great and famous companies whose names are household words in the United Kingdom and many other parts of the world. Newfoundland was greatly impressed when the directors of this great Company announced a few weeks ago their decision to spend up to one million dollars in a preliminary survey of the Hamilton River watershed in Labrador. I am persuaded that one of the great hydro-electric developments of the world is likely to result from this survey.

BRINCO has already, after only one summer's work in the field, found encouraging indications of mineralization within its concession area, and I know that all Newfoundlanders will join with me in wishing this great British development corporation the maximum good fortune in their explorations and surveys in this Province. I have heard the formation of the British Newfoundland Corporation described as the greatest single achievement of this or any Government in Newfoundland's history. Whether or not this is literally so, I do not hesitate to describe it as one of the greatest in our history.

4. We were successful in inducing the Government of Canada to join with us in the creation of the Fisheries Development Committee. Working for nearly two years under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, Sir Albert Walsh, this committee conducted the most painstakingly thorough survey of the fishing industry, of the fishery potential, and of the needs of the industry that ever was accomplished in the history of British North America. We have been busy in this present session of the House enacting legislation to launch our great fishery development program. This will be by far, indeed it will be incomparably, the greatest development program ever known in the fisheries of the northern half of this continent. The Government of Canada have agreed to participate with us in bearing the costs of this great development, which, I expect, is likely to cost as much as \$100,000,000 on all counts over a period of twelve or fifteen years. It is our ambition, as a Government, to make our fisheries thoroughly modern, thoroughly efficient, and thoroughly prosperous.

Even before embarking upon this

great fishery development program we had followed consistently a policy of assisting the fishing industry with loans to enable them to expand and improve their facilities. We have extended financial assistance in excess of \$7,000,000 to some fourteen Newfoundland fishery companies, while loans to two other companies, totalling the best part of another \$3,000,000, are pending and are more than likely to be approved.

We believe that no loans or investments that the Government can make will produce sounder results than those made in the fisheries. In the calendar year 1953, for instance, the plants to which we had lent the \$7 million, employed some 3,100 workers and paid them \$3½ million in wages. They bought fish from 439 dragger fishermen to the value of \$1¼ million, and from 2900 other fishermen to the value of \$1.3 million. Thus these plants paid out in cash, in 1953, in wages and in fish prices to fishermen the handsome sum of \$6¼ million.

Nor is that all; these same loans will this year create nine additional fishery plants that will employ 750 more workers at \$1 million in wages, and will buy fish from another 1200 inshore fishermen for at least another \$1 million.

Thus we find that by lending \$7 million to a number of private companies operating in the fishing industry we have caused expansion and improvement that employs 4000 workers and buys fish from 4000 fishermen. The total of the wages and the amount paid out for fish will be a little over \$8 million a year. This appears to us to be very sound business indeed for the Government. The money has been loaned at interest. It

will return to the Treasury but it will have lubricated the ways for launching a great new earning-power for some 8,000 of our people.

These, Mr. Speaker, are truly great results. I think it is the simple truth to say that this Government, in the past five years, has done more for the development of our fisheries than any Government in our history; and this even before we came to the launching of our present great joint Federal-Provincial fishery development program.

5. We have directly brought about the creation of fifteen entirely new industries in Newfoundland. I refer here, of course, to the new industrial plants.

Three of these—the cement mill, the gypsum wallboard mill, and the birch veneer, plywood, flooring and door mill—were built by the Government at the Government's expense. The cement mill has since been sold, the birch plant has been leased to a private company, and the gypsum wallboard plant is being operated by a Crown company until a satisfactory purchaser is found for it.

The other twelve plants have been launched by European companies by means of cash loans made to them by us. These loans, all of which bear interest, are for periods which vary between ten and fifteen years.

Of the fifteen new plants three are in full production, eleven are in part production, and one has not yet finished construction of its plant. Most of the eleven that are in part production began to produce within the past few weeks or months, and can scarcely be said to have commenced operations as yet.

In all of these plants our cash outlay was about \$17 million.

I am sure the House will be glad to hear that although as yet only three of the fifteen plants are in full production, over 2000 workers are already employed. Of this number over 1800 are native-born Newfoundlanders, while fewer than 200 of them are European settlers. These settlers are the key technicians of the industries, and they are for the most part men and women of skills that are rare for Newfoundland. They are excellent citizens, and they will make good Canadians.

Already these new industries are paying out \$4 million in wages, and in 1955 the figure will go beyond \$5 million.

I am sure that the great majority of our people, indeed the overwhelming majority, have nothing but goodwill for these new industries. Most people realize that it would be highly unusual if all of them were able to go into smooth production without difficulty or obstacle. They have experienced, and doubtless will for some time continue to experience, difficulties in their way. This is pretty much the experience of new industries wherever they may start, and it would be rather silly to expect Newfoundland to be radically different in this regard.

Cement, gypsum, plasterboard, fibre-board, veneer, plywood, hardwood flooring, hardwood doors, storage batteries, rubber boots, woollen clothing, leather footwear, fancy leathergoods, leather itself, leather clothing—these are the new commodities that must now be added to the fish and the newsprint paper and the minerals that have constituted the mainstay of

Newfoundland's industrial production before the present Government came into power five years ago. It is a distinguished and valuable contribution that the Government have made to the strengthening of our Island economy.

6. We have appointed a Royal Commission on Forestry. This is headed by the distinguished Canadian forestry expert, General Kennedy, whose report in Ontario now forms the basis of forestry policy for the Government of that Province. We are confident that this Royal Commission will give us a sound and dependable policy for all forestry matters, and that our economy will be further strengthened by our implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

7. We have appointed still another Royal Commission, to investigate and report on the whole question of agriculture in Newfoundland. We have been fortunate in persuading Dean Shaw, a great Canadian agronomist, to accept the leadership of this Commission, and we are confident that we shall be able to follow safely the policy and program that they will lay down for us.

Our accomplishments in the past five years constitute, it seems to me, a great and noble contribution to the upbuilding of this new Province of Canada. It is doubtless true that this Government have had a greater opportunity to serve Newfoundland in this direction than did any of our predecessors, but then it is equally true that we have lived up to that greater opportunity.

Every proud and sensitive Newfoundlander shrinks from the thought of having his Province regarded else-

where in Canada as a burden on the nation as a whole. Our intense desire is that Newfoundland should be self-supporting, that she should not lean on Canada as a whole but should instead contribute to the growing greatness of Canada. This, in this Government's view, is possible only if we strengthen and develop our own Newfoundland economy.

We have not the slightest desire or intention of ceasing to be Newfoundlanders. We shall become good Canadians all the more readily as we become better Newfoundlanders. We shall be all the prouder of Canada as we have more reason to be proud of Newfoundland.

Having dealt at sufficient length, as I think, with the purely economic side of our affairs, I turn now at once to the less interesting though admittedly important financial side, I shall give a quick review of the financial year just past, and a somewhat longer forecast of the year upon which we have recently entered.

There were, in the year just past, the usual variations between the estimates of revenue and expenditure made a year in advance compared with the actual out-turn for the year. In total, however the forecast was remarkably close to the actual results. I estimated an expenditure of \$32.1 million, whereas the actual expenditure was \$32.4 millions, a difference of a mere \$300,000. A year ago I estimated a revenue of \$36,091,000; the actual revenue was \$36,095,000 a difference of \$4,000. (It should be understood that these figures are subject to variation following upon final audit).

I give now my forecast for the year 1954-55.

I estimate that our revenue and expenditure will be as follows:

Revenue .....	\$39,200,300
Expenditure .....	35,540,200
Surplus .....	\$ 3,660,100

I shall deal in some little detail with the expenditure side first. There is an increase in Consolidated Fund Services vote of \$722,400. Of this amount, \$420,000 is for interest and the sinking fund on a new \$12,000,000 issue of Newfoundland bonds. I propose to ask this House for the necessary authorization to float this issue in the immediate future. Most of the remainder of this three-quarter million increase is to liquidate certain Treasury bills issued to the various Loan Boards in respect of temporary borrowings made by us to assist in financing the \$900,000 advance which we made to the fishermen in connection with their 1953 fish production.

There is an increase of \$128,000 in the Department of Finance. Of this, an amount of \$50,000 is allocated to meet the costs of the Commission of Enquiry into our financial position. This is the committee of distinguished Newfoundlanders who have assumed the great responsibility of preparing Newfoundland's case for presentation to the Royal Commission that will review the financial impact of Confederation as forecast in the Terms of Union.

Four departments, namely, Education, Public Works, Health and Public Welfare between them account for \$2,847,000 of the total net increase of \$3,430,400 shown in the estimates as compared with last year. The Department of Education shows the heaviest individual increase, namely, \$1,434,400 over the estimate of a year ago. Of this large sum no less an



amount than \$1,308,000 has been provided under denominational school grants, inclusive of rather more than a million dollars inserted to cover the recent increase in the salaries of our teachers.

I am sure that the House will be interested to know that in the year 1940-41 the expenditure on Education was \$1½ millions out of a total of \$15½ millions, or about 10%. In the year 1944-45 the total for Education was \$2.8 millions or approximately 11% of the total. In 1949-50 Education cost \$4 millions or some 14% of the total expenditure of that year. In the year for which I am now forecasting, our educational expenditure on current account will be about \$7.3 millions out of a grand total expenditure of \$35.5 millions, or approximately 20%.

We have thus seen the annual expenditure of Education grow from \$1.5 millions in 1940-41 to \$4 millions in 1949-50, and to \$7.3 millions in the present year; and, as I have just said, the proportion has grown from 10% in 1940-41 to approximately 20% in the current year. This Government glories in the contribution it is making to the cause of education in Newfoundland. We hold that all other progress is mere mockery until we have a soundly educated people.

In the Department of Health there is an increase of \$970,000. Over a half million dollars of this arises from a change in the method of remunerating the staffs of the institutions. In previous years it was customary to pay net salaries only, leaving the cost of board and lodging to be supplied out of the appropriate sub-heads of the vote of each individual institution. This has been altered so that gross salaries are not

paid and deductions made therefrom in accordance with the type of lodging provided and with the number of meals supplied daily. Deductions in this regard are reflected under the revenue estimates where collections of some \$500,000 are anticipated on this account in the current year. Expansion of existing health services (which is self balancing through receipts from the Canadian Government) shows an increase of \$100,000. The balance is made up of anticipated small additions throughout the entire department.

The Department of Public Works shows an increase of \$331,500 and the roads provisions account for the greater part of this growth. The balance is to be found under maintenance of public buildings.

A net increase of \$111,000 under Public Welfare is due, in the main, to the transfer of \$90,000 from Health in connection with provision for board and lodging of patients and attendants.

I have stated that our current account expenditure for 1954-55 is estimated at \$35,540,200. Let us now look at the Revenue Estimates for the year, which I estimate in a grand total of \$39,200,300. Of this total \$27,893,800, or an increase of \$1.4 millions, will be brought into the Exchequer Account through the agency of the Department of Finance.

Of this \$27.8 million, an amount of \$17,919,100 is recorded under the sub-heading "Dominion of Canada" and compares exactly with the same estimate of one year ago, the third annual decrease of \$850,000 under Transitional Grant being balanced by the increase in the estimated yield (according to figures supplied by

Ottawa) under the Tax Rental Payments.

The increase of \$1.4 millions under this Head of Revenue is due as to \$370,000 of it to Gasoline Taxation. The rate of tax is to be increased from the existing fourteen cents to fifteen cents a gallon and legislation to implement this increase will be introduced; the \$370,000 is made up of \$170,000 from the augmented rate of tax plus a further \$200,000 which appears to be warranted by the growth in motor vehicle registrations.

The major portion of the increase under Finance is anticipated to arise under the Social Security Assessment which reveals a better improvement of \$1 million over the 1953-54 estimate owing, largely, to an improvement and general tightening up of our methods of ensuring that proper returns are made with all promptness.

The anticipated increase by \$134,000 under Public Works is due, in the main, to the growth in receipts from license fees for motor vehicles and drivers.

Of anticipated collections under Health at an \$878,100 improvement over 1953-54, \$511,000 is to be derived from a new source of revenue (collections in respect of board and lodging in institutions) to which I made some reference when dealing with the Health expenditure estimates. Apart from this factor and an increase by nearly a hundred thousand dollars by way of Federal Health Grants, the main increase is \$250,000 under the Cancer Control Tax. This increase is contingent upon the passing of

amending legislation, which will be introduced in due course, to widen the field of application of the tax upon admissions to entertainments.

Fisheries and Co-operatives exhibits an increase of \$470,000 which is entirely due to the anticipated recoveries (at the rate of a dollar and twelve cents a quintal) in respect of advances, made during late 1953 and early 1954 on account of landings of fish of 1953 catch.

Finally, there is but one Head which reveals collections at a lower level than that anticipated for the previous year. Mines and Resources shows an anticipated decline of \$266,000 of which \$150,000 is attributable to the disappearance of the item Sale of Beaver Pelts (there will be no trapping in 1954); \$45,000 is due to the discontinuation of recoveries from Nalco on account of services rendered on Field and Geophysical Surveys; and an anticipated decline by \$60,000 is recorded under Timber Royalties consequent upon the downward revision of rates established in 1953.

I would direct the attention of this House to a revision, a great improvement in my opinion, in the form of recording revenue which is used for the first time in the 1954-55 Estimates. With this system, which shows types of revenue under subheadings common to all Departments, it is a comparatively easy matter to extract information in the form used by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for treating with the revenue of all Provinces. On this basis, our total current account revenue shows up as follows:

	1954-55	1953-54	
Source of Funds	Amount	%	%
Taxation	\$ 9,820,000	25.1	22.7
Interest	855,400	2.2	2.2
Privileges, Licenses, Permits	1,888,300	4.9	5.2
Contributions, other Governments	2,325,300	5.8	6.0
Other Income	291,000	0.8	0.7
Sales and Services	5,181,700	13.2	12.4
Fines and Forfeitures	93,000	0.2	0.2
Non-Revenue Receipts	821,200	2.1	1.0
Sub-total	21,275,900	54.3	50.4
Canada, Subsidies	17,924,400	45.7	49.6
Grand Total	\$39,200,300	100.0	100.0

It is of interest to note that the recorded or estimated receipts, as the case may be, from 1949/50 to 1954/55 reveal that the proportion of our receipts derived from our own resources have been 35%, 45.6%, 48.1%, 48.9%, 50.4%, and 54.3% while subsidies from the Government of Canada during the same period have been 65%, 54.4%, 51.9%, 51.1%, 49.6%,

and 45.7% of our total revenue.

Capital expenditure is estimated in a grand total of \$17,492,500 which shows an increase of nearly six millions of dollars over the corresponding total for the previous year.

Broadly speaking, this rather large sum may be set out by services in the following manner:

	1954-55	1953-54	
	Amount	%	%
Roads	\$ 7,430,000	42.5	38.3
Fisheries Development	3,405,000	19.5	13.0
Manufacturing Development	2,763,100	15.8	22.3
Buildings, Educational	1,110,000	6.3	8.8
Public	883,800	5.1	9.7
Other	848,100	4.8	5.6
Ferries	500,000	2.9	0.9
Sundry Services	441,500	2.5	0.9
Sundry Development	111,000	0.6	0.5
	\$17,492,500	100.0	100.0

Of the increase by nearly six millions of dollars, \$3,186,700 has been provided under the Department of Public Works. The major increase is

under Roads (\$3 millions) and the balance is attributable to provisions for Ferry Landings at Bell Island-Portugal Cove and Placentia; the in-

creased provision under Roads springs from our determination to press forward as fast as possible with Trans-Canada Highway and other highway construction.

An increase of \$1,909,000 is exhibited under the Fisheries and Co-operatives where the provisions for Loans to the Fishing Industry and advances to the Fisheries Development Authority show at sums of approximately \$300,000 and \$1,600,000 in excess of last year's provisions.

The only other increase of major proportions will be found under Municipal Affairs and Supply in a sum of \$490,000 of which \$400,000 is due to provisions for Co-operative Housing.

Having applied offsetting revenue on Capital Account—in the main, Ottawa's payments in respect of shared services such as the Trans-Canada Highway item—estimated at \$3,053,900, we are left with a net Capital expenditure for the year of \$14,438,600, or, following the application of the Current Account surplus of \$3,660,100, to \$10,778,500 as exhibited on page 3 of the printed Estimates.

I feel that it would be useful if I gave an account of our cash surplus account to the end of March past, which brings us to the end of the first five years of Confederation.

The House will remember that on the date of Confederation the Government of Newfoundland was in possession of a very considerable surplus. This was in two forms. First there was the amount that existed in cash, and then there was an amount that was the total of a number of assets that did not exist in cash. These non-cash assets consisted of such

things as the fleet of Clarenville boats, arrears of income tax due the Treasury, and other items. After the date of Confederation some of these non-cash assets were turned into cash from time to time, a process which goes on to this day.

We began as a Province of Canada with a cash surplus of \$41,232,669. To this the following amounts have been added since 1949-50:

By turning the non-cash surplus into cash:

1950-51	\$1,798,358	
1951-52	862,949	
1952-53	225,777	
1953-54	184,566	\$ 3,071,650

By excesses of current revenue over expenditure:

1950-51	\$ 649,490	
1951-52	1,698,399	
1952-53	6,742,708	
1953-54	2,740,512	\$11,831,109

By the sale of the \$10 million issue, 1952:	\$ 9,850,000
	<hr/>
	\$24,752,759

Making a total surplus for five years of:	<hr/>
	\$65,985,428

Including the excess earnings on current account, and the proceeds of the loan of the year before last, we thus find that to the end of the first five years of Confederation we have taken in a grand total of almost exactly \$66 million under the Financial Surplus Account.

From this total we have withdrawn the following for expenditure as shown:

1949-50:	
Current account deficit	\$ 3,733,875

1949-50 to 1953-54 inclusive:

Economic development and extensions to the public services .....	51,418,209
Liquidation of pre-union liabilities .....	252,374

---

\$55,406,458

---

Having taken in a total of \$66 million, and spent \$55½ million of it, we have still an amount of approximately \$10½ million. This amount lies on deposit with the Government of Canada to our credit, and draws interest at the rate of 2½%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order. Mr. Speaker—I am sorry to interrupt my colleague. I have never seen, Sir, such discourtesy in my life, and have never heard it—from the moment my honourable colleague commenced his speech at least three and sometimes four of the members of the Opposition have kept up a conversation quite audible to this side of the House. It is scandalous and disgraceful.

MR. POWER: I must say, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind it at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I do. It is scandalous.

MR. POWER: We are permitted by the Terms of Union to withdraw it only for the purpose of meeting any deficits we may incur on current account revenue but it will become a free balance on the first of April, 1957.

Having given the House this general outline of the surplus, I think it would be equally useful if I now gave an accounting of the sum of \$51½ million noted in the foregoing table. I refer to the amount we have spent in the past five years on economic development, and on extensions to the public services.

This amount was expended in the extension and improvement of the physical assets or properties of the public service and on economic development as follows:

#### Public Services

Grants and Loans to Town Councils .....	\$ 808,000	
Public Housing and Slum Clearance .....	1,676,000	
School Buildings and Equipment .....	2,752,000	
Construction of Public Buildings .....	574,000	
Construction and Equipment of Hospitals .....	5,824,000	
Roads, Bridges and Ferries .....	15,838,000	\$27,472,000

#### Economic Development

Advanced to Loan Boards .....	\$ 772,000	
Surveys of Natural Resources .....	603,000	
Invested in NALCO Shares .....	900,000	
Loaned to Fish Companies, etc. ....	2,419,000	
Invested in Crown Industrial Plants .....	11,161,000	
Loaned to New Industrial Plants .....	6,500,000	\$22,355,000

Miscellaneous .....	1,591,000
---------------------	-----------

---

\$51,418,000

---

I would not wish to leave the House under the impression that the amounts I have shown represent the total of what the Government have expended on all the items in the foregoing table. They represent only what we have spent on capital account, and do not include large sums spent on current account.

This observation applies to Town Councils, hospitals, schools, roads and such services. Indeed, much more has been spent on these services on ordinary or current account than on capital account.

I should also remind the House that the sum shown as loaned to fish companies represents actual cash that passed from the Treasury. Much more than this sum was made available to assist the fishing industry to expand and improve by means of our guarantee of bank loans to fishing companies.

The amount shown as having been spent on surveys of natural resources represents only what came from the surplus for this purpose. Very much more was spent on current account during the same period.

I am confident that it will come as a surprise to some of our people to learn once again that the whole of the surplus was not expended on economic development. Opponents of the Government have harped so much, in recent years, on the loans made to private industrial companies to help them establish new factories, that many people imagine that virtually the whole of the surplus was spent for this purpose.

It will probably come as an even greater surprise to some people to learn that \$23 million of the amount expended is recoverable and will re-

turn to the Treasury, most of it paying interest to the Exchequer in the meantime. This figure is made up as follows:

#### Invested

Housing .....	\$ 1,676,000	
Loan Boards .....	772,000	
Nalco Shares .....	900,000	
Crown Plants .....	11,161,000	\$14,509,000

#### Loaned

Fish Companies .....	\$ 2,419,000	
New Industrial Plants .....	6,500,000	\$ 8,919,000
		<hr/>
		\$23,428,000

Bearing in mind the \$10½ millions in cash deposited in Ottawa, this means, therefore, that we still have an amount of approximately \$34 millions remaining of the \$66 millions which were available to us.

This, then, is the story of the year that is past and my forecast of the year that is upon us. It is a picture of which we need feel no foreboding whatsoever; it is, on the contrary, one which inspires confidence in Newfoundland and in ourselves, Newfoundland is moving surely ahead: we have emerged from the obscurity of our old isolation and entered boldly into the stream of North American living.

Newfoundland has great and valuable natural resources of fish and minerals and timber and water power and soil. She has stout-hearted people of unsurpassed racial and national origins. She has joined in union with a great British nation. She has a Government that is moved by unshakeable faith in Newfoundland's destiny.

The combination is irresistible.



Greatness is her due, as surely as the sparks fly upward.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that I do now leave the Chair, and the House go into committee of ways and means.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the debate be adjourned until tomorrow.

On motion debate adjourned until tomorrow.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Message read by Mr. Speaker.

Government House,  
St. John's,  
Newfoundland.

The Honourable

the Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, transmit estimates of sums required for the Province for the year ending 31st. March, 1955, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend the estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd.) LEONARD OUTERBRIDGE,  
Lieutenant-Governor.  
31st May, 1954.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the House is to go into Committee of Supply at the present time. If it is the intention to move the House into committee of Supply I would like to raise a matter at this time. I believe it is the practice in all Legislatures in Canada

that at this time it is open to any member of the House to raise a grievance. The reason I wish to raise it is that the Hansard for the Newfoundland Legislature has not been published since 1949 and it is extremely difficult for any one who was not present to know what has gone on during the several past sessions since 1954 and find what has been done on several matters. I feel this is a matter to which the Government should give attention very soon, because we have no way of finding out what speeches have been made, and figures have been tabled and answers given which need not have been asked but however had to be asked again this year.

On motion the House moved into a Committee of Supply:

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to table a copy of the estimates.

On motion the Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again tomorrow.

Report received. Committee of Supply ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before you put that motion may I be permitted to ask the Honourable the Premier if it is the intention to go on with this debate on tomorrow or on Wednesday?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thought I would speak on that on the motion to adjourn.

Motion that all further orders of the day do stand deferred, carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock. In so doing Mr. Speaker, may I say that we hope that the business of the House will proceed as usual tomorrow at 3:00 of the clock. I can't say at the moment what orders will be called at that time. I would rather doubt that the Committee of Ways and Means or the Committee of Supply will be called at the early part of the sitting tomorrow at least; it might be at a later stage. There is no desire that they should not have all the time they need to discuss and consider these matters before they begin to debate them. In the meantime we have a lot of other business which can be proceeded with. No occasions exist, that I know of, for rushing the commencement of the actual debate on the Budget Speech or rushing the going into Committee of the Whole to discuss the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Honour-

able the Premier what they propose to go ahead with—there are several important measures—we would like to be prepared.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already said, Mr. Speaker, I don't know. All the orders on the order paper are of importance, and have been on the order paper quite some time, and all members on both sides ought to be ready to discuss all the matters that are on the order paper. It is not at all the practice of this House to announce the day before what orders will be called on the following day. It is the practice in certain Houses, but not in this one. All I can say is that any of the current orders may be called, but these two, Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means, and Committee of the Whole on Supply will not be called in the early part of the day and possibly not at all during tomorrow.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 1, at 3:00 of the clock.

**TUESDAY, June 1, 1954.**

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### **Presenting Petitions**

None.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

#### **Notice of Motion**

None.

#### **Notice of Questions**

None.

## Answers to Questions

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to Questions No. 99, 100 and 101.

## QUESTION NO. 99:

- (1) Will the honourable member be good enough to restate this part of the Question? What does he mean by "the total amount of interest paid as of 1/4/52"? Does he mean the total amount of interest paid in respect of each loan since its inception, or does he mean the total of interest payments in respect of Sinking Fund investments, the aggregate being subdivided between the loans involved?

(2) 7/1/54 3½% \$96.55.

	Amount Borrowed	Interest Rate	Interest Paid to 31/3/54
(3)			
(i) Industrial Loan .....	\$ 45,000	1½%	Nil
(ii) Fisheries Loan .....	\$225,000	1½%	Nil
(iii) Co-operative Loan .....	\$ 30,000	1½%	Nil

- (4) No. Matter now receiving attention.

## QUESTION NO. 100:

- (i) His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor

To thirty nights' subsistence in London for His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and Lady Outerbridge while attending the Coronation @ \$50 per night .....	\$1,500.00
Railway transportation, St. John's to Gander and return .....	167.63
	<hr/>
	\$1,667.63

- (ii) The Hon. the Premier

To Sea Subsistence enroute to United Kingdom for Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood 6 days @ £1 per diem .....	£ 6/0/0
Nine nights' subsistence in London for Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood @ £21 per night .....	189/0/0
Sundry entertainment .....	10/0/0
Seventeen nights' subsistence in London for Mrs. Smallwood @ £10 per night .....	170/0/0
Sea Subsistence enroute to Newfoundland for Mrs. Smallwood, 6 days @ 10s. ....	3/0/0
	<hr/>
£378 @ \$2.81 = \$1,062.18	£378/0/0

## (iii) The Hon. the Minister of Education

To Sea Subsistence enroute to United Kingdom for Mr. and Mrs. Chalker, 6 days @ £1 per diem .....	£ 6/0/0
Twenty-five nights' subsistence in London and environs for Mr. and Mrs. Chalker @ £21 per night .....	525/0/0
Official entertainment .....	147/0/0
Sea Subsistence enroute to Newfoundland for Mr. and Mrs. Chalker, 6 days @ £1 per diem .....	6/0/0
<b>£684 @ \$2.81 = \$1,922.04</b>	<b>£684/0/0</b>

## (iv) The Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs

(on behalf of Nfld. Division of Canadian Legion—seven members)

To advance for transportation and subsistence .....	\$6,500.00
Tickets to Spithead Revue and transportation to and from Revue .....	275.38
London to Beaumont Hamel and stop-over of five days and return to London .....	629.44
	<b>\$7,404.82</b>

## (v) Transportation for Newfoundland Government Party

To Furness Withy & Co. Ltd.—Transportation to and from United Kingdom .....	\$2,254.00
Furness Withy & Co. Ltd.—Transportation to London .....	41.79
Trans-Canada Air Lines—Fare to United Kingdom and Return (His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and Lady Outerbridge) .....	725.40
	<b>\$3,021.19</b>

## QUESTION NO. 101 :

## 1. Inspection Staff

## (i) Permanent Inspectors

Walter Chambers .....	2/7/53	Corner Brook Area
K. M. White .....	3/8/53	Grand Falls Area
S. F. Foley .....	17/2/54	Corner Brook Area
A. Gallant .....	1/3/54	Bonavista South—Trinity North Area
F. Mercer .....	1/3/54	Avalon Peninsula

## (ii) Temporary Inspectors

M. Andrews .....	2/7/53	Burin Peninsula
P. M. Maloney .....	7/7/53	Bonavista North Area
C. Hicks .....	24/2/54	Fogo Area
E. P. Healey .....	8/3/54	St. John's Area
P. F. Linchan .....	3/5/54	Branch—Cape Shore Area

## (iii) On Secondment

F. Maher .....	July, 1953	General
----------------	------------	---------

## 2. Prosecutions

- (i) Sixty-seven prosecutions were instituted.
- (ii) Twenty-one convictions have been registered; the balance of forty-six prosecutions were withdrawn because the defendant in each case had filed his delinquent returns and paid all assessments due between the time of the issue of the Writ and the Court hearing and as all these were first offences, it was decided to withdraw them.
- (iii) (a) Forty-three prosecutions were taken before Magistrate H. O'Neill at St. John's;
- (b) eight prosecutions were taken before Magistrate B. White at Bell Island;
- (c) twelve prosecutions were taken before Magistrate Abbott at Grand Falls;
- (d) three prosecutions were taken before Magistrate Strong at Corner Brook; and
- (e) one prosecution was taken before Magistrate C. Sheppard at Brigus.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to hand down the answer to Question No. 84, Order Paper of May 14.

## QUESTION NO. 84:

(1), (2) and (3). The documents requested by the honourable member are available in the Department of Finance in microfilmed and original form, in respect of the period from 1st December, 1950, to date. They are now being gathered together and may, in due course, be examined at that Department during normal working hours. The Department will inform the honourable member when all relevant items have been assembled.

(4). The statement requested by the honourable member is now being prepared but it should be noted that its preparation may take some time. For the period 1st April, 1949, to 30th November, 1950 (i.e. prior to the setting up of the Government's central accounting system), the required information is available only from the

various Departments. For the period 1st December, 1950, to 31st March, 1952, it will be necessary to check a large number of Vote Ledger Cards in order to extract therefrom references to payments to W. J. Lundrigan, Ltd. From 1st April, 1952, the information is more or less readily available.

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, before you enter upon the Orders of the Day, there are two questions on the Order Paper of May 26, No. 98 and 99.

MR. SPEAKER: I have notice to the effect that answers were being prepared.

## Orders of the Day

Third reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Committee of the Whole on sundry Bills—Items 3 to 11 inclusive.

On motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

Clauses 1 through 3 read and carried. Clause 4 read :

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, if I read this clause correctly it means that the Minister may appoint a chief fire deputy to assist the fire commissioner in a municipal area. Now the fire commissioner has already been appointed, and we know who he is. He is not a professional fire fighter and there are men in the fire department who are, men who have served for many years and some for as high as twenty years, dealing with fires every day, and dealing with very serious fires, and are very experienced men. Who is to take control if the chief of the fire department is subordinated to the fire commissioner, this new appointee, who, as far as I know, has no qualifications which make him superior to the chief of the fire department which we have in the City of St. John's. There are no experienced men of the same calibre as the men who maintain the fire department in the City of St. John's. But it seems to me it is not right and not sensible that the fire commissioner should have higher authority when there is a fire brigade such as we have in this city. Now we ought to have a statement from the Attorney General on that point. As it reads at the present time the fire commissioner seems to be the person in charge, and if a fire takes place, a serious fire who is going to give the commands? Two can't do it, one must be superior to the other. I think it should be

stated in the Bill that this does not apply to the City of St. John's. I notice by the definition of municipality it is an area where a council exists, and includes the St. John's Municipality, and there seems no doubt, in this section, that it places the fire commissioner before the fire department.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Chairman, in reply to that I can only say that the present fire commissioner is not the inexperienced party the honourable member suggests. The present appointee has been for many years studying fire prevention provisions, and, I think, theoretically he knows much more about it even than the practical men to whom he is referring. Within the last few days I have read a letter from the Dominion Fire Commissioner in which he praises and speaks very highly of our new appointee who is there now taking a course.

It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that the position of Fire Commissioner is not to put out fires. It is to have the general overall supervision of fire protection, fire prevention. The party to whom he refers is a specialist at putting out fires, but that is not the job of the fire commissioner. If there is a fire tomorrow the fire commissioner won't go to it. It is his job to investigate conditions which would entail a risk from fire, and somebody must be in charge. Now obviously he cannot be in charge in some of the outlying districts and not be in charge in St. John's. And we can't have a position in St. John's where it is subordinate to the local fire brigade and at the same time in charge of the fire brigade in Corner Brook, for instance. In any event his job is not to fight fires, his job is to find out what can be done to elimin-



ate fires, such as wiring, which will come under him. Now the local fire brigade has no experience at all in wiring and other hazards which perhaps are not within the knowledge of the local fire brigade, but will be dealt with by him. I don't see any inconsistency or anything in this section, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is just one point which the Attorney General made when he said it would be inconsistent to have the fire commissioner to have jurisdiction over the fire brigade of Corner Brook, say, and not over the City of St. John's. I notice in the Ontario Statutes which I have been looking up, I believe it does not apply where there is a fire brigade such as we have in the City but applies mostly to places outside a metropolitan area.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, we are all a little bit concerned by this clause. We know we have here, particularly in St. John's a very efficient fire fighting service, and a very efficient fire chief. It almost looks as though he were being demoted when the Minister appoints him as assistant to the fire commissioner under this Act. I notice also in sub-clause 2 that the local, that would be the present fire chief in St. John's, serves without any remuneration whatsoever by reason of his dual capacity and also that the mayor of any town could be appointed as an assistant to the fire chief and would also have to serve without any remuneration. I don't know if I am sure you could expect the best results under these conditions. I am not sure how any mayor in any municipality is going to take the matter of being appointed by the Minister as deputy to the fire com-

missioner. After all, the mayor of a town has been elected by the people.

MR. CURTIS: It is purely an enabling clause, Mr. Chairman. Obviously we are not going to appoint the mayor, but there should be some person on the spot to decide to investigate fires and to keep a little check on fires, and to keep statistics with regard to fires and to notify the commissioner when there is a fire, and things like that. We do not expect these local assistants to be able to take over his duties, if so he would not be appointed.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that eliminate the R.C.M.P. There were a number of instances, I remember, in the old days when the police in any area certainly took upon themselves to report on any fires, and that sort of thing, and hazards were reported to the police and through the police to the Justice Department. Is that now the right of the R.C.M.P.?

MR. CURTIS: No. Their report now, Mr. Chairman, will go to this man, the fire commissioner. It may be that in cases where the fire commissioner holds an investigation into a fire we may dispense with the magisterial investigation except in cases where that is deemed necessary.

Clause 4 carried. Clauses 5 through 10 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very wide jurisdiction over a large number of things. I would especially refer to the recommendations to the municipal councils in respect to fire brigades and the necessary organization and equipment for such brigades and the installation and maintenance of fire alarm systems, storage, use and disposal of combustibles, explosives or other

inflammable material, the construction and maintenance of fire escapes and other exit facilities in the event of fire or the alarm of fire, etc. Now I don't think that it can be argued that the newly appointed fire commissioner has practical experience—he may have theoretical knowledge, but in a large number of things like that practical experience is what counts. He cannot have experience comparable at all to the experience of the chief of the fire brigade. Now who is to be the one to recommend to the Minister the kind of apparatus or equipment necessary in fire prevention or fire fighting? Will it be the fire commissioner or the chief of the fire brigade? It seems to me it is going to generate unnecessary hard feelings between officials in a place where there is a large brigade such as here in the City of St. John's where we have three brigades, the west end, central and east end, and where they are all experienced men, otherwise they would not be in the job. To expect the fire commissioner to be able to do all these things that are set out here I think is expecting something that is not realistic—he is not able to do it. Take the question of investigations and inquiries; unless you are going to give him a very large staff how is he going to carry on these investigations? The present system of having the magistrates make the inquiry seems to me to be the most suitable for our circumstances in this country and the cheapest. If the fire commissioner has to go around the country and conduct inquiries and keep records and make reports I think that he will need to have a very large staff at his disposal. I believe it would be very unwise to give the fire commissioner such pow-

ers as are set out here especially in the City of St. John's.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, it reads: He shall, under the direction of the Minister investigate and make recommendations—there is nothing to say the Minister has to accept them. The Minister will naturally go to everybody he has under his control to get any advice necessary, and Mr. Chairman, the Minister will not only continue to get advice from his present advisers but will in addition get advice from the fire commissioner. This is clearly a case of one more additional person who can assist in the very great problem that we are facing. You must remember, Mr. Chairman, that St. John's is only one part of Newfoundland—my honourable friend thinks St. John's is the only place. Because we have a fire department in St. John's paid for by the rest of the country, largely by the three hundred thousand other people who don't live in St. John's, because of that he thinks that everything must be looked at from the angle of St. John's. There is a very serious situation in Corner Brook, Mr. Chairman, a situation the fire department is incapable of handling because they have their jobs here. One of the very first jobs the fire commissioner did after his appointment was, at my request, to go to Corner Brook and investigate the situation there. He was there some time. This is just one more additional method, Mr. Chairman, of trying to put our entire fire prevention on a sound basis. I don't think there is anything in this sub-paragraph (6) to be objected to. We are very fortunate in this country in one respect, it is true we have to pay the local fire brigade, but the government has the advantage of their assistance at all times. It is not as though they

were a municipal organization and not under any department, but the fire commissioner, the fire chief, the fire superintendent are all under the same department, and there is no conflict at all, and there is nothing here to suggest that we have not confidence in the fire superintendent. We have every confidence in him. But his job is in St. John's. In so far as the overriding power of the commissioner is concerned it is purely limited to investigating for the Minister who will take advice from both.

MR. BROWNE: We are now in the position where the municipal councils frequently have applications for construction of certain buildings, warehouses and storage of certain materials. To whom then, will they look for opinions and advice as to construction and storage, to the commissioner or to the fire superintendent?

MR. CURTIS: Up to now, Mr. Chairman, these people have been making application to the Chief of Police. They may still do that, or they may go direct, or even the Chief of Police may relay them to the commissioner, and the commissioner will, in collaboration with the superintendent of the fire department and others give an opinion as to what is to be done.

Clause 5 carried. Clause 6 read.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in reference to Clause 7 (2)—I would like to ask the Attorney General—I think he stated that the fire commissioner is at present away taking a course—I notice that a very serious fire took place in the past few days. During the absence of the commissioner, who has undertaken the investigation there?

MR. CURTIS: I presume that in this case the local R.C.M.P. will make an investigation. This Act has not been yet passed, and although the commissioner has been appointed, it is purely pending the passing of this Act. The department is not as yet set up. So that I presume the same procedure will be followed as if this Bill had never come up.

Clause 7 carried, clause 8 read, carried. Clause 9 carried. Clause 10, 11 carried. Clause 12 read.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, under sub-section 2, would the Attorney General inform the Committee whether or not it is the intention that there be a number of local or special assistants to deal with sub-section (2). I would like to ask the Attorney General also whether local or special assistants are employed to carry out the work under sub-section 2, and I presume they would be fully qualified electrical workers with a journeyman's license?

MR. CURTIS: As I have said, Mr. Chairman, we have not as yet set up the department. It is our intention to feel our way first, and find out what is necessary and the best things to be done. My own feeling is that this commissioner would be able to call upon the entire setup of the fire department, and pick out these individuals there. I, myself, was with the fire commissioner when looking at a fire some time ago, supposed to have started by an electric short circuit or something. We at that time discussed the question of having a full-fledged line man attached to the fire department or something like that. I will say however, Mr. Chairman, although that has been in mind we have no final decision yet. It seems to me we should have in the

fire department of St. John's, available to go anywhere else, a thoroughly trained electrician. Because sometimes when we go to a fire I think we should have someone on our staff who knows sufficient about electricity to cut off the mains and render conditions safe for the firemen. That is a matter very much in our minds. And it is quite obvious that when we get down to the organization of this work we will in all probability have trained men.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised that point is that the municipal council here in St. John's have, I understand, a fully qualified electrician and inspector, and I believe an assistant. At one time the Government did have inspectors also. The point I want to raise, Mr. Chairman, in respect to this section, is that during the past twenty-five years, many of the homes which were wired with electricity under the old standards are not suitable for the greatly expanded use of electrical appliances today. We find that many of the homes and buildings have overloaded circuits now, and the electrical installations in that sense would be called faulty, or the people themselves are overloading the circuits in many instances. In regard to that I would like to point out that this building is not up to the standard in many cases.

MR. CURTIS: I might say I had an experience of that myself in one of the houses I had, when I had to send for the electrician to repair a light in the front hall and it cost about three hundred and fifty dollars before I got through. The electricians are now as good businessmen and better than doctors, and want to rewire the whole house. I have no doubt if half of the houses in St.

John's were examined tomorrow the entire electrical wiring would be condemned. I have no doubt—

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): More than that.

MR. CURTIS: I know I paid the price, and know what it is like. I know my honourable friend will feel that that matter is fully within the hands of the Government, and we don't want to jump all at once and make conditions disagreeable, but we want to crawl before we start walking and walk before we run, and to keep this fire commissioner busy checking up and whatever necessary help he feels he needs he will have it.

Clauses 12, 13 read, carried. Clause 14 read, carried. Clause 15 read.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that Fire Protection Association there—does that include all countries? I take it, it includes England, is that right, or the United States of America, it does not mean that even outside of Canada the manufacturer is debarred?

MR. CURTIS: No, I think it is probably a North American Organization. I don't know myself.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you know whether English Applicants will be debarred under that section?

MR. CURTIS: No.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, Section 15 (1)—I believe some years ago the Commission of Government did adopt, I think it was, the Canadian National Electrical Code, and the Municipal Council of St. John's also adopted the same—I was wondering if it is any different from this code?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the same thing.

Clause 15 carried. Clause 16 carried. Clauses 17 through 20 carried. Clause 21 read :

MR. BROWNE : Mr. Chairman, I know this section is an enabling section, and I take it, as the Attorney General's answer to me was, that he is going to proceed slowly before taking away from the magistrates the duties they now have of holding inquiries.

MR. CURTIS : I think, Mr. Chairman, certainly in the immediate future the magistrates will continue to hold inquiries.

MR. BROWNE : And probably outside the City of St. John's continue to hold them for much longer than here?

MR. CURTIS : I think so.

MR. HOLLETT : Mr. Chairman, may I ask as a matter of form—police are defined here as the R.C.M.P., or are there any others?

MR. CURTIS : I think that term includes both.

Clause 21 carried. Clauses 22 through 24 carried. Clause 25 read :

MR. BROWNE : Mr. Chairman, in regard to that clause does that apply where there is a conflict between the fire commissioner and the chief of the fire brigade in St. John's? It says here—where there is a conflict between the authority of the Fire Commissioner and that of an official of any municipal area the authority of the Fire Commissioner shall prevail—this might mean an interference by the fire commissioner when the chief of the fire department is fighting a fire?

MR. CURTIS : I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Act implies that or not.

MR. BROWNE : I notice in the Acts that the chief of the fire department in places like Toronto and such large cities are excluded from the Act.

MR. CURTIS : Of course, Mr. Chairman, the situation is rather different here in St. John's. As I have already said both organizations are coming under the Attorney General, and frankly if there is any disagreement between the two he will have to settle. But somebody must in the first instance have the overriding authority and in this case, in view of the fact that the commissioner is the provincial commissioner, obviously, he is the man to have it.

Clause 25 carried.

Motion is that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill; "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act":

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read.

MR. BROWNE : Mr. Chairman, while we are on this section I wonder if I could ask the Minister whether the Government has been responsible for the improvement noticeable at Signal Hill. It has been improved considerably, and will be a great attraction, I think, to anybody who comes to the City, as a place to visit.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources) : Mr. Chairman, the answer is that the Government is, I understand, responsible for that, and that it was done through the Department of Public Works.

MR. BROWNE : It does not come under you?

DR. ROWE : No. It has never officially been declared a park.

MR. BROWNE: I see.

DR. ROWE: Within the near future the Government will be claiming certain areas but what will happen in respect to that I cannot predict. At the present time Signal Hill is not a park within the meaning of the Act, and never has been proclaimed as such, therefore it does not come under our department as yet.

MR. BROWNE: I remember the Minister mentioning Big Falls and the abuse of fishing in that area, have any steps been taken to prevent future abuse?

DR. ROWE: That is under consideration, Mr. Chairman, right now.

Clause 2 carried. Clause 3 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell us whether any officials have been appointed under this section?

DR. ROWE: No officials have been appointed whatsoever, and I think I should elaborate to say that we are doing that. So far we have been able to do it within the framework of our present departmental structure, we have a committee within the department made up of a number of responsible officers, the Crown Lands Director, Director of Wild Life and other responsible men there, chiefly directors. They have been considering a number of matters including, for example, a number of sites for our picnic fireplaces, etc. So far we have been administratively able to handle it within the department, and my feeling is that we shall be able to do so for some time in the future. But when he refers to the question of wardens within a large section, let us say Big Falls, that is a fairly large area of six square miles, and contains the most valuable scenic

and other assets we have. We will obviously have to make special provisions for control of that especially in view of vulnerability to the public. I use that word advisedly due to the fact that thousands of cars can be parked near the falls and people can go down there, and of course, commit a great deal of vandalism. I might also add we have now upward of a hundred picnic sites. In the spare time the forest fire patrol are doing that, and on wet days, I don't know if any of the honourable members saw trucks distributing these tables and fire places around the coast. Days like today for example there is no work for them to do as there will obviously be no fires, and we do try to find work for them to do, and they have been able to do a very good job in the preparation of these fire places, the clearing of the sites and making the tables and installing these things in the areas. Here again we have been able to economize in the matter, and have not had to take on any new staff whatever, in spite of the fact that we have upwards of one hundred of these picnic sites now in operation.

MR. BROWNE: I can appreciate the point the honourable Minister has made. But I would like to ask him if there are any so called provincial parks apart from Big Falls?

DR. ROWE: The answer to that is; that at this moment there are no provincial parks.

MR. BROWNE: There will be?

DR. ROWE: I hope so. This is designed to bring these picnic sites within our control.

Clause carried.

Moved and seconded that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.



Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953":

Moved and seconded that the committee report having passed this Bill without amendments.

Committee of the Whole, on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act":

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read.

MR. BROWNE: Does not that certain part there give the Minister very wide powers.

DR. ROWE: On the surface it does, Mr. Chairman, but if the parent Act is read through from beginning to end it will be seen it is not too serious as it looks right here. After all the person has not a mining license but only a development license, on which he is to do a certain amount of work, incur expenses etc., and he would not hold on to his license unless he got some benefit from it, it would cost him too much money. Mr. Chairman, I think I pointed out in second reading the license holders were prevented from doing all they wished to do, and this would give us some discretionary powers.

Clause 2 carried. Clause 3 read:

Clause 3 carried, clause 4 read:

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister tell us why that is retroactive to 1951?

DR. ROWE: That is to cover the situation where people conformed to the spirit of the Act, but where the company technically did an invalid amount of work. If it were interpreted strictly any person holding a block of land to be developed in forty acre blocks would have spent so

much time and money on every forty acres, which is just a ridiculous situation, as it might even be bog or pond or something like that. That is interpreted by using the preposition "On." It has been made retroactive so as not to invalidate anything that has been done in the past.

Clause 4 carried.

Motion is the committee rise, report having passed the Bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act":

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this would be an opportune time to ask the Minister of Public Welfare if he could lay on the Table of the House here the report of the welfare officer, where the welfare officer reported there was a certain locality in Newfoundland where the parents were not fit to live with their children and 95% of them should have their children removed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, we decline to table any such report on the grounds that these reports do not belong to the House of Assembly but are confidential reports from civil servants to the Government and private documents. In the second place this would not be the occasion for tabling it, in the Committee on a Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has cited from it. I wonder if he would be good enough to tell us the locality now, because it must be a very serious situation to be as bad as reported.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to say anything—I

think the indelicacy of the remark, Mr. Chairman, is condemnation enough of the speaker.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, that is the provision for the repeal of paragraph (i) of sub-section (1)—reasonable compensation in a sum not exceeding two hundred dollars to a party injured: award reasonable compensation in a sum not exceeding two hundred dollars to a party injured in his person or by loss of goods, with the consent or on motion of such party.

Now if I recall section 57 correctly, that is where a child is judged delinquent and has committed some offense and people receive thereby compensation. The present allowable, I think, is fifty dollars, and this increase is certainly justified. But my feeling is that we should give some consideration to increasing that amount still further, because the damage that can be done, and frequently is done, by children under circumstances that this Act governs, quite often is a very much more substantial amount than the maximum presently contemplated. Now I realize that the Minister in presenting this draft has perhaps examined the matter, but I do suggest that five hundred dollars might perhaps be a more satisfactory figure. There is the consideration, of course, that one does not want to penalize the parents, on the other hand the rights of the injured parties should not be neglected. I quite often do have cases where the damage might run into thousands and the recovery even of five hundred dollars would be purely a nominal restitution. I have in mind a certain actual case I know of myself, and which I have mentioned to the honourable Minister previously. I do feel sure that we ought to give

some consideration to the alteration of that figure of two hundred dollars as compensation and change it to five hundred dollars.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable and learned gentleman for having raised the point earlier, and thus having given some advanced notice of his feelings on this point. I think I speak for this side of the House quite fully when I say that we have no objections to having that amount raised. If the committee would agree to have it stand, as the honourable and learned member suggests, at five hundred dollars, I think that would be agreeable to us.

There is one point I have in mind, and it is a point I am sure he himself will agree with: The further up we raise the ceiling the more latitude it does give the court, and probably might give a court too much latitude. But we must at the same time provide sufficient protection for a person who has been aggrieved to a very considerable extent. We might, I suggest, Sir, let this clause stand and return to it later.

Clause 2 stand, Clauses 3 through 5 read and carried.

DR. POTTLE: I move the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again. Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act":

Clauses 1 through 4 read and carried. Clause 5 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister who is in

charge of this Bill could tell us how far communities have taken advantage of this Bill to become community councils?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Supply): As to the exact number I am unable to reply. But there has been some five or six or seven since the passing of the Act who have taken advantage of it, and we have some three or four under consideration at the present time, and some interest has been shown by two or three others.

Clauses 5 through 7 carried. Clause 8 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us if any community organizations have already submitted accounts in accordance with this sub-section?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, accounts are always submitted every year.

MR. BROWNE: Could you give us the names of places taking advantage of this?

MR. HEFFERTON: I am sorry I cannot now recall the names, I remember we had one from St. Albans, and I believe we have had one from Steady Brook. I know there are others which came in last year, but were not in time for the report.

Clause 8 carried. Clause 9 read:

MR. BROWNE: Under sub-clause 4—that seems to have been a very important provision in the original Act. Has the auditor yet been appointed? Is there anybody doing that service? It seems to me very important that a community should get off on the right foot, and get all the advice they can get at the beginning of their existence in regard to finances.

MR. HEFFERTON: I might say, that one of our officials helps to set up a council giving instructions in the procedure that should be adopted, and they assist the new organization as to official information. The audit is carried out by officials of the Department of the Auditor General.

MR. BROWNE: I see.

Clause 9 carried. Clause 10 carried. Clause 11 read:

MR. BROWNE: Is there any reason for that?

MR. HEFFERTON: I recall that when I introduced the Bill at second reading, I pointed out that the councils were given power to make resolutions subject to approval, but there was no provision in the parent Act for control, and all the change brought about here is by inserting the word "Control."

Clause 11 carried, clause 12 read:

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me a better position if it does not specify what the business would be.

MR. HEFFERTON: We are attempting to try and get clear of the arbitrary and get down to a more systematic assessment.

MR. BROWNE: It seems very good.

Clauses 12 through 14 carried.

Moved and seconded the committee report having passed the Bill.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council to enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore, Limited, and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited":

Clause 1 read—carried. Clause 2 read :

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that the amount of money has already been spent in connection with the endeavour to increase the output of the mine. Am I correct in that, or is that a new six million dollars?

MR. CURTIS: This whole agreement, Mr. Chairman, is really retroactively worded. The money has been spent, but we want to get the tax.

Clause 2 carried. Clause 3 read :

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would tell us whether the provision here is very different from the provision in regard to the Iron Ore Company of Canada, who I learned will be producing this year, and expect to get out their first million tons this year—is there any difference in the principle there?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a different principle altogether. In the original agreement made with the Iron Ore Company of Canada they would pay a royalty of ten cents a ton, but apparently that was abandoned afterwards, and during the term of the Commission of Government, changed to a royalty of five per cent on the profits. We could easily put a royalty on this, we believe, to get the tonnage.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, in regard to that, I wonder have the Government gone into the matter with the company with regard to the imposition of such a tax. Have discussions been entered into relative to that, and have the company considered it, and are they prepared to sign this?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, they are very anxious to sign it.

MR. HOLLETT: Very anxious to sign it? I wonder if the honourable Minister could tell us why? It is the first time I ever heard of any company ever anxious to sign an agreement for taxation.

MR. CURTIS: Because of the security it gives them for the future. At least they will know where they are now for the next twelve years.

MR. HOLLETT: Could any change of government have any effect on it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pigs could fly!

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, I wonder if the Government thinks it is proper for them to mortgage the future—I don't know if mortgage is the word. I don't think it is quite the right thing for them to do. On the other hand I do think it is a grand thing if the Government can get some money out of this company or any other company. As I have pointed out, I can't quite understand their being over-anxious to pay ten cents a ton, but if the Minister says so I shall accept his word.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question—is their production now up to two million tons?

MR. SPENCER: Over two. They are aiming at three, eventually.

Clauses 3 and 4 carried. Clause 5 read :

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I regret I did not know that clause 4 was being put. If I may I would like to revert back for a moment and ask the honourable Minister if that matter has been discussed with the town council of Bell Island or not?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, clause 4 does not refer to the town council at all.

MR. CURTIS: To public roads.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh, I see.

Clauses 5 through 8 carried. Clause 9 read:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I revert back to clause 5—that is the one I was thinking of when I asked permission to revert back to clause 4. What I am anxious to find out is, if the Government has been in consultation with the town council of Bell Island or at least the people of Bell Island through their town council to ascertain whether or not they are agreeable to that particular clause which states; the taxation imposed upon the company shall not exceed the aggregate of ten thousand dollars in any one year—I wonder if the Minister would like to make a remark on that?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it was discussed with the town council. As a matter of fact the town council on Bell Island has not been very active lately, and frankly that clause was taken in its entirety from the similar clause in the previous Act, which Bell Island did not take advantage of by reason of their not being incorporated before and therefore never being able to take advantage of the section.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the reason why I raised the point, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be a good idea if the Government did take it up with the council. As the Minister has pointed out there was such a section in the old Act. But I do think the town council on Bell Island should at least be consulted in the matter, as

in all probability they do hope to get a certain amount of money from the company operating over there. I am wondering how much they pay the council, and Heaven knows they need a good surplus, to get the town council operating properly. They need a good town council on Bell Island. I know—I lived there six years and I know the necessity for incorporation and the active co-operation of any new industry in an area such as that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, supplementary to that question, may I ask if this amount of four thousand under section 4 and ten thousand under section 5 are accumulative, because under clause 9 here it means a backlog of four years for which these amounts were due.

MR. CURTIS: I believe, Mr. Speaker, we shall have to have their signature to the agreement before we discuss that.

Clause 9 carried. Clause 10 read:

MR. BROWNE: I presume the Government will try and get this agreement signed, and if not, an agreement to the best of their ability?

MR. CURTIS: We can't, Mr. Chairman, sign any agreement other than that. It is either that or none. I don't think our legislation authorizes it as it does not go beyond that. We would have to come back for ratification if there is an amendment. It says in Clause 10—This amendment subject to ratification—this section ten should be stricken out obviously. I ask that that clause be stricken out, and I thank my honourable friend for drawing my attention to that.

Motion is that clause 10 be deleted—motion carried.

Motion that this Bill be passed with some amendment—carried.

Motion is that the committee report having passed this Bill with some amendments.

Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Policies of Fire Insurance":

Clause 1 through 9 read and carried. Clause 10 read:

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister would tell us why that section is there?

MR. CURTIS: The point is this, Mr. Chairman, the red ink is to be limited to certain expressed provisions of the policy, for instance the particular terms to which they want to draw attention. Auditors do not want anyone else to use green ink. They want everybody to know it is their mark. It is to protect the insured. It is not to be used in any other place except as provided herein. If my honourable friend will refer back now to clause 8—that is a clause we read when my honourable friend was asleep.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I am not.

MR. CURTIS: No not now, but when you were.

MR. HOLLETT: I am asking about this one, the red ink—shall not be used on the face of the policy—

Clauses 10 through 13 carried. Clause 14 read:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the committee would want to have this read or not. These are normal statutory conditions actually put on all policies. At any rate the Government would not agree

to any amendments so perhaps we might accept these regulations.

MR. BROWNE: As a matter of fact it is exactly the same as provisions on policies, except in Clause 4 the word endorsed is spelled indorsed. On page 11, I believe clause (c) in the event of there being any other insurance on property herein destroyed, (c) is in there because there may be several kinds included in the insurance policy. I think it is usual to leave that out in the event of having any other insurance.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would let these stay in I could get them confirmed.

Clause 11 carried.

MR. BROWNE: I may say I referred this to an insurance agent and he supplied me with these changes, but I looked it over generally.

MR. CURTIS: That is funny, Mr. Chairman, I also referred it to an agent since it was printed, and got no criticisms.

MR. BROWNE: On just that change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is the committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

Carried.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act":

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read:

MR. BROWNE: Does the Minister know what that means—could he explain that?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I made a point of finding out



what it meant and the answer is very interesting, at least I found it so. The automobile policy insures the owner and those driving his car with his permission. The holder of insurance is also protected under his policy when he drives the car of another person especially if the value of the second owner is not insured. In other words: I am insured to drive my car, but if the honourable member lends me his car and I drive it even if it is not insured yet it is insured when I am driving it. I am insured against accident of a third party liability—I am covered.

To establish what insurance is liable when two or more insurances are all entered in the same vehicle involved in the claim, legislation was enacted two or three years ago to the effect that the insurer of the driver of the vehicle responsible for the accident should pay off first. If his insurance were not sufficient to meet all claims then the insurer or the owner of the vehicle primarily responsible became liable for loss under the first insurance.

The proposed section 3 of the Bill revises the original order in which insurers are required to meet claims, making the insurer of the owner first liable for losses in excess of the limits of the owner's policy of the driver shall be called upon to pay. This is a much more important section than I realized when I was introducing the Bill to the House. This change is recommended for practical purposes:

In many cases of claims applicable to third parties there are also damages to the vehicle causing the damage. As the law now stands the third party claim is investigated and adjusted by the insurer of the driver, but that insurer has no interest in the damage

to the car. Thus the owner insurer has to make an investigation and adjustment separately of that claim. As amended, the owner's policy will also cover the collision loss, and the insurer investigating the third party claim will also be able to take care of the collision claim. The driver's insurer is only interested in the third party claim in excess of the limits of the owner's policy, and can accept the investigation and adjustment made for the other insurer, thus saving time and money.

MR. HOLLETT: Quite clear.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, if not, I have it here in writing, and would be glad to give it to the honourable member. It is just a matter, in a judgment claim, of who pays first.

MR. HOLLETT: That applies to all automobile insurance in this country?

MR. CURTIS: Even to the Tories.

Clause carried. Bill passed without amendment.

On motion the Committee rose, and reported having passed this Bill without amendment.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and have passed the Bill, An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire without amendments.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

(2) A Bill, An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act, without amendment.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

(3) An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act; passed without amendment.

Report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

(4) An Act Respecting the Welfare of Children Act—made some progress and asks leave to sit again tomorrow.

Report received. Ordered sit again tomorrow.

(5) An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act. Passed without amendment.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

(6) An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance—passed without amendment.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act without amendments.

Report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited, with some amendments.

First reading of said amendments.

Second reading of said amendments. On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, without amendments.

Report received. On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bill, Item 12 to 15 inclusive:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority";

Clause 1 and 2 read and carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if you would be willing to call it 6:00 of the clock we could adjourn and resume at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It being now 6:00 of the clock I will now leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

#### NIGHT SESSION

June 1, 1954.

The House met at 8:00 of the clock.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, now we are dealing with that clause which provides for the establishment of a Crown Corporation called the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority, I feel the Minister will feel it is opportune to let the House

know what are the terms on which this authority is being set up, what is the contract being made individually with these three men who have been selected on account of their talents and experiences to organize and direct such an important establishment as has been announced here in this House. We should be informed as to what the salaries are and what the terms are and what conditions. There have been rumors around the city that these men are to receive \$25,000 a year each and a pension after ten years of ten thousand dollars, which may also go to their widows. The Premier has said the same sort of thing now that the Government is definitely committed to this highly speculative venture.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—the honourable gentleman is just not going to get away with it. He is not going to debate it. It is out of order. I will not have this debate all over again.

**MR. BROWNE:** We had five days from the honourable the Premier.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** The honourable member had an opportunity to speak too, but he was too slow to do so. He is not now going to debate the principle of this Bill.

**MR. BROWNE:** I am not going to. I said, now that the Government—

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Chairman, I asked for a ruling on a point of order.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member knows he cannot debate the principle of the Bill. The fact that the Government undertook to set up the authority is the principle of the Bill.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, I am only making the observation now that the Government is committed to the venture I feel we ought to know what are the terms and what are the conditions, and I hope the Minister will give us that information now.

**HON. W. J. KEOUGH** (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether this is exactly the time when I should supply the House with the exact information which the honourable member has asked me already, and in answering that question put here earlier in the session I said that I would supply the House with the information with regard to the salaries and the terms upon which it is proposed to conclude a contract with the personnel of the Fisheries Development Authority when the estimates were before the House. I can say, for the information of the House, as of this moment the Government has not concluded any specific contract with the Fisheries Development Authority, but of course the Government has given them certain undertakings which it would propose to implement if the House sees fit to authorize the Government to set up a Crown Corporation, and to anticipate what is in Section 45, to make a contract with the personnel of the Fisheries Development Authority on such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant Governor in Council sees fit to make. That is what the House is being asked to do at this time.

The House is not being asked to authorize at the moment the specific estimate of salaries and terms.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out to the honourable Minister that I asked a question relative to that recently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order. If there is any purpose in asking for this information it would not be in this particular clause, it would rather be on a clause occurring later in this Bill. The honourable gentleman is therefore completely out of order in dealing with the matter at this stage.

MR. HOLLETT: The answer the Minister gave me was that he would reveal this information when the Bill came before the House. The Bill has been before the House several days, and the honourable the Premier spoke on it for a week, and so far we have not been able to get any information whatsoever. The reply was that when the Bill, An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority, was introduced to the Legislature—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was when the estimates were introduced.

MR. HOLLETT: I have the answer the honourable Minister gave, if you would like to have it. Am I right or wrong, Mr. Chairman? I am not going to be called out by anyone on the other side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the committee would like to hear the answer: When the Bill, An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority, is introduced into Committee.

MR. HOLLETT: And for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would support the request of my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West, that we not only be given the names of this Fisheries Authority, and if they are not given now I shall again repeat the request under the new clause which comes up, but also the terms and conditions under which they are being hired.

On the other point, Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to sub-clause 4 of that section now, which states that the Authority was an agency of Her Majesty and may enter into contract with, hire, negotiate and appoint agents to act on its behalf for any purpose and on any conditions it deems necessary. In one way I suppose that is all right, in another I don't believe it is essential to give them all that authority, and if I go back further, Sir, to sub-clause 2 of 12, the Authority for all purposes of the Act is an agent of Her Majesty in right of Newfoundland and may exercise its powers under the Act only as an agent of Her Majesty. Now in my opinion, humble as it may be, Her Majesty to me means the Government, and I don't think it is quite the right thing for the Government to delegate its authority to any agent in this particular instance where we have been told some one hundred million dollars may have to be expended by this Authority. I object strongly to the delegation of such powers to an agent of the Government. I think the Government should exercise supervision over this particular Authority at all times. That is the point I wish to make there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Leader of the Opposition is entitled to his opinion and to his objections. The Government has seen fit to propose to the House that it shall set up a Crown Corporation to handle fisheries development. That Crown Corporation will exercise only such powers as are delegated to it by the House and specifically from time to time only such powers as the Lieutenant Governor in Council may authorize it to put into effect.

In connection with the objection that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition raised with regard to Section 4—the Fisheries Development Authority is to be an agent of Her Majesty. Normally an agent can't delegate its powers to another agent. That section here will simply provide for its agent to delegate power to some other agent in specific instances, where one may want a specific piece of work carried out.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words; may appoint an agent to enter into contract with Her Majesty on account of the Government who is also an agent for Her Majesty. The Authority is an agent of Her Majesty. It may enter into contract with Her Majesty and appoint agents to act on its behalf for any purpose. There are no limitations upon the powers of that Authority—to act on its behalf for any purpose or any conditions that it deemed necessary—that seems to give them unlimited power. Is that the interpretation?

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Surely, Mr. Chairman, no one can give what they have not got. Precisely for that reason a delegate, in the ordinary course of law, is not permitted to delegate authority. That has to come under that principle, Sir. Surely then the Authority cannot delegate more authority than it has. That would be the limitation on its powers.

Clause 3 carried. Clause 4 read: Clause 5 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I repeat the request I made a few moments ago, under Clause 3. I would like to know the terms and conditions under which the Lieutenant Governor in Council is going to appoint, or in fact has appointed, this

Authority, because we understand that it has been in effect for a year today, and we want to know when they were appointed, what salaries they receive and what are the conditions. According, I believe, to the speech made by the Premier, not only the members of the Authority but their families are being provided for. I would like to have the Minister give the information to the House now.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, first of all, after having seen the reply to the question that I gave the Honourable Leader of the Opposition it is quite obvious that I said I would give the information when the Bill is being debated in the House, but I am afraid that I am going to have to withdraw from that position. Right now this section before the House is to authorize the Government to appoint the members of the authority upon such terms and conditions as it sees fit. No contract has as yet been signed with the Authority at this stage. With no contract signed I don't feel that I should be obligated to divulge the terms and conditions to the House. If the House so orders me I will, but if it does not I must, Mr. Chairman, refuse.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, the three members of the Authority, I presume, have been working with the Government for a year, and it is quite possible, Mr. Chairman, that these three gentlemen would want to know before they accepted the employment of any one what would be the terms and conditions of their employment, and especially so if there is to be an agreement, as set forth here, either before or after the passing of the Act. Goodness, gracious, as if anybody were going to work anywhere with anyone without knowing the wages to be received, and I presume

the gentlemen are receiving wages since the time of their appointment. I would like to know the wages and terms based upon their yearly salary.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we directed this question to the Minister of Fisheries, and he made a definite promise. Now he sees fit to withdraw his promise to give the information to the House when the Bill is being debated. Why is he doing it? Because the Premier wishes him to do it. That seems to be the answer why the House is not given the information, although these gentlemen have been under pay by the Government for a considerable period of time, and no money has as yet been voted for them, but they are under pay. I don't think even they would complain about that, because as I understand it, they were told to write their own valuation, what they wanted, and to name their own figures in advance, and it was accepted. Surely the House does not have to or the members of the Opposition do not have to go upon their knees and beg the dear Premier to give us the information. They have been in the position long enough and these men are getting paid, so let us know.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the point is well taken. Here this Bill is to set up an Authority, Sir, and until this Bill passes this House this Authority is not in existence. The clause now is to appoint members to this authority and if, as, and when the Authority is set up then the question of the salaries can be brought out, and will be in the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, a very simple answer was given to that today when we debated a contract which is coming in Bell Island. We

discussed it but the contract has not been signed, and we discussed all the terms and the Attorney General told us that we could not make any change as that was what they wanted to do. Now here are three gentlemen under some kind of contract with the Government at the present time. Will the Government tell us how much they have been receiving since last June, the first of June? Is the House, the public, entitled to have that information? It is the public money, and I suppose we are entitled to ask about it.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I have to repeat here that, what the House is being asked to do is to delegate the powers to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make a contract with the members of the Fisheries Development Authority on such terms and conditions as it sees fit. Now I am withdrawing from the position that I put myself into by giving the answer that I did to the question put to me by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, because actually I should not have given that answer. The answer I should have given was the one I thought I had given, i.e., that I would reveal the terms and conditions of the employment of the Fisheries Development Authority when the estimates were before the House, and until the specific authority is either given the Authority or not, I still stand by my position that I should not divulge the terms and conditions of the Fisheries Development Authority, and I am not divulging them, unless the House so orders.

MR. FOGWILL: I understand that, Mr. Chairman, there is no contract as yet. But when there is it will be retroactive to June 1953, so I would like to ask the Minister this question: Are the gentlemen in



question employed by the Government at the present time?

MR. MURRAY: What gentlemen?

MR. FOGWILL: The three men, Mr. Dunstan, Mr. Young and Mr. Winsor reputedly appointed in fact to some fishery development authority, are these three gentlemen employed by the Government or by a department of the Government?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if I am here all night it won't worry me. If I have to stay on my feet here all night! I don't think it is fair. I don't think it is right nor just. On the 31st, of March I received an answer to a question by an honourable Minister of the Crown in the person of the Honourable Minister of Fisheries—Give the names of the recently appointed Fisheries Development Authority. The answer to that question was: The information will be made available when the Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" is introduced to the Legislature. It has been introduced for the second time. The second question was: State the amount of salaries being paid to (a) the chairman (b) the members or committee, and state what if any contract has been entered into with these individuals by the Government. Table copies of said contract of agreement. The same answer was given: The information will be made available when the Bill is introduced into the Legislature. That bill, Mr. Chairman, has been introduced for some time, and has been discussed and nearly everybody on the Government side discussed it, told us all about the Bill, all about the duties of the Authority, all the money they were to spend on the northeast coast and all over the country, told us about the three men they

have appointed to exercise the authority given to the Authority under this Act, and what wonderful fellows they were. They gave us their characters and history etc. I am not disputing anything about that. We realize that men have been delegated to exercise the authority given to them under this Act, who can expend a huge amount of money, make loans, borrow money to purchase boats, to purchase gear, to get people away from the land which they own—if they want to, they can do almost anything—and we are asked now here to pass this Act and the Government will not grant us the courtesy of telling us what agreement they have entered into with these three men.

We find under Sub-section 3 that the Government may make regulations to provide for the establishment of a pension scheme for members of the Authority who have served as such for a period of not less than ten years, or for their dependents or widows or for both, and yet we are not to be told what is the agreement which the Government has with these three men, nor how much salary they have been paid since June last year. Yet we are to be asked in a day or two to vote millions of dollars for fisheries. I don't see how, on the face of it, the honourable Minister can refuse to give us the answer, and I don't see how the Government can. We hold they have consented to give us the answer. After all it is not a hanging matter. The people have to pay it. It is the people's money that goes to that Authority, Mr. Chairman, and the people have a right to know that. We have raised the question and want to know just what money they have to find to pay this Fisheries Authority. I repeat, Sir, it is absolutely essential not only that the

Minister will live up to his promise to us, to this side of the House in this particular answer to a question, and that the Government will consent to his telling us now, just where we are heading in this particular Authority. We have been told on very good authority, and if I were to tell you, Sir, on what authority I have been told you might be surprised, that they are to get a salary of \$25,000 a year each for ten years, and that at the end of that period, if they want to retire, then they can get a pension of five or ten thousand dollars a year, the exact amount I do not know, nobody knows, the people do not know, and apparently the members of the Government do not know. Well, we want to know. We want to know what manner of men these are—that we have been told, we were told how lucky Newfoundland was to get these men. And mind you, Sir, we have been told how fortunate we were to get other men in this country, we have been told of men who were worth their weight in gold to us. We are told now these men are worth their weight in gold, pretty nearly that in ten years at any rate at \$25,000 a year, \$250,000 in ten years for one man, and a total of three-quarters of a million for three men—and we are asked to vote here with a blindfold over our faces to give authority to set this up. I think the whole idea is ridiculous. We know the Government has the power to refuse it, but I see no reason why they should, Sir. Surely it is not such a deep, dark secret after all. They have paid men \$25,000 a year before, particularly in one case. They have paid men \$15,000 a year and have paid them \$8,000. Now here are three for \$25,000 a year, so we are told, but the Government won't

tell us. Why not clear up the mystery? It is necessary that the country should know from the point of view of these three men, because surely it is doing them a terrific amount of damage, if we are going to be allowed to talk like this of the salaries to be paid to them. Personally, I don't want to do it. Personally it is none of my business, but it is the business of the people to know, Sir, just what we are going to vote this night for these three men. I repeat, Sir, I want the honourable Minister to honour the pledge which he gave me and the Opposition in the answer to that particular question.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, since the honourable Leader of the Opposition puts it that way, I am inclined to concur with his request. I must say that I really did think the answer that I gave, and I insist the answer I should have given was that I would divulge this information when the House was considering the estimates. That is the proper time for it. The House in not being asked tonight to vote the salaries of the Fishery Development Authority. It is not being asked to vote on the terms and conditions of their employment. It is being asked to delegate powers to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to name these salaries and the conditions under which they will be employed. However, since I did give the quite definite undertaking to the Leader of the Opposition in reply to that question that the information would be made available when the Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority," should be introduced to the Legislature, I did say that, and since I certainly do not want to be placed in the position or to have the Government placed in the position of a

Minister of the Crown going back upon a quite definite undertaking upon being called upon from the Opposition to give the information required, I will release the information now :

First of all the members of the Fisheries Development Authority have not been employed for a year. If my memory serves me correctly, it is since September. There has been no contract signed with the members of the Authority as yet, and there will not be until such time as this Bill may pass the House. Members of the Authority quite understand that condition, and it was acceptable to them. The contract could not be signed until such time as this Legislature gave the authority. However, they naturally have had an undertaking from the Government, subject to the approval of the Legislature, that their salaries and terms of employment would be of this order.

Each member of the Authority is to receive a salary of exactly what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition heard, \$25,000 a year, subject to the further condition that the Chairman is to receive an extra \$500 a year, which leaves the salary of the Chairman at \$25,500 a year. The other two members of the Authority to receive \$25,000 a year.

The other conditions of their employment are these :

The members of the Authority are to be eligible to receive a pension at the end of ten years' service in the amount of five thousand dollars per annum. That is in the event that their services should be terminated at the end of ten years. Their employment may be continued at the end of ten years, but in any event their pension rights in this regard are to be

effective at the age of sixty. And generally the pension rights of the Authority are to be extended, in the event of their death, to their widows, along the lines of the pension policy adopted by the Government of Canada, which is, I believe off hand, that the widow gets half the pension that the deceased would have been entitled to.

That generally covers it. As I have said, what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition heard was quite correct. The members of the Authority are getting \$25,000 a year, and it is also true that they vote their own ticket. They were asked what they would be prepared to come for—the Government was anxious that they should receive a figure of remuneration that would make them completely independent of all other loyalties except their loyalties to the Government via the Fisheries Development Authority, for the rest of their days.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the honourable Minister has seen fit to honour his undertaking to give us this information. As the House knows the only new feature in the information which we did not hear before, was the fact that the Chairman is to receive an extra five hundred dollars as chairman. Now the Minister made an observation here that he may have made before, that these high salaries are being paid for the purpose of making them completely independent and completely loyal to the undertaking. Can we infer from that that nobody else in the service is loyal to his obligations as a civil servant? Has the Government got to bribe people to be loyal and to be independent when it is their duty to perform the functions for which they have been

appointed? I don't see that it was necessary to give such large salaries as are mentioned here.

Then, since the Premier has told us that this has a fifty-fifty chance, I don't know how far the Premier was thinking when he was talking in terms of the chance of success, whether he meant the whole scheme or the scheme—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—is it in order for the honourable gentleman in Committee of the Whole to bring up or repeat or deal with anything said in the debate on second reading? If he is then I suggest that he can take up any point now in Committee of the Whole, any point that was made in second reading or in the debate on second reading and thereby continue the debate on second reading all over again. Is it in order for the honourable gentleman or any honourable gentleman in this present session to refer to any thing that was said in any debate in this present session once that debate has concluded? Is that in order?

MR. BROWNE: May I speak to that point of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that this debate has concluded yet. I don't think the honourable member is out of order in referring to what was said in second reading. I think he might refer briefly to what was said there.

MR. BROWNE: I am referring to this particular clause. What I was speaking about is this: I am not being harshly critical at the moment—if the scheme only has a fifty-fifty chance of succeeding then there is a possibility that it may fail—there is a fifty-fifty chance that it will fail. Will

the Government then be obligated for the balance of the term if it should prove so expensive and so unsound that it would not be worthwhile proceeding? Would we still be obligated under the contract to pay these men seventy-five thousand dollars a year until the termination of the ten years and give them a pension after that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is yes, obviously.

MR. KEOUGH: The members of the Authority will have a contract in these specific amounts, which the Government will have to honour.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the answer given by the Honourable the Premier; in relation to pensions am I to understand that the members of the Authority could retire voluntarily after ten years' service and receive that pension, or be pensionable at the age of sixty-five.

MR. KEOUGH: No. The option would rest with the Government. The contract would be for ten years but with the option to renew it at the Government's discretion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister consider telling us the ages of the three gentlemen appointed. When will they be sixty-five years of age? Will they be sixty-five years of age by the time the ten years elapse?

MR. KEOUGH: Quite candidly I do not know their ages off-hand. I am under the impression that all of them are under fifty. I can probably supply that information for tomorrow. I could inquire personally.

MR. BROWNE: Now I have another question to ask: The Minister has referred to the similarity between

the pensions they will receive and pensions received in the civil service of the Federal Government. Supposing—God forbid—any member of the authority should die before the termination of the ten years, will his dependents be provided for with a pension?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think I ought perhaps to add a word on this point of the salaries and pensions and the rates of pensions and pension rights of these three men. I will put it this way: The Government for about twelve months or perhaps something between twelve months and eighteen months on very many occasions discussed this whole question of fishery development and came at first to one major conclusion; that there would be no fishery development if it were left to civil servants to carry it out. A second major conclusion was that the only hope of success in fishery development was to take the ablest men that Water Street had produced away from Water Street and put them to work, not becoming millionaires, not working for dividends but working for the people of Newfoundland in fisheries development. We asked them to name their own figure, name their own ticket, state their own salaries for which they would be completely satisfied and completely independent; and they named their own salaries. Mr. Young was a director of Crosbie and Company known to everyone up and down Water Street. I challenge any one to say that is not so—everyone up and down Water Street knows that Ross Young is perhaps the ablest young merchant from Maggoty Cove to Riverhead, and that he was, next to Chesley A. Crosbie himself, the ablest member of the firm of Crosbie and Company. What we had to do was

steal him away right from under Ches Crosbie's nose. That is what we had to do. To be frank about it that is what we had to do. And we had to offer him more, far more than he was getting or was likely to get from Crosbie and Company. That is the brutal truth of the matter. Ross Young had to disrupt his whole life's career. He had to wrench himself away from the one firm he had ever worked with in his life, with the exception of when he left school first he did work for two or three years in the Royal Stores Office, and except for that work his entire life he was with Crosbie and Company.

He was the first member who does not belong to the Crosbie Family to become a director of that firm, the first outsider ever to become a director of any wholly owned Crosbie firm. Ross Young was many weeks considering whether he would accept the position or not. He knew that an unscrupulous Opposition, if ever there were such a thing—

MR. FOGWILL: Of course not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He knew that an unscrupulous Opposition could make hell on earth. Yes, it could indeed go into his family, antecedents, rake up every member of his family who ever lived—an unscrupulous Opposition would do that. And if it did happen it would not be the first time in the history of Newfoundland. He was virtually going into politics without the glory and advantage of being in politics. From the obscurity of a mercantile office, where he was a respected member of the company, he had to go into a field in which the world and his uncle would regard themselves as his boss, quite free and privileged to say what they liked about him. So that it was a very



serious decision that Ross Young had to make. He was quite frank about it—if you are going to get me you are going to pay and pay plenty. Before I break away from Crosbie & Company you are going to pay and pay plenty. I was the one negotiating with him and I said; Ross, name your ticket—I have known Ross Young for a good many years.

Well, one man was not enough. We had to have a banker. Now we could have gone to the Bank of Montreal or either of the others, go to them and offer their bank managers the same salaries, for which, no doubt, they would have left their banks. But there was a bank manager in St. John's who had spent his life as a bank manager and then spent two or three years as top man and managing director of a very large fish concern; Northlantic Fisheries—Job's—i.e., Mr. Dunstan. He was a man with a lifetime of orthodox banking experience. For part of that lifetime, some four years of it, I think, manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia here in St. John's. As such he was the man who arranged the financing of a considerable amount of the fishery development for Fishery Products Limited, and because of that fact, he, as manager of that bank at that time, became thoroughly familiar with the last intimate details of the business of Fishery Products Limited, who are our biggest firm in the frozen fish industry in Newfoundland, by far the biggest of them—as manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia he was the man who was primarily responsible for financing Northlantic Fisheries, and as such, again he became intimately, most intimately acquainted with every last detail of the financial history and structure of that company as well. Then there were other fish firms as

well over that period of four years with whom and with whose affairs he became intimately acquainted, as only the manager of a bank doing the financing of a company is probably able to become aware, at least apart from the actual manager of the business himself—then, having spent those four years manager of a bank which did an enormous business in the fish trade, he became himself managing-director of the second largest frozen fish industry in Newfoundland, i.e., Northlantic, Job Brothers—

Having here in Newfoundland a man with that great amount of experience, not theoretical but practical, hardbitten, hard-fisted business experience in Newfoundland as well as outside it, and in addition to that his experience as managing-director of the second largest frozen fish firm, we were delighted and we are delighted that we got him as Chairman of this Authority.

Now the third man is Harry Winsor, an oldtime official of the Newfoundland Fisheries Board, and a representative of the Newfoundland Government at Washington for a number of years. I think during the war and then later he was attached to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, specializing in fish, because the FAO includes fisheries for the whole world in its interests. He was special personal assistant to the Head of the FAO stationed in Rome, where, in fact, I first made his acquaintance on the occasion of my visit to Rome with the Minister of Finance a couple of years ago.

Now, these are the three—we may be mistaken in this, but we believe by offering them twenty-five thousand dollars a year, and a five thou-



sand dollar a year pension when they have served for at least ten years, or when they reach the age of sixty-five, we believe, and we may be mistaken in this, that they are completely independent, once they get the contract signed, if the House passes it, and the Government signs the agreement with these three men, then they will be so completely independent of every fish merchant in Newfoundland, of every fisherman in Newfoundland, of the Government, of the Opposition, in so far as their own personal positions are concerned (not in so far as their work is concerned) they will be absolutely independent as long as they live on the earth, to their dying day. That is something that cannot be said of very many people; that to their dying day they are absolutely independent—until they draw their last breath on this earth they are completely independent. Because if they have served for ten years at twenty-five thousand dollars a year, and then retire on five thousand dollars a year pension, knowing that if they die their widows will get twenty-five hundred dollars a year as long as they live; that is absolute financial independence, as absolute as money can make it. If that were money in the bank it could not mean the same independence. So long as there is a Government in Newfoundland they are sure of that money. Now that is absolute financial independence.

Their loyalty, apart from the loyalty they owe to their God and to their families, their only loyalty is to the Government of Newfoundland. Now maybe we are mistaken.

MR. HOLLETT: You could be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could be mistaken. Maybe you don't get abso-

lute loyalty by paying those great salaries, maybe you don't. I have known cases in history, and not necessarily ancient history, where great salaries did not in fact produce absolute loyalty from those who received the salaries; I have known cases like that in history. We may be wrong, all of us on this side, we may be wrong in believing, as we do, that absolute financial independence for these three men will produce loyalty, absolute loyalty to what they believe to be in the best interest of Newfoundland. We may be wrong in that belief, but that is what we believe—we believe that. Now I will admit quite frankly, and I am not saying it tonight for the first time, and the Opposition will I believe and I hope credit me with enough common sense to admit that I probably thought of this before tonight. This is not a thought that is coming to me now for the first time—i.e., when it is announced on the air tonight and tomorrow that we are asking authority to pay these men twenty-five thousand dollars each there will be thousands of fishermen who will say: Well, Glory be to God! What is going on? Glory be to God! You don't mean to say you are paying them twenty-five thousand dollars a year each? I know, and I knew last year when we were discussing this matter—but I am in this position, I have said it here in this House before, and I am going to say it again now—I have served Newfoundland this past seven or eight years and I am prepared to go on for quite a number of years, but if I don't go on, if the people retire me, I will go out of office without shedding one tear, and I hope my colleagues feel the same way about it, but at least that is how I feel. If the fishermen of Newfoundland have any doubt about the wis-

dom of what we have done then, in the next election, they have the right, and the remedy is very simple, the right to kick us out?

MR. HOLLETT: When is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend said early November. He did not tell me what date. I heard him on the radio Saturday night when he announced this election would be in early November. I listened with great interest and indeed great curiosity, as I was hoping he could say the date.

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): Bonfire night.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition said that—he seemed to know when the next election is to be. He said he knows it is to be early in November. But I think he might go a step further and tell us what date.

MR. HOLLETT: What sub-section is that under?

MR. SMALLWOOD: But whatever the date is, I will say this, the fishermen of Newfoundland, if they think that we have done wrong in paying these three men about the same kind of salaries that Bowaters and the A.N.D. Company pay to their top executives—

DR. ROWE: Less.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't mean their tip-top executives, but their general managers—if the fishermen of Newfoundland think that the Government have done wrong in paying these three top executives in the fishery Development Authority at about the same rate as Bowaters pay their top directors, then the fishermen have their remedy, they will vote

us out, kick us out—and I for one at least will go out without a murmur, without the shedding of a single tear. I say this now; I do not believe it is possible, and I will go further and say, in their hearts the Opposition do not believe it is possible, I don't think that even the Opposition members believe in their hearts that it would be possible to go down on Water Street and pick three able men from the fishery industry and get them for less than twenty-five thousand dollars a year. Now, for political reasons, especially if they are convinced that there is an election this year, for political reasons they won't admit that. They will say it is scandalous, that it is disgraceful, that is outrageous, ridiculous, foolish, stupid, everything but right, that we should pay top rates of pay, almost as much as Cabinet Ministers get in Ottawa, that we should pay such salaries to those who are to introduce the greatest programme of fishery development in the history of North America. Now that may be wrong, but that is what we are doing, and if that means that we are going to be defeated in the coming election whether it be in November or in October or July or August or September or in early December, whether it be in 1954 or 1955 or 1956, whenever it is, if it means we are going to be defeated because we picked the best men we could find and paid them such high salaries, okay, well and good, we will go out and the new Government will then try to remedy the situation and try to get cheap men to do a big job for cheap wages, and succeed where we failed.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Honourable the Premier won't rise to a point of order if I should happen to wander from this

particular section. I am sure I have very great difficulty in locating that point of order, in view of what he said, he has taken everything, political mostly, and said the things that he thought we ought to say in the Opposition. He did not say we were an unscrupulous Opposition but he went as near to it, Mr. Chairman, as he could possibly go.

Getting back to that section, Sir, I am surprised to have heard the Premier say that this was a programme which he could not trust to the civil servants to do, or words to that effect, that we have no civil servants in this country, Mr. Chairman, to take on such a job. I regret very much that the Honourable the Premier of this little Province has seen fit to state that, because, Sir, I fully remember when the Commission of Government came in here so many years ago one of the first things they set out to do was to build up the civil service to a standard which would be a credit to the country. And I have said myself here on many occasions, and the Honourable Premier has said, that we have as fine a civil service in Newfoundland as there is in any province across the whole of Canada. And I maintain, Sir, that if it had been the will and wish of the Government to obtain three men they could have gone to the civil service and gotten three men equally as good as these three men whom we have heard lauded to the skies. I regret that the Honourable the Premier saw fit to say this. I can name a civil servant we saw this morning, Mr. Chairman, who has qualifications no man in this House has, and I am not putting the qualification standard very high—no, I will not say that Sir. I take that back. Who am I to judge any man's

qualifications? I merely have opinions that is all.

Now there is another thing which strikes me about the men that have been chosen. I note the Premier has said that one man, Mr. Young, I believe said: "You will have to pay me if you are to get me." Then the Premier told him to name his price. The price was twenty-five thousand dollars a year; five thousand dollars a year pension, and if I die twenty-five hundred dollars a year to my wife. That is the price Mr. Young gave as his worth to the people of Newfoundland, twenty-five thousand dollars a year for the next ten years. That is the price, said Mr. Young, you will have to pay me if you want to get me.

Mr. Dunstan said, "I am to be chairman and I want five hundred dollars more." I take it Mr. Winsor said the same thing. Now, Mr. Chairman, suppose we grant all that as we must, the Minister said so—it is not what these men are worth that concerns me. I have no way to estimate their value in dollars and cents whatsoever, but I do say, Sir, that this province is not in such a flourishing condition today or ever will be that it can afford to pay civil servants twenty-five thousand dollars a year—that is all these men are, civil servants—they are civil servants. And I see no reason why they should not be content to live in this little province of ours, their province I take it at least in one case for sure—I am not so sure about the others, but they ought to be able to live in this little country, Sir, on as high, or as low if you like, a salary as any civil servants in this country, some of whom are getting ten thousand dollars a year. I grant you, Sir, that these may be very valuable men, Mr. Dunstan has been spoken of by the Premier as the man,

I believe who put Monroes Fishery Products on their feet, he arranged all the great financing for them and did the same for Job's. I know that Northlantic Fisheries at one time was guaranteed by this Government \$675,000 and they borrowed \$650,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that is a little away from this clause now. I think the honourable member is wandering.

MR. HOLLETT: Even though I bow to the ruling, I do remember the Premier referring to and coupling Mr. Dunstan with Northlantic Fisheries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not in detail.

MR. HOLLETT: I say there was also another company with whom he was intimately connected, but I will come to that in another section.

Mr. Young also when he was a director of Crosbie and Company arranged a good bit of the financing of that company. I dare say I have some record of these here. I have them also of Northlantic Fisheries and also of the Bonavista Cold Storage in which Mr. Dunstan was very greatly interested and arranged some financial deal with the Government. Both of them I say are very brilliant men when it comes to finances. Mr. Winsor is comparatively young. I would say he is less than forty. What experience he has in handling fishery matters and financing I don't know. But I would say that these three men are undoubtedly men of integrity and they may be worth a lot of money, but I say this province cannot afford to pay such high salaries. We have already had experience of a twenty-five thousand dollars a year man in this country and that in itself should prove to the Premier and the Government that high salaries do not guar-

antee, I was going to say integrity, but it does not guarantee anything, Sir. And if, as the Honourable the Premier says, he thought they should name their own price and we would have them body and soul until they die, until they draw their last breath, he may be mistaken and he may be mistaken as to the value of these men. I have a feeling, Sir, that when you give a man absolute independence with no fear of an unscrupulous Opposition, no fear of the Government, as the Honourable the Premier said—I suppose they worship the Almighty—but they are absolutely independent—I fear, Sir, that sometimes when a man gets into that state of mind, that his twenty-five thousand dollars salary a year, might occasion in such people, I fear for the mental welfare of such people.

We have to remember, Sir, that last year or the year before we borrowed ten million dollars to run this country. This year we got to borrow another ten million to run this country, yet here we go out and say, "Name your price." You want twenty-five thousand dollars a year, "okay come on." I think we are a little bit too flush with our money, Sir, and we have been for quite a long time—we have been gambling on a card on a draw—Draw Poker—the Premier has admitted that is what we have been doing—"It is worth a gamble." Now, I have a great regard for the Premier in many ways, but I do say this: He is a gambler. Now gamblers do, Sir, sometimes make good, and I do sincerely hope that the Honourable the Premier will make good in this his latest gamble.

I want, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, to thank the Honourable Minister of Fisheries for giving us the information, which we expected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to reply to my honourable friend in one regard, and that is in respect to his reference to civil servants, or his reference to my reference to civil servants. I don't recall that I said anything derogatory of our civil servants, I don't recall that at all.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not say you did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I gathered the impression from the honourable gentleman that he rather did gather that I said something derogatory of our civil servants. I am glad to hear now he did not think I said anything derogatory, or that what I said was meant to be so.

Now, as I recall, what I said was this: We had our choice of selecting the personnel of the Fisheries Development Authority from two types of persons, the civil service or the mercantile trade, i.e., Water Street, the fish merchant class. We decided on the latter. Now I don't think that there is anything wrong with that. I don't think there is anything in that derogatory to the civil service.

MR. HOLLETT: May I correct the Honourable the Premier? What he did say was, "We knew we could not get this job done by the civil service."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, quite so. I remember Mr. W. H. Gorvin devising a great fisheries rehabilitation scheme, which comprehended even more than the fisheries and the fishermen. I remember his asking my opinion on it, and I remember well what my reply was. My reply was to ask him the question, how did he expect his plan, which came to be known as the "Gorvin Plan," to be carried out, did he think the civil

service would do it, did he think he would get it done by the civil servants? Did he think that was the way to get the plan carried out—to get the civil service to do it? He replied by asking me what I would suggest.

I told him my suggestion was that he had to go right into the camp of the enemy and pull their best captains and their best leaders that he could get, and that that took real money to do. Now he was part and parcel of a civil service government, the Commission of Government, and to him it was a horrifying thought, an unorthodox thought to suggest a government should go out and pick the ablest men they could find right on Water Street. That never did occur to him. Their dependence was in the civil service. Where now is the Gorvin Plan? It fell in the winter of 1935, that is where the Gorvin Plan is.

Now we could have looked for these able fishermen in the civil service, to whom my honourable friend referred. He himself said you can look around in the civil service and you will find very able men. Of that there is no doubt. But he did not say able men in the fishing industry, in the fish trade. I notice that he did not say that. Now if there are such they won't be long before being seconded over to the fishery development. If we have men in the civil service outstandingly able, as able as Ross Young is as a director of a big mercantile firm in the fish industry, as Harry Dunstan is in the banking and general commerce and financial industry of this island of Newfoundland, if we have such men in the civil service their place is undoubtedly with the Fisheries Development Authority. I just wanted to make that



one point there clear. We have men in the civil service of Newfoundland who are outstandingly able and brilliant and who have great experience, men of great integrity, men of great ambition, there is no doubt at all. We know them, we have daily contact with them. But I don't know any of them with outstanding experience in the fishing industry, in the fish trade of Newfoundland such as to qualify them to take charge for the next ten years or fifteen years of great reorganization, a great rehabilitation, a great development programme, to be the generals, the field marshals, the chiefs-of-staff, the board of strategy, whatever you like. That is what they are, always of course, subject to the Government, because the Government whoever the personnel always are the Government. They cannot abdicate while they occupy office. They must use their power. So over the Fisheries Development Authority will be the Government. But under the Government they will be the supreme command. That is the word I was looking for, "The Supreme Command" in fisheries development in Newfoundland. I don't think, if I lose every civil service vote from here on, I must say quite candidly that I don't think you will get a great programme of fisheries development successfully carried out by civil servants. I repeat it—I don't think we will.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have to make one or two observations and ask one or two questions: I think we have to be very practical about this although the Premier looks at it as war and of a supreme command under the Government. In the first place what happens if one of the gentlemen should be so unfortunate as to die within the ten years? Will

his widow get a pension? The second question I would ask is this: I am not saying it is likely to happen. It is a provision that the highest officials of this or any other country, the chief justice of the Supreme Court even is removable by an address by both Houses of Parliament. Is there any authority in this country to remove one of the members of the Fisheries Development Authority should he misbehave?

MR. FORSEY: The answer to the first part of the question is contained in clause 5, sub-clause 3.

MR. KEOUGH: It did not occur to me when the honourable and learned member for St. John's West asked the first time, but as the Honourable Minister of Health says; it is contained in sub-clause 3 of Clause 5. The pension will be available only when a member of the Authority has served for a period of not less than ten years.

MR. BROWNE: Then they are not independent and their families are not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are getting twenty-five thousand dollars a year in the meantime.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable the Premier speaks very highly of these men. But there is such a thing as people dying unexpectedly. Only in the last few days we had an instance of that in the death of a celebrated man famous all over the world, who died at the early age of fifty-two. If one of these men should die, is there no pension then for his widow?

MR. KEOUGH: As provided here. Not within the ten years. They have



to serve for ten years before they get pension rights.

In answer to the other question I would say quite definitely that the Legislature can at any time authorize a change in or the abrogation of a contract it ordered or provided authority for in the first place.

MR. BROWNE: Then they are not independent.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member could tell us, has any agreement as yet been drawn up, and if so under what conditions and what salaries are indicated?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, as to the first part of the question, no formal agreement has yet been drawn. The members of the Authority who are employed by the Government have been given, I might say, an undertaking, whether it is in writing or not I cannot say from memory, but in any case an undertaking in the terms just outlined in regard to salaries and pension rights. That is all at the moment. As to conditions they take office under there is certainly not anything pending on that yet.

MR. BROWNE: Just one more question—if the Government makes regulations is there any provision in this Act where they should be tabled in the House?

MR. KEOUGH: That is provided by the section.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is in virtually every other Act we ever passed.

Clause 5 carried. Clause 6 read:

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, is not that going too far altogether in the other extreme. There is no need of having it as drastic as

all that. I understood these terms to apply to the members of the Authority and certainly not to Ministers or officials, certainly it was not necessary to do that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: How would you draw the line?

MR. BROWNE: I would say at the Authority. I don't imagine there are going to be many people with very high salaries. The intention, I understood, was to have them apply to the Authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you have half a dozen men around the Island as general managers of plants under the Fisheries Development Authority, do you want these to be men with axes to grind of their own in other fishery companies, or to be as independent as you can make them?

MR. BROWNE: That is true. But this is so sweeping and far-reaching. It does not draw any line at all. It does not make any distinction between a manager and a fisherman working—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. I don't see how it may be otherwise. How are you going to draw a line?

MR. BROWNE: I think you could draw one.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could state definitely if these three men have severed their connections with various corporations with whom they were interested? I have in my hand here an agreement between the Government and the Bonavista Cold Storage, Hazen Russell and his associate, and I note it was signed in the presence of Mr. Clive Planta and signed by you as Minister of Fisheries; and by H. A. Dunstan, agent of H. A. Rus-

sell. I take it that is the same man. Has he vacated his position as in that agreement? If so who takes his position in that agreement?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the members of the Authority, before they were employed were given the quite definite undertaking that they would have to sever all connections either directly or indirectly with any other fishing enterprise, and subsequently, I should say no later than a month or so ago, arising out of a question addressed to me in this House, I made a specific inquiry of the members of the Authority asking if they had severed all connections with fishing enterprises, and I was told by them that they had.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if that is so, who takes the place of H. Dunstan in this particular agreement in which the Government is very definitely committed to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who takes the place of the Minister of Fisheries if you have a new one?

MR. HOLLETT: I take it, a new minister of fisheries. But, is there a new Mr. Dunstan, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman think that if there is a new minister of fisheries he then has to sign that agreement? Is it not binding under the signature of the old minister who has ceased to be a minister.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case it is binding upon Mr. Dunstan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say it was binding on the old minister. I said it was binding. There is no need of substituting a new director any more than there is a need of substituting a new minister.

MR. HOLLETT: I am afraid the Honourable the Premier is mistaken. I don't need to read all that agreement, but in every agreement there has to be a certain number of signatures, and I take it that, Mr. Dunstan is no longer there or has no longer any interest under this agreement. Most agreements, Sir, do give the parties signing some benefit. In that instance Mr. Dunstan was an associate of Mr. Hazen Russell to whom incidentally this Government loaned a million dollars or thereabouts, I believe. I would like to know if he is no longer there, who has his place?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, suppose the other man died?

MR. HOLLETT: He would not get any benefit then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a question of benefits. But if all the persons who had signed it have since died the agreement is none the less an agreement and is no less binding. They don't have to sign a new one and get new signatures now because he was then a director and signed it, and since he has signed it, ceased to be a director. That does not follow. My honourable friend's follower on his immediate right can set him right on that.

MR. HOLLETT: No member of the Authority (that is Dunstan) shall be directly or indirectly employed or interested in any fishery enterprise—this is a fishery enterprise to which his signature is affixed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But he has ceased to be interested in it since then.

MR. HOLLETT: How do we know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister has informed the committee—that is how.

MR. FORSEY: The benefits accruing revert to the person to whom Mr. Dunstan sold his shares.

DR. POTTLE: That is none of our business.

MR. HOLLETT: Someone must know who signed the agreement, Mr. Dunstan's name is here. Who takes his place?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nobody takes his place. Nobody takes his place as signatory of the agreement.

MR. HOLLETT: Somebody takes his benefits. Is the honourable Minister able to inform this House that Mr. Dunstan has given up his benefits under this agreement?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I have just given the House such an assurance.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us where the head office is situated at the present time?

MR. KEOUGH: The head office is on the third floor of the King George V Institute Building.

MR. BROWNE: They are not going to stay there?

MR. KEOUGH: As far as I know.

MR. HOLLETT: I suppose the Minister is not concerned by the fact that they may be contaminated by the nasty fish merchants on Water Street.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have thought of that, but will take a chance on that.

MR. HOLLETT: That is dangerous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is dangerous but there is a bodyguard around them.

MR. BROWNE: This here is an unusual oath to take. It differs somewhat from the usual oath taken by civil servants who have to give, I believe an oath of allegiance as well. It would prevent them from disclosing information to the Court if they were called as witnesses. Am I correct in thinking so?

MR. KEOUGH: In my opinion—naturally my department depended upon the Department of the Attorney General for the drafting of considerable sections of this Act, and this was one of the sections inserted by the Department of the Attorney General, and passed my department by without question. I would say though, by all means if required by the Court to divulge information they would divulge it.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister can assure this House that this oath has been taken?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is, no, and members of the Authority and employees will not take it until the legislation is passed.

MR. HOLLETT: Before the Act as such? They have been acting for a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are not acting as such until this Act is law.

Clause 6 carried. Clauses 7 through 9 read—carried.

Clause 10 read.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice there a reference to the secretary of the Authority. Is there a secretary to the Authority?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the manager of the three loan boards and the industrial development loan board, Mr. Gerald Drover, has been appointed as acting secretary. He is chairman of the loan boards.

MR. BROWNE: Has he had any improvement in his salary?

MR. KEOUGH: He does not receive any remuneration because of being acting secretary of the Authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I may add to that the fact that it was considered by the Government to be sound to make the gentleman who was and is chairman of the three loan boards, one of which is a fisheries loan board, secretary of the Fisheries Development Authority and the Fisheries Loan Board and its funds and purposes, and the liaison consists of Mr. Gerald Drover who is chairman of the Fisheries Development Loan Board and secretary of the Fisheries Development Authority. That was a deliberate decision on our part. It has not affected his salary.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I should have known about this. Has Mr. Drover taken the position formerly occupied by Mr. Baxter?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: At the same salary of ten thousand dollars a year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, as chairman of all three loan boards.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister point out the necessity for a fisheries loan board after this Authority becomes effective?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same need as before.

MR. HOLLETT: The Fisheries Development Authority has authority

to lend money, and that constitutes also the authority of the Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Fisheries Development Loan Board is an institution of the Government of Newfoundland, but it is also an instrument of the Government of Canada. It has been designated by the Government of Canada as the agency in this Province through which the Government of Canada pay bonuses on certain types of fishing boats. The Newfoundland Fisheries Development Loan Board has been designated by the Government of Canada as the Government of Canada's agent in this Province through which it pays to certain fishermen, under certain conditions, a bonus on certain types of fishing boats. There is no reason that we have seen to abolish the Fisheries Development Loan Board, which is set up primarily to make loans to individual fishermen or small groups of fishermen. The need to make these loans will continue even though there is a Fisheries Development Authority, which, I suggest, is to concern itself with matters of far wider range than that only of making loans, small loans, to individual fishermen. But the liaison is needed so that there will be no conflict, no competition, no overlapping. The liaison is created by appointing the chairman of the much smaller Board to be the secretary of the much larger body.

MR. BROWNE: In describing that loan board there, the Honourable Minister used the term; "Fisheries Development Loan Board": Is that a new title given it. I understood—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may have added the word "Development." To

me it is the most beautiful word in the English language, a word I love. There is no word more beautiful. It is closest to my heart, and it occurs to me in everything I say; like "Loan" and "Lend" mean mystery to the "Tories."

MR. HOLLETT: I am glad to see the Honourable the Premier is beginning to develop. I maintain, Sir, there is no reason for this Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I say there is the honourable gentleman ought to say there is not.

MR. HOLLETT: Not at all. After all you are developing or are supposed to be developing. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but the Honourable the Premier has said that the Fisheries Loan Board, apparently of Canada, or the people who pay the bonus, pay the money through our Fisheries Loan Board. Could they not just as easily pay it through the Fisheries Development Authority now being set up particularly as the chairman of the Loan Board has become secretary of the Authority. It seems to me to be a rather unique setup where the chairman of one board becomes the secretary of another board, both of them having to do with fish. There is too much duplication in this business, Sir. I maintained all along that is half the trouble with our fisheries. I maintain the Federal Government and the Provincial Government are paying out enough in salaries in the various fishery setups to support quite comfortably every fisherman we have in the country today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What kind of a statement is that?

MR. HOLLETT: That is a statement which is absolutely correct. I

challenge the Premier to check the figures and see, especially on twenty-five thousand a year salaries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not worthy of the honourable gentleman. That is not a contribution to this debate at all.

MR. HOLLETT: You are the judge?

Clause carried.

Clause 11 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I draw the attention of the Minister and the Premier to the fact that that is the only place where it says the regulations must be laid on the table, and it does not apply to the previous section I drew to the attention of the Minister, Section 5, sub-section 3 where regulations may also be made. I think the Minister should give consideration to making that a general provision instead of just applying it to that one.

MR. KEOUGH: When I replied to the honourable member before, I replied only from memory and I did think that section with regard to regulations covered all which had to be made under this Act, and the reason for the regulations here is only specifically with regard to the clause. For my own part I would have no objections.

MR. BROWNE: If we could let that clause stand then?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, and have a general clause to cover tabling all regulations. I will take the matter up with the Attorney General.

Clause 11 stand.

Clause 12 read:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I

do not like the words: "Subject to the approval of the Minister." Is there any reason why that Authority should have the approval of the Minister on everybody they employ? It might be the making of good politics you know. After all the Authority has to come to the Minister and say: "John Jones now wants a job. He is a good man. What do you think about it?" I think it puts the Minister in a position he would just as soon not be in. I would suggest that could be amended to some benefit.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have something to say here in regard to the words: "Employ technical, professional and other personnel." I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Premier is too much impressed by the business and technical end of this whole programme. The recommendation of the Walsh Committee was that the fishermen should be enabled to get ownership in the plants that are established in the various communities. I don't see any special reference in this Bill providing for the education of fishermen along co-operative lines. Now this Authority is going to have so much authority and so much power, yet there is no special reference made to the question of co-operatives, and that ought to be the major feature, because this is not only a business venture, in fact this is not a business venture at all. This is a rehabilitation measure that should really build from the ground up, and at the same time that the business of fishing is carried on and new plants are being erected and operated there should be infused into the whole programme an educational policy, especially along the lines of the co-operative movement, so that the fishermen, especially in places where they have not had

the advantage of being instructed in the co-operative movement, may bring these ideas into play. Now the Minister is aware and the Premier is aware that the co-operative movement has been advocated before in this country, and was regarded at one time as being the means of salvation for the fishermen. I am sure that the Minister has often advocated that.

In the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia, since 1928 when the Federal Government appointed Dr. Coady to organize the fishery into co-operatives, they have made great strides, and the Maritime United Fishermen is a result. Now I thought, and I mentioned it before, when the Federation of Fishermen was formed here; it would have been a good thing to have appointed somebody like Dr. Coady and employed him all the year around to teach the co-operative idea to the fishermen. And I do not believe that this scheme will have as good a chance of success if it is kept entirely on a business basis. On a business basis, in my opinion, it is just state socialism, that is all it is. But if we educate or help to educate these fishermen along co-operative lines so that they can take over the business themselves eventually, you do something more than try to build up a business, you try to build up a people, you give them an interest in their own affairs which they won't get by being employed as servants. Now the Minister himself knows perhaps a great deal more about the co-operative movement than I do. He certainly has had direct contact with members of co-operative societies, and he knows the inspiration the co-operative movement has been to many people. Those who are not familiar with the working of the co-operative movement don't know what that inspiration means. I



would like to see right from the very beginning of this work emphasis being placed upon the importance of the principles of co-operation being adopted right from the beginning.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Chairman, I don't see what that has to do with this clause which says that; subject to the approval of the Minister the Authority may employ technical professional and administrative and other personnel for the proper carrying out of its work. Let us assume for the sake of argument that this whole development in the fisheries was to be a co-operative development, a development consisting in the first place of a formation of well trained and well equipped co-operatives, and in the second place of those co-operatives carrying on the actual development. Let us assume that. Is it going to be suggested that there would be no need to employ technical, professional and administrative and other personnel for the proper carrying out of the work? I am sure that is not suggested. The most successful co-operatives in the world in any country you like to take are those co-operatives who employ the best scientists, the best technicians. I sat at lunch with the top executives of the whole co-operative movement of Sweden in the City of Stockholm, one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and the great skyscraper buildings of Stockholm are undoubtedly the most beautiful skyscraper buildings in Sweden and perhaps the most beautiful in all the countries of Europe is one erected in that great city by the central co-operative movement of Sweden. On the top floor of this magnificent building, which gives you a superb view of the whole panorama of Stockholm we had lunch. That movement in Sweden is one of the

greatest housing organizations in all of Europe, and one of the biggest papers in Sweden that has the largest circulation in Sweden is the co-operative paper both daily and weekly and then a monthly magazine, all three of which have the biggest circulation in their respective fields. They own cement mills, gypsum plants, they own all kinds of machinery enterprises and of course virtually every family in Sweden buys from a co-operative shop. You will find "CONSUM" in large letters painted on the front door of literally thousands of shops.

Now what do you find in Sweden? You find the government there scraping the world, going all over the earth to all nations to pick up the best men or the best women they can find with the best technical training. Because the co-operative movement, if it is truly to succeed, has to outsmart private enterprise, got to be better than private enterprise. It must not be a cheap and poor imitation of private enterprise. If it is not better it has no right to exist and its justification disappears. The great co-operative movement of the United States, the great primary producers' movement does precisely that. They maintain their own research laboratories, their own specialized merchandizing experts. Talk about salaries: They have a couple of movements in the United States that pay up to one hundred thousand dollars a year for top ranking men. And if a great co-operative movement does a hundred, two hundred, three hundred or five hundred million dollars' worth of business a year they need the very greatest technicians and the very greatest men on their administrative staff, and to get them they have to compete with private enterprise. If

they do not pay the salaries to get that type of men private companies will. So to get them they have to pay these great salaries. I remember discussing the matter with Edward Fielding the owner of Fieldings Department Stores in Boston, one of the great advocates of the co-operative movement in the United States. It is the same everywhere. If you have a co-operative movement you must have the best, I say the best, the best technical and administrative and other personnel for the proper carrying on of its work. It is not less so in the case of fisheries development, not less so. You have private enterprise—you have Arthur Monroe for example bringing in Germans, Danes, Swedes at this moment, because he is a man who is trying to make a dollar, and that is what he is in business for, not perhaps primarily with Arthur Monroe, but very largely, as most businessmen are in business to make money and pay dividends on their shares, and want to succeed. He wants the best chemists, the best technologists, the best marine experts he can get. He does not care what their nationality is, he just does not care. Similarly the Fisheries Development Authority has got to—is that not obvious, what are we wasting time about in debating that? In 1954 debating whether the Fisheries Development Authority should have the right to employ technical, administrative and other personnel. Of course they should have that right, and they should have the right to go anywhere in the world, this side of the Iron Curtain, because we don't want Communists in Newfoundland, but anywhere in the world they can go they should. Of course we will be hearing—not only are they to get these staggering salaries but can bring in

all sorts of foreigners, foreign tongues—but who cares.

MR. BROWNE: I can't say I am sorry the Premier misunderstood my remark because we have had a very interesting interlude. What I was saying was that the Authority should engage someone who has a very high knowledge of the co-operative movement to work with them, who would not confine himself to the business end and the scientific end but to the educational end. I stress that it is a most important part of the work, and I am afraid—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not going to contradict the honourable and learned gentleman when he makes that point about the work but I do contradict him when he said that is the work for the Fisheries Development Authority to do. It is not—I used to think it was the work of the Department of Co-operatives. This Government created a Department of Co-operatives, and appointed a Minister of Co-operatives, or at least asked the Lieutenant Governor to appoint a Minister of Co-operatives which His Honour did, and we have had a Minister of Co-operatives from that day to this. We have now changed our minds, after five years, indeed after some three years we changed our minds on that, and decided that it is not properly the function of the Government to carry on a propaganda programme for the Co-operative Movement or indeed to carry on an educational movement amongst fishermen and others in favour of the co-operative movement. We decided that some two years ago.

My colleague announced at a convention in Grand Falls, a co-operative convention, at which Dr. Coady was present, he announced that quite properly we had decided in Cabinet, after

careful consideration, and some three years experience, it was not in the best interest of the co-operative movement that the Government should sponsor it through the means of a Government department. My honourable colleague announced that fact. So now our policy is to have the university sponsor it in its extension department. I won't go into that. I described it in the course of my remarks in second reading. Let the university, as other universities have done all across this North American Continent north and south of the border, let the university do it (1) as a great educational effort and (2) as a great sociological effort, through its extension department, but not this. We did not take Ross Young off Water Street and Dunstan out of a bank and Harry Winsor back from Rome because the whole approach is a sociological one, perhaps Harry Winsor, but not these two business men out of a bank and an office to start a co-operative movement.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I accept all the Premier has said, but the point that I think I gathered from what my honourable leader said is, accepting the position that these men are highly competent people, that they are to be given every authority, why should we have them subject to the approval of the Minister? Have we not enough confidence in these people to say—go ahead, run your own show, in your own way, hire whom you want—that is, I take it the point.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the point, and the honourable the Premier has supported that because he said that he expected these highly paid officials of this Authority to go ahead and do something absolutely apart from co-operative

work. They are in full charge, twenty-five thousand dollars a year men. We cannot do it. The Department of Fisheries cannot do it. The Department of Co-operatives cannot do it. So we got the Authority to do it. Yet it says here, subject to the approval of the Minister, a mere ten thousand dollar a year man.

MR. KEOUGH: Seven.

MR. HOLLETT: I beg your pardon! These twenty-five thousand dollars a year men have to come and see the Minister, a seven thousand dollar a year man, and get his approval when they can't get John Jones to clean out the fish bins in the morning or something like that. It does not matter who they employ. Another point I should make is this: This section says, by reason of their being hired by this Authority does not automatically make them civil servants. Why then have the approval of the Minister? If of anybody they should have the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I see no reason—I would like to move, but I don't think I should—I make the motion that "Subject to the approval of the Minister" be deleted and it will then read: The Authority may employ technical, professional, administrative, and other personnel. Unless the Minister prefers to put in "subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council." I am not sure the Government will not use political interference in any way in the hiring of technicians—that is the point I would like to make.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, there never was a government in Newfoundland's history who took so little notice of party politics in employing its important people.

Never was there a government like it. There never was before. Even the Commission of Government was not so careful to avoid politics or party politics and all considerations of party politics when it came to selecting men for really great positions. I could name them to you one after the other, at least a dozen since we have been in office. We have been complimented repeatedly, and by the Opposition more than once, for the fact that we have kept politics out of our choice of civil servants. The Auditor General is a very good case in point. I have no more notion of what the Auditor General's politics are, whether he is a Liberal or a Tory, than the man in the moon, I have not the foggiest notion. But he is a good auditor general. The papers both wrote an editorial complimenting the Government on selecting Mr. Allen to be Auditor General. We selected—

MR. BROWNE: Don't go into detail.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We selected Mr. Baxter to be the first chairman of the three loan boards. We took him clean out of the Royal Bank of Canada. He turned out not to be too successful because he continued to be the banker, and was not able after so long a lifetime operating as a banker to relax and be the type of man as chairman of the Boards, being approached daily by ordinary fishermen, should be. He did not know how to deal with ordinary fishermen. He was used to dealing with businessmen. I could name at least a dozen. On the other hand in some positions when we pick men invariably in announcing their appointment I always point to their political record. Mr. Anthony Muldowney, for instance, and before him Mr. Gregory Power, when

we submitted his name to the Cabinet recommending the Cabinet to appoint him. All appointments made in Cabinet, in fact, I make known, the only ones I have the right to recommend, incidentally recommendations for appointment of deputy-ministers is my prerogative while I occupy this Office and nobody has any say in the matter. The Premier always selects the deputy-ministers as he does the ministers, and the chairman of important boards is a selection of the Premier's. And when I asked my colleagues to appoint Mr. Power, then I announced his appointment as a man who had been very active and prominent in the Confederation Campaign, assistant campaign manager to myself, editor of a newspaper, an ardent Confederate, and then, as Personal Assistant to the Premier. When I announced Mr. Muldowney's appointment to the same position, following on the retirement of Mr. Power on his entering politics, I announced that Mr. Muldowney had with me in Gander launched the Confederation Movement, and he has been an ardent and loyal Confederate from the beginning. Similarly with other appointments of that type. Now these men; do not imagine for one moment that with a change of government they would be permitted by the new government to hold their offices. They don't think so. They don't believe for a moment, because they are frankly men who have been active and prominent in political life of the Province. But when it comes to the other type, the enduring, permanent type of appointment such as the auditor general, the controller of the treasury, I don't know to this moment in all my dealings with Mr. George Allen, any more than I have heard it mentioned, I don't know, and furthermore that is

only half the story, as I don't care. Similarly take the Fisheries Development Authority, one man of the three I know to be a Liberal, because as a matter of fact he was once an officer of the Laurier Club, I presume therefore he is still a Liberal but as to the other two I have not the foggiest notion. One is the nephew of the Leader of the Opposition, and for all I know he may be a Tory.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say tainted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You say he is a tainted Liberal anyway. Now I don't think my honourable friends meant that. I don't think they are one bit afraid that the Fisheries Development Authority are themselves going to exercise political favour or that the Minister is going to ask them to. I don't believe they think that for a moment, and certainly that is not the case.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, there is just one slight inaccuracy, if the Premier would allow me. He said he took Mr. Baxter out of a bank. Is it not a fact that Mr. Baxter had been retired.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, about a year before he retired he was asked by me if he would accept the position. A year before he retired I asked him to accept the position and he agreed to accept it provided the directors of his bank agreed, and provided he could have a short vacation in British Columbia before returning to take up his duties.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, if I might address myself to the point the Opposition has raised about the latitude that ought to be given to appointments under this clause. I think anybody looking at this clause

dispassionately, and looking at the job which the Fisheries Development Authority has to do, will see the sense of the position this Government has taken in framing the clause in this fashion, i.e. that we could not agree to the Authority having carte blanche, especially in the early stages to employ such help as it deems necessary. Neither in the other extreme could we agree to having every appointment submitted for the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, which means going into a rather circuitous and devious way. This method establishes a happy medium between the two, too great latitudes in one instance and too great restrictions on the other hand.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I just raised the point because I really think, if this Government is going to employ three men at twenty-five thousand dollars a year, three such men with qualifications as described to us; and that one of them happens to be my nephew that in itself should be a recommendation, I admit; but apart from that, with twenty-five thousand dollar a year men, don't you think they ought not to have to go to a seven thousand dollar a year man to get the go-ahead to hire the underdog, sort of. I don't think there is any necessity, and I doubt if the Minister would want it that way. I think somebody should have to approve it because the Government will have to pay the bill, at least the people. I was a little bit puzzled, if I may put it that way, that the Premier when he mentioned Mr. Muldowney's appointment forgot to mention Mr. Banfield and Mr. Vincent. I take it they must be prominent Tories. Then there was one of the fisheries board who was supposed to be a Liberal because he was a Member

of the Laurier Club. I might point out that all members of the Laurier Club are not Liberals all the time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We root them out, you know, we root them out.

MR. HOLLETT: What was the name of that other political party—the Comic Union, I believe—one of the members of the Fisheries Authority was a member of that. So that I agree with the Premier that it does not make any difference about a man's politics.

DR. ROWE: That was rather an interesting motion the Honourable Leader of the Opposition put forward, i.e., if the head of a department is getting less than the head of any organization or happens to get less than some organizer who runs that organization he cannot very well give orders to him. By the same token I happen to be one of the seven thousand dollars a year man too, and I happen to have in my department men who receive more than seven thousand dollars a year.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you like that?

DR. ROWE: It looks as if I cannot really give them orders, if you extend that argument. As it happens, every deputy-minister now gets more than seven thousand dollars a year.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see a twenty-five thousand dollars a year man going to a seven thousand dollars a year man for approval to hire or fire help.

MR. KEOUGH: Nevertheless the seven thousand dollars a year man does represent the Government, and I am afraid that is the way it is going to have to be. We would not be able

to accept an amendment to that clause.

It is really there to anticipate a situation arising. I don't anticipate that the members of the Authority are going to come to me and say; we would like to have this person appointed and that person appointed or engage this type of person or the services of such and such an organization or anything else and that I will find any cause for saying, no, unless of course they should get completely out of line and want to hire some more persons at say twenty-nine thousand dollars a year.

MR. HOLLETT: In view of what the Honourable Minister says I withdraw the motion I made.

Clause 12 carried.

Clause 13 read:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact, which is well recognized, that the northeast coast is handicapped by being blocked with ice for such a large portion of the year, would it not be advisable for the Fisheries Development Authority to give consideration to the establishment of plants in other places? I have here now a map, published, I believe, in the Canadian Fisheries Annual Book, in 1952, by the Newfoundland Government, as to locations of fishing ports of Newfoundland and their location in relation to the banks. That shows that the east and south coasts have far more numerous ports which would be eligible to be fishing ports, where the Authority could be established and have all year around operations. Whereas on the northeast coast, I believe that two of the places mentioned there had to be discontinued formerly because of the fact that ice closed the ports for long periods of the year.



MR. SMALLWOOD: It was not for that reason.

MR. BROWNE: That was not the reason? Well I am not quite sure what the reason was, but I believe reference was made to it in the Report of the Walsh Committee, that these two places had to be closed down, and I know that they referred to the fact that the chief problem in the salt cod industry is on the north east coast, but nevertheless if the Premier is right in his prediction that the utilization of fish in a frozen block form and converted into breaded sticks and fingers is the best and most profitable way for the utilization of cod, then that seems to me to be more easily carried on, on the east and on the south coasts than it would be on the northeast coast because—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not my honourable and learned friend see that it is not only a question of where it may be most easily done, but a question of where rehabilitation is most urgently needed. What are you going to do with people on the northeast coast? Suppose it is—would it not be better for us all to go down to Jamaica and live? I am a good judge of that—or let us all go to British Columbia—I am a very good judge of that, or go to Nova Scotia. We got to take Newfoundland as it is, and the large bulk of the fishermen are on the northeast coast. Now don't blame me for that, nor this House and least of all this Government. They were there—my honourable friend said himself that it was a problem of rehabilitation, which it is. Well, whom do you rehabilitate. You rehabilitate those who need rehabilitation, and the majority of these are in fact on the northeast coast.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I can agree with the Premier. The Honourable Member for Green Bay here the other day said the figure given was the average for fishermen in Newfoundland and did not apply to his constituents, because in his opinion the fishermen in Green Bay were making on an average of about twenty-five hundred dollars a year, and that is much, very much, higher than for fishermen in other sections of the country. If you are to talk about rehabilitation, why have people left all the other places on the southwest coast? I was talking to a fisherman this morning, and asked him: "Are there many people in your place going fishing?" He told me there were none left, they had all gone to get jobs in Goose Bay, Seven Islands or in some part of Canada. He said there were vessels lying up in every port and cove in every part of the country. And I was talking to a fisherman from Fortune Bay yesterday, and that man told me that ordinarily where you would have vessels at Cape St. Mary's making it look like a city, you have nothing only the gulls coming along. Talk about rehabilitation—it is in the places along the Southern Shore, Placentia-St. Mary's and other ports where there is need of rehabilitation. It seems to me from my little knowledge of the subject that the fishermen on the northeast coast have stuck more to their calling than they have in the southern part of the island.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What gives the honourable gentleman the idea that the Fisheries Development Authority is going to operate only in connection with the northeast coast? Still the big part of the problem is on the northeast coast, but it would be quite inaccurate to say the prob-

lem is on the northeast coast. The big part of it is. The rest is not, it is in other parts of the island. As at this very moment the Fisheries Development Authority are considering a project running over a million dollars, a project for fishery development that is not on the northeast coast, but is on the east coast, in Placentia Bay. The Fisheries Development Authority is considering other projects that are envisaged not for the northeast coast and not even for the east coast, but for the south coast. The Fisheries Development Authority are considering projects for development on the west coast—although I repeat that the bulk of the problem is the problem of rehabilitating the fisheries of the northeast coast, and therefore the bulk of the fisheries development will be on the northeast coast, but only the bulk of it. There will be many many millions of dollars spent in the next twelve to fifteen years to develop the fisheries in parts of this island other than on the northeast coast. But, if my honourable friend can only take the trouble to look at the population figures, to look at the fish production figures from Cape Pine around to Cape Bauld, on that side of the triangle, and then look at the figures from Cape Race to Port aux Basques or Cape Ray on that side of the triangle, and then look at the third side of the triangle, and then if you like, look at the figures showing the fish produced in these three coasts; and then if he would take each of the three coasts and subdivide them and get the areas of density, he would not be in any doubt whatsoever as to where the real problem is now, he would not be in any doubt in the world; and if he were a member of the Government, he would insist with ordinary native patriotism that the bulk of the

allocations be made in the northeast coast. He could not do otherwise. I personally have as deep a sense of gratitude to the people of the Burin Peninsula, Placentia Bay, Fortune Bay, Hermitage, Burgeo, LaPoile Districts, these areas have been very kind to me from the first referendum to this moment. I don't imagine that anybody is going to suppose that I have anything against them. Take the west coast. We have every district on the west coast, every district on the southwest coast, every district on the northwest coast. We have every district on the southwest coast. We have no better majority on the northeast coast than we have there. I hope nobody thinks it is political.

MR. BROWNE: No—no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then if it is not political, it must be economic and sociological—that is where the main problem is.

MR. BROWNE: The Government is proposing to move people from the smaller settlements.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it has never been suggested.

MR. BROWNE: You spent at least one day talking about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never once suggested that this Government is going to remove anybody, never once—do you think I am a madman?

MR. BROWNE: Sometimes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe so. I think the honourable gentleman thinks it more than just sometimes. Then I think myself that he is a very unusual gentleman. I never suggested it, never once suggested that the Government would remove anybody. I never did. And I hope the honourable gentleman will accept that. If

he will stop for a moment now I think he will know what I mean. If you create a new place and people move into it, you have not moved them. Many people who are now living in St. John's came in from Bonavista Bay. Have we moved them in? Have we moved them in from Conception Bay and Trinity Bay? From my own district, since I first contested Bonavista North there are living here in St. John's now at least three or four hundred families. Have the Government moved them? They like to be living where I am, to be nearer to me, I know that, and that applies to people all over this island as my honourable friend will find in early November.

DR. ROWE: The honourable gentleman referred to what was said by my colleague from Green Bay. I listened with some interest to what the honourable member had to say on that. I don't know if it is in order to refer to it, but I had more than a passing interest in it for a well known reason. The honourable member said that in a certain part of his district last year, for a number of reasons, the earnings from the fisheries were pretty high. But it was in only a part of his district, and that was the northern part of the shore running out towards Cape John, but he also made the point that the great part or at least a large proportion had forsaken the salt codfishery altogether for more profitable employment in the lumber woods. It is rather notable that complete settlements in his district which were once fishing settlements are now almost one hundred per cent logging settlements. There are many settlements in Newfoundland today, Roberts Arm, for example, where the people have deserted the fishery in favour of

logging. There is another point, even in places like Indian Bay and Shoe Cove, even if they earn from the fisheries, three or four times the provincial average or even three or four times what they were last year, I would suggest that there are many more problems that must be solved. The problems of the north side of Green Bay itself, is a problem which I submit can in part be ultimately solved by this piece of Legislation here.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I hope this piece of Legislation will solve the whole fisheries problem in Newfoundland, but I see a lot of difficulties. I hope the Government are not creating a sort of Frankenstein who will destroy the Government itself in this particular Authority they are setting up, this Authority of three men, and giving them almost unlimited power. The setting up of this Authority is the greatest intimation this Government has ever given that it is licked completely, and has not even made an attempt to solve the fishery problem in this country, and if they did they did not get to first base, so they suddenly decided to set up this Fisheries Development Authority and let them take the blame bye and bye. Surely the Government must realize that these men, even though they have received such high praises, and we are going to pay them such high salaries, surely we must remember they are human after all, they are just lower than the angels, I suppose, but they are men, and I don't see these three men performing the miracles that they are supposed to perform according to the five day speech of the Honourable the Premier.

MR. SPENCER: Are you prepared

to admit they are the best men could be obtained?

MR. HOLLETT: Did I hear somebody speak? I have the floor.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to interrupt, I merely asked the Honourable Leader of the Opposition if he was prepared to admit that the three gentlemen chosen were the best we could find in the country.

MR. HOLLETT: I will not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Amongst those available?

MR. HOLLETT: It has to be qualified by the Honourable the Premier. I would say there are men in this country equally as good, I don't want to get personal on these three men. Let them enjoy their brief period of happiness. It is only to be brief, I am very much afraid, although I hope it will last a long time. But I don't see this country paying twenty-five thousand dollars a year salary to anybody for any extended period of time. When I was interrupted, not rudely, as I did not hear the first time—it is the greatest admission of defeat and absolute helplessness on the part of the Government in this fisheries problem. Mind you they are not the first government to be beaten on the fisheries. As I say they have set up this Authority, which I hope will not be a Frankenstein—for instance here: "The Authority shall carry out and enforce all agreements made before the passing of this Act between the Government of Newfoundland and any person to assist in the development, modernization or improvement of the fisheries." I ask myself, Mr. Chairman, why can't the Government enforce these agreements themselves? The Government

made them, the Government signed them, the Minister of Fisheries signed them. Why cannot the Government enforce these agreements? Why have they to appoint these men to do the job? It is an admission of failure, I say, and it is just as well for the Government to admit it first as last. I charge them with having failed in connection with the fisheries. I charge them, but they will get up and say: we have assisted the fisheries—we have given millions of dollars to—yes, to whom? To the merchants of Water Street, the despised merchants of Water Street. Somebody said it was five millions, I believe, Sir Albert Walsh said that four and a half million dollars were given out to assist the fish merchants—that is in the Fisheries Report at any rate, and I could quote from that, as a matter of fact I think I shall, Mr. Chairman. I think I may be permitted to read one or two sections from this report. They say: The implementation of the programme of development will involve—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not in order on this section.

MR. HOLLETT: We can get it later in that case, on that section dealing with the duties of the Authority. I will read it later. It does suggest here, Mr. Chairman that in all these things which are recommended by the Walsh Report, that the interest of the Federal Government must be taken care of, the Provincial Government, the fishermen themselves, and the men living in these communities all have to be brought into this thing. Now I don't see this Fisheries Authority doing anything of that nature. They are going to borrow money up to God knows how much or how many millions, they are going to build plants, lend money to everybody, to buy schooners

etc. But the point I want to make is that here I see no reason why the Authority should have handed over to it to carry out and enforce all agreements. For instance take that agreement here which I spoke of, an agreement signed by Mr. Dunstan; yet now he is being given in this Act the authority to carry out and enforce that agreement, which in company with another man he signed. In other words he is to enforce an agreement in which he was a partner. I strongly suspect Mr. Dunstan is as human as the rest of us, and I think the Government itself, the Department of Fisheries and the Lieutenant Governor in Council are the proper ones to carry out any agreement they made, and not delegate that authority to somebody else.

Then again I have read (b) and (c) of this particular section. And it seems to me that if it is the duty of the Federal Government wholly and solely to investigate, and as a matter of fact they are on it at the moment, and have already invested in making an experiment in the amount of some forty-five thousand quintals. As I said before, there is too much duplication and triplication. The Federal Government has done a lot of that too. But I don't believe there was any need in the first instance of setting up this Authority whatsoever, and giving them the authority which has been given. The Government itself should have been able to do it. For instance they imported a high-priced man here and gave him fifteen thousand dollars a year to do these very things.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is so obviously out of order—the honourable member is now debating whether there should be a Fisheries Development Authority. That was

debated and the vote taken and the principle adopted, yet now he insists on debating it all over again. He argues now that Mr. Planta should be the one and there should not be a Fisheries Development Authority, although the principle of the Fisheries Development Authority has been adopted by this House.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't want to do any such nonsense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The honourable member will please continue.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the authority which shall be given—shall do this and shall do that—and I am saying they are given the same authority to do many things which should be done by the Federal officers and should be done by Mr. Planta, and ought to be done by the Minister of Fisheries and the Department, and that is what I am talking about. And if the Honourable Premier did not understand me I hope he does now. At any rate I say it is no part of any authority whatsoever to carry out the agreements made by the Government with some other bodies. They must be carried out and enforced by the Government themselves. I don't wish to go up until 11:00 o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very important clause and there are two or three sections there that certainly deserve more consideration. It is now nearly 11:00 and cannot be passed now, and I might suggest moving the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the Opposition wish to continue discussing it, perhaps we might try debating it for

a while, and if it goes on into any real length we could have an adjournment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it is such a little time until 11:00 o'clock.

MR. FOGWILL: Yes, it is 11:00 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The House is the master of its own rules in this matter.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is there any rule that the committee should rise at 11:00 o'clock? We have been here all day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Standing Order 8 reads: At 11 of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation, the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage where its progress was interrupted.

The Chairman of Committee must inform the House that it is 11:00 o'clock and remind the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

Report received.

Ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that all remaining orders of

the day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 of the clock, and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is our intention to ask the House after a while to hold morning sessions as well as evening sessions. I am sure it must be the unanimous wish of the House to complete the business of the session as reasonably soon as possible, in view of the fact that we are getting into warm summer. On this side of the House there is no desire whatsoever to shorten debate. We want every member of the House to have all the time he needs or that he feels he needs to debate any measure which we have brought or may bring before the House. At the same time I believe it will be also the desire of all members of the House to devote as much time as practicable to the business of the House so that giving it all the consideration it needs we will nevertheless get through before Christmas time, or before that election in early November.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Premier if we are to go on with the Fisheries Development Authority Bill tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we might do that, depending on what we feel at the moment. We might go on with other business for two or three hours.

MR. BROWNE: You are not going on with the budget tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tomorrow is Wednesday, a half holiday.

MR. HOLLETT: What has that got to do with it? We don't have half holidays.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I frankly don't know. It seems to me if we



keep on endlessly with one bill it may get monotonous, if not we might go right on with this Bill.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 2, at 3:00 of the clock.

WEDNESDAY, June 2, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Questions

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am asking this question although I don't know whether it is permissive.

To ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

A copy of the Agreement for the construction of the Birch Plant at Donovans, and a copy of the Agreement providing for its operation.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. List the names of the new industries referred to in the Budget Speech which are employing 2000 men, and the number employed in each of these said plants.

2. Give the names of plants that are in partial production, and the

value of commodities manufactured in these plants to date.

3. Give the names of plants in full production, and the value of goods manufactured to date. Give dates when said plants went into full production.

4. Give probable dates when all other plants will go into production.

5. Is it expected that any more monies from Government will have to be advanced to the plants that are not yet in production, and if so, to what amount for each such plant?

MR. HOLLETT—To ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. Have any ex-gratia awards been made to the following companies on account of work done and/or on account of price changes in commodities, and/or on account of advances in wage rates since the commencement of construction on the cement plant and the gypsum plant? The firm of Miag; the firm of Beno Schilde; the firm of W. J. Lundrigan & Co. Ltd?

2. If so, state the amounts involved with each Company, the date of the award, and the date of payment, and on what account.

3. Were such payments made by the Government to any of said Companies, or were they made from any one company to the other on instructions from the Government or from any Minister of the Government. Give details in all instances with dates of said instructions.

#### Orders of the Day

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Authority":

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the Committee rose last evening we were considering Clause 13 of this Bill:

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was about to make some observations on the wording of this Bill. It will be observed that it is a mandatory clause, i.e. the Authority must do these things; receive and examine all proposals and suggestions that may be made to or by the Government of Newfoundland touching the development of the fisheries and report thereon—well I can see nothing wrong with that.

The second sub-clause is "shall undertake research and investigations of any kind that may be necessary to enable it to devise and recommend to the Government of Newfoundland projects for the development of the fisheries and undertake such projects upon their being approved by the Government." Now in regard to this particular clause I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is under the Federal Government, Newfoundland Fisheries Research Station, with fourteen scientists, established here in St. John's. And it seems to me that for the Fisheries Authority to set up another research laboratory would be tantamount to duplication.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Laboratories are not under Clause (b). That does not necessarily mean scientific research.

MR. BROWNE: Well, no, but that is generally understood by research.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not what that clause means.

MR. BROWNE: If my honourable friend would only wait a moment until I finish my argument perhaps

he could answer then. If we look across to page 9, we see that the Authority "may" direct or otherwise participate in research or investigation in any matter that concerns the fisheries. In other words there it is again, on one side they "shall" and on the other they "may" direct or otherwise participate in research or investigations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Read the whole clause.

MR. BROWNE: I have read it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Read it again.

MR. BROWNE: Well, it is understood there is a certain amount of research and investigation to be made, I understand that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all it says.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing these investigations are of an economic or business kind—but not attached to the Newfoundland Fisheries Research Station, I am sure there must be a gentleman with a degree in economics as well as in science or in chemistry who would be in a position to undertake research and investigations just as well, if not better, than the Authority. However, I draw that to the attention of the House—

Then on the other hand the Authority may direct or otherwise participate in research or investigation in any matter that concerns the fisheries if the Authority is satisfied that the results of such research or investigation will be of such value to the fisheries as to justify the undertaking, and the results will be available to any person engaged in the fisheries who requests information thereon.

Now it is the second clause which I

suggest should be permissive rather than arbitrary. Then under Clause (c): The Authority shall investigate existing and potential markets and marketing methods for products of the fisheries and, where necessary, undertake such research and promotion as it deems desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to those products. Now it looks very nice to have that there, and it is put there as a definite duty and responsibility of the Fisheries Authority, but, at the same time, there is the Department of Trade and Commerce under the Honourable C. D. Howe, who has been mentioned by the Premier himself as the greatest trader in Canada, and I don't know but he said the greatest in the world. At any rate there is the Department of Trade and Commerce with the departments and special sub-divisions of that department dedicated to the promotion of trade and commerce, and the investigations of markets, etc. Here the Authority which centers here in St. John's, without the necessary agents abroad, are directed to conduct investigations into existing and potential markets. Now if it were a permissive thing so they could do it if circumstances arose to make it necessary I could understand it. But I cannot see that it should be a part of their duties and be an obligation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think on reflection the honourable gentleman will himself admit he is on a pretty sticky wicket. I think he sat down feeling that far more than when he stood up. The Authority "Shall" in Section 13, and in the section immediately following, the Authority "May": The Authority shall receive and examine all proposals and suggestions that may be made to or by the Government of

Newfoundland touching the development of the fisheries and report thereon to the Government with such recommendations as the Authority may think fit and put into effect such of those proposals and suggestions as the Government approves. That is straightforward.

The Authority shall—undertake research and investigations of any kind that may be necessary to enable it to devise and recommend to the Government of Newfoundland projects for the development of the fisheries and undertake such projects upon their being approved by the Government: That also is perfectly straightforward. It is not even debatable. If we are to have an Authority these are precisely these things.

The Authority shall—investigate existing and potential markets and marketing methods for products of the fisheries and, where necessary, undertake such research and promotion as it deems desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to those products; "It deems desirable" after it has seen what the Department of Trade and Commerce has done. After it has seen what NAFEL has done or the Newfoundland Fisheries Board or anyone else has done, what it then deems essential and desirable to enlarge, improve and increase the markets available to these products. Of course—does it follow because the Government of Canada has set up a very great Department of Trade and Commerce which deals in a very great variety of the primary and manufacturing products of Canada that, therefore, there is anything wrong in a province setting up a special organization of its own under provincial jurisdiction, concentrating on the one thing in

that Province that is the life and death of that one province; a matter that can never be of the same intense interest to the great Department of Trade and Commerce as it must be to the province whose very life depends upon it. Is there anything wrong in that? Won't we be blamed if we do not do it, and would we not be blameworthy?

The Authority shall—supervise and carry out an enforcement of all agreements made before the passing of this Act between the Government of Newfoundland and any person to assist in the development, modernization or improvement of the fisheries. The idea there is perfectly simple. It has been pointed out more than once in this House that the Government have lent to some fourteen fishing companies, some fourteen of them, large sums of money running into about seven millions. Before FDA was formed there were the Acts of the Government over a period of several years. We are setting up a Fisheries Development Authority and we wish to enter in that Authority all matters of fisheries development including the loans made or guaranteed by the Government before this Authority came into effect. We want a group of businessmen, such as these men are in the FDA, to keep a sharp eye on the agreements because all these loans we have made upon guarantees have been made with conditions laid down, and we wish these conditions to be observed, and we wish these businessmen whose sole interest is fisheries development to keep a sharp eye on these former loans to see that the Government's interest is protected, that the conditions are observed and carried out by the recipients of the loans—again a very businesslike and very practical proposition. Really if

the Opposition is not opposed to the setting up of a Fisheries Development Authority then I don't see how they can oppose either of these four sections of Section 13. These are the reasons for the setting up of the Fisheries Development Authority. Now it might have been good criticism if they suggested that there were other purposes not named which could be named, but surely there can be no objections to the purposes that are named, so practical, so sensible, they are the essence of the very purpose of the Fisheries Development Authority.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a question to the Minister in relation to Clause 13: (c) in respect to the existing markets. Could the Honourable Minister inform me of the quantity in pounds of fresh fish and fresh frozen fish exported from Newfoundland to the existing markets during the past several years? I feel sure, Mr. Chairman, that would be of interest to the Committee, if he could get the approximate if not the exact figures.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Well, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I would have to have notice of that question. I don't have these statistics immediately available.

MR. FOGWILL: On that point, I did table the question on May 26, and it has been on the Order Paper for several days. That question was in relation to the numbers of plants in operation and production rate of the fish plants. This Bill was coming up and I thought it would be of interest to the Committee when we went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill if we did know these figures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the figure runs around twenty-five million pounds.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in some years it is twenty-six and others twenty-five and then for several years it was down much below that. One year, I think it was 1927, which is quite a long time ago, I think it was down to eleven million pounds. It has increased considerably since that time. But we have not had the figures for the past several years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The figures are in the appendix of last year's budget speech.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): I have it here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was in very graphic form in last year's budget speech.

MR. HOLLETT: On sub-clause (d) of this section, I am not quite sure I see the reason why the Authority should be given that authority over all agreements that have been made apparently, in the past on behalf of the Government and some fishery concerns. It is proposed now, according to these sections, to hand over the carrying out of the Government's part of the agreements to the Fisheries Development Authority and also to enforce the carrying out of these agreements by the fishery companies. For instance I have one here, I don't know the name of the company, but in the Auditor General's Report this year it says—"In paragraph 20 of my 1951-52 report I referred to the failure of this Company to pay the second and third instalments of \$20,000 each of a Government loan of \$280,000 made in 1949. At this date these instalments are still unpaid along with the fourth instal-

ment of \$20,000 which becomes due on 25 October 1953."

"In July 1951 Government guaranteed a bank loan of \$350,000 to the Company, and in June 1953 this guarantee was increased to \$400,000. Clause 3 of the related agreement required the Company to mortgage to Government such draggers as may be purchased by the Company with the funds guaranteed. To date two draggers have been completed but the required mortgages on these boats have not been executed."

There are other cases I could quote, not exactly the same but similar cases. The intention of the Government in saying to the Authority—you shall—is saying, you got to get after these people and make them pay up or else—is that the idea of that section? Has this Authority to take over all agreements made by the Government in the past and by Governments of the past and see that they are properly enforced? I wonder! Is not that the duty of the Government? Is that not rather saddling the Fisheries Authority with something which would not do them any good as far as prestige is concerned? In the first instance, I wonder if the Minister would give us an idea on that?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, the idea of this clause here is to have a competent body that would keep on top of the job of seeing that all companies who received loans fulfilled the conditions of these loans, see that the deadlines with regard to the payment of principle are met and the other conditions such as insurance and keeping the plants and other properties in shape and in the condition that they should be. If it comes to a point where some company has not fulfilled an obligation that it has

undertaken, and since that undertaking is between the Minister and the company, I would think that it would be a matter for the Authority to draw that fact to the attention of the Minister, and the Minister refer it to the Government and the Government decide what action should be taken.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the point I made—"The Authority shall carry out an enforcement of all agreements"—there is no obligation there for them to come to the Minister of the Government. What do they do if John Jones owes interest on his last year's loan and has not paid? There is no obligation there that they should carry out and enforce—I am inclined to think that the Government might well consider a slight change in the wording of that. I don't know whether the Government would consider that or not?

MR. KEOUGH: I think that perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has a good point there. I will ask that this section stand, and I will have the advice of the Attorney General's Department on it.

MR. BROWNE: Before we pass from it I would like to refer back to (c) and (d). As far as (d) is concerned I think the Premier gave a good answer to the objections I raised. But in regard to section (c) I would make a motion: I seem to remember that when the Minister of Fisheries was speaking he said that was the job of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to look after the existing and potential markets and the marketing of our products. I can understand where we have naturally a far greater interest in the marketing of our codfish whether it is salt or in the fresh frozen state, but, is there to be no co-operation then between the

Department of Fisheries and the Department of Trade and Commerce, and is this matter to be left to ourselves?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no suggestion of no co-operation. The very means of doing this, the very means the FDA might adopt to carry out sub-section (c) could well be their collaboration with the Federal Department of Trade and Commerce.

MR. BROWNE: Putting pressure on them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Putting pressure, getting them to undertake special projects and the like, because all special interests in Canada for special commodities, special primary products, especially products that have been manufactured, all special interests put their pressure on the Department of Trade and Commerce.

MR. BROWNE: The Fisheries Department too probably?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and the Department of External Affairs, and other departments of the Government of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the Committee that this clause stand?

Clause 13 stand.

Clause 14 read:

14. The Authority may

(a) at the request of the Minister co-ordinate the work of the several departments of the Government of Newfoundland insofar as they relate to any programme for the development of the fisheries and, on behalf of the Government and any of the said departments, collaborate or enter



into agreements with the Government of Canada and any of its departments or agencies in the implementation of any programme for the development of the fisheries that the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland may agree to undertake;

- (b) assist persons, directly or indirectly, with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries;
- (c) assist the operation of such enterprises as are of an exploratory or experimental character or for demonstration in methods of fishing;
- (d) on its own initiative or on reference to it by the Government of Newfoundland, advise and make recommendations to the Government in respect of legislation, regulations or organizations touching on the fisheries;
- (e) direct or otherwise participate in research or investigation in any matter that concerns the fisheries if
  - (i) the Authority is satisfied that the results of such research or investigation will be of value to the fisheries as to justify the undertaking; and
  - (ii) the results will be available to any person engaged in the fisheries who requests information thereon;
- (f) if and as it deems fit, and on such installations or equipment that it acquires for the purpose

of conducting research or investigation under paragraph (e);

- (g) assist directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the provision of education and training in respect of the fisheries.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the meaning of that last sub-section—assist directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the provision of education and training in respect of the fisheries? Does it mean by grants-in-aid to universities or to schools under some other department?

MR. KEOUGH: Well the thought in adding that sub-clause, Mr. Chairman—yes, it could mean direct aid to individual students. There may be cases where the Authority might have some young persons studying in Newfoundland or elsewhere who for financial reasons may not be able to complete his studies, and they may be impressed by his record and may wish to assist him to carry on his studies. That would be one thing. I think also envisioned in this is the possibility of the provision of scholarships maybe at the Memorial University and maybe at some other university.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, before it is carried—in reference to the plants in Clause (b): “. . . . . establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries . . . .” Does that mean any kind of processing plant with regard to fisheries? It may be one of the large million dollar affairs or a twenty thousand dollar affair or something like that order, or any kind of a plant?

MR. KEOUGH: I would say, Mr. Chairman, the clause does mean that

any plant that in any way undertakes to process or change the shape of fish once it comes out of the water, large or small.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask again a question which I believe I asked before: Is not that the function of the Government through its own Department of Fisheries? Why hand that over to the Fisheries Development Authority? Why? I think that is a function of the Government, to assist persons directly and indirectly in the establishment of processing plants. Where is the thing going to end with this Fisheries Authority, which further on in this Bill will be given authority again to raise various amounts of money up to twenty-five thousand dollars at any one time. Apparently they can raise up to a hundred million over the years. Are they going to be the sole authority to assist one and all in the establishment of fish plants? As I take it that is the object of the Government. I am wondering how and in what way such plants, or at least how plants owned and operated by private enterprise are going to compete with the plants set up by this Authority, unless there is some saving clause, a safeguard sort of, for private enterprise. After all we are living under a system of free enterprise, on this side of the Atlantic at any rate. This section gives the Fisheries Authority the sole power on behalf of the Government to assist any number of processing plants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where does it say that?

MR. HOLLETT: That is on page 9—the Authority may assist persons, directly or indirectly, with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the sole authority?

MR. HOLLETT: It is under this Act—here they may do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Insofar as this Act is concerned they only may do it. We are only dealing with this Act. The honourable gentleman is not suggesting the FDA may do that?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor; I am referring to the repercussions on private enterprise. I think that is something that has to be considered, and I don't want to quibble over a word here and there. If somebody else on this side or the other wants to quibble, let him quibble—the fishing industry as we understand it and know it to be is one of the institutions upon which the prosperity of this country must depend. We are living on the edge of the Atlantic Ocean and there are lots of fish in the sea. And if we are not smart enough to take advantage of that some way or another someone else will. We see that happening today now, Sir, we see these great vessels coming in here. I think we in Newfoundland ought to be thoroughly ashamed to see these vessels coming in, well fitted, well manned, coming in year after year. This Act, I take it, is set up to help us and help our people to put something of that nature into being, particularly with regard to salt fish. So that I think we should not quibble over little things—and I ask a question—is there any possibility of interfering with private enterprise? I don't mean interfering—sometimes private enterprise should be interfered with, but will it compete to such an extent that private enterprise will have to say—well, go ahead, let the Fishery Authority do it. After all you have the

men described by the Government—no greater men under the sun, and men who are made completely independent, according to the Premier. I am afraid they are being built up rather high, and if they do happen to slip they are going to have a very bad fall. I hope they don't. But I think it is up to us to argue out every section of this particular Bill. I am wondering how far they may go—they may assist people directly or indirectly with financial aid or otherwise in the establishment of processing plants and in the acquisition of vessels, equipment and installations that will contribute to the development of the fisheries. I don't know whether the Minister would care to say anything on this particular section or not.

MR. FOGWILL: If the Minister is not going to reply, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister some questions in respect to the number of plants now producing fresh fillets, the number of plants and the maximum daily production of each plant. Could the Minister indicate to the committee the number of plants we have producing fresh frozen fish at the present time, and the maximum daily rate of each plant. I think that would be of interest to the Committee.

MR. KEOUGH: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, my reply there has to be the same as before. I don't have the statistics immediately to hand, and I have to have some notice of the questions to make them available.

MR. FOGWILL: In answer to the Minister, I do have a question on the Order Paper of May 26, asking these questions, which I had asked in view of the fact that this Bill was coming into Committee and I did think it would be of interest to the Committee, Mr. Chairman, if we did have

this information. Because under Section 14, it seems to me, it is the intention of the Fisheries Authority to have the power to say they may or may not advance moneys for construction of plants. Therefore it would be of interest to the Committee if we had these figures. I wonder if the Minister could later in the day bring these figures in?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, when I received that question I passed it to my department for answer. I think that procuring the answers required some consultation with the Federal Department of Fisheries, because some of the statistics asked for are naturally kept by them and not by us. I would not be able to undertake to bring the information in later in the day but could make inquiries and possibly be able to have it for tomorrow.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, what prompted me to ask the question was that five years ago, in 1949, or six years ago as a matter of fact, we had plants for the processing of frozen fillets in Newfoundland capable of producing sixty thousand pounds a day for three hundred days a year. Since that quite a number of plants have been built, some quite large, and I believe there are some more under construction at the present time. So that if our plants in 1948 were capable of producing six million pounds a year on a three hundred, eight-hour, day basis, I would like to know, and I think it would be of interest to the Committee and to every member to know just what the production rate is today, because it has got to tie in with potential markets, and our existing markets.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can tell the honourable gentleman this—if we had in Newfoundland now, this very summer, competent facilities in existence functioning to block-freeze fish we could probably sell in the United States this year fifty or sixty million pounds of cod fillets, but the block freezing idea is quite new, and the demand for block-frozen fish by far outweighed the capacity to block freeze fish because the facilities for block-freezing have not by any means kept pace with the demand for block frozen fish. The block-frozen fish is the main raw material for fish sticks and other prepared and pre-cooked forms of fish for which nation-wide demand is sweeping across the face of all of North America and has now moved into Canada, I understand. You can go down now on Water Street and buy fish sticks consisting probably of cod fillets block-frozen somewhere in Newfoundland. They are being block-frozen, I believe, by John Penney & Sons, Ramea and by Fortune Bay Products, the new plant at Fortune and by Fishery Products plant at Burin. At least these plants are block-freezing them, and it is quite likely that the present breaded and pre-cooked fish fingers which may be bought in St. John's are forms of fish originally produced in Newfoundland, block-frozen in Newfoundland, shipped away to the United States, there processed and then shipped back into Newfoundland for sale in such shops as are now at this moment offering them for sale.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, on that point again: That is the reason why I think the Committee should have some valid information in respect to the market which takes the block-frozen fish. What are the

the markets worth at the present time? What is the potential market worth as far as can be seen as to the quantity of fish required? Because, Mr. Chairman, we have quite a number of plants, and it seems to me that there may be quite a few more. Well, there has to be a safety factor in this respect, in respect to the amount of money put into these plants, government and private capital. If there is a minimum of fish which could be block-frozen and sold in respect to the safe operation of the plant where they could operate at a profit or operate at a loss, and there must be such, then I believe the Minister should give the Committee some information, solid information, not more or less guess work—we should have more than that.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the implications of the honourable member's remarks are that possibly we might find ourselves one of these days with too many fish plants on our hands. Well, one of the reasons for setting up the Fisheries Development Authority is that that sort of thing would be watched. We would depend upon them to watch that and see we are not saddled with more plants than could produce at a remunerative figure. I think that we have to depend upon them for that purpose.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there are no conditions laid down here, and we don't know what the terms are on which the Authority may lend money. We also have a Fisheries Loan Board. Would there be any difference in loans given by this Authority and the conditions under which the Fisheries Loan Board gives loans?

MR. KEOUGH: I would answer basically no. The Fisheries Loan Board makes loans for the most part to individuals for the development of the fisheries individually for the most part, to acquire different types of boats and gear. The Fisheries Development Authority will be making loans for development purposes but the amounts will probably be greater, but basically, no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I add something to that? The Fisheries Loan Board was set up—have you got the Act? The first year we were in office we passed the Act. The Fisheries Loan Board was set up by an Act of this House to create a means whereby small fishermen, individually, might obtain better boats, better engines and better gear for fishing purposes—individual fishermen or groups of fishermen, and that is defined here. The Board consisting of not fewer than five members to be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council (1) the Chairman being appointed for one year and eligible for reappointment—

MR. BROWNE: I know about that. But, are there to be two Boards from now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me explain it now. The Board may, but not so as to restrict the general terms of Section 7, make loans to a fisherman or a group of fishermen for the purpose of repairs or improvement of hulls or boats to be used in fishing, the purchase of any engine or motor power for new or replacement installation in hulls owned by fishermen. The purchase of fishing gear including, but not so as to restrict the generality of sub-paragraph (i) and (ii) of this paragraph, net winches, drag winches and other such gear

whether mounted on ship or not and commonly used in either purse seining, Danish seining, long lining, deep net fishing or the dragging of fish and scallops; (b) make loans to or on behalf of societies or companies (i) for assisting in the construction of plants and the purchase of plant equipment generally and other types of capital expenditure which, in the opinion of the Board, are proper expenditures for which loans should be made by it;

(ii) to build hulls or boats under contract between the Board, company and builder;

(iii) to build hulls or boats under contract between the Board, society and builder;

(iv) for the purchase of new or old hulls or boats not built under contract with the Board;

(v) for the purchase of engines and auxiliary equipment;

(vi) for the purchase of fishing gear and equipment.

Now the whole purpose of this Act and of the Board set up under it is to provide means whereby the little fellow, the small man—

MR. BROWNE: No!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh it is! That is how it is being practised, that is how in fact it has acted, that is how the Board has acted. The loans made have been almost entirely if not entirely to small men or groups of small men. Now the reason for that is this: This Government have hoped from the beginning of our taking office that somehow we could help to prevent the fisheries becoming monopolies by the big aggregations of companies, of capital.

Now the fact is, it stands to reason, it takes a lot of money to build a big fish plant, a modern fish plant. It takes hundreds of thousands of dollars. It takes far more money than the average small man or the average group of small men are able to find even with government assistance, and consequently it is inevitable that these plants will be owned by pretty substantial men or groups of men, i.e. companies. Secondly, when it comes to deep sea fishing these draggers cost a quarter of a million dollars to three hundred thousand dollars each. They have to carry about three hundred thousand pounds of fish, or roughly around that amount. There may be draggers that carry less, but for the most part they carry about three hundred thousand pounds per load. Now these ships run from a quarter of a million dollars up, and clearly small men, fishermen, and small groups of small fishermen are not able to reach on such draggers as these. Now if the only thing we have is the FDA, which is designed primarily to bring about large scale development with large scale investments, with large scale moneys, if that is all we have, and if there be nothing catering to the small man, then inevitably, in its very nature, the fishing industry is changed and the fishing industry becomes more and more industrialized and the small man is simply absorbed into an industrial machine, and he becomes a propertyless proletarian, becomes merely a wage worker for a big fishing company. And this Government, since the first day it came in office in 1949 have been most anxious to help, if it could, find the way to help the small man to acquire boats and gear and engines, to make the primary producer himself, who is after all the foundation—you can't have fish plants big or small

unless there are fishermen, you can't have fish unless there are men to take it out of the water. It is that primary act, that first act of taking the fish out of the water which is the beginning of all fishery. We want that to be in the hands of men sailing their own boats, using their own gear, their own engines and owning the fish they take out of the water. In other words we would like to have an independent population of fishermen. If we must have the great capitalistic, private enterprise industrialized plants for processing the fish and for marketing it, it is even more important because marketing today has become a highly specialized field in which you cannot hope to succeed unless you have a far-flung marketing organization. Arthur Monroe for example has his own office in Cleveland and a far flung trading and marketing organization throughout the whole west and mid-western United States, and he would be completely lost without it. If the new plant at Fortune did not have the tie-in they have with perhaps the greatest of all the fish companies of the United States and their superb marketing organization; if Gaultois Fisheries did not have the tie-in they have with Boston and their big marketing organization they would be lost, and if the other firms did not have their tie-ins for marketing they would be lost. Well, as I say, it is probably inevitable that the big plants, and marketing organizations shall be in the hands of highly capitalized private companies, that is perhaps inevitable—but let us, as far as we can, keep the actual fishery as distinct as we can and in the hands of a bold yeomanry, not the peasantry—we want no peasantry in Newfoundland—but a bold and independent yeomanry.



MR. BROWNE: What is wrong with peasants?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would take me seven days to tell you so I won't even begin. We don't want a peasantry in Newfoundland, we don't want them—nobody does—perhaps my honourable friend—and there was another honourable gentleman who wanted them, and he was the first Leader of the Opposition—he too wanted peasants in Newfoundland. He wanted them dancing around the maypole.

MR. HIGGINS: He was a reactionary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not suggest that my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West is a reactionary, although he has a very great fondness in his heart for the maypole. However, I do say, let us at least try to retain for Newfoundland the bold and independent fisherman, and that he will cease to be if he becomes merely a proletarian, fishing for a private industry company who owns the boat he sails and the plant in which he places his fish and the marketing organization that sells his fish. He will then become a labourer on the sea who will haul fish out of the water for another man in another man's boat for another man's plant to be marketed by another man—what is then the difference between him and a labourer who digs ditches in St. John's? What is the difference between the two? Virtually none.

So that, as I say, it is terribly important to retain the Fisheries Loan Board to deal with the small man—and perhaps, we would hope, and there is no law against hoping, for many hundreds of boats running

around five, six, eight and ten thousand dollars each, built largely out of loans made by the Fisheries Loan Board assisted by the Federal Department of Fisheries which makes bonus payments and pays bounties on boats measuring not over sixty feet, in fact they must be under sixty feet in length. Most of them are built, I believe, fifty-nine feet, nine inches, just one or two inches below the sixty feet top measure, so that they may fall inside the maximum.

That is the purpose of the Fisheries Loan Board—surely my honourable friends opposite are not going to object to that. Surely they are not going to have the functions of that board absorbed by the Fisheries Development Authority, which is set up for an entirely different purpose. I appeal to them to drop any opposition right now to the continued existence of that Fisheries Loan Board. That Board is for the little man, let us not disturb it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is all very interesting, and I have very little to disagree with in what the Premier has said there. But you know that does not answer the question I asked. He said the Fisheries Loan Board was set up to help the little man. Then he read from the Act the purpose for which it was passed, which indicates it was not set up for the little man, but for companies requiring finances, and I don't know of any little man who got any assistance from the Fisheries Loan Board since it started.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: The Premier may know about it but I don't nor the honourable member for the District of Ferryland nor anyone else. Yes,

one man got a loan of several thousand dollars, but he was not a little man, he was a big man as far as the shore fishery is concerned.

MR. MURRAY: I say, I do.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to know how much money was loaned under that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has been tabled.

MR. BROWNE: There is nothing to indicate any division between the two—the Fisheries Development Authority have power to do the same things—where are we to draw the line between the Fisheries Development Authority and the Fisheries Loan Board?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already said the Chairman of the Loan Board is the Secretary of the Fisheries Development Authority so that there may be some liaison there.

MR. BROWNE: In other words the Fisheries Loan Board will be a sub-division of the Fisheries Development Authority—now while we are discussing this matter, we all understand, I think, the absolute necessity of having outlets for fish. It is no use producing fish unless you have someone to buy it off your hands. We know that must be so and so does the Premier. But is the Premier in a position to say anything about the United States in regard to marketing of frozen fillets? We know the Maritime Commission made certain recommendations to the President—is there anything new on that subject?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I understand there is a considerable amount of worry about the matter—a considerable amount of worry—a considerable amount of grave concern—on the

other hand I hear also that since the report was handed in, whatever that report may be, to the President, a new situation has developed, and that is that the firms, the American companies that engage in the processing of block-frozen fish into breaded and pre-cooked fish fingers and sticks, and the like, are discovering or have discovered that they are not able to supply themselves with sufficient quantities of block-frozen fish from the United States sources to enable them to keep up with the demand of the public for these products. In other words clearly the number of fish sticks and fingers and the like that may be made is limited by the number of pounds of block-frozen fish available for the purpose, and the number of pounds of block-frozen fish available for the purpose in the United States, available from United States sources, is not nearly great enough. They have the plants that are specializing in the products that are the end results of block-frozen fish, but they are up against a very great necessity for block-frozen fish, and therefore, they have revised the position they took when this inquiry was held, since then they have reversed their opinions, and now wish that any barriers that exist to the importation of block-frozen fish into the United States be lowered rather than raised so that they can get a sufficient and continuous supply of block-frozen fish for the use of their own plants for the manufacture by them of the frozen fish fingers in the United States.

Now if that is true, and I have heard that, and if that is true the end result might conceivably be enormous—now I have no inside information, or information that could be described as inside information, but if

that were so the end result might be the imposition of a higher tariff on the cooked fish and not on the block frozen fish—only on the fish after it is cooked or maybe after it is breaded. It might be one or the other, and it might be both. If it is on cooked fish then probably none or little if any of our block-frozen fish could then be cooked in Newfoundland, but if it is not on pre-breaded fish it could be pre-breaded in Newfoundland and shipped to the United States where it would be cooked and then sold. If it is on both all we can do is to ship the block-frozen fish, and even that is a very big thing for Newfoundland. If on the other hand they put a duty on or lower the quota on block-frozen or in any other way restrict the importation of block frozen fish into the United States it would be a very sad blow indeed for Newfoundland and to our whole fisheries development programme.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I might add something to what the Honourable the Premier has said. I have heard myself that protests have been sent to the President from all over the United States suggesting that the fish be allowed in as there was not sufficient fish to supply the demand.

Now there is one other question I would like to ask on this sub-clause:

"The Authority may on its own initiative or on reference to it by the Government of Newfoundland, advise and make recommendations to the Government in respect of legislation, regulations or organization touching on the fisheries."

Is the Minister in a position to tell us what is meant by organization there?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to indicate specifically. The occasion may arise from time to time when in conjunction with the trade organizations or the fishermen's organization the Authority may want to put forward some proposals to the Government that might enable them in some way to carry out the purpose they are set up for.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, while on that point; I listened very attentively to the Premier during his few remarks in relation to the Fisheries Loan Board. I would like to point out to the Committee that the Fishery Loan Board does loan money to other people, I refer to the Government loan of two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars last year at one half per cent, and up to the end of the last fiscal year the company did not even pay their interest.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, that is not a very helpful remark—surely the honourable gentleman knows, surely he is aware, he must be, he has been in this House now for five years, and he must have learned something in those five years, and amongst the things he learned must have been this; that throughout the year this Government, like all governments in the world, finds itself in the awkward position where expenses are going on hourly, daily while revenues come in, most of them quarterly, so that there can be whole weeks when there is a great gap between what it must spend from day to day and what it takes in. Therefore the Government has to look around and say; what pockets of money have we got—fine we have something like three hundred thousand in this Board and a couple of

hundred thousand in that Board, and we have a million lying in some other pocket, and we borrow back our own money, the Government's own money which we have advanced to these bodies, borrow it back temporarily, and pay them back again later on. Now what is wrong with that? Why try to make anything of that?

MR. HIGGINS: As long as you pay it back it is all right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Suppose we don't pay it back? It is the Treasury's own money from the beginning to the end, always, there is no limit on that, to the end it is the Treasury's own money—put it from one pocket to the other, and put it back again, and take it back again. There is nothing wrong with that. It is commonplace. Every Government does that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit amused by the Honourable the Premier's reference to the bold and independent yeomanry in the fishery. I believe that Act and that loan fund was set up in 1950, was it not? Anyway it was sometime ago. And they were given an amount of five hundred thousand dollars to lend to fishermen. Since that time they loaned fishermen and others, not including the Government, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I believe they loaned slightly over two hundred thousand to fishermen, and if my recollection is correct, three individuals got twenty thousand or more, which is about eighty or ninety thousand to these individuals alone, and what is left, slightly over a hundred thousand dollars, was divided, I think amongst about seventeen or eighteen or twenty others—I don't remember the exact figures, but that

is what happened. That is the number of fishermen that have been helped in that way. That is not what I got up to say, Sir—I did know, but I have forgotten it now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps it is better forgotten.

MR. HOLLETT: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, I will come across it later. But I am amused at the instantaneous manner in which the Honourable the Premier jumped to his feet and made a political speech right at the drop of the hat—it is marvellous.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I was about to say a bold yeomanry, a country's pride must first be set up and then supplied.

MR. HOLLETT: You can even get poetry at the drop of a hat. Sir, the people of Ferryland will be glad to know they have a poet representing them here in the House. Next thing we will have a report on Provincial Affairs in poetry and it will go down in history.

We are not endeavouring to oppose, in this particular part of the discussion, this Act, and we only refer to things that we think ought to be drawn to the attention not only of the Government but of the people as well.

Clause 14 carried.

Clause 15 read and carried.

Clause 16 read:

16 (1) The Authority shall annually submit to the Minister an operating budget for the next following financial year of the Authority for the approval of the Minister.

(2) The Minister shall annually lay before the Legislature the capital

budget of the Authority for its financial year approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

(3) The Treasury Board, on the joint recommendation of the Minister and the Minister of Finance, may by regulation prescribe the form in which the budget required by this section shall be prepared.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is no date on that budget. I suppose it would be at the time of the estimates. There is no date mentioned for placing before the Legislature the budget of the Authority.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the actual suggestion is that both operating and capital budget for the Authority shall be laid before the Legislature.

MR. HOLLETT: That section has brought back to my mind what I meant to say a moment ago. What I wanted to ask was—this Authority has been working since last June—have they submitted for the approval of the Minister a budget for the present financial year. I note that in the budget speech the Honourable Minister of Finance did say something about two fish plants which were likely to be set up at a cost of possibly around three million dollars—I am wondering if that is part of the budget submitted to the Honourable Minister under this section.

MR. KEOUGH: The actual suggestion is, Mr. Chairman, while these provisions do not presently apply to the Authority until such time as the Act is passed, this procedure generally has been followed—the Authority did submit to me, and I submitted to the Cabinet, both operating and capital budgets for the coming year, and it will appear in one item in the

estimates, and will be broken down for the House when we come to that estimate.

Clause 16 carried.

Clause 17 read:

17 (1) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall, from moneys voted by the Legislature for the purpose, make available and pay to the Authority from time to time such funds as it may require for the proper carrying on of its work.

(2) The Authority may receive and accept such other sums of money as may from time to time be paid to it by way of grant, contribution or reimbursement from any source, if it receives such funds to assist it in the attainment of its objects or in the proper exercise of its functions or to reimburse it for disbursements made by it on any behalf.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman—the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall—I am wondering if that should not be “may.” Surely you are not going to make it mandatory upon the Lieutenant-Governor in Council—

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Yes, I never liked that clause.

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move myself that the word “shall” be stricken out and that the word “may” be substituted therefor.

MR. BROWNE: You have to get someone else to move it.

MR. CURTIS: I make that motion.

MR. HOLLETT: Before you put the clause, Mr. Chairman, “The Authority may receive and accept such other sums of money as from time to time be paid to it by way of grants,

contribution or reimbursement from any source, if it receives such funds to assist it in the attainment of its objects or in the proper exercise of its functions or to reimburse it for disbursements made by it on any behalf." Mr. Chairman, I don't like any Authority being set up by the Government to be in a position to accept contributions from anybody. I would just draw that to the attention of the Minister. I don't think they should receive any contributions. I have heard too much in recent days of people receiving contributions—people have received contributions for doing such things. It might be that it is there to protect such people that might indulge in accepting contributions. I would say it would be much better to have the word taken out.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, it is envisaged there by the granting of contributions that the Authority may have facilities for carrying out certain work in certain communities and the Authority's work may not call for the carrying out of it at the particular moment and another body may wish the work undertaken, and this is to provide that the Authority may receive such contributions from another organization to do the work for them.

MR. FOGWILL: It would apply to the Federal Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It is the Authority and not the individuals comprising the Authority.

MR. HOLLETT: The Chairman is absolutely in control. The Chairman, I think, is the administrative head of the Authority and the Authority may receive and accept contributions. If that were just contributions from the Federal Government it would be quite in order. I still don't like the idea of contributions

from say, Arthur Monroe or Hazen Russell or someone like that.

Clause 17 carried.

Clause 18 read and carried.

Clause 19 read:

19 (1) The Auditor General shall at least once in every financial year audit and may, during the course of the year, make an interim examination of the accounts and financial transactions of the Authority and is entitled to have access at all times to all records, documents, books, accounts and vouchers of the Authority and to require from the members and employees of the Authority such information and explanations as he deems necessary.

(2) Whenever the Auditor General makes an interim examination under sub-section (1) he shall submit a report to the chairman and to the Minister.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, what is the meaning of surplus—is the Authority always to have a surplus to its credit?

MR. KEOUGH: No, I imagine that is a standard provision put in there in all requirements for statements of accounts and makes a stipulation if, and when they do have a surplus.

MR. HOLLETT: Somebody must point out to me how the Authority could have a surplus. Perhaps the Minister could answer that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be shorter if we just struck the word out.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to know how the Authority could have a surplus?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they don't it won't be changed.



MR. CURTIS: If they have moneys they don't spend, is not that a surplus?

MR. HOLLETT: In that case the Government never has a surplus.

Clause 19 carried.

Clause 20 read and carried.

Clause 21 read:

21 (1) Subject to sub-section (3), the Authority shall not later than the fifteenth day of May in each year submit an annual report to the Minister in such form as he may prescribe, which shall include a report concerning the work of the Authority during the previous financial year, the annual report of the Auditor General, and the statement of accounts specified in sub-section (1) of Section 20 and the Minister shall lay the report before the Legislature within fifteen days after he receives it or, if the Legislature is not then in session, within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

(2) The Authority shall make to the Minister such reports of its financial affairs as he requires.

(3) The first report to be submitted in accordance with sub-section (1) may, with the consent of the Minister, be submitted at any time between the fifteenth day of May and the fifteenth day of November, 1954.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that likely to be submitted this year, may I ask?

MR. KEOUGH: I think it most unlikely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That would be just about the time of the election which the Honourable Leader of the Opposition called.

MR. HOLLETT: Anytime within fifteen days—there is ample time yet before the House closes. We do know the Minister told us some three millions are already involved, and consequently they must have something to report, having worked for one year and told the Minister—was not that giving him the plan? Why could not the House have that plan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What has all that to do with the election?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the question is—what has the election got to do with all this.

MR. HOLLETT: It may have more to do with it than strikes the eye.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is so suspicious.

MR. HOLLETT: I will say the Honourable Minister ought to submit it now, undoubtedly the report is good, and any Government or any Minister who is going to distribute three million dollars throughout the country in connection with the development of the fisheries ought to be glad to give it to the people. I know the people would be glad to know it. They have the report—and under this section the Minister may submit it to the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister says he has not received it.

MR. BROWNE: No—no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Wrong again.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you on the Opposition side of this House?

Clause 21 carried.

The House recessed for ten minutes.

Mr. Chairman called the Committee to order:

Clause 22 read:

22 (1) The Auditor General shall report annually to the Minister the result of his audit or examination of the accounts and financial statements of the Authority, and the report shall state whether in his opinion

- (a) the Authority has kept proper books of account;
- (b) the financial statements of the Authority
  - (i) were prepared on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year and are in agreement with the books of account,
  - (ii) in the case of the balance sheet, give a true and fair view of the state of the Authority's affairs as at the end of the financial year, and
  - (iii) in the case of the statement of income and expenditure give a true and fair view of the income and expenditure of the Authority for the financial year; and
- (c) the transactions of the Authority that have come under his notice have been within the powers of the Authority under this Act and any other Act applicable to the Authority;

and the Auditor General shall call attention to any other matter falling within the scope of his examination that in his opinion should be brought to the attention of the Legislature.

(2) The Auditor General shall from time to time make to the Authority or to the Minister such other

reports as he may deem necessary or as the Minister may require.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to sub-clause 2 and sub-clause 3: In the case of the balance sheet, give a true and fair view of the state of the Authority's affairs as at the end of the financial year, and (iii) in the case of the statement of income and expenditure give a true and fair view of the income and expenditure of the Authority for the financial year; . . .

That is rather strange for an auditor to have to do that—a true and fair view—then you will notice if you go down to sub-clause 2: "The Auditor General shall from time to time make to the Authority or to the Minister such other reports as he may deem necessary or as the Minister may require." So that if the Minister does not want a true and fair report he is empowered under this to ask for a different one. I just brought that to the attention of the Minister as he might need it sometime.

Clause 22 carried.

Clause 23 read and carried.

Clause 24 read:

24. The Authority, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money from Her Majesty or otherwise for the purposes of paragraph (b) of Section 14, but the aggregate of the amounts borrowed under this Act and outstanding shall not at any time exceed twenty-five million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, it says here—the Authority, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money from Her Majesty or

otherwise for the purpose of paragraph (b) . . . . Does that mean to say that the Authority may borrow from a bank or issue some kind of debenture or bonds in order to get money? Is that the intention?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not the intention.

MR. KEOUGH: With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the power is there for the Authority to borrow money.

MR. BROWNE: You don't anticipate their trying to borrow money like NALCO tried to do, for example?

MR. SMALLWOOD: NALCO's borrowing was authorized by this House. The position is actually that the Government cannot give to the FDA any authority which the Government itself does not possess—the Government itself has no authority to borrow money except upon the authority of this House. So, as we have not got the power to do it except when we are authorized by the House we cannot give the FDA the power to do it. If we give it it is because we have been authorized by the House to give it. So that they will, in fact, borrow only with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council can give approval only if authorized by a statute of the House to do so, and if we are there is no objection to it.

MR. BROWNE: The words "or otherwise" are the words I am objecting to. What is the purpose of this if they are not going to raise money on the bond market?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that may be precisely the way to do it. It may be that the House may be asked sometime to authorize the corporation, FDA, to float a bond issue on

the guarantee of the Province of Newfoundland. If the Legislature gives the Government that authority then the Government would be in a position, but only then, to authorize the corporation, FDA, to do so. It is all highly improbable.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, I think so too as it stands at the present time. Does it not mean the FDA with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time borrow money on the bond market once this Bill is passed and approved, and if a loan were to be made on the bond market the Authority may raise it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the honourable gentleman say that again?

MR. BROWNE: They can raise money by going to the bank and raising it with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but not a bond issue, because a bond issue can be raised only on the authority of the House.

MR. BROWNE: Well, what does "or otherwise" mean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: May borrow from the Government or borrow from the bank. No one can raise a sale of bonds of the province except on the authority of this House—no one—it requires a special statute.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Government could not borrow money without the authority of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, can't sell a bond issue.

MR. HOLLETT: Then you can borrow money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Short-time borrowing subject to ratification by the House.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case the Authority can borrow it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but not sell bond issues.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell me under what conditions, or how could the Authority borrow money from the Government. What I mean is, can they borrow money without some sort of security of paying it back, some guarantee or mortgage on something. Is the Authority to have the means whereby they can pay interest on loans and that sort of thing? Are they to be set up as a Crown Corporation? That is what I like to know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How can they borrow from the Government? That is the question, is it? Well they borrow from the Government—

MR. HOLLETT: Or from anybody, if you like?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well their ability to borrow from anyone is determined first by the lawfulness of their borrowing, and secondly on the willingness and ability of the lender to be borrowed from. Now one of the lenders might be the Government, and our willingness and ability to be borrowed from would determine what they might borrow, and the willingness and ability of a bank to lend money would determine how much they might borrow from a bank. If the Fisheries Development Authority lends a couple of million dollars to fish firms they have to get it first by borrowing it from the Treasury.

MR. HOLLETT: Can you lend money that way without a guarantee?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we do it commonly and are indemnified at the next ensuing session of the House, when ratified by the House, and then also as provided, the House itself will legislate authority to the Government to lend money to the FDA because it will be in the estimates, it will be budgeted for anyway.

MR. HOLLETT: A couple of million at any time you want to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: First of all we can lend them money out of funds voted by the Legislature to us on the basis of the budget submitted—secondly we can lend them (1) money on a short time basis or any time, subject to ratification of the House at the next ensuing session. That is true of anyone. Since the House met last year we lent money to a number of people. We do that every year, and I suppose we will always do it and our successors will continue to do it and their successors will continue to do it. You cannot always be calling the House together. It is just not practical to do that and, (2) it is not always in the public interest to wait until the House is called together in the normal course. Occasions arise when it is in the public interest for the Government to lend a sum of money in the belief that its action in so doing will be ratified by the House when the House is asked at the next ensuing session to do so. We will come before this House in this present session and ask for ratifications of loans we have made in fact as a Government since the last session of the House. And we have done that, I think, in every session since Responsible Government was restored to Newfoundland, and I suppose we will continue doing it, and, as I say, our successors and their successors after them will do likewise.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure the Government will continue to do it, but if money is voted by the Legislature in this session to be devoted to this purpose, what is the reason why the Authority has to borrow that money from the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They may borrow from us to lend to someone else.

MR. HOLLETT: Almost Clarenville boats again—do you mean to tell us this Government will vote three million dollars for these said purposes in this Act now, and apparently the Government does not pay that over to the Authority?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't give it to them as a gift.

MR. HOLLETT: You give them twenty-five thousand dollars each a year as a gift. What else is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is pretty cheap!

MR. HOLLETT: You don't exactly give it to them, ten thousand of that will have to go to the Federal Government in taxes—so that in reality this Provincial Government thereby contributes thirty thousand dollars a year to the Federal Government. That is one big slice which has to come off. What I am trying to say is that we vote three million dollars to the Authority for the purpose of the work of the Authority, and it does seem silly to me that they then have to come to the Government and borrow that money after the House has voted it for the same purpose. I can't see it. I guess I am dense on financial matters—I can't see it that way.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this sum of twenty-five dollars, I suppose, is put in for good measure, it has no special significance, it could be ten and it could be amended to fifteen or thirty or any figure at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so. At the moment it has no specific significance or plan that calls for the immediate and early expenditure of twenty-five million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Well why are there not blue-printed plans and specifications calling for a certain amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because it takes time, and must be based on a geographical and topographical scale.

MR. BROWNE: In other words we go on a voyage but we don't know where we are going?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are making ample provisions.

MR. HOLLETT: I am still not clear. We voted five hundred thousand dollars, as this House did some years ago, to be devoted to the Fisheries Loan Board. Do you mean to tell me the Loan Board has to come to this Government and borrow? No. It has been passed over to them and put to their credit in the bank. If we put it to their credit in the bank they don't have to go and borrow it. If that is so, Sir, then this Government is likely to have most of that three million gone into some other thing. That is the point I want to raise—are we to earmark three million dollars more or less for the use of this Authority, and yet not allow them to spend it. Surely it is not to be necessary for them to come back to us and ask for that fund. It won't be here. It will be

gone into another birch plant or steel plant in Bay Roberts or something like that. That has happened before—money voted in this House last year for certain purposes did not go to the purposes for which it was voted, but went into some of the new industries. That is the thing I want to safeguard against now. There is not much we can do about it on this side, but I put it to the Government that there is something they can do about it. The whole idea of three men in this Fisheries Authority set up with authority to borrow money seems to me to be ridiculous.

MR. SMALLWOOD: With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier just said that the Government cannot borrow money without the approval of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say it. I did not say that.

MR. HOLLETT: A temporary loan you can borrow, I know—but you can't go and raise a loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can't sell bonds.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the difference?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the difference in the world.

MR. HOLLETT: Very little. These people, I say, have authority in that Authority to raise twenty-five million dollars, and that must be given by this House and not by approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, because I know that if the Lieutenant-Governor in Council gave them that authority, they would not be able to raise the money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would my honourable friend answer this question: Would he approve having struck out the words "With the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?"

MR. HOLLETT: No, I—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. He complains it is there, but he would not strike it out.

MR. HOLLETT: I would agree to the substitution of the words—"With the approval of the House of Assembly—the Legislature." That is what I am asking for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is already the law. It is in the Audit Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Remember we raised the point. I think you will remember five years hence.

HON S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition means prior approval or subsequent approval?

MR. HOLLETT: I think it should be prior approval. I don't think any authority should be given the right to borrow twenty-five million dollars without prior approval of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the prior approval—the passing of this Act. And the safety valve for it is that the Act states that each individual transaction must be at the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That is why we want that in.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, if we vote for this section we vote to give the Authority the right to borrow twenty-five million dollars?



MR. SMALLWOOD: It also insists that they shall submit to the House both a current and capital budget to be agreed on and approved by this House. They cannot spend but what is approved in the House in advance—their budget must be debated and must be approved. When their budget has been approved they then have the right to do the things they have been authorized by the House to do. I don't see what makes the honourable gentleman so dense. I don't think he wants to see.

MR. HOLLETT: It is almost unbelievable, Mr. Chairman, are they then going to get a budget from the Authority before the House closes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the honourable gentleman has been told so this afternoon.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't mind being told again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is yes.

MR. BROWNE: I think the Premier has now let us see another side of this borrowing—it must be for capital account, because the borrowing, I take it, is with the intention of repaying. This is not a grant for the current expenditures of the Authority for which there shall be no definite return. This is borrowing for the purpose of investment, and there will be a return back to the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly.

MR. BROWNE: Now would it not be wise, rather than make the figure twenty-five million for the total outlay—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the total outlay at one time.

MR. BROWNE: At one time—well, this is for all time I take it—outstanding—shall not at any time—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes at any one time.

MR. BROWNE: Would it not be wiser to have a provision of so much in any one year or not more, say, than four million dollars in any one year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it has been intimated to us by the Honourable Minister of Finance that we are to float a bond issue, or the Government is to float a bond issue of twelve million dollars, and I note by the estimates figures in that, it is slated for the purpose of this Authority. Why then do they want extra authority to borrow money up to twenty-five million dollars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: But this clause is not for 1954, but for as long as the statute may last, and what the Authority may exercise this year may be well covered, but for next year and the year after and for ten years hence it may not be.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, why not cover it year by year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the purpose of this.

MR. HOLLETT: Not after the Act passes. They can borrow twenty-five million with your approval.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And our approval only. If we have the right, but we must get our right from this House.

MR. HOLLETT: To raise bonds?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: "The Authority, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may, from time to time, borrow money"—suppose they go looking for a large loan of five million dollars, and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council gives its approval, you say they would not get it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government itself would not get it, let alone its agent, of course. No Government of the size of this can go and borrow five million dollars in short time indebtedness, they can borrow on bonds, a long term, twelve or fifteen years issue, not for six months or eight months.

MR. BROWNE: What is the maximum there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On two or three million maybe, depending upon how near it is to the opening of the Legislature, how soon you can tell them you think you can repay it.

Clause 24 carried.

Clause 25 read:

25 (1) The Minister of Finance, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may from time to time

- (a) make loans to the Authority out of money in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or
- (b) guarantee repayment of the principal of and interest on money borrowed by the Authority but the Minister shall not make or give such loans or guarantees in any financial year except to the extent that the Legislature has authorized him to make or give such loans and guarantees in that year.

(2) Notwithstanding sub-section (1), the Minister of Finance, with the

approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may from time to time

- (a) make loans to the Authority out of money in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or
- (b) guarantee repayment of the principal of and interest on money borrowed by the Authority for the purpose of repaying money that the Authority has borrowed under this Act.

(3) The Minister of Finance shall make or give a loan or guarantee under this Act only in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall approve.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is the opposite side now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One authorizes to borrow from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and the other authorizes the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to lend it, but it says how.

MR. BROWNE: It also says—guarantee—the Minister of Finance may from time to time guarantee repayment of the principal of and interest on money borrowed by the Authority but—the Minister shall not make or give such loans or guarantees in any financial year except to the extent that the Legislature has authorized him to make or give such loans and guarantees in that year—

Now what has the Legislature authorized the Minister to give this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until the estimates are passed, and when the Appropriation Bill is passed that will represent the authority of the Legislature to the Minister to lend out of

the sum that the Legislature has guaranteed to him for the purpose.

MR. BROWNE: Will there be a special clause dealing with this Authority in this respect?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is the clause.

MR. BROWNE: And the amount is in the estimates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount is in the estimates.

Clause 25 carried.

Clauses 26 and 27 read and carried.

Clause 28 read:

28 (1) The Authority may by a person daily authorized by it for that purpose ascertain and delimit the land to be expropriated and for that purpose the person so authorized has the right to enter upon the land to ascertain and measure and obtain a plan and description of it.

(2) The Authority shall notify the owner in writing that the land, describing and delimiting the same, is required and will be taken for a purpose, naming the purpose, referred to in Section 27 and ten days after the service of the notice in writing on the owner or, if the owner is absent from Newfoundland or cannot be found or if for any other reason personal service cannot in the opinion of the Authority be conveniently effected, ten days after the posting up of the notice in writing in a conspicuous place upon the land, the land shall vest in the Authority and the Authority may forthwith enter upon and take possession of it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I presume under these sections 27 and 28, thinking of St. John's East at the

moment—we have a large number of fishermen fishing out of this place, and they cannot find any place where they can have a wharf or storage facilities along the waterfront. I take it that under this section the Fisheries Development Authority could expropriate land somewhere along the waterfront in St. John's to set up and build—

MR. SMALLWOOD: They could under conditions defined in Section 27.

MR. HOLLETT: "Whenever the Authority deems it necessary to acquire any land for the purpose of carrying on any undertaking under this Act or for any purpose incidental or related thereto or for the purpose of assisting or encouraging the establishment or development of any fishing enterprise by any person or for any purpose incidental or related thereto and the owner of the land refused to accept the sum tendered by the Authority for the land, or if for any other reason the Authority deems it advisable to do so, the Authority, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, may expropriate the land in accordance with Section 28"—well surely they must have refused to accept.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the expropriation can take place—because they go about it in a businesslike way to try and buy a piece of land, but the owner won't sell or won't accept a price, then only expropriation followed by arbitration.

MR. HOLLETT: Then under this circumstance there is a chance for fishermen in St. John's to get a wharf?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A fishermen's wharf—of course there is.

Clause 28 carried.

Clause 29 read :

29 (1) The Authority shall make compensation to the owner of any land expropriated under this Act or to the owner of any land used or injuriously affected by the expropriation for all damages necessarily resulting from the exercise of the powers given under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 28 and in all cases any advantage which the owner may derive or be likely to derive directly or indirectly from the contemplated work and operations shall be taken into account in reduction of the compensation.

(2) The amount of compensation to be paid shall be ascertained by a Board of Assessors which shall consist of three persons, one of whom shall be the chairman of the Board, who shall be appointed by the Authority, and the other two of whom shall be appointed, one by the Authority and the other by the owner of the land, and if the owner refuses or neglects to appoint an assessor within thirty days after being required by the Authority in writing so to do, or if the owner cannot be found or is incapable of appointing an assessor, the Authority may appoint the third assessor.

(3) Whenever it is necessary under this Act to expropriate more than one piece of land belonging to different owners in any locality and the Authority and every owner cannot agree upon the amount of compensation, the amount to be paid every owner with whom for any reason agreement cannot be reached shall be ascertained by a Board of Assessors which shall consist of three persons, one of whom shall be the chairman

of the Board who shall be appointed by the Authority, and the other two of whom shall be appointed, one by the Authority and the other by a majority of the owners with whom agreement cannot be reached, and if the majority of the owners refuse or neglect to appoint or are unable to agree upon an assessor within thirty days after being required by the Authority to appoint an assessor the Authority may appoint the third assessor.

(4) In sub-section (3) "locality" means any area designated as such by the Authority.

(5) The findings of the Board of Assessors shall be in writing and shall be made within sixty days of the appointment of the Board unless that period is extended by the Authority and immediately upon being made shall be delivered to the Authority, and the amount of compensation shall be paid within six months of the date of the award but if the compensation is not paid within thirty days of the date of the award it shall thereafter bear interest at the rate of three per centum per annum until the date of payment.

(6) The assessors are deemed to be assessors and not arbitrators and their finding or the finding of any two of them shall be deemed to be the award of the Board of Assessors and is final in all cases.

(7) The Board of Assessors may award costs in respect of any hearing before them under this Act in accordance with a scale to be approved by the Registrar of the Supreme Court but the scale shall not be higher than the scale headed "Lower Scale" in Appendix N to The Judicature Act.

(8) If the sum awarded under this section in any case is greater than the

sum tendered by the Authority under Section 27 the Authority shall pay the costs and expenses of the arbitration and the fees of the assessors but if the sum awarded and expenses do not exceed the sum tendered the costs, expenses and fees shall be paid by the person who refuses the tender, and such costs, expenses and fees shall in other cases where the award is in favour of the claimant be paid by the Authority in addition to the sum awarded and where the award is in favour of the Authority be paid by the claimant.

(9) The Assessors are entitled to such fees as shall, subject to the approval of the Minister of Finance, be fixed by the Authority.

(10) A register containing the particulars of all expropriations hereunder and of the notices and awards in connection therewith shall be kept by the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives for the purpose of record.

(11) A notice of expropriation may be given under this Act where an agreement as to the compensation to be paid, subject to proof of title, has been made between the Authority and the owner of the land, but no reference shall be made to a Board of Assessors.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, there are just two aspects of this sub-section 2 which provides "that the amount of compensation to be paid shall be ascertained by a Board of Assessors which shall consist of three persons, one of whom shall be the Chairman of the Board, who shall be appointed by the Authority, and the other two of whom shall be appointed, one by the Authority and the other by the owner of the land . . ." In

other words the owner of the land is going in when his property is being expropriated with the cards stacked against him—the Authority has two representatives on the Board. I question, Sir, whether that is the fairest way of dealing with the man whose property is to be taken. Ordinarily one finds that in cases like that the owner and the expropriator in the case, whoever he might be, each appoint someone and these two agree on a Chairman—it does not seem quite fair, Sir, that the Authority is to have two nominees, conceivably three and certainly two and the owner who is contesting their offer has only himself or his nominee.

Then again, Sir, sub-section 6 provides that the word or findings of any two of them shall be deemed to be the award of the Board of Assessors and is final in all cases. I submit, Sir, it does not seem to give the property owner the proper degree of protection to which he is entitled when dealing with a government constituted authority. Perhaps the Minister might explain why sub-sections 2 and 6 are worded as they are?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I grant that the powers conferred there are great, but I understand that the powers are conferred in that way to avoid the possibility of the owner of the property required by the Authority hanging up the whole proceedings, hamstringing the expropriation proceedings. It is a principle that we have already established by legislation in this House in the Industries Acts, I believe, and in the Rural Planning Act and the Public Works Act—this whole expropriation section was taken from these Acts—I understand that the thought behind it is to try to prevent any owner of

property from hamstringing these expropriation proceedings.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Minister's reply but I still cannot see why, though it is done in other Acts that we should here perpetuate what seems to be an unfair advantage over the owner of property. I am quite sure, Sir, it is not the wish of this House to lend itself arbitrarily to this possibility of abuse of power. The fact is, as I see it, a man may quite honestly believe that his property is worth more than the Authority is prepared to pay, and there is no justification for our legalizing a land-grab, which is about what it amounts to.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to support the point raised by my honourable and learned friend. As he has suggested here, probably the Authority may want a piece of land, maybe a waterside premises, it may be the most valuable location there. They send their surveyors in and find out just what they want, and they notify the owner they intend to expropriate. Now they can make an offer of say one or two thousand dollars, and say; we give you such and such a time to accept this offer, and if you don't, we are going to appoint two assessors and you can appoint one. The Authority then appoints the chairman and appoints one other and the owner may appoint one. That is obviously a two to one chance against him or of his getting what he considers to be the fair price for his property which is being taken from him. A Board of Assessors set up like that are there to examine the value of the property,

Now there is another sub-clause which says the Authority can reduce the value of the award by any ad-

vantages which the owner may derive or be likely to derive directly or indirectly from the contemplated work and operations. In other words take part of the property and leave say the store and say: "Why you are to have a store right alongside where we are going to put a wharf and there is to be a lot of business going past your store to improve your property, and as a result we are going to tax you now for it and instead of giving you compensation we are going to charge you"—it may even go as far as that, and he would get nothing at all for his property. Surely it is only fair that there should be an umpire among the three instead of having it as it is now with two appointed by the Authority and only one appointed by the man whose property is to be taken.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only answer I can make to that is that the Authority must be trusted with the necessary authority and faith to appoint an assessor who will see that this person whose property is being expropriated gets a fair return for it. I am afraid, as far as this side of the House is concerned, we are going to have to insist upon that provision there for the Authority.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the Minister tell us why they have to insist on that? I think the remedy being offered by my honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's East, and the member for St. John's West, that the Authority appoint a Chairman and then the Authority and the owner each appoint one and agree on another. That seems to be fair. That is being done in many cases. It means you will have to deal with fishermen's property in LaScie and the Authority will have the right to ap-



point two men to go in and decide just what John Jones is going to get for his property. The cards will be stacked against that property holder. It will be a problem for many people there, and I don't see any reason why a third assessor could not be appointed by the Authority and one assessor appointed by the owner of the land. I wonder would the Minister tell us why that would not work?

Clause 29 carried. (Opposition voted against this clause).

Clause 30 read :

30 (1) A copy of the notice provided for under Section 28 upon which is endorsed or to which is attached an affidavit or a certificate of oath in proof of service of the notice upon the owner or of the posting of such notice as provided in that section is deemed to be included amongst the deeds and other documents to which reference is made in Section 6 of The Registration of Deeds Act; and the copy of the notice with the affidavit or certificate attached shall, notwithstanding any provision of that Act to the contrary, be registered in accordance with the provisions of that Act without proof for registration and without payment of fees.

(2) The provisions of the said Act relating to proof for registration of an instrument shall apply to proof of service or of posting of such notice as if the person serving or posting the same were the subscribing witness to the execution of the instrument.

(3) The registration of the copy of the notice with the affidavit or certificate attached has the same effect as the registration of an instrument under the said Act and for the purposes of Section 9 of the said Act the

Authority is deemed to be a purchaser for valuable consideration.

(4) Entry by the Registrar of Deeds in the index to the books of registry of the names of the person or persons or body upon whom the notice is served or upon whose land the notice is posted, if the owner is known, and of the Authority as the parties, the situation of the land to which the notice relates, a description of the document as a notice of expropriation, the date of the service or posting of the notice and the place of registration constitute compliance with the provisions of Section 27 of the said Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of that?

MR. KEOUGH: I am afraid I would have to refer to the Attorney General for that. That is too complicated for me—we could let it stand until the Attorney General returns to the House.

Clause 30 stand.

Clause 31 read :

31 (1) The Board of Assessors may at any stage of the proceedings before it and shall if so directed by the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof state in the form of a special case for the opinion of the Court any question of law arising in the course of the proceedings.

(2) Any party may apply to the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof for an order that any question of law arising in the course of the proceedings before the Board of Assessors shall be stated in the form of a special case.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, that seems to be a very sensible

provision. I take it it governs sub-clause 6 of Section 29 only if there is a question of law arising?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand it is so. It is operative only if a question of law arises.

MR. HIGGINS: But, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister say that the award of the assessors as provided in sub-section 6 of Clause 29 could be held up, if there is a question of law arising for determination of the Supreme Court?

MR. KEOUGH: My understanding is that is so, yes, that is what the section is intended to mean.

Clause 31 carried.

Clause 32 read:

32. Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require the Authority to make or arrange for the payment of compensation under this Act until such time as the owner has established his title to the reasonable satisfaction of the Authority and when any notice of expropriation is served under this Act it is the duty of the person on whom it is served to submit to the Authority his title deeds and any plans of his land which may be available to him and to provide the Authority with any information which it may reasonably require in connection with the title to the land; and where the owner makes delay in furnishing title deeds or plans or in providing necessary information the periods stated in this Act within which the compensation or interest if required to be paid or the finding of the Board of Assessors is otherwise required to be carried out shall be deemed to be extended by the period of delay so made by the owner.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be an unusual provision. I did not give any particular study to it before, but as I hear it read now—"Nothing contained in this Act shall be deemed to require the Authority to make or arrange for the payment of compensation under this Act until such time as the owner has established his title to the reasonable satisfaction of the Authority and when any notice of expropriation is served under this Act it is the duty of the person on whom it is served to submit to the Authority his title deeds and any plans of his land, which may be available to him, and to provide the Authority with any information which it may reasonably require in connection with the title of the land; and where the owner makes delay in furnishing title deeds or plans or in providing necessary information the period stated in this Act within which the compensation or interest is required to be paid or the finding of the Board of Assessors is otherwise required to be carried out shall be deemed to be extended by the period of delay so made by the owner."

What I mean about this is that in most of our outports our people have no grants of land but squatters titles, I imagine, in 95 per cent of the cases. There are no grants of land and if people have to produce title and deeds I think it is going to be pretty awkward for them. I can see the effect of the word "reasonable" but I should think that "shall submit to the Authority his title deeds and any plans of his land if any . . ."

MR. CURTIS: Yes, there would be no objection to these words in there. After the word "land," insert the words "if any."

Clause 32 as amended carried.

Clauses 33 and 34 read and carried.

Clause 35 read :

35 (1) Where any compensation is paid to the Registrar of the Supreme Court under Section 33 or 34 the Registrar shall upon any person establishing his claim to it or any portion of it according to law and fulfilling all of the terms or conditions applying to him under either of those sections, pay him the amount of such compensation or portion thereof, as the case may be.

(2) Where any claim to the compensation referred to in sub-section (1) is not in accordance with that sub-section established before the expiration of three years from the date on which it was paid to the Registrar of the Supreme Court, the Registrar shall on the expiration of that period return the amount of the compensation to the Authority together with all interest accrued thereon; and thereafter the claim of every person against the Authority or any person acting under it in respect of the land on account of which the compensation was paid to the Registrar shall forever cease, be extinguished and become wholly inoperative.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I think we can take exception to this provision because there may be cases where a person is a minor or just an infant, and may have no property rights to the land for himself. Only yesterday I had occasion to look up the statutes of limitations and there is a provision there in cases of infants which gives them ten years over and above what is given to anybody else. So that I don't see that that would be a very fair provision to make. There could be a case where the husband and wife had died and left an orphan who may be in an institution

in St. John's and would not know the Authority was taking his property and things like that have happened before. Or there may be a case of somebody being out of the country and not knowing about this three years. It seems to me to be an inadequate time, and I don't see the point of its being put in. It is an arbitrary time put in there, three years. I would suggest that six years would be much more reasonable. I suggest that it be changed to six years instead of three years.

MR. CURTIS: I see no objection to a change to six years, Mr. Chairman.

On motion the word "three" deleted and the word "six" substituted, also in the side title.

Clause as amended carried.

Clause 36 read :

36. If any land expropriated under this Act is subject to a lease or sub-lease for a term of not less than one year the Board of Assessors shall apportion the compensation fixed in respect of such land between the lessor and lessee and sub-lessee or the assigns of either in such manner as in its absolute discretion it sees fit; and if part only of the land is expropriated the Board shall, in addition, apportion the rent payable in respect of the land between the land so expropriated and the residue of the land and after the apportionment the lessee or sub-lessee or their assigns shall, as to all future accruing rent, be liable only for so much of the rent as is so apportioned in respect of the land not expropriated and in respect of the land not so expropriated and as against the lessee or sub-lessee or their assigns the lessor shall have all the same rights and remedies for the

recovery of such portion of rent as previously to such apportionment he had for the recovery of the whole rent reserved by such lease, and all the covenants, conditions, and agreements of such lease, except as to the amount of rent to be paid, shall remain in force with regard to that part of the land which is not expropriated in the same manner as they would have done if such part only of the land had been included in the lease or sub-lease.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could explain that section to us on this side of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the slightest doubt I could if I read it, but I have not since it came before Cabinet. The honourable gentleman need not doubt that I could explain it. I need only read it once and I could explain it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the difference between the honourable gentleman and myself—I don't understand statutes.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable the Attorney General, I hope, has read it?

MR. CURTIS: Not yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am certainly puzzled by this section, and would ask if the honourable gentleman has already put his seal of approval on it, because it is so complicated.

MR. CURTIS: I think it might stand, Mr. Chairman, while I read it. We could go on with the next one.

Clause 36 stand.

Clause 37 read and carried.

Clause 38 read and carried.

Clause 39 read:

39. This Act shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of June, 1953.

MR. BROWNE: I believe the Minister told us yesterday that the members of the Authority were not engaged until September. We thought it was the 1st of January from the persusal of the Bill when distributed—why is it retroactive until the 1st of June?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, the members of the Authority did take office on the 1st of September. It is made retroactive to cover such action as has been taken up to this time. I know of no action taken before the 1st of September as they were not appointed, and it may not be necessary to cover the three months previous anyway.

MR. CURTIS: It does not make any difference.

Clause 39 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might at this time remind the Committee that clauses 11, 13, 30 and 36 were allowed to stand.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, regarding Section 11, the point was that in addition to the recommendations in Section 11 there was a provision for resolutions under Section 5, sub-section 3, and I suggested that it would be better to have a more general regulation rather than have the one just referred to in the section.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, it looks to me on the face of it—here are regulations dealing with pensions, and these pensions will be made one set of regulations not a set of regulations made every year. It

seems to me that that is the kind of information that could be inquired for and tabled in the House in answer to questions, it should not be necessary to put a clause in saying that they should be tabled. These are not like regulations made from time to time, year to year, but these pension regulations will be made in the early stages, and I should think it would not be necessary to put it in the Act that they should be tabled. I think that the clause dealing with the tabling of regulations is just a way of advertising them. I really don't think it is necessary. I see no objections to tabling it but it seems a silly thing to put in the Act.

MR. BROWNE: I don't agree with the honourable gentleman that it is a question of advertising, when the Legislature gives authority to the Government it is only right the Legislature should be advised when regulations are made. I will agree, as pointed out yesterday, these members are not eligible for pensions until they have served for ten years, and I presume there will be no regulations made in a hurry to cover that, but I think we ought to know them as soon as they are passed.

Clause 11 carried.

Clause 13:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, in this case the Minister has already said the Authority shall carry out and enforce all agreements made before the passing of this Act. I presume the intention of the section is that the Authority will act more or less as a watch dog who will supervise what is being done by these companies in pursuance of their agreements, and report to the Minister if there is anything not being carried out, and the Minister will then proceed to enforce

the agreements. Otherwise we have to make an assignment of every agreement from the Minister to the Authority, and I don't think that should be necessary. It is a matter that can always be dealt with subsequently if we find present arrangements not satisfactory. My feeling as to this section is that this Authority will act more or less as an agent of the Minister in supervising it, and report back and recommend to the Minister any action that they deem necessary should any company not carry out its agreement.

MR. HOLLETT: But, Mr. Chairman, the section does say that—I will agree that is the function set out there—it would be perfectly in order. But they shall, according to this, carry out and enforce all agreements made. In other words as soon as the Act is passed, they have the right to go ahead, with no consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council needed. I think you ought to have the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. CURTIS: If it would make it any clearer we might change to—"supervise the carrying out and enforcing"—I don't know whether that would really make it any better.

MR. HOLLETT: That would indicate, of course, that the first step would come from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, would it not?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that depends on how far you want the Authority to go—is that what you want them to do, supervise them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly. Be a watch dog, see they are carrying out their obligations, see that the country's interests are protected, and report to the Minister.

MR. BROWNE: Why not say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is to sub-clause 2—the first word to be stricken out and the words "Supervise the carrying out and enforcement," substituted.

MR. BROWNE: There is just one question: These agreements are between the Government of Newfoundland and any persons—these are not the Loan Boards, not from any of the Fisheries Loan Boards, but directly from the Government?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

Clause 13 carried.

Clause 30:

MR. CURTIS: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the object of that is: As my honourable friend knows, Section 6 of the Registry of Deeds Act provides that documents must be registered at the Registrar of Deeds within a certain date, and if not registered within that period they are void.

MR. BROWNE: In other words, if not registered persons can't sell the property.

MR. CURTIS: If not registered then it operates as such.

MR. BROWNE: Have you got Section 6 there?

MR. CURTIS: Yes. This is just the normal registration clause and just provides that these things shall be registered.

Clause 30 carried.

Clause 36:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps Clause 36 might pass, and Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to read it before third reading.

MR. MURRAY: I think it is all right. I just went through it, and it is quite simple.

Clause 36 carried.

Preamble carried. Title carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion amendments read a first and second time. On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do not adjourn at 6:00 o'clock.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, is not that more or less a suspension of the rules of the House. I understand, according to Rule 7, the House closes at 6:00 o'clock on Wednesdays, Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question but there is no Wednesday evening as a regular evening for a sitting of the House. I take it that means suspension of the rules?

MR. SPEAKER: No—rules do not provide the House may sit on Monday, but the House may sit on Saturday and Sunday—this motion does not interfere with any freedom of speech.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion? On a day when the House does not usually sit after six o'clock would we not have to have unanimous consent of the House to sit?

MR. SPEAKER: If it were a motion which involved freedom of speech I would not of course accept it. In this case, if not a Government motion, the House might very well decide it would not sit.

MR. BROWNE: Then, Mr. Speaker, what is the meaning of this—at the



hour of six o'clock on Wednesday, Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question—if that is to have any meaning I think the House should adjourn now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That does not prevent a motion. I would refer to another rule; the House when sitting after six o'clock, for instance, rises at 11 o'clock, but that does not prevent a motion that the House do not rise at 11:00 o'clock. Motion may be made that the House not adjourn.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, there is no time to debate this motion, and the rule as it stands now should take effect.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are other rules which may take effect also.

MR. BROWNE: What is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: His Honour just referred to it.

MR. SPEAKER: As I see it the motion is quite in order, for the reason I just explained.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and we ought to adjourn until tomorrow and debate it tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall put the motion. The motion is quite in order.

Motion is that this House do not adjourn at 6:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: In my mind the ayes have it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say before you leave

the Chair that we have no intention until possibly the last moment of moving the suspension of the Rules of the House. We have not done it since we have been in office except in the last day or two of each session.

MR. BROWNE: You don't need to do it if you can do it this way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. It being six o'clock I shall leave the Chair until eight o'clock tonight.

The House is now recessed until 8:00 of the clock.

#### NIGHT SESSION

June 2, 1954

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole on Supply: Leave was given yesterday that this Committee sit again today—I do now leave the Chair.

Chairman of Committees (Mr. Courage).

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the committee that we proceed with the expenditure side on current account and then turn to the revenue side, and having examined and completed expenditures and revenue on current account, then turn to capital account, both revenue and expenditure. The beginning therefore, following that pattern, would be on page 24. Each minister will handle his own department's estimates. The practice then is to have the deputy-minister on hand, or if he be not available then the assistant deputy-minister, to assist the minister and refresh his memory and

the like in answering questions any member of the House may desire to ask. I would therefore ask the committee to turn to page 24. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that some ministers follow the practice of giving a sort of introductory review of the department's estimates while other ministers don't appear to see any particular necessity to do that, and are content merely to answer all the questions that may be directed at them. I think it is a matter entirely for each minister to follow the particular style or manner which appeals most to him. But we are anxious that the committee should have all the information to which the committee is entitled, and that is saying a lot, that is saying a great lot, when we submit estimates and request that moneys be voted for supply.

Current Account: Consolidated Fund Services:

101—Public Debt Interest:

MR. BROWNE: What is the financial position on that? Would the minister give a statement now?

MR. POWER: I think I gave a pretty lengthy statement the other day—if any honourable member has any questions?

MR. BROWNE: The first question I would like to ask is on 101-02 and 101-03. These represent our pre-confederation indebtedness, is that correct? That is the total pre-confederation debt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The total.

MR. BROWNE: I mean the loans, the public debt of the country in 1949?

MR. POWER: At what date?

MR. BROWNE: In 1949, April 1, 1949.

MR. POWER: That would be about five millions—that is what is here.

MR. BROWNE: Has any of that been paid off? How is that going to be paid off?

MR. POWER: There is a sinking fund at present, and this won't mature until 1957 and others won't mature until 1958.

MR. FOGWILL: In respect to the provincial debt as of 1949, was there not a loan at that time paid off in full?

MR. POWER: I think it was. There was a sterling debt of \$150,000.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in 101-07 Fisheries and Roads Loans, I notice an estimate of \$240,000. What was the cost of floating this loan? Was it sold at par or over par?

MR. POWER: This amount as closed—an interest of 4%. That \$240,000 is in respect of interest.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words that is the first year's interest on the ten million dollar loan, is that it?

MR. POWER: That is it. That represents half a year's interest.

MR. HOLLETT: I see.

MR. FOGWILL: I thought the Minister of Finance expected that we would be able to float this loan at par?

MR. POWER: Well, when we raise a bond issue we don't have to sell all the bonds at one time.

MR. HOLLETT: 05—\$150: Is there any reason why we are hanging on to that?

MR. POWER: That is the total

amount to cover any possible overdrafts that we may have.

MR. HOLLETT: You mean from time to time during the year? You don't mean any overdrafts at the present time.

MR. POWER: You see the amounts from Ottawa come in arrears, and practically every quarter.

MR. BROWNE: Is that \$240,000 supposed to be half year's interest?

MR. POWER: Yes at 4%.

MR. HOLLETT: On that particular item—Fisheries and Roads Loan—are we assured that that twelve million dollars in total will be earmarked for roads and for fisheries. I have a recollection of the ten million loan from last year which was earmarked for certain specific purposes, and I have recollection when looking at some of the expenditures, that the whole amount was not so applied as it was supposed to be. In this particular instance is that twelve million dollars specifically earmarked for fisheries loan alone?

MR. POWER: Well, I can hardly say so. I could not tie it down too closely as there might be an emergency sometime.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not mark it emergency loan in that case?

MR. POWER: It is a loan for development of roads and fisheries development, but every last cent of it need not be spent.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, we can get more detail from the Bill itself. Now on Item 101-06. The sale of the cement plant was made for four million dollars, and the management of the cement plant was to pay the interest on four

million dollars. Do I understand the cement plant was sold for four millions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nearer five millions, and they were to take over the interest at 4¾%. That is how they were to pay it.

MR. BROWNE: Have they paid that interest?

MR. POWER: I think before the interest came due that we did defer all interest payments on the new industries loan, I think, for two years.

MR. BROWNE: I thought it was three years.

MR. POWER: For two, as far as I know.

MR. HOLLETT: That was on loans which had been made to them—incidentally on the point—who are the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust?

MR. POWER: I think that question should more properly be addressed to the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. HOLLETT: Perhaps the Minister will be able to tell us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister has already answered that question in this session.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is their representative here in this country?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dr. E. Rothe. Mr. Barforth is his assistant.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the proportionate amount of \$475,000 paid by the purchaser of the cement mill, is it not a fact that they agreed to pay that in proportion to the interest in respect to the ten million dollar loan? If so did they pay

their proportionate share of the sinking fund and interest?

MR. POWER: We can get you that information later. Incidentally in regard to the cement mill the people who bought it have since spent large sums of money in expanding it.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not the point. The point is, have they paid anything towards the purchase. The purchase I understand was the servicing of four million seven hundred thousand dollars of that ten million dollar loan—now we ask the question: Have they serviced as to interest and as to sinking fund their proportion of that loan?

MR. POWER: You have had the answer with regard to the interest, but not with regard to the sinking fund.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the answer?

MR. POWER: We did not accept the interest from them. After they bought the plant it seems there was a sort of cement war on in Canada, some big company had been importing cement from Europe and the price of cement was way down for six or seven months, and the company was just about breaking even. Since then things have begun to boom again, but at the time that we forgave them the interest, the situation was not as good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Deferred, not forgave.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the reason you have deferred interest for all the others?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the same time.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words,

if you do it for one you do it for others. Is it the general practice of the Government to defer interest payments?

MR. POWER: These companies are just getting on their feet, and it would not profit the Government nor Newfoundland anything to squeeze the last drop of blood out of them. It is better to let them carry on and develop what capital they could out of the cost of their operations.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this company now operates or owns the cement plant. They must have been a substantial organization to buy a plant costing nearly five million dollars. Why was special consideration shown them, not having paid for the plant?

MR. POWER: The interest, you mean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They did pay for it. They paid, I think it was, two hundred thousand dollars cash down.

MR. HOLLETT: Which you loaned them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. And before the interest came due we deferred the amounts of interest for two years.

MR. HOLLETT: The point is, we are charged with about three hundred thousand dollars here for servicing of this loan, and three hundred thousand dollars sinking fund and four hundred and seventy-five thousand for the development loan, and this company is supposed to pay its share of nearly half of that, and has not paid it. I submit, Mr. Chairman, the decision of the Government and the Order of Council which I have in my possession here

—copies of it—says that the omission of interest was on account of moneys which were to be paid by companies who had borrowed money from the Government. Certainly there is nothing in that Order in Council to indicate that this particular company should have their interest deferred. It was merely to cover interest payments on loans which had been made from the Government, and that is what the Order in Council said.

MR. POWER: I could not remember now what the Order in Council said.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Minister let that stand until tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let what stand?

MR. HOLLETT: That item.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you mean to say we decide not to pay this? This is a statutory amount—we have to pay it.

MR. HOLLETT: Sure we will pay it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any information the honourable gentleman requires can stand over until tomorrow, but the item we have to pay, the House has no choice.

MR. HOLLETT: It is statutory that the Holding Trust pay it and not this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is statutory, this House pays it.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How the House recovers it is another matter, but that it be paid is statutory.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it laid down how it is to be paid?

MR. POWER: The first of July and the first of September, as far as we know.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, the cement plant was sold for approximately four million, eight hundred thousand I understand—now they did not pay any interest up to today—I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, the amount of interest and sinking fund they owe the Government at the present time.

MR. POWER: The interest is  $4\frac{3}{4}\%$  on the amount which it costs them.

MR. FOGWILL: What is the amount?

MR. POWER: Between four and a half and five million. I think the sinking fund is around 2%. The Government has to provide a certain sinking fund on the ten million dollars. The Holding Trust has taken over about four million seven hundred thousand, which is  $74\frac{1}{2}\%$ .

MR. BROWNE: Do they pay  $47\frac{1}{2}\%$  of the sinking fund?

MR. POWER: We will have that information for tomorrow.

MR. HOLLETT: They owe \$240,000 on the interest alone.

MR. POWER: You are going to get that information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I ought to explain before the item carries that there has not been a forgiveness of that amount due there, but a deferment only. They will pay before they are through exactly the same, no more no less, as they would have paid had there been no deferment. The two years are tacked on to the end, but it will still be the same amount exactly which they will

pay. They have spent some hundreds of thousands of dollars on enlarging and improving the plant. They have spent that themselves. They have spent more, they tell us, enlarging and improving the plant than they would have paid to us had they paid the interest and their share of the underwriting costs and sinking fund.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, why should they be allowed to do that and not pay their interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We decided to allow them to do it.

MR. HOLLETT: The Government has an interest in that now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do we have an interest in what?

MR. HOLLETT: In this cement plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: You have not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except that it interests the Government, and the public and everyone ought to have an interest in its success.

MR. BROWNE: Have we not a mortgage on the plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course—but we have no shares.

MR. BROWNE: I take it what really happened is that the payment of interest and the sinking fund have been deferred for two years, is that right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is right.

MR. BROWNE: Now there is no interest charge on that deferment—you just moved the whole thing ahead two years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: With regard to the item of \$200,000.

MR. POWER: What item is that?

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable the Premier referred to an amount of \$200,000 which was paid for the plant. We have the Auditor General's Report here—"the Cement Mill has been sold to North Star Cement Limited for \$4,340,000 and the shares in this Company, owned by the Government and having a par value of \$100,000 have been sold to Canadian Machinery Holding Trust for \$200,000. Funds to purchase the Cement Mill were advanced by the Government to North Star Cement Limited and this amount together with \$400,000 advanced to the Company for working capital making a total of \$4,740,000 is secured by a first mortgage on the fixed assets of the company in favour of the Government and bears interest at the rate of 4¾% per annum. The amount for which the Mill was sold represents approximately the sums expended by the Government in the construction and equipment of the Mill plus certain commitments amounting to \$115,000 approximately, made by the Government in connection with the erection of the plant, and unpaid as of the date of sale." The Premier said that is not so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say that. It is not so. I said we did not give them the money to buy the company.

MR. HOLLETT: You advanced it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what it says in the Auditor General's Report. Now they say it is the Canadian Machinery Holding Trust, and on



top of that we give them back the interest.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They own it because they bought it. They bought the shares of the company.

MR. HOLLETT: Has the North Star Cement Company a mortgage now or has the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Government has the mortgage on the North Star.

MR. HOLLETT: What have they got?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They own the mill.

MR. HOLLETT: What do the Holding Trust own?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They own North Star.

MR. BROWNE: They have not considered changing the name?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a vicious circle, is it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may appear so to an innocent gentleman like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with no experience in these matters.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank God I have not!

MR. SMALLWOOD: And it is not likely.

MR. HOLLETT: Pray God, I hope I won't.

Item No. 101—Public Debt Interest carried.

Item 102—Sinking Funds:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister

could tell us now the total amount of credit to each sinking fund, i.e. war loans and victory loans.

MR. POWER: It is shown in the Appendix, page 132—the full amount is there but it is not broken down. I believe that breakdown was the subject of an answer to a question which I tabled here.

MR. FOGWILL: That is correct. The sinking funds are there. I don't think it is important to have them broken down.

MR. POWER: I think they were broken down in answer to a question.

MR. BROWNE: Under 102-04, in regard to that sinking fund—I understand that the North Star Cement was sold almost two years ago?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The period of deferment will soon be up.

MR. BROWNE: Are you going to defer it again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not that we know. We don't think we are.

MR. BROWNE: The loan was raised somewhere in the summer of 1952. Was not the sinking fund payable every six months from the date of the sale? Well the second year period will soon be passed and it will be due this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This financial year, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall this item carry?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may we refer to that again on tomorrow—this particular one we are on now, sinking funds?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not unless it is allowed to stand.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, we want to check on the amount of interest which has been deferred by the Government.

MR. POWER: On the cement plant?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

MR. POWER: That would be 4¾% on the cost of the plant for two years.

MR. HOLLETT: I refer, Mr. Chairman, to the amount mentioned in the Order in Council relevant to the deferred amount of interest.

MR. POWER: I think I have already assured the honourable gentleman he shall have the information on the Order in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you!

Item 102 carried.

Item 103—Redemption of Debt:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister would tell us what that \$300,000 is for?

MR. POWER: That is to return to the Loan Board the amount we took on loan during the year.

Item 103 carried.

Item 104—Statutory Salaries:

MR. POWER: That is in connection with salaries for the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Finance.

MR. BROWNE: They are, in their class, both very good men, I think.

Item 104 carried.

Item 105—Issues Under Guarantees: No amount.

Legislature 201 Sessional:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice the chairman is to be increased. It embarrasses me, Mr. Chairman, to speak of it, he is such a nice person, but I understand that the position received an increase last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a typographical error. There is no increase. It is five hundred dollars too much.

MR. FOGWILL: In reference to 201-04—Printing of Hansard and Journals: I wonder could the Honourable Minister who is responsible for Hansard answer a question—when can we expect to get Hansard for the past four sessions. We have only the Hansard for 1949.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know who the minister is, but I happen to be pretty familiar with it. The printing was well advanced at the Job Printing Office of the Evening Telegram when that office closed suddenly, and so far as we were concerned, unexpectedly, and before we could prevent it, or make an effort to prevent it, the type for the bulk of the work which had been set up was thrown out, and so we had to have it done all over again at another office. The Hansard is now being printed at another office altogether, where they had to begin from scratch again.

MR. BROWNE: Where is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Guardian Press—to whom one of the loan boards made a loan, therefore, perhaps we should be wishing them success. At any rate we have passed Hansard to them for printing. I think before this year is over there should be one or two volumes available.

MR. BROWNE: We shall look

forward to that. In the meantime getting back to 201-01; details of which has been carried into the total, says there is a typographical error, which has been carried into the total, Mr. Chairman, I suppose, under the circumstances this year where we have only one stenotypist doing a super-human task whereas in former years I remember we had many stenographers, some special consideration, I suggest, should be given to the person doing the work at the present time.

MR. POWER: That matter has not come up at this session.

MR. BROWNE: I recommend it now in consideration of the Internal Economy Committee.

Item 201 carried.

Item 202—Miscellaneous:

MR. BROWNE: All these totals are wrong because of this five hundred dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has not been the practice to pass the totals in committee. They are totalled afterwards by Finance.

MR. POWER: In any event the Minister just asked me if that might be deferred, having to do with the chairman's increase in salary.

Item 202 passed.

MR. BROWNE: You will make the change.

MR. POWER: Yes.

Item 301: Lieutenant-Governor's Establishment:

MR. BROWNE: There is an increase there of over two thousand dollars. Are these in conformity

with the increases being given to officials in the civil service?

MR. POWER: Yes.

Item 301 carried.

Item 302—Premier's Office:

MR. BROWNE: Perhaps the Premier might tell us about these increases—are these similar to increases right through the civil service now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Thirty-five hundred to four thousand three hundred dollars, Grade VII, that is a big increase.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not according to scale, is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: There must be two scales, at least I see another Grade VII here for forty-two hundred and another forty-two hundred to forty-five hundred. That has been an increase of \$840. There must be some explanation for that, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HOLLETT: Is that officer the same as the personal assistant last year? The personal assistant of the Premier, is that the same thing?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I frankly don't know these titles. I don't know what a Grade VII or a Grade I is, I don't know one from the other. All I know is the names of the people who work in my office.

MR. HOLLETT: I was not referring to the grade, if the Honourable Premier does not mind. I asked if it was the same person as in last year's estimates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Frankly I don't know—tell us where the man is. Surely the Controller of the Treasury would know. I don't know any of these.

MR. POWER: That is Mrs. Templeman.

MR. BROWNE: There has been a new officer taken on there, and I presume that includes an increase of salary of the other—there are now two officials at \$5640. Who is the new person now?

MR. POWER: That is the transfer of the clerk from the Legislative.

MR. BROWNE: What salary does she get?

MR. POWER: The same salary plus the increase.

MR. BROWNE: How much is the increase.

MR. POWER: The increase is approximately ten per cent.

MR. BROWNE: What is the salary now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It says right after it—Page 88—\$2700-100-3400.

MR. POWER: That is \$2800 plus the cost of living bonus that was paid in addition.

MR. BROWNE: That is what I mean. That is what I want to try and understand, what is going on—I notice the cost of living bonus is being dropped—how much did that amount to on salaries?

MR. POWER: Four hundred on that salary.

MR. BROWNE: I see.

Item 302 carried.

Item 302—Executive Council Office:

MR. BROWNE: There is here an allowance to the Clerk of the Council. I take it that is Mr. Carew.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Shorthand typist Grade V—is that accounted for there by the cost of living bonus?

MR. POWER: That would represent the inclusion of the cost of living bonus, then the raise of ten per cent added on.

Item 303 carried.

Item 304—Newfoundland Election Act:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I expect a motion now from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to increase this.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a token vote, is it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: But who is going to pay for the election that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition called for November?

MR. HOLLETT: The people paid for the last one, and paid through the nose, Mr. Chairman, and will pay more through the nose for the next one. I think ten thousand dollars is a very good token vote. If it had been one dollar it would have been better. There is to be no election, Mr. Chairman—the Premier says so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has already called it—that is his right, his privilege.

MR. HOLLETT: That is your right and prerogative. I am sure I have not done as much guessing as the Honourable the Premier did. We shall see why my guess is as good as his. In this particular instance he is

only guessing at this moment. I suppose that is why it is mentioned as ten thousand dollars, which is a lot for that Election Act, a lot of money. I don't know what the forty dollars are for. It was ten thousand last year and forty dollars has been added on this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is because it is to be in November.

MR. POWER: The deputy-minister just informed me that the amount is put there to round off the total at the end of the page.

MR. HOLLETT: Just making a convenience out of the Election Act to round off the total.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what will happen to my honourable friend, he will be rounded off too.

MR. HOLLETT: He will be rounded up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, lassoed.

Item 304 carried.

Department of Finance:

401—Minister's Office:

MR. BROWNE: I take it the Deputy-Minister is the same person as the Controller of the Treasury?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable members will excuse me—we are on Item No. 401.

Item 401 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Shorthand typist is supposed to be increased from \$2360 to \$3090, that includes the cost of living bonus—I see. The travelling expenses 401-01. Should not that have been more than a thousand dollars during the last year?

MR. POWER: I can assure my honourable friend it was not included in the cost of our trip to Jamaica.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sure of what?

MR. BROWNE: The cost of the trip to Jamaica is not included.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to make it thoroughly clear to the House that when I go on a vacation I pay my own expenses out of my salary, out of my own pocket, and any colleague of mine in the Government who goes with me on my vacation does exactly the same thing. Our vacation to Jamaica cost the people of Newfoundland exactly not one cent. We paid it out of the salaries we earn by the sweat of our brow. That is what any man is entitled to do, and that is what we did.

MR. BROWNE: What was the actual cost of travelling expenses last year?

MR. POWER: The Minister's travelling expenses? I have already answered that question. The honourable member asked me that question and I tabled the answer. I don't remember what they were now.

Item 401 carried.

Item 402—General Office:

MR. HOLLETT: Is that the usual salary for assistant deputy-ministers?

MR. POWER: You are referring to the \$7,000. That is the assistant deputy-minister of Finance. The assistant deputy-minister in the Department of the Attorney General and in the Department of Health get eight thousand dollars a year.

MR. BROWNE: There are different rates, I can see that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, three for assistant deputy-ministers.

MR. BROWNE: There are two new positions, have these been filled yet?

MR. POWER: Neither has been filled yet.

MR. BROWNE: Will these be filled through the civil service or selected by the Minister, because I notice the Civil Service Commission complains they have very little work to do, and a very small number of posts pass through their hands.

MR. POWER: I assume these posts will be filled by the Civil Service Commission—that Grade IV there is a very important position.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would you mind if I answered it? The Minister is a little uncertain as to how far he can go in discussing the matter, but the Minister himself has performed a very notable piece of work in recent months in connection with the enforcement of social security assistance. He has, as a result of his own personal work, in that very important matter, after discussions with all concerned including his able deputy, come to the conclusion that he ought to recommend to the Government the creation of two new posts in his department to serve immediately under the deputy-minister for the much more efficient carrying out of the collection of revenue on the one hand and on the other the more effective carrying out the flood of details falling into the hands of the deputy-minister and the assistant deputy-minister. These are the recommendations of the Minister, and actually they have not as yet been decided on by Cabinet, but they are pretty high positions.

MR. BROWNE: I can understand certainly the necessity of having a good staff, and I have no complaint to make on that score. I thought perhaps they had already been filled, and wondered if they had been filled through the agency of the Civil Service Commission, but I am not quite clear on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will be filled by Cabinet—or the second one, which is administrative will be filled by the civil service.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the social security tax gives the department a lot of work and under the cancer tax, in so far as that applies, I have asked a question about that.

MR. POWER: That is administered under the Department of Health.

MR. BROWNE: But you collect it. Can you tell us how much was collected in the past year?

MR. POWER: We will come to that in the health estimates and revenue. It is credited to the health estimates.

MR. HOLLETT: While we are on this I would like to pay a compliment to that particular department. Unfortunately I have had occasion to visit it once or twice recently, and I had occasion to note the efficiency which exists in that department, and if I may, I would like to extend to the Minister, and through him to the officials of the department my great satisfaction at finding such efficiency in that department in the files and the ability to produce the various vouchers that we need in connection with questions asked the Minister, and I would like to thank the Minister for the courtesy we received from his department.



Item 402 carried.

Item 403 Auditor General's Department:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Deputy Auditor General?

MR. POWER: Mr. Luscombe, Mr. John Luscombe.

MR. BROWNE: And the next official there, who is that?

MR. POWER: A Mr. Haines. I don't know his first name.

Item 403 carried.

Item 404—Pensions and Gratuities:

MR. BROWNE: I notice a decrease in the first item there from \$260,000 to \$250,000, what is that?

MR. POWER: That means the vote was over-provided last year and has been brought into line.

MR. BROWNE: This item 404-03 is, I believe, the item under the Civil Service Act entitling the women in the civil service on marriage to receive a gratuity equal to one month for each year of service, and there have been several women who were in the service since 1949 who have gotten married and the Government refused to give them this gratuity, and they have made application to the Canadian Government, because the Canadian Government took over the services in the post office and customs and in certain other departments. I have been informed by the Minister of Finance at Ottawa that they can't collect the money from the Newfoundland Government. I think that is a scandal, because these people had earned that gratuity by their service with the Newfoundland Government prior to 1949. Now I think that these people and the House too deserves some explanation of the

attitude on the part of the Newfoundland Government. Why is it the Newfoundland Government refuses to honour the obligations placed upon them by the Act of 1947 which says they are entitled to one month's gratuity for each year of service prior to 1949?

MR. POWER: I would prefer that the Premier would answer that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is that they did not get married while in the service of the Newfoundland Government. They left the Newfoundland Government Service and went into the service of the Government of Canada, for the most part at better rates of pay than they had been getting. Surely it is not contended that anyone who goes over from the Newfoundland Government Service to another government should, if she marries, then receive a gratuity from the Newfoundland Government. She should perhaps from the Canadian Government but not from the Newfoundland Government surely.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Premier probably has not studied the matter very seriously or he would not make such an absurd answer as that to my statements. A person may have worked all her life in the post office prior to 1949, put it at a normal figure say of fifteen years, and then in 1949, after Confederation, she gets married.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But what else happened?

MR. BROWNE: She has been in the Canadian Service for six months, say, and then the Newfoundland Government turns around and holds up its hands—you are in the service of another government now and you can't expect us to give you fifteen

hundred dollars; they say. If she had not married on the 31st of March she would not receive that fifteen hundred dollars from the Newfoundland Government. On the 1st of April she was disqualified. I think the Premier is sensible enough to see that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I admit that in the cases of a person who got married shortly after leaving the Newfoundland Government Service and shortly after going into the Canadian Government Service, if she had spent a good many years previously in the Newfoundland Government Service, there would be a case of hardship. But at what age would she be, to have gotten married after she had spent a good many years in the public service? What is the likelihood that there would have been many ladies who had punched in a good many years of service with the Government of Newfoundland and then in 1949 left the service of the Newfoundland Government and went into Canadian Government Service and then got married? I suppose there were about one or two. Although I will admit this, I will be frank about it, one case would be too many, one case of injustice would be one case too many.

MR. BROWNE: There have been several which have come to my notice, and I might say that I have taken them up with Ottawa, but the Newfoundland Government still insist they should not pay them now.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Is the honourable gentleman making a distinction between those taken over automatically in 1949 and those who of their own free will left the Newfoundland Government Service?

MR. BROWNE: I am only dealing

with such persons as who had been in the Newfoundland Service and were taken over by the similar Canadian Service, principally in the post office and telegraph office services. Cases have come to my notice, in the post office and telegraph service. I am glad to see the Premier recognizes the injustice of that. But the point is that under our Civil Service Act of 1947 a woman is entitled to a gratuity on marriage of one month's salary for each year of service, and that was limited to one year, i.e. she could only receive a year's salary no matter how many years she had. That would be the highest amount the Newfoundland Government would have to pay. Now the Canadian Government could hardly say we will pay it, because the service had to be with the Newfoundland Government, and the gratuity had been earned with the Newfoundland Government, therefore they would naturally expect the Newfoundland Government to pay it. Now there is an amount of \$7,500 there—enough to cover it.

MR. POWER: I assure the honourable gentleman we will give that matter consideration. It is the first time it has come to my notice. Very obviously someone has slipped up because during the referendum when everybody was being warned about all the terrible things that were going to happen because of Confederation, somebody neglected to tell the postmistress she should have gotten married by the 31st of March in 1949.

MR. BROWNE: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, marriages don't happen that way. People could not get married because of pending Confederation no matter what else they did. But they may have gotten married without knowing what was involved here beforehand. There is a vote

here, and I presume this is the vote for those in the Newfoundland Government Services at the present time who may get married. But I think that now the Minister will give this matter consideration. I am surprised when he tells me that this is the first time he has heard it.

MR. POWER: Yes, it is.

MR. BROWNE: Now the number is not very great. There are only a few which have come to my notice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no recollection of a case ever having come before Cabinet. I believe they died silently when they reached Mr. Marshall, the Controller of the Treasury—I don't think they are ever allowed to get as far as the Cabinet. I know it is so. In fact he has just polished them off in his office so that they never saw the light of day in Cabinet. Now that the matter has been raised we have as much horror of injustice as the next man, and we will certainly have another look, and we won't be influenced by the hard heart of the Controller of the Treasury.

MR. FOGWILL: On Item 404-04 Railway Pensions: There is quite a lot of disagreement in respect to railway pensions in relation to many of the people retired since 1949 and also in relation to those who may retire in the future. They have a claim, which they feel is just under the Terms of Union with Canada. I think the Premier himself is very familiar with that. I was wondering if the Premier at this time would care to make any statement in respect to that item, which perhaps may help clear up the doubt which still exists in the minds of many who are working at the present time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very careful in what I do say in this matter. It is a matter with which I have concerned myself for five years, and particularly in recent months, as I know my honourable friend has. Indeed it is now, I think, about seven years since we both began to take some interest in this matter, about two years before Confederation when it became an issue of its present calibre.

My honourable friend is aware of certain developments recently about which the least said at the moment, I think, the better. He is also aware that the Government has even more recently sought advice as to what position we should take, and that we are awaiting the receipt of that advice at the moment. I won't attempt to forecast what it says except that I know this, if the one whose advice has been sought is now of the opinion that he held a couple of years or so ago, then the advice he will give us is to take a certain type of action. If that is his advice I don't want to anticipate what will be the decision of my colleagues in Cabinet, but I feel that their desire will be about the same as what I would desire myself, namely to take the action advised. My honourable friend will understand all that if the rest of the House does not. I think my honourable friend will understand what I mean. It is not a matter, frankly, I would care to discuss at this moment. At this moment the matter is not subjudice, however it is a matter about which we are awaiting advice, and I think I should leave it at that for the moment, and I hope my honourable friend will not press me. I think he will accept my word that we feel ourselves, and I feel myself personally, morally bound to stand

with the railway men in that matter to the last ditch, and I hope he does not doubt that I will live up, in so far as it is humanly possible and constitutionally possible for me to do so, to my obligations.

MR. FOGWILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that point of discussion made by the Premier I am in entire accord with him on the statement. I am not familiar with many of the aspects of the matter, and, as he says, they were advised by a gentleman very familiar with this business, and if he is of the same opinion as he expressed several years ago I have no doubt that perhaps the matter could be solved to the complete satisfaction of those concerned. I am glad to hear the Premier say he is behind the just claims of the railway workers, and if the railway workers' claim is just he is behind them to the last ditch, even to the extent, I hope, that the Government would be prepared to perhaps vote or spend some funds in respect to the ultimate solving of this problem. Would the Premier assure the committee that he would be prepared to do that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would assure the committee that I would be prepared to recommend to my colleagues, to request my colleagues, to take certain actions along the line that the honourable gentleman has in mind. I certainly would.

MR. FOGWILL: I thank the Premier very much, Mr. Chairman.

Item 404-05—Constabulary Pensions and Cost of Living Bonus:

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us, are the cost of living and marriage allowances included in the salaries of the constabulary as pensionable?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we included them a couple of years ago.

MR. HIGGINS: The reason I asked is, perhaps the Attorney General may correct me, I am informed a petition was directed to his department in the fall of 1953 by a number of ex-police sergeants and constables who have been pensioned since Confederation, requesting that the cost of living and marriage allowances be included in their basic salaries as pensionable. I do believe that men who were pensioned since 1952 had the cost of living and marriage allowances included, but for those pensioned since Confederation and prior to 1952, it did not apply.

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman, we have not as yet gone back and revised the pensions that had been given. I think it is very likely that we will, and I intend to bring it to the attention of the Government at a very early date. Actually a man who gets a pension has no comeback. He gets the pension he is entitled to, and he is clearly not entitled to have a revision. But there have been some cases of hardship where people who have served identical periods have received very uneven pensions, and I am afraid, in common justice to them, we will have to look back and review the pensions that were paid not only to 1949 but before.

MR. BROWNE: There is one class of pensions, Mr. Chairman, which I think deserves consideration perhaps more than others—these old time policemen kept on until sixty-five, probably some of them about ten or twenty years ago, and having spent over forty years and sometimes longer in the service. In the Commission of Government days the term of service had been reduced to

twenty-five years, but these old time policemen seem to me as they were pensioned with salaries very much lower than they are today they should get some consideration by having the cost of living bonus added.

Carried.

MR. CURTIS: That is what I meant when I said we might even have to go back beyond 1949.

404-06—Fire Department Pensions and Cost of Living Bonus: Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Item 404-07 is, I think, an item the Government deserves commendation for. I am glad to see the House paying this pension as the late Sir W. Horwood had many years of public service in this country, many years in the highest capacity in the country, during which time he served with distinction.

Item 404 carried.

Item 405—Social Security Assessment:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us who some of these are, the first three on page 90?

MR. POWER: The Director is Mr. Frank Hue.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister if Mr. Gordon Bearn is still with the Social Security.

MR. POWER: He was sent down there from the Department of Finance.

MR. HIGGINS: He did very, very able work.

MR. BROWNE: Could we know who the officer in the machine section is?

MR. POWER: That is Mr. Rowe. The other inspection officer is Mr. Gosse.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the question the other day about the number of prosecutions. Then I notice the Auditor General has complained about the manner in which the inspection service in regard to the collection of this tax is carried on by an inadequate staff. Is the Minister now in a position to tell the House whether he now has sufficient staff to see that this tax is collected?

MR. POWER: I am quite certain the situation there is excellent now.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister would tell us how much was collected. I believe there was an announcement over the air to the effect they were supposed to have lost many millions of dollars in collections, would that be a bit exaggerated?

MR. POWER: It should be more properly called large amounts in arrears, which we have collected.

Item 405 carried.

406—Miscellaneous:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister could tell us how that sayings campaign stands. Has there been much funds collected under that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is just general propaganda to promote thrift.

MR. HIGGINS: It is a programme on the radio.

MR. POWER: Yes. I can tell the honourable gentleman what the results have been—it runs into hundreds of thousands of dollars in stamps.

MR. BROWNE: These stamps are placed to the credit of people in the Newfoundland Savings Bank.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean to say, Mr. Chairman, the Government spent \$9,500 last year to encourage people to save, advertising the savings bank by press and radio?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was begun by the Commission of Government, and has just been carried on by us.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Minister think it is advisable?

MR. POWER: Well, the only answer I can give to that is to ask whether it is advisable to save or not. If you answer that question you answer this one.

MR. HOLLETT: That is exactly what I wanted the Honourable Minister to say. But I would say to the Honourable Minister it is not advisable to pay these expenses for advertising from moneys you collect under the Social Security Act, hundreds and hundreds of dollars. That is mere nonsense from your point of view, to ask people to save—let them spend and keep the social security assessment up. So I think it is nonsense from the point of view of the Government to spend \$9,500 encouraging people to save when it is in the interest of the Government, from a financial point of view, to have them spend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A clever argument.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see anything clever about it. But I don't think it is clever to continue an expenditure of \$9,000 because the Commission of Government did it.

MR. POWER: Does the honourable member suggest that just because there is taxation there should be no desire on the part of the Government for the people to save?

MR. BROWNE: The more they

save the more they have to pay in taxes.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't figure that out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is getting too profound for me—too deep.

MR. HOLLETT: But, Mr. Chairman, I am just wondering if it is wise to continue a charge of \$9,000.

MR. POWER: What would the honourable gentleman recommend? Telling them not to save?

MR. HOLLETT: No—don't say anything—leave them alone.

MR. POWER: Good enough.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, this amount of \$101,500 is that for the purpose of financing or rather floating the proposed twelve million loan?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on what basis does the Minister arrive at the amount of \$101,500?

MR. POWER: Well the original vote in 1953-54 was fifteen hundred and that amount added is a guess on the part of the department.

MR. HOLLETT: That is for the expenses of the public debt. My honourable friend on my left wants to know if that is to be the cost of raising the new loan—how is it broken down?

MR. POWER: As I have already said it is a guess, and I don't think anybody in the world could do anything but guess as to what the exact amount would be. I think a hundred thousand dollars is pretty good.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it for raising the loan, or managing the public debt made up of half a dozen.



MR. POWER: For the raising of the loan.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not say so here.

MR. BROWNE: The cost of floating the loan in 1952 was twice as much. Do you expect to get it for half that price this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: 406-10—is that someone you are installing?

MR. POWER: That is Peat, Marwick and Mitchell.

MR. BROWNE: Are they going to be on this year too?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: They have been on since 1949, have they?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have been on since Confederation.

MR. HOLLETT: That is about \$25,000 now paid them, surely they should soon have the thing properly lined up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is now probably more so perhaps than any other Province of Canada, but they want to make it even better than it is.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe that is so, all right.

MR. POWER: 406-12—Property Loss Reserve Fund: That is in lieu of fire insurance on Government buildings.

MR. BROWNE: What is done with that \$25,000?

MR. POWER: It is deposited in the Bank of Montreal.

MR. BROWNE: What is the balance now?

MR. POWER: Around \$75,000.

MR. BROWNE: Has there been any fires since payments have been made?

MR. POWER: No.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the financial adviser who receives \$1,000?

MR. POWER: Mr. Thompson.

MR. BROWNE: Is that a retaining fee or does he constantly visit here?

MR. POWER: He visits us.

MR. BROWNE: He visits, but what does he do?

MR. POWER: He is a financial adviser, and whatever financial advisers do he does.

MR. BROWNE: He actually does not do anything at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, lots of things.

MR. BROWNE: Give us an example of what he has done this year.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought that \$25,000 was for Mr. Thompson?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is his firm. That is another function altogether. One is a personal function the other is his firm. The man is our financial adviser, the Government's financial adviser. His firm is the firm which has introduced and are continuing to improve our whole central accounting, central control, central payroll control, our whole financial system. They are established here in St. John's. Mr. Thompson personally comes down once or twice a year to confer with us.

MR. HOLLETT: With all due respects to Mr. Thompson, who I suspect is a very important man, in his job, I would say if we cannot get a man who demands more than one thousand dollars as financial adviser to the Government it would be better to do without him altogether. Now I see what happens to the finances of this country. There is only a thousand dollar financial adviser to the Government. I think it is ridiculous. I think that therein lies the whole secret of the failure of this particular Government in its financial arrangements, borrowing twelve million dollars, and ten million last year.

MR. POWER: If it is wrong to borrow then all the Governments of the world are wrong and all the provinces of Canada, they borrow much more heavily than we do. So if they are all wrong we are all in the same boat.

MR. HOLLETT: They all did not have fifty million dollars four or five years ago.

MR. POWER: They spent far more, most of them.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Quebec and Ontario.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, much more, double actually—we have the figures.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take that contradiction from the Premier, I will argue it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go ahead!

MR. BROWNE: I say they did borrow, and if they borrowed more it was because they were repaying loans. They did not have fifty million dollar nest egg and then another ten millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They did not have sixty millions.

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor. Was the advice of Mr. Thompson sought in connection with the sale of the cement mill—could the Minister answer that?

MR. POWER: I could direct that to the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is no.

MR. HOLLETT: There again somebody made a big mistake, a blunder. I can't talk about that very much now, but I think if you are going to get a financial adviser, Mr. Chairman, you should get somebody that would demand more than one thousand dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What does the honourable member mean by "You"? I would ask the members of the committee to outlaw the words "You" and "Yours."

MR. HOLLETT: When I say "You" I say it in reference to the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not the chief offender in that respect.

MR. HOLLETT: I am an offender, Mr. Chairman, I know that. If the Minister could tell me how much they paid Mr. Thompson during the past year—I believe I can ask that question, but I am not sure.

MR. POWER: The honourable gentleman has me a bit confused. I listened to him for a couple of days, for instance, when he had his hands

up in the air about twenty-five thousand dollars. Now he tells me we should pay this man more. What we pay this man is not enough and what we pay the others is too much.

MR. CURTIS: You can't win.

MR. HOLLETT: Did Mr. Thompson advise the Government to pay these three fish men twenty-five thousand dollars each?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: He did not. Then what does he advise the Government on?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Financial matters.

MR. POWER: Actually that is in the nature of a retaining fee. If we require his services they are higher than that.

MR. HOLLETT: He could get \$1,600 in 1952-53. How is that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because we paid him that.

MR. HOLLETT: If the honourable the Premier wants to be stubborn!

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is heavy stuff, this one thousand dollars. This is worth a couple of days debate—a thousand dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Heavy stuff for heavy minds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Honourable the Premier would keep quiet occasionally—I for one am not going to be brow-beaten by anybody.

MR. BROWNE: 406-17—Workmen's Compensation: What does that mean?

MR. POWER: That has to do with provisions for payment for Government Departments exclusive of the Department of Public Works. It is a provision made to complete the claims of compensation boards for workers in the Government departments, exclusive of Public Works.

MR. BROWNE: Under 406-18 there is a reduction there of \$20,000. That means you ultimately settled the problem of the Harbour Grace and Carbonear Water.

MR. POWER: That is a re-vote there.

MR. HIGGINS: 406-19—Financial Commission of Inquiry: Mr. Chairman, is it permissible to inquire whether most of these gentlemen are not in fact serving on this Commission of Inquiry without receiving any gratuity?

MR. POWER: I believe all of them, as I have said before.

MR. BROWNE: Are they getting paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not been paid yet.

MR. BROWNE: Are they to get paid? And at what rates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have not decided as of now. In addition to the members of the commission, there are officials of the commission and there are financial and economic and other types of experts whom the Commission of Inquiry desire to employ; for instance, they have already retained Mr. Thompson, they have already retained Carl Goldenberg and he has people with him to make the economic survey, and they will engage other

people from time to time. The secretary is a paid man. This is only an estimate. We may have to pay more than that, we are only estimating.

MR. BROWNE: I must confess to not being aware of Carl Goldenberg. Could the Premier tell us who he is?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly. I thought his name was known to the honourable and learned gentleman. He is a lawyer and economist living in Montreal. He was brought here just after Confederation; and he has just completed a very sizable job for the Government of British Columbia in the preparation of their statement of claims, very important claims connected with their railway, of which my honourable and learned friend must have heard, for presentation to the Government of Canada. He has done work for most of the governments across Canada of an economic character and made numerous economic studies. He was one of these dollar a year men during the war. He is a very great, able and clever man with very high standing in Ottawa. Now he has been retained and his associates have been retained by the Commission of Inquiry. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that the Government assured the Commission of Inquiry that they could engage anyone they liked, anywhere in the world, with no limitation whatsoever, no limits. They could employ any one they liked in the world to make any inquiries they felt ought to be made. In other words the Government has given them a completely free hand to prepare Newfoundland's case for presentation to the Royal Commission next year or the year after or whenever it may come. My honourable friend and colleague, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island is the Chairman of

that Commission of Inquiry, and he can confirm the statements I have just made, that they have a completely free hand. All we ask is that they tell us whom they want and what they propose to pay, and the Government will do the rest. If my honourable colleague, the Chairman, cares to tell the committee more about it, he is at liberty to do so.

MR. POWER: I would like to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that out of this fifty thousand dollars Thompson will receive quite a large sum.

MR. HOLLETT: He will receive a large sum?

MR. BROWNE: A royal sum.

MR. POWER: Yes, a large sum.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the honourable Minister tell us at the moment, if he can, whether the other commissions have been given carte blanche?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not. We regard this commission of inquiry as of maximum importance to Newfoundland, of maximum importance.

MR. HOLLETT: Like the fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not my honourable friend agree?

MR. HOLLETT: Of maximum importance? Well I have heard the fishery report is one of great importance, and if this one is of maximum importance, how does he put that, in the second degree?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If my honourable friend does not see it, it is too bad.

HON. P. J. LEWIS (Minister without portfolio): Mr. Chairman, if I

may I would like to qualify that one comment the Honourable the Premier has made in reference to the retaining of experts. It is true that under the Order in Council we have been authorized to recommend certain experts whom we think may be necessary and helpful to us in the work that we are asked to do, but our recommendation is subject to the ratification of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. HIGGINS: I may say that is much more reasonable. I thought the honourable and learned member for Harbour Main-Bell Island would come back on that earlier statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think my honourable colleague suggested that the Government will not back the Commission to the absolute limit. Anyone they have asked us to employ has been employed, and they have been refused nothing they wanted up to this moment, and I don't think there is any indication they will be refused anything they ask for. In other words we wish this Commission of Inquiry to do for Newfoundland a very great piece of work, and we wish them to have all the help they can possibly need. All they have to do is ask for it. I think he will confirm that too.

MR. HOLLETT: I do hope that this Commission will do for Newfoundland what a certain other commission failed to do in 1949. It is a big job, and I may say, speaking for myself and for my colleagues on this side, we have every confidence in the Chairman of this Commission, and I am very glad.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the members?

MR. HOLLETT: I am speaking

at the moment about the chairman. I could not say the members off hand as I don't know who they are. I have heard one or two names. I should know them perhaps—but I have full confidence in the Chairman, and I don't believe, he would have anybody on that commission who was not of the first importance, and I am sure we in the Opposition wish him and his committee every success. And I assure him of any assistance we may be able to offer; and we won't want any thousand dollars.

Item 406 carried.

Item 407—General Contingencies: Carried.

409—Central Accounting and Pay Division:

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister give us the name of the director of Central Accounting and is this a separate account now for the pay offices for the whole of the Government?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: In the department of Finance?

MR. POWER: Yes, and that is Mr. Gordon Bearns.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the director of payrolls?

MR. POWER: That is Mr. Coombs.

MR. BROWNE: And the Director of Commitment Control?

MR. POWER: That is Mr. Rabbits.

410—Civil Service Commission:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have already mentioned the fact they have complained of their lack of work being placed before them. There

are a number of people who have been excluded from their jurisdiction, and they feel they should have wider powers in regard to the number of persons who should go before them for examination either for promotion or for appointment in the civil service. Has no consideration been given to that?

MR. POWER: As far as I remember, Sir, every civil service job goes before them.

MR. BROWNE: No there is a big list of them.

MR. POWER: They are not established civil servants then. Established and pensionable civil servants go before them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could add this comment to what my honourable colleague has said, that the figures are small because of the fact that a really large number of public servants are not, as my colleague says, established and pensionable civil servants. Perhaps pretty close to half the civil service is made up of persons who work in the hospitals and institutions and the like who are not pensionable and are not established, but are a sort of transient public servants. But the majority of these pensionable and established civil servants are under the civil service commission. Now the civil service commission is quite new as yet, and our feeling is that before probably all civil servants are brought under them they should be in operation for a longer period of time, and should feel their way. We have had a representation from them, and we have decided quite deliberately to postpone consideration of their representation for many months to come. It is a deliberate policy to have them take their time. We don't want to have these men in complete

control of the civil service until they are ready for it. And we don't think they are quite ready for it yet.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the names of the three men.

MR. POWER: Mr. Carter, Mr. Ashley and Mr. Taylor.

MR. HOLLETT: How long have they been appointed?

MR. POWER: Almost a year, I should say, not quite a year.

MR. HOLLETT: I think my honourable friend wanted to know about the pension fund, and he would like to make a few remarks about that when he comes back. We could let it stand, or let me continue talking until he comes back, I personally know very little about it.

MR. POWER: I suggest we should have a short recess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say the honourable member could discuss the matter as his colleague will be here in a moment. We are at the end of the department. After finishing this department we might have a short recess.

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to find out is why a civil service commission asking that amount, should require only one officer and one shorthand typist?

MR. POWER: That is all the nature of the work calls for.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me that is quite an expenditure of money for such a small amount of work.

MR. POWER: The chairman's salary is personal. He was a deputy-minister and was earning, I think, almost that amount, and would be



earning more after the raise given the civil servants last year, or about the same. That is the reason why that salary is up, it is a personal one.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I drew the attention of the Minister to the report of the civil service commission, page 2, paragraph 5, which spoke about a recommendation sent to the Minister of Finance and passed on to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but in so far as the Commission is aware, no definite action has been taken in this connection. And you can see from the next page of the report that the powers of the Civil Service Commission are not as great as it might appear. Apparently they cannot deal with a number of positions. I wonder if any further consideration has been given to the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission in that respect. I might say that in my opinion it is very important that you should have good civil servants, and that all the posts which are suitable for examination by the civil service commission should be passed over to them. I don't think all of them should be considered by the Civil Service Commission, not the top positions, certainly not. But I think as far as possible they should have those who are suitable for consideration by the Commission.

MR. POWER: We hope to arrive at that happy state, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was explaining while the honourable gentleman was absent that we did not feel, and I do not feel, that the time is ripe to put all or even the great majority of the higher civil service or in fact of the civil service under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. The document my honourable friend just referred to pointed

out that the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission is over the same posts exactly as the jurisdiction of the late civil service selection board. Now the civil service selection board consisted of some six or seven of the deputy-ministers. The chairman was, I think, the Auditor General, and the deputy-minister of Finance was a member, and the clerk of the council the deputy-minister of Provincial Affairs. Now the Civil Service Commission has the same jurisdiction. We have not added to the authority nor have we taken from it—the same jurisdiction is there, with this difference, that the civil service selection board was made up of men who had far more experience with the civil service and its requirement for the various posts than has the Civil Service Commission. In the first place their experience was more comprehensive and in the second place one of the three is not himself an ex-civil servant, I refer to Mr. Ashley, but is a gentleman who came in from commercial life. So that only two of the men on the Civil Service Commission are themselves ex-civil servants. Therefore we do not feel justified in adding to the responsibility nor to the jurisdiction yet. We do not feel like doing it yet, but only after the Civil Service Commission from day to day and week to week gain practical experience in office. gain more practical experience in the job. As a matter of fact we never would have set up the Civil Service Commission in the first place but for the fact that the work was occupying far too much of the time of valuable and highly paid deputy-ministers. We found repeatedly that when we needed this or that from the deputy-ministers, the Auditor General, the Controller of the Treasury, the Clerk of the Council,

they were working or meeting as a civil service selection board, which was a great inconvenience to the Government and to the Cabinet. It also was an inconvenience to them and they objected strongly, and it was when these deputy-ministers comprising the civil service selection board asked the Government to abolish them as such and set up a Civil Service Commission that we decided to do so, with a certain amount of misgiving.

Now this Civil Service Commission would not be worth their salt if they did not write a report such as my honourable friend just quoted from, saying that they should like to have the entire civil service brought under their jurisdiction. Perhaps that day will come, but not yet. I don't think, frankly, they are ready for it yet.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think all the posts should go under their jurisdiction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but far more will come under it than are under it now.

MR. HOLLETT: I understood the Premier to say here that he himself would appoint all deputy-ministers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say appoint. I select, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council appoints—I select.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words a deputy-minister is a political appointment, and can only fear to be fired as soon as there is a change of government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is untrue and very unsound and very unfair. I am Premier and while I am Premier I act as Premier. When I act as the Leader of the Liberal Party

that is another matter. When acting as Premier I select a gentleman to be a deputy-minister. That does not say the next Premier has the right to fire him. I have not the right to fire a deputy-minister except for very good cause. I would say that more than half of the deputy-ministers in the service today are Tories, but that does not mean a thing. Their jobs are just as sure as if they were the most ardent Liberals. So, if I ever live to that frosty Friday to which I referred; the people of Newfoundland won't thank him if they suspect he harbours any such intentions in his breast. They won't thank him for it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Premier ought to select the deputies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is the Premier.

MR. HOLLETT: Because he is the Premier does not mean he is Almighty God—a deputy-minister is a civil servant just the same as any of them here, and works up by stages until he gets to the top, and he is well qualified then. All the departments have well qualified men and very few were selected by the Premier. It is just as well and better by reason of the fact that in these appointments the Premier does not select the deputy-ministers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It happens to be true that I do select them.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not true—what deputy-ministers were selected by the Honourable the Premier?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All that have been selected since this Government came into office I selected. Never mind who they are. Supposing there is only one—but I selected at least four or five; and whoever is Premier

in Newfoundland he will select the deputy-ministers and whoever the Prime Minister of Canada is he selects the deputy-ministers in the Government of Canada—that is so—

MR. HOLLETT: That is not so, Mr. Chairman—a deputy-minister is a civil servant and he gradually works into that class, and he remains there because he carries out the duties of his office as a civil servant. He is pensionable and the Premier does not select him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who does? Who selects him?

MR. HOLLETT: The Civil Service Commission.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no deputy-minister from one end of Canada to the other who has been selected by any civil service commission, with no exception, in all Canada.

DR. ROWE: I can add to what the Premier has said. I happen to know several deputy-ministers in Ottawa who were selected by the Prime Minister of Canada and not by any board. I can name one right now who was called into the Prime Minister's office for that purpose. What is wrong—the honourable gentleman won't ever believe the Premier of this Province has selected every deputy-minister in this Province since 1949. I have the names right here of those having been appointed since 1949; and there is another who is not now a deputy-minister who was selected by the Premier and appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That does not make it a political appointment either. If he is selected by the Premier it is not necessarily political. In addition to being the leader of his party the Premier is the Premier and

while he is such any selection he makes of persons to be deputy-ministers are not political appointments. I have made no political selections of deputy-ministers since I have been in office, not one. I have selected men that I thought were the best men available in Newfoundland for the particular post, and most people have agreed with it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is nobody saying the Honourable the Premier has selected anybody who was not the best man he could get. That is the history of the Honourable the Premier. For instance the Fisheries Development Authority is made up of the only three men under the sun who could possibly have served on that committee. And on the committee for the revision of financial terms the honourable member for Harbour Main-Bell Island is the best possible man—nobody is questioning the Premier's selections at all, but I am saying that it is unfortunate if every time a new Premier comes into office in this country he has to look at the deputy-ministers and see whether he likes them or not, and selects them. If he is going to select the deputy-ministers he should select the assistants and right on down the line—that would be fine.

410 Carried.

Department of Provincial Affairs:

501—Minister's Office—Carried.

502—General Office:

MR. BROWNE: I notice that there has been one officer moved from Grade III to Grade IV. I should like to know who that is and why?

MR. MURRAY: I cannot offhand. The officer in question is Mr. Christopher. He had been selected since before I went there, and is I believe,

in St. John's, I think with the Department of Public Works.

**MR. BROWNE:** He is being paid by us?

**MR. MURRAY:** No.

Item 503—Public Relations:

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, what are the duties of the officer in charge of public relations? And who is he?

**MR. MURRAY:** The officer in charge is Mr. McNeily, formerly the editor of the paper called "The Newfoundland Government Bulletin" but the publication of the bulletin was suspended last year. Mr. McNeily presently does the job of tabulating records and that sort of thing. Actually he is a very old man and we tried to fit him in somehow.

**MR. BROWNE:** An old newspaper man. I imagine there is great sympathy in some quarters towards him. The reason I brought up the matter is I have been often in there and notice they have a file of clippings and that sort of thing. Are these clippings available for the members of the House to see?

**MR. MURRAY:** Certainly—all these clippings are of public documents and anyone can come in to see them.

**MR. BROWNE:** And all speeches in the last three or four years are filed?

**MR. MURRAY:** Yes.

Item 504—Museum:

**MR. BROWNE:** When is the museum going to open its doors to the public again?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Perhaps I might tell the honourable gentleman

something about that. The new museum was advertised by the curator, Mr. English, as about to open on a certain date. That was news to the Minister and was news to me and news to all of us in the Government. Mr. English is a man of very great enthusiasm and he has a great love for the work he is doing. His enthusiasm, I think, is beyond dispute, and I think everyone will admit it. I however felt that, as the Government as a whole was responsible for the museum, it might be better if the collective judgment of quite a number be sought rather than have the Government put in the position where it had to accept the sole judgment of one man that the museum was ready. I therefore invited some eight or ten prominent persons in the city interested in history and with some knowledge of Newfoundland history, I personally invited them to look at the new museum and report to me personally their opinions as to the suitability of the museum as it stood to be opened to the public.

I don't remember who I asked, but I remember some of them. Mr. J. Higgins and Mr. Robert S. Furlong, Mr. Albert Perlin, Mr. W. Carew, Mr. Don Jamieson, Mr. Michael Harrington, and I think Mr. Jeffery if the Evening Telegram and several others to make a personal inspection of the museum. As a result of the report of these gentlemen it seems to me that we are not ready to open the museum or rather that the museum is not ready to be opened until certain changes have been made there.

**MR. BROWNE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, what is being done about it now? Is it all being left to the curator? I can easily understand it has to be a very slow job, and I think it is beyond the efforts of one man to

organize the great variety of exhibits. Has he any assistance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The latest thought was that we bring—perhaps the Minister remembers this more vividly than I do although I may say this all happened within very recent weeks—

MR. MURRAY: Yes, the latest thought was that we should try to get in touch with some people trained in museum work who preferably had some Newfoundland background or were born Newfoundlanders. The latest thing that has been done is that we have written the National Museum at Ottawa to find out if they have any trained personnel with a Newfoundland background to be made available to us.

MR. BROWNE: That is a very good idea, as is, I think, the Premier's idea of getting a group of people such as he named to form a voluntary board. Most of these men mentioned were members of the Historical Society in which they were advisers and their collective judgment was available. I think the transformation of the museum into a state where it could be opened to the public would advance more rapidly under them than if left to Mr. English or anybody else whoever he might be. And I suggest that the Government give some consideration to the formation of a museum board for history and antiques or whatever you may care to call them, but somewhat similar to the Public Libraries Board, and then you could always have their advice.

MR. MURRAY: There is the Historical Society.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if I may ask what was wrong? Why was it not opened? Was it on the advice of these men that it should not be?

MR. MURRAY: To put it brutally, we did not think it was fit to be opened or that it was worthy of the province.

MR. HOLLETT: There was a time when it was. There were quite a number of exhibits which people would wish to see. Have all these exhibits been preserved?

MR. MURRAY: As to what happened to the old building, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that when the Commission of Government took over the actual building used for the museum, it was taken over for office space and various exhibits were scattered—some were put in the Sanatorium for safekeeping others were put out in the laboratory then at Bay Bulls, which was later burned and a lot of them disappeared there. Some of the others just disappeared or were destroyed from neglect, others have been protected and preserved, principally the Beothic Skeleton which is still in a good state of preservation, and actually the most valuable item we have.

Item 506—Miscellaneous:

MR. BROWNE: Censorship of Moving Pictures: I take it there is no one there?

MR. MURRAY: No purely a token.

MR. BROWNE: Has the Minister given any consideration to having someone to do that. I think it is sometimes necessary.

MR. MURRAY: We would be prepared to study any suggestions put forward. That item for public records, that is an amount made available there. We have found scattered about the country and at various sales

sometimes items of great historical value to the country, which were sometimes found through Mr. Nimshi Carew who had a sort of roving commission on a purely honorary basis, and he used to bring to our attention objects which he thought were worthy of being part of the public records of Newfoundland. The object of this vote is to purchase such objects if we thought they were worth it.

MR. BROWNE: How much did you spend in the past year?

MR. MURRAY: \$375 for the past eight months.

MR. BROWNE: What did you buy?

MR. MURRAY: We got some documents Mr. Carew had in his possession—documents which I thought really historical, about eight of them I believe.

MR. BROWNE: For the museum?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, or to become part of the public records of the country which are kept in Provincial Affairs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We also got one of the world's few sets of the annual report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. That was the body which sponsored many of the early churches in Newfoundland and many of the schools in Newfoundland. Indeed they sponsored schools in Newfoundland as recently as within my memory. Now that is a very famous body in England, and their annual reports contain references to many parts of Newfoundland. And Mr. Carew became aware of the fact that there existed in England an almost complete unbroken set of these annual reports running back to about 1720 or 1730 or some where

about that order. Frankly when he told me about them I said; order them and if I cannot get the Government to pay for them I will, but order them, don't let them out of your hand. He did, and I spoke to the Minister who gladly confirmed my statement. They have been received now, and I think Mr. Carew got us another item of very great value, a complete set of prints of the Governors of Newfoundland, with a few gaps, of course, and these are in virtually good condition. I have never seen prints in Newfoundland in such beautiful condition as these are. They are at the moment, I believe, in the possession of the Lieutenant-Governor at Government House. I believe we paid for these out of this vote or if not in the year just passed.

MR. BROWNE: What are you going to do with them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These I think we should put in Government House. These prints of the Governors of Newfoundland, I think, suitably mounted and framed, should be displayed in Government House.

MR. BROWNE: The year before last the amount was only \$6.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyway—perhaps they have not been paid for yet.

MR. BROWNE: You say they include virtually all of the Governors.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if Henry Osborne, the very first, is there or not? But with the exception of certain gaps virtually all the Governors of Newfoundland down to seventy, eighty or ninety years ago, until quite recently.

MR. BROWNE: Just before your time?



DR. ROWE: I might add a few words to what the Premier has said. When I was doing some research a few years ago I naturally looked for those reports because that possibly was the first organization that had anything to do with Newfoundland, and if it did not establish certainly came to the help of the first school which was started in Newfoundland, in Bonavista, in 1723 or 1724. I could not find a complete set in Newfoundland of the annual reports of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. I found several incomplete sets, and quite a number of them contained most enlightening information such as I have never seen elsewhere about the social conditions in Newfoundland as far back as the 1730's. When I heard a few weeks ago that Mr. Carew succeeded in obtaining or could obtain a complete set I felt that we were about to obtain one of the most valuable historical documents Newfoundland could obtain anywhere.

#### Item 507—Civil Defense:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, have we a director of civil defense at the present time, and if so, who and what salary is he being paid, and also if the Minister would table the report of the director, if he has had one, and tell us what is supposed to be done here under this heading.

MR. MURRAY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, the condition of civil defense here in Newfoundland was rather deplorable up to a short time ago. It was, you might say, more a state of suspense, and the Government cast about to see if they could find a suitable individual to head this service. We were fortunate, Sir, in obtaining a man of great in-

terest, great oratorical ability and a great propagandist, I think, and I have no doubt civil defense will be heard from in the future, in fact it is being heard from now twice daily. As to the salaries, Sir, they are set down in the back of the book here. The director, I think, gets \$7,000.

MR. MURRAY: There is one word of explanation I should make. All these expenses and expenditures incurred by civil defense are borne on a fifty-fifty basis by the Federal Government, including salaries.

MR. BROWNE: What is our share?

MR. MURRAY: We will recover fifty per cent.

MR. BROWNE: Are there any others beside the director? Who is his assistant?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, there are several others. We propose to divide the country into an eastern and western division, and have a chief warden for the eastern division and a chief warden for the western division. We also have an office man, Mr. Rabbits, and a stenographer.

MR. BROWNE: Who are the chief wardens?

MR. MURRAY: One is Mr. Noseworthy, ex-officer of the Newfoundland Regiment who has been appointed for the western division, and another, Mr. John Condon, who has had considerable experience, was with the R.C.M.P. and was a medical sergeant during the war, and is very competent to render first aid. He recently held a position as fire safety preventative officer with Fraser Brace. I repeat again their salaries are borne half by the provincial and half by the federal government.

MR. FOGWILL: The Minister said the director of civil defense was a great man who could be depended upon to breathe the fire of life into civil defense, but he did not say the name of the gentleman.

MR. MURRAY: The gentleman in question is Major P. J. Cashin.

MR. FOGWILL: Thank you very much.

500—Department of Provincial Affairs carried.

600—Department of Education:

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Education is away from the province, I have been asked to pilot the estimates through and give what information I can.

MR. BROWNE: He is absent on departmental business?

MR. MURRAY: I am afraid I am unable to say, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs is Acting Minister of Education.

Item 601—Minister's Office:

MR. BROWNE: I don't see any vote in that office for travelling expenses—oh yes, it is there. I was looking at the wrong page.

601 carried.

Item 602—General Office:

MR. BROWNE: I see there is an increase in the number of directors, officers grade VII, from three to four, what does that mean?

MR. MURRAY: That is a new post. It is being created—a Public Relations Officer—the post is graded as a director Grade VI.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Public Relations Officer?

MR. MURRAY: There has as yet been no appointment.

MR. BROWNE: What about the representation on a petition put in a short time ago which had such support from the members of the Cabinet in regard to the appointment of a Seven Day Adventist.

MR. MURRAY: Not yet appointed.

MR. BROWNE: What happened to the petition?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There has been no appointment made yet. It was only the other day we agreed here in the House amongst us, I think, unanimously, that we ought to do what was requested. As a Government we had decided before the matter came before the House that we did agree. Now this was all printed long before that, at least it was in the printer's hands before that, and what is done will have to be done by action of the Executive.

MR. BROWNE: And where would he come in, as a director?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment here. It does not necessarily follow that when we give recognition to a denomination that we have to appoint any executive officer for that denomination. We have given recognition to a number of amalgamated schools, but we have no superintendent for that particular branch.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is their representative?

MR. HEFFERTON: One of the other superintendents who have the job?

MR. BROWNE: What kind of officer will be appointed if there will be one appointed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can't say at the moment—we have not decided.

602 carried.

Item 603—Accounting Office:

MR. BROWNE: How is the accountant? Is not that a very small salary for such an enormous expenditure running into millions of dollars?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed, Mr. Chairman, a recommendation has been made for a promotion.

MR. BROWNE: I am very glad to hear that, and I hope the Government will give it favourable consideration.

603 carried.

604—School Supplies:

MR. HIGGINS: Under 604-03—might I ask the Minister if there is anything recoverable in that amount of \$404,100?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed that approximately fifty per cent of that is recoverable from the pupils.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, on that point is that increase in that vote caused by the increased costs or would it be caused by the larger amount of units?

MR. MURRAY: One of the causes for the increase in this particular vote is the increase in the number of pupils, I am informed.

604 carried.

605—Supervisory Services:

MR. BROWNE: I notice that thirteen officials have been raised from grade V to grade VI, and the vote increased by twelve thousand dollars—what is the reason for such a large proportion of promotions?

MR. MURRAY: Recently there has been a re-classification all through the educational department, I understand, and that applies to people with grades and to those who have none and to academic qualification.

MR. BROWNE: You have supervisors all over the country?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, they go all over the country.

MR. BROWNE: I notice some have been raised, what about the others?

MR. MURRAY: They were formerly all in one category, now there has been an increase for those with degrees.

MR. BROWNE: And these are thirteen degrees?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, but none of them got thirteen degrees.

Item 605 carried.

606—Library Services:

MR. BROWNE: That Library Services, Mr. Chairman, is that the Gosling?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, Mr. Newell.

MR. BROWNE: Does that include salaries?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

Carried.

607—Correspondence Courses:

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister in a position to say how that system is working, is it used very much?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed there are presently about thirty-five people taking advantage of it. It is mostly being used by the children of lighthouse keepers, section-men and

railway men and such isolated people, and there are some in the sanatorium, about twenty-two from in there.

**MR. BROWNE:** Has it been long in force?

**MR. MURRAY:** Since 1946.

Carried.

608—Training Teachers:

**MR. HOLLETT:** Is there a reason for scaling the grant from \$70,000 down to \$60,000,

**MR. MURRAY:** It is based on previous experience, for the first eight months of 1953.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** A more realistic appraisal of the actual amount needed.

**MR. POWER:** This would be a generous vote.

Carried.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion the committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Report received. Ordered sit again tomorrow.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 of the clock. In reply to the inevitable question—I suppose tomorrow we will continue the estimates, and we might get into the budget debate. I don't know if my honourable friends

are ready for the budget debate, but let us decide tomorrow.

The House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, June 3, at 3:00 of the clock.

THURSDAY, June 3, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

**HON. L. R. CURTIS** (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish."

**HON. M. P. MURRAY** (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland."

**MR. M. M. HOLLETT** (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House the following information:

I. A copy of Agreement or Contract between the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and/or the Department of Economic Development with

the firm of W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. for the building and erection of (a) the Gypsum Plant, (b) the Cement Plant.

2. A copy of the amended Contract aforesaid on March 13, 1951.

### Answers to Questions

Question No. 107 addressed to the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development :

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Any questions addressed to me, Mr. Speaker, are in the course of preparation.

Question No. 105 :

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, that question should have been directed to the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can answer that in part now.

105—(2) and 105—(3).

The plants that are in full production are the cement mill at Corner Brook. That is the only one in full production.

The plants that are in partial production are the gypsum plant at Corner Brook, the birch plant at St. John's, the Atlantic Hardboards Industries plant at St. John's, the United Cotton Mills at St. John's, Terra Nova Textiles at St. John's, CMIC at St. John's, and Hanning Electric at St. John's, Superior Rubber at Holyrood, Koch Shoes at Harbour Grace, Gold Sail Leather Goods at Harbour Grace and Atlantic Gloves and Dorn Tanneries at Carbonear. All of these are in partial production only. Only the cement mill of all the new industries is as yet in full production.

Now the industries employing the two thousand men are those I have just named. How many are employed in each of the said plants is a matter for each company concerned to answer, if they care to do so. The value of the commodities manufactured is also their own private information and they might or might not be willing to give the information if they were asked.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I say that the reason I directed that question to the Honourable Minister of Finance was because it referred to a statement made in the budget speech, and I took it he must have had the necessary information at hand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did.

MR. HOLLETT: Then why did he not answer the question?

### Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Finance would allow me to address a question to him—I wonder if he would tell us the source of the information, and where he got the value of the earnings for this year.

MR. POWER: That was the result of letters addressed to hundreds of firms.

Committee of the Whole on Supply:

MR. SPEAKER: This Committee was given leave yesterday to sit again today. I do now leave the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last item passed was 608, page 32.

Item 609—Teachers' Pensions, etc.:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get some inform-

ation about this cost of living bonus, which seems to have been absorbed into the salaries but still remains here as a cost of living bonus—is it the intention to keep it that way, or is it the hope to have that absorbed into the pensions? Another question; is that \$36,000 the cost of living bonus on the \$100,000?

MR. MURRAY: The reason, I understand, for the \$36,000 appearing here is because the estimates were set up before the decision of the Government to incorporate the cost of living bonus. On the second point the answer is, yes the figures shown here are the result of experience over the years.

609 carried.

610—Scholarships:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that item, I remember there was some discussion about the scholarships when the new Act came in repealing the Act which set up these particular scholarships. At that time I thought that the names should be merged into the new Act, but it was passed through without the change being made. Now by what authority do we vote amounts for these various scholarships when the Act to set them up has been abolished? I wonder if the Minister could answer that question?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed, Sir, that there is actually an Act—I can't cite it to you—setting up the scholarships, but the actual amount revoted by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that creates the scholarships and the amounts are set by minutes of council.

MR. HOLLETT: My understanding was that the Act was repealed a short time ago.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the Act has not yet been assented to, and has not yet received the Royal Assent, therefore, I presume we still work on the old basis and the money will be transferred from one vote to another when the time comes. Those estimates, I understand, were prepared long before the House was opened.

MR. HOLLETT: How are the Government prepared to go about it? Are they willing to still retain these names? That was the point I raised at that particular time.

MR. MURRAY: I understand it is the intention to retain the names of Queen Victoria, George V and Jubilee Scholarships with these first three going back to before Confederation. The Provincial and Memorial University scholarships were set up by this administration.

Carried.

Item 611—Vocational Training:

MR. BROWNE: On this vote here I would like to know if any amount here is refunded from the Department of Labour in Ottawa? Whether the vote from the Department of Labour is in addition to this, and whether the Government is taking advantage of all the facilities provided by the Department of Labour for vocational training purposes?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed, Sir, that practically full advantage is taken of the Federal Legislation, and that approximately fifty per cent of the expenditure under vocational training is refunded by the Federal Government.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is a capital vote for capital work in reference to the department proceeding with the erec-



tion of the school adjoining Memorial University?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I presume some alterations have been made in the plan since the first plans met with such general approval?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed that since the first plan was drafted very substantial alterations have been made, and the ground floor space has been just about doubled.

MR. HOLLETT: On page 92—Officers—does that refer to teachers in the vocational school?

MR. MURRAY: These are instructors in the vocational training school. There are a great many courses run off up there. There is a little pamphlet here which sets out the number actually in training, and it is comprehensive. The vocational training school, as honourable members might know, was originally a rehabilitation school for ex-servicemen, and then extended to general application, and at present gives courses in auto mechanics, diesel engineering, mechanical and electrical work, carpentry, wood work, brick laying, plumbing, pipe fitting, and I have been informed that tickets can now be obtained for first and second marine engineers. There is also a course in wireless, radio, electronics. You will see a vote there in the amount of \$30,000; allowances to out-port students of \$30 a month.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the answer given by the Honourable Minister, is there any relationship between the director of apprenticeship under the Department of Labour and the vocational training school over on the southside?

MR. MURRAY: There are two different departments. The Director of Apprenticeship is attached to the Honourable Minister of Labour's department, I understand, and the vocational training school gives actual training by requirements and qualifications set by the director.

MR. BROWNE: I notice the second officer in the vocational training school receives a salary marked personal—who is that person, and why is that? Page 92—Officer Grade VII, second item, marked personal.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): If I may answer the honourable gentleman—Mr. Whitney who is the remaining one of the English personnel brought out in the original office was given a certain salary somewhat higher than that in agreement with the scale adopted by us.

MR. MURRAY: These men were brought out here on contract.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the Director Grade III is in charge of the whole school?

MR. MURRAY: That is the principal of the school, Mr. Frank Templeman.

MR. BROWNE: Has the report of the Department of Education been circulated? I have not a copy.

MR. MURRAY: I am informed it has been laid on the table of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask if these teachers will share in that million dollar increase?

MR. MURRAY: No, they don't share in the increase to the teachers.

Carried.

## Item 613—Adult Education :

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there has been any report of the work of the handicrafts and the Jubilee Guild? That report should be circulated amongst the members so that they could get an idea whether this movement is progressing or otherwise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say that in connection with this vote, this matter raised by it is one that has caused the Government very considerable thought and concern. When we came into office five years ago we discovered that there were three completely different and separate organizations in receipt of public moneys and engaged on virtually the same work. There was first, a division of the Government itself known as the Handicrafts Division, with headquarters at that time in the Seamen's Institute or King George V Institute. That handicraft division taught handicrafts and domestic science and home cooking, and did a certain amount of work which you could perhaps best describe as vocational training work. They had a number of field workers, I think, some seven or eight, who travelled in the Province. The total cost of this handicrafts division of the Department of Education was a very substantial amount of money. I forget what the amount was, but it ran to forty or fifty thousand dollars or something of that order or perhaps even more.

Then secondly there was the organization known as the Jubilee Guilds. The Jubilee Guilds was a voluntary organization receiving only from the Government a vote that ran, I believe, to twelve thousand dollars a year. They had been receiving twelve thousand dollars a year for a

good many years from the Government. Now, they carried on much the same kind of work as the Handicrafts Division although they had no wood-work activity, and there were certain other activities of that type which existed in the handicrafts division that they did not carry out. But this organization also had some seven or eight field workers who travelled around Newfoundland giving lessons and holding classes for teaching home crafts; domestic science, home cooking, home preserving of foods by means of bottling and canning and the like. They came to see the Government shortly after we came into office, and put up a very convincing argument that the Government ought to help them by more than we had been doing. I questioned them closely on just what it was they did, and what exactly was the nature of their work. I mentioned during the course of the conversation that night in my office some five years ago that I imagined they were doing virtually the same work as was being done by the handicrafts division of the Department of Education. It occurred to me at that time that there was here a distinct duplication of effort, and it further occurred to me that a voluntary body made up of ladies to whom this work was a labour of love would get better results and more economic results than would ever be gotten by a division of handicrafts of a department of government.

I held a conference again in my office consisting of several Ministers of the Crown; the Minister of Education of that day, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Minister of Welfare, and one or two other Ministers. We discussed the matter, and as a result, we agreed to

ask Cabinet to approve a project. Cabinet approved, and the project was that we should ask the Jubilee Guilds if they would take over the work of the handicrafts division of the Department of Education, less those features of the work of the division which really did not belong to the handicrafts division, but such work might well be passed over to the vocational training school on the southside. This was done. The woodwork and other activities of the handicrafts division was passed over to the vocational training school on the southside, and all the rest of the handicrafts division were passed over to the Jubilee Guilds. The Government, at the same time, increased the grant to the Jubilee Guilds from twelve thousand to thirty thousand dollars a year, and have maintained the grant at that figure from that day to this.

Now that having been done—and I for one personally felt a sense of self-congratulation upon having welded two conflicting and rather rival activities of the same character into one organization, and in so doing having saved the Treasury a little money—but I suddenly had my satisfaction deflated very considerably when I discovered that there was a third activity that was carrying on the same work as well, and that was the adult education branch of the Department of Education. This branch also had some seven or eight field workers who were travelling about the Province holding classes and giving lessons on domestic science, household work, cooking, knitting and sewing and home cooking and canning. I said: "In Heaven's name, where does this stop? How many more?" I was afraid to look too closely for fear I would discover another two or

three activities carrying on the same work. Well at that point I gave up because just around then we became pretty occupied with our plans to create the new University, and we began to consult carefully with a number of people, and we came to the conclusion that all of these activities ought properly to form part of the extension department of the university. And it is our hope that all expenditures of the Government on such things will be made solely by making a contribution annually to the Newfoundland Memorial University, who then, through their extension department would take care of all the activities or virtually all of the activities that once were carried on by (a) the Handicrafts Division of the Department of Education (b) the Jubilee Guilds and (c) the Adult Education Branch of the Department of Education.

Now if that were done the Adult Education Branch could either be absorbed completely with its fine personnel, specialized personnel particularly in the person of its director, Dr. Florence O'Neill; either the whole of the division with its director and such of its staff as cared to continue in that work would be absorbed into the extension department of the University or else the division itself could remain as an activity of the Department of Education but confining itself entirely to the academic side of its present work, so that the sociological side could then be carried on by the extension division of the University and the academic side by the Division of Adult Education.

Now no decision has been taken on this matter. It is still very much under study. To begin with the University itself has not got its extension department and until it does it

would be quite impossible to pass over to the University the activities which are presently carried on by the Jubilee Guilds and by the Adult Education Division of the Department of Education.

I am delighted to see the interest of the honourable member for St. John's West in this question of the Jubilee Guilds, I wonder if he would bear with me for a moment while I make a statement of my personal credo in these matters.

I feel that the Jubilee Guilds that presently function or the Adult Education Branch of the Department of Education or preferably the Extension Division of the University, as and when it comes into being, that this activity should and could become next to the work of the churches, and one need not ever make that qualification, because it is always understood in Newfoundland that next to the work of the churches this work in this island, with its peculiar and distinctive character, should and could become the most fundamentally important work possible to be done in Newfoundland. Because when the schools have done their work, and the Government have done their work and all the churches and societies and clubs have done their work, this business of moving out and bringing together young men and young women and older men and older women into social groups to harness and train their intelligence and their social interests in the direction of building a better and a sounder Newfoundland, that is fundamentally the most important thing that can be done. It is so important as to make the work of a government look trifling over a period of time, but that would take time, two or three generations.

I think of the work of the land grant colleges of the United States. I will say this, I think that the present greatness of the United States would be yet unimagined had there not existed the land grant colleges, and had there not existed the extension departments of the great universities and the small universities of the United States, had there not existed the extension work of the United States Department of Agriculture. If that fantastic work which has embraced scores of millions of young men and young women with the 4-H Clubs and a dozen such organizations, all the outcome of this extension movement of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Land Grant Colleges—what these movements have done to shape American industry, to shape American agriculture, to shape the very character of the American economy, what they have done to make Americans eternally anxious to improve with an insatiable appetite, always to make it a little more efficient, what they have done there—and what could be done here in Newfoundland to reshape, harness great sections of our Newfoundland character, is enough to challenge the patriotism and creativeness of any thoughtful Newfoundlander. If I were ten or fifteen years younger, and knew what I know now, I would never go into politics, I would go into university extension work. If I were young enough I would be trying to work for the junior red cross or the 4-H Clubs; these things that we grown-up, sober-sided men of affairs only despise, but these things which can change Newfoundland more truly than laws and legislation and we serious-minded men meeting here and talking and spouting—that is what young Newfoundlanders should

go at if they have a love of Newfoundland.

I am delighted to see the honourable and learned gentleman for St. John's West show such interest in this question of the Jubilee Guilds.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I won't try to imitate the Premier by adulation of the work of the Jubilee Guilds and Adult Education and similar movements, but I think the Premier knows I too am just as keenly interested and have just as much admiration of the work of the adult education movement in other countries as he has. But from a practical standpoint, after listening to that, he will grant we are brought face to face with this question of what is to be done now. Nothing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not too encouraging.

MR. BROWNE: The co-operative movement stopped about two years ago, stopped short. When is it going to get started again. While I think I agree a hundred per cent we should get the adult education movement into an extension department of Memorial University—we have a model right alongside us here in Cape Breton and Antigonish and we knew that all along. I have been closely allied with the progress of that work since 1936 when Mr. Richardson came down here as a result of a conversation one of the commissioners then had with Dr. Coady; and I know exactly the technique in this country that has been followed. I don't know why we were so slow about getting it going, or who was responsible for the fold up. In regard to the University of course I can understand. It is a young University trying to get on its feet, but this is important work, and as the Premier said, is fundamental.

In my opinion it is more important than the fisheries scheme he has praised so highly. And if he thinks it is so important as he said today, well then I think his government deserves some censure for not being more active in bringing it into greater activity and giving it unity under the administration.

Now I did not realize that there were three separate and distinct organizations doing similar work. I believe they had some sort of work such as wood carving carried on, and I believe they had a very able man, almost a genius, a chap by the name of Ismil Humber. I don't know if he is still associated with vocational training. But he was a genius as far as wood carving was concerned, and he was teaching in that department.

I must thank the Premier for giving us such an enlightening talk, and I hope that the ideas which he has expressed here this afternoon will soon be put into action.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I must say I listened with close attention to the excellent but brief address of the Premier on the various social organizations mentioned. I regret that he finds the years beginning to lean so heavily upon his broad shoulders.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should have a chance yet.

MR. HOLLETT: And that he anticipates a 4-H Club after November. I assure him I shall do my best to get him a job in a 4-H Club.

Apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent idea of the Premier's, very fine and very excellent and I agree with him. Perhaps a lot of us even as we grow older and find grey hairs in our heads and some of

us with no hair, might still think of these things, and perhaps do a lot by way of voluntary assistance for these various organizations which have to do with the social welfare of the country in which we live. I do think the Premier's remarks were very well taken, but we must get back to the facts. I think, as I remember, he said it was several years ago since he gave that \$30,000 to this work, and I think the Government must have been asked for an increase in that grant and if so I would like the Minister to tell us why it has not been given some consideration?

**MR. MURRAY:** I am informed, Sir, a request has actually been made and is under consideration.

**MR. HOLLETT:** In that case I might again ask the Minister if it is the intention to make that recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I mean, after the address of the Honourable the Premier, I don't see how any of us could object to the recommendation.

**Mr. Morgan in the Chair:**

**MR. COURAGE:** Mr. Chairman, arising out of some remarks made a few moments ago I should like to tell the committee something about the work being done in adult education. I know something about the work being done in adult education because I have many times visited the adult education centre, and I don't believe the Committee is aware that we have here in St. John's one of the finest adult education centres to be found in the world. I would like the honourable member for St. John's West to pay special attention to that, and I hope he will be in a position to go up and see the adult education centre here in St. John's working every night. I know the Honourable

Minister of Education attends the special night, when diplomas and certificates are given out. I know he was there on that night last fall, and he was very much surprised to see what was going on there. If my good friend, the Deputy-Minister of Education, had a voice here I know he would bear me out in what I am going to say. I repeat; there is here one of the finest adult education centres to be found. The work being done there under the capable directorship of Mr. Wilfred Dicker is outstanding. Honourable members might be surprised to know that there are in attendance this year more than 750 students at that adult centre. Honourable members may be even more surprised to know the adult education centre of St. John's headed all the schools in the number of Grade XI students taking examinations. There are more students taking Grade XI examinations this year at the adult education centre than at any other school in St. John's or in Newfoundland which includes the colleges here in St. John's. Most of these, Mr. Chairman, are students who have come in here from the outports to finish their Grade XI, some of them people who had left school in Grade II and Grade III or in some cases with no formal education at all. They came in here and went up to the adult education centre and there continued year after year until they finally got up to Grade XI and Grade XI Commercial. I have a personal recollection of a young man who attended first in Grade II and today has his Grade XI diploma and his Grade XI Commercial diploma. I know of young ladies who attended that school while working here as maids and started in Grade IV or V and today are registered nurses. The



adult education centre has turned out scores of teachers from St. John's and from the outports who came in here and worked at various jobs, and I don't know how many hundreds have passed their Grade XI at that centre.

The centre was begun here in 1945, when I had the honour of starting it with nineteen students. When I left it in 1949 there were at that time some six hundred or so attending, and it was grown every year, slowly but steadily. Not only are people there taking Grade XI and learning to read and write, but there are classes in other things as well. There was for example a class given in oral French, in Spanish, in discussion techniques, in speech and in various other phases of educational work. They not only teach geography and history but the social side of living as well. On the last night of the term there was a very successful barn dance held at the adult education centre. Now it might strike honourable members as strange that a barn dance should be considered as part of education, but it is. Many people in my experience came to the centre who did not know much about mixing with other students and who were a little shy and backward, but it was amazing how soon they blossomed out and became leaders.

I might say that the adult education centre in St. John's is filling a need, and one can hardly visit any government department or any school or for that matter any shop or business where one won't find some person who has either attended the adult education centre or who is presently attending. I would like here now to pay tribute to Dr. Florence O'Neill, Mr. Wilfred Dicker and to the other teachers of the adult

education centre in St. John's who are doing such a very fine job.

There are too, I understand, six adult education centres of that nature being carried on at Buchans, Corner Brook and other centres around the country. Now I am not so familiar with the rural part of adult education, but I do know that we have reason to be proud of what is being done. I don't mean to say we should stop here. I know that the job will go ahead. There is a great deal to be done yet. Still I would like to tell honourable members that it would be wrong to say there is nothing done or very little being done.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the honourable member for his further reference to the work of the adult education centre. I was familiar with it but I did not have the honour of attending the closing last year. If the Honourable Minister would give invitations to these functions such as barn dances and closing nights, I think we would perhaps learn to appreciate more the work that is being done. Now we must remember that this adult education movement, such as it is, is not enough in itself. It must be for some purpose. What is the purpose? That is where the Antigonish movement has it over most of the other educational movements. As the Premier knows better than anybody else the work itself was designed principally for the training of workingmen to take the leadership in trade union organizations. In Antigonish the Adult Education Department of St. Francis Xavier University was formed for the purpose of training people for social action so that they would become leaders, not merely to get better jobs, not merely to qualify to become nurses or stenographers or anything

of that kind, but to become leaders in their communities. They harnessed up the educational work to a practical object, and that is how they built up the great credit union movement and the co-operative organizations of the province, I might say now, of the three maritime provinces. It is the harnessing of educational work for some definite purpose such as the co-operative movement that is extremely important. It is good in itself to have students get their Grade XI and Grade XI Commercial, but I think we must go a step further, follow these people on, and help them to develop their thinking and take part in things that are going to improve not only themselves but the communities in which they are going to reside.

Now I have mentioned here before the great lack of co-operative credit unions, as they call them. These are people that could be led so easily to this credit society idea. We could not have enough of them. I would say this country needs ten times as many at least of these co-operative organizations to help people, and that must come through study, come in connection with the adult education movement. There should always be kept in mind that idea when training them, to think along co-operative lines and help them to be able to form these co-operative units.

Now there is another point here in connection with 4-H Clubs to which Mr. Premier referred. Now I was surprised recently when I first heard of the organization. I am certainly very glad to know that they are in existence here. I can see they have only just begun, and are not doing very much at the present time. I would like to hear from the Acting Minister of Education if he has any information to give us on this point;

just exactly what they have been doing. I know the value of the work in the United States, and I presume in Canada, but we don't have any exhibitions on our agricultural products and cattle products where these young people, boys and girls, can come in and let us see the animals they have raised. Let us see the kind of work they do. That gives them confidence in their work and pride and sometimes lasting interest in the breeding of animals and raising of animals. And that type of organization should be promoted and fostered amongst the people in that way. I would like to hear if the Minister has any information to give us on that?

MR. COURAGE: I must thank the honourable member who has just spoken for rounding out what I had just said. I should have gone a little further. The idea behind the adult education movement here is exactly the idea that is behind the adult education movement everywhere. It is not enough to give a student Grade XI alone. The bread and butter idea is not enough. I might say that the aim of adult education is to promote thinking. It is a pleasure to teach in such centres, and the aim is to produce leaders, and as the honourable member said, to produce thinking men and women, and better Newfoundlanders, you may say.

MR. MURRAY: Now, Sir, in answer to the question asked by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West the 4-H Clubs, as I understand, the position is to provide training for young people. I am informed by the Deputy-Minister it is on the basis on which all future adult education must be laid. It has taken on, Sir, I am informed, fairly well in this Province and at the present time

there are ten clubs in existence, with a total membership of 191 boys and girls. They held 38 meetings with a total attendance of 587 during the past year. The organization, I am informed, is part of the Dominion Organization, and the centres in this Province sent representatives to the Dominion Conference. The last one was held at Toronto and a representative went from this Province. There is a 4-H week. There was one such held last year, and it is proposed to hold another this year. You will note there is an item there dealing with the 4-H Clubs—\$2,000, which is partly to cover the expenses of bringing the young people in to St. John's for a conference. Also it will be noted there is an increase in the salaries there to \$7,200. Part of that increase is for a normal increase of scale, but there are provisions also made for an extra post of 4-H Organizer.

613 Carried.

Item 614 Grants:

Item 614-01—Salaries of Teachers—Carried.

MR. MURRAY: Now, Sir, I am informed that there is an error there. Instead of four millions it should read \$3,450,000 and to that should be added the cost of living bonus. That is \$3,450,000 made up of the basic salaries of teachers and added to this the cost of living bonus and consequently you get an amount of \$4,237,000 for 1954-55. Recently, Sir, a decision was taken to add a million dollars to that amount. The million dollars was passed over to the Department of Education and the scale is set within that framework of these separate grants to which a million dollars is to be added, and a different scale set up.

MR. BROWNE: It has been done already?

MR. MURRAY: But it is not shown here. The estimate for this item therefore should be \$5,237,000.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Sir, I think we would be remiss in our duty as an Opposition if we did not say a word, and I say a word of commendation to the Legislature for acceding to the request of the teachers for an increase in their salaries. I think that the teachers are basically at the top as well as at the bottom of our society. We must have good teachers and if we are to have good teachers we must endeavour to pay them something better than they have been paid in the past. After all with the knowledge which today is made available in every country it is most important we have teachers who are real teachers, and to do that I think, when there are so many other callings offering so much higher salaries, we have year by year to increase the amount which has to be paid to our teachers.

I would, on behalf of the Opposition, say to the Government that we are glad that they have seen fit to make that one million dollars increase. What is a million? To a Liberal it does not mean a thing. But in this case it means a lot to many teachers—I congratulate the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman, with his flippant reference to a million dollars, reminds me of the cartoon of two United States Senators walking down the sidewalk in Washington, with the national capital in the background. The two walking along with their brief cases and wearing big black sombreros and one saying to the other; "a billion for

this, a billion for that, it soon mounts up!"

Mr. Courage in the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we might let that item stand and iron it out and come back to it. Suppose we let 614-01, 614-03 and 614-08 stand—

Items stand.

614-04, 614-06 and 614-07 carried.

MR. BROWNE: But I wonder if the Honourable Acting-Minister could tell us what that industrial education is?

MR. HEFFERTON: Manual training.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Grants distributed on a denominational basis for city schools for manual training.

MR. BROWNE: How many schools?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the colleges, Bishop Feild, St. Bon's, Prince of Wales and in the case of an over vote it goes to Mount Cashel.

614-08 carried.

614-09—No vote.

614-10—Transportation of School Children:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is a new vote. May I have an explanation as to how that is to be used?

MR. MURRAY: Yes—as the honourable and learned member has pointed out, this is entirely a new vote, and it is to come in with the setting up of regional high schools. With the regional high schools set up it is proposed to provide transportation for children in the areas. The department asked for \$50,000, but as it is a new vote we thought that amount too high to start off with so

early in the scheme, so we provided \$10,000 to see how the scheme works out.

MR. BROWNE: How many regional high schools have been established?

MR. MURRAY: One definitely and there are two or three planned. There has been one already established at Manuels, and there are two or three others about to be set up.

MR. BROWNE: What is the method by which the transportation may be provided—is there a school bus to be operated, or what is the scheme?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I may say something on that—the Cabinet considered this matter very carefully, very carefully indeed. We are quite convinced that there will be, there must be, a very strong drift in the direction of regional high schools. That must come, that is coming. Then there arises inevitably the question of getting the students to the schools, where a regional high school is to serve the children of a certain number of places, one school is to serve a number of settlements, getting the children to that school is a problem. Now, God forbid, that the Government, that the Treasury should have to bear the cost of bringing all Newfoundland children to school and back and forth to and from school. When this matter came up in Cabinet, frankly our first inclination was to say, no, we won't get into that field. But the more we thought of it the more we felt that ultimately we must get into it, up to a point. We can at least visualize a situation in which the drain on the Treasury, the cost, the burden on the Treasury will be less, if you have a regional high school serving a number of places, and that regional high school is

served by a bus system, than there would be on the Treasury having different schools with students from Kindergarten going right up to Grade XI. Now that would be particularly true, of course, in cases where a regional high school is put up in a place where virtually all of the people are of one denomination, or where, for instance, they are all Protestants, and are willing to attend the one regional high school, or where the people are all Catholics and there is no question about their being willing to attend the one school. If the committee would consider it, I think, the members will see it is a very thorny, exceedingly thorny problem. It is not one which you could flip-pantly decide, because we don't want to find ourselves responsible for carrying children back and forth from their homes to their schools. Newfoundland can't afford that. But we are testing it out. This is in the nature of a test to see what happens. I don't say we are going to spend that ten thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: It is a lot of money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But then possibly before the House meets again there may be a couple or three regional high schools, and it may be money-saving to have the transportation system. That may be preferable to building a lot of additional schools scattered about, here and there. It may be better to put up a good high school and have it served by a bus system.

MR. BROWNE: I understand there is only to be one built this year?

MR. MURRAY: One has already been built.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One has

been definitely decided upon. The Church of England people out around Manuels and Upper Gullies have decided on one. In addition to that, I believe, there is definite talk of one at Corner Brook. I believe the bishop out there is talking of putting up a regional high school. Then again there is definite talk of one at Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: I don't see that the same problem arises at Corner Brook and Grand Falls. Well it might—I am going to ask, at Trepassey, where my honourable friend is the member, there is a high school at present while four and a half miles away there is a small one-room school or it may have two rooms, but it is a very small school which teaches perhaps up to Grade VIII. Now I have had requests from people there to see if I could get some assistance. The department knows about this. There is no assistance for them there to get their children to the convent four and a half miles away. How do they come in under this?

MR. MURRAY: I understand that is another matter also under consideration, and transportation would be provided if shown it would be cheaper to transport them into the main convent school rather than support a small school and teacher.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Obviously we have to proceed very cautiously. We don't want to wake up some morning and find the Newfoundland Government responsible for the transportation of children between their homes and schools. The expenditure in the department is heavy enough, it is up now to seven or eight million dollars a year for education. We don't want another two or three million for transportation, as a matter of fact we can't do it.

614-13—Memorial University:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would the Premier like to say if any progress has been made in the development of that extension idea of the University?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It is very much in hand on the part of the President and Vice-Chancellor of the University. I believe the Board of Regents is intensely interested in the matter, and they are all fully appreciative of the importance of the question and all are following it up very carefully, and I believe some progress is being made.

MR. BROWNE: Sundry Associations: What are the Sundry Associations? Are not these all under 614?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the Canadian Educational group. As a matter of fact, I believe, the Deputy-Minister of Education of Newfoundland is President of the Canadian Educational Organization, a fact which constitutes, I think we all agree, a great compliment to Newfoundland, that Newfoundland should have an educator actively engaged in education, big enough and able enough to be considered by the Canadian Educational Association as being capable of being President of the whole national organization.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose 614-19 is for the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides?

MR. MURRAY: Yes and the Kiwanis Boys' Camp and the Catholic Boys' Club, the CLB, etc.

MR. BROWNE: What is the individual amount of each organization?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have the total here. The CLB \$1,500; Girl Guides \$1,500; Boy Scouts \$1,500;

Catholic Boys' Club \$2,000; Kiwanis Boys' Camp \$2,500. There is a note here which says that the \$2,000 to the Catholic Boys' Club is probably more than they will draw. They have never yet drawn the amount to which they are entitled.

MR. BROWNE: How much did they draw last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not say. But they have never drawn up to the maximum.

MR. BROWNE: Does that depend on larger membership?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, on what they raise themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It must be a matching grant, I suppose.

MR. HOLLETT: Under 614-19— I remember some time ago one of the honourable members asked a question about the International Grenfell Association. This is not in connection with that. This is along educational lines. There is another grant, I believe, under Capital Account for them.

MR. HEFFERTON: Under Public Health.

Item 614—carried.

615—Audio Visual Education:

MR. BROWNE: On that director, is that Mr. Kendall?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: There is no increase in staff here. There is one less Grade III?

MR. MURRAY: He has been up-graded to Grade IV.

MR. BROWNE: There is an item there where the stocks of film strips



are cut down to \$12,100 from \$38,000. Could someone tell us what the explanation of that is? Then on the next item—Radio Education—that has gone up from \$5,000 to \$12,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They don't need to spend so much this year, we have the stock.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the reason?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure? I am wondering if that is the reason. Are you getting the material from somewhere else in another vote. Another vote last year was \$148,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The radio education vote is up because of the greater activity planned and more radio sets to be sold on a fifty-fifty per cent of cost basis.

MR. BROWNE: The expenditure in 1952-53 was \$123,000 out of a vote of \$148,000. Have the purchases been cut to \$12,000 a year on this vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I think you must have a very big stock on hand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have.

MR. HOLLETT: Where do these films come from, the United States or Ottawa?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Both.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it the intention to have some film made here for that purpose?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Atlantic Films are making them all the time.

MR. HOLLETT: Would that be the reason for the cut made there in this vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. The reason why is, as I have said, we don't need to go on buying a large amount year by year.

MR. HOLLETT: You formerly did not buy from Atlantic Films?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For two entirely different purposes.

MR. HOLLETT: Both educational?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but not both for schools.

MR. HOLLETT: One is to educate the general public.

MR. BROWNE: What is this vote for radio education?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For radio sets.

MR. BROWNE: Where are these placed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The schools buy them and pay one half the cost. The Government pays the other half.

MR. BROWNE: Is that generally known?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Kennedy has made that fact very well known. I might say in connection with that: Until recently the only school radio receiving sets that were manufactured anywhere in Canada were those manufactured in British Columbia, and every school radio in all parts of Canada and in this Province came from British Columbia. Now Atlantic Films are manufacturing a very fine, much improved standard of radio receiver set, much improved over the British Columbia one. It has a bigger speaker and its quality is better. It has additional wave lengths and the cabinet is a better quality. It is a better radio all through. It has a two speed turntable for records.

It is a very much improved radio set. Now of course any radio set we buy for school purposes we buy from Atlantic Films because they are made here. In addition to that I think Atlantic Films sell their school radios in various other provinces. There are now two provinces making school radios, British Columbia and Newfoundland, and certainly Atlantic Films will sell these radios on this side of the Rockies or on this side of the Great Lakes.

MR. BROWNE: I am very interested in that because I felt years ago that that should be done. But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would say to what extent these radio receiving sets have been purchased by the schools, the one which the Premier spoke of, how many of them have been bought?

MR. MURRAY: The Deputy-Minister informs me there are about three hundred and fifty radios in schools all over the island. How many have been bought under this scheme or bought otherwise I do not know.

MR. BROWNE: But do you know the cost of the local ones?

MR. MURRAY: Fifty dollars to the Board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which is a magnificent bargain. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition examined one, the first one put on display. It is superb, out of this world, worth seeing.

MR. BROWNE: Is it from material imported from Germany?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not Germany, I think it is Holland. Their birthplace is Holland and they manufacture in Holland and in England

and other countries. They get quite a bit of their material from them and some from the United States, the best of this, that or the other thing depending on what countries manufacture them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of seeing one of them myself. They are very serviceable and I think the proper receiver sets for schools. Sometimes they do get something interesting, and the reception on the one which I saw was perfect. I think they are very excellent, and I do hope the Atlantic Films will be able to sell a lot of them throughout Canada.

MR. BROWNE: This radio script preparation, etc. to whom is this to be paid?

MR. MURRAY: I see a note here that thirty scripts have been prepared at \$30 each, \$900.

MR. BROWNE: By whom?

MR. MURRAY: Including payments to actors—to different people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thirty scripts for \$30 each and the actors \$30 each.

MR. BROWNE: Was that for re-broadcast or what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For broadcasts to schools here, to schools tuned in on these radio sets, who hear the broadcast.

MR. HEFFERTON: Sometimes courses are prepared by the teachers themselves. We may go to somebody and ask them to prepare a set of lessons, four, five and six upwards to ten and within a certain field.

MR. BROWNE: This is in connection with radio education, so that the thing works together? I see.

MR. MURRAY: The matter is fully covered in the report of the Minister; page 125 of the report.

616—Public Examinations—Carried.

618—Physical Fitness and Recreation:

MR. BROWNE: What is that?

MR. MURRAY: I am informed it is a new service. The post has been set up but it has not been filled yet.

MR. BROWNE: Have you anybody in mind?

MR. MURRAY: An agreement has to be signed with the Federal Government as to 50% of the cost.

619—Curriculum Services:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the director of Curriculum?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Gough, a former Supervisor of Education.

MR. BROWNE: I take it this is a new post. What are the duties?

MR. MURRAY: I am told it is to look after all matters pertaining to curriculum, all the matters in connection with the courses of study for the various grades. The curriculum of each particular grade is under the supervision of this officer who is responsible to the superintendent.

MR. BROWNE: He got a big increase in salary this year.

MR. MURRAY: The normal reclassification.

MR. HEFFERTON: Going back a little further you will recall that the older members, the Council of Higher Education, did a certain amount of preparation work for the setting of the work to be carried out in the schools and the books to be

studied during the course. They went out and we set up instead "the Council of Education." Now during the last four or five years we had certain revisions due to the change in the books and methods of teaching and what not, and we have been also forced to do a certain amount in order to keep in touch with methods and tendencies on the Mainland. Now we found from our experience that the supervisors were not able to carry on that work. We found it was desirable and necessary that some man should be appointed who would co-ordinate all the various activities and more than that, keep in touch with things, watch developments and bring about the necessary revision where it was deemed desirable. For that purpose we have called on the help of the senior teachers in the Province and there are various sub-committees either appointed or in the process of being appointed who act as collaborators in trying to revise the curriculum where necessary and advisable.

MR. BROWNE: Has there been any great improvement since?

MR. HEFFERTON: He has only been appointed less than a year, consequently there has not been very much change. It is bound to have an improved effect on the course of studies in our various schools.

620—Temperance Education:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Honourable Minister how the vote here is distributed, the number of temperance societies in the province etc.?

MR. MURRAY: The vote is passed over entirely to the Newfoundland Temperance Federation.

MR. HOLLETT: Who are they, and where is their headquarters?

MR. MURRAY: It would be difficult to say—I know certain members of the body.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are on Water Street.

MR. BROWNE: Members of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know a little about it and perhaps I could answer that.

The Newfoundland Temperance Association is what its name says, a central, unofficial body for a number of other bodies that are affiliated and these other bodies are churches and church groups of one kind and another. They have opened an office on Water Street. They have brought in from Manitoba a gentleman who is a native born Scotchman, who has, I think, lived on the Mainland of Canada for a number of years, a man named Neaves. Mr. Neaves has special training in educational work directed to the discouragement of excessive drinking and educational work in favour of temperance in drinking. He is an exceedingly practical-minded man, not at all fanatical, but a man who advocates temperance. He does not advocate prohibition but advocates temperance. His educational efforts take the form of showing pictures, plays, acted out for the purpose of illustrating the point that excessive drinking can be pretty dangerous. In addition to motion pictures he has still pictures that are projected on the screen, and printed literature of one kind and another. But mainly, I believe, his work is the work of going into such schools as permit him to go, and to lecture to school children and also to go into churches, not while the church services are on, but church halls, basements, parish halls, to address actual bodies of such churches

as will permit him to do so, always carrying on an educational effort in favour of temperance, especially by way of pointing out to young men and women who are not aware of the dangers of excessive drinking, the actual facts. I would like the Committee to understand clearly that this is not a prohibition movement, that it is not a movement that advocates prohibition of liquor, but rather one that advocates temperance in the use of liquor.

The Government had a standing offer for several years of up to twenty-five thousand dollars a year to any organization or movement that might form itself and wished to avail itself of any amount up to that maximum for the purpose of helping to defray the costs of temperance propaganda in the world today and certainly in this Province. It is this Province that we are responsible for in this House. There is a considerable amount of drinking, and I don't think it will be denied that all young men and all young women are entitled to know, entitled to be informed, that there are dangers in excessive drinking. There is a tremendous propaganda today that goes on endlessly. You can't go into a house but the first thing you are asked is what do you want to drink. We think we do right in voting from the Treasury this amount or even a larger amount which should be needed to assist in that temperance propaganda. Now I do honestly feel it is primarily the work of the churches. I have an uneasy feeling about this whole business, that we may not be doing wrong, but I wonder if we are doing right in trying to take the place of the churches in this propagandana for temperance. Such propagandana, it seems to me, ought to be carried out

by the churches, not that it is my business to tell them what they ought to do, I don't presume to do so, but somehow I have always thought, always assumed, that temperance propaganda ought to emanate from religious bodies. If they don't and somebody says; give me the money and I will carry on a temperance propaganda programme, and if that person is reputable, sensible, then we will say all right, here is your ten thousand dollars a year and more, up to twenty-five thousand, if you need it—that is the explanation of that amount.

Now it may be argued, Mr. Chairman, that the Government are the ones that are selling it. That is true. We are vendors of it all, the beer and liquors in the first instance sold in Newfoundland, and I don't know of any other way of doing it. But the fact that we are the principal vendors of liquors and beer, the fact is that we make huge profits, tremendous rates of profit—there is nothing so profitable as the beer and liquor that this Government sells. We would make it even more profitable if we thought we would not thereby drive people to bootlegging and moonshine, if we thought that thereby we would not just drive people to lawlessness we would take even a bigger profit out of it. We are not at all ashamed of the fact that we make an enormous profit out of liquor, and we will continue to do so.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like first to ask whom is the ten thousand dollars paid over to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Newfoundland Temperance Federation.

MR. HOLLETT: The chairman is this man Neaves?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No he is the employed director. I could get the names from W. R. Dawe of St. John's, who is the president, I believe. Reverend L. A. Curtis is secretary and there are other clergymen and prominent citizens, very reputable and prominent citizens.

MR. HOLLETT: I realize, Mr. Chairman, the difficulty of this liquor question. I do think it is right and proper of course that the Government should control the sale of it, and naturally that they should get revenue from the sale of it. Either that or abolish the sale altogether, and that was tried with terrible effects by our people and not only by our people but all over the world experience has proven that that is not the way. If the Government is to engage in the business which they have and which they always shall, I do deem it essential that the Government ought to be careful about the various regulations they make in reference to the sale of it. I am not now going to make any political speech about the fact that this one has a beer parlour and that one, I am not going to talk about the hypocrisy of the thing, but I want to tell you a story which only happened two or three years ago. A poor frantic mother called me on the telephone and wanted to know was it legal for the Newfoundland Hotel to sell alcoholic drinks on the Sabbath Day. I did not ask her her name, because I did not want to get involved too much, but I told her I believed it was. I said I believed it was more than that, I believed it was legal to sell alcoholic liquors in the various clubs. She told me she believed it was too, because she had a son and on Sunday he was home to lunch and after lunch he went to the Newfoundland Hotel and got loaded

up. Invariably he goes to the Newfoundland Hotel or to one or other of these clubs and, well he becomes intemperate.

The point, therefore, that I want to raise is this: Does the Government think it is justified in allowing the sale of alcoholic beverages on the Sabbath Day? I think most of us were brought up in an atmosphere where to drink alcoholic liquors meant you were, well, heading right straight for hell, but to drink it on the Sabbath Day was something which would put you away down in the basement of that establishment. Here we have today in Newfoundland a set-up whereby the Government allows these places, the hotels and the various clubs around the city and out of it, I suppose, to open their doors, I think it is, around 12:00 o'clock on Sunday, as soon as people come out of church, where they have those places open for the convenience of these people who want to go and get a drink. I tell you of that telephone conversation simply to show the danger existing in allowing these places to be open on Sunday. On weekdays we are all working, as that boy is working, and he does not go to church on weekdays and he does not get a chance to go to the Newfoundland Hotel at 12:00 o'clock and he has to work and has to turn up again in the afternoon to his job. But Sunday seems to be a day of license for everybody everywhere particularly here in St. John's, where a man can jump in his car and go to a club and drink to his heart's content, and then come out and get aboard his car and drive madly through the streets. I don't know whether any of you have been watching carefully the accident day, as I may call it, the motor car accident day. I think if you have you will note that the most of these occur

on the week-ends and particularly on the Sabbath, and usually in broad daylight on the Sabbath, in the afternoon. Even now I wonder if the Government considers it has any responsibility in that regard. I know it has to sell alcoholic liquors, but I do know they have to control also the sale of them, and I think something ought to be done about the opening of these taverns on Sunday, at 12:00 o'clock at any rate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman explain a little more about what he meant by that qualification?

MR. HOLLETT: What I mean by 12:00 o'clock? Well, I think 12:00 o'clock is or any time on the Sabbath Day—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like the honourable gentleman to explain the qualification he had on Sunday, particularly at 12:00 o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Immediately after people come out of church a lot of them, good men and good women in a good many cases who go to church regularly, feel they want to go to the hotel or some club or other and have a drink or two and in some cases at least, as I know, when they take one or two they are going to take a load. Now I know you can't close all the beer parlours and all the taverns and hotels just because there are a few alcoholics. On the other hand I do think we could do without the amount of revenue gained by the Government by reason of the fact that these places are open on the Sabbath Day. There was a period when we had the open saloon, but I don't think they were allowed to be open on Sunday then.

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think



they were allowed to be open on the Sabbath Day. But as I said our people are not used to that sort of thing—

MR. POWER: Would the honourable gentleman allow me? I would like to say that this business of drinking on Sunday and having the taverns open on Sunday is something this Government inherited. We did not create this system. All through the Commission of Government's time the taverns were open on Sunday from 1:00 o'clock to 3:00 o'clock and from 5:00 o'clock to 8:00 o'clock, and we just continued that system which we inherited.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not accuse the Government of doing that. Sometimes we inherit things we are not very proud of and ought to do something about.

MR. POWER: You were implying it was something we introduced.

MR. HOLLETT: Did I? If I did I regret that. I am not implying that anybody has done it. I know somebody must have done it. I do state now you are allowing it to exist, and you have the power to bring in an amendment, you have the power to make a regulation which would prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on Sunday. I think it is something you ought to consider, and the Government ought to consider, and I think you will find the majority of the people, even those who drink, will probably agree you are doing the right thing.

Mind, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to make any political credo out of this. I just want to say that in my opinion (and I know as much about alcoholic liquor, I suspect, as any man in this House) moderate or temperate

or alcoholic or what not, the time has come when in this country one thing we ought to see to is that if a man wants a drink on Sunday he should buy it on Saturday and have it in his house like everything else, and these places should not be open on the Sabbath Day. That is my opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, in supporting what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has said I have here a letter addressed to me from the Women's Christian Temperance Union. It is under the date of May 25th. I have had it on my desk here in front of me for several days, thinking about it and mulling it over in my mind, and wondering what was the best thing to do. It is not always easy to know the best thing to do. But this letter says:

"We the officers and women of the Women's Christian Temperance Union humbly beg a portion of your time and interest in a problem in our midst which seems to be a very serious one in our estimation.

"Whereas it has come to our notice on several occasions that certain taverns and clubs are open in our City and suburbs for the sale of alcoholic beverages on the Lord's Day . . ." (By the way, I think there are no taverns open—there are clubs but no taverns. I think the Women's Temperance Union is mistaken here when they say they understand that taverns are open—at least that is highly unlawful).

MR. POWER: Taverns are not open on Sunday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Whereas we consider this to be a disgrace to our christian principles and standards as well as breaking the Fourth Commandment 'Remember the Sabbath Day and keep it holy,' and whereas it

has recently come to the hearing of one of our members from a telephone conversation from a heart-broken wife whose husband visits these places not only on days of the week but on Sundays also finds a way to obtain the alcoholic beverage and is fast destroying the peace of their home (to quote this woman) 'Is it not possible the union can do something for such cases as mine?' and whereas we feel as a temperance organization that it behooves us to appeal to the powers that be to do something about this terrible situation, and whereas we understand Quebec and Newfoundland are the only two provinces where this law is allowed, we contend we are too small and yet too christian a province to have such a law existing. Be it resolved therefore that we, the Christian Women's Temperance Union in this Province go on record as hereby asking you and your Government that you preserve our heritage in this respect, and at least try to keep God's Commandments and keep such places closed on His Day and so try to raise the morals of our older citizens and preserve our youths from temptation.

"Hoping this will receive prompt attention we are, Sir, very expectantly yours, The Women's Christian Temperance Union, per Mrs. H. K. Windsor, Secretary."

This, of course, bears out the point made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, because this letter deals with an objection to the opening of clubs on Sunday. Now I don't know frankly—I don't drink myself, and it is difficult for a man who does not drink to be able to appreciate the feelings of a man who does. I don't want to be fanatic about it and condemn everybody who takes a drink. I suppose if a man is used to taking a drink, I suppose he wants to

take one on Sunday as well as on Saturday. If a man has a habit of taking a drink or two or three every day I suppose he wants to take it on Sunday as well as on any other day, I don't know. But I imagine that is the case. I wonder what would happen if all means of getting a drink on Sundays stopped? Would there be the same number of alcoholics? I wonder—

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman thinks there would. Would there be the same number of broken homes?

MR. HOLLETT: I would not be surprised.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Alcoholics would get it anyway whether they were open or not.

MR. BROWNE: A lot of other people who are not exactly alcoholics would not get it and would not have the trouble in their homes.

MR. HOLLETT: That is true.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the other hand would such a man not get it on Saturday and bring it home or get it in his office or in some friend's home. It is obviously difficult. The suggestion seems to be clubs which are now opened from 1:00 o'clock to 3:00 p.m. and from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. should be opened instead, if at all, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Sunday and from 8:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.

MR. HOLLETT: Who suggested that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is suggested to me. Now if they were not open until 2:00 p.m. which would be after lunch, it certainly would not

interfere with anyone going to church. It would be after lunch, from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., and then close until 8:00 p.m. and close again at 11:00 p.m. Frankly I don't know. I confess it frankly. I used to be secretary of the Vigilance Committee in St. John's many years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: What was their responsibility?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a committee of clergymen and others who formed up a huge public meeting for the purpose of trying to see a prohibition law was enforced. God help me! I was the secretary of the committee trying to enforce prohibition in St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: How far the mighty have fallen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We were attempting a quite impossible task, I see that now, I did not then. I had the fire and enthusiasm of a young man and was the secretary of this organization. I wonder, suppose you allow every grocer who wants to do so to sell beer?

MR. HOLLETT: They won't be open on Sunday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but suppose you did on six days a week—if every grocery store everywhere stocked beer to sell it as they do flour or sugar, as they do, for instance, in Quebec where it is as easy to get and as commonplace as water. There is less drunkenness in Quebec than there is in Newfoundland, far less, and there is much less drunkenness in New York where there is not a block you can walk hardly in Manhattan where you won't see a shop simply stocked to the ceiling with every kind of drink ever seen or heard of but you

never see a person drunk. The only place you see a man drunk is here in St. John's—you don't even see them around the outports. I don't know why. What is the answer? Mr. Chairman, I frankly don't know the answer. I confess I don't know.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): A question has just come into my mind—I understand the British Columbia Government has instituted a Royal Commission or some sort of commission to go into the whole liquor question, last year, and I am just wondering whether that commission finished its report and if so where is the report. I don't know the answer to this, but I do remember reading some account of it from time to time, but they seemed to be getting nowhere the last time I heard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Royal Commission in British Columbia completed their work and now a new one is working in Manitoba. It is an eternal problem. I have heard more common sense from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition this afternoon on this question than I have heard from anyone in the House on this question, and at the same time more common sense from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition than I ever heard from him on anything in what he gave use here this afternoon, and it was a pleasure to hear him.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say one or two words. I agree of course that the problems of drinking and drunkenness are big problems and very difficult to solve. The Government, of course, has the control of the sale of alcoholic liquors and beer, and they sell, I think, up to and around a million bottles of

spirits a year, a million bottles of beer, but because of the fact they do control, have the sole control of selling, you don't blame them for that. Now it was suggested by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I believe, in 1949-50, that there be a no-treating clause, but that was turned down by the Government at that time. But I do think the no-treating clause if it was in the Act would help to stop excessive drinking at times.

I also support the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in respect to the Sunday-closing. I agree with the Premier about the saloons in New York. I was there on a couple of occasions and the saloons there are open practically all night and all day Sunday. But I suggest that perhaps he did not visit a part of New York where he might meet some people under the influence, down on the Bowery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You can get it there day or night all the year around.

MR. FOGWILL: I don't say it is a pleasure to visit that section, but I did, and I saw quite a number of people. But I did visit another place, Kansas, Miss., where they have a no Sunday open clause. But they do open from 12:00 to 2:00 a.m. Monday morning and anybody who really wants a drink can get it at 1:00 o'clock on Sunday night.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable member know where the prohibition movement began?

MR. FOGWILL: Kansas, Missouri. In Kansas, Kansas they were open on Sunday but in Kansas, Missouri they were closed on Sunday. They are two different cities entirely.

I think the Government could pos-

sibly do something in respect to excessive drinking, and I do compliment them on the fact they have voted ten thousand dollars to a temperance union. Perhaps they can put it to good use, but we have not seen any particulars on this union. I will say this; I am not a prohibitionist. I do not believe in entire prohibition, but in temperance drinking. Perhaps much of the fault of the excessive drinking of today was caused by the fact we had prohibition. I believe it was in the first days of the first world war when people interested in temperance at that time laid down and thought the battle was won. If they had continued what they were doing prior to that perhaps the situation today would be much different than we find it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there is any report from any organization or any account of how they are getting on or spending their money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Neaves came up to my office the other night and I am pretty sure he submitted their annual report. The position is that when he came first they had half their capital account spent, they had to set up offices, buy typewriters, desks, chairs, filing cabinets, then after that they would be ready to function. Mr. Neaves impressed me very much as a very practical-minded fellow, not going to be rushed off his feet. He is not a prohibitionist. He is not advocating prohibition and he is not going to be rushed or pushed. He is a Scot and pretty stubborn and has his feet pretty flat on the ground. He hopes to get all the churches, all of them without exception, to back him in their temperance, purely temperance work. He knows, and none

better, it is impossible to get all the churches in any movement connected with liquor except just a temperance movement. He would not get all the churches to support prohibition for instance,

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is one organization in the city which was established a long time ago, I refer to the Total Abstinence Benefit Society, where Father Pat Kennedy has been advocating total abstinence as a solution. For many years when I was a small boy I was a member of the juvenile branch of that society, and many boys when they get to be about twelve or thirteen join and take a pledge to keep total abstinence until they are twenty-one. Today I think the effects of drink are to be found amongst teenagers because the regulations are not strict enough or are not strictly enough enforced, and there are not enough inspectors of the premises. There have been times that I have been impressed by the very great crowd of young people there, and by the hilarity going on which certainly does not speak for people who are temperate in their drinking, and sometimes you see people weaving back and forth in the room, which indicates they have taken too much, and should not be served with any further alcohol. I don't believe that the regulations, if there are any regulations about serving lunches or serving beer to people who are under the influence of liquor, are carried out at all. I think the department is falling down in that respect. The Government has created a great many outlets, one recently, and the people of that neighbourhood have asked that they might be allowed to decide whether it might stay there or not, and can't get any answer whether the Govern-

ment is going to do anything about it. If the Government is serious about temperance, at least where the people of such an area are concerned, where that club is established, their wishes should be considered, and if they are opposed, and the Government is interested in temperance at least they will encourage that much temperance in that particular area where that outlet is.

MR. POWER: I should like to say in answer to the honourable gentleman; the only inspection ever having been carried on in Newfoundland on liquor premises was introduced by the Board of Liquor Control and that system is still continued in every liquor establishment. Every liquor establishment in St. John's is visited both day time and night time by our inspectors, every one.

MR. BROWNE: Every day?

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: How many inspectors?

MR. POWER: Three, I think, anyway, when I took over the Department of Liquor Control I will say this, if the honourable gentleman finds something wrong with the way the premises are being controlled he must have been horrified at what I found in 1949. They were the worst dives in North America without exception, a hang-out for bums, alcoholics and every kind of disreputable people. Then very good regulations were laid down, I think these were taken from the most of the liquor regulations acts of Canada, and I fail to see that it is not a hundred per cent better than it used to be.

When I went into the Board of Liquor Control I could not find in the files of that department any com-

plaints worthwhile from anybody around St. John's about the conditions of these premises, still everyone must have known they existed and that they were terrible places. Well, we cleaned up these—and we did not introduce Sunday openings—I fail to see where the liquor situation has not improved at least a hundred per cent. I, for one, do not believe that drinking is such a problem in Newfoundland. I will say this, if you meet a man weaving down the street he gets more publicity than the ten thousand quite, sober people. I believe that as far as the Provinces of Canada go that next to Quebec, Newfoundland is best off in that respect. In the outports of Newfoundland drinking is not such a big problem. Here in St. John's, I say, a few isolated cases may be picked out and a lot made of them. But state control of liquor has proven to be successful all over Canada, and I think that it has been successful here in Newfoundland, at least I think it is a lot better than it was when we took over.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, without wishing to prolong this debate indefinitely I would like to say that from time to time I hear about all the drinking that goes on amongst teenagers of St. John's. I believe the honourable member for St. John's West referred to teenagers drinking in St. John's. I feel sure there must be some drinking amongst teenagers here in St. John's but on the other hand, I believe I can boast that I know as many teenagers personally as anybody in this House. I have never to my knowledge ever met or spoken to a teenager under the influence of liquor or to one who smelled of having had a drink. Now let us take into practical consideration what is meant by teenagers, who are, I pre-

sume, somewhere in the bracket between sixteen and nineteen to twenty years of age. The average age for Grade XI boys in St. John's is probably between sixteen and seventeen years of age, I think it is 16.8 or something like that. So that how many of the Grade XI's who go to the city schools would be found who had ever been in a beer parlour? I would be willing to bet that of the hundreds of teenagers I know personally not one, and certainly not five have ever been in a beer parlour. I believe that what the Honourable Minister of Finance has just said applies to teenagers too. Some young chap goes off and gets a few drinks somewhere and puts on an exhibition. In this world there are people who must be exhibiting themselves one way or another before the public. But immediately someone writes this up, and then everyone starts to wring their hands and ask what is the world coming to. I don't believe there is any more drinking among our teenagers today than there was fifty years ago, and I don't know what it was then. But as a matter of fact I do recall now that one of the reasons why Bishop Feild insisted on separating the boys and girls in St. John's who went to the same school one hundred and twenty years ago, in 1824 I believe it was, was the fact that many of the boys used to come to school smelling of rum. Now I don't want to be misunderstood in this matter. We are in perfect agreement at this moment, I think, and I hope we will be when I am finished.

MR. HOLLETT: But the point that I raised is the Sunday opening of clubs and hotels for the selling of alcoholic liquor. You close your taverns and don't let poor John Brown or Bill Smith who worked



around all week go into a tavern and get a drink on Sunday but you let the man who has a car drive from the church door to the hotel or Bella Vista—I am going to ask the Honourable the Premier to do something now—some Sunday this summer, and he might take the Minister along with him, the Minister of Finance, and come in from Roache's Line and go to church—that would not hurt them either. Then after church go and visit every one of these clubs in St. John's and every hotel between half past twelve and two o'clock. Then they can make up their minds whether it would be wise to close these places on the Sabbath. That is the only point I raised. I am not talking temperance. I am not talking prohibition. I don't believe in prohibition, and temperance is something over which this Government has no control whatsoever, but they can control the opening of liquor clubs on the Sabbath Day. They have that in their hands. You have ten thousand dollars here voted for the cause of temperance, and I am not so much interested in that, but I do think Sunday should not be a day when we can all go to a hotel and purchase drinks whether we are teenagers or bald-headed people or what not. As for the alcoholics they will get liquor anyway, and the alcoholic is not going to a club or the hotel nine times out of ten. I am saying this having some experience of alcoholics. They are usually fairly intelligent people until they get a drink, then they are no longer intelligent except in one thing and that is as to the wherewithal to get the liquor and how. They know how to do that, and they won't go to these places to get it because they know they are not wanted there. They

have sense enough for that. But I was talking about the young fellow whose mother phoned me, and I know lots of other young fellows and lots of old fellows too. And I think, if that woman, whoever she might be, had gone to the B. of L. department and purchased a little bottle of whiskey or something and have it in her home and let the boy get a drink that might be the best thing. But I don't know. I am no judge of that. I was brought up in an atmosphere of absolute temperance and prohibition in the family and taught that if I took a drink I would go to hell. That is not right. I know that now but I did not know it then. I could tell a lot of stories about drinking but I am not going to do that now. All I want is that the Government should consider whether or not they might find it possible to make a regulation to that end for a trial at any rate. I could point out the dangers of motor car accidents and things like that. If you look at the statistics you will find that most of these accidents happen over the weekend.

MR. POWER: There is more traffic then.

MR. HOLLETT: Probably there is, but you will find there are more accidents, and you will find there are more people arrested for drunken driving over the weekends than at any other time. If you will look up the police records you will find that is so.

I don't think you will lose any revenue by doing that because the man who goes in there on Sunday would buy it on Saturday and bring it to his home. I ask the Honourable the Premier to consider that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will certainly do that, and I will also con-

sider the idea of changing the hours. I will give the whole matter very careful thought. To be quite honest I am worried about it—I am worried about it—I don't want any home to be broken up by me nor any woman's heart to be broken by any bungling around here.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say one thing in connection with the Newfoundland Hotel. I understand from the Act that the lounge in the Hotel is not allowed to be open. The only sale of liquor in the Hotel on Sunday is to guests in their rooms or at meals at specified hours. The Hotel Lounge is definitely closed on Sunday.

MR. HOLLETT: They get it there nevertheless.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They must get it from some guest.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that.

Item 620 carried.

MR. MURRAY: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we might revert back to 614-01. I am informed now by the Deputy Minister that this \$6,650,000 includes the million recently voted.

Item 614-01 carried.

MR. MURRAY: If we could turn now, Mr. Chairman, to page 75 to deal with capital expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rest of that item was not carried on 614?

MR. MURRAY: They are all right as they stand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not now on capital but current expenditure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This completes the Department of Education.

Department of Attorney General:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should just run through the whole grant and not jump up and down every few minutes. If honourable members would agree I might consider pages 36 through 38 first and deal with all the salaries as a bracket rather than keep turning back and forth to salaries all the time.

Item 701-01—That is the normal Minister's salary and the travelling expenses and office expenses which are the same as last year except that there is \$20 additional for office, which is purely nominal.

Under 702—Salaries are up a bit. That will be explained when we come to salaries.

Travelling is up. We have asked for the extra \$1,100 because we hope to send two representatives to the Uniformity of Legislation Conference in Quebec and there is to be a conference in Ottawa later in the year on the Companies' Law, and we are making provision so that it may be possible for officials of my department to attend these meetings.

The office expenses are the same. Law books are down by \$500, but if honourable members will refer to the very last item under 716 they will find provisions there for law books for the new district courts, and for that reason we are allowing the grant for law books here to drop from \$2,000 to \$1,500.

703—Supreme Court—salaries will be dealt with later. Office expenses are the same as last year practically. There is not quite as much put in this year for the Circuit Court, but we may be able to get through with that. We are trying to manage to have two sessions, one in the spring and one in the fall. Of course the costs of the circuit courts vary from year to year and it is impossible to

tell in advance just how long a court will have to remain, but if we can't get along with \$3,500 we will have countervailing savings, I hope, from somewhere. The contribution to the Law Librarian's pension—I think honourable members will remember that was Mr. Summers pensioned some years ago.

704—St. John's Magistrate's Court: (Salaries to be dealt with later) Office expenses are the same as last year. Travelling is up a bit because we have four vacancies in the magistracy which we hope to be filled and that means there will be travelling expenses. There is a token vote for a convention. I think we will have to have a convention of magistrates some time after the new criminal code is adopted in Ottawa. Houses and Rent Allowances, the House will allow an item whereby magistrates who have no homes provided and have to pay rent—we allow them any rent they have to pay in excess of \$30 a month. All magistrates pay \$30 a month for Government houses they occupy. If a magistrate has no Government house and has to pay rent we pay it only in excess of \$30 a month. Operation of Vessels. That is "visitations" and the expenses are the same as last year except for the normal increase to the crew members.

706—Deeds and Companies: the same as last year.

707—Constabulary. The increase in salaries will be dealt with when we get to them. For travelling expenses we are asking for the same as last year, and we are trying to cut down on office expenses from \$4,000 to \$3,000. Equipment and supplies the same as last year. We are asking for an increase of \$500 for motor vehicles, supplies and gasoline. I think that will be normal. On the other hand we are not asking for quite as much

in the case of motor vehicles. We got two new patrol cars last year, and we may have to replace some of these prowler cars. I think it is cheaper to turn them in every year and buy new ones rather than carry the old ones over. That is really commonplace.

708 is the same as last year (Royal Canadian Mounted Police).

709—Fire Department: The salaries will be explained later. The other items are practically the same. Under vehicles, etc. Maintenance and Gasoline we are asking for an increase of ten thousand dollars there for maintenance of equipment. We have a lot of very valuable equipment and it means we would have to make very substantial repairs should those repairs be found to be necessary. The increase in the vote for uniforms, Mr. Chairman, is due to the fact that we have increased our staff so as to make it possible to give them the eight hour day. The vote has been increased from \$9,000 to \$10,000. For the purchase of apparatus etc. we are trying to get along this year with \$14,500. I think we could very well use some additional money, but at the moment we are content with that. The other items are the same. There is a small increase in the maintenance of horses and harness due to additional expenses.

710—H. M. Penitentiary and Goals: I am very happy about the penitentiary and the prison camps which are an outstanding success, and Superintendent Case and all his staff are doing a wonderful job. We are not so proud of the women's wing of the penitentiary and we have been negotiating for a new place on the Bay Bulls Road which we have been able to get from the Federal Government. We have made provisions in our vote for salaries for some extra staff for that institution.

The item for provisions is down, you will note, Mr. Chairman, largely due to the fact of the increased production taking place on prison farms. They are supplying meat, vegetables, milk and eggs and we can save five thousand dollars on that item.

Furnishing and equipment—that is a necessary increase due to the higher cost of items.

The other items are pretty well the same. Farm Industry is \$12,000 instead of \$10,000—that is because we are increasing the number of cattle.

I think, Mr. Chairman, we might rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might inform the Committee I was out of order myself the other evening. I find in the Standing Regulations that I should not recess the Committee, but the Chairman should report progress to the House.

On motion the committee rose and reported having passed these items and asked leave to sit again.

Report received—items 100 to 600 Legislature, Executive Council, Department of Finance, Department of Provincial Affairs, Department of Education.

Committee ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock I will leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

#### NIGHT SESSION

June 3, 1954.

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

The speaker (Mr. Courage) in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply—leave has already been given for this Committee, I do now leave the Chair.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, just before we recessed I was on Item 710, and I was saying how very pleased I am with the conduct of the penitentiary and the prison camps. I was also saying we were not very happy about the women's portion of the penitentiary. That is a section of the penitentiary which is not very often fully occupied, for which we are thankful. But there have been times during the past year when I have felt something should be done or had to be done, and we have arranged, as I said, to get from the Federal Government a building on Bay Bulls Road.

Item 710-02-04 is a pickup for transportation to the prison camp. Then under 710-03 there is a decrease of \$5,000 in supplies or provisions, due to production at the prison camp. Under 07 there is an item of \$12,000, an increase of \$2,000. We are increasing and improving our cattle every year. The other items, Mr. Chairman, are all the same.

711—Miscellaneous: Prosecutions are the same as last year and investigations are the same. We have not asked for as much for civil actions this year. I am sorry for that now for since these estimates were prepared and printed we have had summary proceedings which may cause us substantially more than \$1,500. The next two items are the same as last year. But conveyance of witnesses is another item that is going to have a very heavy expense this year because of the Labrador manslaughter case which will necessitate a lot of witnesses being brought down from Labrador. Registration of Jurors is the same except for a little increase in the vote last year.

Under 712 we are asking nothing for the Consolidation of Statutes, although I am aware we have no index

as yet, and we are trying to make arrangements for a form of index which will be of some help in locating the Acts, but there will not be a full fledged index such as in the past. I may say we found to have the index would be very expensive, \$6,000, but then of course we would have a professional job. But I may say the amount startled me and I have not yet summoned enough courage to ask the Cabinet for that much money, which is a very large amount for that.

713—Transportation: That is our annual fee to the Maritime Board of Trade. Board of Transport \$15,000. About half that is a retaining fee we pay a traffic consultant, Mr. Gerald Murphy of Montreal. He gets roughly half. Then of course, we have expenses of one kind and another. We find that transportation is fast becoming a very important thing, and we are sparing no expense to try to get the traffic rates between here and the Mainland such that our industries can compete.

715—Fire Commissioner: That is new.

716—District Courts: This is a new item not there last year. We may need four district courts. The judges, Mr. Chairman, are paid by the Federal Government. We have the amount of \$14,600 for staff and \$1,200 put in for travelling expenses. There is an allowance of \$2,000 for law books.

I think, Mr. Chairman, I have made all that clear. We could now glance quickly through the salary items. I wish to say at the start that I want to make a sort of apology: Between the times these items left our office and reached the printers some change was made in the titles of these people, and therefore I would be glad if honourable members would check their

volumes and I will explain what is actually meant by some of the silly titles here. Actually all civil servants are graded, all deputy ministers have a standard, and assistant deputies a certain standard, then administrative assistants have a certain standard, the directors and after that they are officers. All officials in my department were classified under one or other of these headings, but unfortunately in a number of places they put down the classification and did not put the rank. Under the Minister's Office you will see the Attorney General \$7,000. I hope you will vote my salary, and shorthand-typist Grade V \$3,000. All the secretaries are put on the same bracket. Director Grade VIII should read Director of Public Prosecutions—Mr. Carter. Then next, Assistant Deputy Attorney General. That is now Mr. Cyril Greene. Then we have three directors. Actually the official terms for these gentlemen is Legal Assistants.

Now I would like to pay here, Mr. Chairman, a tribute to the officials of my department, Mr. Carter, Mr. Greene, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mahoney and Mr. Soper. These men are doing a very excellent job. When we were talking about the Election Act the other day I should have mentioned that Mr. Greene and Mr. McCarthy have put in many, many hours on that, and have done a really painstaking job. There are two officers Grade V, one is Miss Bartlett, Office Manager, and the other Mr. Gerald Whitty, Accountant. The officer Grade IV is Miss Croak and the officer Grade III Mr. Edward Murphy, assistant to the accountant.

Supreme Court: The officer Grade VI is the Chief Clerk and Registrar. He was originally getting \$5,210 and we gave him \$7,000 by including the

cost of living and gave him the classification which we felt was in keeping with that office. Officer Grade V, that is the Chief Clerk and Registrar's Assistant, Mr. Kent, who is deputy-registrar. The two officers Grade IV are Mr. Stirling and Miss Page. The officer Grade III has just been appointed, and then the shorthand-typist Grade IV who are really the court reporters, Miss Thomas and Miss Corbett, and the shorthand-typist Grade I is just temporary. The officer Grade V is the Sheriff. To outport Deputy Sheriffs we give a sort of standing fee. The officer Grade III is the Bailiff and Deputy Sheriff, Noseworthy, and the messengers, Grade II. As you know, the Law Librarian is Mrs. Pinsent, and there is a messenger there too.

Then we move on to the St. John's Magistrate's Court: This describes Magistrate O'Neill as a director, Grade V. Actually that should be stipendiary Magistrate and Clerk of the Peace, Grade IV; Richards, shorthand-typist Grade IV, etc.

705—Magistrates: District Magistrates are in there as directors Grade I. Someone had a sense of humour, Mr. Chairman. These are stipendiary magistrates. We have at the moment provisions for 19 but we actually have at the moment 14 in the outports and one in St. John's, fifteen altogether. We have provided for four additional appointments. We will need one in St. George's, one in Springdale, one in St. Anthony and one in Holyrood. I think we shall have to divide that Conception Bay area as it is too large for one man. So that there are four appointments which have to be made. We have the applications at my office, and are about ready to make the appointments, but I think we may have to do some switching

around. The magistrates that are there in the various places have been there quite some time, and it is usual to promote and move them around. I think we will have to do that. The shorthand-typist at Grand Falls, I understand, is about to retire. The other shorthand-typists are one at Bell Island, one at Corner Brook, one at Placentia and one at Harbour Grace.

Deeds and Companies: The Registrar is described as a Director Grade I, which is a good one. He is getting his cost of living bonus and general increase of about ten per cent and perhaps a little more.

Constabulary: The Chief of Police is put in here in brackets, which should have been done all through. The police force, Mr. Chairman, at the moment is in very good condition, and we are trying to keep everybody there happy. They are all on an eight-hour day and have leave periods, and I am glad to hear that everybody is happy. Now I think all these are self-explanatory. We have incorporated the rent and marriage allowances in the basic salary and there is no longer any allowances. Manual Grade III is a carpenter and the police surgeon—as you know, we pay Dr. Anderson \$1,500. Special service vote \$200. That is a little vote the CID can use sometimes to good advantage, and the detectives also have an amount of \$1,600 allowing us to pay the CID \$3 a week for special hours they have to work.

Fire Department: The Superintendent there is listed as a Director Grade I. I don't think there is anything there that needs an explanation.

H.M. Penitentiary and Gaols: We have the Superintendent of the Penitentiary, Mr. Case and the Chief Warden, Kelland. We have increased the number of sergeant wardens by one,



and decreased the number of wardens by one, which brings the total the same. But you will notice when we come to Assistant Matrons we have allowed for the appointment of four, in case we have to staff the women's penitentiary. Everything else, I think, is perfectly clear.

**Fire Commissioner:** Mr. Frank Ryan gets \$5,000 and an allowance of \$1,500 for a typist. The District Court is allowed two shorthand-typists and two officers Grade IV. We have allowed a vote of \$5,400 for an additional staff.

**Mr. Chairman,** I have just gone through this briefly so as to give honourable members a brief picture of the operations of my department, and I move section 700.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, I must thank the Attorney General for the explanation which he has given of the votes for his department. There are some of them, however, on which I have to make some observations now, following the method that he followed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** If the honourable member will allow me—I wonder if it would not be better to pass and discuss each one as called. That might be more in order.

Item 701—Carried.

Item 702:

**MR. BROWNE:** Now, Mr. Chairman, these are votes for the staff in the general office. I notice there is the Deputy Attorney General, his assistant and three legal assistants, that is six legal officers. That is certainly a sufficient staff to carry on and I should think we might even get some of them to attend to the indexing of the Statutes. I don't see why that should be too big a burden. They can't be busy all the time, cer-

tainly not always with prosecutions—during the summer months there are no prosecutions. It seems to me that they could at least make a start on that and I would suggest it to the Attorney General, that at any rate there should be an index of the different statutes, describing the statutes.

**MR. CURTIS:** That will be in this year's statutes, I have already said that.

**MR. BROWNE:** Now he has told us that it is the intention to send two representatives to the Committee on Uniformity of Legislation at Winnipeg. I don't understand why there should be two representatives from a small province like Newfoundland. Why is it necessary to send two. The City of Winnipeg has a population equal to the whole population of Newfoundland and I am sure they won't be sending two representatives although it is being held in their own city. One should be sufficient to take in these matters. Therefore I think there would be some money wasted if that is done. There were two conventions to which he said he was sending representatives, one at Winnipeg and at Ottawa. I would suggest to him that he send one to each instead of sending two.

Now these young men in his office, Mr. Mahoney, Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Soper, I imagine are very good men. I think Mr. Soper is a little senior to the others as far as being called to the bar. They are all good men. I would say there is a very good staff there. I think, in comparison with other votes that will come up here this evening, they are well paid. That is all I have to say on that item.

**MR. MURRAY:** There was some mention of indexing the Statutes. I wonder, as a matter of information

could I ask what is being done there? There was a proposal that it be farmed out. Was that adopted?

MR. CURTIS: We discussed it, as I said. There is a firm of professional indexers in Toronto, I think it was the CCHM who do a lot of that work for the other provinces, and they offered to do ours, but when I got the price I was frightened and am still looking around. I did get in touch with one university and thought they perhaps might have facilities for handling it.

In connection with the other items I mentioned, the conference in Winnipeg and in Ottawa, they will be meeting at the same time.

MR. BROWNE: One man could cover them both?

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps so.

MR. BROWNE: Did the Attorney General try our own university. They might be able to undertake the responsibility for this indexing of the statutes. I am quite sure the Librarian is quite accustomed to indexing thousands of books, and should have sufficient training to make an index for four volumes—has that been tried, and could it be considered?

Item carried.

Item 703—Supreme Court:

MR. BROWNE: Did I understand the Attorney General to say there was a new Grade III Officer there?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, he is replacing Mr. Stirling who has been promoted.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but the new officer is put in at the top of the scale?

MR. CURTIS: I think that must be a mistake, I will check on that.

MR. BROWNE: There are two Grade IV Officers. Miss Page has been there many years, I suppose, I would not like to say how long she has been there, but she has been there most of her life, and at that rate, two officers Grade IV getting \$5,500 between them—is the new officer who has just come in and does not know his way around the office given the same rate? Now there is no comparison in the value of the two people. While I like to see a man get good wages I think we ought to consider the services of the people who have been there so long.

MR. CURTIS: I think we might let that stand.

Item 703 stand.

704—St. John's Magistrate's Court:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation about the salary paid the magistrate in the Magistrate's Court, Magistrate O'Neill. I think I should draw to the attention of the House the fact that Magistrate O'Neill is a man with over twenty years experience, and the gentleman who has been recently appointed to the Justice Department is receiving a salary which we just discussed; directors, are getting an average of \$6,000 a year, and the Assistant Deputy Attorney General \$8,000 a year. Magistrate O'Neill is a man of experience in the busiest court in the country, and he is rated at a lower rate than the Assistant Deputy-Attorney General. It seems to me that never in the history of that court has the person in charge received a salary less than three or four other officials in the Department of Justice, or in the Department of the Attorney General. It is quite a difficult job there, in fact much more difficult now, I am sure the Attorney

General will admit it is more difficult today than ever because, although the Premier talked about how high the magistrate and the judge of the central district courts were, there is no question about how high the magistrate is today. Under the Criminal Code he has power to send people to gaol for years. That is a very great responsibility. Then the law is more complicated. There has been a change-over, as the Attorney General knows, to the Criminal Code and it is an especially difficult one to follow and to apply. Therefore, since it is such a busy court great responsibility falls under it, and I would like to ask consideration from the Attorney General in the matter of increasing this salary, and at least put him as high as the Assistant Deputy Attorney General.

Now there is one other item in connection with the Magistrate's Court which I feel I should draw to the attention of the Attorney General. Again he knows very well this is a very congested place, the office over there has been a disgrace for twenty years. It is just a single room with a stenographer and another small room off that with a stenographer and two clerks, and a little tiny room for members of the police, and sometimes members of the legal profession come in and it is extremely difficult to do any work. I don't see how you can expect any efficiency from the Magistrate's Court while it is carried on in that congested manner. I presume that Magistrate O'Neill comes under the other Magistrate's vote. Could the Attorney General tell me what his salary is?

MR. CURTIS: I don't know, Mr. Chairman, the individual salaries of the magistrates. The salaries of the magistrates are voted in a block sum,

I don't know what each individual one is.

MR. BROWNE: Well again I am sure the Attorney General must know that the matter of giving more space for the magistrates court was under consideration, certainly ten years ago, if not longer, and was dropped for some reason or other. Part of the offices there were taken by the Department of Public Works, which, in my opinion, should never have been done, and these offices should have been given to the court.

MR. HOLLETT: In that matter, Mr. Chairman, of Magistrate O'Neill: He has been there quite a long time, I believe. This matter came up for consideration last year, if I remember correctly, and the year before. I notice under Director Grade V an employee is given an increase year by year, but how does he get to Grade VI and so on up to Grade X?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a decision of the Cabinet. It is a matter for the Cabinet to decide.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no incentive, it is up to the Cabinet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is how it is with all directors.

MR. HOLLETT: You take a lot of these who are, for instance, Grade IV. There are five or six hundred of them and they go up by yearly increases, and they have a chance of advancement as far as salary is concerned. I was wondering if there is any chance for a man in the position such as Magistrate O'Neill to improve his conditions financially?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a decision of the Cabinet, confirmed subsequently by the Legislature.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that the way it was always in connection with that appointment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly. Judges to the Supreme Court and all magisterial salaries are decided by Cabinet. Since entering Confederation the salaries of Supreme Court Judges, and County Court Judges are decided by parliament.

MR. HOLLETT: Magistrates are increased by yearly increments?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, none increases automatically. But unless there is some black mark against him he gets the increase.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no black mark nor white mark against Magistrate O'Neill, yet he does not go up or down?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not automatically no.

MR. CURTIS: Magistrate O'Neill is getting seventeen hundred dollars a year more than any other magistrate in the country.

MR. BROWNE: The Attorney General must admit he does a lot more work. His is a busy court, and is at times extremely busy, and far more difficult cases go before Magistrate O'Neill than before the other magistrates.

MR. CURTIS: We have done more, as honourable members know, for Magistrate O'Neill in the past five years than any other government did in ten years.

MR. BROWNE: I don't agree with you. What he is getting now is no better than in 1949.

MR. CURTIS: I believe he was getting \$4,500.

MR. BROWNE: Even so the value in money has certainly brought down the value.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it is not a matter of Magistrate O'Neill or anybody else. We all know that the position of Magistrate in the Magistrate's Court in St. John's is very important, where a man has to work morning, noon and night. I know that to be a fact, and I think there should be some provision for the enhancement of the salary to compensate for conduct and hard work in every walk of life.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Attorney General able to give the amount of fines collected in the Magistrate's Court last year?

MR. CURTIS: No, I only know the amount throughout the whole country.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Attorney General make any statement regarding the congestion in the Magistrate's Court, and whether there is any intention to remedy the situation?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have had the matter under active consideration. I might say we had plans prepared but I was not prepared to accept them because they chopped it up too much. I may say the improvement of facilities is a very active matter before the Government.

MR. BROWNE: There has been some talk of removing traffic cases?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, it is being done.

MR. BROWNE: How will it be done—would the Attorney General be able to tell us?

MR. CURTIS: We have a Traffic Court, Mr. Chairman, all ready to

open at Fort Townshend, and why it has not yet been opened I do not know. It should have been opened months and months ago. I gave instructions it was to be opened, and one of the two magistrates is supposed to go up so many days a week. Up there there is lots of parking ground and everything is quiet and ordinary. Criminal cases will not be heard there. I don't know just why they have not done it. The last I heard of it the court definitely was ready, but they are putting in the bar and facilities, and I would expect to see it open any day.

Item 704 carried.

705—Magistrates:

MR. HOLLETT: On that item, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General said there were four people they were quite ready to appoint. Who are the appointees to the magistracy, who have been just about approved?

MR. CURTIS: We are making provisions for four.

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to inquire about is, have these applications been considered by the Civil Service Commission?

MR. CURTIS: No, they don't come under the Civil Service Commission. They are supposed to know more than the Civil Service Commission. Magistrates are always recommended to the Cabinet by an inter-office committee of lawyers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean to tell me the old Civil Service Commission never had anything to do with magistrates? I was a magistrate myself for twenty years. I am beginning to wonder what this Civil Service Commission is for anyway?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not in force at the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: These are civil servants and I am certainly entitled to ask questions as to whether they are supposed to come before the commission. The House is voting, I believe, eight thousand dollars for civil service commissioners, and as far as I can find out thus far, I don't know what category they do take care of. I don't think they take care of any at all, it is just a matter of setting up two or three people in a job, as far as I can see. There are some three or four thousand civil servants, and as far as I can see, only about seven hundred come before them, when they do come before them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The vote under debate is 705.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, magistrates do not come under that Civil Service Commission and deputy ministers do not come under it. Could the Honourable Minister tell us what classifications come under it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps the honourable member might turn around the other way, and discuss the magistrates.

Item 705 carried.

706—Deeds and Companies:

MR. BROWNE: Under 706, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that that also is a very congested place. I suppose we have probably one of the ablest men in Canada today in charge of that division, and I believe that it was the most efficient department up to a certain time ago, but today it is unable to cope with the work and the volume of deeds being prepared has increased, the number of companies has increased and they are about a

month behind with registrations. I understand that some recommendations have been made to the Attorney General regarding some other method of registering deeds. Is he in a position to tell us whether any progress is being made in that, and whether any consideration has been given to it and if there is any likelihood of any improvement being made in the Registry of Deeds?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I might say that office is congested, and we have been trying to get some additional room up there particularly in view of the fact that they have in mind an endeavour to get a photographic outfit for photographing deeds, which will enable a deed to be immediately registered and returned. I might say that matter is under consideration, and very active consideration.

706 carried.

707—Constabulary:

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing much to say on that except that I am very happy to know, as the Attorney General has stated, all policemen are happy about their salaries. I think I brought up the matter here some time ago, and showed there was at least one policeman on the force whose son, on the RCMP, gets about twice as much as the old man. So that I am glad to know that all policemen are happy with the salaries they are getting.

I would like to ask the Attorney General is there any pressing need for that special vote—it is only \$200?

MR. CURTIS: Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it is not a vote I know anything about.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while we are on this vote, I think I

would be expressing the sentiments of the Premier and every member of this House if I took advantage of the occasion to express my own personal sympathy and of the other members to the relatives of the late Frank Stamp, whom the members of the police force thought so much about, and who died so suddenly the other day. He was a great athlete and a very popular police officer and very attentive to his duty.

I notice here there is a vote for compensation to families of deceased constables. Is that being carried on in the old way in which it was done before when there was a fund created? I notice there is only a vote of \$100. There used to be a fund out of which compensation pensions were given widows. Is that in existence now?

MR. CURTIS: I really don't know, Mr. Chairman. That is purely a token vote. It is not presumed that it will be enough, but that is a fund which will enable the Cabinet in a proper case to take steps to relieve the family of a constable who should die under any unhappy circumstances. I don't think many claims have been made on that vote in previous years, and that is the reason it is down to this token vote. I might say that my department tries to be very considerate in every case like that.

I want to thank my honourable friend for bringing up the case of Constable Stamp. I did not know Constable Stamp personally, but I have heard him spoken of by men in the highest possible terms. I am sure we all join with the honourable and learned member in his remarks.

707 carried.

708—Royal Canadian Mounted Police:

MR. BROWNE: How many men



of the RCMP are there in Newfoundland now?

MR. CURTIS: I can't say that, Mr. Chairman. We pay at the rate of \$1,500 a year, and that is what it costs. It is a mathematical sum to work out two-thirds of that. There are of course a lot more RCMP in Newfoundland than we are paying. We pay \$1,500 individually.

MR. BROWNE: That is roughly about 155. There are a lot more RCMP officers than we are paying for.

MR. CURTIS: The Federal Government maintain RCMP.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know how many they have here?

MR. CURTIS: No, we only pay for certain detachments in certain areas. They have additional men which they themselves pay for.

MR. BROWNE: Have we any of the police outside of St. John's, or does the RCMP look after them all?

MR. CURTIS: Everything outside St. John's.

708 carried.

709—Fire Department:

MR. BROWNE: On this the only observation I would like to make is on the remuneration rates, the salaries. I suppose it is not a good argument to say that the Superintendent only gets \$4,700 and the new Fire Commissioner is getting \$5,000. What has the Fire Commissioner got that the Superintendent has not? The Superintendent of the Fire Department is an intelligent man with about twenty-five years of experience behind him, and yet he does not get as good a salary as the new commission-

er, who just worked into the job out of a plumbing store. Is that supposed to be a political appointment I wonder?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I regret that the honourable gentleman asked that question. I regret that the honourable gentleman had that thought in mind. Frank Ryan is a strong Liberal. He campaigned actively and energetically for the Liberal Party, as I judge certain friends of the honourable gentleman campaigned actively and energetically for the Tory Party. Now citizens who have campaigned during elections are still citizens and are not debarred from an appointment by this Government. We are proud of the appointment. We have been congratulated by the Board of Fire Underwriters on the fact that we have appointed Mr. Ryan as a Fire Commissioner. That is that. Now if the honourable gentleman does not like it he can lump it!

MR. HOLLETT: That is nasty!

MR. SMALLWOOD: He can like it or lump it! The question was nasty, as I would expect. I say he can lump or like it as he likes.

MR. BROWNE: You seem to be very sensitive about it.

709 carried.

710—H.M. Penitentiary and Gaols:

MR. BROWNE: On this matter of the prison farm, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us a little more information about that farm? I take it that there are certain prisoners sent there. How many wardens are there out there, and to what extent is farming being done?

MR. CURTIS: There are actually, Mr. Chairman, at the moment at the prison farm—in the country we have sixty male prisoners at the Penitenti-

ary and four female prisoners, and forty-five male prisoners at the prison camps, so that the total number of prisoners is about 109. At the Penitentiary we have a staff of 32, and at the camp a staff of eight. We need a larger staff at the Penitentiary than we do at the prison farm.

I am not in a position at the present moment to give a full report from the Superintendent of the Penitentiary. I asked for it today, and I found we have not received last year's report yet. But if I can get it while the House is in session I will table it—that will be on the whole Penitentiary. I cannot give the details now.

MR. HOLLETT: On page 96, under salaries, I notice there is one fixed personal, \$2,610. Can the Minister explain what that means?

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't carry the intimate details of all the staff.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't mean the name, but what does it mean?

MR. CURTIS: That means he was a policeman, I understand, assigned to the Penitentiary and rather than have him suffer some loss in salary he carried his salary at the time with him.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that principle runs all through these classifications, and it means they received a certain salary under a formal vote and when transferred they retain their old salary, with the cost of living bonus and the 10% etc.

MR. BROWNE: Did the Attorney General say how many female prisoners there are in the Penitentiary?

MR. CURTIS: Four.

MR. BROWNE: Is it necessary, do you think, to get a new building?

MR. CURTIS: Not if we can keep the female population down to four. Last year unfortunately we had ten and twelve off and on, and had cells for half of them.

MR. BROWNE: For any length of time?

MR. CURTIS: Too long to be doubled together, the quarters are too cramped for even a week.

Item 710 carried.

711—Miscellaneous:

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell us something about 711-03 Civil Actions \$1,500? Apparently the Minister thinks that will not be enough for some reason or another.

MR. CURTIS: Maybe it will be.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if you would care to mention what Civil Actions?

MR. CURTIS: No, I would not care to.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you would not care to. Fifteen hundred dollars does not seem a lot to cover that. I don't see why the Minister does not ask to have it amended right now.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask what is the practice when a vote runs out like that?

MR. CURTIS: The Cabinet is allowed generally to transfer counter-vailing savings from one vote to another, within a department.

MR. BROWNE: Is that under the Audit Act?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Attorney General tell us how long it has been since the department took a civil action against any person or corporation?

MR. CURTIS: I think I would have to have notice of that question. We have taken civil actions before.

MR. HOLLETT: Not since Confederation?

MR. CURTIS: I think so—I would not say we have not.

MR. MURRAY: As a matter of fact I took some number of actions. It is not unusual for the Attorney General's Department to take civil actions.

MR. HOLLETT: In Newfoundland—could the Honourable Minister cite one?

MR. CURTIS: It also covers defending civil actions, and very frequently we become involved in civil actions.

MR. MURRAY: I have been myself in several civil actions where vehicles owned by the several departments are involved.

MR. HOLLETT: That is where some department is a defendant?

MR. MURRAY: Or where any of the property of the province is at stake.

MR. HOLLETT: Can you remember any particular one?

MR. MURRAY: I do know I was on several myself, and I know it is not unusual.

MR. HOLLETT: But there is one pending now?

Item 711 carried.

712—No vote.

713—Transportation:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the Minister make a breakdown of the vote for the Board of Transportation, \$15,000, and give us some details on it?

MR. CURTIS: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gerald Murphy and his firm is the Board of Transport Consultant; and it provides for travelling. The rest is purely a reserve as we don't know at the beginning of the year how many applications will be made before the Board of Transport.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent last year?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a stranger in the gallery!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the honourable member disturbed?

MR. HOLLETT: Somewhat.

MR. CURTIS: I have not the figures here, but I think we probably spent about ten thousand of the fifteen thousand last year.

MR. BROWNE: In regard to the civil action, or to the freight rates, is the Government contemplating any civil action in that respect?

MR. CURTIS: That vote, Mr. Chairman, deals more with actions which we take jointly with the other maritime provinces. You see we are members of the Maritime Board of Trade. Now and then the other maritime provinces institute actions and sometimes we join with them and sometimes we don't—it always depends upon the matter of the application, and this just gives us a small vote on which to finance any such action.

713 carried.

715—Fire Commissioner—Carried.

716—District Courts:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is now in a position to tell us when and where the district courts are to be set up, where they are to be located, and when they are to be opened for cases. They have been appointed now, I believe, since last summer or early fall, and there has been no case heard yet.

MR. CURTIS: I understand, Mr. Chairman, the judges have just returned from Ottawa, and they have not yet reported to me, but we are proceeding to get quarters for them, and one will be in Corner Brook and the other in St. John's. We have no word from Ottawa of any other appointments up to the present time.

MR. HOLLETT: Are these Federal appointments?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Federal appointments.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask why we have to provide offices and stenographers?

MR. CURTIS: The same reason as for the Supreme Court. Ottawa provides the judges and we look after them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The point must be remembered that these courts are created by the Legislature of Newfoundland. All courts operated in Newfoundland are created by an Act of the Legislature of Newfoundland, all courts without exception.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General has decided on

where the courts are to be situated? I can easily understand Corner Brook,—they have the courthouse there.

MR. CURTIS: No the courthouse is not big enough. They are trying to get other quarters. That is part of the delay, negotiating for other quarters there. There are a lot of litigations in Corner Brook and the magistrate is very busy all the time, and I am told by people who know Corner Brook that there is not enough room in the Corner Brook District Court just now. We have the same position in St. John's. Frankly we are desperately cramped.

MR. BROWNE: I could suggest a place.

MR. CURTIS: That completes the list, except for 703 which might stand, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The next one we would call is the Department of Public Works,

900—Department of Public Works:

901—Minister's Office—Carried.

902—General Office—Carried.

903—Accounting Office—Carried.

904—Registration of Motor Vehicles:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question the other day about the number of vehicles registered last year, and I asked for the number which were registered for each district in the island, and the answer came back that there were no statistics kept showing the localities where the people who register the vehicles live. I am sure that when the application is put in each person has to give his address. Is it because of pressure of work that no record of that kind is indicated; where he lives, the number

in St. John's, Corner Brook and Grand Falls? It seems to me it would be a very nice record for the department to have because they would then know where the great part of the vehicles were located, and naturally where the greater part are they would want the greater number of roads, or it would determine whether they would get more attention. Now I would like to suggest to the Minister that in the future more attention should be paid and some arrangement should be made like that so we would know the distribution of the motor vehicles over the whole province.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, replying to the question raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, I would like to say that the question posed with regard to vehicles recently, if my memory serves me right, asked for the number of vehicles by districts. Up to now there has been no such record kept for the simple reason that certain sections throughout the island overlapped slightly, and one might be in one district and one in another, and honourable members are well aware of that. The department has however, new as it is, been from year to year improving its methods of recording. There has been set up a system of calculating of ten particular areas rather than twenty districts, and we have records within the main which are divided into these particular areas. The honourable member can rest assured that no application and no car is registered for any part of the country that we do not know where it is.

MR. BROWNE: I am not asking for that.

MR. SPENCER: Anyway we have

decided to divide communities into a certain group, and during the last few years we have been endeavouring to set up totals for the areas of St. John's and Grand Falls and Gander and for Corner Brook, one for the Clarendville area and one for the Burin Peninsula. These records are available, and we are endeavouring, I might say, to do all we possibly can, almost identically what the honourable member suggests. In fact we want to go still further. I would point out again that the department is comparatively new, the volume of work it does has increased tremendously within the last few years. We are still cramped for space although we took from the Justice Department a building which they were using and which really, I believe, they could still use to good effect. We find now we are going to have to enlarge even that. The hope is that we will also put in in the very near future an alphabetic system whereby, if inquiries come in to the department to find out, for instance, where John Jones lives, whom we don't know by the name of John Jones at the moment but by the license number, and we look up the number of the license, if that is given, and thus find the name of John Jones. These are things we are endeavouring to do to bring the department up to date, but it cannot be done all at once.

MR. BROWNE: How many vehicles are registered this year, do you know?

MR. SPENCER: Approximately twenty-one thousand. Insofar as we can compete, we can give them for ten or a dozen areas, and possibly by the end of June we may have these figures available.

MR. HOLLETT: Purchase of motor license plates: Are these purchased in this country?

MR. SPENCER: They have been imported up to now.

MR. HOLLETT: Is there no way of getting them made here? There are not sufficient, I suppose.

MR. SPENCER: That is a very good question, and I can assure the honourable gentleman we are very anxious to try and provide work for any industry that is operating in Newfoundland. That is one of the things nearest and dearest to the heart of any member of this Government; to try and provide employment in Newfoundland. Unfortunately at the moment there is nobody in Newfoundland with a press to provide that. We have gone into it very carefully, and we have had samples made, we have tried different methods only to find that the rates at which we can buy the plates from people already in the business on the Mainland are so obviously cheaper than we can produce them here that we cannot even justify the difference on behalf of the local trade. Unfortunately there is nobody at the moment prepared to produce them?

MR. HOLLETT: Not even CMIC?

MR. SPENCER: They have not a dye at the moment.

Item 904 carried.

906—Buildings:

MR. HOLLETT: 906—Is that a token vote there. I notice last year it was \$1,001.

MR. SPENCER: Provision was made to employ two architects for the department, and a token vote was put in there so that, if at some future time those positions were filled then the Government would be enabled to provide the salaries. So that

is really there as a token vote at \$100 each. These positions are not filled.

MR. BROWNE: Have you any architects employed by the department now?

MR. SPENCER: On a contractual basis.

MR. BROWNE: As civil servants?

MR. SPENCER: No.

MR. BROWNE: Who are on a contractual basis?

MR. SPENCER: Well, we have an architect, actually a gentleman who should be classified—I am very glad this point came up as it gives me an opportunity to say it. Two years ago we were privileged to get hold of one young man who came here from Europe and was a very highly qualified architect. We did not bring him here, he came entirely on his own at a time when we found a very great need of the services of such a man. We placed him in our department at a very minor salary, so minor that I was very considerably worried when I found the gentleman's qualifications were such that I realized it was entirely out of line. Last year I managed through the good graces and co-operation of my colleagues to raise his salary, and again this year I have raised it still more. I think at the present time he is just about in the category of our first engineer, \$4,600. That is a contractual salary. I am glad to say he has provided some of the most excellent work architecturally that we have been privileged to get since I have been a member of the department. He had complete charge for us for the production of plans and designs for the ferry docks at Portugal Cove and at Placentia, a work really that previous to then he



had not been engaged in. He is a man from the central part of Europe where probably the only water he had seen was the width of the Rhine, a hundred feet or so flowing past the city of Bremen where he lived. But with his technical knowledge he applied himself to such a degree that I sent him to Nova Scotia to inspect the various docks throughout the Maritimes. He came back here and produced plans and designs for these four docks, one at Bell Island, one at Portugal Cove and two at Placentia, in detail. We have had them thoroughly examined by those qualified for the work. I am very happy to say we are proud to have him. We are paying him at the present time \$4,800 a year. Honestly if I were to employ such a man in my own business I would really like to give him the top salary, but we can't do it, although he is well worth it. We can only measure the garment reasonably according to the cloth. But I am very happy to have this Dr. Steinbrink with us.

MR. HOLLETT: He is not included in this item?

MR. SPENCER: No, he is on a contractual basis. There is no architect in this at all.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, before we carry this item I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister the inadequacy of the lighting in this chamber. I did so last year and the year before. I don't know what it seems like to honourable members opposite, but everywhere we turn it seems to cast a shadow. The Honourable Minister said last year he would take the matter up and see what could be done. I find it very difficult particularly in the evening to try to read in here; whatever way

you turn there seems to be a shadow. Is the Minister going to do anything about the lighting in this Chamber?

MR. SPENCER: In regard to that point, I take it it is a fair question—I would be more inclined to say to the Government and to all and sundry to quit this business of working morning, noon and night. But apparently we of this Government are so concerned about carrying on the work of the province that we are not satisfied to do that. This Chamber with its present lighting system has existed here, apart from those extra lights on the wall, probably a hundred years, but I do take the question seriously, and if the honourable gentleman will observe he will see that only this day or yesterday an extra light has been added. I am quite sure the reporter over there really did deserve that extra light. It was merely mentioned to me and like a flash it was there. I don't know whether or not I could do the same for the honourable gentleman. I don't know if we are to do much of this evening and night work, and if extra lighting is required obviously we can get the electricians to work to look into the matter or get some advice. I am rather surprised to hear the honourable gentleman say that I promised I would look into the matter last year and at some previous time, I regret that if I did say that I certainly lost sight of it. I did not even know the request had gone in, at any rate I don't recall it. If extra lights are necessary, however, we may have to do something about it. I don't know how—this very beautiful chandelier and settings, as honourable members can very easily observe, are such that I don't know how we could put in any extra lights unless we put in floor lamps, which would change

the picture, harmony and beauty of the Chamber.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us if any of the architects in his department had anything to do with the planning of the birch plant and the gypsum plant and the cement plant?

MR. SPENCER: I think that question was answered on another occasion, Mr. Chairman, and I don't see that it has any bearing on the vote here. It was certainly not done under this vote.

MR. HOLLETT: It was under buildings, and these are government buildings. All I am asking is did the department have anything to do with the architectural plans for these three plants?

MR. SPENCER: The answer is in the negative—No—

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the attention of the Minister has been brought to the fact that there is no garbage collection at all for this building or has not been for several days and there is an accumulation of garbage at the entrance downstairs which has been there for several days. I suggested many times to the people down there that it should be removed, and they tell me nobody has come to take it away. I wonder if some attention could be given to that?

MR. SPENCER: In reply to the honourable gentleman I can only state that we have several buildings arranged somewhat similarly. The system is that we have an arrangement with a contractor who at stated periods, and at the request of the caretaker of the building comes along

to remove the garbage. If the matter the honourable gentleman has raised has been neglected in any way I will certainly be glad to call the attention of my department to it, and I thank the honourable member.

MR. HOLLETT: 906-03-06 Rentals—Memorial University Annex. I asked a question some time ago as to the rent and hire of this building on different occasions. I did not get any reply. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was a reply that the information might be had from the Board of Regents of the University.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take exception to everything the Honourable the Premier says, but surely the Board of Regents would tell the Government when they would not tell us. Our duty is to ask the Government to reply to a question which the people want to know, and it is not good enough to get up and say we have to apply to the Board of Regents of the Memorial University. We can't do it and they would not answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has the honourable gentleman tried—has he asked?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not going to try.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nor are we.

MR. HOLLETT: We are asked to vote money on account of this thing, and we paid \$8,320 for cleaning last year and this year we pay \$8,320 for cleaning and electric light and power \$15,000 and we are asking what rental you get when you hire it out to people. Somebody hires it out and

somebody, surely on the government side should tell us that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't rent it out.

MR. HOLLETT: We are voting money to pay for light and cleaning and it is being hired out and used for various things. I am asking if they got anything for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who got anything for it?

MR. HOLLETT: The Board of Regents if you wish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How about asking them.

MR. HOLLETT: We don't have to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't either and don't intend to now.

MR. FOGWILL: How are we to vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Vote against it.

MR. HOLLETT: We will.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is logical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member who has the floor insists on speaking to members of the committee—

MR. HOLLETT: I won't speak to him any more, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask the Honourable Minister of Public Works as to whether any rentals are received from the Memorial University Annex or has been during the past six or eight months?

MR. SPENCER: In reply, Mr. Chairman, there are several times during the period while the honourable gentleman was asking the ques-

tion when I was about to rise and give the explanation that I know to be the case—the building in its entirety is passed over by the Government or by the Department of Public Works, which has the jurisdiction over public buildings, to the Board of Regents. The records are there to prove that. What they then do with the building is entirely their business. The building is simply passed over by the Government to the Board of Regents and they operate the building as they see fit, and we do not charge any rental whatsoever.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if we want to hire the Memorial University Annex we must approach the Board of Regents?

MR. SPENCER: That is right—you don't ask me.

MR. HOLLETT: For instance if the P.C. Party wanted to have a ball?

MR. SPENCER: If I had charge maybe you would not get it. However I do not have charge.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought the Honourable Minister had a bigger heart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: There are certain members on the opposite side who might not do that, but I believe the Honourable Minister would let us have it. All I want to know is what happens if we want it. We may need it soon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, with an election in November.

MR. SPENCER: Well, the honourable gentleman has the answer—we have no jurisdiction. But we pay for light and cleaning—we have to, of course, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is not that item put in the regular vote for the Memorial University to pay for the light and cleaning?

MR. SPENCER: Responsibility for cleaning in most of these buildings and certainly for all light and heating is ours, and so we have to take care of these, and the votes are there for that purpose—but we do not collect any rental.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't quite understand some of the financial gymnastics of the present government. They pass over the building in its entirety to the Board of Regents and yet pay for the cleaning and lighting; and if it is to be hired one must go to the Board of Regents and they may or may not give it. If the Honourable Minister were Chairman of that Board we would not get it anyway—possibly that is the answer to that question.

MR. SPENCER: I said "probably"—now don't forget that.

906 carried.

907—Roads and Bridges:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice there is a considerable increase in the staff and top salaries for roads and bridges, an increase of seventeen persons in the personnel and an average of over a hundred thousand dollars in salaries. I wonder if the Minister would give us an explanation of that?

MR. SPENCER: The answer is, Mr. Chairman, that within the past few years we have been struggling very hard to get additional engineers, and these additional seventeen persons that the honourable member sees recorded there are some additional engineers that have been employed

during the past year; and a group of men who were on a contractual basis before have been put into the civil service, and now their salaries will be voted in the regular way. I don't know exactly the number who were with us before on a contractual basis who are not under the civil service.

MR. BROWNE: What is the explanation of the footnote (c)? Six new Directors Grades I to IV, (foot note): Point of entry governed by qualifications. Vote for \$32,000.

MR. SPENCER: I am informed that that particular item refers to the fact that we have been continually advertising for men, and we find it difficult to get highly qualified engineers—in fact we would still be glad to hire additional good road engineers if we could get them. Our programme calls for them—that figure is really put in to cover various classifications as we hire them. I think that might be the answer the honourable member wishes?

MR. BROWNE: The first position is Mr. French?

MR. SPENCER: Of course.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the second one?

MR. SPENCER: The assistant chief engineer in charge of the drafting of bridges, Mr. C. A. Knight, who has been with the department for some twenty years.

MR. BROWNE: There are three new directors—they have been established?

MR. SPENCER: These are some of the people I have referred to. I can't remember the names.

MR. BROWNE: I just asked for the information.

MR. SPENCER: One of them, Mr. Chairman, I think came to us as one of the displaced persons from Europe whom we were fortunate enough to get some two years ago when we could not get men anywhere except a half dozen from Europe. I believe he is a Latvian, and a very fine fellow.

MR. BROWNE: Most of them are.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it these six directors could get anywhere from \$4,800 to \$6,000.

MR. SPENCER: Exactly—most of them are at \$4,800.

MR. BROWNE: That means you have about twenty-three engineers there?

MR. SPENCER: I should not be surprised, we have quite a number.

MR. BROWNE: Any Newfoundlanders there?

MR. SPENCER: We hired about four or five this year.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, with reference to the maintenance of roads and bridges I should like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Minister the conditions of the roads in St. John's East. Most of the main highways in St. John's East, Mr. Chairman, have been more or less forgotten about or they have not been given much attention. For instance, Mr. Chairman, the road going from St. John's down to Torbay on the way down to Pouch Cove—there has been very little repairs to that highway. It is an old and established highway which was being used by thousands of people every day coming to work from their homes to Fort Pepperrell and other places. I think

these people down there have room for complaints of the conditions of the roads. There are a thousand people there who are taxpayers, and I believe, Mr. Chairman, they have every right to make this complaint which I am now making on their behalf tonight, in respect to the conditions of these roads which have had very little done on them during the past five years.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Chairman, the conditions of the road running to Logy Bay, Middle Cove and Outer Cove—the Marine Drive. These roads are in a deplorable condition and need attention. As a matter of fact if some attention is not given to them this year they will deteriorate to an extent where they will cost the Government quite a lot of money to put them in condition. The road down to Portugal Cove is not in as bad a condition as these others although it does need quite a lot of repairs from the outport out. Many of the other roads in and about St. John's East, main highways and secondary roads need a lot of attention from the department. I hope that the Minister will find himself able to spend more money on the roads in St. John's East this year than he has done during the past four or five years. I would like the Minister, if he could, to make a statement now in respect to the roads in St. John's East, because, Mr. Chairman, they have been neglected in these past five years, and it is time something was done to put those roads in a better condition than they have been.

I would like to point out too, Mr. Chairman, while I have this opportunity to say something about roads—if the roads in St. John's East were put in a better state of repairs it

would relieve the congestion on the main roads running out to Conception Bay on holidays and Sundays when so many people take advantage of the fine weather to go out on that highway in cars. If these roads in St. John's East were put in better condition I am sure many people would go down that way, and by doing so, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the motoring public would have more comfort in their little pleasures than they do have at the present time.

I would like to ask the Minister if his department intends to do a little more this year in St. John's East than has been done in the past five years?

MR. HOLLETT: Before the Minister answers that, I wonder if he would couple with that request so ably put by my honourable friend from St. John's East what is to be done in St. John's West. Last year, I believe, we had forty thousand dollars spent on the roads in St. John's West and St. John's East—I don't think I need elaborate—if the Honourable Minister is to make a statement I would like him to include St. John's East.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I am just as happy that the two honourable gentlemen representing St. John's East and St. John's West have made these comments, and made these inquiries. I am very glad that the honourable member for St. John's East has put it in such a manner—if the roads were put in a better condition it would be most desirable—or words to that effect—that same thing applies all over Newfoundland, and where there are no roads perhaps it applies with still greater force. We have some roads and we try to get by with as little maintenance as possible, and so last year a vote was provided for both these districts and very con-

siderable work was done. This year we plan, depending on the votes—I can't say just yet as it has not gone through this House—but we plan to have a vote for each of these districts again. We have the figures listed for them, and we are ready to go in there with our equipment and try and improve the roads, again somewhat along the lines suggested by the honourable member for St. John's East. I am quite prepared to say, without any fear of contradiction, that we will still not satisfy either ourselves or the people whom we must try to serve, because there just is not sufficient money to do it. But we will go as far as our money will allow us, distributed over the thirteen hundred communities that there are in the island.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he would table his proposed programme for road maintenance for this year, and the allocations that he is going to make.

MR. SPENCER: That has not been determined as yet.

MR. BROWNE: When can we determine it if not now? We have an estimate for two million dollars. Where and how are you going to spend it?

MR. SPENCER: These are made up in two amounts, Mr. Chairman, \$700,000 for improvement and reconstruction and \$1,000,000 for new constructions, to be distributed, as I have already intimated, over the thirteen hundred settlements of Newfoundland and until this vote is through we are definitely unable to say just where we will put ten thousand or fifty thousand or one thousand, but we have certain engineering plans, and I can assure the honourable members of this House that



we are making a very great effort in this year, and I think the Honourable Premier reported a week or two ago during my absence that I was trying to get a very substantial programme made up. That is definitely true, and I can assure the House and the honourable members in reply to these questions that we will not get sufficient money this year, next year or any other year as long as I foresee, in the foreseeable future, to build all the roads demanded. We have not the money. Our economy just does not provide it.

I think the honourable members may rest assured that we are providing votes for St. John's East and West this year along with the other twenty-eight districts of the island.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is not very satisfactory. I think that is a rude answer.

MR. SPENCER: It was not given with any intention to be rude.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman does not intend to be rude, but he tells us we will not get any information. Why not, if the money is to be spent?

MR. SPENCER: At the moment I can't tell you apart from the fact that one amount is in one vote and the other in another.

MR. BROWNE: On page 131—details of vote—we have here—Avalon Peninsula to Chapel Arm Bridge; Maintenance of Highroads \$540,000; Maintenance of Secondary Roads \$135,000.

MR. SPENCER: That is for the district.

MR. BROWNE: For the whole of Avalon Peninsula to Chapel Arm the sum of \$135,000 is to be granted to

cover all secondary roads and \$540,000 for highroads?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, but the honourable member should know that \$135,000 for secondary roads does not include all the roads.

MR. BROWNE: What would you call the Marine Drive.

MR. SPENCER: That is a secondary road. No—I am informed that it is a highway.

MR. BROWNE: Where are the secondary roads?

MR. SPENCER: The branch roads and some roads connecting one community to another.

MR. BROWNE: That is not sufficient, it seems to me, because the great bulk of motor traffic is around St. John's.

MR. SPENCER: Not entirely, we have roads travelled much more than the St. John's roads.

MR. BROWNE: The Avalon Peninsula must have at least three quarters of all traffic.

MR. SPENCER: No it does not. The Avalon Peninsula, oh yes.

MR. BROWNE: On the road from Brigus there going on to the Hodgewater road, etc. I don't know what effort the Minister is going to make to convert that into a paved highway, but it seems to me to be just a waste of money to be doing anything else other than get a paved highway. It is a main highway of the country, and I presume it is a route along which the Trans-Canada Highway is to go. Is the Minister able to tell us tonight what the position is to be, if he intends it to be applied towards the Trans-Canada

Highway and will it have a hard topped surface?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I really gave the honourable member my reply, and he thought I was rude in my reply. I assure the honourable gentleman there was no such thought.

MR. BROWNE: I withdrew it.

MR. SPENCER: That is a help—I did not even bother to ask for that.

Mr. Chairman, the road that the honourable member referred to, the Hodgewater highway and on through to Clarenville, is part of the Trans-Canada Highway, and so does not come into this at all, except from a maintenance point of view. The \$2,000,000 that the honourable gentleman is looking at there has been exactly the same for the last ten years except that there has been less money. It is divided into four districts, and that sum of money is for the maintenance of highways, divided into four districts covering the whole of Newfoundland, of which, by the way, the Avalon Peninsula gets the largest sum, and there is an increase there this year, as the honourable gentleman will see and also in the other districts with the exception of the unfortunate district which I happen to represent in the centre of the island, Grand Falls. Out of the goodness of my heart or because I am weak or some such thing, I have not been able to persuade the engineers or people in my department to increase my amount from last year. That is the only section then, in the centre, which has not been increased.

Now with regard to the Trans-Canada Highway. The fact that the road exists between Brigus and Clarenville is something, and there is no intention of trying to make that a

Trans-Canada Highway yet. That we are not going into yet. The policy of the department is, together with the advice of the Federal Government, that we should try and connect up the gaps and make a road right across the island before we begin to pave to the Trans-Canada Highway standards much of what we have in effect at the present time. That is really the answer. Now I realize as the honourable gentleman and everybody else does with regard to roads, that the sooner we can make a permanent job of things and put our paving on the sooner we will reduce the maintenance costs. But to do that needs obviously a very large amount of money and this province just cannot afford to do it all at once. We are now trying to get the road through right across the country.

MR. BROWNE: There is a vote for maintenance of highroads, \$540,000. Can you tell me what percentage of that will be spent on roads around Conception Bay as far as Carbonear?

MR. SPENCER: The details I don't have.

MR. BROWNE: There will be a very slight proportion spent on paved roads compared with others?

MR. SPENCER: There is very little paved road outside of Holyrood.

MR. BROWNE: To Carbonear—that comes under it of course.

MR. SPENCER: The honourable gentleman asks me if I can give a percentage—but I can say we have adopted a standard which we are maintaining pretty much on paved roads. We spent approximately \$600 a mile per year maintenance on dirt roads and \$450 per mile up to \$7,000 per mile in some areas per year—very expensive—

MR. BROWNE: There are very great difficulties.

MR. SPENCER: You are not telling us anything new. I know only too well, unfortunately. We are unable to rebuild all of these roads at one time. If the Government of course, and the province, wants to decide to borrow thirty million dollars to put on a highroads programme that is for the Government to say—I don't know if the Government could afford it—I think we should get along as best we can until we complete this highway in accordance with the agreement with the Federal Government; and we are endeavouring to increase our own local roads and have done so in the last five years at a greater rate than this province ever knew. There is no doubt in this world about that. Hundreds of miles of outlying sections of roads have been built, but they can only be done periodically—we just cannot do them all at one time. Then again there is the factor of staff and engineers and we just have not got them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Opposition, unfortunately at the moment just St. John's, we do appeal for a larger grant for our roads in this area. It was only four days ago I drove over to St. Phillips, and it would not only break your heart but every other organ in your body—

MR. SPENCER: I advise you to keep off it if that is so; don't break your heart.

MR. HOLLETT: This is not a joking matter. Last year the Government gave forty thousand dollars for St. John's East and St. John's West, and I maintain there is not a person hardly, in St. John's East and St. John's West who does not at some

time during the year go over these roads. These are roads leading out of the city, out of the capital, and I do think it would be a credit to the Government, even though we are in Opposition, to give us a little better show on roads. We are not questioning the necessity of money being spent in other districts. We know you need it and that there are some places that never got a road yet, and I pat the Government on the back for getting roads for some of them.

MR. SPENCER: That is what we are trying to do.

MR. HOLLETT: But I want to point out that it is unwise to neglect the roads we have already in congested areas like the area which we happen to represent. And after all the more people there are the more revenue is being paid to the Treasury from which you get the money to do the roads. I think I can recall places where money has been spent on roads in the last five years which even the Honourable Minister would just as soon we did not mention. I can think of one in Corner Brook now leading out of that famous mountain, and one right in the Minister's own district, which cost, I think, (and then it is just an ordinary dirt road, a little wider than ordinary) a hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars a mile, and that is more than we have had in St. John's East and West for the last three or four years.

MR. SPENCER: An ordinary dirt road. It was built to Trans-Canada standards.

MR. HOLLETT: I know it cost a hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars, just a cut-off—I think it is all right, if possible to get the highroad through as quickly as possible, but I do appeal for the people in the area

we have the honour to represent; they need roads as badly as anybody else in the country. No matter where we live we need roads. I hope the Minister will take what I have said to heart and do the best he can to assist our people to walk and ride to work in peace and comfort.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear.

MR. SPENCER: I am anxious to get through with this vote, but I cannot let the remarks of the honourable gentleman pass without at least giving the House the opportunity to know why a section of road one mile and one-tenth cost such a lot of money. But I would call attention to the fact that there are miles of road on the Mainland of Canada as near as Nova Scotia which cost three hundred thousand and three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Possibly the honourable gentleman may be able to make some allowance and not just point the finger at the fact that we have built one mile and one-tenth which cost \$165,000. I can tell you that right at Harmon Field they are building an access road to take the place of a piece of road which the American people decided to have closed, building an access road just under one mile and it cost three hundred and ninety thousand dollars. Now I can go to dozens of places on the Mainland of Canada where it cost three hundred thousand dollars a mile. But I am only trying to give the honourable member who raised the point the opportunity to visualize the difference between these various types of roads we have built. Some roads we have built for \$32,000, some at \$20,000 and some at \$18,000, but not to Trans-Canada standards. The Trans-Canada standards are costing approximately \$60,000 a mile here in

Newfoundland today, and we are advised our rates are very very low in our estimates for completion.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the road to Mount Moriah?

MR. SPENCER: As for that I just don't know what you are talking about. There is a road leading past Mount Moriah, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: And what is the story—what did that cost?

MR. SPENCER: Very little, I would say.

MR. HOLLETT: Was there a road built there in connection with the gypsum plant?

MR. SPENCER: I thought the honourable gentleman must have had something up his sleeve, he usually does.

MR. FOGWILL: Before we go off this I want to thank the Honourable Minister for his promise that he is going to give every consideration to the roads in St. John's East.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I be permitted to agree with my honourable colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and assure the Committee, as he has done, that there is every disposition on the Minister's part and every disposition on the Government's part to give St. John's both East and West a break. There is no thought at all of discrimination in St. John's—it does not exist. The honourable gentlemen opposite must not forget the Liberal Party represents St. John's East and West as well. Now I hope my honourable friends will take that in good part—the point I want to make, Sir, is that we have no desire to discriminate against St. John's so let us get through with this work.

MR. BROWNE: I want some information here. It would cost \$600 a mile for maintenance?

MR. SPENCER: No, what I did say was that we spent up to six hundred dollars per mile maintenance, and on paved roads we have adopted that sort of standard, four hundred and something dollars—it varies—I did not say it cost six hundred dollars per mile.

MR. BROWNE: Taking that as an average, \$600 for 75 miles to Carbonear, that leaves five hundred thousand dollars for maintenance here—now where is that five hundred thousand dollars to be spent, or at least what proportion would be spent in each of the sections? That is for the sections of the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister has already stated that he cannot give the answer.

MR. SPENCER: Simply because I have told the House, in answer to the honourable gentleman's inquiry, that we spent six hundred dollars per mile maintenance, that that is a sort of standard. It does not mean that we will spend six hundred dollars per mile on every mile between St. John's and Carbonear. The honourable gentleman knows that. There are miles this year which we will not touch while on others we may have to spend several hundred dollars. That is just a matter for the engineers and the men who know road-building. I can assure the honourable gentleman we are getting pretty good value for the money we are spending.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, like the honourable member on my left said; I also was down on the road to Portugal Cove, where incidentally there is a road from the wharf to the

highroad, which is probably costing three hundred thousand dollars a mile because it is being blasted through the rock, but the road I am speaking of is leading out of Portugal Cove, the old Broad Cove Road. I have not seen anything like the rocks down there. They are in a terrible state. I hope the Minister has already, and before this vote is passed, given attention to it, because it was simply awful, just a continuous series of potholes, and one could not drive more than five miles an hour in a car. It is an utter disgrace. In fact people have remarked that the road was far better thirty or forty years ago.

MR. SPENCER: They were not driving cars over it then.

MR. BROWNE: That is true—but it is a disgrace. That is a nice part of the country, Beachy Cove, where people coming to the country are taken by friends; and they ask, is there a Minister of Public Works in this country?

MR. SPENCER: If they are going to blame me I will have to get busy.

MR. BROWNE: Now there is another road I would like to draw to the Minister's attention, and that is the road out to Cape Spear, which is a very interesting and a very attractive drive with nice scenery, and many people would go that way if they did not have to come back the same way. Now there is a road through Petty Harbour and coming back through the Goulds, but that road is in a terrible condition.

MR. SPENCER: So are many others.

MR. BROWNE: If the Honourable Minister is going to take that attitude we are going to get nowhere. Here is a city of sixty thousand

people and right here on the Avalon Peninsula there are a hundred and fifty thousand people. If the roads around here are not going to get any attention, God help the people who live in places with no connecting roads. I don't think they are going to get any help. Here we have a road to Cape Spear and a road in wretched condition leading to Petty Harbour, a short distance of three miles. If a bull-dozer and a few men were to be put on it for a week it would make a passable road. Now it is not unreasonable when I ask the Minister to give some attention to a proposition of that kind. There are no voters on that road, and nobody is living there, but it would make a reasonable drive for people who would like to go out and see the scenery on Cape Spear. Then again there is the road on the Southside Hill. There is a considerable community up there, that is outside the City of St. John's. The roads up there are in bad condition, and I do hope—I don't know if any money had been spent there last year, but it was not noticeable. Some money was spent on the hill itself, but on the valley road and the other road going over there I don't think there was any money spent.

MR. SPENCER: It is all under the main vote.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister in a position to tell us how much was spent last year?

MR. SPENCER: Not at this moment. I could tell you from the office records. I cannot tell you exactly but I do know there was money spent on that road.

As to the road leading out beyond Cape Spear into Maddox Cove, etc., as far as I know it has never been classified as a highroad. I did not

even know about it. I have been up as far as Cape Spear and it is amongst many, many places that I would certainly like to see improved. But again I have given the answer as far as that is concerned—we just cannot do all at once. As far as Cape Spear is concerned I doubt very much if the District Superintendent had any thought in mind with regard to that. But in regard to the regular maintenance on the Blackhead Road on the Southside, that is being looked after by the City up to the bridge and we take over beyond the bridge. Maybe the honourable gentleman did not know that, but it is the case. We look after the maintenance of the road up there and there is a certain amount spent there periodically. I have been up there at least three times since I have been representing the department.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister has given any thought to the building of a road to Blackhead which would not be so steep. I think there is a possibility of going further south.

MR. SPENCER: You are thinking about the wartime road, part of the way?

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know anything about that. The road there I know is very steep and it is very often difficult for anybody to get up there—I wonder if the Honourable Minister has given any consideration, with the Council, to some diversion or something there?

MR. SPENCER: I can merely say in answer to that; I have gone up there myself, and have had a look at it, the so-called wartime road, to see the possibilities. I am also trying to look into the possibility of improving the road, if I can, and so have made



special trips up there to that end—whether that would be the best idea or not is up to the engineers to say—I have looked at it and have taken it into consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is another question I should like to ask—we have that vote here for what is called the St. John's area, but it covers more than St. John's, as I see it. It takes in St. John's, Harbour Main, Bell Island, Port de Grave, Carbonear and Trinity South.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Avalon Peninsula is called the St. John's District. It is just a name.

MR. BROWNE: It is not a proper name. However, I won't argue about that.

MR. SPENCER: There are only four districts in the island.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very difficult for the stenographer to take this down unless members speak one at a time. When cross-conversation occurs the stenographer can't possibly get it down.

MR. BROWNE: I am sorry Mr. Chairman—here is the point I am making. When you have to make up the figure of that vote, don't you get reports from the superintendent e.g. on the road to Torbay or Pouch Cove or from St. John's to Portugal Cove etc. on all the different roads around the Avalon Peninsula—is there not any allocation to assure those gravel roads get some attention every year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman suppose that every mile of road in Newfoundland can get attention every year?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case we would have all the money that comes into the Treasury devoted to roads—that is what it would take.

MR. BROWNE: Oh no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are about seven thousand miles, and if every mile gets attention—

MR. BROWNE: They will all get the same?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To get any attention for every mile it would take the whole Treasury to do it.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister in a position to give his estimate for various roads?

MR. SPENCER: The two million dollars for the districts is based on a mileage basis.

MR. BROWNE: Arising out of that—take the district represented by my honourable and learned friend—Ferryland—he has a district where the road extends a hundred and twenty miles, therefore he gets a bigger grant—he needs a larger grant of course—but take for instance the road going to Petty Harbour, that road is in very bad condition and needs attention.

MR. SPENCER: And received attention, you know that.

MR. BROWNE: Then it must be recently. I drove over it myself recently. The part I am speaking about is going down into Petty Harbour, which is in very bad condition or was when I saw it. There is a great deal of traffic going over that road with buses going back and forth several times a day, and it seems to me that road should get attention on something other than a mileage basis. It is only about three or four miles,

yet you may have to spend more on that than on other sections.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, that is so obvious we should not even have to say it—because you have so many miles in a district does not mean you must spend precisely the same amount on each mile. We might spend twenty times that much on one mile and none at all on another—is not that obvious?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am directing my remarks to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. If he does not see fit to answer I will have to accept it.

MR. SPENCER: I have given all the answers I have. We try to make up estimates to get the most out of them and go as far as we can. That is definitely the case. The honourable gentleman refers to one particular piece of road he happens to know about. I know about hundreds of roads he does not know about at all, that are in a similar condition—and to that end we try at least to keep them passable. Perhaps that does not quite give the answer. It is quite true though many of our roads may not be exactly impassable, it is difficult to get over them certainly. It has been a soft year, which has affected this and many other roads adversely.

Carried.

908—Miscellaneous Services:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that \$30,000 grant to St. John's Municipal Council, what does that take care of?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that thirty thousand dollars is given to the City Council in lieu of taxes they at one time used to receive.

MR. SPENCER: That is in lieu of motor registration which now comes under the Government rather than the city.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask then how much in motor registration does the department receive now locally in St. John's?

MR. SPENCER: I have not the figures.

MR. BROWNE: Is that under an agreement? Does it depend upon the number of motor cars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not if it is a fixed amount. They have not a sliding scale depending on traffic.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me the Municipal Council should get a higher grant now than several years ago.

Carried.

909—Wharves, Breakwaters and Ferries:

MR. HOLLETT: What is that vote for \$5,000?

MR. SPENCER: Actually, Mr. Chairman, those votes that are there are merely token votes. Nobody can see through a stone wall, and it so happens that in connection with the breakwaters and/or wharves the amount there is merely a token of what will be spent during the present year, as far as I can see, on the construction of ferries and docks.

MR. HOLLETT: There was no vote in there last year—how was it taken care of last year? Was there anything such as this taken care of?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was capital account last year—the building of ferries was on capital account.

MR. SPENCER: This is not the capital account—this is merely for administration.

MR. BROWNE: In the operation of the ferry on Placentia Gut—have we any responsibility in connection with the Portugal Cove-Bell Island ferry?

MR. SPENCER: We are committed to provide the docks for these ferries.

MR. BROWNE: At Portugal Cove and Bell Island you are constructing the docks, I thought the Federal Government—

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman is a little bit mixed up there. After very considerable consideration, and effort on our part to get them to come in with us on that wharf building at Portugal Cove, the Federal Government finally decided they would build the breakwater, we will build the docks—two operations, one by the Federal and one by the Provincial Government.

MR. BROWNE: Being built by different people?

MR. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: In regard to the ferry on Placentia Gut, has the Minister worked out or has he any idea of the cost of operating that—is that what he meant a few moments ago when he said administration.

MR. SPENCER: In reference to that a committee is being appointed to look after the operations of the ferry—that has been under consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Government officials?

MR. SPENCER: We will be represented.

MR. BROWNE: And the Placentia people?

MR. SPENCER: That is right.

909 carried.

Department of Mines and Resources:

DR. ROWE: I don't think I need make any explanation—as I come to the points I shall deal with them.

801 carried.

802—General Office:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, who is the Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources?

DR. ROWE: Mr. P. J. Murray.

MR. BROWNE: When was he appointed?

DR. ROWE: If my memory serves me right, June 1, 1953. He was appointed consecutively with Mr. Carter's appointment to the Chairmanship of the Civil Service.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Assistant Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Haynes.

MR. HOLLETT: The fixed personal officer there, is that someone who is given additional salary from some other department?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I can explain that better than anyone: that is Mr. Howse.

DR. ROWE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman—Mr. Warren is the man in charge of the records of the department, the record office of the department.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the idea

of "personal" is that an increased vote or something?

DR. ROWE: There is no increase there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: Why call it personal?

DR. ROWE: Under the old scale he was receiving more than under the new scale for that, or provided for that office, so he continued on a personal basis. That procedure is sometimes adopted in a number of cases where it would impose a hardship, the salary is made personal where the scale or category is reduced. Take a case where a man is brought in at \$3,000 in the past and the scale is brought in to cover that position, and the scale goes down to \$2,900; rather than reduce him to \$2,900 he is kept on at \$3,000 personal. That is the explanation.

MR. HOLLETT: There are persons like that throughout?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About a dozen in the whole service.

MR. HOLLETT: We will ask the question again, I suppose, before the estimates are over.

Carried.

803—Accounting Office—Carried.

804—Forestry:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the chief forester—I don't know what the title is—there are so many directors now.

DR. ROWE: Actually that is rather difficult to answer. The supervisor of forestry is Mr. Charles Cahill, but the forestry engineer, a professional man whom we obtained from Norway this year, after trying in vain to get a Newfoundlander and then a Canadian, is Mr. Finn Frost, a dis-

tinguished Norwegian forestry engineer.

MR. HOLLETT: That man gets \$8,000.

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Have you any other forestry graduates in the department besides?

DR. ROWE: He is the only one unfortunately. I am compelled to say in the whole field of forestry and wild life we have not one person who had even a week's professional training in either of those two fields. It is a terrible situation. We have lately acquired the services of a wild-life biologist, Mr. Pimlott, who will be Dr. Pimlott this year, with his degree in wild life. We have also been able to acquire a fine technical staff in the mines branch.

MR. HOLLETT: What exactly are the duties of the Chief Forestry Engineer in this country where we all know most of our forests have been leased out to the various companies?

DR. ROWE: To take the second part of the question first—I think it is a wrong impression to give that most of our forests are leased. A very considerable portion of Newfoundland forests still belong to the Crown.

MR. HOLLETT: All over the Province?

DR. ROWE: If my honourable friend would like to have a map I will give him one showing our estimate of at least ten million cords on Crown Lands. We must not forget we took back altogether hundreds of square miles through the Timber Revision Act. Then of course there is most of the timber in Labrador which is in possession of the Crown. That is the

greatest stand of coniferous trees in probably all the new world, I would not say the whole world.

MR. BROWNE: Of course, if we can make use of them.

DR. ROWE: We will some day.

MR. BROWNE: Sometimes they are allowed to be there too long.

MR. HOLLETT: What are the duties of the forester?

DR. ROWE: A forestry engineer, Mr. Chairman, is a man who has spent say five or six years in a university studying forestry as a science and profession—I am not competent to elaborate on what the science is except to say that there are a great number of questions that every province, every state, every country has to know the answers to and many of them don't know at all. For instance last year we found almost accidentally that the timber on the Labrador is growing annually now two or three times as much as it did say thirty years ago.

MR. BROWNE: How do you know that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Due to Confederation.

DR. ROWE: It is very simple—we got it from Washington.

MR. HOLLETT: We got along for quite a number of years without a forestry engineer, and we had huge stands of timber under the control of the department. I do agree there is money in forests and it has contributed a large amount to the economy of our country. At the same time I do hope the Government is trying to increase that wealth. But I wonder how we ever got along without such a man all these years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not move to strike the item out? Why does not the honourable gentleman move to have the vote stricken out, and have no chief forestry engineer?

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister would give us just a general idea of what a trained university man, a graduate in forestry should be doing. We have a problem here, I understand in connection with the government birch mill. I have heard it said that there is talk of importing birch for the present mill. I wonder if this forestry engineer would be in a position to advise the Government on that, to seek out stands of birch or direct the search for birch suitable for manufacture—Would that be part of his duties?

DR. ROWE: It would be practical. May I go back to what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said just now—We got along very well—Yet it is rather strange that we are the only sizable community in the civilized world that got along. I would say my grandfather and my great-grandfather got along without a great many things, for instance, motor boats—I don't know the answer to that.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not ask any question.

DR. ROWE: I merely point out the fact we got along without a forestry engineer does not mean a single thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Move to cut the item out.

MR. FOGWILL: 804-18 Commission of Inquiry: I take it that is the Royal Commission. Would the Minister explain?

DR. ROWE: The Royal Commission on Forestry was set up a few

months ago, consisting of General Kennedy who is the Chairman, and two commissioners, Mr. Cameron, a professional forestry engineer of the Federal Department in Ottawa and the third, as you all know, a Newfoundland, Mr. Roland Goodyear who has a lifetime association with our forests. This fifty thousand is designed to cover their salaries and other expenses.

**MR. FOGWILL:** Would the Minister tell us the salaries?

**DR. ROWE:** General Kennedy does not receive a salary. He is not a full-time man but a consulting engineer, who I believe is at the moment doing some consultation work for the Province of Ontario. He will be given a professional fee at the end of his term.

**MR. BROWNE:** What is that?

**DR. ROWE:** I think it should be very moderate. The other two men are on a full-time basis, on salaries, if my memory serves me right, ten thousand dollars a year each. All expenses, of course, will be paid.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

**MR. COURAGE:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Supply have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the following items—Under heading 700 and 900 Department of Attorney General and Department of Public Works with the exception of 703 and under the heading 800, Department of Mines and Resources 801 through 803 inclusive.

On motion report adopted. On motion Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do adjourn tonight at 11.30 instead of the normal 11.00 o'clock.

**MR. FOGWILL:** Mr. Speaker, Rule 8 says that at 11:00 of the clock unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation, the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up at the same stage when its progress was interrupted.

Under that rule, Mr. Speaker, I think it is in order that we close now.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** To that point, Mr. Speaker, I think it is also in order to amend that by a majority rule of the House.

**MR. COURAGE:** I believe that rule was considered, and I believe Mr. Speaker gave his ruling a few days ago on that very point. I cannot remember the exact words of his ruling but I believe they were to the effect that the House by a majority vote could amend that rule and could extend its sitting. I can't say I remember the exact date of that, but it was two or three days ago.

**MR. BROWNE:** It was yesterday at 6:00 o'clock.

**MR. COURAGE:** Well, the same principle, I believe applies—The motion is—

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion, if I may, I strongly resent having to sit here until 11:30 unless something of extreme importance has to come before the House. I think it is highly unfair—



We might even be rude and walk out and leave no quorum here. I don't think it is fair on the part of the Government to expect the members to stay here until 11:30. We have to be here again and go on all day tomorrow. I am quite sure, sir, that I am not prepared to stay here until 11:30. I object very strongly to the motion and to the —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Speaker yesterday, in making his ruling, stated that the House, if it desired, could sit all night. Now all I have suggested is a half-hour, and I don't see why the honourable gentlemen opposite ought not to be willing to sit —

MR. BROWNE: I will tell why.—The gentlemen opposite are not willing to sit—There are only three of us, working hard all day. The other members can go out and relax but we cannot do it. And I think it is very unfair to expect us to stay after 11:00 o'clock. We should not have been here last night—and Mr. Speaker, if we continue after 11:00 o'clock I am walking out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have not worked half as hard. We have been here every moment and in addition when the House does adjourn I go back to work. If he can't stand it let him walk out and those of us who can, stay and earn our pay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw my motion.

House adjourned.

FRIDAY, June 4, Morning Session.

The House met at eleven of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege may I speak now?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to the motion made last night, to sit after 11:00 o'clock, and the subsequent motion relevant to sitting this morning.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, it was 11:00 P.M. when the motion was made, and that the motion was entirely out of order. With regard to the subsequent motion I fail to see why it was made in the first place, and in the second place it was after 11:00 P.M., and entirely out of order again. And I will ask your ruling on it. There is another matter relevant to the Standing Orders: meeting of the House at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon each sitting day.

Standing Order 2: The time for the meeting of the House is at 3 o'clock in the afternoon of each sitting day, and if there be not a quorum present by a quarter after three of the clock, Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House until the usual hour of the next sitting day. When the House rises on Friday, it stands adjourned unless otherwise ordered, until the following Monday.

Standing Order 3: The presence of at least 12 members of the House not including Mr. Speaker shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the House for the exercise of its powers.

When Mr. Speaker adjourns the House for want of a quorum, the time of adjournment, and the names of the members then present shall be inserted in the Journal:

4. (a) Any member may direct the Speaker's attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present. A member need not remain in the House after giving notice that a quorum is not present.

I wish to draw attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, in connection with that,

at nearly ten minutes after eleven o'clock I drew attention of the Speaker, or I think it was five minutes after eleven, that there was not a quorum according to the rules. I am not referring to the House of Assembly actually but to the rules under which the business of the House is supposed to be conducted, those rules which were passed after the House of Assembly Act, I take it. They were published and have been used for a number of years, and definitely state the quorum is twelve. There was no quorum at that particular time and in the minds of this side of the House that motion was out of order—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have your ruling on that.

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the honourable member can really ask for a ruling on something done last night at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very glad the honourable member raised the point because something in this House should be decided now—The Act says ten members constitute a quorum and the rules say twelve members. In my opinion, given for what it is worth, the Standing Orders do not supercede the Act. The Act really should take precedence over the Standing Orders. But that suggestion just raised by the honourable member is a good point, and I think this might be a good time now for the House to settle the question.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the point is well taken. When the Standing Orders were prepared in 1949 it was overlooked by the House and by the Committee which brought in the Orders that the Act creating the House of Assembly, which you will find in the 1914 Consolidated Statutes, definitely stated at that time, that the

House of Assembly should be constituted of 36 members and that ten should constitute a quorum. Now that is an Act of Parliament passed by the House of Assembly of that day and by the Legislative Council of that day, and was assented to by the Governor, and I don't think there is anything in the House of Assembly Act to enable the House itself to have the effect of amending the Act of Parliament. I feel therefore that a quorum of this House is, and always has been, ten members even though we have amongst ourselves felt that it was twelve. Actually the quorum is ten. I felt therefore at the relevant times mentioned by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition there was actually a quorum.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: The principal point that I would like to make on this question, Mr. Speaker, is on a matter on which the Act is perfectly simple, and that is as regard to the 11:00 o'clock ruling. If the business is not completed at 11:00 o'clock the House stands adjourned until 3:00 o'clock the next day. Last night the Premier moved adjournment until 11:00 o'clock this morning. Now have we any rules? If we have rules remember they are to be respected—that is the question. This House is supposed to be a model for all organizations and it has its rules and if these are not carried out, well we then must justify ourselves, that is what it amounts to.

MR. SPEAKER: Does any other honourable members wish to address himself to this point?

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I support the observations of my two honourable colleagues here—But would it be proper at this time now to introduce another matter in respect to the

carrying out of the Rules of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I think so, if it is relevant.

MR. FOGWILL: On Tuesday afternoon last the House had gone into Committee of the Whole and was discussing some business when at the hour of six o'clock the Chairman of Committee of the Whole, I would say through error or some little mistake, did recess the committee until 8:00 of the clock. Now it is not provided anywhere in the rules whereby the Chairman of Committee of the Whole can recess the committee until 8:00 of the clock. It is provided by the Rules of the House, and he is directed to report progress and ask leave to sit again. So that I was wondering, and I would like to point out to Your Honour and the House that, if the Committee of the Whole had no right to recess until 8:00 o'clock then perhaps it had no right to do business; and I was wondering whether or not the business which was done on Tuesday night was entirely legal. I would question the legality of what was done by the committee of the whole House on Tuesday evening because of the reason I have just stated.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I point out in connection with this point of privilege made, that the observations made by my two colleagues—I would point to Rule 8 of the Standing Orders: At 11 of the clock p.m., unless the closure rule (SO 50) be then in operation the proceedings of any business under consideration shall be interrupted and Mr. Speaker shall adjourn the House without question put, provided that all business not disposed of at the termination of the sitting shall stand over until the next sitting day when it will be taken up

at the same stage when its progress was interrupted.

I would point out that at the time the Honourable the Premier withdrew his motion there was no business before the House, as it was then after 11:00 o'clock and that Mr. Speaker, therefore, should have interrupted the proceedings immediately and postponed the proceedings until today at 3:00 of the clock. What I mean to point out is that after the Honourable the Premier had withdrawn his motion to keep the House open until 11:30 p.m. there was no other business before the House, and this rule should have been adhered to.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has, in my opinion now concluded the debate thereon, I don't think it would therefore be in order for any member to speak again, only by leave of the House.

MR. COURAGE: I wonder if I could have the leave of the House just to make one observation in answer to the question raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's East.

Leave given by the House.

MR. COURAGE: I might say that it was for many years the custom in the House for the Committee of the Whole to recess. We did that for about three years before these standing orders were passed, and that for that reason, as all that time I had been in the Chair, and many times previously had left the Chair at 6:00 o'clock p.m. until 8:00 o'clock p.m. On Tuesday past I did forget the standing order, but I read it when the matter was raised yesterday, and said I had made

a mistake on Tuesday; but I believe we would have to stretch the rules very far, and we would have to be adhering to them very strictly to conclude that, because the House was recessed at 6:00 o'clock what was done after was not legal. I think that would be carrying the thing rather too far altogether. I just make the point that it had been for many years customary to do what I did do.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been asked for a ruling, which the House itself will recognize will be an extremely difficult problem. The House must have noticed that I was absent from the sitting last night, therefore I have only hearsay to go on.

We will take the last point first: It is clearly stated by parliamentary authority that business if transacted in the House without a quorum and no member has called attention to it, that business does stand and is legal. I would argue therefore that business transacted by a committee having recessed without reporting to the House would certainly be legal.

The argument has been offered that if a rule says something definitely it means that and nothing more. I refer particularly to that part of Rule 7 which says: "If at the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. except on Wednesday, the business of the House is not concluded, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until 8 o'clock p.m. At the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question put. The House then stands adjourned until Thursday. If at the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. the business of a Committee of the Whole House be not concluded the Chairman is directed to report progress and ask leave to sit again."

Now if we insist on the exact letter of that rule to mean just what it says,

then we could not sit nor transact any business after 6 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday. I do not think that that is the true interpretation, for this reason: if we admit that, then how shall we interpret this? If at the hour of 6 o'clock p.m. except on Wednesday (instead of except Wednesday we might mean Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday) the business of the House is not concluded Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until 8 o'clock p.m.—Would it not therefore follow we cannot ever adjourn the House on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday or Friday until 11 o'clock at night?

I would make this observation: Rules like this (1) where they do not curtail freedom of speech permit of other interpretations subject to a decision of the House. For instance, every honourable member knows that the House of Commons at Westminster sometimes sits on Saturday and has even sat on Sunday; in times of national emergency has sat Friday night, yet their standing order No. 3 states that the hour of 3 p.m. on Friday Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair until Monday morning. If we adhere strictly to the letter of such rules as these, purely routine ones, then the House could never sit on other days other than those specified. However, with reference to the 11 o'clock rule, it is laid down that, if the House intends to sit later than 11 o'clock the motion may be made that this House does not adjourn at 11 o'clock today.

I think it will be agreed that the point taken there is that the motion was offered after 11 o'clock, therefore, I am in no position to rule, because I did not know of my own knowledge that it was after 11 o'clock, and I cannot very well rule on a, to me, unknown case. If I were to say that a motion ought not to be made after 11

o'clock, it becomes an issue as to whether it was 11 o'clock. I do not know, and I cannot, of course, come into the House and criticize a discussion, nor a ruling made by the Deputy-Speaker in my absence. That, of course, would be unethical.

The thought occurs to me that in this matter of a quorum and the hours of sitting of the House contained in the House of Assembly Act where it says, the quorum consists of ten and the Standing Orders say, a quorum shall be twelve and the rules should not take precedence over the House of Assembly Act—Then how do we explain we have not thirty-six members in the House when the Act says there shall be 36 members.

Now I had a discussion last night with Mr. J. G. Higgins, and we were discussing this very thing—for this reason that when these Standing Orders were passed he was then the Leader of the Opposition and member of the Committee on Standing Orders. He and I worked closely to try and weld some semblance of order out of the Standing Orders of Great Britain and Canada, New Zealand and several other parts of the British Commonwealth, and the old Standing Orders of Newfoundland, and we assumed that when we made a quorum of this House twelve, the House of Assembly Act would of course be amended to bring everything in line. We discussed the proposed changes here in this House, in committee, adopted them in committee and they were afterwards adopted by the House. Mind you I am not arguing it should be twelve. Personally I do not care if it is twenty-four or five, it does not matter to the Speaker, of course. But I do agree that honourable members of the House should decide now what is to be a quorum. Is it to be ten as the Act

states or twelve? I do hold that the House can decide for itself, rules to the contrary, on what days it will sit, apart from the rules, and at what hour it shall sit, 11 o'clock in the morning (because it is not usual to sit any later). However, the House may sit all night.

I don't know whether I have given the Honourable Leader of the Opposition much satisfaction. I am sure he will appreciate the difficult position in which I find myself and might let me conclude that the rules are the lubricating oil of a machine. A breach of rules is tantamount to throwing sand in the lubricating oil and the machine must suffer. I would ask honourable members from now on to adhere as closely as possible to the rules. If an emergency arises to necessitate going beyond the rules I think it might be settled by recessing the House and discussing it privately and coming back to the House. The House can always ask Mr. Speaker not to see 6 o'clock or not to see 11 o'clock if a few more minutes are needed. Would the House like to make a decision now on the matter of quorum? It could be done by amending the rule.

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, is it within the competency of the House to overrule an Act of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The answer to that is no, only by another Act.

MR. MURRAY: As the matter stands the legislation on the House says the quorum shall be ten, and unless that Act is amended, my submission is, it is not competent to overrule it.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I take it the only change we can make is to vote a

change in the rules but not in the Act. We could change the number of the quorum from twelve to ten because that would not be a contravening of the Act, but we could not change the quorum of ten to twelve.

MR. MURRAY: We could amend our rules to come into conformity with the Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest we could not alter the quorum of ten except by an Act too—I would like to point out that in the old rules passed in 1909 at that time twelve was the quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: Obviously the House cannot override the Statute because if it could override one it could override another. So if any honourable member would care to make a motion amending the rules concerned to bring it in line with existing legislation?

MR. CURTIS: I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of the House (Standing Orders) where they refer to twelve as a quorum be amended to read ten so as to bring them into conformity with the Act.

MR. MURRAY: I second that motion

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that wherever in the rules twelve appears as the quorum that the twelve be changed to ten to bring the rules into conformity with the existing Act.

MR. BROWNE: Before you put that motion, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if there are any provisions in the rules for amendments to the rules?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes a two-third majority of those in favour of the amendment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there should be some notice of motion given.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a matter of little concern, I suppose, just how many should constitute a quorum so long as we have a substantial number. But we seem to be on the horns of a dilemma. Since 1909, according to the rules the quorum has been twelve even though the consolidated statutes of 1914 states ten. Nothing has been brought forward to show any changes made in the rules of the House. There are a lot of rules made which have not been carried out exactly in committee and this apparently was one of them. My chief objection to the rule is the occurrence last night, and I note, Mr. Speaker probably forgot to deal with a point I raised under Rule 8. After 11 o'clock a motion was withdrawn and then another one accepted, which I believe was contrary to Rule 8. If Mr. Speaker would like to rule on that we have no objection on this side to twelve or ten.

MR. SPEAKER: I referred to that when I said: not being present in the House myself I only had hearsay to go on that it was after 11 o'clock, and I could not be expected to rule on a decision the House had made. But I did urge honourable members to conform to the rules.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I maintain it is not exactly hearsay when an honourable member gets up and makes a statement of fact which has not been denied. If it were not correct then I would expect somebody else here, who was present last night, to deny it.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order? Surely when there is a motion before the House it



must be out of order to discuss another point which does not deal with that particular motion?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't see anything in that point. We are on that point, the Rules of this House. An amendment has been introduced to amend the Rules of the House, surely I can refer to Rule 8 and ask for a ruling?

MR. SPENCER: I don't think that is so.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable member is so fond of points of order we can't get anything done, and that is why we must sit at 11 o'clock in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—is it not possible even to discuss that simple rule of the House without honourable members losing their tempers?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, if I may? I am not losing any time in any sense but was merely taking exception to a remark made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition when he said—The honourable member is so fond of making points of order—I think in my experience in this House I have not risen to a point of order more than possibly three or four times in my five years' experience in this House—if that is too much for the Leader of the Opposition—I think he should withdraw his reference to me in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: This is all entirely out of order.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the motion before the Chair to change the quorum of the House from twelve to ten, there is nothing definite in the Standing Orders providing for the amendment of those rules of the House. I wonder if I

would be permitted to direct a question to the Attorney General, to ask him if he would inform the House whether provision is made in the House of Assembly Act for amending the rules of the House of Assembly?

MR. CURTIS: The House of Assembly Act, Mr. Speaker, is now covered by Chapter 3 of the revised statutes, and the revised statutes provide in section 3—The House of Assembly shall consist of twenty-eight members of whom ten shall form a quorum. Later on in the same Act, Mr. Speaker, it says—The House may establish rules for its government and attendance of its members and the conduct of its business and for limiting the length of time that members may speak, and may alter, amend and repeal the same provided that no such rules shall be altered, amended or repealed, except by a vote of two-thirds of the members of such House; provided also as aforesaid, no such rules or orders or anything in this Act shall or shall be considered to limit the freedom of speech or debate of such House or any right of or privilege of such House now existing.

So, Mr. Speaker, there was no need to have an amending clause in the Standing Orders—We can amend the Standing Orders by the House of Assembly Act, and I submit it is in this case really an amendment which we must make because by the Act we have no right to make it twelve, and our Standing Orders therefore are not in accordance with this Act, and therefore we should, without any question, amend them because they were made in error.

MR. FOGWILL: I thank the Honourable the Attorney General. The reason I asked was to clear up any

doubts I had in mind that it would require notice of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I might remind honourable members we have amended rules before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps it might be of value to all of us if the Honourable the Attorney General would make one point clear in this matter, a point which is not presently clear, in my opinion at least. Earlier in the present debate, the Attorney General said that the House of Assembly Act set up a quorum of ten members of the House. In the same statement he said that that same Act created a House of Assembly of thirty-six members, to which the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West replied, or perhaps it was Your Honour who commented on the fact that in one part the Act appeared to say ten members as a quorum and in another part thirty-six as the total membership—Now in a later remark the Attorney General refers to this Act as setting a House of twenty-eight members, the same as at present, and a quorum of ten—I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney General could clarify that point?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I looked into that matter this morning, and I found it due to bad drafting. In 1927, I think it was, when the House of Assembly membership was changed from thirty-six to forty,—my honourable friend the Member for St. John's West was in the House at the time, a member of the Monroe Government, when it was then increased from thirty-six to forty. Now when they made that amendment they omitted to change the words—thirty-six—consequently you had a House of Assembly which called for thirty-six

members; you had an amendment to the same Act which set forth forty electoral districts, and obviously the two were inconsistent. The Act said thirty-six but actually the number of districts set forth totalled forty. Subsequently when the membership in the House was reduced to twenty-seven members, changes were not made in the quorum nor were the changes made when the membership increased. Perhaps some honourable member of the House might refresh my memory as to just when it was increased from thirty-six to forty. It was thirty-six during all the period I was here reporting and that was up until about 1920.

MR. BROWNE: In 1927 or 1928.

MR. CURTIS: Therefore I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we must accuse the draftsmen of that day of erring inasmuch as it set forth thirty-six when the membership was increased to forty from thirty-six.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): If the honourable member would permit me I could tell him it was in 1928, because it was at that time Lewisporte was made a district, and in the fall there was the first election in Lewisporte under that Act. It was passed in the spring session of 1928 when these sections were added.

MR. CURTIS: It looks then as though the 1928 Legislature of that day increased the membership of the House from thirty-six to forty by creating forty districts, but they did not at the same time amend the section of the House of Assembly Act, which still continued to read thirty-six. In fact I checked up this morning and found out that through 1916 to the date of the revised statutes

there had been no amendments to that House of Assembly Act—I don't know what date it was—I have only gone back to 1916—I don't know when that House of Assembly Act was passed.

MR. BROWNE: 1913, I think.

MR. CURTIS: Could my honourable and learned friend inform the House what the membership of the House was prior to 1909 when it was thirty-six members—It must go back before 1913.

MR. BROWNE: Well, the Election Act is called the 1913 Election Act.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend is getting confused. There are two Acts. I agree the Election Act was in 1913. But the House of Assembly Act probably goes back to before 1902. We all remember the elections of 1908 and 1909 when there was a tie and at that time each party had eighteen, so that it must go back a good deal prior to 1913. I would not be surprised if that Act actually went back to the 1892 consolidation.

MR. BROWNE: It is not important now.

MR. CURTIS: No, the only thing of importance is that here is an Act calling for thirty-six members, and at some period (my honourable friend thinks it was 1928) it was increased to forty districts, and then in 1912, I think, it was reduced from forty to twenty-seven. Then again Mr. Speaker, they did not change Paragraph 3 of the House of Assembly Act.

MR. HOLLETT: What happened when the Commission of Government came in? Did they suspend that Act?

MR. CURTIS: Of course, everything we had was suspended in 1934.

Then in 1949, of course, our constitution was reinstated as it was in 1934. But at that time, Mr. Speaker, the Terms of Union, which were an Act of our Parliament in addition to being an Act of the Federal Government and an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, the Parliaments of Canada and Great Britain made it twenty-eight by adding Labrador, and apparently the committee which consolidated the statutes covered the error and amended it in the revised statutes. So that now in the revised statutes the position is that there are twenty-eight members. Now I don't know just what is the effect of this clause in the revised statutes—If my honourable friend will refer to the Act for the Revision of the Statutes, Section 11 of the Act, No. 27 of 1952, the revised statutes state—shall not be held to operate as new laws but shall be construed to have effect as a consolidation. The reference to that section will lead one to think that the consolidation committee was perfectly within its rights in reading all these Acts as a whole. In other words, that they were within their power in reading this item thirty-six where it referred to thirty-six members, and then in reading that in conjunction with the other Act which sets forth forty seats and later twenty-seven seats and ultimately twenty-eight seats. I think the committee doing the consolidations was within its rights in declaring, under this section, that the number of members of the House would now be twenty-eight. They did, of course, continue the quorum as ten.

I was very interested to hear my honourable friend state that the previous rules of the House called for a quorum of twelve. That is probably the reason, Mr. Speaker, why that was brought into our present Standing Or-

ders. I know I was on the committee and we, as far as possible, followed our original rules; and we just accepted the twelve as a quorum as in the original rules, and presumed they were right.

MR. BROWNE: This is a publication in 1909—But I believe the rules must have been passed in the same year as the Act, and were confirmed again in 1893—according to extracts from the Journal, where they were quoted in the back of the book.

It was published in 1909 and says: "Adopted in the first session of the Assembly and amended in the fifth session of the said Assembly."

But the extracts from the Journal says that in 1890, pursuant to the Orders of the Day there were thirty-four members in the House when consideration of the Committee of the Whole on Rules and Orders of the House was proceeded with—Moved by the Honourable the Colonial Secretary and seconded by Honourable E. P. Morris, they being then adopted, there being thirty-four members present.

Then in 1893 the rules were amended—Moved by Mr. Morris and seconded by Sir James Winter the House resolved into Committee of the Whole to consider amendments to the Rules of the House. The amendments were considered in committee, of which notice had been given and ordered accordingly. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Apparently that was the procedure followed then, it was considered in Committee of the Whole. I would suggest it might be advisable for my honourable friend not to press his motion at this time, as there is no great urgency at the moment. I would

suggest rather letting it stand over and give the matter more mature consideration.

MR. CURTIS: I think perhaps the suggestion of my honourable and learned friend is a good one. It is, I think frankly, a matter of that Standing Order being just improper, illegal and effective—But I think it is a thing that should be settled, and should be done with deliberation. Let us try to do it in an orderly fashion. If the House is agreeable, I would suggest that the motion might stand until we have had time to think the matter over.

MR. SPEAKER: It must be with the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw a motion. (Leave given. Motion withdrawn.) I must inject something here. I have been mostly amused to see in the past three-quarters of an hour members complaining of breaches of rules—our rules must be kept—must be adhered to. For the past forty-five minutes I think we have broken more rules of debate than any honourable members in any past session. May I further add that, if the House has a Speaker who makes an interpretation of the rules, to which continual criticism is offered as in this case, about which the work being done by twelve members is illegal or with a quorum of ten is illegal, we shall have a series of these interesting and very nice discussions all leading nowhere every time we sit.

I might offer a further suggestion, that the House might appoint a committee to study those old Acts and Rules and bring in something tangible and definite to put before the House so that the House can vote on it.

I am going to add also that I think the Rules of the House of Assembly for 1909, which the honourable member read have been amended, I think, twice since then. I am just offering that as a bit of history —

Does the House accept the suggestion that a committee be set up to inquire into that matter, if so would the House like me to name the Committee now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, we might defer that and give Your Honour more time to consider who the members might be.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps Your Honour might like to consider it during the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is withdrawn by consent of the House.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motion

None.

#### Notice of Question

(108) MR. BROWNE: To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House the following information:

1. What was the revenue and expenditure on current and capital account by Departments for the month of March 1954?

2. What amounts of money, if any, were borrowed during the said month? Give date and source of funds.

3. What was the amount of bills payable at March 31, 1954?

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 107:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the answers to all questions addressed to me are now in the course of preparation.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question yesterday afternoon —A copy of the Agreement for the Construction of the Birch plant. Are these copies available. Can they be readily made available?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Copies of the Agreement for the Construction of the Birch Plant and copies of the Agreement providing for its operation—I understand these have already been tabled some time—I have not got them. We don't table them every session, and are not expected to do so. On the other hand we are willing to accommodate the honourable gentleman, if possible. If the clerk can find the copies—they must have been delivered to the Opposition at the time.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and the Honourable Minister of Public Works indicate when they are going to bring in answers to questions 97 directed to the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives and later directed to the Minister of Public Works, on the Order Paper of May 26th?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): In addition to that there are one or two others on the Order Papers directed to me. I hope to be able to supply the answers on the next sitting day.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to give notice that I will, later on today, ask leave to move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider the amendment of certain statutes relating to advance and guarantee of loans by Her Majesty.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Provincial Affairs, who I believe is the appropriate minister, when can we expect an answer to a request sent to the government to hold a plebiscite in a certain area regarding the sale of liquor in Mount Pearl?

MR. MURRAY: The petition has been submitted to the Executive Council—I can't say—At the next meeting of the Executive Council I will bring up the matter again.

#### Committee of the Whole on Supply:

MR. SPEAKER: Leave has been given for this Committee to sit again today.

Chairman of Committee—Mr. Courage.

Department of Mines and Resources:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee was considering item 804:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the minister could tell us how many survey parties are expected to be out this year? And also where they are going to operate?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, we have detailed notes here on that particular item. We are doing some forestry surveys in Notre Dame Bay. We did so last year and will continue this year, in one area in particular extending from Lawrenceton to Boyd's Cove.

I do not have the exact number of parties here, Mr. Chairman, but there will be several of them including two or three for the royal commission's survey on special assignment for the royal commission. I have not the exact number here, but I am informed that there would probably be four. My own feeling is that there will probably be five.

MR. BROWNE: You have not an engineer, have you, to put in charge of these parties?

DR. ROWE: At the head of each party we have what we call a forest surveyor.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the purpose is to find out what timber there is on our Crown Lands?

DR. ROWE: And, for instance, a couple of years ago we had a terrific storm in the area roughly from Clarenville to Green Bay, with sleet, snow and wind, and in order to do some salvage work it was necessary to send in several parties to see how much damage was done.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any work being done in the southern section of the island?

DR. ROWE: We will have a survey party working on the Salmonier Line this summer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have been informed that General Kennedy is in charge of the Royal Commission—Could the Minister give us any information as to the possible help that can be rendered to us by General Kennedy? And could he tell us if there is any agreement—There must be an agreement. Surely the man would not work for us for nothing.



DR. ROWE: I did indicate that I expected the Bill to be around six or seven thousand dollars. In fact I have good reason to assume that the Bill would not exceed seven thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while on this item, are there any other forestry men associated with the Commission besides General Kennedy?

DR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cameron and Mr. Goodyear. Their terms of reference gives them powers subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to employ certain other technicians and scientists as they need. Right now I believe they have two on temporary employment; one an expert on the interpretation of aerial surveys and the other an economic statistician.

MR. BROWNE: I notice in the detail of salaries there is a sum of \$35,000 for extra assistance, what is that amount for?

DR. ROWE: Those are forest fire fighters, seasonal assistance taken on in the spring and summer.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that fifty thousand dollars, is that for the services or setting up or the machinery of the commission or has that anything to do with the salaries which are to be paid to the commissioners and the bill from General Kennedy?

DR. ROWE: It is designed to cover all the expenses. It is a rough estimate. It will take care in the first instance of the salaries of the commissioners and some other help as they may have. It is a very rough estimate.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman,

this royal commission on forestry was announced in the Speech from the Throne in 1953, and the vote is only being set up now. When were these appointed?

DR. ROWE: I explained that earlier in the House this year in reply to a question. It is true the Premier announced it last year, but we were seven or eight months altogether negotiating with people and to get General Kennedy and it was not until February past that we were able to get everybody lined up and their appointments date, I think, from February 28 or March 1—I believe it was February 28 actually.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us the terms of reference of that commission.

DR. ROWE: I had the complete terms of reference published in the newspapers, Mr. Chairman, and announced over the radio very comprehensively. I would be very glad now to table it in the House any time, or later in the day for that matter—it is a very long document, covering four or five pages as a matter of fact.

MR. BROWNE: I notice here an item for travelling expenses in connection with forestry. Is that the only item for travelling expenses, that thirty thousand dollars. I notice last year you spent more than forty thousand dollars. Do you think that thirty thousand is going to cover it this year?

DR. ROWE: It is impossible for me to predict. Last year we had a very good year as far as forest fires were concerned. We may have another good year this year, but it is difficult to say.

MR. BROWNE: There is an item here for \$17,500 for forest fire equipment. Why? Is it necessary to get equipment?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, we have a huge quantity of hoses and of course a number of very valuable trucks and they are subject to very rough wear. For example this year we have to purchase a four and a half ton truck, and we propose purchasing additional radio-telephone sets, which we introduced last year and which proved their worth elsewhere in Canada. We introduced them here last year as mobile sections for fire fighters for the first time and they are now kept in connection with towers and headquarters etc. We have this year twenty-four hand pumps with six thousand feet of one and a half inch linen hose, at a very considerable cost, and shovels and firefighting brooms and other equipment.

MR. BROWNE: Who supplies that—do you buy it from any particular person?

DR. ROWE: We order everything through the Department of Supply, Mr. Chairman, and I have not the faintest idea—I do know we try to keep our bills uniform.

MR. HOLLETT: Possibly this is a question for the Department of Supply. But are tenders called for the supplying of equipment?

DR. ROWE: I think so—if we need a new truck we just tell Supply that we need a half-ton or a pick-up truck or whatever it is—I presume tenders are regularly called for.

Carried.

805—Agriculture:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice there is an increase of staff here, for a new officer Grade V. Will the Minister explain?

DR. ROWE: I can save time by explaining that there are actually no increases in staff there at all. I believe that actually there may be a little reduction. If the honourable member will refer to the past year's estimates he will find the two divisions within agriculture—we had the division of land development which was one organization left over from the Commission of Government's various land settlements carried on by Cormack Development etc. Last year, in the interest of efficiency and economy both, we consolidated these two divisions and made one director, Mr. Clarence Badcock, former director of land development who became director of agriculture. The staff from that was then transferred, and what looks like a substantial increase is exactly no increase at all.

MR. BROWNE: Has there been any promotions there?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Clarence Badcock former director of Land Development, I believe, there was a small promotion there when Mr. Badcock took over both divisions. He was raised, I think, from something like Grade II to Grade IV.

MR. BROWNE: Now this item of ten thousand dollars extra assistance, is that also taken over from the other?

DR. ROWE: These are the garage workers. We have some twenty tractors altogether.

MR. BROWNE: The vote is increased by six thousand dollars?

DR. ROWE: I think that is the

transfer. On page 42—806 you will note that was \$30,900 last year, for land development. It has been transferred back and has been broken down.

MR. BROWNE: I have here the Public Accounts and there is nothing in there about extra assistance for last year. I have the item for expenses, but there is nothing in there about extra assistance. Who are those persons you are going to take on? What class of persons will they be?

DR. ROWE: They are the seasonal employees who have been on for many years, garage men and mechanics etc. looking after our equipment.

MR. BROWNE: Where will they be located?

DR. ROWE: The bulk of them will be at Whitbourne and Markland.

MR. HOLLETT: How has the cost increased? You say it was the regular employees.

DR. ROWE: Most of our extra assistance was used on land development where most of our vehicles were, twenty tractors, etc. then development was incorporated into it so that all extra assistance for land development has now gone under agriculture and extra assistance on surveys has driven it up to ten thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only a transfer from one section to another, it is not an increase.

DR. ROWE: Last year it was shown under land development, extra assistance \$6,139.

MR. BROWNE: It should be here somewhere in last year's vote.

DR. ROWE: It is merely a trans-

fer from one division last year and is now in with the agricultural division this year.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister explain how the three thousand dollars for education is expended?

DR. ROWE: That is assistance to agricultural students going to an agricultural college. I believe it is \$400 a year which is given to students who go to Truro, MacDonald College. I think that programme has been in effect for some years, since the days of the Commission of Government.

MR. HOLLETT: How are they selected?

DR. ROWE: They are not selected. Anybody who wishes to go to Truro and study agriculture, can do so.

MR. BROWNE: I notice the actual expenditure is \$1,700 and the year before it was only \$695.

DR. ROWE: There is nothing we can do there—it is just the fact that there are not enough claimants.

MR. BROWNE: Is it advertised?

DR. ROWE: It is generally known—we publicize the fact from time to time.

MR. HOLLETT: Standardization of marketing—will the Minister explain what steps are being taken towards standardization?

DR. ROWE: I don't know why that term is used. It is an all-embracing term—what we have in mind, for example, we plan to construct a frost-proof warehouse on the West Coast at Robinsons, and we intend to put another, I think, on the east coast. We plan to at any rate on

a co-operative basis with the community assisting. The idea behind it is this: Take a simple case—some farmer who is living perhaps twenty miles from the railway is going to ship a few hundred sacks of potatoes a year. He has to come up and ship them on a freight train. He will not know what time the train will be along, and he may have to either take them back again or leave them and risk the frost. The idea is to provide some place where we can hold his vegetables and products until such time as transportation is available. We have had a number of cases where farmers received very heavy damage through frost. We also have provision for construction of a cold storage and slaughter house in the Codroy Valley to come out of that also. We hope to do something in that line to assist the people on Avalon also, something in the line of a cold storage and slaughter house. Then there is some need for temporary employment to come under that heading.

MR. HOLLETT: I think that is very commendable and I compliment the department on that. I think money spent along these lines will be well spent, there is no question about it. On the Land Fertility schemes you have \$15,000?

DR. ROWE: That is agricultural limestone, I might say we experienced some difficulty in getting supplies of that last year, but it is now beginning to roll in at last. The idea is that we subsidize the farmer in the purchase of limestone. It is beginning to roll in—right now we are able to get a good many hundred tons.

MR. HOLLETT: That is purchased locally?

DR. ROWE: Yes, it is being manufactured by the cement plant on the west coast.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to both these items, does the Federal Government assist considerably in the erection of cold storages and warehouses and also in the land utility scheme?

DR. ROWE: Yes, the Federal Government pays a dollar fifty on limestone and one-third of the cost of cold storage units. Actually the working plan we have is that, speaking from memory and subject to correction, the Federal Government pays one-third, the province one-third and the local community one-third.

MR. HOLLETT: There is an item here—Demonstration and Experiments \$2,000. You actually spent \$1,353—I note there is no item here regarding exhibitions—is it going to be the policy of the department not to have any exhibitions—have they given that any consideration?

DR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is hidden there under 805-03-04. Grants to Agricultural Organizations, exhibitions and fairs which are conducted under the auspices of some local organization. We did last year, as a matter of fact, contribute materially to the Grand Falls Exhibition.

MR. BROWNE: There is \$13,000—you voted \$13,000 last year and actually spent \$5,000. What I mean to ask is; is there to be encouragement to having exhibitions all over the country, Long Pond, Manuels, Bell Island, Corner Brook and other places?

DR. ROWE: We are doing just that. Last year you might recall

there was a very large fair at Fox Trap embracing all Conception Bay South, and also a number of sheep fairs and a number of others, and at Grand Falls the people of the interior put on an agricultural exhibition. Then again we are only waiting for the stadium before we get going on a provincial wide basis.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, since 1952-53 we have had a reduction in the vote in 805-03-05—Health of the Animals including compensation, amounting to \$63,730. Are we to understand by this reduction that the health of animals has improved?

DR. ROWE: Of course, Mr. Chairman, in the last two years we have, in conjunction with the Federal Government and the co-operation of the farmers, carried on an anti-T.B. campaign amongst the cows. We have been able practically to eradicate T.B. from our cows. The campaign is now in the process of completion. Last year a heavy burden fell on us because it was then the majority of T.B. cows were detected and we had to replace the cows or—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that point, is there any area in the country where T.B. amongst cows is concentrated more than in others?

DR. ROWE: The answer to that now, is no. Last year most of them were found around St. John's area.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the vote for land clearance is only \$1,000 bonus—

DR. ROWE: That is a hang-over from the Commission of Government.

MR. BROWNE: Does the Minister think that is a good idea?

DR. ROWE: We do it in a different way. We are actually spending more money under 805-05-05—Land Clearing and Development.

MR. BROWNE: In regard to the improvement of livestock, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us what happened to the herd of sheep brought here from Scotland about three years ago by the present deputy-minister of natural resources and put on Brigus barrens and removed them from there, I believe. Has the experiment been a success?

DR. ROWE: It was purely experimental, of course, and I think I could say, in general the experiment was a success. They are now down at Branch. But, by the way, we have disposed of a number of them to interested parties; sold them around the province. In general the experiment has shown that it is feasible to keep these breeds of sheep over the winter.

MR. BROWNE: Then you think the experiment was worthwhile?

DR. ROWE: I may say the departmental report which will go out within the next two or three weeks has a full account on that experiment.

MR. BROWNE: For what year is that report?

DR. ROWE: For last year, 1953-54.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is an item of \$27,300 for the blueberry industry. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us what results we are getting from that?

DR. ROWE: I would say in general the situation is that our blueberry industry is bigger today than ever before. Everybody concerned, I think, has contributed to its success.

Through our burning programme and our general programme last year our people got nearly a million dollars on the Avalon Peninsula.

MR. HOLLETT: How is this to be spent?

DR. ROWE: I estimate we burn fifteen thousand acres of blueberry land which costs approximately a thousand dollars an acre. We build trails and rough roads to inaccessible areas. This year we will probably spend about three thousand on that feature. Then of course we have inspection services, as all blueberries are inspected. These inspectors are taken on for the season. Then we have the supervisor and his assistant etc.

MR. HOLLETT: What area do you intend to burn this year?

DR. ROWE: As a matter of fact it has already been completed, most of the burning has been done now.

MR. BROWNE: In respect to the Commission of Inquiry, \$50,000, has any agreement been made for compensation to Professor Shaw, Mr. Chairman?

DR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, \$8,000 a year.

MR. BROWNE: How much are the others to receive?

DR. ROWE: There is only one other member who gets paid, Professor Drummond. The third member is the present Deputy-Minister of Mines and Resources who is not paid at all of course for that work.

MR. BROWNE: Professor Drummond, I take it, gets ten thousand dollars?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Are they holding sittings now or visiting around the country? What are they doing at the present time?

DR. ROWE: Two weeks ago they were sitting. For obvious reasons I have not been in close contact with them. I believe they are now visiting around the province. A few weeks ago they held public sittings here.

MR. HOLLETT: You have a contract for just one year or two years?

DR. ROWE: There is no contract for that. We expect the Commission to complete its inquiry around the end of the year.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no question as to what time this terminates?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There has been no time limit set.

MR. HOLLETT: It could go on for years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, ten or fifteen years.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not address my remarks to the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am answering.

MR. HOLLETT: I would prefer the Premier to keep quiet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I ask the honourable gentleman to take back that remark through you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the remark was in bad taste, but I wonder if he need take it back—I do think it was in bad taste.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman,



I would ask you if in your opinion the Premier should jeer at me as he did when I was asking a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is in bad taste for any member to speak unless he rises and addresses the Chair—Order—

MR. BROWNE: As we pass on to 805-05—Land Clearing Development vote, I notice \$125,600, which I take it is a transfer from the farm and development vote. Can the Minister give us any idea how much land was cleared last year, and was it a self-supporting proposition—did it pay for itself?

DR. ROWE: It is a subsidy to our farmers. We subsidize the farmer and he pays us \$2 an hour which is the exact cost of operating the bulldozers or it is a bit above that.

MR. BROWNE: The reason I asked is that the Department of Public Works had a tractor down in Dunville, as my honourable friend knows last year and they charged, I think, about twelve or fourteen dollars an hour, and the people paid for it down there.

DR. ROWE: Not farmers.

MR. BROWNE: It was to get land cleared anyhow.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, that tractor was merely clearing ground around rows of new houses which had been built, and had nothing at all to do with agriculture.

MR. BROWNE: The charge was \$12 an hour. Now on this here, could you tell us exactly how much was cleared last year?

DR. ROWE: I would say one thousand acres of land.

MR. BROWNE: In what parts of the country?

DR. ROWE: As I happen to know, in practically every district, as a matter of fact in every district except Burgeo. I know we had land cleared down in the northern districts.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, 805-05-07 is that a token vote, and for what?

DR. ROWE: That is dealing with Cormack, a token vote.

MR. HOLLETT: What construction is going on there?

DR. ROWE: The Government still owns some buildings out there in Cormack.

MR. HOLLETT: There was no vote for it last year nor the year before.

DR. ROWE: Yes, I think so, under land development.

MR. BROWNE: Is the department booked up for this year with land clearing schemes?

DR. ROWE: I would say at this given time we are probably two years behind the requests from farmers all over the province, down in St. Barbe, Bonavista Bay, Notre Dame Bay, everywhere, and we are definitely booked up.

805—Carried.

806—Land Development: Carried.

808—Crown Lands and Surveys:

MR. HOLLETT: I see here an item for National Park, \$10,000, what is that?

DR. ROWE: That is for general

expenses in connection with the National Park surveying and other investigations we have to make in period of several years.

MR. BROWNE: How are you spending this \$10,000 for this year?

DR. ROWE: As a matter of fact the whole subject is under discussion between the two governments and I would not be able to say right at the moment in detail how that money will be spent for that matter or if at all. We have to have it there. We may be doing extra survey work this year.

MR. HOLLETT: Consumable Supplies \$100—a token vote.

DR. ROWE: I asked myself that yesterday. It is some breakdown, I believe, by the Department of Finance this year, covering paper and pencils, and I was informed it was for extra tracing paper used for surveys.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder could the Honourable Minister tell us what is the situation in regard to the National Park, now that the Federal Government is going to take charge.

DR. ROWE: We have had under consideration for some time according to arrangements with the Federal Government placing at their disposal an area of land in Bonavista Bay area, a very large track of land with many attractions there. We have to keep in mind when the Federal Government sets up a National Park all rights held by individuals are cancelled, including the provincial rights in mines and water powers or anything of that kind. Last year it is true the Government was under pressure from various quarters to get this thing through, nevertheless, we could not pass over a hundred square miles or so, which could conceivably

contain minerals. So we had a survey done there, and we found nothing of consequence to hold up the matter on that score. We may however very well be wrong and in five years somebody might discover a gold mine. Right now we are thinking of water-power. The Terra Nova River has a potentiality of seventy-five thousand horse-power, probably the greatest on the east coast. We have to think twice before forfeiting that potential there. That thing is being examined and studied right now. I might say the question of any National Park in Newfoundland, especially where we have such a long history, is not so simple as most people think. It is not a question of taking a great block of land and saying; here take that and make a National Park out of it.

MR. BROWNE: Are any of these survey parties going to Labrador?

DR. ROWE: I think we spent a little there last year, in Port Hope Simpson, where we sold some houses to residents at Port Hope Simpson. I think this year we may well have to send some one to Happy Valley, but that has not been decided on yet.

808: Carried.

810: Miscellaneous Services: Carried.

811: Wildlife:

MR. HOLLETT: Under 811-03-02: I wonder if the honourable minister could tell us what sort of equipment?

DR. ROWE: That would be trucks, motor boats, canoes, etc., for our game wardens.

MR. BROWNE: Who are the directors there?

DR. ROWE: One man is the chief game warden, Mr. H. Walters. And this year we are very glad to say we

have for the first time a scientist attached to this division, Mr. Pimlock, who is a specialist in wildlife. A man who came down here on a temporary basis and made a survey in Newfoundland. He is now with us permanently.

MR. HOLLETT: I notice the government intends to spend \$25,000 in relation to development of wildlife. Could the minister tell us what that means?

DR. ROWE: Yes. That includes the moose survey we have been making now over two years, one of the most extensive, and it has already received international attention. Also included here is a provision for the introduction of rough grouse, a decision made by the government a few months ago. We expect to have five thousand for that this year, in addition we intend to have a survey of partridge this year, or at least the beginning of a survey. It is estimated that might cost five thousand dollars. Then a general survey by Dr. Gabrielson, authority on wildlife, who while not receiving any salary for himself nor for his assistance, nevertheless there are expenses incidental to that. That estimate might well cover five thousand dollars, but we don't know that. Then there is the transfer of beaver. Travelling and salaries run about \$9,000—That is how that vote is taken up.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is conducting the partridge survey?

DR. ROWE: Only this morning I was talking to my officers about it. We hope to get the services for a few months of a university professor who has specialized in it. I must say we regard this survey as very important. There are certain parts of Newfoundland where it means a great deal to our people.

MR. HOLLETT: Has any thought been given to a bounty on red foxes, which in my opinion destroy a great deal in the country as far as partridge are concerned.

DR. ROWE: From time to time within the department we consider that whole question, which is fraught with all kinds of danger. We have consulted New Brunswick who have in the past put on such bounties, and they always come back to us with a suggestion to be very, very careful as we could get ourselves into all kinds of trouble. As a matter of fact Dr. Gabrielson says a bounty system is something we ought to be very cautious about approaching here in Newfoundland. The thing is under study.

MR. BROWNE: I believe some one recommended that the government import white-tailed deer some time ago. Did the department drop that idea?

DR. ROWE: No it has not been dropped. It is still under consideration. There again there are other things tying in with the white-tailed deer. Nobody knows why the moose are disappearing from the mainland and from Nova Scotia and a lot have disappeared from New Brunswick; and a lot of people seem to think it is because of the white-tailed deer. We cannot take a chance on destroying our moose. What I mean is that we should in fact know as far as possible what the white-tailed deer will do.

MR. BROWNE: There is a vote here for fifteen hundred dollars for a fishing lodge.

DR. ROWE: That lodge was built by the Commission of Government for government use in Commission of Government days. It is on the Gander.

MR. BROWNE: It takes fifteen hundred dollars to operate it.

DR. ROWE: From time to time the government does send special parties there. It has to have a cook and caretaker and that kind of thing. It may not run into that.

MR. BROWNE: Any government officials spend time there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No never. While on that question—We found that the Commission of Government had built quite a few cabins on the Salmonier Line, and each Commissioner had one, and some high officials had others. I personally gave orders that the whole lot of them be leased out to the highest bidder. Then I discovered the other one existing at Gander and was about to sell it when it occurred to us it might be good business to hold on to it and let it be used by distinguished visitors whom we would invite for the purpose of getting in some salmon fishing at the expense of the government, most of them from the United States of America.

MR. BROWNE: Seasonal Assistance \$12,035 and Game and Fish Protection. I thought that was a federal matter.

DR. ROWE: That was a co-operative arrangement made at the time of union between the Federal and the Provincial Governments—That is our share of the cost of wardens, etc. We have them for six months of the year.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the minister care to say anything about the situation in regard to beaver at the present time. You had an open season last years, I believe, and I remember going out on a trip last year and standing in one place and counting about twenty beaver houses, and they are particularly numerous around there,

and I could see them all over the place. I frankly suspect that every one of them was slaughtered last year.

DR. ROWE: Last year we did decide after very careful investigation that the time was ripe for another open season, and about seven or eight thousand were killed. That means of course in certain parts of the Province things were rather slack last year, some of the men there made a few dollars during the winter. This year we do not propose to open the season. What will happen is that probably in about three years time we will again open the season. The fact that this quantity was taken last year without any serious loss is an indication the beaver situation is very well looked after.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the value of the pelt?

DR. ROWE: In some cases a little bit disappointing for us, and not only for us but for all Canada. I think they ran about \$12.

811: Carried.

820: Mines.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister is in a position to tell us about the Asbestos Mine to which the government gave considerable assistance?

DR. ROWE: The Asbestos Mine in Port au Port, that is still working, still going on there, and as a matter of fact, we hope there will be some development there late this year.

MR. BROWNE: Is it costing the government anything, apart from the road building?

DR. ROWE: No, it is not costing the government any money other than the money advanced.

MR. BROWNE: Are they working here now?

DR. ROWE: As of this month I resume they are. They are already here now, yes.

MR. BROWNE: I understand an announcement had been made that it is a wonderful asbestos mine and would be in operation long before this. Is there any definite information about it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They had some delays caused principally by the government's delay in getting the road on. The road is now almost in and they hope to be shipping asbestos this year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice the Deputy Minister gets an additional vote of a thousand dollars under this subhead.

DR. ROWE: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the honourable the Premier could better explain.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is paid for. Claude Howse and has been for the last four or five years annually by the Office of the Premier or the Department of Economic Development. I am not sure at the moment which one, either one or the other, for a very special work which Mr. Howse has been doing for the Department of Economic Development.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask why was reduced from two thousand dollars to one thousand dollars last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because the salaries went up at the same time as reduced that amount.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the director, Grade VI?

DR. ROWE: That is Dr. Baird, the provincial geologist.

MR. HOLLETT: I see here an item for \$20,000 for diamond drilling. I wonder if that could not be done either by NALCO or BRINCO? To what extent is diamond drilling carried on by the Department of Mines and Resources?

DR. ROWE: We maintain drills and crews, etc., and occasionally we rent them out to private parties. Last year, I think, we lent them to NALCO, and were paid back. That came under revenue. Then there are special things which we ourselves do from time to time as a government service. It is the government's prime duty to get production, and that is the prime interest of the government irrespective of who is doing private drilling on private property, etc. If the public interest demanded it we would not hesitate to put a diamond drill in anywhere.

MR. FOGWILL: Salt Survey \$8,000. Would the minister indicate some of the results of that salt survey up to the present time?

DR. ROWE: All I can say, Mr. Chairman—Nova Scotia's survey, I am informed, took them twelve years before they proved up their salt deposits and got their mines working. We have only been at it a year or so. It is encouraging. That is all I can say. It will take a long time unless we are very lucky. It may take several years to ascertain whether or not there is a workable deposit there. That is what we are trying to find out.

MR. FOGWILL: Will the minister tell us if they have found any salt deposits?

DR. ROWE: Nothing in commercial quantities.

MR. FOGWILL: Small deposits.

DR. ROWE: Yes, some brine and something like that, which means there is some salt. It may peter out or prove a new mine.

MR. FOGWILL: Would the Minister tell us in what part of the island the survey is being carried on?

DR. ROWE: From Flat Bay down to Codroy is the area in which the survey is being conducted. Last year, Mr. Chairman, we had a survey based on specific gravity, and that is going ahead this year—from the Nova Scotia Foundation.

MR. BROWNE: Who is in charge of the work? Somebody from Nova Scotia?

DR. ROWE: Yes, the director of the Nova Scotia Research Foundation but with no charge for salary, just a gesture to the province.

MR. FOGWILL: I notice there is a new item—Publications \$5,000. What is proposed to be done under that?

DR. ROWE: That item there will be a new geological map, which will be a milestone in the geological history of Newfoundland, the first map for fifty years. The map will incorporate everything that has been done in geology in Newfoundland since 1907.

MR. BROWNE: Who is preparing that?

DR. ROWE: Our mines branch. The five thousand will be used chiefly there, but there may be other items as well.

MR. BROWNE: It is being done?

DR. ROWE: Yes, it is in the hands of the printers, and we hope to have it in July or probably late this month.

MR. FOGWILL: There is an increase, Mr. Chairman, of \$11,000 for equipment. Would the Minister indicate to the committee what the department proposes to purchase under that heading?

DR. ROWE: Yes, I am told there is a change in the item up there. Formerly one was under diamond drilling and the other under field surveys, now all are blocked together and consolidated into one vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move the committee rise and report having passed sundry items.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply have considered the items to them referred and have passed the following items of current estimates under the heading of Mines and Resources 804 through 820 inclusive.

Report received—Committee ordered sit again presently.

On motion the House recessed until 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

June 4, 1954.

The House met at 3:00 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before we go back into Committee of the Whole on Supply I should like to table answers to Question No. 106 asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the Minister of Economic Development—with permission of the House.

(1) The answer is, yes. Ex-gratia payments were made and were made because of advances in wage rates incurred by the contractors during the period of construction—wage rates and other advances in costs.



The amounts were as follows:

MIAG	—	\$ 4,770.23	Mar. 1, 1952
		9,284.59	Apr. 30, 1952
		128,628.71	Mar. 20, 1952

That was paid to MIAG in respect of the cement plant.

Then to the firm of Benno Schilde the sum of \$150,000 on the 14th of May 1953. That was paid to Benno Schilde in respect of their increased costs in the building of the Gypsum Plant at Humbermouth.

Mr. Speaker, on two separate occasions during the building of these plants there was a considerable increase in the wage rates which had to be met by the firms concerned—MIAG in the case of the cement mill and Benno Schilde in the case of the gypsum plant. One of these occasions was when there was a strike of workers in both plants, and was followed by a wage increase of considerable proportions. Subsequently there was a second wage increase, not the result of a strike but as the result of a threat of a strike. So both companies, not acting together but separately, approached the government with a request for additional payments over and above the amount of the contracts. The government in each case agreed to an increased payment, but not by any means the amounts requested. If I had thought of it I would have requested the Treasury to furnish me with the amounts requested by the companies concerned. If that had been included in the question no doubt I would have had the information now before me, but they got rather considerably less than the amounts requested. I am speaking from memory and some member of the Cabinet may be able to correct me, but I have a feeling we agreed to pay about half the amounts requested, or it might have been rather more than

half, but I think it was something of the order of half of what they requested. Now there was one condition made in connection with one of these payments, the payment to Benno Schilde. We agreed to make this payment of \$150,000 to Benno Schilde on a condition we laid down; that they should invest that money in the Province of Newfoundland. They agreed to do so, that they would invest all that money in Newfoundland and put more money with it. That was to be put into a plant for the manufacture of light machinery based upon the use of sheet metal by them, sheet tin and sheet metal and sheet copper and sheet zinc and sheet brass sheet metal in general, and the plant was to have been constructed at Bay Roberts.

These were the statements they made to the government when they signed our contract, that they were to invest the money within Newfoundland. They then proceeded to incorporate a company called Eastern Machinery Company, or some such name. I think there were other words also in the title of the company, but the two words I remember most are "Eastern" and "Machinery." In the crush of business I believe I omitted to press for the building of that plant for some months after the agreement was made. Then I began to press, and in the present year, in, I believe, February—I am not anticipating statements I will be making or that will be made now in another place later this year—but in February, I believe (I could easily find it because the carbon copy would be in my office) I wrote a stern and rather stiff letter to the firm of Benno Schilde drawing their attention to the fact that we had made them this ex-gratia payment of \$150,000 on condition that they would

establish this small plant and demanded that they either proceed at once with the building of the plant or return the money to the Treasury. That letter started something—started quite a holocaust. I know they were greatly startled to receive a letter in those terms from me. They were not expecting a letter in those terms nor any stiff terms from me. I believe they thought they had good reason not to expect me, of all people, to talk to them like that. They thought they did know me—but about that the least said at this stage perhaps the better. There will be a better and more proper occasion when that could be said. But that is the story of the ex-gratia payment of the \$150,000 to the firm of Benno Schilde.

In the case of MIAG there were no conditions imposed. As a matter of fact we felt that each firm honestly was owed in equity but not legally and by contract but owed in equity in justice more than their contract required us to pay them; and that their expenses had been away beyond what they had a legal right to expect us to pay them.

Now as to the firm of William Lundrigan & Co. Ltd., we paid also an ex-gratia amount there. That is the firm that constructed the buildings of both plants, the actual structures of both mills; and we made them an ex-gratia payment of \$21,520.23 on August 9, 1952. So that it appears that MIAG and William Lundrigan & Co. Ltd., were both given ex-gratia payments in 1952 whereas Benno Schilde were given their payment only last year, 1953, May of last year. I may say the reason why they were not given their payment until as late as that is that they had asked for it long before, and we had haggled and bargained with them to agree to the

conditions we wanted to impose upon them. At first they demurred and in fact refused to accede to the conditions, holding that we owed it to them in equity and ought to pay them. We had paid MIAG and Lundrigan and had to pay them, we knew in our hearts that that was so, but we were anxious to establish a small light machinery plant because they happened to be famous all over the world for the particular type of machinery they do manufacture.

MR. HOLLETT: Arising out of that, I wonder if the Premier might state to the House whether or not Benno Schilde has returned that \$150,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they have not returned the money. Instead they came to us shortly after they received the letter from us—the letter went to Germany to their Head Office—they came to us and confessed they could not begin to compete with CMIC who were in fact doing the same type of work because the overhead of CMIC would absorb that particular branch of their activity whereas if they established a plant of one activity it would have to absorb the whole activity of the plant and they could not compete. They said they would either pay back the money or, if the Government were agreeable, invest the money in another plant in Newfoundland; which ever the Government would say. We wanted to know where they would invest it? They told us, if it were agreeable, they would invest it in Humbermouth in a concrete products plant, for the manufacture of concrete pipes, culverts, processed concrete forms for construction and generally prepared and processed and premoulded concrete products. The Cabinet considered it, and thought that the \$150,000 so in-

vested by Benno Schilde in Newfoundland would be of more benefit to Newfoundland than to have it going back into the Treasury to be spent by the Government in the ordinary course of Government business. We felt that it would help strengthen, if only by a little, the economy of Newfoundland more than it would if we just recovered it to the Treasury. But what we were not willing to do was just to have them accept the \$150,000, put it on their books and we in Newfoundland have nothing more to show for it than this gypsum plant for which they had been paid this amount.

MR. BROWNE: And did they actually invest it in concrete products?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I understand they have done so. I don't actually know, but have no doubt they have done so in partnership with Mr. W. J. Lundrigan. When the firm of William J. Lundrigan was engaged to construct the gypsum plant it brought them in close touch with the firm of Benno Schilde, as the directors of Benno Schilde came frequently to Humbermouth and had a certain degree of close collaboration, because one firm was building the mill and the other firm was building the machinery, and they came to have a great respect for one another, and that has culminated in their forming a partnership in Humbermouth, and a certain degree of close collaboration, and I am now informed they are starting in the concrete business.

#### Orders of The Day

Committee of the Whole on Supply.  
(Mr. Courage Chairman of Committee):

MR. CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose we had reached 821. Printing and Photography:

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might revert for just one moment back to 804, merely to table a document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable minister may table the document.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that this morning somebody asked me what were the functions and duties of the Royal Commission on Forestry. I have now the formal statement here. I could only locate one copy of it in the minute or two I had in the department, but I shall be glad to table any other copies.

While I am on my feet, Sir, 821 has been called. I think in view of the fact that this is an entirely new division I should make just a very brief statement regarding it. For some years we had attached to the Crown Lands Division a photographic service and we had two officers looking after it, and on occasions, of course, when heavy work demanded it we could always put in other staff. That service was designed to look after the needs of the Crown Lands Division in the first instance. However, especially in the last two or three years, increasing demands have been made on that service by other departments of government, for example, the department of Economic Development, the department of Fisheries and Co-operatives and the department of Public Works. Also we found that certain pieces of work, certain things needed by the various government departments required very considerable time to obtain. For example somebody might come and say they would like to have fifty reproductions of a map, let us say for argument's sake, the bottom of Conception Bay. To get that done by the ordinary means available to the department

of the government might sometimes require a number of days or even a week.

This new division we have is an expansion of the old service in two ways. It is an expansion in the sense that the service is far wider, it includes printing, facsimile reproduction of any material, any document, any deed, any map, facsimile reproduction by photographers in the department. This may come as some surprise to the House and the public—we have almost one hundred thousand aerial photographs of Newfoundland, practically every inch of Newfoundland. So that if any honourable member were to come into our department today and say he would like to have a look at a block of ground two miles by three miles situated in the heart of the country or on part of the Great Northern Peninsula we could locate that for him in a few seconds, an actual photograph of that. Now in all these various surveys encompassing mines surveys, crown lands surveys, forestry surveys and so on, every day of our lives we get requests for reproductions of an area. The new division looks after that. The new division also is able to do for us certain things that formerly could not be done except through commercial channels, such things as the printing of pamphlets and documents of one kind and another. Last week for example our photographing division turned out one hundred and seventy-seven thousand forms for the Department of Health, Public Welfare and Education. That was in connection with toxiding, and other medical forms for the Department of Health; and these one hundred and seventy-seven thousand were turned out almost at a few hours' notice.

I would invite any member of the House, and I think it would be edu-

cational and interesting to visit the division. The Premier and I went up there a few days ago. I invite any member of the House to go up there and see some of the most modern machinery of its kind in the world today. I might say it is located in the building on Harvey Road. This particular service was brought to the attention of the Government by the Honourable the Premier who had seen similar services in England during one of his visits. I think it is one of the finest additions to the Government service that we have. I think the Honourable the Premier is in a position to give a more elaborate description of the actual functions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps the committee would like to have a little additional information. This is not a new division of the department but in some aspects it is a new division. It is an old division, fairly old, to which we have now added some new features, and to which we propose to add still another new feature. In the department of Natural Resources there is of course naturally a need for a map department and a blueprinting department. Under the control of the deputy-minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Claude Howse, and under the immediate and active operation of a young man named Butler, whose first name is Don, a most dependable and most resourceful young man, this division has developed into quite a sizable proportion and activity of the Government, i.e. the making of blueprints, the reproductions of maps sectional and different types of maps for the Mines Department and the Crown Lands Office and all the activities of that department and of other departments of the Government. Well then having already that nucleus of the present division and I having

seen in Charlottetown, having been shown the installations of that Government under which they print their estimates and all their acts before they are printed finally for the House, print all their reports; having seen that in actual operation in Charlottetown, having been shown personally by Premier Jones the installations of that Government, I then asked the Cabinet to authorize me when I was about to visit London, a year ago for the Coronation, to visit the Crown Organization in London with a view to being put in touch with a firm that manufactured that kind of equipment in England. They did so, and I went out to the factory where the stuff is manufactured. The result was that I placed the order, as I had been authorized to do, through the Crown Agency, and the equipment came and we brought a man here from the company to familiarize Mr. Butler with the use of this Roto Printing Equipment. That Roto Printing is a very rapid system of reproduction, actually photographs a document and from that photographic plate you can print many many thousands and in fact you can print scores and even hundreds of thousands of copies. Then these forms can be held on file, and if another ten or fifteen or fifty thousand copies are needed, a phone call can get them put on the press and printed in a matter of a few hours.

There is one thing remaining to be done, i.e. the installation of a microfilm outfit to microfilm all kinds of documents. There is, I think, one but only one microfilm outfit in the whole Government service, and that is the one in the Department of Health and that one is sometimes lent to other departments or sometimes the other departments bring documents to the

Health Department to be microfilmed. We feel that in this new division we should have a microfilm outfit to serve the Government in general. So that when that is added we will have as efficient and as complete division of its kind as probably any government possessed across Canada, with the exception of the Government Printing Office in Ottawa and in Washington. We have no thought whatsoever of establishing a Government printing office. I often wondered whether we should, but certainly we have no intention and no decision has been made to set up a Government map printing, photographic reproductions and microfilms, yes. These are necessary activities of the Government, and we are setting up a division that will be extremely useful and invaluable indeed for that purpose.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is very interesting because it costs \$22,300 to get forms printed on this Roto Press.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, my honourable friend is quite wrong, the twenty-two thousand is not just forms, it is for the whole activity of that division.

MR. BROWNE: That is the cost of this new vote. Now I take it the Government went ahead without any authority from the House and appointed a staff, I believe, of five additional, a director and grade one officer, a grade three and a grade two. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this press is certainly not going to be working eight hours a day for three hundred days a year, and is going to be tied up for a long time. Where is the purchase price for the press? That is not included in this figure at all. How much did we pay for the press?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has been

bought and paid for. That would not be in these estimates.

MR. BROWNE: What estimates? The department was not there last year. I would like to know how much this cost.

DR. ROWE: I am afraid off hand I cannot recall. The Department of Supply purchased it.

MR. BROWNE: How is it going to be generally beneficial to set up a department costing \$23,000? Are we going to save \$23,000 a year by it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Many times over.

DR. ROWE: I have not a balance sheet here, but I can assure the honourable gentleman that we went into this thing very thoroughly, and we had our technical staff go into it. It was not merely an administrative decision, we went into the economy of the whole thing. Let me say also that is not entirely a new expenditure. We have had two permanent persons of the five shown here for years, and from time to time other supplementary staff transferred from other divisions at times of heavy pressure. So that I might say two-fifths of that expenditure, as far as staff is concerned has been a permanent feature of the department.

MR. BROWNE: Where did the other two come from?

DR. ROWE: They were with the Crown Lands Division in previous years. As far as the benefits are concerned, the benefits will be more administrative than economic. Sometimes in the past very important activities have been held up because we had to wait for the reproductions of maps and blueprints etc. when they had to be done either here by

commercial, private enterprise, or as sometimes happened, sent to the mainland. We had to take our turn, and sometimes it would be five or six weeks. I remember sometime last year on something very important we were six weeks getting it done in Ottawa. Today we can get it done in six hours in our own division. As far as the actual dollars and cents are concerned we went into that and we are convinced that this will, in addition to giving a greater degree of efficiency and more satisfactory service actually save us money. I know very few things like this ever save the Government money, but we are convinced it will be done in this particular case.

MR. BROWNE: Who is in charge?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Donald Butler. He was the man in charge of the photographic division all along in the department. He is very efficient; as a matter of fact he is one of the most ingenious persons I have met in this particular field. I would be very happy to take any member at any time up to that division. Mr. Butler had been overworked in this division and went to hospital for some weeks but is now out, and when he gets back again I would be very happy to take any honourable member up to that division, because it is really an education in itself.

MR. BROWNE: How large a map can that machine print?

DR. ROWE: The Roto Printing Machine is 13 x 17 and makes a map 36 ins. x 40 ins.

MR. HOLLETT: Do I understand it can reproduce any part of a map that there is a copy of?

DR. ROWE: I might explain to the honourable member for St. John's West that in addition to the aerial



photographs we purchased last year, I forget the amount we spent, but we purchased from Ottawa original copies which are all on file in our department and of course in use every day by our Crown Lands and Mines Branch you may see hundreds of them laid out. Now it is the reproduction of those we are enabled to do with our own press up there, the reproductions of these photographs themselves.

MR. HOLLETT: Am I to understand the honourable minister said the Government purchased photographs from Ottawa?

DR. ROWE: I am informed that all provinces purchase them. The Federal Government takes the photographs and the provincial departments purchase them from Ottawa.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought in the Terms of Union the Federal Government was to assist in all surveys which were made. How could we have to purchase these photographs from them afterwards? That is the point I want cleared up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are not surveys but photographs.

MR. HOLLETT: Aerial surveys, I suppose—what is the difference?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman does not know, this is not the place for finding out the difference between photographs and surveys, a school or a dictionary is the place.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I was speaking to the honourable minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You were speaking to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable

members speak to the House. Honourable members are in Committee of the Whole on Supply. The honourable member has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I shall take my time and shall not be rushed by anyone except the chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has no desire to rush.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that, Sir. To get back to the point—it was the stated policy in our terms of union that the Federal Government would assist in all surveys at any time whatsoever, tending to development. Now I am informed by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources that we have to purchase from the Federal Government any aerial photographs which have been taken. Furthermore I recall that Newfoundland spent about two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, I believe, on aerial surveys—are these in the possession of the Department of Mines and Resources? I wonder would the Minister assure me of that.

DR. ROWE: All the surveys that have been made by this Government are in the possession of the Department of Mines. Just one final word on this, Sir, as far as I am concerned. If we had to conduct these surveys ourselves they would cost us many millions of dollars. All we do actually is pay for the print. We don't pay for the survey. What we pay for is the piece of paper it is on, that is all.

MR. BROWNE: There is just one question, Mr. Chairman, that means now the department has no other expenditure for printing beyond what is allowed here, and in addition they have certain revenues from other departments for printing done for them.

Will there be a revenue coming in from the other departments?

DR. ROWE: No.

MR. BROWNE: What about this one hundred and seventy-five thousand forms?

DR. ROWE: No, we don't charge any other department of the Government.

MR. BROWNE: Don't you think they should pay you?

DR. ROWE: We would want to be bookkeepers for that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wonder if the Minister could tell us the colour of that machine, and, while he is at it, the shape, how much it weighs and if it is made of iron, steel or copper.

MR. BROWNE: Or small wood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or is the colour brown, or is it the shape of Brown's corner, for instance?

DR. ROWE: I have already answered that we do not charge any other Government department at all. Whether we will have any other printing costs at all is another question. The answer to that is, yes, I am quite sure there will be certain things it is not feasible to have done up there.

Item carried.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH:

1001—Minister's Office—Carried.

1002—General Office.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Administrative Assistant Grade III, \$500 over grade, personal.

HON. P. FORSEY (Minister of Health): Mr. Butler.

MR. BROWNE: Where is the per-

son who is head of the actual service now—is he in the General Hospital vote, Dr. Wilson?

MR. FORSEY: The superintendent of the General.

MR. BROWNE: I see—he is in the General Hospital.

1003—Accounting Office—Carried.

1004—Registrar of Vital Statistics.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could give us any idea of the rate of increase in population in Newfoundland over the past four or five years?

MR. FORSEY: I have no idea—it is increasing.

1004—Carried.

1005—Registry:

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, that is an office set up for and operates a joint service for both Public Health and Public Welfare.

1005—Carried.

1006—Ambulance and Transport Services:

MR. BROWNE: There seems to be a large item there for new or replacement vehicles, what is that for?

MR. FORSEY: For cars and ambulances.

MR. BROWNE: How many of each?

MR. FORSEY: I would say about one ambulance and about four cars.

1006—Carried.

1007—Headquarters Medical Staff:

MR. FORSEY: That is for the Chief Medical Health Officers and Pathologists.

MR. BROWNE: Dr. McDermott. Who is with him? I think there is a new doctor there.

MR. FORSEY: I forget his name now. He is a chap who recently came over from England.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know the names of the other two?

MR. FORSEY: Dr. Josephson, I imagine, would be included there and also Dr. Knowing—no that is not right—I don't know their names, Mr. Chairman.

1007 Carried.

MR. BROWNE: We would like to know sometime.

1008—Nursing Service:

MR. BROWNE: What is the situation now in regard to nurses? Does it apply to hospitals? Do the nurses in training get any pay at all at the present time or do they get allowances at all of any kind?

MR. FORSEY: Yes, I think something of the order of \$30 a month.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure?

MR. FORSEY: I am not sure but—Institutional Officers Grade VII are on the same vote as last year with thirty new ones put into a higher scale.

MR. BROWNE: These are nurses. Are they all at the General Hospital?

MR. FORSEY: No, also at the Mental Hospital and the Sanatorium.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, in connection with that item, I have an answer here to the question as to how many student nurses are presently in training. There are 105 student nurses at the General Hospital—what I want to ask is this; it is understood these nurses get, not including their board and lodging, \$300 a year, less than a dollar a day. On what grounds do we arrive at the conclusion that

they are getting better pay than any nurses in Canada. They get \$300 a year over and above their keep, and in addition to their eight hours on duty they have to work long hours studying. I think that is very small pay, less than a dollar a day; three hundred dollars a year in this day and age, even though, as this will indicate, they may be paid better than anyone else on the mainland. I wonder if the Honourable Minister would like to comment?

MR. FORSEY: The whole point is that they are getting an education.

MR. HOLLETT: They are working for it. I am wondering if the Minister has considered any increase in the salaries of these nurses, I mean? I should think the nursing profession is badly in need of nurses in this country and they are certainly not being over-paid, and I don't think that is wise—if, as the Minister says, they are getting an education that may stand them in good stead, but to pay less than a dollar a day to hold these nurses there for three years seems hardly sufficient. I was wondering if there might be any possibility that the Minister might recommend to the Government some increase.

MR. FORSEY: Not while the law of supply and demands is in operation. They have doubled the number of students and there is no point in putting up the rate if they are satisfied to accept that; and it is higher than elsewhere in Canada. I know, I would like to increase everybody's wages—but, can we afford it? We must cut the garment according to the cloth.

MR. HOLLETT: They can't afford it—that is the answer I am getting. The Government are not in a position.

MR. FORSEY: I will waive this question, Mr. Chairman.

1008 Carried.

1009—Tuberculosis Control:

MR. BROWNE: I note there is some increase, although not very much it is true, but \$2,500 in this vote over last year, but an increase of about five thousand over the previous years actual expenditure. Is the Minister now in a position to tell us if the incidence of TB is declining so that we might expect from this on, there might not be a need of so much. I know there has been a wonderful campaign conducted for a great number of years, starting back in the years of the Commission of Government and of course the fact that the people are enjoying a higher standard of living has had a lot to do with it, but it seems to me TB has been very much under control recently.

MR. FORSEY: Five years ago 128 people died with TB in St. John's—last year it was in the 20's. But the increase and most of the money now is spent on prevention and seeking out the disease and preventing it before it progresses too far.

MR. BROWNE: I take it this is Dr. Knowling here under this item. Who is his assistant?

MR. FORSEY: Dr. Lewis.

MR. HOLLETT: I notice grants to non-government hospitals, International Grenfell Association \$45,000, which brings to my mind a question raised by one of the members on the other side of the House relative to White Bay. I don't know whether this is the right time, but I might as well bring the question in here as anywhere else. Is it the intention of the Government to implement the

wishes of the people in White Bay to secure a cottage hospital there in the future?

MR. FORSEY: I am not in a position to answer that question, Mr. Chairman—that would be at the discretion of the Government. The Department of Health's only interest is in implementing any decision the Government may make in the future.

Carried.

1010—Health Inspection:

MR. BROWNE: I notice on this item the travelling expenses are only \$1,000. Where are the health officers located? Are there any outside the City of St. John's, and if so, how many?

MR. FORSEY: At Corner Brook, Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: Do they do any travelling? That does not seem like very much.

MR. FORSEY: They do some travelling, but they have their own vehicles for travelling.

MR. BROWNE: Then they get paid out of this vote for travelling?

MR. FORSEY: No.

MR. BROWNE: How do they get paid for their travelling if they have their own vehicles?

MR. FORSEY: They would be departmental vehicles.

1010 Carried.

1011—Business Management: Carried.

1012—Central Laundry: Carried.

1013—Central Pharmacy: Carried.

1014—Central Stores:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there was a report from the Auditor General to the effect they had recommended certain changes be carried out about supplies, and he reported that after a certain period they checked up and a lot of things were found to be unaccounted for—is there any improvement in the management of the stores as he recommended?

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, some of the personnel have been retired and replaced and according to the latest check of the Auditor General everything is carried on satisfactorily.

Carried.

1015—Unallocated Equipment and Supplies: Carried.

1016—Prosthetic Service: Carried.

1017—General Health Services:

MR. HOLLETT: Fees for professional services—would the Honourable Minister tell us what these are?

MR. FORSEY: That would be operations performed by various city doctors for the indigent poor, non-paying patients. They have a set scale, for instance the removal of an appendix, \$30. I don't remember all of them but the charge is very low.

Carried.

1018—Venereal Diseases Preventative Service:

MR. BROWNE: These are just part-time. You would get no doctor for that amount?

MR. FORSEY: Yes—the other officer would be just an ordinary civil servant.

Carried.

1019—Public Health Laboratory:

MR. BROWNE: Who is in charge of that now?

MR. FORSEY: Dr. Josephson.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister tell us whether or not the supply of blood to the various hospitals is ample generally, or is there generally a shortage?

MR. FORSEY: There was a shortage, but we have entered into an agreement now with Ottawa whereby our supply here can be supplemented from other provinces.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Instead of Ottawa drawing blood out of us we draw it out of Ottawa.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you pay for it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we get it free.

MR. HOLLETT: That brings me back to another item. I remember, Mr. Chairman, how much I was ridiculed about this particular item. The item, I think, was \$37,000 for mouth wipes. And I tried to prove, and I did prove, I think, to the satisfaction of the Honourable the Premier, there was something wrong in Denmark somewhere. Anyhow I put up with ridicule by the members opposite and one on this side, and finally I remember the then Minister of Health getting up and saying they had discovered a typographical error amounting to ten thousand dollars in that particular item. In other words, it was not \$37,000 but \$27,000. I do hope the Honourable Minister will not allow any typographical error like that to slip into the bookkeeping of the General Hospital nor any other department.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I

am looking at the vote for the General Hospital in 1952-53 amounting to \$1,100,000, and the vote this year is \$1,800,000. Can the Minister give us any idea why the vote has gone up so high?

MR. FORSEY: Because there is a different accounting proceeding being carried on, board and lodging is included and shows up in the revenue so that the net possibly will be the same, apart from the increases to the civil servants, which they got this year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make an observation about the General Hospital. I was at the General Hospital on Sunday. At the emergency entrance I saw a man being brought in unconscious. He looked to me like a man either dead or dying, and we tried to telephone outside for the police to come and investigate the case and could not get any answer from the switchboard. Both I, and the police that came there afterwards, had to go over to the Old Ladies Home across the street and phone from there to get an answer.

MR. FORSEY: The girl was suspended this morning. She was caught asleep a couple of nights ago.

MR. BROWNE: It is a very serious thing as there were several emergencies there.

MR. FORSEY: There had been quite a few complaints. But the girl has been suspended.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I had the same thing happen to me when I tried to get through and could not. I got mad and rang the superintendent. I might say it was 1:00 o'clock in the morning and I could not find him, and I had to draw it to the

Minister's attention. The result was that he found out the cause.

MR. BROWN: I think Mr. Chair-board item. I notice that some newspaper, the Minister might take a little time to explain that half million dollar papers are making inferences from some remark of the Finance Minister in the budget speech that somehow the Government are trying to collect another half million dollars a year by charging board where they did not charge it before, and that there is a net increase of half a million dollars. My understanding of the budget speech as I heard and read it is that the item is a mere bookkeeping transaction. The salaries now include board and lodging, but they are charged with it, so that the net difference is exactly nothing. Would the Honourable Minister explain that?

MR. FORSEY: Prior to this year the people living in these institutions were receiving their board and lodging with no accounting kept of them, and consequently the true picture was not shown. This year we increased the salaries—for instance a person was getting \$1,000 and got an increase of ten per cent and is now getting eleven hundred. Then another \$360 was tacked on to the salary, which would then read \$1,460. But there would be deductions by the Department of Finance of \$360. That was merely to show the true picture of the cost of maintaining the various institutions, which was not known before.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A straight matter of accounting and nothing else.

MR. BROWNE: I notice a very substantial amount here for legal fees. That seems to be an enormous amount of money to be paying out for legal fees.



MR. FORSEY: We have passed over some 290,000 old uncollected and uncollectable accounts. As I understand it the amount to come out of that collection is set by the Law Society.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is one item there for \$340,000, provisions. Is that inclusive of supplies of fresh fish. As you know the fishermen coming down from the Narrows sell their fresh fish for 2½c., as the case might be, to various firms. I notice the General Hospital has to pay 7c. per lb. for fresh fish. Now the only thing that has to be done with that fish after it is purchased from these fishermen is to put it aboard trucks and bring it to the General Hospital for delivery. If you give them three cents a pound it would mean a difference of four cents, which now goes to some commission merchant at 7c. a lb. That price of course to fishermen would be a Klondike. I suggest these fishermen ought to get together and form some sort of a corporation and tender themselves to the Government for the supplying of fresh fish. The supply is not frozen, it is fresh, just brought to the hospital with the guts out, and the General Hospital, I suppose, uses it right away. It seems to me the price they have to pay is exorbitant, i.e. the difference in the price on fresh fish in Steer's Cove and at the General Hospital is from 2½c. to 3c. which is quite an item.

There are one or two things I would like to refer to on this item. The price of provisions: For instance ham, I notice it was supplied to the General Hospital and the Sanatorium at 80c. per lb. and was later increased to \$1.01 per lb., and raw ham was increased from 64c. when they started to 81c. per lb. Then there was bacon.

Bacon and ham seem to be the big offenders, bacon, contract price under tender, 53c. and I notice before the end of the tender it went up to 57c. per lb. There were a few more of these things, but I am more interested in the fresh fish and the ham and bacon advances in price to the General Hospital. I am wondering if the Minister could give any explanation for these large increases particularly on ham and bacon and for the difference between the prices for fish paid by the merchants on Water Street, or on Duckworth Street, I think the difference between 7c. a lb. and 2½c. a lb.?

MR. FORSEY: Well, Mr. Chairman—

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is prepared to listen to me I will try to give the answer because it came through my department. Take fresh fish: It is quite true the fishermen sells it from the boat and only gets 2½c. and we pay 7c. because in the first place we ask for tenders and any fishermen or group of fishermen who wanted to do so and were in a position to tender and could guarantee a supply in line with what we wanted, i.e. the variety and the delivery, we were prepared to accept it. Now that is the first thing that comes into consideration not only the price but the delivery and variety, and I think the Minister will bear me out, it is not as satisfactory as a rule to deal with fishermen who have fish today but it would possibly be two or three days more before they can get out again—that is one factor.

Now it seems to me the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has followed very little the market trend particularly in the hog industry during the

past year. Conditions have been abnormal. Our tenders when they were accepted, I may say, were on the basis of an escalator clause whereby market conditions governing the price upward and downward (and there have been several instances where they have been downward) were accepted in the tenders during the year. That accounts for the advance in the prices from time to time. For instance, only a few days ago we had a request showing that ham has again gone up. Now we don't accept any request that comes to us from any merchant or anyone else, we check on every possible avenue that we can to ascertain the facts, and more than that, I may say, I keep a very close watch on market conditions, and have been doing so for many years. Only when we are convinced from all available evidence a markup is justified do we permit it. Sometimes too we try to get a reduction when that is possible. I hope I have answered the question.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Honourable Minister for a very satisfactory answer. I might also add that the prices for fresh fish except cod are considerably lower than the prices for which it is on sale—rosefish fillets and other types of fish, considerably lower.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the two last items there seem like a new vote, what is the reason for them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a tendency to have a much greater subdivision of the accounts for the purpose of the estimates year by year, and I think that several of these votes are not new although they appear now for the first time in the estimates as a result of this strong desire on the part of the Treasury to show the estimates in ever greater detail.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, last year that would be included under furnishings and equipment.

MR. BROWNE: Is \$60,000 a reasonable grant for furniture and equipment.

MR. FORSEY: Yes.

1020 Carried.

1021 Fever Hospital:

MR. BROWNE: Have there been any patients in the Fever Hospital during the past year? I understand there are very few cases of infectious diseases.

MR. FORSEY: Yes, there are quite a few patients there all the time. Sometimes during the past year it has been filled. I think we had to use part of it for the overflow of polio patients there one time last summer and last fall.

MR. FOGWILL: Has there been any polio cases reported this year, and could you give the number of cases?

MR. FORSEY: I have heard, I think, of three cases lately.

MR. FOGWILL: In St. John's?

MR. FORSEY: One in St. John's and two in outlying places, in Grand Falls and around that area.

MR. HOLLETT: I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Fever Hospital is filled practically all the time then \$13,000 provisions seems very small. How many patients can that hospital hold?

MR. FORSEY: I would say around thirty.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought it would be more than that—I see.

MR. BROWNE: One other question in regard to polio, Mr. Chairman: I notice the United States Government, I believe, made polio vaccine available to some Canadian Hospitals, (I believe the Province of Alberta is interesting in taking it.) Has the Newfoundland Government had the opportunity of doing that?

MR. FORSEY: It is under consideration at the present time.

MR. BROWNE: You have the offer?

MR. FORSEY: Yes.

Item 1021 Carried.

1022 St. John's Sanatorium:

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell us approximately the number of patients in the sanatorium at the present time?

MR. FORSEY: Six hundred.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the Minister would care to make a statement relative to the success or otherwise of the improved treatment, the new treatments that have been instituted for TB patients—a statement as to whether or not these people are having some measure of success, and then also with regard to the rehabilitation scheme or plans, are they having the desired effect with regard to putting the patients when they come out of the sanatorium back into jobs again?

MR. FORSEY: The instance of TB treatment and the various forms of treatment vary and are having a marked effect. As a matter of fact for the first time in our history we now have vacant beds at the sanatorium, whereas three or four years ago we had to have a waiting list as long as your arm. Somebody who

wanted to get in would probably have to wait two or three months. Today there are vacant beds.

With regard to rehabilitation; yes we have a lot of rehabilitation and I know quite a number of ex-patients are working with government departments. As a matter of fact in the Department of Supply there are a couple, I believe, and last year an ex-patient held the record for the least number of days on sick leave.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that TB rehabilitation organization under the TB Organization or under the Government?

MR. FORSEY: The Government and the TB Organization work jointly and co-operate in an effort to get individuals placed.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is the person in charge of the work?

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Edgar Howse, former principal of Bishop Feild College.

Item 1022 carried.

1023 West Coast Sanatorium:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the establishment of the sanatorium on the West Coast has been largely responsible for the vacant beds here at the St. John's Sanatorium rather than the new drugs? It has something to do with it, I feel sure. How many beds are there in the West Coast Sanatorium?

MR. FORSEY: Two hundred. It would have an effect of course.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the figures are right there then. The cost for the two hundred would be \$645,000 and the cost of the six hundred here only \$990,000.

MR. FORSEY: The cost of supplies are approximately fifteen to twenty per cent higher in Corner Brook than in St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: The prices?

MR. FORSEY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the doctor in charge of the West Coast Sanatorium?

MR. FORSEY: I don't know his name. He is an English or Irish doctor. I forget which.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Minister mean that remark about prices to apply to such things as provisions or linens or services, when he says they are fifteen to twenty per cent higher on the West Coast?

MR. FORSEY: Provisions mainly and also general furnishings.

MR. HOLLETT: Is there any explanation for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just that theirs is a richer economy out there.

MR. FORSEY: And you have not the same type of competition you have here in town.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable the Premier explain what he means by his remark?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I will not explain it—it is fairly obvious.

MR. HOLLETT: I was of the opinion you could not go other places other than Water Street if you wanted to find a rich economy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is rich down there too.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it not a fact it gets richer and richer in Corner

Brook, it is all they talk about out there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: See the wages of the wood and pulp and paper. Forty-three millions this year easily. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee might be agreeable to a short recess.

Before you call the recess, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the presence inside the bar this afternoon of a former district member of the House of Assembly in the person of Mr. Thomas LeFeuvre from the old town of Burin.

Mr. LeFeuvre was elected to be a member of this House from the district of Burin in a by-election that occurred in the year 1911. He was re-elected in a general election in 1913, and sat here for the eight years from 1911 to 1919. In 1919 he did not offer himself as a candidate for re-election.

Mr. LeFeuvre is one of the few remaining old time Tories. He was elected from Burin District as a Tory Member. I believe in those days that district was so strongly Tory that the party of Bond, the Liberal Party, did not even bother to put up a candidate against Mr. LeFeuvre when he ran as the candidate of the Tory Party of that day, under the great Sir Edward, later Lord Morris. It was rather a coincidence that his visit this afternoon coincided with that portion of our proceedings during which the present member for the same district of Burin was, as Minister of Health, piloting the estimates of his department through committee. I am sure that all of us present are delighted to have the presence here of a veteran and a real veteran of the House of Assembly, and I am sure that I speak for both sides of the House when I say that.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear, hear!

Although Mr. Chairman, the Premier spoke for both sides I would like to say a word from this side, because I was born in Burin, and Tom LeFeuvre (Tom I call him, he is young enough yet to be called "Tom")—we think there is nobody else like Tom, never has been and never will be. But I was surprised to learn he was a confirmed Tory, and I think it highly unfair of the Honourable the Premier to call a man that to his face, without his having the privilege to respond.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not mean to insult him. I said "An Old-time Tory"—they were pretty good people.

MR. HOLLETT: Anyway I am very happy to see my old friend "Tom" LeFeuvre here inside the bar. I hope he will be here, if he is a Tory, as the Premier says, representing Burin on that side of the House the next time—after November.

Committee recessed for ten minutes.

1024—Hospital for Mental and Nervous Diseases:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us if there is any waiting list for this institution?

MR. FORSEY: There is quite a waiting list. There are six hundred presently there, and according to Canadian standards we should have hospitalized fifteen hundred, so that there must be quite a few around the country.

MR. BROWNE: There are a lot of patients loose then?

MR. FORSEY: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: In regard to the Mental Hospital I should like to ask a question: Sometime ago, Mr. Chairman, certain people were laid off prior to an inquiry which was held some time ago. Some of these people, I understand, were completely exonerated but have not since been reinstated. As a matter of fact I believe some of them have not been even paid, back pay they are owed. I am quite sure the Minister has some knowledge of that. I have had occasion to go into it, and I wonder if the Minister would care to make a statement in regard to that. There were some 14 people laid off altogether, and some of them were exonerated completely of any charge which had been made. I deem it rather a hardship that these people are not re-instated. It has been over two years now since this happened, and I wonder if the Minister would like to make a statement on it now?

MR. FORSEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if any of them were completely exonerated. But there had not been enough against them to warrant court action, but all of them certainly did things they should not have done, and they were unfortunate in that the thing was long drawn out, because in most places they have been replaced by people who have given better service than these people concerned were giving. It would be, I think, just as much a hardship to dismiss the ones that have been hired on and in some cases people who have been dismissed we are trying to place and will place them when the vacancies occur in the various other institutions.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that has been at least two years ago now, and I am only referring to the charges made against them, and the

Royal Commission set up under Mr. Hunt, and I am referring to a few people who were exonerated according to Mr. Hunt and the Royal Commission. It says so in that report, I read that report, the Government tabled it. I wonder if the Government would consider re-instating these people who were exonerated by Mr. Hunt. I am not referring to those with suspicions against them nor unproven charges against them, but I am referring to those who Mr. Hunt said in his opinion were not guilty of any offences.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, they were exonerated from law-breaking but not from negligence in the strict legal sense of the term. And surely the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would not have men replace reliable employees presently in the hospital with some who have proven unsatisfactory and did not give good service when at the hospital.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not the point. I agree with you there. If you take on a man or a woman who gives good service surely you will hold on to such a person. But I am thinking of the individuals who are hurt in their minds and would be with regard to charges made against them and who were, as I have said before, completely exonerated by Mr. Hunt and the Royal Commission. I feel quite sure the Government would want to do something about that. It is highly unfair, and I think the Government will admit that the position in which some of these fourteen people have found themselves is largely not through their own fault but rather through the fault of somebody higher up who had apparently neglected to insist upon and enforce proper discipline, I think it is highly unfair that any person exonerated by Mr. Hunt and the Royal Commission

should be overlooked and neglected by the Government. I would now make the request that the Government do consider these cases.

MR. FORSEY: They are being considered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much.

MR. BROWNE: There is a new position, Grade VIII. Who has been appointed to that position?

MR. FORSEY: Dr. Walsh.

MR. BROWNE: He has been there a couple of years?

MR. FORSEY: Yes, but he would be promoted, and there has been a new medical doctor hired on in the institution.

MR. BROWNE: There seems to be other medical men down there, under professional, two directors at \$7,000 and four directors at \$6,000, do you know these? There is also one director at \$4,000? That seems to be a very big staff.

MR. FORSEY: Yes, but still inadequate.

MR. BROWNE: You don't know who they are, do you?

MR. FORSEY: I don't know all their names. I know most of them are living-in on the grounds in there.

MR. BROWNE: There is one matter that I would like to mention, i.e. an item for which there is no vote, and for which there has not been a vote. The Board of Commissioners in Lunacy which was set up under the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931, carried the legislation for the creation of this board. I know about it because I sat on it about fourteen



years, as Chairman. Dr. MacPherson act as secretary and Mr. Roy Mercer had been one of the members. I don't think they ever received any recognition of their services. I know I did not. It seems to me they have to do an enormous job for which they should receive some consideration. I know Dr. MacPherson was most faithful in performance of these duties and was very interested in the welfare of the institution and the people concerned there—I think this matter has been overlooked.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, they have never made any request.

MR. BROWNE: Have they not?

MR. FORSEY: No.

Carried.

1026—Gander Hospital.

MR. BROWNE: We often see references in the paper to patients coming out and being treated at Gander Hospital—people coming on planes—do we get anything in grants from anyone else to assist in the running of Gander Hospital?

MR. FORSEY: The air transportation is paid for by the Federal Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the Federal Government also maintain a number of beds at the hospitals or pay for a number of beds to be held in reserve for them at the hospital at Gander?

MR. FORSEY: Yes, for the Department of Transport, and also for the professionals and for the residents.

Carried.

1027—Botwood Hospital:

Carried.

1028—Cottage Hospitals and Nursing Stations:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, have there been many requests from other localities for hospitals?

MR. FORSEY: No the only request I am aware of is from White Bay, but it is intended to extend the hospital at Come-By-Chance and also to build two or three more to take care of the present needs.

MR. BROWNE: Come-By-Chance is very central.

MR. FORSEY: One of the largest hospitals in Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: Has the Government any plans for the erection of any cottage hospitals particularly in the north where there are certain areas inaccessible at the present time?

MR. FORSEY: I am not aware of any, Mr. Chairman, except that I do know the Grenfell Organization are going to extend their services.

MR. BROWNE: I suppose no consideration has been given to the erection of a cottage hospital in Ferryland District—there was some talk of it several years ago.

MR. FORSEY: No.

Carried.

1029—Grants to Non-Government Hospitals:

Carried.

1030—Expansion of Existing Health Services:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister now if he would like to make a statement on the extension of existing services and what form it is to take, in the present year?

MR. FORSEY: This is comprised mostly of a Federal Health grant, and will cover all phases of health in Newfoundland, and will represent extra machinery, polio grants, hospital beds and everything, covering several aspects of health.

Carried.

1031—Geriatric Centre:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, where is the Geriatric Centre?

MR. FORSEY: In the Orthopaedic Hospital.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister say what it means?

MR. FORSEY: The chronically ill, senile people—for diseases of the aged.

Carried.

Department of Public Welfare XI:

1101—Minister's Office—Carried.

1102—General Office:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Assistant-Deputy Minister? I notice four new positions there and an increase in the vote of seventeen thousand.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Stewart Godfrey, Mr. Chairman, is the assistant-deputy minister. There are four increases (1) an officer Grade V being a person who has lately graduated from the school of Social Work and has had much experience in our public welfare work and is attached presently to the City Welfare Office, but is on the general office staff. (2) The increase in the officer Grade III category is due to a transfer from the Department of Health, in as much as we have taken over the transportation of indigent people from various

parts of the province to St. John's for various forms of treatment. The new Grade III officer there has been set up for a special review of records of statutory allowances so that there will be less overpayments and stricter administration and control. There is also a shorthand-typist who was transferred from 1109, Public Assistance, which is unchanged. In the meantime we have integrated that division with the Division of Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances.

MR. HOLLETT: What are the functions of an Officer Grade 1, \$1,200-\$1,500, what is the work involved?

DR. POTTLE: That would be a doorman, Mr. Chairman.

Carried.

1103 Accounting Officer:

Carried.

1104—Registry:

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, that is a joint service operated with the Department of Health. In other words this registry serves both departments. It might be of interest to learn that the department carries now no less than one hundred thousand files for the purpose of records. Honourable members should note that the figures for 1953-54 column should be corrected as follows: Disregard the figures there, or take them as I read them from the top down they should read, 1-2-2-5-2-1-1-1.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, if that is so, as I read them, that means two officers both at \$6,710.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, that will be adjusted accordingly. The figures I read are last year's figures, and I just read them for the record.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the discrepancy there?

DR. POTTLE: There is no discrepancy, Mr. Chairman, because the salaries have been stepped up since last year, and some posts are not always filled. I read the figures, and believe they are correct. 1-2-2-5-2-1-1-1.

MR. HOLLETT: It would appear then as five officers, Grade II, at \$1,500—that makes it worse.

DR. POTTLE: It might make it worse as far as the figures we have here are concerned, but the estimates have been revised for promotions within the service.

Carried.

1106—Regional Welfare Services:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us where these welfare officers are located?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, we have a strength of about seventy welfare officers in all for the province of Newfoundland including Labrador. These are in forty-nine different regional welfare centres where there are either one, two or three welfare officers each, depending on the concentration of the population and upon the spread of the districts. In St. John's, which is obviously the largest, we have a superintendent, a supervisor and twelve welfare officers and in addition a clerical staff.

MR. BROWNE: Maybe the Minister may now tell us the report from one welfare officer.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order—I shall have no further reference to that matter in this House. I shall ask for a ruling

immediately, without any further reference. I would like the support of this House.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to tell the Minister what I referred to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I did not get the gist of what was being said, but if the reference is what I think it would be, it might be better if—

MR. BROWNE: I might restate my question then, Mr. Chairman, as it might clear up the objection. In the course of a previous speech the Minister referred to "unfinished business" and referred in one place to where he had received a report from a welfare officer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The point of order the honourable gentleman knows. And no one knows more completely than he does that it is completely out of order for him to refer in this debate to any things said in a previous debate in the present session. He knows he is out of order, Mr. Chairman, and Your Honour ought to rule him out of order even before he gets the words half through his teeth.

DR. POTTLE: Not another word, Sir, I ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable members will just consider my position for a moment. As every honourable member knows, there should be no reference to a previous debate. That is a very old and well-established parliamentary rule. Furthermore if the honourable member is making a reference to a report of a welfare officer, which may possibly have some reference to a matter which may come before the Courts, I do rule it is out of order altogether, and I would suggest that the committee not lose its sense of proportion.

DR. POTTLE: There is no sense of proportion being lost from this side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is nothing personal in any of my remarks.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I accept your ruling but I do think they will have to be very careful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is just what the Chair said.

MR. HOLLETT: I think you will have to be very careful about how far you are going to go in respect of freedom of speech in this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—is the honourable gentleman in order now in debating your Honours' ruling? Can he go on expressing his opinion on it and drawing inferences from it? Is he in order? May we now have a debate on Your Honour's ruling?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has begun a debate—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the committee—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be ordered by anyone on the opposite side. I am not going to be bawled at by any person on the other side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest we consider now the estimates, the salaries and various welfare officers.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, as a Minister of the Crown I am saying here, now, there will be no reference to this matter—the estimates stop right at this point unless I can be assured.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are considering now the estimate of salaries.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, there are again here a series of typographical errors which I should like honourable members to take notice of so they will have it for their permanent records. The figures should read, on the left-hand column: 1-1-1-6-1. The side note in brackets is a reference to a welfare officer at Corner Brook who is being transferred from the constabulary and remains at his former rate of pay.

MR. BROWNE: Where are the officers on the higher scale located?

DR. POTTLE: That provides for supervisors of welfare workers, that list we have not been able to fill thus far. Last year we sent two people to the University of Toronto for training, which, in addition to the work we had already been able to do, would, we thought, qualify them for this larger rank, so that we have two or possibly three people who are qualified for that rank. Now we propose to send two others this fall to the same institution in order that they may be so qualified. At the present time all the offices in that rank have not been filled, but there are supervisors.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister tell me how many welfare officers there are for Placentia East District?

DR. POTTLE: As a rule, Mr. Chairman, (and I should have said that at the beginning) welfare officers' districts do not coincide with electoral districts. They sometimes overlap. I cannot say at the moment how many correspond to Placentia.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of

Finance): I would say that probably in Placentia District, Placentia East, there are two welfare officers. One whose territory comes into Placentia East on the north side and also has, I think, something to do with Placentia West on the other side of the bay, but all told there are two operating.

**MR. HOLLETT:** In reference to that amount of \$1,100, what is that?

**DR. POTTLE:** That is an allowance for living on the Labrador, hard-living allowance.

**DR. ROWE:** Perhaps, if the Honourable Minister would allow, some three years ago the department experienced considerable difficulty in recruiting staff for Labrador, and the Government decided to give what is called technically a hard living allowance to these welfare officers who went to Labrador. That, incidentally corresponds with Federal policy towards the RCMP and other Federal organizations in all northern territories.

Carried.

1107—Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances:

**MR. FOGWILL:** Mr. Chairman, would the Minister inform the committee of the number of persons receiving allowances under both these headings?

**DR. POTTLE:** The figures change from month to month—take at the end of February, for instance, at the end of this year, figures will not vary very much. There were 3,031 Mothers' Allowances broken down into various classifications—if the honourable member wishes these? I think I should draw attention to one classification

which is very significant, i.e. the number of mothers with incapacitated husbands, which is practically one half of that total number. Mothers with incapacitated husbands make up the largest single quantity of Mothers' Allowances received. If the honourable member wishes to study the matter as a whole I should be glad to give it to him. Now for the same months for dependents' allowances there are 903.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I expect this is the last time they will appear in this form now that the new Act has been passed.

**DR. POTTLE:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition raises a good point, Sir. They will stay in this form until the Social Assistance Act is passed and has become law, and comes into operation because we don't want any suspension of payments. Consequently the Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowances may have to stay on the books for a while until the Social Assistance Act really gets into operation, but as soon as it does then these allowances as such will disappear, and they will fall into one category under the general heading of Social Assistance.

Carried.

1108—Child Welfare:

**MR. BROWNE:** Maintenance of Children \$125,000—are these children kept in foster homes?

**DR. POTTLE:** That vote, Sir, is to take care of foster children who are described as families. There are 511 children in foster homes receiving rates such as I described to the House recently in answer to a question. There are forty-seven children receiving allowances through the Public

Welfare Department in the denominational and other orphanages. There are 558 children receiving foster family allowances; 511 in foster homes and 47 in orphanages.

MR. BROWNE: On that vote for handicapped—are they blind or deaf and dumb?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, there are both blind and deaf mutes there, 88 of them in all; 39 who are taken care of at Halifax Institute for the Blind and 31 in the Halifax Institution for the deaf mute, and 28 at the McKay School for the deaf and dumb in Montreal; 88 in all.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, what steps are taken for the education of these children—do they go to school in the institution or what?

DR. POTTLE: Well the children's education and maintenance are taken care of in each institution where they are boarded at the Government's expense. The cost per child is roughly \$1,000 a year, and this vote will have to be increased in the course of the years in order to take care of the total number we have under consideration, which we believe, Sir, is the total population of children who need that kind of help.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, with respect to handicapped children I would like the Minister to inform the committee; when they have completed their education and have been fitted to take their place amongst the civil population, is it correct to say that quite a number of them are able to earn their own living?

DR. POTTLE: I could not answer the honourable member from the point of view of percentages, Sir, be-

cause I do not know that, but a number of them have; an encouraging number of them have found their way into positions where they can earn their own living; with the help mainly of the Canadian Institute for the Blind, and our own division does an excellent piece of work in that respect. Now I may say this work has been going on with children, and it takes about nine or ten years for a child who has been taken up, say at six years of age, before that child should normally begin to work. These children require anywhere up to nine or ten years training, and consequently we have not been at it long enough, shall I say, to grow an adult population. But those who were taken in somewhat later along the line and have become adults, a number of them have gone into society and are earning their own living or partly their own living. But it is not an easy row to hoe. It is hard enough for a young man or woman in this competitive society to find his way, but it is even more so with regard to any person who is handicapped. But I may say the attitudes of society are very much better in this respect because of the great weight of support brought to bear on their behalf by private societies together with what we have been able to do by way of financial assistance, and in that way a great deal of good has been done.

MR. FOGWILL: When I raise the point, I am personally acquainted with several deaf-mutes who have developed into good citizens, which takes a lot of courage. Quite a few of them are earning their own living today, some of them in shoe-repair departments.

Carried.

1109—Public Assistance:



**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell me if any of these officers are connected with the regional welfare services in St. John's, or where they are located?

**DR. POTTLE:** Sir, the Officer, Grade VII post has been abolished, or shall we say, at least it is not filled. That post was held by Mr. Taylor and it was abolished on paper at least as a result of his going into the Civil Service Commission, and also because we had it in mind, as the House well knows, to integrate some of our allowances into a general scheme. I should like here to pay a tribute to the services of Mr. Taylor who along with Mr. Jardine was one of the chartered members in the sense of the old Public Health and Welfare Department, and gave his services very generously and very faithfully in a very difficult post, the post of relief. He had to carry on the service in many lean and hungry years, and it was not always a "thank-you" job to administer relief in those days. But, as I say, Mr. Taylor did an excellent job. I should like here also to pay tribute to the senior officers, Mr. Jerry Power, Grade V, under Mr. Jardine and the next officer Grade IV, Mr. Slade.

One typist was transferred to the general office, and that makes a total of a reduction of two in the staff.

**MR. BROWNE:** Could the Minister tell us how the situation in as far as able-bodied relief is at the present time, the report on unemployment? Is there a great deal of unemployment?

**DR. POTTLE:** I can only speak again generally, because the reports are always late in being tabulated at departmental headquarters. But the amounts for relief have been going

up, as they do during the winter months, and they did take a precipitous rise somewhere between December and March, but we expect that rate will begin to fall, and there has already been an indication in that direction.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Would the Minister be able to tell us how much was paid out?

**DR. POTTLE:** \$432,000, Sir.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Do you think \$350,000 will be sufficient for this year?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** This is to be a much better year than last.

**MR. BROWNE:** What are the reasons for that?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mainly the fisheries. A couple of thousand men will be fishing this year who were not fishing last year; prices will be quite a bit better this year than last year.

**MR. HOLLETT:** That is a statement such as we all love to hear. We would like for the Honourable the Premier to give an extensive statement on that—our fishermen today need all the encouragement they can get, and in fact can be given to indicate the price of fish will be much better than last year, I would love to hear the Premier.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** And if I were wrong the honourable gentleman would benefit from it in November.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I can't see how anybody could benefit from that.

Carried.

1110—Old Age and Blind Persons' Allowances:

DR. POTTLE: May I say for the information of the committee that there are 5,124 persons on old age pensions and 336 on blind pensions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, there is a most astonishing contrast in that matter between today and the days before we became a Province of Canada. There were 2,999, exactly one person below three thousand who were in receipt of old age pensions, and the total amount was one quarter of a million dollars, speaking from memory, the total amount paid out per year was a quarter of a million dollars, \$250,000. Now we find, according to the Minister, 5,124 between the ages of sixty-five and seventy, but not reaching the age of seventy, receive a total of two million dollars or 1.9 million dollars. Then in addition, according to Federal figures the number receiving old age pensions is twelve thousand, (I think it is twelve thousand) or I am told it is fifteen thousand. That is twenty thousand old persons and a total of nine million dollars against something under a quarter of a million. That is an almost unbelievable contrast, an almost incredible improvement in the status of thousands of us who have reached the age of sixty-five and are in need, and all of us who have reached the age of seventy whether in need or not. It is an astonishing, and, altogether astonishing improvement. It is that and many things like it which make thousands of us who fought for Confederation feel very humble and very grateful to God that we saw the light. It makes us very thankful to God that we saw the light and saw our great dream of making Newfoundland a Province of Canada come true. It is this for which I firmly believe that hundreds of thousands of New-

foundlanders in Heaven must have been praying for us while the Confederation campaign was on. It was a great thing. Even the humblest Newfoundlander, the most unimportant Newfoundlander in the most unimportant little cove in the most unimportant little bay who voted for Confederation did more for his native Newfoundland just by voting for Confederation in the referendum than four-fifths of the public men who have become famous, have done for the common people of Newfoundland, the ordinary people of Newfoundland; by just voting for Confederation—this alone is evidence of that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, every time the Premier gets an opportunity he wishes to rub in about the patriotic spirit of the people who voted for Confederation. Well, there is another side to it. He makes this statement, but he knows he does not want to go into it, or enter into a debate on that subject—it is a wonderful thing the people are getting these old age pensions—but he knows too that if another government had carried on they would not have allowed the old age pensions to remain at the figure they were; they could not do it. The trend all over the world is toward security, every country has it and not only in the past few years even in Canada the United States, and in England. So that there is another side to it, and I do not think he is justified in making the accusation that he does about the incompetency and lack of patriotism of those who did not support his campaign.

Carried.

1111—Home for the Aged and Infirm:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell me

how many inmates there are in the poor asylum at the present time?

DR. POTTLE: There are 118.

MR. BROWNE: Can the Minister tell me how many people are eligible for the home for the aged and infirm and are located in boarding houses outside the City?

DR. POTTLE: I am not sure whether the question is asked in the right form. That information I might say was given in answer to a question asked by the honourable member for St. John's West on May 18, and a copy of the full answer has been given the Opposition Members who have all this information.

MR. FOGWILL: Yes, I have the answer.

DR. POTTLE: The Government has been very, very concerned over this whole question of proper care of the aged and infirm, and we are hoping to make a substantial move forward this year towards improving these facilities and provide better care. I would say anything that is done or any improvements made by the public at large either through denominational effort or any other private source is good news indeed for the aged and infirm in Newfoundland. This problem along with the problem of the care of the mentally defective is one of the primary social and humane problems we have to concern ourselves with in Newfoundland. So I say we in this Government are very much heartened by the moves which are being made in the communities at large towards improved care for these very needy people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I add to what my colleague has said my

own personal feeling of satisfaction that we have in our midst an ecclesiastical statesman who, if I may say it without being misunderstood or being offensive, is a second statesman in Newfoundland today; one a political statesman; and one ecclesiastical statesman deeply concerned in these matters of social welfare. Thanks to the great energy and great vision of the reverend gentleman to whom I have referred at this moment, this community is shortly to have not one but several institutions engaging in the work which to my honourable friends and my own belief is a great labour of love, and to the reverend gentleman to whom I refer it is, I happen to know, also a matter of a great labour of love.

A government after all only provides those social institutions because and only when others fail to do so. There was a time when the only hope you had of getting an education was from or in a school provided by a church; the only alms you got were the alms provided by a church; the only recreation you got or entertainment you had, the facilities were provided by a church; and the only succor in old age or in great infirmity was what you got from a church. Now that disappeared to an enormous extent, leaving it to the state almost entirely to provide these things for the people who needed them. To see churches re-admit, re-accept their responsibility is a satisfactory experience, and we in this country have seen in the past year or so a most definite trend in that direction. For one I will commend it. I feel that all of us in this House, on both sides, will commend that trend and welcome that move. I believe that the Treasury, the Government, will be asked to assist in that good work, and I am

sure that the whole House would wish, if, as and when we are asked, that we would accede to all reasonable requests for help from the public funds for work of that character carried on by religious bodies of whatever denomination they may be, and on equal terms as between one religious body and another.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all appreciate the words the Premier has said about the movement instituted by His Grace the Archbishop for the erection of a home for the aged and infirm which will accommodate about one hundred and sixty people and cost about one half million dollars. His Grace has the support of the Catholic Community in all his social efforts. About three hundred thousand dollars have been collected towards the projects. For those who are familiar with the conditions under which those people are presently living I think it will be good news because the institution as comprised will give them every care and every comfort and place them on a scale far better than what they are receiving at the present time either at the Home for the Aged and Infirm or any of the other institutions.

DR. POTTLE: In the meantime we are carrying on as well as we can in a very outmoded setting. The institution is no credit to any administration. The question is when will its turn come? We hope it has come now. In the meantime we are trying to extend our staff here, and I would like to record two things (1) my tribute to the staff who have carried on in such circumstances for their energy and their devotion to their work. The staff of the infirmary are wonderful people, and they deserve the tribute of this House which I am trying to express now. The second

thing I would like to say is that we have been very encouraged also by the support of the various bodies such as Rotary, the Civil Service Association and the Newfoundland Government Employees Association and other groups as well who from time to time, in season and out of season throughout the year, have made the lives of these inmates more comfortable and enjoyable than they otherwise might have been. I should like to pay this tribute, Sir, both to the staff and to the community who have expressed their beliefs in such encouraging and useful ways.

Carried.

#### 1112—Infants Home:

MR. BROWNE: I believe, Mr. Chairman, these are all covered by salary increases as given before?

Carried.

#### 1113—Boys' Home and Training School:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the Minister intends to mention it, but he ought to say that every Newfoundlander who visited the new Boys' Home and Training School at Whitbourne is just bursting with pride in its magnificence. Every such Newfoundlander just puffs his chest out with satisfaction and pride. It is splendid; a beautiful building. The grounds are beautiful and the work that is being done is excellent. If he builds no other monument than that one, he, the present Minister of Welfare, has built that monument to his name.

MR. BROWNE: How many boys are in there now?

DR. POTTLE: There are accommodations, Mr. Chairman, for forty

boys, and there will be close to that number there now.

MR. BROWNE: Of what ages?

DR. POTTLE: Eleven and twelve to seventeen. They go on beyond seventeen up to eighteen and nineteen. The average age is fourteen plus.

MR. BROWNE: How long are they kept there?

DR. POTTLE: That depends on individual progress. Sometimes the institution finds it is not the place for the boy at all.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the man in charge?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Johnson Brown and Mrs. MacCormack.

MR. FOGWILL: It must have a very efficient staff?

DR. POTTLE: They are a good working team. I may say in addition to the training which we may think of, say, as academic, it takes various forms, farm training, leather work, wood work, hobby shop and photography which we are introducing shortly. The report, which is extensive, is now in the course of preparation and should shortly be released, in which case honourable members will have a chance to see the whole picture. I may say they have 93 hens and produced 1,075 dozen eggs last year, and 375 barrels of potatoes, 25 tons of hay, cabbage, carrots, and other crops. I may say we have just settled in there and are trying to get maximum results from the facilities we have there.

MR. BROWNE: Is it located on Sir Robert Bond's Estate?

DR. ROWE: I think the Minister

has been almost a little over modest in describing what is happening out there, I feel about it myself very deeply because I was the lucky, and I say "lucky" individual selected by the Government to take over that estate from Bond and also the Minister who selected the site out there on which the school is built. In my opinion, the training these lads are getting out there, while some of it may fall on barren ground, in general, the training these boys get on that beautiful estate, working in the fields, raising livestock and with recreations which are almost ideal, and the training, many of these unfortunate boys get if not the best is certainly amongst the best in all of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would suggest that any member of the House on either side who could spare a day should take a drive over to Whitbourne and see that school. On a Sunday a few weeks ago I arrived there just around lunch time. They got up a lunch for me and for my party, four of us, and I believe any member of the House who arrived over there would receive a meal. Unless it is meal time it will probably be a cold one, but it will be a good meal. And I am sure any member of the House would be made welcome and would be shown over the institution. I think every member ought to visit that institution and go through it.

MR. FOGWILL: I would like to ask the Minister how large is the area surrounding the Boys' Home and Training School? I understand it is quite an area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About four square miles.

MR. FOGWILL: There is quite a bit of birch on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some, yes, which is being cut for the plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report progress, and beg leave to sit again presently.

On motion the committee rose and reported having passed items 800 through 821, Department of Mines and Resources; under the Heading of Public Health all the estimates and under the heading, Public Welfare items 1101 through 1113 inclusive.

Report received. On motion committee ordered sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 of the clock, and the Orders of the Day not being completed I now leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

House recessed until 8:00 P.M.

#### NIGHT SESSION

June 4, 1954.

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. COURAGE (Chairman of Committee): The item that the committee has under consideration is item No. 11, Department of Public Welfare, page 59, item No. 11 to 14.

MR. BROWNE: How many girls are in this home?

DR. POTTLE: The number of girls at maximum accommodation is fifteen but the number goes down as far as five and six. The last count they had nine. I may say with regard to this institution that it is a small institution as the vote indicates and has over the years since the institution has been set up taken care of a variety of girls including neglected girls from

homes where neglect was established as well as outright delinquent girls. Unfortunately, in a sense therefore, we have had to make the institution house different and somewhat incompatible classes of girls. The numbers have been very small. My own hope would be that we could do without the institution altogether. My own hope would be that until our plans for treating adult women develop we might abolish this home and house our girls in special private homes under special probation care and in the case of the most difficult girls, we may have to find some other means of institutionalization, whether outside of Newfoundland or otherwise. I am not in a position now to say but it is conceivable that if our probation services are well carried out we might be able to do without this institution problem altogether. I would like to think that was so in any case because we are carrying on a fairly heavy overhead for a very few girls. That is my answer.

MR. BROWNE: If you did not have the number of girls there, you did not spend all that money.

MR. HIGGINS: Might I ask the Minister one question, is there any charge made to the people who go to that home? Is there anything in the way of recovery realized?

DR. POTTLE: Normally no, although provisions are made in the Act for parents to make contributions. As our financial records show, we did take in a considerable sum from the parents of children committed to us.

MR. FOGWILL: Who is the officer in charge of these girls?

DR. POTTLE: The officer in charge is Miss Rendell.



MR. FOGWILL: How long has she been in charge?

DR. POTTLE: She was the Assistant before the Superintendent left. Miss Murphy is now in the States.

MR. FOGWILL: Miss Murphy was a very suitable person.

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

Items carried.

Item 15 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope the Committee has taken notice of the fact that the grant for orphanages has been increased. The rate of the grant has been increased from \$12.50 a head to the sum of \$15.00. Now I feel that although this is an improvement of \$2.50 a person it is not sufficient of an increase and if we come back to the House a year hence asking endorsement of our Act in increasing it beyond \$15.00 I hope we will receive that endorsement. I can't say, I have not consulted with my colleagues in the matter and I really don't know what will be the reaction but if we do come back a year hence I hope we will have our action approved.

DR. ROWE: I seem to recall that it was increased two years ago.

DR. POTTLE: Yes from \$10.00 to \$12.00.

MR. BROWNE: There is a matter of family allowances. Have any steps been taken by the Government with the Department of National Health and Welfare to have family allowances instituted?

DR. POTTLE: In common with other provinces we have made representations with the proper authorities about this matter but we cannot advise the Federal Government respect-

ing family allowances which will not regard institutions as parents. We have to go on as we are I am afraid unless there is a concerted effort made by the other provinces to approach the Federal Government. The Federal Government has not yet recognized these institutions as parents and consequently we are in the position of other provinces which operate these institutions.

Carried.

Item No. 16.

MR. BROWNE: There is a vote of \$6,500 for the John Howard Society. I do not think the organization is new. It has come under the Department of Welfare before, has it not? I seem to remember it.

DR. POTTLE: The entire vote described generally as miscellaneous is a very good illustration of the way the Department or the Government relates itself to the efforts of these bodies. If the Government had to carry on these services they would cost a great deal more than these bodies who depend in their several ways on the generosity of the public. The Canadian National Institute for the Blind receives a grant of \$15,000.00 annually. We made the grant of \$15,000.00 in November and since that vote was set in force we have raised the vote to \$20,000.00 and we shall have to ask to raise that amount. The Cowan Mission records our contribution in another field with regard to the care of aged people. Professional training speaks for itself and illustrates our continuous concern in preparing our staff to do a special job here as we go by. The rehabilitation of T.B. persons is another to which we are happy to subscribe \$15,000.00. It is a vote for rehabilitation of

people who have been discharged from the Sanatorium. There is very lively interest and excellent progress being made to enable these people to come back on their feet in more ways than one.

With regard to the vote which the learned member across the way mentions, the John Howard Society, it enters here for the first time as a separate vote. We have covered it in another way ever since it began. It began under the Department of Public Welfare and came within the jurisdiction of the Department, but our view is that while we started it, or helped to start it, our thought was to move out as fast as possible, as fast as we could from direct involvement in the society and to permit them to go on as if they were on their own. That is easier said than done. This Society works in a public field and it is not easy yet for the public to catch all of this question of rehabilitation of prisoners. They have ample claims made upon them and it is one of the liveliest societies we have. Up until this year we provided from our own Welfare Officers the executive officer of the Society. We gave them Mr. Arthur Hurley as executive officer of that organization.

We also provided the Society with rent free rooms on Duckworth Street in our Family Court, City Welfare building. We gave them also a grant of one thousand dollars which they will use for the rehabilitation of prisoners. The time came when they felt they should be given a little more independence and if they were given a vote to hire their own man and go their own way it would leave them free to develop their own organization a little more independently of government fostering. We were glad to do

that. The vote now appears for the first time in the estimates.

**MR. BROWNE:** Has the Minister got anything to say how it is getting on?

**DR. POTTLE:** I thought I already indicated. The report of the Society is published in the press and it is not over optimistic to say they are doing a most constructive job in a difficult field.

Item carried.

Item 1117 carried.

Item 1118 carried.

Item 1119:

**MR. HOLLETT:** What was the revenue for those affairs?

**DR. POTTLE:** See Rentals and Revenue.

**MR. HOLLETT:** It states \$365,000.00.

**DR. POTTLE:** This is the first full year we have tried this and the difficulties have been worked out, so we are trying to operate—

**MR. HOLLETT:** Film, radio and library have been cut out. Does it come under some vote?

**DR. ROWE:** A word of explanation will be in order. I happen to know that the Department of Education, through the Audio Visual Division, is doing a very splendid service on the Labrador with these films and it would seem that this cutting out of films from the Department of Welfare is based on the fact that Education is doing a good job. I would take this opportunity as the Member for Labrador District to express my appreciation to the Department of Welfare generally and the

Department of Labrador Affairs in particular for services they are giving to the people who occupy that tremendous stretch of coast on the Labrador. During the last half hour I have looked at the books in the library, books provided for our own Esquimaux people and I could not help but recognize the neglect among these Esquimaux people and the general care and service we are giving our people in the northern part of Labrador.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder is the Federal Government taking full responsibility for the Indian population on Labrador?

DR. POTTLE: We face an unusual problem in regard to the Indian population. It is an unfortunate one. On the Mainland the Indians are wards of the Government and here they are full fledged settlements and as the member for the District has indicated on other occasions, their welfare is being at least reasonably well taken care of and this is an undertaking of the local authorities. I had intended to say and occasion now arises, that in the Department of Public Welfare we are merely the pools of information from the various parts, so it is not one Department working, it is one Department focusing the efforts of a number of Departments. We have five at least concerned and we have a capable committee of Ministers who are continuously watching the development of Labrador settlements. Two or three or four features I should mention on that point. First with regard to supplies to the different depots, we have the stock, we have better stock there now than ever before both with regard to variety and volume. The volume of stock supplied to Labrador depots has doubled since 1939. While

up to this very year the Government has been in the shipping and transportation business in the Northern Labrador, I would say no to permanently carrying on in this manner because we are not qualified to do so. This year the C.N.R. has taken over the whole transportation service for Northern Labrador Area, and details have been worked out and the whole scheme will get into operation this year.

Now there is another point I wish to make: This year, also beginning April 1, the Government of Canada will undertake a ten year general health rehabilitation programme in Northern Labrador, not least of all for Indians, who are most susceptible to diseases but including Indians and Eskimos, and conduct a particularly vigorous anti-TB campaign, and a general health programme, which will be the first comprehensive step towards rehabilitation. Another point is that the Government of Canada, up to a limit of two hundred thousand dollars, will share the expenditure on health, welfare and education as to capital investment down there such as schools, nursing stations, and the like. The Government of Canada is subscribing two-thirds and we one-third. I mention this as an indication of the continued interest we have in that very considerable section of our province.

I just have one more comment to make, Sir, and that is as to where it looks on the surface as though there had been a very considerable increase, i.e. an increase of staff from 16 to one of 25. That is now shown here for the first time. Hitherto it was shown in a block vote for Labrador, and the details had not been shown.

Carried.

1120—Corrections:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, where is this carried on, in institutions?

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, there is a Director of Corrections. I gave the honourable member the information but I shall have to refresh his memory again: The Director of Corrections is Oliver J. Walling of the University of British Columbia who was recommended highly to us by a person who knew our situation at first hand, and he is doing a very fine piece of work with us not only in collaboration with the Attorney General but also in the community. The idea there Sir; the Director of Corrections takes his authority from an Act of the Legislature, i.e. the Corrections Act; the division is set up within the Department of Public Welfare, but his business is, amongst other things, to assist in the proper training of children who have been committed to the training schools, so that the training schools come under his notice. He also has to have special regard for the training and rehabilitation of adult offenders, so that he works in very close co-operation with the institutions for adult offenders and acts as a liaison officer between us in this field and the Department of the Attorney General. The prevention of crime and delinquency falls under his direction also. There is a correction to be made in the second line. It should be Officer Grade IV and not Grade V.

Carried.

Board of Liquor Control, XII:

1201—Administration: Carried.

1202—General Office.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the normal increase there? Is there anything special?

MR. POWER: No, it would be in line with the increase given in those grades, Sir.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister why the Board of Liquor Control does not engage more staff at times like Christmas, just take on a temporary staff. I have myself gone to the controllers sometimes and have seen a line-up there, and one has to wait hours before getting served. I wonder would it be a reasonable suggestion to make, to suggest that the Board take on more staff at these particular times.

MR. POWER: Well, we considered that many times. But the difficulty is, that, if you take on extra staff at Christmas you must have trained staff, and they are not easy to get for a temporary staff. We would certainly have to keep them on once we have them at all for twelve months. Apart from special seasons such as Christmas and Easter there would be very little for them to do. The staff there now is sufficient for the normal work, and people should get there a little earlier around Christmas time.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I take it this Director Grade II is the General Manager?

MR. POWER: That is Mr. French, yes.

MR. HIGGINS: I notice this year he has had a healthy increase in salary, but I notice he is amongst the very lowest directors. He is a man who to my knowledge is a very competent person, and has been in that particular job for a good many years. Is that as high as he can go in the service? Can he move up to Grade III or anything else? Is that

the maximum for him after all these years?

MR. POWER: No. Mr. French was getting, I think, when he was there \$4,600 a year, and since then he has been raised to \$5,300. I think that is the top of the scale. I agree with the honourable member for St. John's East, Mr. French is a very excellent man. When I went to the Board of Liquor Control I found that the administration there was excellent, and he was responsible for setting it up.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the Minister perhaps give some consideration to Mr. French's future?

MR. POWER: I will.

MR. HIGGINS: Thank you!

Carried.

1203—Sales and Miscellaneous:

MR. HOLLETT: Under this item, could the Minister explain the distribution of beer through the country. There are agents in various part of the country who distribute the beer, I have been told. I wonder would the Minister explain just how it happens?

MR. POWER: Up to last year the brewers appointed their own agents all over the country. We decided to change that because it would give us more control over the item. So that now they have probably a couple of hundred agents operating all over the country, and these agents are responsible for their conduct to the Board of Liquor Control now rather than to the brewers. The imported beer is sold directly by the Board to the agents. Two agents of mainland breweries are on the Board and they sell to the Board without any in be-

tween and the Board sells to the public without any in between.

MR. BROWNE: I notice here an item for extra assistance, \$27,000. Is that seasonal assistance or what?

MR. POWER: During the rush season we sometimes have to take on additional help, temporary workers, trucking too.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, there is a Trade Commissioner visiting now Portugal and Spain—we used to get a great deal of Spanish wine, I know, and still get some. Would it be possible to include in the purchases we make abroad an order for Spanish and Portuguese wines and spirits?

MR. POWER: Well, the famous Newman Wine is Portuguese Wine, and I think that is the biggest seller by far of any European wine.

MR. BROWNE: If it were made a little cheaper, there would be more of it used.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who wants more of it used?

MR. BROWNE: Wine is not as intoxicating.

Carried.

Department of Municipal Affairs & Supply, XIII:

1301—Minister's Office:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if this would be the proper place to raise the question of a problem that exists at Jerseyside Placentia between a person who has a home in the vicinity of Larkins Pond—is there any way of getting these councils to come together periodically, the Placentia, Jerseyside and Freshwater Councils, in order to solve any problems like the one I mentioned.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, that does not come under 1301. I cannot give any answer to that except the answer I gave some time ago. The matter is under consideration and for the moment we are held up by the matter of compensation for the property.

Carried.

1302—General Office:

MR. BROWNE: There is a new appointment there?

MR. HEFFERTON: That has not yet been made. It is under consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Has the work of the department decreased with the removal of the price control?

MR. HEFFERTON: The removal of the price control has not made very much difference because other factors have taken up the slack caused by the removal of price control.

Carried.

1311—Municipal Affairs Administration:

Carried.

1312—Local Government Affairs:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I see an item there (03) Plebiscites, \$500. I wonder if the Minister would inform us under what particular clause of the Act was the plebiscite ordered in Bonavista Area relative to the town council there?

MR. HEFFERTON: Under the Election Act, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: Which Election Act?

MR. HEFFERTON: The General Election Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Is there provision for it in the Election Act? Provision for holding plebiscites under town councils?

MR. HEFFERTON: Maybe.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister would tell me what section?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot. I may say under the Election Act a plebiscite may be held for any particular purpose.

MR. HOLLETT: I am referring to the plebiscite held in Bonavista last year. Would the Minister be able to say on whose advice it was ordered and the reason for it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Under my advice.

MR. HOLLETT: I was asking the Minister but the Honourable the Premier answered. Perhaps the Premier would tell me under what particular section it comes? Or under what particular section of the Act the advice was given?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I gave no advice under any Act. I gave advice. I did not look under any Act under which to give it. I just gave it to the Cabinet.

MR. HOLLETT: The point I want to raise is—are any other councils in danger of being subject to any such treatment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any council created by fraud, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that an admission that the one in Bonavista was created by fraud?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not an admission. It is an assertion.

MR. HOLLETT: That it was



created by fraud under Government supervision?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly, precisely, indubitably.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, I won't have anything more to say. If it was created by fraud under the supervision of the Government I don't need to say anything more.

MR. BROWNE: You would not wish to elaborate, I presume?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—I would not wish.

MR. HOLLETT: Had there been a promise made to the people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The promise was made after the matter was discussed in Cabinet.

MR. HOLLETT: I put it to the Honourable the Premier that the matter was raised during the Federal election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least eighteen months prior to when the announcement of the plebiscite was made. Prior to the election and during the election both.

MR. HOLLETT: Why was not that announcement made eighteen months before?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because we took time to consider and investigate.

MR. HOLLETT: I see it was purely coincidental.

MR. SMALLWOOD: More or less. Timing is always important.

Carried.

1313—Price Control: No vote.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is there a rent control now? I don't see any vote.

MR. HEFFERTON: No. Rent control has gone out and has been transferred to housing.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the Minister, Mr. Chairman, break down this remuneration to the rent board. Is that one, two or three persons?

MR. HEFFERTON: There are more than one person on the rent control apart from civil servants. There is the chairman plus one or two members, it may vary. At the present time, I believe, there is only one. The chairman, I believe, received \$1,500 and members \$1,200.

1315—Housing:

MR. BROWNE: There are a number of new votes here. Housing Director Grade I, \$4,900, etc. In all the vote has increased from \$32,000 to \$83,000. I wonder would the Minister explain the reason for the large increase there?

MR. HEFFERTON: First of all there is the director who is the person in charge of the price and rent control boards. Officer Grade V is the accountant in our office. Houses and Subsidies: \$17,500 represents the part we pay for subsidized rentals of which we have roughly 340 at Westmount and 145 at Empire Avenue.

We have a sort of arrangement with the Municipal Council whereby we have at the present time a staff of three planners and two assistants, and we have given a vote of \$15,000 towards that. The amount of \$26,000 is explained by the fact that when the St. John's Housing Corporation started, the St. John's City Council voted and invested, I believe, one million dollars in the project, and sold a bond issue for that amount. Within recent years the Government has taken

over that part of the City Bond Issue because the city has given up its interest in the corporation as such. That amount of \$26,000 there is our payment against all that bond issue. Interest, Co-operative Housing \$6,000—of course these are the various payments made.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister would allow me to revert to (02) Municipal Planning? I think it is a fact, Sir, that this municipal planning and these three officers referred to have arrangements with the St. John's Municipal Council. In fact their services are available to all municipalities throughout the province, that is not just the city.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right. I am sorry if I omitted that. It is not entirely municipal.

Carried.

1331—Supply Administration:

Carried.

1332—Purchasing:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on this vote could the Minister tell us if there are any rules about what shall be tendered for, how high a figure has to be or the volume of articles before tenders are called? Are there any rules on that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Only the general rule, Mr. Chairman, every single item is tendered for. I want to make this exception. Suppose we get a manufacturers price list as we very often do, suppose we get a price list today and we want some similar article tomorrow, we don't send out and get another price list for every order. As a matter of fact everything goes on tender supposing it is only a dozen matches.

MR. HOLLETT: That does not seem to correspond to the feeling we had relevant to supplies to institutions in places like Corner Brook. I believe we were informed that arrangements for purchases were made by arrangements with local merchants and no tenders were issued.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is perfectly correct. If there is an apparent inconsistency, I was thinking of supplies which are needed for all establishments around St. John's. In regard to outport stations we are just not able to do that, and so have to depend on the local supply.

MR. HOLLETT: I am going to raise the point—I feel you are in error there. Is it not possible that the goods for the cottage hospital at Corner Brook, Twillingate and other places could be gotten by tender? After all if you are going to make such an arrangement you are putting yourself in the position where you could be accused of politics. I know you would not be guilty of such a thing. I suggest that through tenders is the only possible way for supplies of that nature to be purchased.

MR. HEFFERTON: As far as hospitals are concerned many of the hospitals have their own purchasing agent appointed under the supervision of the Health Department and those purchases are based on competitive prices on particular articles in a particular area. Here there are only certain larger supplies that come from Supply, and then it is a matter of general tenders.

MR. BROWNE: Who is the deputy-minister of Supply now?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Crummey.

Carried.

1333—Printing, Stationery and Office Supplies.

MR. BROWNE: Would the Minister say the new roto printing machine in the Crown Lands Department will cut down on this?

MR. HEFFERTON: When fully operating it may possibly cut down but certainly it is not going to take care of all our demands.

DR. ROWE: May I say it was only about two weeks ago this new machine actually started production, and we really have had no time to see how it will—

MR. BROWNE: I know the machine, and know it is an amazing machine and can do a lot of work.

Carried.

Department of Fisheries & Co-operatives, XIV:

1401—Minister's Office:

Carried.

1411—General Office:

Carried.

1421—Fisheries Administration:

MR. HOLLETT: The deputy-minister of Fisheries—I note there is some change from last year—are these contractual officers and the deputy-minister of Fisheries one and the same person?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable Minister explain why it is put in in that particular way?

MR. KEOUGH: The deputy-minister is contractual at \$15,000 a year. The honourable member will note

that under the year 1953-54 the salary was set down at \$12,000 and also contractual officer \$3,000. This year in order to set down in the same way, the deputy-minister's salary, which you will find in the back of the book, \$8,500 and also we have the contractual officer placed at a figure to make up the balance. We have not reduced the salary.

MR. HOLLETT: He still gets the fifteen thousand dollars, I see. It is just another way of putting it there.

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, a financial arrangement for the estimates.

MR. HOLLETT: For what period is that?

MR. KEOUGH: Began in 1951 and was made for five years.

MR. HOLLETT: The deputy-minister has been absent from the province for some time. Was he on particular business, does the Minister care to tell me?

MR. KEOUGH: The Minister would not care to tell beyond saying he was on government and departmental business.

Carried.

1422—Fisheries Production Engineering:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask who is the director of fisheries?

MR. KEOUGH: Colin Story.

MR. FOGWILL: What are the duties? What do they do?

MR. KEOUGH: The duties of this division, they are rather long. It may be boiled down to this, to keep in touch with the development of all new types of fishery gear, equipment

and machines and depots and keeping in touch with new technical developments in filleting processes and in the fisheries industry generally and the duties of the Director would be accordingly.

Item 1422 \$16,000.00.

MR. KEOUGH: You will recall that in 1953 the Government made an advance of \$1.50 a quintal on salt codfish. All of that advance could not be paid in 1953 because there were some fishermen who had fish of 1953 production who would not be able to sell it until 1954. This is to clean up any over balance carried on by fishermen.

MR. FOGWILL: What is the total amount advanced on 1953 production approximately?

MR. KEOUGH: The last time I checked it was somewhat over \$900,000 possibly \$920,000 or \$940,000. Our calculation is that it will cost about \$1,000,000 on 700,000 quintals.

MR. FOGWILL: Have any recoveries been made from the Federal Government?

MR. KEOUGH: Not as yet. Proceedings for recovery are being worked out.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point I have said that is one of the wisest things the Government has done. They have helped many a fisherman over the winter. In view of that fact and in view of the present situation throughout the country in fishing areas, I was wondering if the Government would be able to make any statement which would give some encouragement to those men who prosecuted the fishery last year and those two thousand extra men?

MR. KEOUGH: That would be a question concerning overall Government policy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am only prepared to say at the moment that the fishermen of Newfoundland are well aware, if for no other reason than the reason we did make an advance of one million dollars — they need not fear, the Government of Newfoundland are quite willing and quite eager to stand behind the fishermen in any pinch. They are also very well aware that the Government of Canada are equally with them and stand behind them in a pinch and with two governments ready to stand behind them I think the people of Newfoundland, with some exceptions perhaps, have a feeling of confidence that will carry them through the fishing operations of this year.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it that their efforts this year will be rewarded in that the market will not bring a limited price, and that the Government will not fall down on their obligation to them. That is the substance of the statement and I am sure we are glad to hear the Premier say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sure I must not allow the other gentleman to put anything in my mouth.

MR. BROWNE: The vote has been dropped last year for Vocational Training. Is there any vocational training going on at the present time?

MR. KEOUGH: You will find it under another heading.

Carried.

Item 1423:

MR. BROWNE: Who is the Director of Economic Research?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Bruce Feather.

MR. FOGWILL: Item 1423, (03), (01), Market Research and Consumer Education. What does he mean by Consumer Education?

MR. KEOUGH: Consumer Education would be the education of the public to eat more fish.

MR. FOGWILL: To eat more fish foods?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes, demonstrators for women's groups and restaurant operators.

MR. FOGWILL: Will any pamphlets or booklets be issued on those lines?

MR. KEOUGH: Not by the Department but perhaps to assist some other organizations.

MR. HOLLETT: On the item Fisheries Research I noticed the salary is \$7,500. I was of the opinion it was more than that. There is no post laid down in the estimates to cover the duties of Assistant Deputy Minister. If this is done by the Deputy Minister what does he get for that and where is it shown?

MR. KEOUGH: The fact of the matter is that he is contractual at \$7,500. He performs the duties of Assistant Deputy Minister with additional remuneration. That is why the post is not shown.

Carried.

Item 1424:

MR. BROWNE: Vessel Construction and Inspection. There are two new appointments. One administrative Officer with salary of \$5,000 and another officer Grade 7 with salary of \$4,500. Where are the vessels being constructed?

MR. KEOUGH: Actually the Department is not constructing any vessels. The Government pays a ship building bounty of \$90.00 a ton on fishing vessels and \$30.00 a ton on trading vessels. Part of the duties of this Division is administering the Ship Building Bounty Act under the Minister. The Loan Board, the Fisheries Loan Board, is acting for the Federal Department of Fisheries for the payment of subsidy on vessels for the dragger and long liner class from forty-five to sixty feet. This subsidy is \$65.00 a ton. Usually the Department, that is the Federal Department, before paying this subsidy will require specified plans but by agreement with the Department which will expire in 1955 the Federal Department is prepared to accept lines drawn and so forth, in place of fully prepared plans. The Division also advises the Fisheries Loan Board re the suitability of vessels that come before it for prospective loan applications and of things having to do with fisheries vote.

MR. BROWNE: How much bounty was paid last year?

MR. KEOUGH: I do not know off hand. Did I not supply an answer to that already?

MR. BROWNE: The shipbuilding plant at Clarendville has stopped operating. Does the Minister know that?

MR. KEOUGH: I was quite aware of that. It is a private operation.

MR. HOLLETT: I was wondering if that item, Fisheries Economic Research, if that will not eventually come under the newly appointed fishery authorities.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman has put his finger on quite a problem. The Fisher-

ies Development Authority has not settled in the job long enough for its functions to be fully rounded out. While estimates were being prepared the question was raised whether or not some functions presently being performed be more appropriately transferred to the Fishery Authority. Some will be transferred and votes will then appear under Authority vote. By introducing that bill in the House I might have gone a long way to voicing myself out of a job. Mr. J. A. Currie is the Director.

MR. HOLLETT: You will hardly be out of a job?

MR. KEOUGH: I just say it may.

Carried.

Item 1425.

Carried

Item 1426.

MR. HOLLETT: Where are these training schools? Are these the ones where they go around the country teaching?

MR. KEOUGH: Cecil White is the Instructor for Diesel Engineering.

MR. HOLLETT: There are four officers there and the total is only \$6,800.

MR. KEOUGH: That is a misprint. That four should be a two.

Carried.

Item 1451.

MR. BROWNE: We come to the Co-operative Branch of this and there are three votes. I wonder if the Minister can give an idea what has been going on?

MR. KEOUGH: I too have to put it that way. In November 1951 or

1952 I announced at a conference held in Grand Falls that the government would withdraw from the field of Co-operatives in favour of co-operative unions as rapidly as possible, as these organizations gave evidence of being able to take over these functions and the government would stay only in the field of Registry which deals with Registry Inspection. Since that time we have been gradually taking off the staff of the Co-operative Extension Division and building up the staff of Registry Division. The Co-operative Extension Division is really carrying on a holding operation which would be servicing the existing movement to the extent that it can give advice and other assistance required and to hold the line until the extension department can take over.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is the Director of Co-operative Extension?

MR. KEOUGH: William Compton.

Carried.

Item 1452:

MR. BROWNE: Are there any field workers now engaged in co-operative societies?

MR. KEOUGH: There are six men in the field.

Carried.

Item 1453.

MR. BROWNE: Has the minister the figures giving the number of societies registered in the different branches, credit societies and so forth?

MR. KEOUGH: Not at hand. It could be secured from the Registry in a number of days. The Registry is functioning under difficulty. The head of the Registry has been seriously ill. He has been with the co-



operative movement for a long time and performed good service in the Registry. I hope he recovers as he would be a great loss to the movement.

MR. HOLLETT: I join in this expression. I know him, and he is very good and very efficient. The Department would suffer greatly if he cannot return to work soon.

Carried.

Item 1501—Departmental of Economic Development.

Carried.

Item 1502:

MR. HOLLETT: I note the Deputy Minister of Mines, that is Mr. Howse, is it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I referred to that this afternoon.

MR. BROWNE: What is the position of the department as to the Development Programme, has it slowed down? Would the Honourable Minister care to make a statement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Department of Economic Development was never created to deal solely with industrial development. It was created to be a department whose responsibility was roundly, widely, general economic development of which industrial development would form one part, but only one part. The industrial development side of economic development, as the honourable and learned member suggests, slowed down in the sense of creating new industrial enterprises, but only in that sense. The other activities of the department continue on the broader general economic development and it is, although small, quite streamlined. It is an extremely busy

department and I hope it will always be an extremely busy department.

MR. FOGWILL: The Honourable Minister was asked if he cared to make a statement. I would like to ask a question regarding the Gypsum Plant. Is the Gypsum Plant in full operation at present?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not in full operation at present and is not likely to be in full operation for another two years. The position is rather obvious to any one who is at all familiar with industrial processes. It is a plant that is designed to operate in three shifts, twenty-four hours a day around the clock. That, of course, calls for three shifts of workers, skilled workers, efficient workers. They begin with one shift and with certain key skilled men, key technicians in charge of that one shift. They then took on Newfoundlanders to make up the shift, that one eight-hour shift. The problem was to get that one shift trained with sufficient skill, experience, speed and dependability generally to operate one shift with at least fifty per cent capacity. You can operate one shift with the machine running at a certain speed; all the machines are geared together, the machines that grind up the gypsum rock. There is no point in grinding more rock than you need.

As the process goes right along from the crushing of the rock to the finished wallboard emerging from the great dryer which is about two hundred and fifty feet long. At every stage in the processes all of the equipment must be geared together, not by keys and gears but geared together by co-ordination and speed. Equipment that may turn out say 50,000 square feet for a shift may be running at a speed whereby the staff of the shift

will turn out 20,000 square feet in eight hours. The job is to get that same shift trained to turn out thirty and forty thousand and fifty thousand square feet. But if you do that you have to do the same thing with a second shift, because if you produce your maximum on one shift you are producing one-third the capacity of that plant. If your two shifts turn out what it is capable of turning out then production is two-thirds of capacity. To get full production you have to get three shifts working at maximum. You must have the shift crew trained so that every man is virtually perfect or reasonably so and then you have your plant hitting on all cylinders. They began with one shift but by the month of August 1953 they had trained the one shift sufficiently to be able to take some of them off that shift as key men on a second shift and take on green men on the first shift, and some green men on the second shift. They trained enough men on the first shift to divide them into two shifts, enough for the first and second. By Christmas they had gone so far as to take on a third shift. The men they had trained on the two shifts could be spread over the third shift by taking on some green men. Now since they have begun operations this present year in February or March, after the winter shut-down, they have been working three shifts but not getting maximum production in either one of the three shifts because the men had not attained the degree of perfection necessary and therefore we are not getting maximum production. We will not get it in 1954. I would hope that before the end of 1955 the plant will be turning out maximum production by having all the machinery operating at maximum speed because of the fact that the crews are

able to keep up with the machines going at maximum speed. I hope that answers the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. HOLLETT: Since we are on the gypsum plant, can the Premier tell us whether they are represented here now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but under their contract they were to start operations and deliver it to the Government and the Government was to accept only if it was satisfied the plant was a good and workman-like job and operated satisfactorily. They operated the plant for a couple of months under supervision and they ironed out the mechanical kinks that come from a large complicated plant and that has two hundred and fifty electric motors. It is a young plant and the honourable gentleman should go to Corner Brook and make it a point to be shown through the plant. There is one machine in that plant that is five hundred feet long, it is an immense plant.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case you say there is not, Mr. Chairman, operating in this country at the present time anybody looking after the interest in the investment of one hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say anything about having anybody in the province nor the country.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not mean to ask if operating it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Asked exactly that—are they operating the plant?

MR. HOLLETT: I mean in the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Province or country—in the province I believe

they are. I believe they invested money in this prefabricated or processed concrete plant at Humbermouth.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance—I don't see him here tonight—said in his budget speech that three of the fifteen new plants were in full production and eleven in part production and one not yet finished. I was hoping the gypsum plant, one of the first plants built, was one in full production. Which one of the fifteen plants is in full production?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think there is a sense in which it would be accurate to say the gypsum plant is in full production, at least it is on a full three shifts, but is not yet producing at the maximum capacity of which the machines are capable.

MR. BROWNE: I heard the Premier's statement. It is very interesting, and I gathered that the plant is something like the paper plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I might explain that—you take your gypsum rock, of which we have in Newfoundland perhaps the largest quantity in any part of the globe and certainly of the purest and finest quality. It is, not substantially but considerably, better than the gypsum rock of Nova Scotia which was the best hitherto in the western hemisphere, but now of course is somewhat better—you take the gypsum rock and put it through great crushers and crush it into a powder and it automatically goes through the conveyor on up into the rotary kiln which really bakes it, and then it is piped off and led along into other machinery where water is forced on it and then other chemicals are added and finally it is agitated into a foam which then is thickened

and thickened and thickened until it is just thick enough to flow but no thicker. By the time it has reached the main machinery you have two rolls of paper, very much like on a newspaper press, and these great rolls unrolls and the paper runs along on great rubber conveyors about five hundred feet long. The two sheets of paper run along and the stuff is in between. It is like plaster-of-Paris, and it is squirted between the two sheets of paper, and as it goes along it comes closer together until it reaches exactly the thickness you want. It goes on fairly fast but will go on at the maximum speed only when the men are able to handle it at every step of the process. If you touch the board at this point you can leave your finger print in it, as it is still soft. As it goes down the great conveyor it hardens quite rapidly, until when it gets down at the end it is quite hard. It is an endless process, never stops completely, an endless flowing along and there is an endless line of plaster board and there is a great knife revolving which cuts it without stopping the line. Then there are brushes which revolve swiftly and brush away the dry gypsum that has come on top of the face of it from the cutting knife.

Now it is at the end and automatically at the right angle and goes into the oven which is parallel for  $2/9$  of the distance of the conveyor belt. It then goes through this great dryer, for which Benno Schilde is famous in the world, and comes out at the farther end as a sheet of board. The speed of all of that depends on the competence of the men to keep up with the machines at every point of the long and complicated process. Our men are learning it very fast. They are acquiring the skill, and it is a

pleasure to see the way that Newfoundlanders from fishing settlements, from Placentia Bay, Fortune Bay, Bonavista Bay—these men who work in the plant are typical of Newfoundlanders all over the island, north, south, east, west, right out of the fishing boats and the potato gardens, now working in this modern plant, perform this work. They have caught the spirit of it, and it is a pleasure to see Newfoundlanders learn that skilled trade of making this high-class plaster-board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would forgive me, all this is most interesting but hardly strictly relevant, and might more possibly be properly discussed further on.

MR. BROWNE: There must be some place in the estimates for the Department of Economic Development where we can ask about the industries owned by the government; i.e., the ones we do own.

The minister stated that it was closed for the winter. How long was it closed and why was it closed so long?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was not closed long. It was closed and always will be closed for about a month of the winter for two reasons (1) because they want to overhaul the machinery and because that is precisely the time of the year when you cannot sell it, can't ship it. What is now being used has been made in the previous summer and fall and what will be used in the coming fall and winter will be made in this late spring and throughout the summer. Actually the last thing that goes into a house is the plaster. It is an inside job and most builders aim to have their housing covered in by the fall and then start to do the inside work through-

out the fall and winter, and in the spring lay down their new foundations. So that in the winter there is virtually no sale for plaster board.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe we are still on 1502—General Office. And I certainly must agree with the ruling you made a moment ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a reminder.

MR. HOLLETT: I must agree, and I think my colleague on my right and the Premier are completely out of order, both of them, as there is no mention of a gypsum plant here. Getting back to that 1502, I think the fact that there is a Secretary of Research and Conservation \$1,000 would indicate there must be some form of conservation setup.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there is not.

MR. HOLLETT: What does a secretary to that mean?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a board, if there should be a board.

MR. HOLLETT: And where do you get your authority for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No authority except what I described here this afternoon.

MR. HOLLETT: Which was?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman's memory ought to be good enough to remember what I said this afternoon, surely he does not want me to say it over again?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. It has been so long since I have seen the Honourable the Premier so much stirred up. I would like him to get that steam off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think would.

MR. HOLLETT: I will get on to the other, the birch plant, in a minute, but there is no such board. Is not that putting the cart before the horse to begin by getting the secretary and then by next year perhaps get the board of conservation.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before that goes through may I be allowed to ask if the minister, if he can recall the agreement regarding the birch plant, for the construction and the operation. I asked the clerk and he could not find any copies of the agreement. Perhaps he can tell me from memory what the agreement is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I must admit quite candidly I don't remember. All documents are in the Department of the Attorney General where they are kept in vaults, or else the department of Finance where they are kept in the vaults there. In our department we keep no original documents. We have not the facilities in Canada House. In fact we are very much jammed down there for space although we are quite a small department but we have here two departments, the Office of the Premier and the offices of Economic Development. If I had it I would gladly table it. It has been tabled. If it is not too much trouble for them in Finance I will ask them to type again and table it. Although I do suggest when we table documents for the Opposition they ought to have a little tin box or something to keep them in from year to year so that they won't have to ask for them every year. Why don't they just keep them in an empty file cabinet or a shoe box or something and not have to keep asking for them again and again.

MR. BROWNE: There is a filing cabinet downstairs and I have been trying for two weeks to get a lock but it has not been fixed yet.

Carried.

1503—Tourist Development.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this particular item I would like to bring up a matter that concerns travelling expenses of the tourist director. He gets a salary of ten thousand dollars a year, and his travelling expenses last year, I think, amounted to five or six thousand dollars. I have here some of the items. This deals with an item of \$3,600 for one trip which lasted for eleven days. Another trip took thirty-one days and cost \$1,433.61 and a trip to Montreal lasting thirteen days cost \$581 and another trip to Montreal—Halifax and Montreal and New York—cost \$1,013.12. Now the first one averaged \$52.67 a day, the next one \$44.71 and the next \$42.21. So I took the trouble to go up and look at some of the vouchers. There is one thing about the Tourist Director and that is, he lives well. Any man who can take \$1.80 breakfast and \$2.50 lunch and \$3.50 dinner or \$4.50 dinner and then have a snack at \$5 or \$6 before going to bed is living well and being treated generously by his boss. Now one night he had a very good dinner costing \$7.50. I don't know where he dined that time, but in New York. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that he should bring back vouchers on these trips for each expenditure that he has made. I don't think it is expecting too much to ask civil servants to give vouchers for their expenses at such times. It should be either that or limit him to a certain amount a day. I think he ought to be limited to, say, ten dollars a day or whatever it

is, \$12 a day. Surely he could live very well on \$12 a day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where?

MR. BROWNE: As far as meals are concerned—Now for taxi bills in New York they were \$7, \$8, \$10 and \$12 a day. And for a great many of the items, especially meals, there were no vouchers at all. I noticed that on one trip he entertained at the Canadian Club. That is a club for Canadians situated in New York, and situation I believe in the Waldorf Hotel, and occupies certain floor space there. He gave a film entertainment, I presume a Newfoundland film. He hired a room for \$25. He entertained the people not only with pictures but with beverages and then there was a little refreshment from the restaurant costing \$60. Then this big-hearted gentleman gave tips to the value of \$30, and throughout all his bills there is a lavish distribution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At that one function.

MR. BROWNE: Well, I must say his gratitude at this time amounted to \$26. Then there is an item for \$5 immediately underneath, which I presume is part of the tips. Wherever he goes I am sure they must be glad to see him he is so generous with these tips.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this gentleman, as he travels so extensively, should be asked to bring back vouchers to show the actual expenditures. It is not sufficient to put down \$7.50 for gin and \$4.50 for rye without bringing the bills to show that he actually paid it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, what the honourable gentleman has said has a certain amount of plaus-

ibility about it. Of course if he did very much travelling—he did live and eat in parliamentary restaurants in Ottawa where every meal a member eats is subsidized for him by the public of Canada, and he would not be accustomed to the rates one has to pay in hotels across Canada and more especially across the border in the United States. You cannot go into a restaurant in New York and get a lunch for less than \$1.50 at the cheapest. I am sure of that. Dinner at night costs from \$3 to \$7 or \$8 for one person. And try to get a breakfast in New York under \$1.70 or \$1.80—try to do it. Unless you leave the hotel and go down town somewhere off in the Bowery Section and try to find a restaurant in the poor section, otherwise it cannot be done.

Another thing to remember about Mr. Vardy is this: Over and above the travelling he has done as Tourist Director is the travel he has done for me, on my behalf. I have used Mr. Vardy as a sort of personal ambassador. I have found that I was not very much interested in travelling except when it came to the establishment of industries, or where an industry was concerned. I would go half way around the world. But in regard to dozens of other things I did not want to travel. I was not interested, was fed up. I have had enough now to last me the rest of my life. You cannot drag me now beyond Roche's Line. I have sent Mr. Vardy instead. He likes it.

MR. BROWNE: I can see that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He positively likes it, really revels in it. He is at home in it and likes it. I have sent him up to Washington several times on private and extremely important and very often delicate missions on my



behalf as Premier of Newfoundland and on behalf of the government of Newfoundland. Mr. Vardy has done extremely valuable work. I wish I could tell the committee about it.

MR. BROWNE: Do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wish I could, but I know I cannot. He has done extremely valuable work for Newfoundland on these visits to Washington and these visits to New York and these visits have resulted in returns for Newfoundland running into many hundreds of thousands of dollars of business and additional business done by Newfoundlanders with the Americans operating here in this province. There was one particular occasion, I may say, when he went to Washington when even the Secretary of the Treasury received him and sent to his hotel a private car with a special uniformed driver—The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States Government, who then took up a phone and sent for the Secretary of the Army and the secretary for Defense to come in and for the Secretary for Air to come in. These cabinet ministers of Eisenhower's Cabinet sat and discussed these matters with Mr. Vardy. Mere generals there were a dime a dozen. There were military aircraft whisking Mr. Vardy from Washington down to their headquarters in Virginia, and he ended up back here in St. John's with three or four generals who flew with him down here in a U. S. Army aircraft. Now we are not charged for that. My honourable friend did not find any bill for a U. S. Government aircraft although they flew him down from Washington.

MR. BROWNE: What trip was that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't re-

member the date. But he has made many trips for me, and has done especially valuable work. On a good many of these trips it is absolutely necessary that he should entertain—I am not talking now about the visits he made as tourist director.—What my honourable friend has just read from was a very notable thing. We invited some of the greatest sports writers and outdoor life editors, magazine editors and extremely important people from a tourist standpoint to get together in New York to see a motion picture of Newfoundland. All of which resulted in four or five famous editors coming to Newfoundland and writing up Newfoundland in their magazines, some having a circulation of millions of copies in the United States. That cost us, the whole thing, the hiring of the room, the tips, the liquors, all the expenses involved, what did it run to? \$260. Now I don't know places where you could get people worked up to the point where they would want to come in with a rope to hang every member of the government; because you can work them up and tell them how this man went up there to New York and spent \$30 for tips and so much for rum, the demon rum, and it could be painted in such a way that they would want to come in and murder the government. But that \$260 was one of the best investments that we made, that got for Newfoundland publicity that you could not buy for a million dollars. No, not for a million dollars cash could you get for Newfoundland the publicity she got through the writings of these famous editors, writings of our magnificent scenery and outdoor life, fish and game.

Now, apart from those trips he made for the Tourist Board; when he made trips for me he had to enter-

tain. My honourable and learned friend ought to ask me sometime to table vouchers for my trips. I would like him to go very carefully into all the vouchers for my trips for the five years I have been travelling, because I am out about five thousand dollars, about a thousand dollars a year, which I was ashamed to put in. I was a fool. I bet if my honourable and learned friend were in my position and travelled around as I did I bet every copper that he spent officially would have gone in to the government. I was a fool, and if I were not a fool I would do the same. I am out about five thousand dollars hard cash, which I was ashamed to put in. If I invited someone to dinner I paid like a fool, out of my own pocket. Perhaps I am the only one foolish enough to do that. If he goes away and has to entertain someone and talks over the business at dinner, which costs \$7 or \$8, to some people it sounds awful.—But there is nothing very bad about it, or I don't think there is.

MR. BROWNE: I must say the Premier is not so experienced a traveller on behalf of the Government as Mr. Vardy, as he had only \$1,500 in the same year, but he made more trips and his average per day was about \$10 a day less than Mr. Vardy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and I am poorer on that account.

MR. BROWNE: Now the Premier has made a good many more trips than I have made to New York, certainly in recent years, but when he says you cannot go into a restaurant in New York and get a breakfast for less than \$1.70 or \$1.80 he certainly exaggerates. That, of course, depends upon what kind of breakfast. Now, Mr. Vardy is a big, robust man, and

I am sure he must be a hearty eater. But I could go to "Childs," who are very distinguished people, and I did the last time I was there, and I met the Chief Justice of Canada and his wife there. If it is good enough for them it is good enough for our 'embassy'—Ambassador Vardy—As for lunch, I am quite sure there must be places in New York where one could get lunch for less than \$3.50. As far as \$7.50 a meal, well I think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Vardy is entitled to a good substantial meal, such as he is used to in his home, and I don't think he is entitled to anything so elaborate as a dinner at \$7.50.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was that for himself or for himself and guest?

MR. BROWNE: How would the Honourable Premier know that. It is put as an item.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the honourable gentleman might have had two or three people at that dinner.

MR. BROWNE: There is no sign of that, perhaps he had, but he did not say anything about it. He would be entitled, I take it from the observations of the Premier, to do that. His expenditure was \$5,784.04, and there is a little item outstanding still of \$39.68 for a couple of days he spent at the Mount Royal Hotel for which he had no vouchers. He has been asked to furnish the vouchers, but I don't know if he could or not. I must say he seems to stay around the hotels pretty well when in Montreal and Toronto but when in New York he is on his own.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to us that Mr. Vardy is an expensive man; like the Premier, he is somewhat expensive too. Now getting back to the subject under dis-

cussion; I know that last year, Mr. Vardy for travelling for the Department of Tourist Development was allowed \$1,800. On one particular night Mr. Vardy spent \$276, still I would repeat he is a somewhat expensive man, and these are a lot of travelling expenses we could go into. What I am going to ask now is, on page 123-1503 we have a director—that is Mr. Vardy, who gets \$10,000 a year. We have next a director Grade II, contractual, and there is a token vote there. Is it the intention to appoint a second director?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has not been filled.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it the intention to fill it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we had that in last year too as a token vote. We have thought to bring into Newfoundland a man who is a thoroughly experienced hotel man to go about for the Tourist Board visiting every place in Newfoundland where visitors and tourists are accommodated and advise and assist and to help such establishments to operate in connection with their food and meals, in the way that tourists are generally accommodated. We did have half in mind to bring in Norman Squires. He has had remarkable training as a hotel manager. He worked in Sydney and in Paris. After the war he was maitre d'hotel for a hotel in Niagara Falls. He was manager of a chain of motels. I do not know what the title was but he was quite high and he managed a chain of motels so he had had remarkable experience in catering to tourists and we have half thought, and we have in the back of our minds what the amount is there to give him. The

amount is shown there in the total. The scale is shown there.

MR. HOLLETT: You would not get that man for that scale.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps not.

MR. HOLLETT: We had Mr. Vardy as Tourist Director and we had to get rid of him, he was so expensive.

1503—Development: \$15,000.00.

Would the Premier tell us what is being done along those lines?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am informed regarding that vote \$15,000 that since it began four or five years ago it has in fact been spent on general publicity. That vote was transferred to the vote that precedes it or the one that follows it.

MR. HOLLETT: How much have we spent last year on general publicity and development?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the figures here. We spent \$35,521.00.

MR. HIGGINS: Item 1503. Two officers Grade 6, \$7,954.00 would those two officers be Mr. Woodland and Miss Godden?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HIGGINS: It would appear these two people are rated on the small scale but Miss Godden has been in the tourist industry for twenty-seven years and Mr. Woodland has two or three years experience. Is there any reason for classing a comparatively new comer on the same basis with a person who has had the unlimited experience of Miss Godden. Either Mr. Woodland is being overpaid or she is being underpaid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say

both are being underpaid. Miss Godden is a remarkable public servant. There is no doubt of that and to her it is a labour of love. Mr. Woodland is a very able newspaperman, journalist and writer and it is not fair to compare them, or to compare their salaries. They are not comparable.

MR. HIGGINS: They are lumped together in the same classification in the same office.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whether we took Mr. Woodland on or any one else in the same capacity we would not get them for less than that.

MR. HIGGINS: I am not reflecting on Mr. Woodland at all. I worked in the office with Miss Godden away back in 1931, 1932 and 1933 and I can not only support what the Premier says but emphasize it. She was recently recognized in a national magazine.

MR. HOLLETT: Could you tell us if, Chairman of Publicity \$20,000, would be included in the figure spent by Mr. Vardy for his election in the west end. He did quite a lot of travelling around in that election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think possibly it is. I think also the expenses of the honourable gentleman who was defeated might have come out of the same vote.

MR. HOLLETT: I think the Premier is very candid on that. We can take it for granted that some of the \$20,000 was used in the west end.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would take what it was to pay the expenses of the man who was liked and the man who won and perhaps it went in the east end also.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Vardy is quite a man to have there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite a man. If the honourable gentleman insists on being opposed to Mr. Vardy the Government might be induced to part with him as Tounist Director and become director of Hollett activity in the west end.

MR. HOLLETT: I think we can handle the situation very well. We had him before and he was so very expensive we could not keep him.

MR. BROWNE: As a matter of personal explanation, Mr. Vardy had nothing to do with paying my expenses. He did take part in the campaign both east and west but not on my account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To good effect.

MR. HOLLETT: What about the question of \$1,000.00 for local tourist boards? Have any been set up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, at Gander, Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Port aux Basques, and Channel. The \$1,000 is to make a small vote to each of the boards.

MR. BROWNE: It appears not every year is there a vote for documentary films. Year before there was none. Is it the intention to set a similar amount this year as year before last?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. They made one which I think all members of the House should see. "You are Welcome" is the title and it is in colour and its premiere, the first showing, was at the Newfoundland booth at the Trade Fair in Toronto early this week. It is an excellent picture and I hope when shown locally all members will make a point to see it.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder would you consider striking out the word "development"? There has been no development along tourist lines. If it is all publicity then we better change the word. If there is any development we would like to know about it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is what it is there for and we hope to spend it on that. It takes the form of tourist development. It is so widespread an activity you can confuse it unless you call it development, one word, and put all the vote under one word. Unless you do that you have to do what we have done, break it down into various items.

Carried.

Item 1505:

MR. BROWNE: There is a vote for \$10,000 general investigations. Would you state what you have in mind?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, something might happen in the next twelve months for tourist development in Newfoundland in some direction or other, something might crop up which needs to be investigated, inquiries to be pursued and somebody would have to be sent up or brought here. It is hard to say what it might be.

MR. BROWNE: Travelling expenses are cut down to \$1,000. I take it that is a suggestion?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Unless the Deputy Minister travels more than he has done and unless the Director General of Economic Development travels more than he has done I think the amount for travelling is sufficient. My travelling is paid for by one or either of the two departments, rather two votes. In the Pre-

mier's office or Economic Development.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the Director General, Mr. Valdmanis, got a vote last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, he was not Director General last year. He resigned in 1952. It might be for part of the year.

Carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we take up the Labour Department if the committee might revert to an item in the Attorney General's Department which has not been passed—Page 94—703. I was asked by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West to detail the position of Mr. Stirling, and Miss Page. I find Mr. Stirling and Miss Page are blocked together in this item here—officer Grade IV. I find that Mr. Stirling has recently been appointed to that, or has recently been promoted, and as part of his promotion he received an increase so that he is now on the scale of \$2,900. Miss Page is on the scale at \$2,800. The Grade III is now down at \$2,121 and not \$2,700 as stated. I might say that when these estimates were prepared no appointment had been made, therefore provision was made at the full amount of \$2,700 in case a person were transferred from another department, which would put him up at that scale.

Item carried.

Department of Labour XV:

1601—Minister's Office:

Carried.

1602—General Office:

MR. FOGWILL: Will the Hon-

ourable Minister inform the committee as to who are these gentlemen?

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): The Director, Grade I, is Labour Relations Officer, Mr. Malone, the Officer Grade V is Mr. MacKay, who is the secretary for the Labour Board and chief executive officer of Labour Relations Board. The officer, Grade IV, is Mr. Blanchard who does all of the office work, including what accounting there is, etc.

Item carried.

1603—Labour Boards, Committees and Enquiries:

MR. BROWNE: The vote for 04, Woods Labour Board, is there any salary for that or is it just expenses?

MR. BALLAM: There are no salaries attached to that, Mr. Chairman, that is expenses paid to them annually for annual conventions.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, 05, Conciliation Boards, could the Minister tell the exact amount spent last year for conciliation boards?

MR. BALLAM: Yes, the exact amount spent last year was something over six thousand dollars. The vote is being reduced, as it is hoped we may be able to get by with less, if not we will have to find sufficient money from some other vote or get this extended.

MR. HIGGINS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could tell us whether the incidents of labour conciliations this year are higher than last year. Have you had as many requests for conciliation boards as at the same period last year?

MR. BALLAM: I don't think we have had one since April. The 31st of March was the end of the year.

MR. HIGGINS: There was no conciliation for the garage strike.

MR. BALLAM: No.

MR. HIGGINS: If I might, I would like to express a word of commendation to my good friend the Minister of Labour. I think he did an admirable job in solving a serious situation in that garage strike. I don't know if he is entitled to all the credit, but he must have been to a good portion of it.

MR. FOGWILL: In respect to minimum wages, would the minister care to make a statement in respect to that—Is there a minimum wage set for any area in the island, or what is the purpose of the vote?

MR. BALLAM: I think my honourable friend asked that same question last year, and the reply was that there had been a minimum wage set at that time. It has not been changed. However, the work of the board is contained in a report that I tabled here in the House, not only for the minimum wage board but also a labour relations board report and a report of labour conciliations done under my department under the Labour Relations Board. These reports were tabled, and my honourable friends might have a look at them at their leisure.

MR. FOGWILL: What prompted me to ask the question in respect to the minimum wage, is that I believe there were minimum wages set for the area in St. John's, hourly rates, but I have a recollection that some people when they were required by the regulations to pay a minimum hourly rate put some personnel in their employ on a weekly basis, therefore got away from it in view of the fact that the weekly rate was lower



than they would have to pay under the hourly rate. Is the Minister aware of that situation?

MR. BALLAM: We have had a few incidents in that matter, and our officers have investigated these cases. I may say since last year, since this minimum wage was instituted, it was not set only for St. John's Area but for the whole province. Within recent months the Board made another order, which up to the present has not come before the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but will be dealt with shortly, having to do with weekly rates and hourly rates for females etc. It has not been dealt with as yet.

MR. FOGWILL: In other words where hourly rates are set for certain classifications of work they won't be able to get over the fact by paying less by the week?

MR. BALLAM: That will be done.

MR. HIGGINS: 07—Labour Legislation Review Committee—I note in the last year and the year before there was no vote for that. Would the Minister be able to tell us what that envisages?

MR. BALLAM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is a new vote, but is now only a token. It is customary in most provinces, and we may find it necessary to do it here. After a period say five years to ten we review our legislation, i.e. Labour Legislation and have it reviewed by a committee or commission appointed to review that legislation and all of the proposals we have had from different sides, both from labour and from the trade regarding proposed amendments, and suggestions as to what they would like to have in our existing legislation. It is thought sometime during this year

we may set up such a committee, and because of that we have this heading in here. Although there is not vote for it, if the Government sees fit to do so, I think we will find the money somewhere.

MR. HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister be able to tell us if that would include a possible widening of the scope of the applications of the Workmen's Compensation Board benefits, and include any category not now included—would that committee have any power to review that particular aspect of the situation?

MR. BALLAM: Well the committee would review all of our existing legislation, and it could do that if we gave it to them in their terms of reference, together with all the other proposals we have for changes in the existing legislation, which would come under review.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Before you carry it, Mr. Chairman—Industrial Enquiry Committees—what would be the functions there? Is that an enquiry into disputes? I thought industrial enquiries belonged properly to the Department of Economic Development.

MR. BALLAM: No, that has to do with disputes under the Enquiries Act in any industry where a dispute is likely.

Carried.

1604—Boiler Inspection:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister, who is the director, Grade IV.

MR. BALLAM: The Director, Grade IV, is our chief boiler inspector

and examiner of engineers, Mr. Cardwell.

Carried.

1605—Apprenticeship:

MR. FOGWILL: There are two new officers, Grade IV, I wonder would the Minister care to inform the committee who these people are?

MR. BALLAM: Well, as the department is not fully organized as yet, we have only one recently appointed. The other vacancy will be filled sometime.

MR. FOGWILL: What is the name of the person you have appointed?

MR. BALLAM: His name is Mr. Rodgers who was formerly one of the head instructors of the Vocational Training School.

MR. FOGWILL: What particular branch of instructions did he look after in the Vocational School?

MR. BALLAM: I think he was more or less a mechanic, but I think he was competent in a lot of trades, a quite competent person very well qualified.

MR. FOGWILL: A Jack of All Trades.

MR. BALLAM: Actually I think his specialty was mechanics.

Carried:

1606—Minimum Wage:

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the end of the estimates on current account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, we might turn to Page 14 and begin the revenue side.

Current Account — Department of Finance IV:

460—Dominion of Canada:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say, Mr. Chairman, this is merely for the information of the House. The Authority to spend, on the expenditure side, has to be sought from the House and the House has to give it before it can be spent, but revenue is automatic because this revenue is a result of legislation already enacted. So that it is only for the interest of the House that these estimates are given in detail. Honourable members may ask questions but no vote, as I see it, is required because the vote was taken when the legislation out of which this revenue flows was enacted, and it was then the authority was given.

MR. BROWNE: May we ask questions on it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, of course, Mr. Chairman, for information.

MR. HOLLETT: When does the transitional grant peter out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twelve years from the beginning.

MR. HOLLETT: Payment on Tax Rental Agreement, that is more or less guesswork?

MR. POWER: That is on information from Ottawa.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, did not the Government give some consideration to removal of that social security assessment on some of the necessities of life? It seems to me to be a very harsh tax on so many of the necessities and foods used by poor people who have to pay this tax. Has the Government given any consideration to limiting some of the articles of food?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: I think they should.

MR. FOGWILL: On gasoline tax, Mr. Chairman, I notice the Minister estimates an increase in collections. Perhaps this is not the proper time to bring it up as I understand there is to be an increase in the tax, and we can speak about that when it comes before the House.

MR. HOLLETT: On that Social Security Assessment. I take it the estimate is based on what the Minister estimates as what went into peoples' pockets.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no connection at all.

MR. HOLLETT: I figure out that \$6,700,000 represents 3%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does not the honourable member realize the same money is spent repeatedly throughout the year.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see that. Suppose I receive \$5,000 a year, how do I spend that three or four times a years. Can the Premier explain that to me?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thought my honourable friend studied economics. I thought he had a master's degree in it. Now he wants me to educate him in economics.

MR. HOLLETT: I want you to tell me—

MR. SMALLWOOD: My degree is in law, civil law.

MR. HOLLETT: It is quite evident you have not read a book on economics. I ask the Honourable the Premier how does a man earning a

thousand dollars spend it over and over during the year. Now I know the whole secret of the economic development plan of the Honourable the Premier. I don't say of the Government but of the Honourable the Premier, it must be based on that particularly arbitrary statement he has just made. Does the Honourable the Premier realize; he says that if the people earn, say, \$270,000,000 in the run of the year, they spend that over and over and over. You only have to apply that to your own economy, Mr. Chairman. How many times are you allowed to spend a hundred dollars a week?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did I really understand that it was in economics the honourable gentleman got his degree?

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know where you got yours, nor the words for it—certainly not "Economics."

I do know there is to be \$6,700,000 to be taken out of the pockets of the people in this country, which is quite a figure, more than half the family allowances.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The customs duties used to be twice as much.

MR. HOLLETT: We don't pay much in customs duties these times because we get all our goods from Canada, and most of these things are manufactured in Canada. But I am not so sure we do not pay just as much customs duty today as we did in the pre-confederation days.

MR. POWER: You can be sure we do not.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to see the figures produced to show that we do not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman would not believe them if they were produced.

MR. HOLLETT: If the figures were produced by the Minister of Finance, I would be very much inclined to believe them, because I have a very high respect for figures brought in here; but I have a greater respect for the money he is able to juggle around and make black appear white and white black which is a pretty good idea for any finance minister. I congratulate him on that. It is absolutely essential to be able to show when there is a deficit, by going back to the other thing. I do wish the Honourable the Premier would tell me how he is going to spend what he earns this year over and over again. Would he tell me that?

MR. FOGWILL: It is eleven o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I move the committee rise and report having passed certain legislation.

The Committee of Supply have considered the matter to them referred and have passed certain estimates on current account, namely, under heading (7) Department of Attorney General 703, (11) Department of Public Welfare from 1114 to 1120.

The House passed following estimates under heading (12) Board of Liquor Control, (13) Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply, (14) Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives, (15) Department of Economic Development, (16) Department of Labour. The Committee made some progress.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports on matters to them referred and

passed certain estimates. Committee asks leave to sit again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are going on until midnight with agreement of honourable gentlemen opposite and meet again Monday. I move the House do not adjourn 11 o'clock tonight.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move the House go into the Committee of Supply.

House goes into Committee again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it will be more proper if consideration of revenue which has not to be voted were given in the debate on the budget and if we therefore proceed with Capital Account Expenditure and if there is nothing particularly controversial in Capital Account Expenditure it might be possible for us to complete the debate on this heading before midnight. If it is not possible for us to do so then it is not possible. There is no desire whatever on the part of the Government to rush the matter or to deny the House all the time and opportunity desired to debate the matter thoroughly.

Page 75, Capital Account Expenditure.

MR. BROWNE: \$1,885,000 guaranteed. Is that done in the form of a loan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: There is a document produced?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Will the Government pay it out of a loan that it will raise?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of surplus, financial surplus.

MR. HOLLETT: At the 28th of February 1954, the Atlantic Hardboards was guaranteed a loan of \$146,000, it must have been since the 28th of February.

MR. POWER: That one matured on the 1st of May, 1954.

MR. HOLLETT: I asked the question for all guaranteed loans and the amount owed or borrowed by Atlantic Hardboards as of February 28, 1954, was given as \$40,000. In other words \$278,000 is advanced to Atlantic Hardboards.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They had not drawn the balance of that. They have since drawn the remainder of the loan.

MR. HOLLETT: The only amount guaranteed was \$40,000. How could they draw \$278,000?

MR. BROWNE: What is the situation regarding Atlantic Hardboards. About how much do they owe?

MR. HOLLETT: Before we leave I am not satisfied. As of February 28, 1954 the amount guaranteed was \$40,000 and the amount borrowed was \$40,000 and the amount owed was \$40,000 as of that date, and now we are told it was \$278,000. Can we have that straightened up?

MR. POWER: I can't give you much information on that now.

MR. BROWNE: Is the \$500,000 on the Newfoundland Hardwoods now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was already answered in this session.

MR. BROWNE: It was \$150,000. I do not know if that was paid off but it was owed at February 28.

MR. HOLLETT: Can we have the amounts guaranteed named out and the dates?

MR. POWER: Springdale Fur Company \$7,300. It does not say when it will mature.

MR. BROWNE: It has already matured.

MR. POWER: The Atlantic Films \$50,000 maturity is 30th of April, 1954. Newfoundland Hardwoods, \$500,000 will mature on the 30th April, 1954. The Atlantic Hardboards matures at May 1st and the next one will mature October 1st 1954.

MR. BROWNE: That means the Government has paid the bank these amounts on April 30th and the 1st of May.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the maturing dates. I do not know whether they have paid the bank but they were due to pay the bank on the dates named.

MR. BROWNE: The Government would be in default if they did not pay the bank?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They would try to pass legislation in this House.

MR. BROWNE: There is interest due on these notes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is paid by the borrowers.

MR. BROWNE: Has it been paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: By the borrowers.

MR. HOLLETT: Atlantic Films \$160,000 outstanding April 1954?

MR. POWER: All outstanding now is \$50,000.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words \$100,000 has been paid by the Government to the bank. The amount was guaranteed.

MR. POWER: What dates are shown there.

MR. HOLLETT: That was a cash loan. The amount outstanding was \$150,000 as at February 28th, 1954.

MR. FOGWILL: With respect to the \$500,000 that is Newfoundland Hardwoods. Was that guarantee made in the past fiscal year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. FOGWILL: There was a \$150,000 bank loan which was guaranteed by the Government. This is in addition to the other items. The total investment in the Birch Plant is nearly \$3,400,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Around \$3,000,000.

MR. FOGWILL: A little over.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have been given the guarantee for working capital. These amounts are not all added together.

MR. FOGWILL: At March 31, 1953, the cost was \$1,780,000. Advance for working capital was \$640,000 and the bank loan of \$150,000. That was March last year. In addition to that there is another \$500,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The larger amounts swept up the small one.

MR. FOGWILL: Which larger and small one? According to the Premier the \$500,000 loan would make an addition to what the Auditor General has in his report \$150,000. That would make it a little over \$3,000,000.

MR. BROWNE: The Bonavista Cold Storage, a guaranteed loan of one million dollars. Are you going to guarantee a loan on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: A certain amount is voted by the House that you foresee and you ask the House to vote these amounts or vote you authority to spend these amounts but in the course of the year something comes up, say larger fishery development, for which no money has been voted by the House. You have no funds?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All we can do is to see if the bank will lend the money. We will guarantee the loan until the House meets. We are not too sure when the House will meet, sometime around the winter or spring. How long will the loan have to be? Well as long as the bank will give it, —five, six, eight or ten months. The bank agrees so we give the guarantee and the date falls due and the bank gives the money and the construction begins on the money given by the bank. They are short term loans from the bank, not to the Government, to the concerns named but they are guaranteed by us.

MR. HOLLETT: These are the only loans which will fall due this fiscal year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: I was told that the Gaultois Limited had been given a cash loan of \$125,000 whereas under Guaranteed Loans they had been guaranteed a loan of \$425,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the same thing. They were financed by us in precisely the same manner. We guaranteed a loan at the Bank of



Nova Scotia and accepting our guarantee the bank lent the company the money. The loan matured and we then paid the bank. So it appears twice, once as a guarantee and once as a cash loan. It is only the one amount.

MR. BROWNE: According to this cash loan outstanding \$425,000 but in 1952 it was supposed to be \$170,000 at Gaultois. Amounts guaranteed is \$425,000 and amounts outstanding is \$170,000, but it says here on the 28th of February this year that the full \$425,000 was still outstanding. Down below under guaranteed loans it is shown as \$425,000. Is it transferred from guarantee to a loan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These amounts are on our accounts at the moment to make up \$1,885,000. We have not lent them that money at all. It has not left the Treasury. It left the banks following on our guarantee. We asked the House to authorize these amounts; these bank loans guaranteed by the Government. They are short term loans.

MR. HOLLETT: That \$1,800,000 is included in the one and a half million the Government will spend next year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: You have in there the money guaranteed last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. It is a common thing to guarantee money and ask the House when it meets to approve it. In a Government so interested in economic development it is likely and especially between sessions of the House it is more likely to happen. I tell the committee quite frequently, if what appears to you to be sound come to us before the House

meets again. If it requires a quarter million or one hundred thousand or something we think will strengthen Newfoundland economically, even though we know nothing about it this session, and have not asked the House to authorize us to spend it we will ask the bank to advance the loan and ask the House when we meet to justify our action. We have done it every session.

MR. HOLLETT: We know that and the reason why you harp on it. I wonder where we are going. While the Premier is there he intends to grasp every opportunity that he thinks will strengthen the economy. While he has been there we have spent fifty-five million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Seventeen million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: You have spent seventeen million dollars, or we will spend seventeen million this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have spent seventeen million on these industries.

MR. HOLLETT: You could not get it to add up to that if you tried. The Government has borrowed ten million and this year they are borrowing another twelve million and if the present Government is in power next year they will have to borrow another twelve or fifteen million and if they are in power the following year they will have to borrow another ten or twelve million. Where are we and whither tending as a small province with not too many people to pay all this and are we in danger of some day waking up to the fact we have a huge government debt of eighty or one hundred million and we have to keep on raising the taxes to pay the interest

on that. It has been pointed out here—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a speech for Ways and Means.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to point out that every dollar which the Government pays out on the guaranteed loans helps to increase our national indebtedness.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And also helps to build up the province.

MR. HOLLETT: Helps to lift its debts. But we do not build it up if we do not give people employment and so far we have not been successful and the Premier must admit that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The budget is specially provided to debate these matters.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to speak on this \$1,800,000. The question of the amounts of money invested in the Birch Plant. This amount of \$55,000 was guaranteed last year, that is in addition to the \$150,000 they already had. I think the Minister should make explanations of these loans. They are confusing.

In the Auditor General's Report the Fisheries had a loan with a corresponding loan to Fishery Products Limited. In some instances new people are taking over the loans. Is the Bonavista Fishery and Oils Limited the same as the Bonavista Fishery and Cold Storage?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the same but the same ownership largely.

MR. HOLLETT: It is an additional amount. In other words, loaned the Atlantic Films \$5,000 since February this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, guaranteed a bank loan.

MR. HOLLETT: I was under the impression Atlantic Films were doing exceedingly well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but they are just now getting into the black.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the Grand Bank Fish Plant. Why call it Bonavista Cold Storage?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the name of the company.

MR. HOLLETT: No relationship with the cold storage?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No—the same company built another big plant at Grand Bank.

MR. HOLLETT: Out of that loan—they transferred?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they operate in both places.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: A man came to me a couple of days ago looking for a loan because he could not get it. He wanted two or three thousand dollars. He was a mill owner. He had the engine but said he wanted some ready cash to start paying his men, so he went to the Industrial Loan Board but did not succeed in getting a loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course not, the Act creating the board specifically forbids lending money for anything other than plants and equipment.

MR. HOLLETT: I can't see why.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe he could not meet the conditions the statute requires.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think that was the trouble.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe not, don't know.

MR. HOLLETT: They have loaned a big lot of money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is disappointingly small. But then a man before he can borrow has got to be able to meet the conditions that are created by statute.

DR. ROWE: I have sent several of my constituents to the Board and they have not been able to get a loan.

MR. HOLLETT: I think he was a constituent and a strong supporter of a member on the opposite side of the House. I did meet him some years ago. He did want a tractor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe we ought to amend the legislation, under the Act as it stands now not too many can get a loan. Why not talk about it in the budget speech where time is not the essence.

Department of Provincial Affairs—  
Department of Education—

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Honourable Minister what kind of machinery is to be purchased and all the equipment and plans for the university?

MR. BROWNE: That is all recoverable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Half from the Department of Ottawa.

MR. BROWNE: Is this the one under which school desks are supplied? It must be, it is the only capital account for Education. Could the Acting Minister of Education tell me how much school desks cost the Government?

MR. MURRAY: I could not say

exactly, Mr. Chairman. I could undertake to find out for the honourable and learned gentleman.

MR. BROWNE: The reason I would like to find out is that I believe they have been supplied very cheaply to schools, something like \$2.50 a desk.

MR. MURRAY: My understanding is that they are supplied locally by CMIC.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know how much they cost?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are different types and sizes. There is the type with arms in three sizes and then the type with the desk in three sizes, with six different prices, I would say around \$17 and \$18. They are very solid, made of birch and kiln dried.

MR. BROWNE: A party informed me he wanted some desks. He could get them for \$2.50 each, but had to pay \$16, I believe, to import them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is simply not so. The various departments of Education or denominations are the ones who pay for them, and my honourable friend could ask any of the denominational superintendents and he will find it is around \$17 or \$18.

MR. MURRAY: I will undertake to supply that information.

MR. HOLLETT: Are any tenders asked for them?

MR. MURRAY: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I am informed Horwood Lumber and Gosse.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Horwood Lumber never, Gosse did.

MR. MURRAY: I think we did have the prices to import and they could be supplied cheaper locally.

DR. ROWE: I could say the type of desks CMIC makes were formerly imported, but they could not be compared locally at all. We compared prices for the exactly similar desks and our prices compare favourably.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only that but they are probably the best desks being made in Canada today. The honourable gentleman ought to go in and see. They have about 25 men at it eight hours a day.

MR. HOLLETT: I would never get out of the place again if I went in there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman likes he could come with me. I will protect him and show him through the plant, and see the plant making school desks.

MR. HOLLETT: Have you a gun with you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If you come with me I will be your gunman, I am sufficient gun.

MR. HOLLETT: This is a pretty thing. The big CMIC plant costing five million dollars, now they have to set themselves up making school desks. I wish to goodness the Premier would find something for the machine plant to do. Perhaps he will some day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We might get them making chamber pots.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: I am still on my feet, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And with your back to the wall.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not sitting on anything—and CMIC won't need to supply—I do say it is rather a pity

though that this company should have to get down to the level of making ordinary school desks, and I do think it is a pity any Minister of the Crown should get to his feet and say nobody in Newfoundland could make desks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who said that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, may I make a little explanation. Probably I know as much as anybody about it. We have been importing desks from quite a number of concerns as long as I can recall, from firms in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and we have had one firm locally making desks for the last twenty-five years, one type of desk which proved most unsatisfactory, and as a matter of fact my board of education would not have them. Three or four years ago we found ourselves in a difficult position in as far as trying to get delivery of supplies of desks when we wanted them. We then went to CMIC and asked them whether they could put up a desk, and told them what we wanted, gave them dimensions and material requirements. They saw the type of desk being used in the schools, and gave us a desk which in price ranged roughly \$15, \$16 and \$17, a shade lower than we could import similar desks from outside. As far as I can see there was nothing at all wrong with our employing a firm to give us desks, employing our own men, and obtaining desks as good as we could import. That is the situation on the desks.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Honourable Minister did he take that same desk and plan, to Gosse and Sons at Spaniards Bay? Did the Minister ask them if they could turn out similar desks?

MR. HEFFERTON: I certainly did not, because Gosse could not supply that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now may I give an answer?

MR. HOLLETT: One is enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, two is better.

MR. HOLLETT: I asked the Minister of the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. The fact that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asked the Honourable Minister does not prevent the Premier from answering nor any other member who so desires.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I personally asked that firm of Gosse & Sons and appealed to them to accept a loan from the Government to set up for the manufacture of furniture. The reasons why they would not were no doubt to them good, I could not quarrel with them, and just would not quarrel with their reasons, but the reasons were such that in their view they could not and would not and did not accept a loan, which I urged them to do in my office where we had a talk about it. I saw the opportunity here now to make one to two million dollars worth of furniture yearly. Why not? Can anybody tell me why we can't make tables like that here in Newfoundland as well as they can in Quebec?

MR. HOLLETT: CMIC? Why don't they?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Never mind why they don't. I have other plans for that. Nobody can tell me that you can't make perfectly fine furniture here in Newfoundland, all you need is machinery, that is all, and the

skilled men and a bit of capital. It may take a half a million dollars but if you get a good furniture plant it would employ two or three hundred people and would be worth it. That is one thing everybody should be in favour of. We have the wood. We are now paying about two million dollars a year for our furniture in Newfoundland; the Newfoundland people are paying about two million dollars yearly, retail value for furniture. It is big. There is a glorious opportunity for some one to start a completely modern furniture plant, make half a million dollars worth a year and sell it—that is a big turnover for furniture.

Now the negotiations have collapsed with Gosse, but they can be resumed at any time Gosse & Sons want to do so; and if not I got someone else willing to jump at it.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier has not added anything at all. It is all very nice to go to CMIC with a picture book from some firm in the United States and say: "Here is a nice school desk. We want you to make some desks for us." So CMIC makes those desks. I maintain Gosse & Sons and other firms, if the Honourable Minister had gone to them could have made these desks just as well and just as cheaply as CMIC, but these industries were in the air, and certain people were trying to throw everything—even our garages could feel the effect of the CMIC taking a lot of their work.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not taking one dollar's worth of work from the garages. The honourable gentleman is just talking trash.

MR. HEFFERTON: May I add one or two things, Mr. Chairman? We

were dealing with William Dawe & Sons and subsequently Chester Dawe and could not get a satisfactory desk. Then we dealt with Mr. Max Dawe who imported some of the steel fixtures and had the wood imported and again we did not get a satisfactory desk. They could not give us what we wanted. I might add that Gosse & Sons could not even supply the desks they were constructing and kept us tied up so much we were forced to get CMIC or trust to importing them, with a long delivery.

DR. ROWE: If what the honourable gentleman says is true, why did every educational board in St. John's import tens of thousands of dollars worth of desks. I happened to be associated with the Board of Education, which has since 1943 imported tens of thousands of dollars worth of these very desks the honourable gentleman says could be made here. I tell him they could not, and whether they could or not they were not, and we as a board could never get them. Go to any school or college in this city and you will find thousands of dollars worth of these desks which were imported.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Minister tell me our people cannot make school desks?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not saying they can't. He is saying they were not making them.

MR. HOLLETT: They could. Why did they not? If they went around and asked them could they make one like this or that like they did with the CMIC. It is nonsense to talk like that, as if our Newfoundlanders could not make school desks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Newfoundlanders are making them. Who, in

the opinion of the honourable gentleman, is making them at CMIC if not the Newfoundlanders. There are 25 Newfoundlanders in there making these very desks—he can put that in his pipe and smoke it. The CMIC is employing Newfoundlanders. They have only got about twenty non-Newfoundlanders in there.

MR. HOLLETT: What about Gosse & Sons and Dawe, they employ Newfoundlanders also, from Bay Roberts or someplace—talking nonsense, that is what you are talking.

Carried.

Department of Attorney General:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there is a prison camp warden's residence being constructed on the Salmonier Line. Have they not a mill there, and why could they not build a house there themselves and save considerable on that expenditure of \$25,000?

MR. HEFFERTON: They are doing so, Mr. Chairman, more than that they are sawing the lumber.

MR. BROWNE: What is the vote for \$25,000?

MR. HEFFERTON: You just must remember the residence has to accommodate quite a number and they will want different offices in that building. Apart from the labour they can use themselves it will also cost considerable for facilities for heat and lighting and for equipment.

Carried.

Department of Mines and Resources:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, Farm Development Loan Board \$100,000, is that the loan fund out of which money has been already loaned?



DR. ROWE: I believe that \$30,000 should be down a line there. It looks like a typographical error. We got \$20,000, I believe, voted last year.

MR. BROWNE: For loans?

DR. ROWE: Yes, for farm loans.

MR. BROWNE: These are actual cash loans are they? Because I wonder if those people have been advised by the Farm Approval Board?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the branches here now advertise that actually amongst the farmers.

MR. BROWNE: Do these people make applications for these loans? There seems to be a certain amount of overlapping.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say my son-in-law now has no fewer than two, if not three at the bank here, guaranteed by Ottawa for capital etc.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad to know it is being taken advantage of. I know I have talked a good deal about it myself. This is a very good thing—no doubt about it.

MR. BROWNE: There is a vote for fur farming.

DR. ROWE: A token vote in case we do get going on mink development.

MR. BROWNE: What became of the mink we had?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was disbanded years ago. That was one of the serious mistakes this Government made on bad advice, and we are now trying to work up interest in a great mink raising programme about which Newfoundland and all Canada may hear a little more in the course of this year—it is quite an idea.

MR. BROWNE: It is not easy to rear mink.

MR. HOLLETT: Can you say just what was the cause of the failure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What failure?

MR. HOLLETT: What caused the failure of the mink?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nothing has failed that I know of—discontinued. I said it was one of the serious blunders of the Government, I hold, our action about five years ago, in disbanding the government mink farm.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it was a serious blunder.

Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must advise the Committee it is now five minutes of twelve.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not seem possible—I move the Committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the following capital account estimates—Consolidated Fund Services, Department of Finance, Education, Attorney General, and Mines and Resources.

Report received—Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House, I don't know, quite candidly, until

what hour on Monday. Some of us, I don't know how many, and I don't know if any of the members of the Opposition, at all events some of us are going at some time tomorrow to Argentina to proceed to St. Lawrence to be present at the opening of the hospital there donated by the United States to the people of Newfoundland. When we will be back is more than I know. Perhaps we would be just as far ahead if we did not rush it too much. I don't mind confessing to the Opposition I am torn between swearing on them for taking so much time and trying to hold my tongue so they won't get angry and get stubborn and prolong it. We are trying to get the estimates through because, frankly, we have run out of interim supply. It is as simple as that.

I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Monday at 3:00 p.m. of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, June 7, at 3:00 of the clock.

—  
MONDAY, June 7, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 1953 Annual Accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council.

#### Giving Notice of Motions and Questions

None.

#### Answers to Questions

Question No. 108—Stand.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Economic Development could say a word about the copies of the agreement I have asked him about—the birch plant—

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): I have asked the Department of Finance to get the copies.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before we call the Orders of the Day we could give the Minister of Finance an opportunity to see if it is ready.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Premier whether Mr. Doyle of Canada has applied to the Government for permission to build a spur on the Wabush shore of the Labrador railway?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have applied.

MR. BROWNE: Has any decision been made about it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No decision has as yet been made.

#### Orders of The Day

Committee of the Whole on Supply:

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given yesterday for this Committee to sit again today. I do now leave the Chair.

Chairman of Committee, Mr. Courage:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 76—Department of Mines and Resources—02: Last clause carried.

Department of Public Works:

MR. BROWNE: In the details given on page 129, I notice there is a revote of \$293,700 out of the \$500,000 voted last year—could the Minister tell us how the balance was spent last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the absence of the Minister of Education I can say that none of it was spent last year, in the financial year just past only what was paid to architects. Actual construction has not as yet begun and may not begin in the present calendar year. They are just waiting on plans and specifications. This amount is inserted in the hope that the amount can be spent.

MR. BROWNE: There was some money spent, you had \$500,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is simply a revote of that portion of the half million. Virtually none of the half million was spent.

MR. BROWNE: Does the Minister possess any details of this \$293,700?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, neither of us does. It possibly would be in connection with one of the buildings they are hoping to commence this year.

MR. BROWNE: Well, does the Minister of Public Works know anything about it?

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Chairman, I would assume part of the payment for land came out of that particular \$500,000 vote. How much was spent I would not know. To the architects there has been paid on account about fifty thousand dollars to date—it is likely in anticipation of building this year.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Does that same ex-

planation apply, Mr. Chairman, to the vote for the vocational school? Has any of that been spent?

MR. SPENCER: That particular vote is in connection with the present extension to the Memorial which is the vocational high school.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it hoped that this \$150,000 will take care of this year's operations?

MR. SPENCER: As far as we know, yes. The contract for that building is, I believe and speaking from memory, around \$120,000. We bought the steel frames and it is a concrete block building, but not a very extensive job.

MR. BROWNE: But you will need more money than that?

MR. SPENCER: That was earmarked for this year. If they need more they have to go back to the Government and ask for it, but I don't happen to know of anything more at this time.

MR. BROWNE: Where is the magistrate's residence being built?

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): At Twillingate. That was a very old building bought by the Government many years ago, and very large. It has been demolished and a new one is being built there.

MR. BROWNE: Do magistrates pay rent?

MR. CURTIS: All magistrates pay \$30 a month. Those who have not houses supplied by the Government rent houses outside and the Government pays anything over \$30 in that event.

MR. BROWNE: Garage, Fire Patrol, Whitbourne—perhaps the Minister would tell us what that is?

MR. SPENCER: It is merely to take care of unforeseen demands, Mr. Chairman. We find every year that things come in we know nothing of at the time of the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Is it to be used on capital account?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This whole vote is capital account.

MR. BROWNE: Can it be diverted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. FOGWILL: I notice there is a vote for the Home for the Aged and Infirm. Is it the intention of the Government to begin construction or consider plans for the construction of the new building for the aged and infirm this year?

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, the Government has approved in principle the idea of replacing the present institution as early as possible.

MR. FOGWILL: Would the Minister care to inform the Committee if the site has been selected.

DR. POTTLE: No site has been selected.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Public Works could tell us the amount of money involved in rebuilding the General Hospital since the start of the rebuilding about ten years ago?

MR. SPENCER: That is a question of which I must have notice. There has been quite a sum of money spent in the remodelling of the old building, and there is still much more money to be spent there to take care of the situation, which at the present time is still very desperate, particular-

ly where housing of some of the staff, who are at the rear of the building, is concerned. The building there is in a terrible shape, and it is a shame that they have had to put up with it for so long. Actually there are plans on hand to remodel a portion of that building, I don't know how much it has cost, but if the honourable gentleman wishes to place a question on the Order Paper we will be glad to furnish the answer.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister of Public Welfare could tell us the form the Memorial to Sir Robert Bond is to take?

DR. POTTLE: No definite idea has been worked out as yet, Mr. Chairman, except it is thought it should be of natural stone, possibly field stone or granite, suitably inscribed.

MR. BROWNE: Could I make an inquiry as to the possible cost of the monument?

DR. POTTLE: No such estimate has been made, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Would it not be a good idea—as after all, Sir Robert Bond spent thirty-five years in the public service of this country and eight as Prime Minister—to have a bust or figure in stone such as is done in other places.

DR. POTTLE: No definite idea has as yet been worked out, Mr. Chairman.

941-01 Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Under 941-02 (04) New machinery, does not that seem a lot?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the honourable member asked that question. The House is

entitled to know, and this gives us an opportunity, without taking too much time, to give the answer. Every year for the past ten perhaps the department has been requesting a machinery vote, and every year without exception, as far as I know, they get a machinery vote. But in no year has it been anywhere nearly sufficient to supply the needs. This year the request was for half a million dollars, and the Government stretched their funds as far as they could and agreed to set the vote at \$350,000. I might add, for the information of the honourable gentleman, that where we do not have an opportunity to get the necessary equipment it follows that when work must be done additional equipment must be hired. That policy is followed and we hire a certain amount of equipment as we never have enough on hand in the department to do the work.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister could say at what rates per day?

MR. SPENCER: Standard rates set all over the Dominion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, sometime ago, I think it was April 6th, I asked the Minister a question. The main question was about advertisements for tenders for road construction or bridge construction during the past fiscal year. I received an answer dealing with Pynn's Brook—South Brook, Middle Brook to Fishells Brook, Codroy Pond to 12 miles east of South Branch, etc. Now one of the questions I asked was; how much money had been spent for work up to date, and in some cases the answer was nil—

MR. SPENCER: That is standard practice, Mr. Chairman. It could very well be some contracts were let

late in the year—there are several outstanding at the moment, with very little if any work performed during the past year, or it could happen there had been a certain amount of work performed and payment had not been made for it. It is usually made up on vouchers by our engineers in the field, on the basis of their returns the payments are made for the construction. There are no major outstanding payments on that account.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if plans have been made for new construction to cover this item of \$1,300,000? Could he give the House any idea as to where the new construction is to take place?

MR. SPENCER: I have referred to it, Mr. Chairman, on several occasions, perhaps not in the House. The honourable gentleman will note there are two amounts there—improvement and reconstruction and new construction. On one or two occasions I have endeavoured to explain to my honourable friends opposite. I remember last year going across the House during a recess and giving them reasons why only \$40,000 appeared for St. John's. The reason is that there are four different accounts for road work around the island. First of all there is the maintenance vote for which there are two million dollars, not coming into this at all, but in current account, and then local roads—another vote of about \$250,000, that appears too in current account, which the House has already passed. These two votes are accounts towards which money can come for road construction 941-02 (01) and 941-02 (02), one for improvement and reconstruction \$700,000 and the other for new construction \$1,300,-

000, or two million dollars altogether. I feel that I have voiced my sentiments regarding that previously, but if not I do so now. I would say that of the applications listed in our department or demands that are made to us and petitions received from all over the island this year we have listed amounts which would require perhaps three and a half million dollars instead of two million dollars as in these two votes. We have been as yet unable to determine the exact location of any major job, but we have two million dollars to spread around in thirteen hundred settlements more or less, in and around Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Had the Minister a definite programme last year? As I recall he did give a public statement in which he said where the work was going to be done.

MR. SPENCER: That programme is not completed as the estimates are not yet through.

MR. BROWNE: But in making up the estimates you must have in mind certain roads.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me—I have just stated that for these amounts listed we would require three and a half million, and two millions are being voted, unless the House could see its way clear to give us more. If we could vote the amount we could prepare a list then as to where we are prepared to spend it. But inasmuch as I have not got that, if we have two millions where we require three and a half, we have to distribute that amount as best we can and to the best advantage, as we see it. That is the answer. There is no plan to spend the two millions, but there is a plan to spend three and a half millions if we had it.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell the House how much if any amount has been put aside for new construction on roads on Bell Island?

MR. SPENCER: In reply to the honourable gentleman from Harbour Main-Bell Island I would say we have a plan there, yes, it is true. But there again at this moment I cannot say just how much as I don't know how much we will have to spend there. I have the figures here in front of me of how much we want to spend, but as to how much we can spend when we distribute the amount, at the moment I am unable to say. Now the House must understand these statements do not refer to maintenance, that goes on just the same. The question now is for improvement and reconstruction and new construction, and I cannot say until I know how much we have.

MR. BROWNE: Improvement and reconstruction is a pretty broad item, and certainly many of these roads are in a pretty bad state of disrepair and need reconstruction. But this two million dollars the Minister is asking for seems to me a blank cheque for up to two million dollars which he can use where he sees fit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where he sees fit? No.

MR. BROWNE: Where the Government sees fit then. The House has no say as to where it is to be spent at all. Why could not the Minister come to those decisions before he came to the House, or the Government come to these decisions before coming to the House, and tell us where he proposes to spend, a hundred here and a hundred there. We know we are voting for new construc-



tion to be spent afterwards wherever the Government and the Minister decides. And I can imagine the Minister and the Premier getting together and saying; we put it over on the Opposition; and we won't spend a cent in their district.

MR. SPENCER: In that case we had better wipe out the amount for St. John's East and West. Perhaps the honourable gentleman wants me to do that?

MR. BROWNE: No—but I say it is possible that could be done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is very suspicious.

MR. BROWNE: I know it is nothing in proportion to the amount of revenue which the Government gets from St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman suggests the amounts we spend ought to bear some relationship to the amount received by the Government.

MR. BROWNE: I am not referring to anything at this time, but it is a well known fact that in the City of St. John's there are thousands of motor cars and heavy traffic and wear and tear upon the roads, and in consequence it is obvious there must be repair work going on all the time. That is only to be expected.

I want to refer in particular now to a petition which was sent in to be referred to the Department of Public Works, from Fairhaven in the district of my honourable friend in the Department of Finance. The petition asks either to build a road to the railway or go on to the highway, which I believe has been under consideration. That is certainly an isolated place and they are under terrific

hardship in getting back and forth to hospital.

MR. SPENCER: We have that in mind.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad to know that.

In regard to that construction, there was a road built from Trepassey to St. Shotts to Peters River two years ago. It is a very good road or at least was last year. I was astonished when I was told it only cost two thousand dollars. To me it seemed incredible that a road of that length could be built for such a small amount of money—it must be ten miles long, in good condition, wide and straight over the hill. They must have had very good ground to work upon. Possibly the Minister remembers the cost of that. But if a road could be built like that there is no reason why every community could not have them.

MR. SPENCER: I agree with the honourable gentleman. Apparently the expenditure on that road he referred to was for one year. It is quite obvious, as everyone in the House knows, a road ten miles long cannot be built for two thousand dollars. That road has been under construction ever since I went into the Department of Public Works in 1949. I recall very vividly arranging a meeting with the Honourable the Premier and the executive committee to discuss the matter with a delegation from Peters River. That delegation was well received, and I was instructed to do what I could by the executive committee, and for the past four years have spent money on the road. I am very proud the honourable gentleman went over it and thinks it is a good road.

MR. BROWNE: I hope to be able to go over the road between the high-road and Fairhaven and say the same thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable member hangs around a little longer he will find we are the greatest road builders in Newfoundland.

MR. SPENCER: I do not wish to delay the Committee any further but when we were putting through the current accounts the other day the honourable member for St. John's West referred to roads, and this is the same topic. On that occasion he pointed out for my information and perhaps for the information of the House that there was a section of road leading from Cape Spear, off towards Maddox Cove, which the honourable gentleman was pleased to say would provide a very nice piece of pleasure driving and a nice little loop around to connect these two sections of road. I have looked into that as I told the honourable gentleman I would do, but I have to point out again that we have still only 360,000 or 380,000 people in this island, and it is a physical impossibility, which will shortly be shown when the records are presented to the Federal Government in connection with the reviewing of the terms of unions—that this island with 380,000 people can just not possibly provide sufficient money to make pleasure roads. Now I admit, as I did in a recent talk to Rotary, where I was talking to most of the St. John's people or most of the audience were, I take it, St. John's people, I pointed out our aim was and still is and will be as long as I have any voice in the road work in the department over which I now preside, to provide a loop out of St. John's in addition to what we have at

the present time, at both ends. I am very anxious and my Department of Public Works has plans in mind to provide a loop of the west end to come back possibly by Witless Bay. We don't know as yet, whichever is the cheaper, into Holyrood Road and back via Topsail Road. For the East End we want to go out, say, along the lines suggested by my honourable friend from St. John's East the other day, through perhaps, the Marine Drive to Pouch Cove and back by way of the Bauline Line and Portugal Cove Road. These two loops will provide two very fine outlets. But in the main, Mr. Chairman, these will be for the pleasure of the people concerned here, and I agree, I am one of the people who would like very much to drive over them; but unfortunately we have a small revenue available from 380,000 people, and I think it follows service roads must come before pleasure roads. I do hope the House will note my comments in that regard—the roads to service the people must come before pleasure roads, although we must realize we must try to give some pleasure too. I am satisfied from the very fine service we have received from the Department of Public Works within the past two years that a great deal is being accomplished, and people are beginning to realize that a great deal of pleasure is being given them through the provision of roads in Newfoundland.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the Honourable Minister, and he did refer to one particular road which may be classed as a pleasure road, but the road that I referred to a few days ago, and also to which some reference was made a moment ago by the Honourable Minister in respect of St.

John's East, the Marine Drive and Logy Bay Road, are not pleasure roads. These roads are utility roads used by thousands of citizens down in that area to come to St. John's who use these roads for business purposes every day, and possibly over a thousand people come to work in St. John's besides other people who come up for other business they may have to do. I just want to point out the fact that these are utility roads. Special parts of the little road which goes down for a part of the Marine Drive may be classed as a pleasure road, but there are many people living all along these roads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: I am under the impression that not as much money was spent on roads last year as was voted by this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think we spent more.

MR. HOLLETT: On certain parts of the programme.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Over all.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think so. I meant all around the island, throughout the country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Much more—we spent more.

MR. HOLLETT: What I do want to point out, Sir, speaking of pleasure roads and service roads, I think the service roads between the sections are absolutely essential for the people to carry on their day to day duties and that sort of thing. The road which was brought up by my honourable friend on my right is not in my opinion a pleasure road at all, although he may have inadvertently referred to it as a pleasure road.

MR. BROWNE: The section I am most interested in is that section between Maddox Cove and Petty Harbour, a distance, I think, of less than a mile. I remember distinctly getting in touch with the Department last year when this road was made practically impassible after a very heavy storm of rain, and I was informed that nothing could be done. Now they have there, I think, twenty odd families in Maddox Cove who are unable to come east to Cape Spear and have to come into the city via Petty Harbour. Now that certainly is not a pleasure road. They have to use that road every day, and I fail to see how or why the Honourable Minister can bring up the matter of pleasure roads. We in St. John's East and West are not looking for pleasure roads, but we are looking to utility roads to the various sections such as this road in the west end and Portugal Cove and St. Phillips and Petty Harbour and the road up over the hill to Blackhead, and to Maddox Cove. Now the Honourable Minister will remember that road was built there many years ago between Cape Spear Road and Maddox Cove. Now I am not asking for any great improvement on that particular section, but I am asking that some consideration may be given to that small part of the road leading from Maddox Cove to Petty Harbour, as, after, all, their isolation there is made much more so if the road is impassible.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable gentleman may be glad to know, if for the first time or not, that particular road like a good many others which come under the maintenance of the Department is considered a secondary road, from Petty Harbour out to Maddox Cove where there is a community existing,

and to that extent does receive maintenance from our department. Now again I merely repeat the great need is there. There are still many many greater needs and demands than—with all due respect to my honourable friend—Maddox Cove—I know some people out there, I have had them in my office—very fine people, and I am very glad we are able to do something for them. There are, as the honourable gentleman says, about twenty or thirty families out there. I could name many communities around the island where we have fifty, and perhaps a hundred families with no road whatsoever. Now I don't want to stress that point. The honourable gentleman knows as well as I do that is so, but I merely want to point out that I might point to the efforts of the Department since it has been my pleasure to serve in it and to the fact that there have been more of these communities connected up within the last four years than within any other twenty-five years or so of government road building throughout Newfoundland. I am not asking for compliments, but I do think that is so.

MR. HOLLETT: I realize that, Mr. Chairman, and congratulate the Minister on the work he has done. I must say it is a pleasure to deal with the Department of Public Works although we don't always get what we come for and don't expect to do so. The reason I referred to this particular road was that I did not want the House to have the impression the honourable and learned member on my right was asking for pleasure roads for St. John's. I do repeat that I think the Department of Public Works has done very excellent work with the money it has at its disposal, and I would like through the Minister to congratulate him and also his assis-

ants in this matter. I don't want him to have the impression I am criticising in any way his programme or the government's programme nor the way in which it is carried out. I do think there are places even yet, and that there will be within the next ten years, which need to be connected up with main highways. I think that is one of the chief ambitions of this Government or any other government which comes into power, after November.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, before we go off roads I should like to ask the Minister if he would be kind enough to give us, not in detail, but a progress report on the Trans-Canada Highway? For instance could he tell the Committee how many miles of road have been completed, if they are now paving or when he would consider that paving would begin etc. and perhaps he would be good enough to tell the Committee the average possible cost per mile, how much has been done and the total cost to date. We would be interested in all the details the Minister could possibly give at this time.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, it would be utterly impossible for me to give what could be a really detailed report at this particular time covering the Trans-Canada Highway, but out of deference to the honourable gentleman who has put this question so well, speaking from memory—I have already given this in this House—speaking from memory, we have approximately two hundred miles of the Trans-Canada Highway—despite Scene Passing who does not see a mile. If that gentleman were in some places I know perhaps he would not see at all—I am happy to say there are more than two hundred miles to Trans-

Canada standards. Now there are another perhaps couple of hundred miles which have to be brought up to Trans-Canada standards, and there are about 125 miles which have not yet been touched. We hope to close one gap of about thirty-five or thirty miles this year. The main gap will be between Clarendville and Gander.

It has been found that our costs have mounted steadily year after year in accordance with demands for wages and equipment until today our cost per mile is from fifty to sixty thousand dollars for grading.

MR. FOGWILL: By grading, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister means, ready for paving?

MR. SPENCER: Rough grading is the building of a road to grade, out of the material which the terrain supplies. The greater part of the soil throughout Newfoundland unfortunately does not give the building material required for the building of a road to HS20 standard—that is a technical term. Now I will give it in everyday language. In other words, for traffic to carry that load a certain standard base is required. Our soil does not ordinarily provide that, so we have to put on what is known as a granular sub-base, or if you like, crushed rock over many miles of that road. This will cost another five or ten thousand dollars per mile depending on the thickness. Then the paving will cost from twenty to thirty thousand dollars a mile for standard 22 ft. paving. If we add sixty thousand dollars maximum for grading and fifteen thousand dollars where we must put on a rock base and, say, twenty-five thousand, in round figures, our Trans-Canada Highway will cost today one hundred thousand dollars a mile.

I would just add this word, and

then I am finished. On this point recently in comparison with our sister provinces in the Maritimes, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, some of whose conditions are somewhat similar to ours, we have been advised that our estimate, as it is placed at one hundred thousand dollars per mile, is below what it will cost them to do the work; in spite of the fact people think we are spending more than Nova Scotia for road construction. I am in a position to supply the actual figures. I have the tabulated figures for the last number of years, where I find they estimate their Trans-Canada Highway is to cost about \$125,000 per mile.

I think that gives the answer to the honourable gentleman. But for this year, I might add, under current account we plan to spend \$2,700,000 on roads for both maintenance and improvements and reconstruction, and under capital account our vote is seven and three-quarter millions, round figures. In other words, eleven and a half million dollars to be spent this year. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done. It is a matter of funds, which is something the honourable gentlemen opposite know as well as I do—it just cannot be tackled all at one time.

MR. FOGWILL: Is the Department going to do any paving this year?

MR. SPENCER: Very little, possibly six or seven miles.

MR. BROWNE: Does your department publish an annual report?

MR. SPENCER: No.

MR. BROWNE: I know it is rather late in the day, but would it not be a good idea if in the future

the Department of Public Works published a report showing the work done during the year. We did have a report of work done largely by voluntary assistance, but that only deals with a comparatively small amount of money, but this would be very much more important to the public and the House, to know how much money is being spent out of this eleven million dollars.

MR. SPENCER: If it becomes statutory it is okay with us.

MR. BROWNE: The Attorney General is not present, but I think it should be a matter of routine every year for every department to give an account of what it is doing. I don't see how the members of the House can intelligently discuss what is going on otherwise—the Minister knows better than anyone just how little we know.

MR. SPENCER: The honourable members got all the information asked for.

MR. BROWNE: I know. We should not be expected to ask. It should come in printed form.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then the Opposition would not have anything to do but could just stay at home and read the reports. Then what would the Opposition do if they did not ask questions, and if all the answers were given before the House opened—why open the House except to pass the estimates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier knows this is the place for discussion. In other places the basis for discussion should be laid down, the work should be laid down, and we should have a report. The Minister of Labour gave a report of

the work of his compensation board, for example—we wanted to know if the Minister of Public Works would tell us where he spent his money. Now going back to that answer dealing with sixty miles of road and only \$320,000 spent. Now can the Minister tell me if this was the construction programme, the whole construction programme for last year. The question I asked was for copies of all advertisements for tenders for road construction or bridge construction during the past fiscal year, or where the tenders issued the year before—was there a programme for last year amounting to two and a half million dollars?

MR. SPENCER: I speak from memory as I have not the figures I gave you now.

MR. BROWNE: If that was the programme only three hundred thousand had been spent. What happened to the other two hundred thousand dollars balance? And the Minister also told us that in the last year not a sod had been turned on much of that work. Does that mean we are tied up on that?

MR. SPENCER: It does not. In reply to the honourable gentleman, the contracts may be let on which very little work was accomplished last year, that is quite true, and more contracts are let now on which nothing has been done to date. The actual figures the honourable gentleman has there, I am not in a position to say just what he is referring to. I repeat, the contracts, some of which were let as we got the survey work done and ready to call for them, we called for as quickly as we can irrespective of the time of year. He was told, in answer to his question what mileage was done last year. Contracts might



run into hundreds of thousands of dollars over and above the figures that were given up there. For instance I have told you the programme was for two and a quarter millions last year for Trans-Canada, of which the Federal Government, after we complete the work, will contribute half of that contract cost. Now whether or not the sixty miles of road you referred to here and the total expenditure is only three hundred thousand dollars—I am at a loss to find out just what that is—but I would say it is the amount of money due contractors at the time the last returns were sent in at the end of the fiscal year, and there might be some still outstanding. At the end of the fiscal year we will very definitely have contracts out which will not be completed within the year, I am quite certain of that.

MR. BROWNE: You are not able to do that work this year. You have here seven millions voted, but you are not able to do that work this year?

MR. SPENCER: We will now. Our contractors have been requested to step up to that extent. The big one we are very anxious about this year, as the House has been told before, Mr. Chairman, is to endeavour to close the gap between Port aux Basques and Corner Brook, in connection with the agreement between the Federal Government and the new ferry. To that end we are planning to build a total of thirty-four miles I believe, speaking from memory of the Trans-Canada Highway in that area this year. In addition to that we will utilize several miles of former roads in order to make the connection through from Port aux Basques out to Robinsons, through farm roads and back to the Trans-Canada Highway on through St. Georges by the present

road system. So that in that area alone this year we hope to build thirty-two and a half, I think it is, Trans-Canada Highway miles to ordinary grade. That is not paved road. We have not paved one inch of the Trans-Canada Highway yet, not one inch, and have not started paving on the Trans-Canada Highway. I think that just about gives your answer, and if it does not, it is all I can give.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister could add whether all this work is in process of construction now.

MR. SPENCER: They are not but they will be very soon.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could tell us whether it is the intention to complete the road between Buchans and Grand Falls this year?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, we do hope so. The contracts are ready for it now.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I have one more question to ask. The Minister spoke of a road connecting the highway between Corner Brook and Port aux Basques. Do I understand that bridges on that section of the highway will be completed also?

MR. SPENCER: Some of them, not all.

MR. FOGWILL: Will the long one be completed?

MR. SPENCER: We plan a through road. Some bridges will be built, but others will not.

Carried.

941-03—Wharves and Ferries:

MR. BROWNE: Ferry construction \$10,000, Mr. Chairman, what does that mean?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, that ten thousand dollar vote is the balance outstanding against the Placentia Gut Ferry, last year, and we had to vote a certain amount this year to take care of the winding up of that particular construction vote. Now perhaps the honourable gentleman would want to know what the \$490,000 is for? I think the House is well aware, Mr. Chairman, we will be building two docks for Bell Island Ferry and two docks for Placentia Ferry. That sum is voted to take care of these two particular docks, four in all, of course, one in Portugal Cove, one at Bell Island and the two at Placentia, one at Placentia and one at Jerseyside. These docks are to be completed this year, and it is our very sincere hope that we can complete them for the summer.

MR. BROWNE: What is the cost of the Placentia one?

MR. SPENCER: The contract is for \$269,190.

MR. JACKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't wish to disturb the Minister, but as a matter of interest to all the people on Bell Island, I wonder if the Minister would give any indication as to what time this landing on Bell Island will be finished. I understand the one at Portugal Cove is practically finished. But the one at Bell Island has not been touched as yet. I wonder if the Minister could give any indication as to when work is to begin on the construction of the new landing at Bell Island?

MR. SPENCER: In reply, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I have this very day had a discussion with the company that is to operate the boats there, and I was able to tell him, as I can now tell the honourable

member, the tenders have either been publicized or are about to be publicized for the completion of the Portugal Cove dock. After that is completed the tenders will be called for the one on Bell Island. The plans are ready, and I would be very proud to have the pleasure of showing these to the honourable gentleman and to my honourable friend who represents the Government, who has not seen them. The Portugal Cove dock will perhaps be completed in two months—now that is pulling a figure out of the wall—I would think the one on Bell Island would take until pretty late in the fall. I would not be too sure, but perhaps up in November—no one knows. The plans are ready and we propose to call for tenders to construct that dock within the next few weeks.

MR. JACKMAN: I hope you will have that dock completed before Christmas anyway. I have a very special reason for that.

MR. SPENCER: We will strive towards that end, I assure you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to delay the progress of the Committee, but I feel I ought to say just a word or two on this question of ferries, ferry construction and ferry landings. It is our hope also as a Government to make headway this year, this calendar year, 1954, if we can, with a new ferry service on the Humber Arm, or on the very low part of the Lower Humber River, to connect both sides of Bay of Islands. I cannot add much to that except that it is the Government's hope in this calendar year to make some progress in the matter of a ferry service connecting both sides of Bay of Islands.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Federal Government footing any of the bill for the ferry to Bell Island?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the landings, no.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us when the ferry landings will be finished in Placentia and when the ferry will be in operation?

MR. SPENCER: I cannot say, in this present year. The ferry is to be launched on the 16th of this month. The dock, I understand, on the Jersey-side is well advanced, and the material is in place on the Placentia side to begin the construction. I am merely guessing, and the honourable gentleman is just as good at that as I am, but I would think possibly, if one were prepared to stick out one's neck a little, I think we ought to have it in operation by the end of August. That is just pulling a date out of the air.

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the Committee rise for a ten minutes recess.

Department of Health:

1071—Fixed Assets:

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Premier would like to make any observations on the ceremony at St. Lawrence?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I could add anything to what the press and radio account gave. There was a very large crowd of people, the largest I have ever seen on the Southwest Coast in any one place and at any one time. The fog was as thick as I have ever seen it. The destroyer was

for two and a half hours outside the entrance of the harbour in the thickest fog you could imagine waiting for an ore boat to come out, because they could not go in until the ore boat was out. She then nosed her way in an inch at a time. So we got into the harbour and inched up to the wharf. A few minutes later the fog rose and we saw the town and harbour for the first time. From the top of the hill at the end of the harbour we had a most magnificent view overlooking the harbour, where we could see the shipping and the destroyer bedecked. The whole thing was very beautiful. The sun came out for about twenty minutes when the fog again settled in until we could not see a sign of the harbour. It came to the edge of the crowd and blotted out the people and we were surrounded in just a little circle by the fog. The fog was cold and raw, nevertheless there was a very fine spirit, a very good spirit indeed. The ceremony was quite impressive, and the people of Lawn and St. Lawrence were very proud of it and their record, and, I believe, at the same time were very grateful to the Americans for the extraordinary fine hospital. There was a good spirit all around.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if I might say a word now—in regard to that hospital I am very glad that the Honourable the Premier and some of his associates were able to attend that function because, well, I come from up there in that District of Burin and I can assure the Honourable the Premier and the Government they can turn out the finest fog in the world.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not say the finest—I would say the thickest.

MR. HOLLETT: A good spot to start a new industry on fog. What I want to say is that I think we all join in paying a tribute to the generosity of the Americans for this wonderful and noble gesture which they have made on account of the efforts of the people of Lays and St. Lawrence and other areas nearby in doing their utmost, as naturally they would do, to save the lives of American sailors and soldiers on that day during the war. It was a very tragic affair when two ships almost at the same time ran into the cliffs there. At that time the people of the area did everything possible to save lives and to provide the comforts which were necessary under the circumstances. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, I join with the whole House in expressing our heartfelt thanks to the American people for this noble gesture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be agreeable to the Committee if all of us present were to stand and express our congratulations to the people of St. Lawrence and Lays for their great heroism ten years ago and our gratitude to the American people for their fine generosity in donating the hospital—if we could all just stand and show our feelings.

Applause.

MR. BROWNE: This \$100 for furnishings, cottage hospital is a small vote—I take it a token vote?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It keeps the vote there. The honourable gentleman probably knows by now, if not before this year, we have set up certain votes whereby we vote any moneys under the heading of that vote in any given year, and we hold the vote there sometimes by putting in a token.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister care to state the number of cottage hospitals now in the province?

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): I can't say offhand—somewhere over twenty, twenty-three, I believe.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it, Mr. Chairman, these cottage hospitals are all adequately staffed. Could we have some assurance on that point—adequately staffed as to nurses and doctors?

MR. FORSEY: Perhaps I would not say adequately. They are when we can obtain the nurses. At this particular moment I don't think there are any cottage hospitals understaffed, but next week maybe the position may be different.

Carried.

1074—Other:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is the arrangement between non-government hospitals and the Government regarding the construction of hospitals? What percentage does the Government pay. I notice here \$395,000 in connection with the Grace Hospital?

MR. FORSEY: This is the grant for the Grace Hospital made three years ago, and was made in three parts, forty-five per cent is reimbursable by the Federal Government. It is so much a bed, somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$2,000 a bed.

MR. HOLLETT: How much, Mr. Chairman, altogether has now been paid over to International Grenfell? What is the total amount, somewhere near a million dollars?

MR. FORSEY: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Over eight hundred thousand some time ago.

MR. FORSEY: That is since Confederation and includes Federal health grants.

Carried.

Department of Public Welfare:

MR. BROWNE: Could we ask the Honourable Minister what is that—Northern Labrador?

DR. POTTLE: These are for exactly what they say; buildings and boats. It may be anything—enlarging of depots or building of new schools. Now these are capital costs which may be shared with the Dominion of Canada—two-thirds—one-third basis up to two hundred thousand dollars. That is to say agreed proposals in the field of health, welfare and education will be shared two-thirds being paid by the Dominion Government and one-third by us as our share. We will have to put in the gross, possibly, for the time being.

MR. BROWNE: Is that the gross?

DR. POTTLE: No, that would be net, our share.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Department of Welfare build any schools in Labrador?

DR. POTTLE: We have not built any lately—rehabilitation of Labrador, the building of schools and for instance a resident school at Nain might be one of the projects, and we are anticipating that may be the one.

Carried.

Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply:

MR. BROWNE: For Town Councils I notice the vote is three times

that of last year. Could the Minister say a few words about that?

MR. HEFFERTON: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, is that we have three times as many and the requests are three times what we had last year. It arises from this. Town Councils may want some considerable work done, not heavy enough to call for a bond issue, and consequently they appeal to the Government, and if the request is granted then the Government makes them loans as councils.

MR. BROWNE: This is an expenditure?

MR. HEFFERTON: It says loans.

MR. HOLLETT: That item Co-operative Housing—I think I raised this question before, Mr. Chairman—with regard to the assessment for rental purposes, and I pointed out that in some instances family allowances amounts were added to the earnings of the father in order to—

MR. SMALLWOOD: These have nothing whatever to do with rental—this is ownership of houses. The man owns it outright. It is not rental housing. That comes later, but not under this item.

MR. HOLLETT: All right, Mr. Chairman, if you want to defer it, I will raise it again.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on co-operative housing. I want to know if any places outside the City of St. John's have houses being built on the co-operative plan in which the Government are assisting?

MR. HEFFERTON: At the present time, Sir, there are some nine co-operative groups in town and one outside. Corner Brook, is under consid-

eration at the present time. Or to the best of our knowledge, there are seven, and three in the process of being formed in the immediate present at Gander. Just how many there are to be during the year I am unable to say. We are hoping this amount may be decreased this year by means of a plan we are negotiating with C M & H at the present time.

MR. BROWNE: Very good.

1341—Investments:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would state whether there is any intention of altering the system of financing the rental. The way I look at it the man who has children and is getting some family allowance it is rather unfair to have that added to his earnings in order to make a higher rental. It would mean that a man with four or five children would have to pay a higher rental than a man and his wife in a similar home. The family allowance, of course, is meant for clothing of the child and I think it is rather unfair to add it into the husband's income and thus raise the rental which has to be paid by the father. In that particular matter I wonder if the Minister would care to make any statement?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, first of all let me deal with the vote, there are three projects mentioned there.

In answer to the question raised by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the conditions are laid down by the Federal Government, remember we are a minor part, 25%, and consequently we have to accept conditions, and that is why the family allowance is included as part of the income for

assessing the total income of the person.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like the Minister to tell the Committee how much money is actually involved in housing in these figures. Is that the gross on which we will get reimbursement or do you add three-quarters to this total to make it three times as much?

MR. HEFFERTON: This involves this year possibly \$750,000, but that is recoverable when these jobs are done, because C M & H reimburses us and takes a mortgage on the work.

MR. FOGWILL: The offset here of revenue is very high.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman does not follow my point. Take the half million, for example, in co-operative housing, that half million cash expenditure by this Government in turn is an expenditure by the Government of Canada for three or four times as much, or much more than that, because what we do, I think, is to advance four or five or six hundred dollars per house, and if you divide five hundred thousand by, say, five hundred dollars, that is a lot of houses. On that number of houses the Government of Canada has to advance enormous sums, because they take over the mortgages on the houses as roofed in, they advance all that has been spent up to there, they reimburse the Newfoundland Government and every one concerned; that is largely the Newfoundland Government but not entirely. They advance in addition to that the full remaining costs of the house. So that, if we spend half a million dollars as advances in co-operative houses, what is involved is a much larger sum on housing. Now that half-million is



not an expenditure by us at all but merely an advance. So that the net expenditure by us, I am surprised to find, is one hundred thousand dollars, because this is all loans and investments.

MR. HEFFERTON: Under 1341 (01) all we are dealing with is projects partially completed, except land-scaping, and is held back until the contractors complete the whole thing. The only new project at the present time would be 1341-03 (03), which is a Federal project—that is slum clearance here in St. John's.

MR. HEFFERTON: 1341-02 that is capital account \$7,500, capital, part of the interest taken over by the Government on a one million dollar investment that the St. John's City Council had.

Carried.

MR. HEFFERTON 03-(1) that is the completion of the project in St. John's—03 (02) in Corner Brook and 03 (03) is the beginning of the one in the central area of St. John's, slum clearance, I assume that will start this yea. Burin is the completion of a land assembly job which is already partly done.

MR. BROWNE: They were all blocked together last year. There was nothing spent on 03-(03) last year, was there?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, nothing. But there was quite a heavy expenditure on Corner Brook.

MR. BROWNE: Why is the bracket put around it?

MR. HEFFERTON: Because it is a land assembly.

MR. BROWNE: What does that mean?

MR. HEFFERTON: Servicing the land, getting ready for housing projects, water and sewerage. 04 is merely a housing project. Nothing has been done on it as yet.

Carried.

1344—Other: \$347,000.

MR. BROWNE: May we have some information on that? It is a big item.

MR. HEFFERTON: It is quite a big item. It must be borne in mind, however, we have thirty-four town councils at the present time and somewhere around sixteen community councils, and we are negotiating for another four or five. The same thing applies as to the amount to which I made a reference a few moments ago—projects come up where town councils are not able to raise a bond issue as the amount involved is too small and we accede to their request and give them a loan, and sometimes we may give them a grant. For instance last year we gave twenty-five thousand to Corner Brook as a special grant for fire fighting apparatus. You can see where there are quite a number of grants which have to be made in the course of the year.

MR. BROWNE: How did you make that grant, not under the vote?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, there was a block vote for it.

MR. BROWNE: Who is this \$370,000 to be given to?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is allocated amongst the different town councils, in accordance with what we consider the urgency of their particular requirements.

MR. BROWNE: But how many of them will get money?

MR. HEFFERTON: Maybe five and maybe ten, I cannot tell.

MR. BROWNE: It would help the Committee, I think, if information like that were brought in in advance. Who is getting it? We have no idea where that is going now.

MR. HEFFERTON: I might add also, Mr. Chairman, that several of the town councils which have been given authority to raise bond issues, the Government there obligates itself to pay to 60% of the interest charges. That is included, of course, in this special vote.

MR. BROWNE: Do you remember any of the town councils which will get this money?

MR. HEFFERTON: No. I could give you some of the town councils.

MR. BROWNE: Could you bring in the information, say, tomorrow?

MR. HEFFERTON: We have not decided yet who is to get it or what is to be given.

MR. BROWNE: That is what gets me. I do not understand—how is it carried out—is there so much for Corner Brook—I don't know if Bonavista will get any or not?

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): May I add a word? That amount was determined by taking the total vote in the current year 1953-54.

MR. BROWNE: Where did you find that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Private notes.

MR. BROWNE: That was the amount actually loaned last year?

MR. HEFFERTON: As a matter of fact—this may help a little bit—last year our estimates were included

in special assistance—\$280,000 in current account. This year we thought that belonged to capital account. We transferred it out of current account. We have some seven, eight or ten additions this year, so that acting on that we put down this amount.

MR. BROWNE: This is not returnable?

MR. HEFFERTON: Well, look at Capital Revenue and we can see whether or not that is so.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, just what form does that assistance take, to satisfy what expenditure or shortage or what not?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mostly interest on bonds.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Government then pay the interest on these municipal council bonds?

MR. HEFFERTON: Half.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the total amount that has been issued by all the town councils in bond issues?

MR. HEFFERTON: I could not tell without checking. I could find out.

MR. HOLLETT: Could we have the information tomorrow?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, I will get the information for you tomorrow.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Minister could give me details of the amount spent last year under this heading, which the Minister of Finance said amounted to \$300,000.

MR. POWER: \$347,000.

MR. BROWN: That is in addition to the \$80,000 that is here. But he says the figures he has show \$347,000

as special assistance to town councils last year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not say that—I have the same note here as he has before him, and he could not have said that. He said that amount of \$347,000 has been fixed by taking the total of the authorized expenditure in the year 1953-54, deducting bond issues and adding the per cent to the bond issue payment made in 1954-55. He could not say this is the amount which was spent last year.

MR. BROWNE: Well was it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know—I doubt it.

MR. HEFFERTON: Here is the note, Sir, which I want—the amount is being determined by taking the total of authorized expenditure of account in 1953-54.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the same note I just had.

Carried.

Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives:

MR. HOLLETT: Under 1440-01, I wonder if the Minister would tell us what this \$330,000 takes care of?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): That \$330,000 is to take care of two commitments made by the Government in fisheries development, and henceforth all such commitments will appear under the budget for the Fisheries Development Authority. The reason these two appear here is because these two commitments were given by the Government before the Fisheries Development Authority was appointed. \$300,000 is to cover a commitment, or part of a commitment

to Fisheries Products. The House may recall that in last year's estimates there was authorized in capital account for the expenditure of the sum of one million four hundred thousand dollars. Subsequently the Government entered into agreement with Fishery Products whereby they undertook to make that sum available to Fishery Products. Six hundred and fifty thousand of it was to be for the general purpose of the company and seven hundred and fifty thousand of it was to be invested in capital assets that would enable development of commercial production of block frozen fish at various places around Newfoundland, to be further processed at Trepassey. This six hundred and fifty thousand was paid out last summer, July, and the seven hundred and fifty thousand was to be paid out in monthly instalments of fifty thousand dollars per month, and that ran to four hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and the three hundred thousand is to cover the balance of that commitment, fifty thousand dollars a month for April, May, June, July, August and September. The making of that loan available to Fishery Products enabled the company to purchase a plant at St. Anthony from Northlantic Fisheries, Job Brothers, and to install therein two plate freezers. I am not quite sure if there is a filleting machine there or not. They completed the installations last fall. There was some production last fall but it was too late to have any great production of block frozen fish last year. They go into production this year as soon as conditions open up down there. Then in the plants at Long Harbour and Greenspond there are plate freezing plants with bait and filleting machines. This enabled considerable expansion of the

facilities at Trepassey to further provide block frozen fish and enable somewhat of an expansion of the facilities at Burin further to enable the production of block frozen fish, and provided for the equipping of a refrigerated carrier, and the equipping of a carrier for offal. The \$30,000 is to cover a commitment given by the Government to O'Brien Brothers of Witless Bay in respect of the erection of a small frozen fish plant there for that place.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister would care to say just how much has been loaned now to Fishery Products. I have a reply but this seems to make it a somewhat different statement—I wonder if he knows the total amount?

MR. KEOUGH: As of this moment roughly two million dollars. In the succeeding item 1444, there is a proposal under fisheries development to loan the Fishery Products another million and a half which would bring it to three million six hundred dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: That \$330,000 is included in that, or is it in addition?

MR. KEOUGH: No, that figure I gave you would be exclusive of that.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister any idea when the Trepassey Plant will be working?

MR. KEOUGH: My latest understanding is that Greenspond, Long Harbour and Trepassey will go into production this month or early next month.

MR. FOGWILL: I was going to ask, the fifty thousand that was loaned is that to be given to the fund?

MR. KEOUGH: As the honourable gentleman knows, the Government in setting up the Fisheries Loan Board made available to it the sum of half a million dollars. That is the estimate of the Board of the working capital they would require to enable them to meet the loans they anticipate during the coming year. In other words; if this vote passed, this money is made available to them.

MR. HOLLETT: They have loaned about \$170,000.

MR. KEOUGH: I think it is more than that, around \$275,000.

MR. BROWNE: This \$330,000 has already been loaned, has it?

MR. KEOUGH: No, it is committed. Fifty thousand dollars of it has been made available out of temporary supply, voted to the department, and another two hundred and fifty thousand has to be paid.

MR. HOLLETT: All right.

Carried.

1444—Other:

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could explain what that Fisheries Experimental Grant means?

MR. KEOUGH: Some eight or ten thousand dollars of that is to be provided for an experiment that is being conducted at the Memorial University, an experiment which it is hoped will assist possibly in the setting up of an economic dryer for light salted fish. The Federal Department of Fisheries are carrying on experiments mostly at Bonavista in the drying of light salted fish in commercial quantities and quality. These experiments are being conducted at the Memorial University to eliminate a lot of tests

which would otherwise have to be carried on at Bonavista, and could be eliminated at the Memorial University laboratory, and so would not have to be covered at Bonavista where the actual experiment is being carried on. That \$25,000 is for that. The other is a provision in case that sometime during the year the Government may see fit to make a grant to some company to carry on such experimental work in fisheries—there has been nothing decided on that as yet.

Carried.

Fisheries Development Authority,  
\$3,000,000:

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, that three million dollars is voted for the Fisheries Development Authority. It is proposed to have the vote broken down in the printed estimates right here, but I have here now a breakdown of this three million dollars vote which I would like to have circulated to the House to assist in the discussion of the matter.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are very anxious to know just how this three million dollars is to be spent.

MR. KEOUGH: It is all there.

MR. HOLLETT: Do I understand that the full amount to be spent in LaScie this year is \$353,000?

MR. KEOUGH: LaScie development is to consist of installations put there at two stages, first of all the preliminary work of preparing a site, breakwaters and what not, which is to be done by the Federal Government. When that is completed the Provincial Government will proceed to erect a salt fish plant, a salt storage for salt and a plant for electric power development. It is anticipated that these

three would cost three hundred and thirty thousand dollars. Now at the moment we do not know whether we will get far enough ahead to proceed beyond that stage in this year, but the next stage will consist of the erection of a fresh fish plant and a fishmeal plant. In the event that we do get far enough ahead this year, then we would have to draw upon this.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is to perform the work at Seldom and Valleyfield, is that to be done by the Fishery Development Authority?

MR. KEOUGH: Except wherein Fishery Products name is set down.

MR. HOLLETT: And they take half of the grant, one half million dollars. It looks very much, Mr. Chairman, as if the members of the board and the salaries of the gentlemen amount to well over one hundred thousand dollars, and general expenses another fifty thousand, and in actual fact the amount of money to be spent in that great experiment at LaScie is small indeed compared to what we were led to believe. Meraheen general working capital \$25,000—St. John's—I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us just what is proposed to be done with St. St. John's?

MR. KEOUGH: If the honourable member would not mind—first of all with regard to LaScie: The extent of Federal participation, the site of the breakwater is expected to be in the order of \$790,000, the provincial expenditure for the salt fish and subsidiary installations and fresh fish and subsidiary installations will be of the order of \$700,000, then housing development, water and sewerage, which is something we will have to go into at a later stage, and this will

not enter into the picture this year, it may or it may not.

With regard to St. John's this is a provision to enable the Fisheries Development Authority to acquire a site in St. John's on the waterfront where the Federal department will erect a fishermen's wharf, and \$250,000 is also contemplated to cover the marketing installations that the Provincial Government will place on that wharf. There will be some sort of marketing facilities there. We have not decided on what form, but it will be a fishermen's market.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister say just where the wharf will be?

MR. KEOUGH: I am unable to say that now.

MR. HIGGINS: Will the Fishery Products Limited be given that amount and asked to spend it or does the Authority supervise what they are going to do there?

MR. KEOUGH: It is contemplated as a loan, and authority for it will be sought later in the Loan and Guarantee Act of the House, a loan of one million five hundred thousand dollars to the Fishery Products Limited to enable them to put plants such as I have already indicated in the places named. Mostly they are plants for the production of block frozen fish, with a fishmeal plant at Catalina and Twillingate. That money will be made available to Fishery Products, and the Fisheries Development Authority will have to watch for the Government to see that the money goes into the installations of such plants in these places.

MR. HIGGINS: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, are these to be regarded as loans, and are there any securities to be given for them, or is the position to

be that the Authority exercises a watchful supervision—is there any security for the money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the Committee would regard this as the budget for the coming year of the FDA which they submitted to the Minister, and the Minister to the Cabinet and the Cabinet to the Committee of the House, this is the budget of FDA. Now it consists principally, as the Committee will see—this is their first budget for their first year after becoming a legal institution—of loans from them to Fishery Products Limited to enable Fishery Products Limited to finance in whole for the most part these plants on the Northeast Coast and in Trepassey on the East Coast or Southeast Coast and Bay de Verde on the East Coast. These loans to be made by the Fisheries Development Authority after they have received the applications for these loans from the Fishery Products Limited, and after they have examined their applications carefully, after they examined the balance sheet of Fishery Products Limited carefully, after they have considered each individual part of the whole programme, or rather each individual project put forward by Fishery Products Limited; after all that careful consideration, the FDA then submitted this request to the Government with their recommendation that the Government submit it to the Committee on Supply with the Government's recommendation, and the Government's request that these amounts be authorized for the Fisheries Development Authority for the purpose named in these FDA estimates.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, might I again repeat the question: These are loans; is there any security



for the loans? It would appear that in these areas at least Fishery Products is doing the work of the Fisheries Development Authority this year or apparently for some years to come—is there any security?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A complete chattel mortgage.

MR. KEOUGH: The securities are the assets created by the loan.

MR. FOGWILL: What interest will the FDA charge on this loan?

MR. KEOUGH: On this loan it will be 4%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say in that connection that the Government decided that as the Northeast Coast and East Coast, but particularly the Northeast Coast, was the part of the island that attracted capital least of all, because of geographical and climatic conditions, the Government, as an inducement to private enterprise to move in on that coast, ought to make its own special contribution not only in the form of loans but loans at an especially low rate of interest. Because it must be clear to the House that loans made to the Fisheries Development Authority and by them to private enterprise at 3% are loans made at a rate lower than the rate at which the Government itself can obtain the money by borrowing; the difference between the two rates then being, of course, a subsidy. If we do this in Newfoundland then obviously the less said about it the better.

MR. HOLLETT: About what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The difference in the cost of the money to the Government and to the firm to whom the money is lent. We would not

want to be accused of subsidizing our fisheries. That is the last thing in the world we intend to do.

MR. HOLLETT: The point that struck me about the 3%, Mr. Chairman, if any firm, I won't say on Water Street, but in St. John's wants to go to the Northeast Coast and start a plant and had to go to a bank they could certainly have to pay appreciably more than 3%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is doubtful if the bank would lend it.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The banks to begin with don't lend money for capital account expenditure except on very short terms, a year or a half year.

MR. HOLLETT: The loan then is for experimental plants. What sort of plants are they going to build for \$237,000?

MR. KEOUGH: That is only a small balance of a large amount which we have paid already.

MR. HOLLETT: You are adding this amount to it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the balance due under the original loan.

MR. HOLLETT: You will agree, Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for us, just having gotten this, to analyze anything herein. We don't claim too much competence. It lists, for instance, Valleyfield and Badgers Quay, nobody knows what that is all about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is clear enough: That is a Federal project in which there may well turn out to be some activity of a provincial character, and ought to be conducted there—that is a token vote.

MR. HIGGINS: From what the Minister said I understand this item from Trepassey only represents a small portion of a loan already made?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The unpaid balance, the remainder of the total amount promised.

MR. HIGGINS: Did we already vote the original token amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The House voted some, I believe, last year, and the Government has since promised the additional amount.

MR. HIGGINS: This is really now in excess of what has already been voted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is.

MR. HIGGINS: We are not voting the same amount over again.

MR. KEOUGH: The House last year voted \$287,000 and in the agreement that we made, based upon the House's authority to spend \$1,400,000 of which I just spoke, there was another one hundred thousand dollars spent for a further increase of facilities in the Trepassey Plant, and this will be for a further increase in the facilities, so that actually the Government is enabled at the Trepassey Plant to lend something over seven hundred thousand dollars, by the time it is all added together.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the interest rate based on the whole be 4%?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Most of it. Some of these loans were made to Fishery Products Limited a couple or three years ago at higher rates.

MR. HOLLETT: I was thinking of Trepassey, that will be 4%?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so, a good bit of it.

MR. KEOUGH: As far as I can remember offhand this much only would be at 3%. I believe previous amounts were for 4½%.

MR. HOLLETT: Are all such loans to other fish companies at that rate or similar? I don't mean on the Northeast Coast—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there is no need to give that special inducement.

MR. HOLLETT: Surely there would not be much difference between Gaultois and Trepassey.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will do it for any one along the Southwest as well as we have done it for Trepassey.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words the interest rate in Trepassey to Fishery Products Limited and the people in Gaultois will be the same?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, the agreement with Gaultois was made several years ago.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if the plants at Quirpon and LaScie, Seldom-Come-By and Merasheen will deal with block freezing of fish and fresh frozen fillets?

MR. KEOUGH: Quirpon no. At LaScie this provision here is only for salt fish. When we get around to installing a fresh fish plant there the decision will have to be taken at that time as to what its nature will be. At Seldom-Come-By and Merasheen it is all salt fish.

MR. BROWNE: Well, it looks like Fishery Products Limited are carrying out their original intention of getting a monopoly in the fresh frozen fish trade. Were there bait depots at

Change Islands, Joe Batts Arm and Twillingate and Catalina before this scheme was devised?

MR. SMALWOOD: It is the first I have heard of Fishery Products Limited desiring to have a monopoly.

MR. BROWNE: Well last year the Premier announced he was going to make an agreement to have Fishery Products Limited take over fourteen or eighteen depots to establish plants, but was unable to carry out the plans because the Federal Government stopped them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was never any intention of a monopoly in the fresh fish industry.

MR. BROWNE: I was asking if there were bait depots in these places?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In some of them.

MR. KEOUGH: I think we had them at some of them. I could not say at the moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not at Change Islands, and there is not at Quirpon and not at Joe Batts Arm, that is three, and there is not at Meraheen, which is four, and there is not at Catalina, five—in five of them there are no bait depots.

MR. BROWNE: At any rate Fishery Products will get the bulk of this money this year, and they will set up their own plants and the Fisheries Authority is going to, from what figures I can make up, spend about \$680,000. So that Fishery Products will do more than twice as much as the Fisheries Development Authority, and it won't cost us anything.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not

quite so. I thought I did detect at the end of the honourable gentleman's remarks some satisfaction that private enterprise was doing this, if so I welcome that note from him because clearly it would be better for Newfoundland, far better, if the fisheries were carried out by private enterprise—period—Private enterprise whether a group of private enterprisers or a co-operative group of fishermen, but private enterprise rather than government.—We would prefer that infinitely. The only difficulty is that there is not enough private enterprise or not sufficient enterprise even with government financial assistance, and there are not enough enterprising, profit enterprisers in Newfoundland today to accept financial assistance from the Government to carry out fishery development, consequently the Government, with its own money and with the help of federal money have to engage in fisheries development in certain places. So that we have two types of development proceeding simultaneously, some of them in public enterprise, government enterprise, federal and provincial jointly, at Quirpon, at La Scie, Seldom, Meraheen. These are government enterprises, joint federal-provincial, and private enterprise in all these others. Now the pity of it is that there are not enough private enterprisers with enterprise to come to the Government, as Fishery Products Limited has done, and as other fishing companies have done, and get loans to carry on fisheries development—That is the pity of it—

MR. BROWNE: Don't you think the Fishery Products are up to the maximum now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In what, activity or money?

MR. BROWNE: They are carrying on with twelve and a half million this year, you cannot expect them to do any more.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite so. I referred not to them doing more but to other enterprisers doing something.

MR. BROWNE: How far is Seldom-Come-By from Change Islands and Joe Batts Arm?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are all pretty close together, but it is a great fishing area.

MR. BROWNE: What is the difference between conditions at Seldom and Change Islands?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The public enterprise going on there is salt fish.

MR. BROWNE: As far as private enterprise going in there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Private enterprise has shown no desire to get in there.

MR. BROWNE: Was it not private enterprise that established there a freezing plant in Seldom-Come-By and have taken it away.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Monroe's operated there. They have quite a big plant down there. That is the building at Joe Batts Arm. They did operate during the war, but it has not operated since the war, and they had to move their equipment out. There is nothing at Change Islands.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think it almost looks as though the Fishery Products are the Fishery Development. Last year \$1,400,000 was voted for fisheries development, and then later was passed over or loaned to Fishery Products, and now of the three million voted this year they also

get one million five hundred thousand. In other words they get two million nine hundred thousand of the total in two years voted by this House for Fisheries Development. \$4,400,000 has been voted in two years and of that amount nearly three millions have been loaned to Fishery Products. Now when the Honourable the Premier spoke of there not being such private enterprisers with private enterprise, I wonder if there is not a sufficient number of private enterprisers with government capital at 3%. We have to remember that if John Jones, a merchant on Water Street, can't get a loan from the Government he has to go to the bank and probably pay 6% or 7%, but if he has the ear of the Government he can get it for 3%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He cannot get it at the bank at any rate, high or low, not for capital account investment.

MR. HOLLETT: They have been known to have given guarantees.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Government guarantees.

MR. HOLLETT: They don't get it for 3% there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not objecting at all. I hope Fishery Products will succeed. But I am really pointing out that it is very difficult for other private enterprisers to be enterprising, following the Premier's line of thought, when Fishery Products come to the Government and get three million dollars, you may say out of a vote in two years of \$4,400,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the pity of it is they have not a half dozen firms more like them.

MR. HOLLETT: Would you give it to them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly! Does not my honourable friend agree it is incomparably better for Newfoundland that fisheries development be carried out by private enterprise than by Government? Now that private enterprise may be a Water Street firm or an outport firm, a private fish merchant, a co-operative society, or it may be any community or group of producers—all private enterprise.—Does he not agree it is far better that it be done by private enterprise than by the Government? Does he not agree—the whole Opposition there is the private enterprise party?

Now secondly, if private enterprise is enterprising and has the drive, has the energy and ambition but not the capital then, in an industry so basic to our very way of life in Newfoundland, is it not the Government's proper part to lend that capital, and to lend it at as low a rate as possible? Is not that a proper function for the Government? Now if it, and the answer to both of these questions is, yes, there is one remaining fact to be settled: the means, the technique, the machinery you set up to scan the applications for such loans, and the supervision of the loans when they are made. Hence, in our view, if the FDA—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, if there had been no FDA these applications could be brought in and granted the same way as you loaned four million four hundred thousand in the last two years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, in addition the FDA spends money on its own account in government enterprise at Quirpon, LaScie, a gigantic enterprise which will run probably to many many

millions; and at Seldom.—These are places where government enterprise will be carried out by the Fisheries Development Authority which has this double function; lending money to private enterprise and following it up and supervising it and spending money itself on these government enterprises in collaboration with the Government of Canada.

MR. HOLLETT: Is the spending of this million and a half dollars which you loaned Fishery Products this year to be under the supervision of the FDA?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As the House and the Committee must be aware we cannot debate the Fisheries Authority Bill all over again, but surely the honourable gentleman remembers they were entrusted with supervision of all fisheries loans, past, present and future.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I understood the Minister to say the Trepassey Plant would be in operation by the end of this month or early next month. I take it then this money will be loaned to Trepassey already.

MR. KEOUGH: No, the money has not already been loaned, but I would imagine that possibly the great bulk is to be spent for equipment and the purchase will be rather rapid.

MR. BROWNE: It is quite late.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might be working capital.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I did ask the Minister some time back to table an answer to a question in respect to the quantity of fresh fish processed in Newfoundland in all these plants. I think it would be of interest to the Committee—as I said before I

was wondering if the Minister would like to give that information for, I understand, somewhere between twenty and thirty plants for the processing of fresh fish around the island. Well production is based on a hundred day year, eight hour day. I might be wrong. It is not out of idle curiosity I am asking. I would like to know the approximate figures at least.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, my department cannot take responsibility for saying what the fish production figures are in Newfoundland. That is a function of the Federal Department. My department has certain statistics available but, before I could say publicly what the production is, I could not take the responsibility for making a statement publicly on my own behalf. All I could do would be to refer the honourable member to the source where he could get that himself.

MR. HOLLETT: The Federal Fisheries Department?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can tell the honourable gentleman now where the plants are: St. Anthony, Englee, Bonavista, Harbour Grace, St. John's, Fermeuse, Burin, Fortune, Gaultois and three up the coast. Ramea, Burnt Island and Isle Aux Morts and Burgeo, that is thirteen.

MR. FOGWILL: I am not going to dispute that, perhaps I do know, but anyway I understood the Minister to say when debating the Fisheries Authority Bill, once the fish comes out of the water and comes on the land it is a provincial responsibility coming under his department until the fish are exported from the island. I should think that means we should at least know the scope of these plants, particularly these plants into

which the Government has invested money and in which we have such large amounts of money as we have been talking about—we should know the capacity of the plants. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out there is a safety factor in the operation of these plants. If a plant can produce say—I have a note here somewhere—fifty thousand pounds per day, well they could produce for probably a maximum of one hundred eighty-hour days—what is the safety factor—fifty million pounds—where is the point?—is it in the red or the black. They have to produce a certain amount of fish to make a profit or break even. These are things the Committee, I think, should know about, Mr. Chairman.

MR. KEOUGH: I disagree—that is why we have the Fisheries Development Authority to pass on these purely technical matters. I don't think the House is in a position at any time at all to pass an expert opinion on matters of that nature.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I am in entire agreement with the Minister. We are discussing the matter now, and the House is passing at the present time three millions to be spent on fisheries development, and these things if not brought in in great detail, we should have some indication of the production capacity, the safety factor in production and where is the margin. We understood from the Premier that a certain kind of fish product is unlimited, but we have no evidence, but only know from what the Premier told us. Surely there ought to be more evidence than that brought before the Committee.

MR. HOLLETT: As to the salaries of the three men, may I ask if they



were paid since June last year, and if so, from what vote were they paid?

MR. KEOUGH: They were paid from the department last year, and they were paid by special warrant which will be covered in Supplementary Supply Bill to be brought into the House later.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like some information from the Minister. There is a special vote there, unallocated, \$344,000, are we taking it that there are certain suggestions in the air that the Authority is considering now or are these just provisions for things that may come up?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the Authority ever since last September has had a certain number of propositions come before them, and some of them are being culled out, and some have been accepted, but are not at the moment to the stage where the Authority could submit them to the Government, and this unallocated portion here is just in the event there are other proposals the Authority will eventually decide on recommending to the Government to assure that some money might be available for that. And if the Authority should make recommendations to the Government in excess perhaps of this four hundred thousand dollars they may have to take the action of seeking further money by special warrant covering it by asking the House for it in a Bill next year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is extremely likely to happen. That amount might run up to four times that.

MR. HIGGINS: One other thing—I don't see any reference to market research?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I doubt if they will do very much market research this year.

MR. HIGGINS: I thought that would be one of the big jobs?

MR. KEOUGH: It would be covered there if at all.

MR. HOLLETT: There is an item there for salaries—could the Minister tell us just what the salaries are for, and who they are for?

MR. KEOUGH: I cannot tell you who they are for because certain appointments have not been made yet. The three members of the Authority have secretaries, on a scale of \$100 less than Deputy Minister's secretaries. They are Mr. Storey, Mr. Thistle and Mr. Mercer. \$2,600 Mr. Storey, \$2,400 Mr. Thistle and Mr. Mercer. The balance is to provide for new staff not yet appointed.

MR. HOLLETT: Under demonstration, I wonder if the Minister could give us any idea of what that is?

MR. KEOUGH: Well, there is nothing specific decided as yet, other than that the Authority can either perhaps later in the year try to carry on an experiment to prove the commercial feasibility of scallop beds off the south coast, or maybe to enable other operators, fishermen or firms to put equipment on their vessels to demonstrate its effective use.

MR. HOLLETT: To me, Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a most extraordinary statement—there is nothing definite about it. Seemingly nobody seems to know just what these things are for. Somebody made a guess, and said we will put that down for general experiments, and somebody else said—gear and equipment,

and so it goes on, throughout the whole thing—technical services a token vote—there does not seem to be anything working except the Fishery Development Authority, and the whole thing, as far as I can see, is still in the air, and when it comes to vote for these things, and the Minister is unable at this moment to tell us what it is for, maybe a scallop bed or to try out experiments—we are supposed to say okay, fifty thousand dollars. So it goes on. I must say I am afraid I am a bit disappointed in this whole statement particularly in view of the fact I don't see anything much there for the Fisheries Authority to do except to draw their salaries.

MR. BROWNE: The plants at LaScie which are being constructed this summer, I suppose won't get into operation this year?

MR. KEOUGH: It is unlikely.

MR. BROWNE: What about Seldom?

MR. KEOUGH: Possibly late in the year but it is doubtful.

MR. BROWNE: It is doubtful that any of these will then? Now Quirpon, LaScie and Seldom are three places where the salt codfishery is carried on, are these going to give up the fishery this year?

MR. KEOUGH: I don't see why.

MR. BROWNE: You mean they will carry on in their traditional pattern? Of course everyone expects they will look for work on these big undertakings, and everyone expects they will be the first ones employed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they knock-off this year to build these plants they will be all back fishing next year, there is no doubt of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and ask leave to sit again.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the following items of Capital Account Expenditure: Department of Public Works, Department of Health, Department of Public Welfare, Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply, and Items 1440-1441 inclusive.

Report received. Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock, I leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

#### NIGHT SESSION

Monday, June 7, 1954.

The House resumed at eight of the clock.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees:

Committee of the Whole on Supply:

Department of Fisheries and Cooperatives:

1444:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister know whether any of this money is going to be used for the purpose of vessels and boats and dragnets and things like that?

MR. KEOUGH: None of the money of the million vote.

MR. BROWNE: Because I was going to draw the attention of the Minister to an article appearing in the Evening Telegram by Mr. Antle,

Treasurer of the Fishermen's Federation :

"The big dragger will follow the banker and the Labrador floater to the boneyard, if the present trend continues," P. J. Antle, Treasurer of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen told the Evening Telegram to-day.

"Turnover in crews is simply tremendous," he said, "A few years ago, fishermen were practically begging for jobs on draggers. Now you have to go out and search for men."

"With present prices for fish from the plants, Newfoundlanders can never afford to fish in modern boats," he declared. "It just isn't possible to run an expensive boat and make a living for her crew at the prices received. Even the Danish Seiner Matthew II, billed as the greatest success of any experiment ever undertaken in Newfoundland fishing is now tied up, and has been for many months," he said.

"Fishermen suspect that the price of fish to the inshore man is being kept down in an effort to cut losses on the dragger fleets," Mr. Antle continued.

#### *Fish Run Colossal*

"The run of fish in the bay this year is simply colossal," he said. "If possible, it is even greater than last year, when it was the biggest since 'grandfather's time.'" Mr. Antle firmly believes that the inshore fishery comes and goes in a big cycle, and that we are reaching the point in that cycle when we are again in the era of huge catches, in fact "we must now be near the crest of possible production."

#### *No Bait*

Unfortunately, "the fishermen al-

ways loses for some reason or other," and this time it happens to be bait. There is no bait at Burin, and the men who could have landed several hundred dollars worth of fish already this season in most cases have very little.

Some men have jigged some fish, and Mr. Antle tells of one case—almost incredible—where two men set a trawl (just to keep the berth) with nothing on it but the bare hooks, and when they hauled it, took from the bare hooks \$27 worth of cod fish.

The cold storage at Burin has been used "for everything except bait," Mr. Antle said. At the present the Department of Fisheries is investigating the matter. The fishermen, he said, sincerely hope that it can be used to keep them supplied with bait, so that they can take advantage of the phenomenal run of fish. They don't care if its Socialism, Nationalization, State Capitalism, or whatever it may be called, so long as they can get bait at the cold storage, he declared.

Now here is the point that I was coming to: In the new plant that will be under the control of Fishery Products Limited will there be any guarantee that the fishermen will get the first bait there is to be got?

MR. KEOUGH: In any instances where the Fishery Products may have made an arrangement with the Federal Department of Fisheries to lease the bait depots.

MR. BROWNE: In Burin, say, can they get any bait there?

MR. KEOUGH: I don't know there. I do know the Burin installation is not one operated by the Department of Fisheries, the Federal Department, but is privately owned, I believe.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, the bait depot at Burin is privately owned, and when the bankers were operating and they sold bait to the bankers they made a profit. Unfortunately since the fisheries declined they have used up any reserve from the installation originally built, and the bait depot there has now run out of funds. There is presently a proposition before the Federal Government. As a matter of fact only three days ago the representative of the Federal Department of Fisheries began an investigation of the position of the Federal Government taking over the bait depot at Burin. The report has not yet been written, but will be tabled, and within a week we will know whether the Federal Department is taking over the bait depot at Burin, and will extend there the same facilities for bait as they are extending in the various depots they own already.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in that information about the Burin depot because I was very largely instrumental in getting that bait depot there a good many years ago.

MR. FORSEY: Twenty-seven years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: It must be that. We wanted a bait depot and wanted a hospital, and we organized and got together and eventually we got enough to build a bait depot, and had something over. That, I understood, was in trust, I think, in the name of the Old Colony Hospital Trust. Now the Minister stated that the Federal Government is likely to take it over, but in what manner or by what process will they take it over?

MR. FORSEY: They will buy it from the Old Colony Hospital Trust,

and the money received will have to be used for the purposes of this trust in Burin.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Minister tell me who they are now?

MR. FORSEY: They are composed of the director, who receives no remuneration, Mr. Ernest Day and Mr. Don Hollett; I forget the other gentlemen's names.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell me under what department of the Government the supervision of that Old Colony Hospital Trust Fund comes. Does it come under the supervision of any department of the Government from year to year?

MR. FORSEY: It is under the supervision of no department. It is a private corporation, a limited liability company, and the cold storage is a subsidiary of that, and the holding company, the Old Colony Hospital Trust, has been financing the subsidiary company during the past ten or twelve years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These two Burin District men are carrying on a personal conversation which has no bearing whatsoever on the estimates. We spend no money and have no control as that is just a private company up there.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate I think a couple of Burin members could have a conversation even across this House occasionally.

While I am on my feet I would like to know the exact amount owed the Government by Fishery Products. I believe they got one or two amounts there, if I remember correctly.

MR. KEOUGH: A million, four hundred thousand.

MR. HOLLETT: That was last year?

MR. KEOUGH: Oh yes, under the vote we are now discussing.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, as I have it from an answer to a question, cash loans to Fishery Products amounted to \$1,337,000. In addition to that there was an amount of \$110,000 and an amount of \$350,000, still owed, and another \$79,500 and another guarantee of \$250,000 still outstanding. That makes a total of \$2,500,000. If we add these amounts we get a grand total of \$3,840,500, owed by Fishery Products.

MR. KEOUGH: With the advances or loans now suggested, \$1,500,000, the total will be \$3,840,500. There have been certain repayments but I don't have that to hand.

MR. HOLLETT: Might I ask if the same interest rate of three per cent applies on all these loans?

MR. KEOUGH: No. There was the one million, four hundred thousand last year, at three and a quarter, and several previously on which the interest rate may probably be higher. It may not be, but I do not know. I have not the information to hand. It was not less anyhow.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it is most important that every man in this House should pray every night that the Fishery Products have a very successful year and for the next twenty-five years in order to enable them to refund that money. I think we will probably need it for many other things. I believe the present loan is largely based on the new methods of putting up fish—is that the idea, block frozen fish?

MR. BROWNE: Is there any time for repayment of this money?

MR. KEOUGH: There is no time limit. The suggestion is twenty-one and a half years.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if it is intended to put a drying plant, the new experimental dryer of light salt fish at these three places, Quirpon, LaScie and Seldom?

MR. KEOUGH: At Quirpon and Seldom as the case may warrant. It is intended to put a dryer at LaScie.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, are there any provisions in any of these plants for the heavy salted fish being dried by artificial means? I believe in Nova Scotia their fish is dried in that way.

MR. KEOUGH: I have the specific information here. I would take it the dryer to be installed there is a dryer for heavy salted fish. In Quirpon and Seldom, in the list of the installations that are to go in there is no mention of a dryer of any sort. Perhaps as time goes on one may be installed there. It is certainly not envisaged in the initial installations.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the size of the block frozen fish Fishery Products will put up?

MR. KEOUGH: The standard size is usually 21 pounds. It may vary.

MR. HOLLETT: I received the figure of seventeen and a half pounds.

MR. KEOUGH: I suppose blocks of that size could be processed.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Minister know what the export price is at the present time?

MR. KEOUGH: No.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, we have heard all about fishsticks. How many plants are making these fishsticks now?

MR. KEOUGH: I don't know if there are any.

MR. FOGWILL: We have it on very good authority they are put up at Fishery Products plant at Burin.

MR. KEOUGH: I think that is possibly frozen packed.

MR. FORSEY: No, there are no fishsticks put up at Burin.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, none in Newfoundland.

MR. FOGWILL: No fishsticks at all put up in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Block frozen, not sticks.

MR. FOGWILL: I have seen the sticks put up in Newfoundland, marked "Newfoundland Product."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but processed in the States and they come back here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is too much conversation back and forth. I would like again to refer the Committee to the use of the personal pronoun "you." If I could do it I would have honourable members write a thousand times—"I must not use the pronoun 'you'."

MR. HOLLETT: Is it the Government's intention to institute any housing at LaScie this year?

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, the policy with regard to housing has not been decided. I notice there is a vote in here. If a decision is made later the allocation from this could be called upon for this purpose.

MR. BROWNE: In reference to this vote for St. John's, I hope some real effort will be made on the part of the Fisheries Development Authority to find a suitable place here in St. John's for a fish market. There is a big market here for fresh fish, and I don't think any other kind of fish can compare with fresh fish. It has a virtue all its own. When it is frozen it is not the same. And I think it would be beneficial to all concerned and to the public if they could get this market very soon.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Chairman, I think I can give the honourable gentleman an undertaking that the Fisheries Development Authority are pursuing the matter very seriously, and have been carrying on negotiations with regard to a possible site for months past, and will certainly give all due attention to the matter.

MR. HOLLETT: Under this Bay de Verde—Fishery Products Limited. My understanding is that there is already a plant there at Bay de Verde, owned and operated, I believe, by Cy Moores. I am not sure, but I think it is Northeastern Fisheries Limited. I believe there is a plant at Bay de Verde at the present time. How will it be affected by the operation of this particular one the Government finances, by Fishery Products?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It won't be affected—that has been gone into.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it not possible that the existing plant there could have handled that situation for Bay de Verde?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We had conversations with Mr. Moores, and Mr. Moores withdrew from the situation.

Carried.



Department of Economic Development:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Committee would prefer to have me say just a very brief word about the vote in general, and then to give a little additional detail on the individual items making up the total vote.

The Committee will notice to begin with that the total amount involved is well under a million dollars, and is by far the smallest vote there has been in this department since the department was created. The amounts have varied from six or seven or eight millions a year down to five and a half millions voted the year before last and two and a half millions voted last year to less than a million this year. That, I think, reflects the fact that Economic Development on the purely industrial side is now qualitatively smaller than it has been and quantitatively too because there is a corresponding increase in the amounts for fisheries development, in the department immediately before this, and at the top of the same page in these estimates. The Committee will notice that amounts voted in Fisheries and Co-operatives have increased steadily from half a million the year before last to one and a half millions last year and three and a half millions this year, and secondary development, which for the most part in these estimates have consisted of industrial development, has gone down from five and a half millions to one million or less than one million. The Fisheries have gone up in precisely the same period from half a million to one and a half million to three and a half million.

Now to explain the estimates: The first one, cement—that is a token vote of one hundred dollars none of which

will be spent. I don't know why it is in. If the Committee cares to do so we might make nothing there—but there are some claims outstanding, I am informed, in respect of the land that was purchased for the site of the plant, not the immediate site of the building but the whole surrounding site of the enterprise, consisting of some thirty or forty acres of land. There are one or two claims in connection with that land outstanding, for which reason we have a token vote of a hundred dollars.

The gypsum vote is \$160,000. Now the position on that is that there was a loss, an operating loss, last year of \$168,000, as I have already informed the House some \$80,000 was found during the year out of countervailing savings that was underspent under some other vote within the same Department of Economic Development, and within the vote for capital account. That was applied towards the operating loss for the year leaving an amount of \$160,000 to complete payment of the loss, which we ask the Committee now to authorize.

I may say, in connection with the gypsum plant that the estimate of the operating loss for this year is \$100,000 and the estimate for next year is nothing, in fact we estimate that next year we will be in the black.

The birch plant: This is again a token vote.

Tanneries: Here an amount is asked of \$2,700. The authorization was originally \$393,000. All but \$2,700 of this was paid, and this \$2,700 is inserted now for the coming year.

The next item is Hanning Electric. That is the battery plant, and there again the amount is merely a token vote.

The next is Atlantic Gloves, the glove plant. The amount of the loan

authorized was \$350,000, and as at the end of the financial year just passed all of that had been paid out to the Atlantic Gloves, with the exception of an amount of \$103,400, in other words that is the balance of the loan, the rest having been paid them up to the end or before the end of the past financial year.

In the case of Koch Shoes the authorized loan was \$750,000. As at the end of the financial year that had all been paid to the company except for an amount of \$478,000 which we now ask the Committee to authorize us to pay.

Item 24—Knitting Mills—that is Eckhardt Woolen Mills at Brigus. The amount of \$187,400 we ask for, I shall have to seek advice on the meaning of that. The amount of the loan in this case was \$387,400. As at the end of the financial year just passed there remained to be paid to the company an amount of \$187,400 because they had been paid the rest. So that we have to ask the Committee to authorize the payment of this balance.

I know of no other explanation required. But if there is I will seek to give the information.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Premier what he means by "We paid them" I mean, does he not pay according to certain advances in the construction. One hundreds thousand dollars—does that mean over half the building has been constructed? I understand only the foundation has been laid yet at Eckhardt Mills.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. The roof is on the building, and it is practically completed. The honourable gentleman is not quite right when he assumes that the methods of payment

is according to progress made on construction of the building. The method of payment is, as and when machinery and equipment and material and supplies are landed at the site or landed within Newfoundland, payments are made on the production of vouchers, because in nearly all of these assisted European industries or nearly all the principle has been to match their investment dollar for dollar. Now that it not true of all of them, for the last two or three of them the formula has been somewhat different, and the very latest of them is Eckhardt Mills, the one we are now discussing. In the last two or three cases the Government put up more than half, more than matched the investment of the European concerns. In the case of Eckhardt Mills I forget the exact details now, but we more than matched it. In the case of Koch Shoes at Harbour Grace we put about two-thirds to their one-third.

I may say, incidentally in connection with Koch Shoes, Gold Sail Leather and Eckhart Mills—this First in connection with Koch Shoes, I had a letter a few days ago, (and if I had remembered to bring it in I would have done so) from Mr. McKay, the boot and shoe manufacturer in Harbour Grace. He told me that he has spent his life, as the Committee knows, manufacturing footwear. The Committee is aware of the fact he was the purchaser of the Newfoundland Boot and Shoe Company plant up here on Job Street, at least of the mechanical equipment, and that he kept on manufacturing at Harbour Grace until the last ditch, with help from the Government. We paid a premium price for all of the footwear for the Mental Hospital, Infirmary, General Hospital, Penitentiary, the prison camps and all other institutions

at which we provided people with footwear. We bought all of that, running into a good many thousands of dollars a year, I believe, from a factory in Harbour Grace, paying a premium I think, of 20% above what we might have gotten the footwear for. Mr. McKay made a game attempt to keep the plant afloat, but in the end he had to give in and close out. Well he has just returned from a visit throughout the United States and Canada and he wrote me a letter the other day saying that he thought I would probably be interested to hear his reactions. He said that in his opinion this plant at Harbour Grace is the most modern, the most streamlined, the most up-to-date boot and shoe plant anywhere now to be found in all North America. He does not say it is the biggest, but the most up-to-date. And I can well believe that. I am a bit of an expert myself on the appearance of machinery. I have seen machinery now in hundreds of industrial plants. And it does a man's heart good to go into the plant at Harbour Grace and see utterly streamlined machinery—it is superb, it is matchless. They are turning out footwear over there that is going to be a good seller, without any doubt about it. I have good faith in Koch Shoes. The son, who is the managing director running the plant, is a man of great energy and great drive and great skill, and I believe he is going to be an outstanding success. I believe that Koch Shoes will be sold up and down Canada like the "Hart Shoe" which is manufactured in New Brunswick and sold in every town across Canada. So also I believe the Koch Shoe will be a popular seller all across Canada and all across Newfoundland.

Now, Gold Sail: They had to

change their name. Their original name was Canadian Leather but they found some other company in Canada had the same name, and they had to change their name to "Gold Sail." They are making leather goods beyond comparison in North America. Nothing in North America is as good. It has got to be the best and that is it. They are making the best. Honourable gentlemen who go into the Newfoundland Hotel might stop for a moment and look at the show cases on the ground floor as you go inside the revolving doors, to the immediate right. You will find on the immediate left, Eckhardt Mills showcase and on the right Gold Sail Leather. The leather they use in that plant is made by Dorn Tanneries in Carbonear, and the women's handbags they are making over there in Harbour Grace retailing from \$5 to \$30 each are incomparable in North America today. They are just superb, just beautiful. The Newfoundland sealskin, a pure white product of the Dorn Tanneries in Carbonear, is absolutely beautiful leather, very fine, and the grain has not to be put on as it has on some leather to which you have to add the grain by a process of stamping, but the Newfoundland seal leather gives a beautiful grain that is natural, and the leather dyed white makes a dressy handbag which is the envy of any woman's heart. I believe it is making quite a hit at the Trade Fair at the great Newfoundland Booth at the Trade Fair, which, incidentally, is the greatest booth in the whole of the Trade Fair in Toronto as it was last year. It is even more so this year. In this booth the leather goods of Gold Sail are attracting great attention. I may say this; the Minister of Finance, the Attorney General, the Minister of Public Works and I have,

in Offenbach in Germany visited the people who have started this factory in Harbour Grace, Anton Schaefer. Mr. Schaefer is a man who is, I would say, close to five hundred pounds, an enormous size of a man. He is the president of the leather goods association of manufacturers in Germany. Offenbach is the leather goods heart of the world. There are in Offenbach eleven hundred manufacturing plants making leather goods. Mr. Schaefer, father of the manager in Harbour Grace of the Gold Sail Leather Company, is the founder of the association of the leather goods manufacturers in Germany, and the president of it. He is the founder of the leather goods fair, and he is the man who built the great building housing the fair. They hold two a year, two exhibitions a year, in which all the leather goods manufacturers of Europe exhibit and leather goods buyers and manufacturers from all over the world visit that fair twice a year. We visited the fair and there is no question about who was boss of that fair. It was the same man Schaefer.

Now he came out here and visited us about three years ago, but it was not until last year that they were able to meet our conditions and come in with their share of the investment to start the plant at Harbour Grace.

Finally we have Eckhardt Mills. They are from Austria. Mr. Eckhardt comes from Austria, near Vienna. He is a most charming man, a gentleman to the tip of his fingers, very gracious and very charming. His plant in Vienna has been selling through the United States ever since the war ended and before the war broke out. All the high-class sport shops sell goods, one class of his goods. He makes different classes and different types of

merchandise. But his high-class stuff, cardigans for women and sweaters sell for \$50, \$70 and \$80 each and men's for \$100 in these shops that cater to millionaires. Now if honourable members would stop and look at the window in the Newfoundland Hotel on the ground floor they would see these woolen garments and see for themselves what perfectly magnificent goods they are.

Mr. Eckhardt has opened three shops in Toronto, three retail shops on Yonge Street and Bloor and St. Clair. He has opened three in Montreal on St. Catherine Street. That is six retail shops, and one here on Water Street, being patronized by every lady of means, I believe, in the City of St. John's today who are buying the very high-class woolen knit wear of this gentleman named Eckhardt. I prophesy here today this plant will manufacture woolen goods that will sell in every nook and corner in Newfoundland. That will not be that high-class, very high-priced stuff that will sell in these fashionable shops in Toronto and Montreal and New York, Boston, Chicago, but that will be a popular line of socks and sweaters and skirts and coats and the like; and I prophesy that their high-class products will sell all across Canada and the United States.

I am very proud of these three plants, the three latest we have, the shoe plant, the leather goods plant, which is, by the way, not to be confused with the leather clothing plant in Carbonear, the Dorn Tanneries have started as an associated activity for the manufacture of leather clothing. That is not to be confused with the Gold Sail Leather Goods. Now the leather for the clothing factory in Carbonear, the leather for the shoe plant at Harbour Grace and the

leather for the Gold Sill Leather Goods all come from Dorn Tanneries, or will all come from the Dorn Tanneries in Carbonear. So that we are now rounding out the idea. Our idea was to have a shoe plant. We felt that Newfoundland with a population of three hundred and seventy thousand coming up to four hundred thousand and then to a half million, could no doubt support a shoe factory even if not one shoe made in such a plant sold outside Newfoundland. We felt that Newfoundland itself could support a shoe factory provided that the factory were streamlined, up-to-date, up to the last moment, and operated with efficiency. Then we felt that a leather goods plant, if it put out the right products, high class, good quality goods, would sell all across Canada and even down through the United States. Then we thought further of a leather clothing plant. All of that then simply called out for a tannery. Now we began with the tannery. Our first plant of the four was the tannery. And I will confess here, frankly, that the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare and I and others in the Cabinet have worried a great deal about the tannery, because we had started the tannery, and they were operating when there was no leather goods plant and no shoe plant to take their output, and the only leather they could sell was what they sold in Toronto and Montreal and a few thousand pounds of leather here in Newfoundland. And it was a problem to keep that plant going. Indeed we are not out of the woods yet because neither of the three leather goods plants is yet in anything like full production. In fact they are not in anything more than token production. But before this year is over we hope, we won't guarantee it, but we

hope strongly that before this year is over these plants will be in full swing and absorbing an increasing output of the tanneries. We will then have in Carbonear and Harbour Grace in these two adjoining towns, a respectable little leather industry, employing altogether, perhaps, three or four or five hundred people. I won't attempt to say exactly how many because I frankly do not know and prefer to wait until they are actually operating to see how much is involved.

Now is there any other point on which my honourable friend desires enlightenment?

MR. HIGGINS: Just one question, if the Minister will allow me: In reference to the Eckhardt Mills I have seen some of the things the Minister has talked about, the sweaters and so on. Of course none of these are a production of Newfoundland. They are made in Austria, I believe?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. I may say the goods they are manufacturing in their plant in Austria are identical to the goods they will manufacture in their plant at Brigus, with this difference, in addition to these goods in the plant at Brigus, they will have another type of machinery which will make a coarser knit for a more popular class of goods. The big thing about their machinery is the fine knit of their needles and they use "marino" wool, which, as the Committee knows, is the finest of all wool in the world, coming chiefly from Italy. It is the last word, the aristocrat of wools. Most of these high-class products are made of "marino" wool. The machines that knit these garments, literally hundreds of these machines, require quite a large building. These machines are too fine a weave to knit, say a pair of

socks or a suit of underwear or an ordinary sweater or pullover. So that they have additional machinery with a coarser knit, with thicker, bigger needles, and that will cater to the more popular trade. We felt, when we were discussing it with them, it might be hazardous to have a plant manufacturing only a luxury article. If times went bad in the States and across Canada, if there was a bit of a recession, even the rich people might draw the line at paying \$70 and \$80 for a cardigan. It would be better to get a bread-and-butter article, of common use that the majority of people would buy.

MR. HIGGINS: In that branch of the Eckhardt activity I hope there is no danger of putting Nonia out of business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh none!

MR. HIGGINS: It is the same type of thing Nonia is catering to today.

MR. HOLLETT: In connection with these new industries I notice in February 1954 there was an order of council asking the Lieutenant-Governor to sign a warrant for three hundred thousand for increased expenditure. Would the Minister tell me what industries got that three hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What number was that?

MR. HOLLETT: That was in 1954. The number of the vote was 505, (1) A.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was for Atlantic Hardboards Industries Limited. Before the company was formed they, with typical German thoroughness, worked out all the details of

their economy, but their forecast was shot to pieces by one little factor which they had never taken into account, namely the fact that wood in Newfoundland, timber, the wood; spruce and fir contained a degree of moisture with which they were completely unfamiliar. The pressboard is made of chips which they create themselves from the wood. This pressboard must be very dry and the chips therefore must be very dry, and therefore the wood must be very dry. But the wood is very wet. Therefore to take the moisture out costs a lot more, and slowed down the drying, so that they needed additional dryers, a second dryer which they bought out of this loan. On top of all that they needed a warehouse, which they bought in England, strangely enough made of asbestos. Honourable members may have noticed it immediately beside the railway track immediately across from the plywood building of the Newfoundland Hardwoods. That building is made of asbestos. In addition to the new dryer and the warehouse there were some additional chipping machines for chipping the wood into chips. That is what that loan was for.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, should that item of three hundred thousand dollars show here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I think that would be found in supplementary supply which is not yet brought down. We had interim supply not supplementary brought down.

MR. HOLLETT: Would that take care of any needed running expenses?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all. We have no concern with the running expenses of North Star Cement.



MR. HOLLETT: Now in connection with the building of that: I believe it was Lundrigan built it. I asked some time ago for a copy of the agreements for the building of the cement and gypsum plants, but I have not yet seen them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thought it was the honourable and learned member for St. John's East who asked for that.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I have asked for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Anyway, I have asked Finance to get it.

MR. HOLLETT: That would not make any difference, I hope?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no difference whatsoever.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe I have heard the Premier or somebody say the contract called for Lundrigan to supply the building, the plant; in other words to buy all concrete necessary. But I am surprised to find in answers I have received some time ago, in addition to concrete there were literally thousands of bags of cement sold to the Government also in connection with the cement plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To whom?

MR. HOLLETT: Sold by Mr. Lundrigan for the construction of the cement plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can explain that: In the course of construction of the cement plant Crosbie and Company brought in a shipload of cement. I forget the ship's name. She was not loaded up with cement but carried a part load of cement. And he asked the Government; or rather he did not ask the Government but asked MIAG

if they would care to avail themselves of the fact that he had some space in this ship in which he was bringing in a load of cement. And MIAG did avail themselves of that space, and so the ship brought machinery and cement. Now the Government's contract with MIAG provided that it was only as and when the machinery landed in Newfoundland that it became the property of the Government, and it was their care to bring it in, freight it over. That is why Crosbie and Company had to make their arrangements with MIAG for this cement and for this machinery. Now as it happened we saved, MIAG saved—I think the Government had to pay the freight, but obviously the less freight the less we paid, and it was to the Government's advantage to have the freight reduced on that cargo by having the space divided between cement and machinery. Crosbie then approached the Government asking if we would wish to buy the cement, which I don't think we did. Public Works Department, I think, bought a little. Meanwhile the cement was there stored in the Bowater's shed, or one of their sheds; and the Government asked Lundrigan, who is in the cement business, and who has been for some years, and still is in the business of selling cement, like different firms here, Murray, Bowrings, Newfoundland Concrete Products, Chester Dawe Limited. What Chester Dawe is here they are out there. So the Government asked him to sell or Crosbie asked him to sell the cement to anyone he could. And he did, he sold it.

MR. HOLLETT: My point is that he sold it to the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think a small amount to Public Works.

MR. HOLLETT: Thousands of bags. I have it all here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman has it why ask me. Does he think I carry these details four years later? Is it his idea to outdo a formal answer he has in front of him?

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to know is if the contract was with Lundrigan to build the premises, supply the concrete, find forms and pour the concrete? Then why would we want to buy many thousands of bags of cement for the building of the cement plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did not. The honourable gentleman need not think one solitary split second that we paid for cement twice. If our contract—and I don't even remember the details of the contract with William J. Lundrigan Limited—if that contract provided for building the plant and finding the cement when he found it, if there was a transaction for cement it was completely different. We did not pay for it twice.

MR. HOLLETT: I feel, Mr. Chairman, I beg your pardon, Sir, the Government did pay \$37 and \$40 up to \$58 for concrete, as high as \$58 cubic yard for concrete, but generally it went from \$37 to \$40 for ordinary or standard concrete and \$40 a cubic yard for reinforced concrete.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the honourable gentleman now talking concrete or cement?

MR. HOLLETT: Concrete now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Changing the subject?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, trying to ask the Honourable the Premier to

explain why they had to pay \$40 up to \$58 for a cubic yard for many thousand yards of concrete, and in addition, for the cement plant, buy many other thousand bags of cement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was no connection between the two whatever—none at all.

MR. HOLLETT: They would not buy cement. They would not want to buy another load of cement if they were going to sell you concrete for \$40 a cubic yard. But they did and charged you \$40 a cubic yard. I have it here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You have not. The honourable gentleman has not got it there, that they sold us concrete—because they did not. We contracted with them for them to pour concrete for us but they did not sell us any concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: But they did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at all! Not at all! If I contract with the honourable gentleman to build me a concrete building and pay him so much a cubic yard for building the building of concrete, can he say he is selling me concrete?

MR. HOLLETT: 637 cubic yards of concrete at \$37 a cubic yard, then reinforced \$55 cubic yards at \$40 and reinforced for 77 cubic yards \$58. Then concrete—91 cubic yards at \$37. And in the same bill we find 15,000 bags of cement at \$1.30 and reinforced iron at \$1.60. Here is another item for reinforced concrete at \$58 a cubic yard, and concrete for \$37 and \$40 and as high as \$58. Why that is so I would not be able to say. Here we have 71 cubic yards of reinforced concrete at \$58 a cubic yard and 225 standard concrete at \$41 a yard. And

in the next bill we have 150 cubic yards at \$37. That was for the cement plant. And 66 cubic yards at \$40 and 428 standard yards of concrete at \$37.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What has all this got to do with it?

MR. HOLLETT: What I am trying to find out from the Honourable Minister is—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not table a question and I will give the honourable gentleman all the information I can. Do you expect me to carry that in my memory?

MR. HOLLETT: I certainly do not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why bother now? Table the question tomorrow, and I will give the answer.

MR. HOLLETT: I tabled a question some days ago for the agreement and it has not been tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will be.

MR. HOLLETT: If it had been I probably would not want to ask the question. That is what we are here for, the Premier himself told us that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a time for everything.

MR. HOLLETT: This is the right time for this. We are on a vote here for the cement plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not.

MR. HOLLETT: What are we on if not the cement plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The cement plant is not cement.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, I may be able to help a little here; I understand my honourable friend the

Leader of the Opposition was questioning the different prices of cement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the concrete that Lundrigan sold the Government.

MR. BALLAM: That is right. In all types of buildings there is a different consistency of concrete in different parts of the building. Your honourable friend on your left there will understand that, he knows something about construction, and will be able to follow me. In the foundation they must have a heavy mix with lots of reinforcement, etc., therefore the cost of such concrete per cubic yard is much greater than that in other parts of the building. In the designing of the building the engineer designing it would call for certain consistency either heavy, reinforced etc., depending on the stress and strain in the building. If my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works were here he could probably explain it a little better, but I have an idea, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's associate on his right who is an engineer knows exactly what we are talking about, and he will know that it is correct. Therefore this variation in the prices of the concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister of Labour thinks everybody on this side of the House knows everything about everything except myself. I want to tell the Honourable Minister he can send up to Concrete Products and buy it for \$17.50 a cubic yard. I can understand Mr. Lundrigan had to put the bills in order and had to pour in the concrete and for that charged \$37 to \$40 a yard. But what I am trying to get at is why also did he have to put in many many thousands of bags of cement when he charged anywhere

from \$37 to \$58 per cubic yard for the concrete. In other words did he sell the concrete? And he did. It is there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did not sell it. He did not sell us concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I can take them all up to the Finance Department and show it to them, in dozens and dozens of cases where they sold the Government, or at least the Government paid for it. For instance there is one item right there—reinforced concrete at \$40 per cubic yard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sounds to me like a fearful scandal and we should get a firm arrested over it—it sounds bad.

MR. HOLLETT: You have already started that process.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sounds awful ugly.

MR. HOLLETT: I am telling the Honourable the Premier that in the building of the cement plant the Government bought cubic yards, many many cubic yards of concrete for anywhere from \$37 up to \$58 per cubic yard and they bought thousands and thousands of bags of cement at \$1.30 per bag and one lot at \$1.20 and they bought many many tons of reinforced steel for the cement plant and paid the price charged by Mr. Lundrigan. They bought many many tons of crushed stone for which they paid \$4.25 per ton, and they bought many many tons of sand for \$2. Now what I am trying to get from the Honourable the Premier is; why did they have to buy all these separate items for the cement plant. If Mr. Lundrigan was to get anywhere up to \$58 per cubic yard, that is the question I would like to ask and want to get a reply to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It sounds like graft and it smells like graft, and a few more people will have to go to gaol from the look of it.

MR. HOLLETT: You are saying it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am saying it. It sounds bad. I know here we are—graft—buying crushed stone, buying reinforced iron, buying cement and buying concrete—what else did we buy?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is bad, terrible—

MR. HOLLETT: It may be bad, it may be worse than the Honourable the Premier—I am making the charge now you bought it for the cement—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we are being charged, sounds bad, looks bad for us now. Does not the honourable gentleman realize he is getting nowhere. There is no percentage in that—

MR. HOLLETT: I have an itemized statement here from Finance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh—prove it—the Finance Department proves we bought concrete? Get the figures and prove that we bought concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see that is a reasonable way to answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Stop the nonsense, I say.

MR. HOLLETT: We will prove it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: If the truth is nonsense—I am not suggesting anybody

did wrong. I am asking the Government for a straight answer to a simple question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I asked the honourable gentleman to table the question and I will answer. He does not want to do that. It does not suit the purpose—he wants to talk about it tonight. Ask the question tomorrow—I am telling him now.

MR. HOLLETT: I expected that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not going to make a little political propaganda.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, because I am asking a simple question in connection with the cement plant—I want to know why the Government paid these prices \$37 to \$40 to \$58 a yard for concrete while having to buy many thousands of bags of cement. Why have to buy reinforced iron? Why have to buy crushed stone and why they had to stand that? It is a simple question demanding only a simple answer. There may be a proper answer for it. I suspect there is, but I would like to have it.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I have the answer, the vote under consideration is a token vote and a typographical error. It should have been a token.

Item carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how this amount is to be spent. This is a plant owned by the Government. How is it going to be spent and what is it for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is additional working capital.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on the gypsum—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could we take it one by one—we are now on (02).

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier said there was a loss on operations last year of \$186,000, paid through countervailing savings and \$108,000 to be paid still. Is that on operating expenses or for building?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Operating.

MR. HOLLETT: Then we owe nothing further to Benno Schilde for machinery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, nor to anyone else.

MR. HOLLETT: I understood from the Premier there was paid finally a settlement price of \$150,000 to Benno Schilde—is that right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not exactly paid to them. I am not sure if it was actually paid out in cash or not. We agreed to pay \$150,000. We paid some, I know—yes all of it is paid but not to Benno Schilde. We paid it to Northeastern Machinery, a locally incorporated company, some such name as that.

MR. HOLLETT: But I understood there was a claim from Benno Schilde for \$150,000 and the Government made an award and paid them \$150,000 on condition that they would invest it in in a local concern—am I right in that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: Then, Mr. Chairman, the Government must have paid them that, I take it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not Benno Schilde, no. We paid the local company which they incorporated. In fact we made it payable to that local

company at their request and with their consent.

MR. HOLLETT: We are informed it was paid over to them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To whom? I never said any such thing.

MR. HOLLETT: You said to Benno Schilde. Did not the Honourable the Premier tell us it was to be invested by the firm to whom it was paid by a local company. May I ask to whom it was paid for investment in a local company?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I explained it all before, but I will do it again. We paid the money to Eastern Machinery and something and something. I forget the full name. But the name is undoubtedly down in the Registry of Deeds and Companies. The company is incorporated. It is a limited liability company, and we paid it by cheque to that company.

MR. HOLLETT: Not Benno Schilde?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we paid it to this company for them, but being owned by Benno Schilde. Now Benno Schilde decided they did not want to build that machinery plant in Bay Roberts, and asked us if they could invest it instead in another company, namely Concrete Products firm in Humbermouth, of W. J. Lundrigan. We agreed to that. As far as we know that is what they have done, if not that is what they are going to do. Benno Schilde passed out of the picture and came into the company, Eastern Machinery owned by them. The difference is that Benno Schilde is a German firm in Germany and Eastern Machinery is a Newfoundland firm in Newfoundland. We paid the Newfoundland firm. That is all.

MR. BROWNE: Is there to be any vote for this year's operating loss? Or are you anticipating an operating loss this year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already said I anticipated an operating loss, a hundred thousand, this year, and that they will be in the black next year.

MR. BROWNE: Who is going to find that one hundred thousand?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We come now and ask for a vote for last year and will next year for this year. But the next year we won't be asking for it, but rather we will have a little revenue, we hope.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable the Premier tell us if that \$150,000 has actually been invested?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I already stated that I don't know. I assume that it has been, and if not it will be invested. I have not followed up the matter.

MR. HOLLETT: Well it is \$150,000 floating around somewhere. I think we should find out what happened to it in the first instance. I fail to see why the Government should have to attach any strings to the payment if they made an ex gratia award.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't see what it has to do about this vote. The time to talk about it is in the budget.

MR. HOLLETT: It is on the gypsum.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not. Does the honourable gentleman suppose that because we have here—02—Gypsum—\$160,000 any connection with the gypsum plant and therefore anything connected with gypsum can be



discussed now at this stage in Committee. Does he honestly think that? I think he realizes it is a matter for comment in the debate on the budget. That is why we have a debate on the budget, which allows certain latitude. But on the vote on supply we have to stick to the subject.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I certainly agree with the Honourable the Premier, but everything was talked about tonight, not all on these votes.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** The honourable gentleman is certainly not strictly in order. When I did that I introduced my estimates for my Department of Economic Development, which I administer. That was a review, which was proper. But when debate starts we take up every item, and just because gypsum was mentioned does not mean we can go ahead and talk about everything under the sun. It is out of order. It is in order when on this vote to argue whether this vote should or should not be passed. Any debate on Benno Schilde is out of order. At this point we are not on the debate on the budget.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I accept the Premier's ruling, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Chairman, here in 03 we have a vote there of \$100. I have a recollection that recently we voted an expenditure under a guarantee which I think has matured—if the Minister would explain that—several hundred thousand dollars—is that right?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** That is right—five hundred thousand dollars.

**MR. BROWNE:** What is the purpose of having it here?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** In case we need to vote some more to them in the coming year. We have it in as a vote. I have already explained to my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West that in our system of budgeting whether we put in a token amount or no money at all, when we have a vote we like to keep it. If he would run his eyes down the page he will see that Cotton Textiles has nothing there. There was something there last year but this year nothing. Pressboard nothing. Once an item appears we like to hold it there year by year even though we vote nothing. It is simply our system of budgeting, that is all. Throughout the budget honourable members will find dozens of instances where we are not asking for any money but the item is still there. Someday they will disappear, no doubt, from the estimates, but until then they are there. In the case of the gypsum plant we have in a token amount of \$100 and in the birch plant we have a token vote. Otherwise what we have to do is get a special warrant and get indemnified for it at the next session of the House. But when it is a vote in a given department if there are any countervailing savings in the department these countervailing savings can be used for the purpose for which a token vote is in.

**MR. BROWNE:** If there was no token vote you could still give a guarantee.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Yes, but this is the honest way to do it, although I know there are cases when you can't. Now I will say quite frankly and quite honestly I don't know, nor the Minister of Finance nor anybody on this side and nobody in this world, only the Almighty knows all the expenses we will meet in the coming 12

months. We don't know to the last cent or dollar or even hundred dollars what we may have to spend in the next 11 months. But we can anticipate we may have to spend something on this or that and put in here a token vote. We may have no money for that vote and we may have a hundred dollars token vote for it, but it is a vote so that any money we save in that same department we can apply to that vote. What we save on this we can spend on that in the same department providing we have a token vote. Otherwise we have to go to the Lieutenant-Governor, have to declare it is an emergency governing public interest maybe damage, ask the Lieutenant-Governor to issue us a warrant on the Treasury for an amount of money; and come into the House afterwards and get indemnified. Don't blame us when we do the right thing. Don't try to make it look bad. Blame us when we do the wrong thing but not the right thing.

MR. HOLLETT: I am just going to speak on that. The right thing, I suggest to the Government, when voting the next amount on that token vote, when buying the next amount of cement for the birch plant we watch the price. Because when we built the birch plant they paid \$1.80 per bag to Chester Dawe for cement when at the same time it was \$1.20 and \$1.30 in Corner Brook.

Item carried.

MR. BROWNE: On 07—Tanneries, I notice—I understand the Minister to say there were two tanneries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there is one; Dorn's Tannery.

MR. BROWNE: There is a glove factory?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there they are an entirely different tannery and tan for their own use.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to know if you are finished making payments to the United Cottons and Terra Nova Textiles?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They don't appear.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder why.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am informed the payments to be paid Terra Nova Textiles, or the amount agreed to be lent them, was in an agreement made after these estimates had been prepared and gone to the printers. The amount, I believe, is about \$300,000. Terra Nova Textiles have a new building. I was in there today. It will be finished the end of the month. It is a magnificent building up beside the United Cottons building, a magnificent new building with a steel frame, concrete blocks, concrete floors covered with wood, beautiful. It is 89 ft. wide and 120 ft. long, all one big room.

MR. BROWNE: It will come in in supplementary supply, that \$300,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will have to now. It will be in the Loan and Guarantee Act. I said \$300,000 but it is actually \$298,000.

MR. BROWNE: Why \$298,000—any special reason?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the exact estimate of what they need.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Honourable Minister tell us if they have started the weaving as yet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, how could they without a weaving mill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item is No. 7—Hanning Electric (token) \$100.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, Hanning Electric Company, are they in operation now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was in the plant today, and I believe they are just about ready to start production. They have been making some material, but are not really producing. Incidentally I have heard a number of people who have spoken very highly about their batteries.

MR. BROWNE: Are they now on the market?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have sold probably three or four thousand batteries which are excellent. People speak very highly of them.

MR. BROWNE: The question would be one of cost, and how they compare with other prices.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Batteries are things on which a man does not lose money as a rule, something like drugs.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if there are some men coming out from Germany at the present time to endeavour to get the rubber plant going properly. I have personally heard a rumour to that effect. I wonder if it is a rumour or a fact?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman ought to adopt a resolution and not wait until the new year to do it, about these companies in Holyrood. There was a rumour the manager had absconded with all the money and was in gaol—God

knows what kind of rumours there were. It is much easier to say what was not said. The fact of the matter is that the company which has been producing forty pairs of rubber boots a day is now up to nearly three hundred pairs, and in a couple of months will be up to seven hundred pairs a day. They began with ten or fifteen workers and then went up to thirty or forty then up around eighty or ninety, all in a month and a half. They are going up fast and they are going to be a good successful company.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not true that there are a couple of people coming out from Germany to assist them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Coming out from Germany? Some came out last year, some came out last fall, some in the winter and some this spring, I believe about ten or twelve men, who are outstanding in their field.

Item 22—Gloves:

MR. BROWNE: Does that complete the vote for the glove factory?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

Carried.

Item No. 23—Shoes:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to these last three votes here, do I understand on shoes the vote is \$478,000 and \$500,000 was voted last year, but not all of that was spent, is that the idea? So that it is \$478,000 now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the end of the financial year the amount due under the agreement probably this amount—

MR. BROWNE: You have probably given some of that already?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Probably so.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier would tell us how many men and/or women are employed in these operations?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am speaking from memory but, I believe, 250. That is on the last item in this vote of the Department of Economic Development. May I suggest to the Opposition a thought which perhaps I ought to have suggested long ago, but did not. I am going to do it now. Perhaps enough time and enough water has run under the bridge by now to make this suggestion a practical one. Last year we had an election, a Federal election, and the year before a Provincial election, and so with Federal elections, by-elections and Provincial elections, perhaps the time had not been just right hitherto for me to make this suggestion I am going to make now: The suggestion is that honourable members of the Opposition make two resolutions (1) that now, as the Americans say, there is no percentage, no future in attacking these industries nor ridiculing them nor sneering at them nor pin-pricking nor tail twisting nor indulging in harsh criticisms because—they are all going to succeed—they are all going to get in the black. Oh they are going to have their ups and downs, but they are going to get in the black and they are going to succeed. The second resolution is that; if I were willing I could forever, as these plants succeed, rake up all kinds of statements made in the last two or three years concerning these various indus-

tries, but I am willing to forget all that—life begins to get to be too short—I am getting interested in other things.

MR. HOLLETT: Up above?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, very much on the earth, very carthy, in fact, of the earth—earthy. I am willing to tell the Opposition now that I won't remind them after tonight of the peculiar statements made about these plants, which are incidentally now in the black and making money—their being built in a graveyard and being bolted together rather than riveted and all the others—I have a list of them, a collection of them. But if the Opposition will smarten up and realize that there is no political future—if they have any hope now—they never had any hope—but if they have any hope, that if they have any thought that these plants would all flop and the reverberations of their failure would resound around the land, they can put it out of their minds. It is not going to happen—drop that as a political issue—that is the first resolution I have asked them to take. The second is how to make it a little harder for us to win the next election—it might make it a wee bit harder if the Opposition came out with—God help us—we opposed them—now we are all for them. It would be slightly harder for us—we might lose twenty or thirty votes in Newfoundland if they adopted that attitude—and we will gain two or three hundred if they don't smarten up. Now the second resolution would be this—to go in and visit all these plants, talk to the proprietors, who are nearly all Germans, not Germans but Austrians, all Europeans, some of them speaking very broken English; make their acquaintance and talk to

them and ask them if they will unbutton and tell you their hopes and personal expectations, and their problems, and become aware, don't feel strange about it, become aware these are significant developments going on in Newfoundland with a couple of thousand Newfoundlanders now, our own flesh and blood, working in these plants, getting jobs, getting paid. This is going on under your very nose and I don't think the Opposition should ostracize, but welcome these plants. I think they should begin to take them under their wing and see if they can help. Now if they do that—agree to adopt this plan—I don't mean to say stop asking questions. Yes, ask all you like. There is nothing to hide, except that I am not going to give balance sheets of private companies. Now the newspapers can turn pink and green and black and red and all sorts of colours of the rainbow, stand on their head, do and say what they like, but I still will not give the balance sheets of these private companies. I still am not going to do it. I will answer all kinds of questions, but not as to the private affairs of private companies merely because we lend them some money. But I will stop talking about them if the Opposition will stop and give them the next two or three years, say until the next election is over, say two and a half to three years, stop talking about it, all of us. Table your questions, sure. We will answer them, except no balance sheets. We are not going to tell you what their costs of production are. That is their own private information. We will give you all the information we reasonably can. Let us stop talking and give them a break and begin making friends with them, visit them, ask about and talk over their problems

and see wherein you can help them, and help this industrialization here. Anyhow you are not going to stop it here in any case. Let that cease to be an issue. Let us find other political issues to fight about and not these factories and the livelihood of a couple of thousand Newfoundlanders. Let that cease to be an issue to fight about. Take me up on that and it will be one of the smartest things the Opposition has ever done, not alone a smart thing politically—out of the depth of my political wisdom I give them that advice.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are on the knitting mills.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now we are going to see the result of my advice.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Chairman, I realize that the industries, we realize that the industries are here. We realize that the people of Newfoundland have paid for them. But that will not stop us from asking the Government why a thing which was \$5,000 probably cost \$6,000. It will not stop us from informing the Government of any mistakes they have made. I think the Honourable the Premier, if he were on this side, would be the first to say that is the only thing we can do. Now, mind you, we have never condemned these industrial plants. We only condemn the methods that brought them about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Like Confederation, for example?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. Who wants to talk Confederation, I don't. It is a dead issue as far as I am concerned. We fought against it and lost and have to put up with it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not a thing you have to put up with, but a thing you can live with and enjoy.

MR. HOLLETT: A lot of people are not too pleased with it even yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Confederation has no place in this debate.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I did not raise the issue, the Leader of the House raised it. As regard the new industries: If the Government had taken the people of this country a little more into its confidence there would not have been so much criticism. There would not have been perhaps so much justifiable criticism. I think the Honourable the Premier will admit now that if he had to do the same thing over again he would probably have taken a little more time on some of these issues. As long as we see items like these that exist under the Department of Economic Development, cement, gypsum and birch, tanneries, cotton, etc. as long as we see these we are going to criticize. As long as we see revotes for running expenses, as long as we see interest that has been paid into the Government by some of these concerns being paid back to them again we must ask questions in the interest of the people of the country as a whole. Other than that—of course I can't give the Honourable the Premier any particular promises from my party, Sir. I speak for the Opposition when I say—we do hope these new industries, every last one of them, will succeed, and if they do then I am quite sure we will all be very happy that Mr. Smallwood was one time Premier of this country and introduced them here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you.

Item carried.

Financial Surplus Account:

Department of Finance: 454 Other:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question on that, referring back to the matter raised the other night about those persons who are in the public service, women who get married—will that be charged back to their time they received before 1949 under a vote like this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These two votes are to cover any liability the Government contracted before Confederation, because at the date of Confederation there stood to our credit a surplus, but that surplus was added to by realizations since and taken from by the liquidation of pre-union liabilities. Since that though, it is to take care of possible liquidations for the coming year which cannot be foreseen, as we don't know just what they will be, but anything that comes up—

Carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report having passed the matter to them referred and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Supply have passed the following estimates on Capital Account—Item 1444-02 and under Heading 1500 Department of Economic Development. Under Estimates of Expenditure—Financial Surplus Account under heading for the Department of Finance the Committee has made progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to receive this report. When shall this Committee have leave to sit again?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At a later hour this day.



Committee ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I request a recess of ten minutes:

House recessed for ten minutes.

House called to order.

Third Readings:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore

Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General promised to look over the last section of the Act on compensation cases of lessors and leasees in the Fisheries Authority—I take it—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That complicated paragraph neither of you understood?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, we have provisions in our rules whereby, if we discover that there is any correction to be made we can recommit a Bill even after third reading. Under that section, I might say, I had forgotten to look through the section. I did go through other sections, which I found personally all right. I think, Mr. Speaker, we could let this go for third reading, and I assure the House if necessary it will be recommitted.

The Bill was then read a third time.

Committee of the Whole on Supply—leave was given earlier this Committee sit again.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and recommend to the House that a Bill be brought in giving effect to the resolutions being passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is that the Committee rise and ask that a Bill be brought in to give effect to resolutions the Committee has passed.

On motion the Committee rose.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Supply have considered the matter to them referred and I have been instructed to ask that a Bill be brought in giving effect to certain resolutions which the Committee has passed.

On motion report of Committee on Supply adopted.

A Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the defraying of certain expenses of the public services for the financial year ending the 31st day of March 1954 and for other purposes relating to public services." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time now. On motion read a second time. On motion now referred to Committee of the Whole House. On motion the Committee reported having passed the Bill without amendments. Report received. On motion Bill referred for third reading on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, on the last order on the Order Paper, I think the Clerk may not have taken down exactly what I said. The exact title of the Bill I asked leave to introduce is a Bill, "An Act Relating to Financial Assistance to be rendered to certain Industrial Undertakings." I have asked leave to introduce this Bill. I now move, Mr. Speaker, that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider these resolutions.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on a Bill "An Act Relating to the Financial Assistance to be rendered to certain Industrial Undertakings."

MR. CURTIS: The only object of asking the House to go into Commit-

tee is to circulate the resolutions. It is not the intention of the Government to proceed at the moment. I move the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, ordered to sit again tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly." This Committee had leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Clause 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. Subject to this Act, every man and woman is qualified to vote in the proper polling division who

- (a) is of the full age of twenty-one years or will attain the full age of twenty-one years on or before polling day at the pending election;
- (b) is a Canadian citizen;
- (c) has been ordinarily resident in the province for twelve months immediately preceding the date of the issue of the writ of election; and
- (d) was ordinarily resident in the electoral district at the date of the issue of the writ of election.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we get very many British subjects who are not Canadian citizens, and it seems to me we have lessened the

qualifications to some extent in that respect by confining it only to citizens of Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is a Canadian citizen to begin with?

MR. BROWNE: That is a statutory definition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is it?

MR. BROWNE: I can't remember it all. But I would say it would be persons who were born in Canada; persons who were born in England or in the Republic of Ireland who are British subjects of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and—it is in the Citizenship Act, and it might be wise, since the Minister is not familiar with it to let that section stand.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Yes, let it stand.

Clause 4 read and carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. (1) Subject to Section 30, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall before an election is recommenced cause lists of electors for the province to be prepared, revised and compiled in accordance with this Act.

(2) Whenever it appears necessary or desirable to cause lists of electors for the province to be taken, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall

(a) appoint a compiling officer for the province who shall in accordance with this Act superintend the preparation and revision of the lists of electors for each electoral district, arrange for the compilation and printing of all such lists and perform the other duties assigned to him, and who

shall hold office during the course of the preparation, revision, compilation and printing of the lists; and

(b) designate or appoint justices of the peace to be known as revising justices for the purposes of causing lists of electors to be prepared and revised for each electoral district and for those purposes may assign an electoral district or any part thereof to a revising justice.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, would it not be a good thing to have the electoral officer appointed at that stage if he is to be the one to take charge of elections?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, actually there is no talk of elections until the writ is issued and then the electoral officer takes over when an election is proclaimed. The whole idea of this Act, Mr. Chairman, is to have the list of electors compiled and put on ice and ready for use any time within a year after.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing, having gotten his supply through the House, the Premier should decide to have an election right away?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As of the 3rd of November—let us argue that.

MR. BROWNE: For arguments sake let us take the 15th of June.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member thinks it is to be in November. I don't see why he should change now. It is to be announced early in November.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose the Premier decides to have an election. Well, the first news the public gets of the election is the publication of

the writ. That is all. The Premier does not say; "I want all the Opposition candidates to get ready because in a week or two I am going to the Lieutenant-Governor to have him issue a writ and am going to have an election. We are now going to take a voters list and show you we mean business, and before the season is out we are to have an election." No, that is not the way elections have been carried out in the past, not what I know of them. Always a writ has been issued and the Government has taken the voters' list in a rush and then have nomination day, and ten days later polling day. Now there has been no voters' list taken since the time of the referendum. I don't think there has been any list since then.

MR. MURRAY: There have been two federal since, of course.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, of course that has nothing to do with this. But look at the number of elections held on that list. If you go back previously to elections held in 1932, is the Minister in a position to say whether a voters' list was taken for that?

MR. MURRAY: I could not say.

MR. BROWNE: It would be valuable information for the Committee here to go back to the election 1928 and see whether a voters' list was taken and when the writ was issued, then you would be able to tell us. But it seems to me the first thing has always been done is the writ issued.

MR. MURRAY: Of course, under the old system—this is entirely new.

MR. BROWNE: It is now confined to 21 days. I remember the 1923 election, the first one I took a

personal interest in. It must have been at least a month prior to the election that the writ was issued.

MR. MURRAY: 21 days is the minimum.

MR. BROWNE: In the spring of the year 21 days, and even in the late fall, would not be enough. I think you will find the writ should be issued first.

MR. MURRAY: Not as this Bill stands.

MR. BROWNE: This Bill is very much the same as the Act?

MR. MURRAY: No the procedure changed completely, and one of the reasons, as my honourable friend pointed out, is to avoid taking a voters' list in a rush and there would be a lot of panic about it. Mr. Short, who is an officer who has had a lot of experience in dealing with elections, says that with the inclusion of Labrador it is completely impossible to compile a list overnight or within a given period. So there must be a completely different system whereby a list of electors is taken by enumerators, and an election can take place anytime within a year afterwards.

MR. BROWNE: Then every year a list is taken? So that when a list is taken there must be an election.

MR. MURRAY: It provides that a list can be extended.

MR. BROWNE: That is why I don't know where we are.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surely the honourable gentleman is not to be put in a position where he does not know where he is.

MR. HOLLETT: I take it the compilation officer has not yet been appointed?

MR. MURRAY: You mean the men taking the list, presumably—no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I make the gentlemen of the Opposition a sporting offer now—that, if we hold an election this year—or when we hold an election this writ of election will not be issued until after the voters' list is taken. There will be no such thing as a writ and then scurrying around to take a voters' list. We will first take time and do it right and then have the writ and then have the election 21 days or a month after.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a sporting offer? I do think the Honourable the Premier ought not to find it necessary to carry a huge secret like that all by himself. He should be compelled to confide it to somebody.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no secret—the honourable gentleman himself announced the election for the early part of November. And I was personally very grateful to him for letting me know. I did not want to be taken unaware.

MR. MURRAY: Here a compilation officer is appointed to co-ordinate—under the old a revising officer. But a compiling officer is in charge of the whole lot too.

MR. HOLLETT: But that would not make very much difference as far as that is concerned. The point we were dealing with was the question of issuing the writ then taking the voters' list.

MR. MURRAY: It could have been done as a matter of expediency, but the Act did not call for it.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier tells us now the list will be taken before.

MR. MURRAY: That is conditional upon an election this year.

MR. HOLLETT: That is good enough. We are quite sure of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well if the honourable gentleman is sure of it, now he knows the list will be taken before the writ of election is issued.

MR. HOLLETT: It is nice and warm in the summertime to take it.

MR. SPENCER: At the rate we are going now I don't think there will be time for an election.

MR. MURRAY: If this Bill becomes law that will have to be done.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6 read and carried.

Clause 7 read:

7. (1) Every revising justice shall under the direction of the compiling officer appoint enumerators to prepare lists of the electors in the polling divisions located in the electoral district or part thereof assigned to the revising justice, and two enumerators shall be appointed for each urban polling division and one for each rural polling division.

(2) When appointing an enumerator a revising justice shall make the appointment in accordance with Form No. 1 of the Schedule, and every person appointed an enumerator shall take the oath as in Form No. 2 of the Schedule before proceeding to prepare a list of electors.

(3) A person may be appointed an enumerator for such number of polling divisions as the revising justice may deem advisable.

(4) Every revising justice shall make out and keep a list containing the name and address of each enum-

erator appointed by him and a description of each polling division for which the enumerator was appointed, and when he has completed the list he shall send a certified copy to the compiling officer.

(5) A revising justice may in his discretion remove, suspend, reappoint or reinstate any enumerator for a polling division in the territory assigned to that revising justice or appoint another in his stead or to act in his stead.

MR. BROWNE: What does that mean here in (3) "A person may be appointed an enumerator for such number of polling divisions as the revising justice may deem advisable"? That applies in an urban area—two of them can be appointed?

MR. HOLLETT: Why two?

MR. BROWNE: It is hard to get good enumerators, of course.

MR. HOLLETT: Why two in urban areas and one in rural?

MR. MURRAY: He can cover a bigger area, I imagine going from house to house.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me like the rural area is more extensive than an urban area.

MR. MURRAY: Usually small settlements and everybody knows everybody else.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they get paid by the name they will collect a lot more in urban areas. They must go half over Newfoundland to do the rural areas.

Carried.

Clause 8 carried.

MR. MURRAY: I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received, ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day to stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock, rather than in the forenoon, because, Mr. Speaker, Tuesday morning happens to be the morning for regular Cabinet meetings. We have business of the Cabinet which cannot very well wait. So we could adjourn until 3:00 o'clock tomorrow, if it pleases the House.

On motion all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us what business they intend to go ahead with tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It seems to me we have these long Bills in Committee—

MR. BROWNE: Do you want to take Ways and Means tomorrow?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think if we got through the legislation and then decide how long we want to stay here debating the budget, we will want three, four or five days. Let us settle on that between us privately. In the meantime let us get the business done. Meanwhile there is no desire in the world to shorten the debate on the budget. But my suggestion is that we do our hard business in the meantime, the monotonous



business of committee stage on these long Bills. And we have one or two Bills to bring in yet. It is terrific. We don't want to be all summer.

On motion the House then adjourned.

TUESDAY, June 8th, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Companies Act."

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act." Also a Bill "An Act Respecting the Licensing of Companies carrying on the Business of Insurance in Newfoundland."

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

Also a Bill "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands."

Also a Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited."

Also a Bill "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act," and a Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act."

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquor Act."

#### Answers to Questions

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there was a question directed to me asking for a copy of the agreement between William J. Lundrigan and the Government for the building of the cement plant at Corner Brook.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): And the gypsum?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not realize the honourable gentleman asked for both. I have asked the Attorney General's Department, which I believe has a copy, and if I receive it this afternoon it will be tabled.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister for a copy of the agreement regarding the birch plant, that is the construction of the birch plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think there is an agreement, but if there is I will have that too.

### Orders of The Day

MR. CURTIS: There was a third reading, Mr. Speaker, but it is not on the Order Paper.

MR. BROWNE: Should not the Committee of Supply also be there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It should be there.

MR. CURTIS: Would it be necessary then, Mr. Speaker, to ask that the Order Paper be amended by putting on there—Committee of Supply—That should definitely be in the same place as it was yesterday. The third reading of which we had permission, that we could call Item 1 (a).

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I now move third reading of a Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Services for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-Five, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Services for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-First Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-Five, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service." In so doing I think I can explain some of the matters which were not quite clear.

The Supply Bill before the House, Mr. Speaker, provided for \$49,358,100; which includes the \$5,722,000 previously voted; the consolidated fund service which does not require a vote, made up as follows:

Page 7—Current Account.....	\$1,791,400
Page 9—Capital Account .....	1,885,300
Page 11—Financial Surplus a/c .....	25,000
	<hr/>
	\$3,701,700

These amounts, Mr. Speaker, do not need to be voted. These added to the \$49,358,100 make up the grand total of \$53,059,800.

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

### Notice of Motion (Continued)

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act."

### Committee of the Whole

On Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly":

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees:

Clauses 9 through 19 read and carried.

Clause 20 read:

20. As soon as the places and days for the holding of a Court of Revision in the territory assigned to a revising justice have been determined and set in accordance with Section 19 the revising justice shall prepare copies of a public notice as in Form No. 12 of the Schedule setting forth the days on and the hours during which the Court of Revision will be held at the

several places approved by the compiling officer under Section 19 and shall cause a copy of the notice to be posted up at each of two conspicuous places located in every polling division for which he was appointed, and the copies of the notice referred to in this section shall be posted up in a polling division at least two days before the Court of Revision is opened in the place determined under Section 19 for that polling station.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I was wondering, in the light of the fact that this is a very lengthy piece of legislation, and I do not wish to delay the progress of the Committee, it occurs to me these clauses are pretty much in accord with what has gone before, and the side title pretty well calls attention to the details, I was wondering if we could not avoid the necessity of reading all these and call their number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is agreeable?

MR. BROWNE: I think if we read the numbers and sub-clauses number—

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed—The numbers will be called, and only the side titles will be read.

Clause 21 carried.

Clause 22:

MR. HOLLETT: On that particular one, I wonder if I could ask the Clerk to read that.

Clause 22 (1), (2) read:

22.—(1) At every sitting of a Court of Revision the revising justice shall produce the original lists of the electors prepared by the enumerators for the polling divisions to which the sitting relates, and before the Court of

Revision is opened at any place the revising justice shall cause a copy of each of the lists sent to him by the enumerator and retained by him, to be posted up at a place near the Court of Revision to which the public have access.

(2) When any of the original lists of electors forwarded to a revising justice by an enumerator has been lost or so damaged as to be illegible, the revising justice may obtain and use in place of the original list the certified copy filed at the office of a magistrate under this Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, on that I voice an objection. The Revising Officer appears somewhere and puts up a notice to be at a certain place, and a storm comes up or anything happens and he cannot carry out the court of revision on that particular day, he is not required by this Act to give any further notice of the sitting, but people in the area, in my opinion, would not know exactly what time the Court of Revision is to be held. I think some change might be made in that.

MR. MURRAY: They are held as soon thereafter as possible.

MR. BROWNE: If there were appropriate words, or if it were borne in mind or say: as soon thereafter as possible.

MR. HOLLETT: It could say after that—Due notice to be given.

MR. MURRAY: What would due notice consists of?

The amendment is that the words thereafter be deleted, and a fullstop substituted.

Carried.

Clauses 23 to 25 carried.

Clause 26: Appeal.

MR. BROWNE: Why so long? What is the precedent for that? I think it should be immediately.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I suppose, but there is one difficulty, the revising officer might, in all probability, be the magistrate of the district, and if appeal would arise he would have to arrange to get a representative in from outside the district—Forthwith means as soon as possible afterwards.

MR. HOLLETT: That means if he does not do it forthwith there is no appeal.

MR. MURRAY: If we set a limitation it has got to be observed.

MR. HOLLETT: Within fourteen days?

MR. MURRAY: Fourteen days will be the maximum.

MR. HOLLETT: It could be the next day?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: The point is this—I suppose when he goes to the justice and says: I would like to appeal; the point is the justice may say to him—"Why did you not do it before? It is now two weeks since I have been dealing with this matter, and I have passed all the papers." Why did you not tell me right away? I would say it should be "as soon as possible."

MR. MURRAY: Would the honourable member wish to have the clause stand?

MR. BROWNE: And you could consult the drafters on that.

Clause 26 stand.

Clause 27 carried.

Clause 28: Duties of revising justice when Court of Revision is closed.

Original list to be sent to compiling officer and copy to Magistrate.

Copies to be kept for two years.

MR. BROWNE: Copies of lists shall be kept at the office for a period of not less than two years—what does that mean?

MR. MURRAY: The lists are only for one year, as clause 30 says, but there is a proviso that the time may be extended. The idea is that the list would only be allowed for a year, but it could be the Lieutenant-Governor in Council could extend the period from time to time, up to five years.

MR. BROWNE: I have no objections to this.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: I was just wondering is there likely to be any conflict between the compiling officer and the election officer?

MR. MURRAY: In all probability the two offices will be held by the same man, but once the writ of election is out, in all probability, the compiling officer will become the election officer. The two different jobs will in all probability be performed by the same person.

MR. HOLLETT: He would not be required to do so under the Act? It could not be provided for there?

MR. MURRAY: The election officer is not a permanent official. He is only appointed after the proclamation and the writ of election has been issued.

MR. BROWNE: You did not check on the days of the writ, did you?

MR. MURRAY: No, I did not. The same period 21 days in the old is in this—the 21 days, of course is a minimum.

Carried.

Clause 29 carried.

Clause 30: Official lists of electors.

Copy to be sent to each candidate on nomination day.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on this one, I don't like the part which reads—"From time to time the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, when he deems it desirable so to do, order that the official list of electors last prepared, revised and compiled under this Act may be used at an election held on any date occurring within the period of five years immediately following the date on which the printing of the lists for the province was completed, and when an order is made under this subsection the lists shall be used at the election to which the order relates."

Now I think there should be a new list for every election. I don't think it is fair because where you have got polling divisions with two hundred and fifty names there may be a considerable turnover in these names, and a considerable change in five years; a number of people will have died, people removed and a number of people will have reached the age of 21 years and there will be new people who have moved into the district. There is bound to be a certain amount of difference, and it will make for many difficulties as many voters for some reason or another leave it

until towards the end of the day to do their voting. At the end of the day there is generally a pile up, and the voting stops before all these people have been able to cast their ballots. In that way I have known many people to have been disfranchised.

I would like to have that left out, and that section end with the word "completed."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, do we want it worded, so that every time there is an election or a by-election there must be a special Act passed to authorize the use of the old list?

MR. BROWNE: There is nothing to prevent that being done. But to say in here in the Act that the list can be used, I think, is going too far.

MR. MURRAY: A member might die immediately after the House closed, and surely it would not be necessary to have the House get together again.

MR. BROWNE: The House would be in session within twelve months.

MR. MURRAY: The main idea was to avoid the expense and trouble when a by-election was declared within any session of the life of a parliament. We have had numerous by-elections; and we thought to avoid the expense of having lists compiled for every by-election, so that the clause was modified by saying—the Lieutenant-Governor in Council could extend it from time to time, but not beyond the period of five years. For instance there was a general election in 1951—we assume a voters' list was taken for the whole country for that general election. Now there was a by-election in February—well that was all right—the list would have been

good for that. Then another by-election in September, and the list was good for that. But now we come to a by-election that was to take place in January, I think, of this year. It is true that there was no list ready for that. Then that would mean that we would have to take a list. It seems to me that would have been a very great inconvenience.

MR. BROWNE: The voters' list could be taken under sub-section 1, you see.

MR. MURRAY: I thought the honourable gentleman's contention was the list could only be validated from time to time by an Act of the Legislature. If that were so, in the honourable gentleman's own case, he would not be sitting here now.

MR. BROWNE: What I mean is that the list which is taken for a general election should be only good for one year. Then if needed for a by-election after a period of one year it should take special legislation.

MR. CURTIS: In that case, Mr. Chairman, going back to my honourable friend's own case, we would have gone to all the trouble and expense of taking a list of electors with no electors, and that certainly would be silly, would it not?

MR. MURRAY: The other objection is that electors are likely to be disfranchised. I don't think that is so, in view of the fact provisions are made for supplementary lists, and provision is made that the election officer at any time can increase the number of polls; and in view of the fact all booths stay open until 8:00 o'clock at night, and anyone standing in the house, outside the booth, is allowed to vote. I think it is practi-

cally impossible for anybody to be disfranchised.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure my honourable friend does not need much imagination to imagine what the situation would be like if there were a crowd outside, say, the K. of C. where there are fifteen booths. Let people line up out there and I guarantee it would take at least an hour after closing time before these people will be able to vote. I know the delay, as does anyone who has seen it. The Premier must know of the delay where people have to be sworn in. There is no doubt about it, the election machinery, should run as smoothly as possible because it is a very important thing, even if one man is deprived of his right to vote. As the Minister in charge of this Bill knows, every vote counts. It is therefore desirable that the machinery should run as smoothly as possible on election day. There are people who come in to vote who cannot write, and in the hurry and pressure the deputies don't have time to give consideration to points that should be considered.

MR. MURRAY: Well, the honourable member will notice that for the first time in this Act we tried to avoid that by saying, a polling division must be set up for two hundred and fifty electors. And we think that any deputy returning officer can handle up to two hundred and fifty in a day with ease.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a matter of having enough booths.

MR. BROWNE: Yes—but if there are two hundred and fifty electors on the voters' list of which 125 are not on, and the 125 have to be put on, five years after the list is taken—that is the answer. Then to follow it to



its logical conclusion it seems to me twelve months is long enough to have it, well perhaps people might say two years, but I think five years is too long.

MR. HOLLETT: Suppose we start to take a list of electors today for the November elections, you would have almost as many coming of age as you would have electors now at the end of five years.

MR. CURTIS: Offset by those who died. A lot of people will have died.

MR. HOLLETT: They won't want to vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who says that.

MR. HOLLETT: Their names will be stricken off automatically by the Man Above, but the new ones coming of age to vote, their names won't be on the list in five years time. They will get on the supplementary list. I grant you even there that takes a considerable lot of time.

MR. BROWNE: Will the Honourable Minister tell us why the five years?

MR. MURRAY: It is the length of time, as the honourable member knows, for which any parliament is elected, and it was thought a list taken could be used if necessary in any period between the life of one parliament and the next.

MR. CURTIS: We can always do what my honourable friend's predecessor did when he went to Port de Grave—declare an invalid election, and then come back and rectify it.

MR. BROWNE: I am not sure, but probably a list was taken in 1932,

and the election or by-election in Port de Grave referred, would certainly not have been later than 1933.

MR. CURTIS: They had an invalid election.

MR. MURRAY: They kept the booths open to 8:00 o'clock instead of 4:00 o'clock. I don't know what the cause of that was, there might have been some reason, or there might have been some mistake.

This is merely permissive. It does not say "shall" but "may from time to time" when it would be desirable to extend the list.

MR. BROWNE: For five years. In the meantime there might be two general elections. I don't see it is a tremendous expenditure on the part of the province for a general election to have a voters' list taken.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope the Honourable the Attorney General is not going to blame the Opposition for the 1932 election. Then I would have to refer to an invalid referendum in a town council in Bonavista.

MR. CURTIS: No, but I say, it is a fact you had a Tory Party in 1932.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have no worries about being called the "Tory Party." At least we do the Government the honour of calling them representatives of the "Liberal Party" in Newfoundland. We have never called them the "Whigs" but we could do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not? Sure.

MR. HOLLETT: We have no objection to being called "Tory" but our official title is "Progressive Conservative." In Newfoundland the

Government does not recognize that, but we will make them. So if you want to be called "Whigs" we will call you "Whigs." We have lots of earwigs in the Housing Corporation.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I move that all the words after the word "completed," be stricken out. In doing so, Mr. Chairman, I want to contend again that since voting is a privilege and a right of every citizen that he should be protected in the exercise of that right. And if, as a result of an old election list, a man is deprived, and he may be easily deprived, then he is being done an injustice which nothing can repair. I think the Minister ought to feel most scrupulous about this sort of thing. I think some provision should be made for by-elections. There is no provision in the Bill at all for by-elections that I can see or remember.

MR. MURRAY: The next clause.

MR. BROWNE: Once a voters' list has been compiled for the whole province that is supposed to be good for every by-election and every general election within five years. I doubt if the Minister can show any precedent in any part of the British Empire for legislation of this kind.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is another point—I do realize that due to the fact we had not had any elections for a period of sixteen or seventeen years we had a young generation during that period not taking perhaps the active interest and have forgotten. I maintain that is one of the things that created interest in the old days, the mere fact of taking the voters' list got people talking about governments and oppositions, etc., and they did take an interest;

there is no question about it in the old days, much more so I believe than the younger generation of today. I think this mere fact of taking a voters' list would be a sort of inducement to the electors to begin thinking of the future, shall I say, in government matters. That may be a small point, but in my opinion it is a big one.

MR. CURTIS: We have had more elections since 1947, Mr. Speaker, than any other generation of Newfoundlanders.

MR. BROWNE: They have not been to the House of Assembly.

MR. CURTIS: We have had two.

MR. HOLLETT: I think they did take a voters' list for the Federal Election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the amendment to sub-clause one—All words following the word "completed," which is in the fifth line be deleted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On motion I declare the amendment lost.

Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the motion stand:

Mr. Higgins, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those against the motion stand:

Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Attorney General, Hon. the Premier, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. Minister of Labour, Mr. Morgan, Hon. Minister of Mines and

Resources, Mr. Janes, Mr. Brown, Hon. Minister for Provincial Affairs.

Clause carried.

Clause 31: Proclamation.

Days of polling and nomination.

Same days in all districts but three.

Deferred election.

MR. MURRAY: I think the honourable and learned member for St. John's West a few moments ago said that no provision has been made for by-elections. I think if he reads the sub-clause there he will see that is not the case—It says every election shall be commenced by a Proclamation of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and subject to this section the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall —If he reads the sub-clause he will see.

MR. BROWNE: I think that covers a deferred election rather than a by-election. Mr. Chairman, I feel there should be a change here in sub-clause (2) where the day of polling is referred to—the day of polling referred to in paragraph (a) of sub-section (1) shall be a day not less than twenty-one clear days after the date on which the Proclamation mentioned in that sub-section is issued, and the day of nomination referred to in that paragraph shall be on the tenth day before the day of polling. Now I submit that twenty-one days are not enough. We should have at least thirty-five days. That is five weeks prior to an election, when the writ should be announced, so that parties should have a full opportunity to visit all constituencies. And the nomination day should be for ten days so that candidates—candidates won't be able to get the voters' list for ten days

before the election—and so that the deputy returning officers will have time to carry out the big responsibility on their shoulders I would say that ten days is too short a time and if we consider that there may be bad weather and fog in some districts they may not be able to carry out their duties fully during that short time. Therefore, if this is acceptable, I propose to move an amendment. Then I may deal with sub-section (4) which gives the Government power to defer elections in the electoral districts of St. Barbe, White Bay and Labrador. Now I can understand about Labrador. That is especially excluded in the same fashion in the Terms of Union. But I cannot see why it should apply to White Bay and St. Barbe.

MR. JANES: The honourable member should go down there.

MR. BROWNE: I have been down there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the summer.

MR. SPENCER: I was down there in May and June and do know.

MR. BROWNE: Now it will be different when we get the big plants down there, the big fish plants, it will be different, the weather is going to change then.

MR. SPENCER: I thought you were going to say highroad.

MR. BROWNE: Could be, too, Mr. Chairman. I don't remember in my lifetime ever hearing of any special difficulty on account of elections in these districts. Now the spring election of 1923 was the earliest I can remember, and that was held the 3rd day of May, and the election went off as usual on that occasion. I don't re-

member any time when an election in this country had to be deferred. It was always regarded that October or November would be the latest part of the year when an election could be held. I don't think we have had an election except a by-election in some places like St. John's in the winter months. There are many districts where it would be impossible to hold an election from the end of November, I would say, until the month of May or June. But general elections should not be held at the convenient time, and the experience in the past rather justifies us assuming such is not likely to happen in the future. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I oppose, and our side opposes the deferring of elections for both St. Barbe and White Bay.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, the honourable and learned member has raised several points there in regard to this clause. I will try to deal with them as they were brought up. First of all I think that five or six weeks should be allowed after the proclamation, and before the elections take place as was suggested. All I can say is that the honourable and learned gentleman is a wonderful campaigner much better than most of us—and there is nothing new about this provision. It is part of the old Act, and has been in there since 1913, when communications were not nearly as good as they are today. I don't think we have heard of any hardship being caused in that connection. As I have pointed out this is the absolute minimum. The Act sets it down as the absolute minimum, but it does not follow every proclamation will be issued just 21 days before the elections take place.

MR. BROWNE: What about the ten days?

MR. MURRAY: The ten days has also been there since 1913. It also comes straight out of the old Act. All I can say is that it seems to have worked out. With regard to Clause (4), the honourable and learned member does not see the point about being able to defer an election in White Bay and St. Barbe but sees the point in regard to Labrador. Well, it is exactly for the same reason for which this provision has been made. The honourable and learned member has spoken about the experiences of the past. Well, it is precisely because of the experiences of the past that provision is put in, and it has been done at the recommendation of Mr. Short who has had much practical experience in these matters. Mr. Short maintains it is completely impossible to have a proper election in White Bay or St. Barbe except perhaps in the months of July and August.

MR. BROWNE: Only two months in the year?

MR. MURRAY: An election could not have been held in White Bay, no, nor Green Bay last month nor this month. It is purely as a result of experience.

MR. CURTIS: We could not have gone to Twillingate this month.

DR. ROWE: I have been told—I cannot cite the dates—I have been told that in at least one election a number of settlers in my district lost their vote or did not get a chance to vote because of ice. I know when I was told that I did not think it was correct. But I have an active interest in it now, and I know the ice conditions in the Straits. I do know this, only yesterday two of the coastal boats in White Bay District were barred in port with ice. I make this point now

to show that, if you are going back to the past, you will find, if a proclamation were issued say the 15th of May this year for an election, the people of the northern part of White Bay and in fact the southern part would not get a chance to vote because yesterday Green Bay was filled with ice, you could not get around there. In the northern part of St. Barbe District especially, the voters there could be prevented from exercising their franchise because of ice conditions. It can be argued that the answer to that would be to hold elections in August and September or October, when you are bound to be able to get around down there. That is true. But it may not suit the Government nor the country nor the province to hold elections always in August, September or October.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the Government would be well advised to have elections at the proper time in the year, at a time when it is most easy—I could say agreeable—but it is never agreeable—but at a time suitable for all the people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Early in November?

MR. HOLLETT: Early in November is rather late, I must admit, but as the Honourable the Premier has been pleased to set the time, perhaps we will have to excuse it for this year, if he wants an election in early November. Perhaps there has been an interesting event which might have caused him to change his mind afterwards and he may have it sometime next year—who knows—

But with regard to this the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs gives as one reason for not extending the 21 days between the date of the

Proclamation and the date of the election, that it will be too long on the campaign.

MR. MURRAY: I did not say that. I don't think I said that at all.

MR. HOLLETT: Spent a whole year campaigning in Ferryland District.

MR. MURRAY: That is true enough, a year and a half.

MR. HOLLETT: Getting back to what I was trying to say, that the interval should not be more than 21 days. My honourable friend on my right suggested that would not be long enough, and the time should be a little longer. He probably had in mind the fact that there may be some ice floating around, and for that reason he suggested that 21 days is not a long enough period.

Then we come down to the section where it says the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may defer the election in Labrador, St. Barbe and White Bay, and they are going to do it because of the weather. In other words—21 days is long enough—

MR. SMALLWOOD: How else could we possibly do it without creating a lot of damage to ourselves?

MR. HOLLETT: If you are going to defer elections in White Bay why not in Fogo? Or why not in Green Bay, if you like? As a matter of fact, as my honourable friend suggested, why not wait until the proper season in the year to have elections. I think it is ridiculous to defer elections in three out of twenty-eight districts. Defer the elections there until you see the result from the other areas and then run off an election down there, quite helpful. We have no very great

objections to it, of course. We still think it is unfair to the people to have an election and then, when the people in White Bay and St. Barbe and Labrador all have to sit back and watch what is going on and not join in the fun. They would like to be able to mark their ballots like everybody else without their being scared by a previous vote which would have been taken in the rest of the island. I don't think it is right and proper for the Government to more or less penalize the people in these areas. The proper thing to do would be to have the elections at the proper time of year, when most people can get around. I do think the Government would be wise to do so. I can see in Labrador where you can have some difficulty because the extent of the district is so great. But in St. Barbe and White Bay you could have an election there in the middle of the winter almost anytime. You now have aeroplanes and helicopters and what-not, and I am quite sure it is possible to run off an election in St. Barbe and White Bay at the same time as in the rest of the island. I think the point is well taken by my honourable and learned friend.

MR. MURRAY: If possible the elections in St. Barbe and White Bay would be run off, but if it were not possible they would be deferred.

MR. BROWNE: Well the answer is—Why not hold the general elections at a time when it is possible to have it. If we are to have a general election let us have a general election, and not have an election for twenty-five districts and no election for the rest but let them sit by and watch what is going on, and make up their minds afterwards.

MR. MURRAY: We are up against this—we would have to face the possibility that a number of the electors in White Bay and St. Barbe and Labrador would be disfranchised if an election were held at certain times in the year, or otherwise that all elections must be held at the same time, which would be tantamount to saying that general elections could be held only in July and August—It is almost the same thing.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister is not seriously contending that July and August are the only two months when elections can be held. One Minister gets up and talks about the Labrador, the summer down there, and these beautiful farms on the St. Mary's River, etc. We have been told of the magnificent climate down there. I am quite sure then even if Labrador is no bigger than the District of Saguenay, and there are others in Quebec, they don't defer the elections as far as I know, certainly not general elections. The idea is general elections for Canada are supposed to be held at a time when people at least can get around their district. We did have an election in August last year when people were disfranchised for other reasons. They are certainly not going to decide on having an election in February or some impossible time when they know it is impossible. Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel the Minister should give consideration to this provision about the twenty-one days. Twenty-one days, I submit is insufficient. Since 1930 the population of this country has increased by 30% and the districts are much bigger today than they were when there were thirty-six members, while there are now only twenty-eight. That is an additional reason, if one is required. Would the Minister accept four weeks,



twenty-eight days instead of twenty-twenty-one days. A period of twenty-one days is obviously very short, and the election, I believe, in 1951, was called in twenty-one days, and I am quite sure there was not sufficient time given at that time.

MR. MURRAY: That is, as I pointed out, the minimum.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but it can be used by an unscrupulous government.

MR. SPENCER: If you had such.

MR. BROWNE: There are some people who think we have.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the words "twenty-one" in the second line of sub-clause (2) be changed to "thirty-five days" and that sub-clause (4) be removed altogether and sub-clause (5) be substituted for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand the amendment is that sub-clause (2) in the second line, the words "twenty-one" be deleted and the words "thirty-five" be substituted. That is the question I will now put.

On motion the amendment lost.

MR. BROWNE: Divide:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member has asked for a division—All those in favour of the amendment will stand:

Mr. Fogwill, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Browne, Mr. Hollett.

Those opposed to the amendment:

Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Labour, Mr. Morgan, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Min-

ister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Janes, Mr. Clyde Brown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next amendment is that Clause (4) be deleted altogether and the clause be renumbered.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I see clause (5) is only applicable if clause (4) be in there.

MR. HOLLETT: I think, Mr. Chairman, that is something to which the Government ought to give very considerable attention. I think we have put forward reasonable enough arguments to indicate it is highly unfair that people on long sections of our coast should be deprived of the opportunity to cast their ballots at the same time as Newfoundlanders along the rest of the country. There is no reason except that the election should be held in the middle of the winter, and I suggest if they set the date at the appropriate time there would be no need of setting it at a date when these people would not be able to vote, or would not be get-at-able as it were. If the Honourable Minister could give any valid reason why any election should be held in the middle of the winter then I think that would be the time to suggest some sort of an amendment. I really do not think there is any cause whatsoever for not holding an election at the same time or season. Otherwise one-quarter or one seventh in this case would be disfranchised. That is exactly what you are doing, disfranchising one section of the electorate, not exactly one-seventh, but one-ninth rather. At any rate they would be disfranchised simply because the Government of the day was unreasonable enough to call an election at a time when election material could not be gotten to them,

or when they could not get to the polling stations.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, there is just one thing about this. I should have recalled this before when I spoke. If my memory serves me right, in one of the elections, I believe the first provincial election I found out very quickly and easily that a number of people in Northern Labrador were not able to vote in that election which was held in June, or around the 26th of May, I think.

MR. CURTIS: That must have been a freak year—we did not see a bit of ice.

DR. ROWE: What I am getting at is that as far as Labrador is concerned, we cannot very well depend on what the ice is going to do or is not going to do down there. I was told only yesterday by a man I was speaking with who knows more perhaps than any other person living about the Labrador, that on one occasion it was the first day of August before they could penetrate down to Nain. Incidentally that has nothing to do with what I and others have said about the climate of Labrador. As a matter of fact I was swimming in Labrador on the 12th day of July with icebergs visible to me a mile off there. You can't go by that. Arctic ice can be up and down that coast and still you can go into the bottom of Lake Melville and find the weather as hot as any we ever get here in Newfoundland.

There is one other point. The honourable member referred to Saguanay. I don't believe you will find five or six or perhaps several hundred square miles of Arctic ice in Saguanay River. I don't know what the comparison of the two districts is. But I would say

this: I don't believe, and I am pretty sure, there is no other provincial district in any province which has such a far-flung population. I do think the experience of several elections have shown that, as far as Labrador is concerned; and many people feel that the same applies to St. Barbe and White Bay, because they are also districts with a tremendous coastline; where it is impossible to call an election during most of the year because of climatic conditions. The most favourable time would be probably August or September. But it is not possible for any government always to have an election during these two months.

MR. MURRAY: There is just one word I would like to add. Everyone seems to assume that in every general election these three districts will have the election automatically deferred. That is not what is intended. If the situation demands that it be deferred in any of these three districts it will be.

DR. ROWE: As a matter of fact, I would say, and I have heard others say this—the easiest time to hold an election in Labrador, and the same would apply, I think to St. Barbe and White Bay and certainly St. Barbe, would be in the months of February and March, preferably March. I would have no hesitation myself, if the general election were called for the month of March, I would have no hesitation, if I felt I could get along, of covering the district in the month of March.

MR. BROWNE: I am reminded of the phrase—the tail wagging the dog—for the sake of one district the elections should be held in the month of March. I don't think the honourable gentleman seriously puts that forward. But generally speaking the time for

holding an election is decided by the Government. They have it within their power to hold it at a time when it is reasonable and convenient for the great majority of the voters to vote. Now there has been argument and discussion from time to time as to when would be most suitable to have a general election in this country, and I think it was recommended by most people that the fall of the year, in October was the most suitable time. We have had upsets in this country since 1923 as far as holding elections is concerned, prior to that elections went on in their ordinary course, but since 1923 we have had governments upset and elections had to be called at times when they would not ordinarily be called. But let us hope we are back to normal times; and this Government now has over two and a half years to run its course, and should be able to pick a time which is favourable for the majority of the people.

MR. HOLLETT: There is just one other point, Mr. Chairman, may we assume the Government is to have an election in November this year, and weather conditions are pretty terrible, so that they decide to defer the elections until a later date in these three districts; run off the election in November, and there are only 25 seats, and they get thirteen seats and the other fellows twelve, then there is no government, and there can be no government until the middle of June or July, until we can hold an election in the other three districts. The House cannot even be called together, as there would be twelve on each side, with the Speaker in the Chair. That is just possible, and we are creating legislation which could bring it about. But in any case sup-

posing you have a return of twelve and thirteen—

MR. SPENCER: The people could go either way in such circumstances though.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, it might make for an awkward situation. But you would have to remember the Government made it awkward by such legislation; if you are going to defer elections in half the districts in the country. In the old days for instance you had the people in Labrador district fishing, the people in Burin district away on the Grand Banks or anywhere else away from home. Consequently because of their occupation in most of these districts we ought to take a chance on the Government having sense enough to call an election at the time best suited.

Motion put—Amendment lost.

MR. BROWNE: Divide:

Those in favour of the motion:

Mr. Browne, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Fogwill and Mr. Higgins.

Those opposed to the motion:

Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Janes, Mr. Clyde Brown, Mr. Norman and Hon. Minister for Provincial Affairs.

Clause carried.

House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

Clauses 32 and 33 carried.

Clause 34: Appointment of staff of chief electoral officer.

MR. BROWNE: In Clause 33 the Chief Electoral Officer is supposed to be in charge, but in Clause 34 it is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. I thought the Chief Electoral Officer on appointment was given authority to supervise the whole thing. He should, therefore, be given the authority to engage any help, otherwise you are going to be accused of playing politics.

MR. MURRAY: Most of the clerical staff would be a matter of routine. The Electoral Officer would choose them and send to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for ratification.

MR. CURTIS: They are usually seconded from Provincial Affairs.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Quigley in my office would in all probability be seconded.

MR. HOLLETT: That refers to such officers and help as may be deemed necessary. That is all over the island, clerks, etc. Why have they to be appointed by the Government rather than by the Chief Electoral Officer?

MR. MURRAY: As far as over the island—These local measures apply only to the staff in St. John's, who supervise the returns of the election. The other returning officers for each district are also appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The returning officers to a very large extent, practically entirely, appoint their own deputy returning officers and poll clerks, and the Electoral Officers staff in St. John's who have the general supervision of the election, as the Attorney General says, have been several seconded from their various departments to these jobs.

Carried.

Clause 35 carried.

Clause 36: Returning officers.

Oath to be taken.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, clause 36 refers to a person to whom a writ of election is directed. Should it not be a qualified elector—There is nothing to indicate that.

MR. MURRAY: It has to be in any case because he has to be to cast his ballot. I will check on that—We could let it stand.

MR. BROWNE: There is another point there: If he is unable to act or is disqualified this writ of election may be withdrawn and in lieu thereof a writ of election may be issued—another one may be issued.—There are 21 days so that would be a deferred election too—see what I mean?

MR. MURRAY: The honourable and learned member assumes always that every election will be held in 21 days. That is the absolute minimum—That is only the minimum.

Clauses 36—40 carried.

Clause 41: Qualifications of candidates.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may we refer back to qualifications of electors—Now our qualifications under the 1913 Act states that every male British subject of the full age of 21 years, and under this Act it is every male person.

MR. MURRAY: I have a brief here from Mr. McCarthy but have not had time to go through it—I took that matter up with him this morning. That is your point—Should your elector be other than a Canadian citizen, should he be a British subject?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: We could let that stand.

Clause 41 stand.

Clauses 42, 44, 45, 46 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Before you put that—I have a note here.—According to Section (54) of the old Act if the candidate withdrew he would have to make a declaration saying he did so freely and voluntarily. Is there anything like that here?

MR. MURRAY: We actually did not see any necessity for it.

MR. BROWNE: Well, it might be brought out.

MR. MURRAY: Any more criticism of that clause. I think the Bill is pretty much in line with the Federal clause.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, all right.

Clauses 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, does not the Minister think that is going to create an awful lot of difficulty. I can understand in the case of hospitals it is feasible, but if you are going to take in the general public travelling all over the country, then the only fair way out is to have two polling stations in every district or every sizable town.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, we realize it is going to lead to a lot of difficulty. But here is what we are up against. Take Goose where thousands of working men from all over the country are situated. What in fact could happen—There are other cases of people, in the lumberwoods and other things. We thought, after consideration, the

only thing, if at all advisable, let us set up polling stations for electorate out of their district on polling day.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it very well depends on the Government to do the right thing. In these things I know they will. I do think it is wrong to deprive a number of men of any fixed place for their ballot, and if the Government could make arrangements for them to mark their ballots in Goose, Seven Islands or elsewhere, I certainly think that is wise.

MR. BROWNE: When will the proclamation be issued in places like that—If the proclamation is 21 days will it be decided?

MR. MURRAY: It will be in all probability if it were 21 days. The honourable member still insists.

Clause 52 carried.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask the Minister the precedent for this. We have cases of elections being deferred in these districts, got it reduced down now to polling station in 53 (1)—Any polling division may be adjourned or deferred.

MR. MURRAY: For two days or so.

MR. BROWNE: Why?

MR. MURRAY: For weather conditions and other reasons. A great deal of election material is taken around by aeroplane, which could be grounded, or a boat going around could be held up from one harbour to another. So this is not an extensive deferment, but only gives an extra two days.

MR. HIGGINS: Meanwhile they get the results of the poll of the elections over the radio.

MR. MURRAY: I think it is worthwhile to consider the question of holding elections on Monday. It seems to me the Federal Government is wise in doing so, and they have had a great deal of experience through the years, and in their case it seems to work well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it would be unwise to fix Monday as election day in Newfoundland. It would be very unwise.

MR. BROWNE: That is what I call making a statement, not an argument.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not want to give the argument, because I don't think it would be wise.

Clauses 53, 54, 55, 56 and 57 carried.

Clause 58:

Ballot papers and their form.

Printing of ballot papers.

Numbering of ballot papers.

Printer's name and affidavit.

Ballot papers to be furnished by chief electoral officer, or printed by returning officer if so desired.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point. I think I raised an issue on second reading of the form of the ballot paper, form No. 30.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, we have taken note of that.

MR. HOLLETT: What will the form be now?

MR. MURRAY: Well, if the honourable member has the Federal Act there, he will see there a form of ballot, and that is the form we propose to have. Is there any objection to that form?

MR. HOLLETT: No, the same as under the old Act. I thought that was very good in fact. I have no objection to that at all.

Carried.

Clause 59: Indictable offences.

MR. BROWNE: A person who votes twice—Is that covered there?

MR. MURRAY: It is certainly covered somewhere.

MR. BROWNE: Is the offense of duplication covered anywhere. It is very easy for people to vote twice.

MR. MURRAY: Yes it is.

Carried.

Clauses 60 through 63 carried.

Clause 64:

Examining and sealing ballot box.

Commencement of voting.

Admittance of electors.

Idem.

MR. BROWNE: Originally the returning officer initialled the ballot just prior to delivering it to the voter. In this case he is to initial all before the poll opens. I don't see any improvement there.

MR. MURRAY: There is quite a distinction, if honourable members of the Opposition remember, the reason for having the initials beforehand and with lead pencil is to assure that all initials are put in the same place, in exactly the same way one under the other.

MR. HOLLETT: The point I am getting at is that if the agent arrives in the morning five, ten or twenty minutes ahead of time the Deputy Returning Officer has to initial 250 bal-



lots before opening the polls. I would like to know how long it will take them to initial 250 ballots.

Heretofore they were initialled before being given to the voter. That to me seems to be the best manner of protection. If you are going to leave these ballots some may not be used—

MR. MURRAY: They are all stitched and bound together in blocks of 25, stubs and counterfoils and ballots. I can assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition this system worked out as a result of long experience in the Federal field is much better than our own.

MR. HOLLETT: It is the fact of them having to initial 250 first,

MR. MURRAY: A matter of ten or fifteen minutes, I suppose.

MR. BROWNE: Does he have to do the whole lot of them before he opens the polls?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, it is not a big job. I can see the necessity for it.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't see the necessity—What is the necessity?

MR. MURRAY: The reason is if done before by the Deputy Returning Officer it is done uniformly—

MR. HOLLETT: Under the old system a man came in and gave his name, and when all that had been gone through, the Deputy Returning Officer took the ballot paper and initialled it in the presence of the agents or candidates and passed it over, and all the others were not initialled and could not be used.

MR. MURRAY: But under the old system the ballots when in the centre box were mixed up altogether, and none could see the box, and therefore

no identification would be on the back except officer —

Carried.

Clause 65:

Who may vote.

Certain electors whose names do not appear on official list of electors may vote.

Supplementary lists.

Determination of residence.

Persons who may vote at polling stations established under Section 52.

Plural voting.

MR. BROWNE: Is it clear what is meant by a person's residence? Take a person working at Fort Pepperrell or Argentina, are they residents?

MR. MURRAY: No.

MR. BROWNE: Well, if the election is held in the middle of the week, what are those persons to do? Are they to go home to Quirpon or Harbour Grace in order to vote?

MR. MURRAY: No, we will have polls situated down in the Seamen's Institute as we did before.

MR. BROWNE: What do you do in Argentina?

MR. MURRAY: The same thing if necessary.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose they come from a whole fleet of districts?

MR. MURRAY: To get every vote it would be necessary to set up polling booths.

MR. BROWNE: It would be much easier to manage if we had elections on Monday.

MR. FOGWILL: Another point in connection with persons resident at

Fort Pepperrell—And quite a few reside at Fort Pepperrell who have no home anywhere else; and they are not living in Newfoundland.

DR. ROWE: The Honourable the Premier did not say elections would not be held on Monday. It might well happen it would be held on Monday.

MR. HIGGINS: The point my honourable friend from St. John's East makes is that there are people living on Pepperrell—Are they to vote in St. John's East—Take a man ordinarily living in Placentia who is employed at Pepperrell and living on the base—In the Federal Election he voted in St. John's East. What happens in our elections?

MR. MURRAY: Well, when the election list is taken up, if they were resident there then they would be listed, or they could go on the supplementary list.

MR. FOGWILL: I think the same thing applies at Argentia. Newfoundland people who reside at Argentia vote there, if they have resided on the base over a period of a year.

MR. MURRAY: Their names go in the election list for that polling division, at either Argentia or Pepperrell, as the case may be, if they are living there for a year.

MR. HIGGINS: What is done about persons attending the Memorial?

MR. MURRAY: There is a special clause there for those.

MR. POWER: As far as I remember in the elections I have any knowledge of, in the Argentia area everyone on the base was entitled to vote.

MR. HOLLETT: For what district?

MR. POWER: They voted in Placentia and St. Mary's in the provincial election.

MR. BROWNE: But fifty per cent did not vote.

MR. POWER: What happened was the American authorities gave leave, and those who took their leave went home and voted in their own district.

MR. FOGWILL: Before we go on from there—we have a case of persons living in St. John's during the week and their names are taken on the St. John's voters' list and probably their names are given to the voting list in their place of residence. You get a lot of persons that come in to St. John's, say, Monday morning, board here during the week, but it is not their ordinary place of residence.

MR. MURRAY: If a man worked in St. John's during the week and went back around the bay for Saturday and Sunday, then that would be his place of residence, and he should actually vote there.

MR. FOGWILL: How is he going to get there in three hours? On the other hand, if he had three hours, he could vote before coming in on Monday morning.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, before that is carried—Sub-clause (vi)—Clause 65—Now what do you mean there by "a division in which he ordinarily resides on polling day?"

MR. MURRAY: We have to read this in connection with sub-clause 4: We make exceptions of certain people under Section 4.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it has to be read in conjunction with the sec-

tion 10 where ordinary residence is described—That section is going to confuse.

MR. MURRAY: If you will notice the first three sections of Section 10, which decides who will go on the list. This qualifies it still further.

MR. HOLLETT: I am just looking at it from the point of view of confusion, so deputies may refuse certain people an accept some of them.

MR. MURRAY: We are always up against that. We are trying to make it as clear as we can.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister is considering that clause he ought to consider the question of patients. Suppose a patient is shifted from his district and sent to the Sanatorium between nomination day and polling day?

MR. MURRAY: We gave that consideration. We thought at first patients in the Sanatorium should vote only in St. John's West, in the district in which they are resident. Then again we thought that would be unfair, so that we came back again to the idea that we will set up these outside polling stations in there. That is the only fair way. It is more cumbersome but—

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, it is better. Clause 65—stand.

Clauses 66, 67, 68 carried.

Clause 69: Delivery of ballot paper to elector. Instructions. Mode of voting. Spoiled ballot. Second voter. Entry in poll book. Elector unable to mark ballot. Blind elector. Oath of friend. Entry in poll book. No delay in voting. Electors present at closing of poll. Voting at hospitals, etc.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, sub-clause 12 is in my opinion unworkable—if at the hour of the closing of the poll there are any electors in the polling station who are qualified to vote and have not been able to do so since their arrival at the polling station, the poll shall be kept open a sufficient time to enable them to vote but no one not actually present in or inside the outer door of the polling station at the hour of closing shall be allowed to vote even if the poll is still open when he arrives. How are you going to tell—is the Deputy Returning Officer or the Clerk who are inside able to tell who are at the door at this time. Why not close at eight o'clock, and if not within the booth—

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the booths closed at ten o'clock or at midnight there would be a few late.

MR. HOLLETT: I think perhaps if it were made definite, then they would get along in time to vote. But as the Honourable the Premier said; there are bound to be a few late. For instance there may be a crowd outside of some polling booths a quarter of a mile long. I think, Mr. Chairman, most of us have had the experience of seeing people arrive to have the doors closed in their faces—

MR. FOGWILL: I would like to state, for example, that in 1951 I was in a polling booth when the poll closed, and the deputy closed sharp at 8:00 o'clock and there were a number of people in the hallway, inside the door who could not vote, who I agree should vote—however, those who are inside—

MR. MURRAY: It is because of the number of such incidents that came to our attention this is put in there.

MR. BROWNE: There were other reasons, the Minister must admit, where there was such closing up in 1951. But take a place like the Gaiety Theatre where there are fifteen or twenty booths and accommodations for over five hundred people—

MR. SMALLWOOD: If there is a group of people inside this gives them time to vote, but the doors of the building are locked.

MR. BROWNE: But what about the booths which do not accommodate any number, and people have to stand on the sidewalk—why not at the hour of eight let them in and then close the doors, when the house will hold them. That is not what it says here. You cannot carry it out that way. The way it reads now it says that, if at the hour of the closing of the poll—no one in line at the door, after the outer door is closed will be allowed to vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They should be admitted, the doors closed and the poll kept open until they can vote. Not only in this election in November that will come, but in lots of others—take the election next month or the month after.

MR. MURRAY: I think the clause should stand.

I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again presently.

Report received, Committee ordered sit again presently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, have I your permission to table a reply to a question directed to me, copies of the construction agreement

between William Lundrigan Limited and the Government in respect of the cement and gypsum plants; also the construction agreement between the Government and Chester Dawe. These are photostatic copies of the originals.

Reports tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock the House will adjourn until 8:00 of the clock.

### NIGHT SESSION

Tuesday, June 8, 1954.

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly"—leave was given this Committee to sit again later—I do now leave the chair.

Chairman of Committees—Mr. Courage.

MR. MURRAY: I think we were on 69 (12).

MR. BROWNE: Yes, that was permitted to stand.

Clauses 70 and 71 carried.

Clause 72: Returning officer and deputy to be conservators of the peace. Summary proceedings on personation. Detention of alleged personator. Warrant of arrest. Execution of warrant. Where name of alleged personator unknown. Constables. Application of Summary Jurisdiction Act. Appointment of constable.

MR. HIGGINS: Under 7—every poll clerk has the authority of a constable

for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

MR. MURRAY: That is a well established system.

MR. HOLLETT: I think section 9 is intended to give authority to appoint a constable?

MR. MURRAY: No. That was intended in case some sort of a disturbance when officers would call special constables to see—

MR. HOLLETT: I remember in the old days we had the authority to call the police over to do anything relative to elections in case of any dispute—then in this case it would be the RCMP who would be the constable.

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Well then it is all right.

Carried.

Clause 73: Exclusion of armed persons. Delivery of weapons. Loud speakers, ensigns, etc., prohibited. Flags etc. not to be furnished. Sale of liquor. Offence.

Clause 73 carried.

Clauses 74, 75, 76, 77 carried.

Clause 78: Return of elected candidate. Notice of return in Newfoundland Gazette. Reports by chief electoral officer.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the same as in the old Act?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, the procedure is identical, I think.

Clause 78 carried.

Clauses 78 through 100 carried.

Clause 101: Illegal payments. Saving as to personal expenses of candidates.

MR. BROWNE: I notice in the old Act the words used are "Directly or Indirectly"—

MR. MURRAY: I think we could accept that. I have no objections. Or if you would like to have it stand over?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would again draw attention to the use of the word "You."

MR. MURRAY: If the honourable member would wish to have it stand over I will discuss it with the law officers. It was probably taken from the Federal Act and some of it from our own Act.

Clause 101 stand.

Clause 102: Treating.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, is that clause a carry-over from the old Act too?

MR. MURRAY: I think it is almost identical.

MR. HIGGINS: Even so I don't see how it is going to react. I can see every agent in every polling station in every district starving to death if that is allowed to stay in.

HON. P. S. LEWIS (Minister without Portfolio): I can't see another election in Harbour Main. It says either before or during the electing.

MR. HIGGINS: It says—"or cause to be given or provide or is accessory to giving or providing, or causes to be given or provided, or pays wholly or in part any expenses incurred for any meat, drink, refreshment or provision to or for any person." I think, Mr.

Chairman, we ought to be realistic about this. Mind you I will say this, speaking for my colleague and myself, we were fortunate the last time. I agree with my honourable and learned friend from Harbour Main, we should be practical about this thing; in this thing we perpetuate a farce.

MR. LEWIS: Is this a recapitulation of the old Act?

MR. MURRAY: I think a similar provision will be found in every Election Act.

MR. HIGGINS: That is no reason we have to follow.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose you take it away and put in that every candidate may give as much as he likes to the electorate to drink or eat during elections—there is some restrictions on them now.

MR. LEWIS: It touches even natural hospitality.

DR. ROWE: That has never been adhered to to the letter of the law yet it has had a restraining influence.

MR. BROWNE: Where, in Labrador?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this clause carried?

(Voted against by members of the Opposition).

Clause carried.

Clauses 103-104 carried:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have a note here saying 152 and 153 have been left out. In the old Act section 152 says—"No person in the employ of any department of the Government, or employed upon any public works under any department of the Government, or employed on any

public work being performed under a contract with the Government shall be eligible to hold any office in connection with any election, or to act as any candidate's agent. Provided that the provisions of this section shall not be taken to apply to any District Judge, Stipendiary Magistrate, Clerk of the Peace, Deputy Land Surveyor, Surveyor of Lumber, Fishery Warden or Constable."

I think that is a very salutary section, and I don't know why it has been left out. I drew attention to it before, and I think it should be put back in again.

Then there is another clause, 153—"It shall be unlawful for any candidate or for any person on his behalf, to pay any money to any agent of any candidate, and any candidate or other person by whom such payment is made shall be guilty of a corrupt and illegal practice within the meaning of this Act."

Now I think the first one I read ought to be put back.

MR. MURRAY: Under section 153 (1) under the Act we are considering now it is absolutely essential for each candidate to have an agent, and I doubt myself the possibility of getting men without paying them.

MR. HIGGINS: If the Honourable Minister left in that section 102—he certainly should have left in the other two. If a candidate can't feed a man he certainly should not be allowed to pay him.

MR. MURRAY: If he pays him he should feed himself.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. A man who would be employed should not be allowed to be paid.



MR. BROWNE: Now what is to be done about section 152?

MR. MURRAY: I will consider it and report back again. I was going to raise the Committee and report back later on.

MR. BROWNE: What about 152? Here is a case where a candidate gives the agent money?

MR. MURRAY: As a matter of sheer practicality I think that should remain—Agents are necessary.

MR. BROWNE: There is such a provision in the Canadian legislation—It leaves the way open to abuse, always, although it may not be carried out according to the letter of the Act it has a restraining influence, as my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Resources said. There have been stories of candidates who spent most of the night previous to elections—My honourable friend from Harbour Main may have heard of the practice—

MR. LEWIS: I heard a lot of them. We have heard of a lot of things in Harbour Main to which we could listen with profit.

MR. MURRAY: I don't know what happened in the past, Mr. Chairman, but under this Bill only one agent for each candidate is allowed in the booth, and there must be when we come to it. There has to be an agent for each candidate. The ballots are counted in the booth. Therefore, I think it is a matter of sheer practicability, and a candidate is not going to get a man unless he pays, or it is going to make it that much more difficult to get a man.

MR. BROWNE: Then the point is to get off with as much as you like.

MR. MURRAY: I don't mean on the outside, but inside.

MR. BROWNE: It is certainly not practical to say: have as many agents as you like. That is what happens if we leave the clause out. A candidate's agent means a person authorized to represent a candidate at elections or anything preceding elections. The section is here under 110, the one I was looking for—"It shall be unlawful for any candidate or for any person on his behalf to pay any money to the agent of any candidate and any candidate or other person by whom such payment is made is guilty of a corrupt practice." That is the one I thought was omitted.

Now would the Minister give serious attention to replacing Clause 152.

MR. MURRAY: That is 111 here, is it not? Yes, I will have consideration given to that.

Clause 105 stand.

Clauses 106, 107, 108, 109 carried.

Clause 110: Unlawful to pay agents.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not so sure I like that one.

MR. BROWNE: It is in the old Act as Clause 152:

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure everybody who has ever been elected to the House paid agents, and if this is in the old Act we are all here illegally. I don't think there is any need for it here anyhow. I disagree with my honourable colleague from St. John's West on this point. Everyone has a right to his own ideas. We agreed in the first instance this would not be a party issue. Everybody in every election has agents who have been paid either by the candidate or somebody acting I won't say, associate on his behalf or associated with him.

I think that has been going on as long as we have lived and as long at this House. I think it is rather silly to make it a common practice.

DR. ROWE: What is the practice in Federal elections. I understood in the Federal the candidate appoints one election agent to take charge of his campaign and make all the arrangements and contracts of expenditure for him, but cannot engage any paid agent. He can pay messengers, and pay for freighting and printing and publications, and that is all. He has only one agent literally.

MR. SPENCER: It is a pretty good clause, I would say.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I think it is a most impractical clause. Speaking from experience in more than one district, I have always paid agents, and I would not expect a man to go into a polling booth and stay all day without being paid. Not alone this, but I have not been limited to one. I think it is most necessary to have an agent, and unless he is a very patriotic supporter.—You said that is part of the old Act?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, section 152.

MR. LEWIS: I disagree entirely. I think his agent should be paid.

Clause 111 carried.

Clauses 112, 113, 114 carried.

Clause 115: Prohibited conveyances. Interpretation. Use of private vehicles.

MR. HIGGINS: Does this include private vehicles?

MR. MURRAY: No.

MR. HIGGINS: What happens to all these things going around every election?

MR. MURRAY: We want to stop it.

MR. HIGGINS: What about a person crippled or sick and that sort of thing, nine times out of ten it is done as a favour. Sometimes it is necessary to get a taxi to take these persons to the polls.

MR. HOLLETT: Could not some provision be made to that end?

MR. MURRAY: I know myself, that it has been a racket and I think we should put some limitations on it.

MR. HIGGINS: Make it mandatory for everybody who votes to get there how he can. Any Minister who will propose that I will support him.

MR. HOLLETT: And he will receive the hearty support of the House.

Supposing during the November elections, if we have one in Newfoundland, some fellow will see a taxi cab taking a voter to the polls, and immediately somebody complains, and the next thing we have the police pick up the taximan and give him the third degree and he says well, Jim Higgins hired me, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, I don't mean this Jim Higgins—I am not allowed use of members' names in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable gentleman resented it?

MR. HIGGINS: I did, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I only just noticed this reference to cabs and conveyances, etc. What about a helicopter?

MR. MURRAY: It does not include wheelbarrows.

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): Mercy flights?

MR. BROWNE: Sub-clause (3) I don't understand what that means. As I understand, it is forbidden to convey voters to the polls. In fact that is the provision in the Canadian Act, and that is the provision, I am sure in our 1913 Act. I believe an amendment was brought in permitting electors to be brought to the polls. I think it was brought in by members of the Opposition and accepted—This is a contradictory section. According to the first part every one is forbidden to hire or promise to pay or pay for a conveyance to carry a voter to or from or on the way to or from the polling booth, or pay the travelling expenses of a voter. Then in sub-clause (3) there is nothing in the Act to make it unlawful for a person to provide his own private vehicle for the purpose of taking persons to or from the booths. In other words it does not mean a candidate, it means any individual.

MR. MURRAY: A supporter if he uses his own car. Surely that is reasonable enough.

MR. HIGGINS: I might say, Mr. Chairman, I am entirely in sympathy with the idea of the Honourable Minister. This Act represents, undoubtedly, a considered approach to the business of conducting an election. That being so, and accepting the position that a lot of research has been done into it, I wonder could the Minister tell us whether at any time he considered the Act with Australia where compulsory voting is lawful?

MR. MURRAY: No. Quite frankly that was not considered. I don't know why. It just was not considered.

MR. HIGGINS: Would the Minister be prepared now to consider it?

MR. MURRAY: If the honourable and learned member would advance his reasons.

MR. HIGGINS: My reasons are to do away with this provision here in Section 115. But I think we are all agreed it will never be properly enforced and cannot be, never has been and never will be.

MR. BROWNE: May I read the section I was referring to: It shall be unlawful "for the hiring or promising to pay, or paying for any horse, team, carriage, cab or other vehicle, by any candidate, or by any person on his behalf, to convey any voter or voters to or from the poll, or to or from the neighbourhood thereof, at any election or the payment by any candidate, or by any person on his behalf, of the travelling or other expenses of any voter in going to or returning from any election, are or shall be unlawful acts, and the person so offending shall forfeit the sum of \$100 to any person who shall sue for the same, and any voter hiring any horse, cab, cart, wagon, sleigh, carriage or other conveyance, for any candidate, or for any agent of a candidate, for the purpose of conveying any voter or voters to or from the polling place or places, shall ipso facto be disqualified from voting at such election, and for every such offense shall forfeit the sum of \$100 to any person suing for the same: Provided that where the nature of the district is such that any electors residing therein are unable at an election for such district to reach their polling station without crossing the sea, or a branch or arm thereof. This Act shall not prevent the provisions of means for conveying such electors within the district by sea, to and from their

polling station, and the amount of payment for such means of conveyance may be in addition to the amount of personal expenses of a candidate under this Act. Provided, also, that if it be necessary for such elector to be conveyed by sea, as aforesaid, such electors may, notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, be provided with a reasonable amount of food and other refreshments (except spiritous or fermented liquors or other strong drink), and the expenses of such conveyance by sea and of such food and refreshment shall be in addition to the amount of personal expenses of a candidate."

That is a very generous provision.

MR. SPENCER: Is that the law now?

MR. MURRAY: That is an amendment brought in in 1931.

MR. BROWNE: I thought before that there was an amendment made to the Act of 1925, and in 1928 and 1929. Have you got these amendments here?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, they are in this here.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the House ought to give their own personal consideration to this without any party or anything else. I think it is rather strange. Say I have a friend who wanted to go to the polls and I have not got a car. If I had a car it would be grand, I could then take that person there. But if I have not a car and then this Act forbids me from phoning the Hotel Taxi or some place or other and asking for a taxicab to come and take that friend up for me. I want to take old Mrs. Smith who

broke her leg a few months ago to the polls, but this Act forbids me from doing that. I think that is plain silly. We are trying to encourage people to take an interest in public affairs, and here is a person who wanted to take somebody to the polling booths, who has not got a car, and he is disallowed from hiring a taxi to take that person. I don't think there is any point in it myself.

MR. POWER: I think it would be a good idea to forbid their paying of taxis to bring electors to the booths. I know it has become a bit of a racket, and I know some cases where in the provincial elections myself and honourable gentlemen opposite were paying the same fellow. If you want to get people to the booth there are other ways, Sir, besides hiring special cars.

MR. HOLLETT: I will take it all back.

MR. POWER: Here in St. John's it may not be bad, but here in St. John's it is pretty bad too.

MR. HOLLETT: I agree it becomes a bit of a nuisance at times. I agree with that. I think we should prohibit it, and if the Honourable Minister of Finance and my honourable friend on my right, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, found themselves at one time paying the same bus driver or taxi driver to take people to the polls, one or the other should have had the courage to take action. There is a remedy for every offence.

MR. MURRAY: The thing that happens is that the opposite candidate is not always completely unaware.

MR. POWER: Some do detect it.

MR. MURRAY: It is quite a common practice, I believe, to go along and approach each candidate and get hired to—

MR. HIGGINS: According to my suggestion too about this Australian system, in case the Minister is a little alarmed at the possibility of retributions, since that time, during the last election in Australia the Liberal Government was returned.

MR. POWER: More conservative than liberal.

MR. HIGGINS: Call it what you will, the newspapers said; the Liberal Government. I think it is a good suggestion.

DR. POTTLE: I feel quite sure the House agrees on one principal point, that it is utterly desirable to encourage everyone to vote, and we should use every means to assure that everyone who can vote will vote. Obviously, Sir, the House is all for that, but I am equally sure that we do want to encourage good voting practices and good elections, and what we lose by making it difficult for some people to get there we more than gain by prohibiting people from paying other people to vote. I think there is plenty of safeguard in sub-clause (3) that provides anybody who is anxious to vote can get there without being paid.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I still insist it creates a dangerous situation. You are going to have the members accused of corrupt practice simply because somebody has sent or seen a taxi go up to the polling booth, or perhaps a dozen, and then so and so says; that fellow Hollett has everybody engaged and somebody is perhaps bad enough to swear I, or perhaps somebody in my behalf did

engage one. I am not speaking only of myself but everybody will be charged with corrupt practice, and half the members in the House will have to wait six months before being declared elected. I don't think it is wise.

MR. POWER: In the last Federal Election it was forbidden to hire a car, yet I do not believe anyone here in St. John's who wanted to vote did not get there because of not being able to walk.

MR. HOLLETT: But the taxis were hired.

MR. HIGGINS: Of course they were hired, if not they would not get one-fifth of the crowd out.

MR. JANES: I don't think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is the one to be worried. I thought first he should be worried, but with the establishment of polling booths for every 250 people it is going to eliminate the big need for taxis here in the City of St. John's. People here at least will be able to walk to the polls. But it is in the rural areas where people are spread out and probably would be about two miles from a polling station and still in a polling division where they have less than 250 people—I think we, the outside members, should be the people to worry about this.

MR. HIGGINS: It is quite obvious the honourable member for Fogo has not lived in town very long. During the last elections at about a quarter after seven, and the polls closed at nine o'clock, I had a call from a man who wanted a car to go to Canon Wood Hall although he lived on York Street. I think if they wanted to go a hundred yards some people would ask for a car.

MR. HOLLETT: What is wrong here is that this provision says you are not permitted to hire a taxi on election day to drive people to the polls, and they are going to be hired in the City of St. John's and all over Newfoundland where there are taxis. It is just as well to be realistic about it. Everyone knows here that we are going to have taxis. We are going to get them somehow by hook or by crook. And I think a taxi man has a right to earn a dollar on election day as well as some other people.

MR. POWER: In St. Mary's, Placentia Areas, I don't believe there was one hired on either side in the Federal Election and people got to the booths just the same.

MR. HOLLETT: Half of them did not.

MR. MURRAY: Sir, I think people will get used to it in the Provincial Elections in the same way as they got used to it in the Federal Elections. The only thing I see wrong in subsection 3 is that the word vehicle should be conveyance, because conveyance is described in sub-clause 2 and when we say vehicle we might think only of motorcars whereas in some parts of Newfoundland it may be a boat.

MR. HOLLETT: I see the word taxi is not there at all.

MR. MERCER: It is a vehicle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendment is that the word vehicle be stricken out and the word conveyance be substituted. Shall this clause as amended carry?

Carried—Voted against by Mr. Higgins, Mr. Hollett and Mr. Browne.

Clauses 116 and 117 carried.

Clause 118: Procedure. Penalty for indictable offences. Penalty for non-

indictable offences. Corrupt and illegal practices.

MR. BROWNE: Usually, Mr. Chairman, there is a provision—I don't know if it is anywhere here—for disqualification of such persons to stand as a candidate for five years—Is that here somewhere?

MR. MURRAY: I think later on we will come to that i.e., qualifications of candidates.

MR. HOLLETT: I think on that section 115, if you happen to have a taxi turn up you are guilty of corrupt practice and are liable to a fine of from one to two hundred dollars and suffer other penalties besides.

MR. POWER: That is not so—if someone else sends a taxi you cannot be responsible.

MR. HIGGINS: "Any other person on his behalf."

MR. HOLLETT: Suppose he does swear he did it on your behalf?

MR. LEWIS: Supposing he does it on your behalf?

MR. MURRAY: Then he is the person who does it, not the candidate.

MR. LEWIS: That is not reasonable at all.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, anybody on his behalf who does it is liable for it.

MR. HOLLETT: I could go out on your behalf and do that.

MR. MURRAY: It is pretty strange that a man can commit a crime in spite of himself.

MR. LEWIS: I wonder if we were to refer back to 115 again?

On motion committee reverted to Clause 115:



MR. LEWIS: I would like an explanation. Does that mean that John Jones can hire a taxi without my knowledge or consent and then afterwards come in and say he did that on polling day to bring voters to the polls and convict me of corrupt practice?

MR. MURRAY: No, John Jones is guilty not the candidate.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, John Jones with the best intentions in the world and wanting to help out Jim Higgins, goes and hires a taxi to get people to the polls. I might know nothing about it, but it is done on my behalf, would it still serve to put me in the bar?

MR. POWER: Is that the same wording as in the Federal Act?

MR. BROWNE: No, it is not the same as the Federal Act. In the Federal Act it is only illegal and is not a corrupt practice. I have the section of the Federal Act here "Every person who before, during or after an election directly or indirectly or by any means or devise attempts evasion of the following provision, hires in whole or in part, pays for or promises to pay for, etc."—But the bona fide payment of the elector himself of a fair or reasonable charge shall not be deemed an offence.

That is, if he pays for his own fare and hires a taxi, if an elector pays for his own fare that is not an offence.

MR. HOLLETT: That is wonderful is it not?

MR. BROWNE: The situation is quite clear. It is this decision the Committee has to make: Does it wish to permit, under the revised statutes of the Election Act, candidates to engage cars either by hire or through

friends to bring voters to the polls, or do they not.—That is the situation.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not strictly correct. That is a prohibitive clause. Now the point I want to make is that it is useless to prohibit something you cannot prevent happening, and everybody here knows that it is only nonsense and a waste of time, and I would say corrupt morals.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the clause means that at all. I think it is very clear. With all due deference to my honourable and learned colleague from Harbour Main-Bell Island—Here it says: By every candidate who himself does it, or by any other person on his behalf or any private person who does it either on behalf of the candidate or not is guilty if he pays some vehicle to take voters to the polls. I have never yet heard of an accused being found guilty because someone else did something about which the accused personally knew nothing.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would care to consider that with the law officers.

MR. MURRAY: It seems absolutely clear to me—If any other person does it unknown to the candidate surely the candidate himself cannot be found guilty.

MR. HIGGINS: I suggest that the honourable and learned gentlemen in the Chamber can give equally valid opinions—It is a matter of some importance.

MR. LEWIS: I would point out he does not have to pay at all. All he has to do is promise to pay—Every candidate who himself or by any other person that hires or promises to pay or pays—

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has given any particular thought to the matter of one neighbour or one friend using his car on his behalf voluntarily or without pay at all. Is that provided for?

MR. MURRAY: That is quite all right.

MR. SPENCER: Otherwise I would be in trouble. I happened to carry candidates to the booths during the last election. I can't recall receiving any cheque for it of course.

DR. ROWE: It seems to me the crux of the matter hinges around that phrase "Any other person on his behalf." Does that imply promises on the part of the candidate, or obligations on the part of the candidate to pay—or to go back to the situation quoted by my honourable friend from St. John's East—If a friend of mine goes out say in Labrador and engages a half dozen taxis, and I know nothing about it, I don't promise to pay, and he does it—Is my election invalidated by that? Is not that the crux of the matter? The whole section, as I see it, is that there has not got to be culpability on the part of the candidate.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I have heard several points, but I would like for someone to tell me—what does it mean?

MR. LEWIS: We have three positions here: The candidate himself—By any other person on his behalf—Then, every other person. Now what is the idea of—every other person? It means every other person on behalf of the candidate.

MR. MURRAY: It seems to me completely clear. There is one man, the candidate, and another person

does something as his agent—That is one set of circumstances—Another situation is where a man, without any knowledge on the part of the candidate goes ahead and does something. These are two entirely different situations. In one case the candidate is guilty, if he knows what is being done on his behalf. In the other case it is the man himself who is guilty.

MR. HIGGINS: I think the thing itself sounds a whole lot simpler than the wording of Section 115. My honourable friend from Harbour Main pointed out there are three separate cases—Any other person on his behalf and every other person—that is one and the same type of thing. Why have the two sets of phrases in?

MR. MURRAY: Because they are two different phrases. The candidate and an agent of the candidate or a man without the knowledge of the candidate.

MR. HOLLETT: Will you tell us what is wrong with 143?

MR. MURRAY: It is completely different. That is what we want to find out. Do we let them go ahead with this business of hiring cars or do we let this clause stand. If we want to restrict the hiring of cars on polling day then we must have something like Clause 115 of this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS: But can you make it stick?

MR. LEWIS: You have the ideal situation under the Federal Act—That may be the ideal thing—something to aim at for us. Actually the federal position is impractical as far as Newfoundland is concerned, or in so far as certain districts within the Avalon Area it may be all right, but in other sec-

tions where they have not got transportation, I think, it is entirely inapplicable.

MR. MURRAY: It was much more stringent than that. That is why we tried to make this more applicable. But I think this federal section dealing with this, which has just been read out by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West, does tie up much more completely than this does.

MR. LEWIS: They still have to hire cars here to get people to the general elections.

MR. HIGGINS: I think it demands further study, Mr. Chairman.

DR. ROWE: There is a question still unanswered, Mr. Chairman—Can the candidate be held responsible when some friend of his does things without his knowledge?

MR. MURRAY: No.

DR. ROWE: I understood from what some of the honourable gentlemen said that he could be held responsible.

MR. HOLLETT: The stigma would attach to the honourable member, Sir, there is no question about that.

MR. MURRAY: Most honourable members are not so thin-skinned.

Clause 115—On motion agreed the clause should stand.

Clause 119 and 120:

119: Appointment of official agent.

Candidate may act as his own official agent.

Election officers may not be official agents.

Claims.

Death of claimant.

When contract not enforceable.

Payment within three months.

Action where claims disputed.

Return of election expenses.

Bills, etc., to be preserved.

Penalty.

Offence.

120: Petition.

Proof of right to be a petitioner.

MR. BROWNE: Now, is this going to be carried out, Mr. Chairman, and has it been carried out in the past.

MR. HIGGINS: Might I ask the Minister: is there any provision for payment of official debts or is he supposed to serve voluntarily?

MR. MURRAY: Supposed to serve voluntarily.

MR. HIGGINS: There again, Sir, I suggest we have a completely unrealistic position. If you are to have a man as agent, how is he going to pay bills and everything else? It is contrary to reason to expect to find people so dedicated to any cause today as to do that sort of work without being paid something. I don't see much point in putting it in.

MR. BROWNE: What is the Federal Section—Have you got that? I have the Act here.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a month's work, you know.

MR. BROWNE: There are several sections here about agents.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, could we go on to the next clause while the honourable and learned member is looking for that?

Clause 121 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Now if we could go back to the one about official agents. That is covered by Section 62 of the Federal Act.—The duties of official agents involve payment of all expenses.

MR. SPENCER: Is that the present Canadian legislation?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. SPENCER: That is mandatory "It shall." Whereas in ours it is "May."

MR. BROWNE: Much of the section seems to be similar to ours.

MR. MURRAY: What about the question of whether official agents may be paid or not?

MR. BROWNE: I don't know if it is stated in any form. I don't see anything here about his being paid, not in this section. There must be some provision somewhere else.

Section 121 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 119 is carried, is that correct?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

Clauses 122 through 138 carried.

Clause 139: Corrupt practice agency.

MR. LEWIS: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, that section on corrupt practice, could we have that section read?

"139. Unless the Judges otherwise direct, any charge of corrupt practice may be gone into and evidence in relation thereto received before any proof has been given of agency on the part of any candidate in respect of such corrupt practice."

MR. LEWIS: That checks back to the original section on the hiring of cars, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: That charge of corrupt practice by the candidate may be gone into.

MR. LEWIS: That charge may be gone into without proof of the agent or any authority on behalf of the candidate.

MR. MURRAY: Would not that be purely procedural. It means it could be established in the first instance whether or not there was any corrupt practice at all.

MR. LEWIS: Under one section the hiring of cars being done by persons other than one authorized by the candidate—It brings up the question of corrupt practice. Is the candidate guilty of corrupt practice? In such an eventuality of corrupt practice it can be gone into and evidence heard before any official questioning of the agent dealing with it at all.

MR. MURRAY: It is surely a question of the agent being heard before any decision of a court was given.

We should let the section stand over, I think.

On motion Section 139 stand.

Committee recessed for ten minutes.

Committee called to order.

Clauses 140, 141 carried.

Clause 142: Candidates not liable in certain cases for corrupt practices.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, where did this come from—How can a person knowingly do something corrupt in good faith?

MR. MURRAY: Was not that in the old Act?

MR. BROWNE: I believe it was, but not self-contradictory like that.

MR. MURRAY: Well, supposing a constituent comes into a place where I am staying at the time. I am having something to eat or having something to drink, and I offer him a drink. I don't intend it as a corrupt practice or to buy a vote. But he may decide after I am elected to come into court and swear I gave him a drink. He would have to prove I gave him that drink with the intention of buying his vote. I may be guilty of doing that, but may be able to prove to the judge I did not do it with any intention to corrupt. If the judge found not only corrupt practice, but that it has been committed with the knowledge of the candidate—

MR. BROWNE: The definition you speak of is—Every candidate who himself or with any other person within any time either before, or during elections, directly or indirectly, gives or provides or incurs expenses wholly or in part for food, meat, drink, in order to be elected —

MR. MERCER: But a candidate must have the intention of corruption.

MR. BROWNE: 142 does not say that. 142 says: if it appears to the court upon the trial of an election petition that an Act constituting in law a corrupt practice was committed by a candidate or with his knowledge and consent, but without any corrupt intent and by an inadvertence which was excusable, and that the evidence showed the candidate to have honestly desired and in good faith endeavoured as far as he could, to have the election conducted according to law, the candidate shall not be subjected to the penalties and disabilities which he would but for this section incur.

MR. MURRAY: I am not happy about two or three of these sections

here. I am going to have it reconsidered in connection with Clause 139. I will ask to have them all held over. 139, 119, 115, 142.

Clause 146: Invalidation of election.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this seems to be inappropriate here where the House only sits for two or three months a year. If the House were sitting for eight or nine months of the year and the Speaker were always on the job, like the Speaker in England or in Canada, I can see the meaning of it, but I don't see the purpose here. It was not in the old Act. It was the Lieutenant-Governor in Council under the old Act.

MR. MURRAY: Well you notice in the definition "Speaker" includes the Clerk of the House who is presumably always available.

Clause 146 carried.

Clause 147: Duty of Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: What has the Speaker got to do with issuing the writs in this country? It is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council who gives instruction to issue. I don't know what is the purpose to introduce the Speaker in this, unless it is the intention to depart from previous practice—Is that the intention? It has not been made clear.

MR. MURRAY: Perhaps it should be the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. We could let this section stand over also.

Section 147 stand, or we could let from 144 to 148 inclusive stand.

On motion Section 144 through 148 stand.

Clauses 149 through 156 carried.

Clause 157: Lieutenant-Governor in Council may order advance polls to be held.

Period during which advance polls may be held.

Chief electoral officer to designate polling stations and publish notice.

Returning officer to furnish supplies to deputy.

Who may vote at advance poll.

Oaths to be taken.

Additional oaths to be taken.

Entries to be made in poll book.

Ballot box not to be opened until close of ordinary poll.

Precautions to be taken by deputy returning officer.

Procedure after close of advance poll.

Counting of votes cast at an advance poll.

Powers of chief electoral officer.

Application of this Act to advance poll.

Regulations.

MR. BROWNE: It seems here under sub-clause 2—advance polls may be held on any or all of the seven working days immediately preceding the ordinary polling day. That means: from nomination day to the polling day, or to the day before polling day? Election day is out and Sunday is out and nomination day is out. Therefore it is for the whole time the advance polls may be held. It seems to me to be too long a time and three days is the usual provision. Do you mean to say you got to get poll clerks and deputies for the whole week and

the number of people who use it are only three or four?

MR. MURRAY: We actually considered not putting it in at all. We put it in as premissive in case an occasion may arise where we may have to use it. Personally I doubt myself whether it is worth all the trouble involved. Actually the section may never be used at all.

MR. BROWNE: I would say three days would be adequate.

MR. MURRAY: We could make it three, but if you make it three days it makes it more worthless still.

MR. BROWNE: Well, let it stay if you like.

MR. MURRAY: I question it will ever be used here unless some very unusual situation arises.

MR. BROWNE: They have it in the Federal Act. Three days is all they have. I think if we were to let the clause stand and let the Government decide —

Agreed—Clause 157 stand.

Clauses 158 through 161 carried.

MR. BROWNE: May I just ask a question in regard to Clause 157—I don't know if there were any such provisions in the previous Act.

MR. MURRAY: No.

MR. BROWNE: Is it felt necessary to do this?

MR. MURRAY: It is a usual procedure in the Act to make regulations not inconsistent with the Act. Cases may arise where perhaps we feel we have not covered every set of circumstances which would arise.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a very doubtful matter to give the Lieuten-



ant-Governor in Council power to make regulations in regard to the Election Act.

MR. MURRAY: Not regulations inconsistent with the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: We could argue around that word for a long time. At any rate could we not meet that when the circumstances arise?

MR. MURRAY: There are quite a lot of qualifications there in order fully to promote the objects and purposes of the Act itself, to make recommendations not inconsistent with the Act for carrying out the spirit and purpose of the Act. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, "within the limits" would give sufficient safeguard.

MR. BROWNE: I don't like the idea. These things are supposed to be foreseen by the Act. It may be a precaution but it seems to me that—

MR. MURRAY: It is a precaution. With the qualifications "not inconsistent with and to carry out the true intent and meaning of the Act" I don't see what possible harm could arise.

MR. BROWNE: In reference to Clause 159 we would have either to amend that or bring in regulations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was no motion made to revert to Clause 159.

On motion Committee reverted to Clause 159:

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Honourable Minister have any idea of the sort of regulations which might be necessary under that section? Can he think of any regulations?

MR. MURRAY: There might be in connection with changing the forms here or that sort of thing, or different methods of communication or that

sort of thing. Other matters also might arise not inconsistent with the true intent and spirit of the Act. There may be more expeditious methods of carrying out the Act which could be prescribed by regulations, with the proviso in here. I can't see what harm could arise from it.

MR. BROWNE: Maybe a great deal of embarrassment and trouble over it. Unless it is necessary, I would suggest that it might be removed. Why not let it stand and consider that?

MR. MURRAY: We could let it stand, and I will ring Mr. Short about it.

Clause 159 stand.

Clauses 162 and 163 carried.

MR. MURRAY: That is the clause referred to previously.

MR. BROWNE: "No person in attendance at a poll or at the counting of the votes shall publish any results of the poll or of the counting at the poll until the conclusion of the count on polling day, but nothing in this section shall prevent the publication at any time of the results of the count by the returning officer or by the chief electoral officer."

The usual practice is that, as soon as the agent gets the result he goes and telephones his headquarters, and what is to prevent his doing that? What do we do about the radio stations and the press?

MR. MURRAY: That is exactly what the electoral officer wants to prevent. In previous elections results were coming on the radio, and the people running the election, the electoral officer himself, would not be in a position to confirm the reports as he had not heard. The electoral

officer wants to get the first information from the various stations or booths; and this is to prevent wires being choked. It is not a thing we feel strongly about.

MR. BROWNE: It is going to be impossible to maintain.

MR. HOLLETT: But nothing in this section shall prevent the publication—The returning officer can make a statement?

MR. MURRAY: The electoral officer wants to be in a position to let out information first.

MR. HOLLETT: There is nothing wrong with that.

MR. BROWNE: There will probably be a hundred booths making returns, and while they are coming in they are being tabulated as fast as they come in. But at headquarters the information is being relayed, and they are getting it there. I don't see any great wrong in the action of a candidate phoning his headquarters at a similar time to the deputy doing it. They all go in the same time.

DR. ROWE: That would not be published?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, as fast as it could be gotten.

MR. MURRAY: His professional pride was hurt, I think, when we asked for information he did not have.

Carried.

Clauses 164 and 165 carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it is supposed to be in this Act or the House of Assembly Act, in the case of a member who dies, having been elected, who dies or resigns. Is there any provision in this Act for issue of a writ?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes it is there—After nomination day and before polling day.

MR. HOLLETT: Not after he is elected?

MR. MURRAY: I imagine it would be in the House of Assembly Act to take care of that.

MR. BROWNE: Do we have to check the forms?

MR. CHAIRMAN: These forms were, I believe, passed in the clauses relating to them. But they might be considered although I don't think they need to be passed.

MR. BROWNE: There is one there, Form 5, which I drew to the attention of the Minister, which should be called Form 3, as there is no form three nor Form 4. I notice there is a clause here which says the chief electoral officer can change these forms. Where are Form 3 and Form 4? Has the Minister any idea what these forms are?

DR. POTTLE: They do not occur in sequence in the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: I think that should be changed.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, I will have that changed. I will have the clause covering a member who dies or retires checked. I must thank the Committee for the careful attention given to this Bill. I now move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again tomorrow.

On motion committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again tomorrow.

Report received, Committee ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

I move Committee of the Whole on various Bills: Nos. 2, 3 and 4 on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given earlier this Committee sit again.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

"An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

"An Act Respecting Social Assistance:"

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the honourable members I would remind them these Bills were referred on 1st June and progress reported.

"An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act." This Bill was read but Clause 2 was allowed to stand. The other clauses were read and passed, and clause 2 was read:

Clause 2:

Section 57 of The Welfare of Children Act, chapter 60 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended

(a) by repealing paragraph (g) of subsection (1) and substituting therefor the following:

"(g) commit the child temporarily or permanently to the care and custody of the Minister;"

(b) by repealing paragraph (i) of subsection (1) and substituting therefor the following:

"(i) award reasonable compensation in a sum not exceeding two hundred dollars to a party injured in his person or by loss of goods, with the consent or on the motion of such party;" and

(c) by repealing subsection (3).

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, speaking to that point; there was a question as to what might be a more realistic upper limit for compensation. The Bill, as it now stands, provides for an upper limit of compensation of \$200 in the case of a claim being made against a juvenile delinquent judged as a delinquent, amending the old Act which provided for an upper limit only of fifty dollars. A question was raised in Committee, in an earlier stage, that this raise to \$200 was not enough and that it should be more of the order of five hundred dollars. Now I have no feelings one way or the other, as I don't think any great matter of principle is involved. The honourable and learned member for St. John's East raised the point out of his legal and court experiences; and I have checked with the Attorney General, who believes there is no objection, and I see none, to its being raised to \$500. It is quite a jump and probably the legal members might be able to advise us here. But no great damage will be done, as I can see, by raising the limit to \$500. It is still within the discretion of the court.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I raised this point before because I had some specific interest in mind. And in the period between the time since this matter was first discussed and tonight I have had called to my attention another instance in the district of my honourable and learned friend from Harbour Main-Bell Island, where two children, boys, got on a roof and did considerable damage to property. I think they did get a certain amount of fame in the paper, described themselves as "Arizona Kids," and did two thousand dollars in property damages to property of men in the district. It is conceivable

that in this case the judge should be allowed some discretion. I am not saying it should be made obligatory on the part of the parent to make good, but, as I recall the words, it is entirely within the discretion of the judge. He may allow nothing, or he may, I believe, from a practical standpoint arrange that they may work it out themselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I honestly feel that there are occasions when a lot of damage is done to completely innocent people where the parent might properly be called upon to contribute to making good the damage suffered by the party; in cases where parents have knowingly allowed children to run riot I see no earthly reason why a party should not be given reasonable compensation in person or goods.

DR. POTTLE: I move the word "two" be stricken out and the word "five" be substituted in its stead, in sub-paragraph (i) of Clause 2 of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: It must be understood, Mr. Chairman, the parents are not liable for this. There is nothing in the Act which says the parents are liable for this.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point, Mr. Chairman, why state any amount at all, but just leave it at the discretion of the judge, and have it read—award reasonable compensation to the parties injured. Why not leave it to the discretion of the court which will have all the circumstances before it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why don't you get together sometime on that side.

DR. POTTLE: I think it is a matter of going from one state to an-

other and not getting to the other too violently. We are providing a new limit now, higher, to lift the limit altogether and say there is to be no limit might be possibly too much or a jump. So I think it ought to be allowed to stand as amended.

MR. BROWNE: May I make a correction to a statement I made a moment ago. While there is nothing under this section to render the parents liable, there is a subsequent section which says; "The judge may order that damages or costs imposed may be imposed upon parents." This provides that the amount imposed shall not exceed the amount fixed—and provides also for hearing the parent. Then there is a provision for appeal, so that the safeguards are all there.

Clause 2 as amended carried.

Motion carried—The Committee reports having passed this Bill with some amendments—

"An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act,"

Clause 1 and Clause 2 read:

1. This Act may be cited as The Local Government (Amendment) Act, 1954.

2. Section 2 of The Local Government Act, chapter 66 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended

(a) by inserting immediately before paragraph (a) as paragraph (aa) the following:

"(aa) "chairman" includes the mayor of a Council;" and

(b) by repealing paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) "Minister" means the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply or any other Minister of the Crown appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for the time being to administer this Act;"

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, before that passes did we not see an Act giving the Minister of Health certain powers in regard to councils of Corner Brook which definitely stated; for the purpose of overriding the failure of the councils in Corner Brook to act in accordance with the rules of the medical health officer—that gave the Minister of Public Health certain powers. Now under this Act the Minister of Health is being substituted by the Minister of Municipal Affairs; so that now he will take over the administration of that other Act too?

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): No, it is the other way about. What we have done is to bring the Public Health Act and this Act into conformity so that there can be no clash of regulations, and the health regulations will carry precedent, as far as that goes—we did the same thing when Public Works regulations clashed there.

Carried.

Clauses 3 and 4 carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. Section 6 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

6. (1) The first councillors to hold office shall be elected in the manner provided by The Local Government (Elections) Act.

(2) Subject to this section the term

of office of the first councillors shall be four years from the date of the first election after incorporation.

(3) The term of office of all councillors holding office in a council immediately before the enactment of this section shall expire

(a) where all of the councillors, were elected at the first election held for the selection of members for that Council, on the expiration of four years from the date of such election; and

(b) where any of the councillors were elected at a second or subsequent election held for the selection of some of the members of that Council, on the expiration of two years from the date of such election.

(4) Where the number of councillors holding office in a Council constituted before or after the enactment of this section is less than that required by this Act as a quorum for the purpose of a meeting of the Council the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, by order, determine the term of office of such councillors and direct that an election be held in accordance with this Act for the election of a full slate of councillors, and as soon as the order takes effect all of the consequences shall follow as if the councillors so holding office were councillors referred to in subsection (2) and had held office for four years, and where an order is made under this subsection it shall be published in The Newfoundland Gazette and the order shall have effect on the expiration of sixty days from the date of the publication.

(5) Where the term of office of councillors expires or is determined in accordance with this section the councillors shall continue to hold office

until councillors to succeed them are elected in accordance with this Act and sworn into office."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, in sub-section 4 the last line, that \$60 should be changed to \$90 to bring it into conformity with the Local Government Election Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that amendment;

MR. CURTIS: I second it.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: There is a new section, Mr. Chairman, which I move be added at the end of Clause 5—"Where the number of councilors holding office in a council constitute above or over the enactment of this section is less than that required by this Act as a quorum for the purpose of meeting of the council, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint a number of councillors sufficient to constitute a quorum, and the councilors appointed under this sub-section shall hold office until the expiration of the term of office of the councilors who last held office in the council before such appointments were expired or in accordance with sub-section 4 (a) and (b) councillors to succeed them are elected in accordance with this Act." Now, I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister explain that amendment, which I move.

MR. BROWNE: Have you got a copy for us to look at?

MR. CURTIS: This is the only copy we have at the moment. We could allow that section to stand if necessary.

MR. HEFFERTON: May I make an explanation: Not very long ago we were notified that in Corner Brook

West, through death, resignations or leaving the place, only the mayor and one councillor was left. This was not a quorum under the Act, consequently an intolerable situation arose as they were not able to hold elections for ninety days, and there was not very much we could do. So that in the interim we thought that we might possibly appoint two, three or four members or whatever may be necessary to carry on the work while the election was proceeding. That is the purpose of this particular amendment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister in this case how long it will be before there will be an election?

MR. HEFFERTON: Ninety days.

MR. BROWNE: Has an election been called for?

MR. HEFFERTON: That we do not know.

MR. BROWNE: I thought from what I heard the Attorney General read; they can hold office as long as the councillors who have resigned or died or left the town could have held it. That might be for two or three years?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is quite true. But the other section says there must be a quorum in order to transact business.

MR. BROWNE: I understand they need to appoint them to carry on until the elections, but these elections ought to be held at the earliest possible moment. I have not seen the section.

MR. HEFFERTON: That earliest possible would be ninety days. They have to get a voters' list—they have to



call for a voters' list. They are only appointed for the interim period, and the election is supposed to be called, naturally, to take place at the earliest possible date. During that interim council remains in office until the new council is elected, that is all.

MR. BROWNE: I did not get the explanation from the Minister as to why it is necessary to put in 90 instead of 60.

MR. HEFFERTON: Because under the Local Government Act it is 90 days.

Clause 5 on motion allowed to stand over.

Clause 6 carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the members of the Committee would be willing to have this Bill called by section and number. It is a long Bill. These Bills from the time they get drafted in the originating department and then have passed the scrutiny of the Attorney General's Department and then the scrutiny of the Cabinet, by the time they come in here they are for the most part, allowing for exceptions, pretty good. While the Opposition has every right and duty to question the meaning of this, that or the other clause, I think that nine times out of ten they find the explanation given justifies the clause in question. Perhaps as this is a long Act we could read it by number and titles.

On motion Committee agreed Bill be read by number and titles. Clauses 7 and 8 read and carried.

Clause 9: Addition of new section. Election to fill up vacancies in Council.

MR. HEFFERTON: That simply

means the person elected when any by-election is called goes out of office at the same time as the rest of the council.

MR. BROWNE: Does that apply to Corner Brook West?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, they have to have a general election.

MR. BROWNE: I thought, Mr. Chairman, the situation at Corner Brook West was that they did not have a quorum, did not have enough councillors.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is why they will call a general election as soon as possible.

MR. BROWNE: That is where the number has gone down below that required for a quorum, and there are vacancies to be filled.

MR. HEFFERTON: If there are two or three vacancies they will have an election for that number of members.

MR. BROWNE: For the five years?

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Minister could tell me what time the term of office of the council in Bonavista will expire?

MR. HEFFERTON: That I could not tell you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It expires about a week from now, if the House passes legislation we are bringing in, we will expire their term here in this House.

MR. BROWNE: In this Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not in this Act, no.

Clause 9 carried.

Clauses 10 and 11 carried.

Clause 12: Addition of new section. Offence.

The word "to" in the last line deleted. Clause carried as amended.

Clause 13: Repeal Sections 18 and 19.

MR. BROWNE: Where are these repealed?

MR. HEFFERTON: Around an airport and in the vicinity of naval bases.

MR. BROWNE: Is there some reason for it?

MR. HEFFERTON: The particular reason for it here—We made provisions to set up local municipal areas and sometimes —

MR. BROWNE: I know, Mr. Chairman, I understand that at Goose Bay near that airport there is an area, a small town called Happy Valley—Are you going to abolish that area as a municipality?

MR. HEFFERTON: It is not a municipality.

DR. ROWE: It is owned by the airport.

MR. BROWNE: It was.

MR. HEFFERTON: It never has been.

MR. BROWNE: Do you want it to be, or what is the position?

MR. HEFFERTON: What they do want to do is to pass it over to us and have it placed under provincial control. We are not in the position to take it and set up a municipality there at the present time, for various reasons, so that under this provision we hope to set up local improvements of the area and appoint two, three,

four or five members for a period not to exceed two years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This merely repeals a redundant section.

Clause carried.

Clauses 14 through 18 inclusive carried.

MR. BROWNE: I understand now the councils may appoint the clerks and, I presume, some other officials without consulting the Government. Is that the purpose?

MR. HEFFERTON: No the chief purpose is to lay down the duties of the clerks, which were not laid down in the parent Act.

MR. BROWNE: It is under Clause 28 in the Local Government Act, unless it has been altered since, and I don't think it has—The council should have power, subsequent to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to appoint such officer and servants as may be necessary. Now this section deals with the appointment of clerks. Can they appoint anybody else? Is there another section giving power to appoint other officers, or are they just confined to a clerk?

MR. HEFFERTON: Just confined to a clerk.

MR. BROWNE: What is the purpose of that? Might one add assistant clerk, a doorman or caretaker? It seems to me strange to take away powers like that from them. They might need a tax clerk or something.

Clause carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

On motion Committee rose, reported that they had considered "An Act to

Amend the Welfare of Children Act" and has passed the Bill with some amendments.

On motion said amendment received first and second reading and concurred in.

Bill ordered read a third time tomorrow.

On Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act," the Committee reports having made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received, ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

On motion House adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday at 11:00 of the clock.

---

THURSDAY, June 9, 1954.

The House met at 11:00 of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave of the

House to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act," and "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act."

Also on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, a Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act."

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting Commissions to Administer Loans."

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare): There is just a small point, Mr. Speaker. On the Order Paper, item No. 10 refers to the Minister of Fisheries and item 21 the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, on the same Order Paper.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he is aware of the dangerous conditions presently existing on the steps of the entrance to the Magistrates Court. They are now almost in a state of total collapse. These steps are used daily by some hundreds of citizens, that is the actual steps leading from Duckworth Street into the court.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I think that is a municipal responsibility the honourable gentleman is inquiring about.

#### Orders of the Day

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Welfare. I wonder if Newfoundland was included in the nine provinces which have agreed with the Canadian Government regarding the new Act for pensions for disabled persons? I might say it was announced

in the press that nine provinces have, and I understood Newfoundland was mentioned.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Speaker, I was anticipating a question like that from the Opposition. I have seen two references in the press which might give the impression that Newfoundland has made some formal statement that she was willing to enter into an agreement. I can only say this now, Sir, that at the meetings I attended where this matter was discussed I said we would look into the situation very carefully. But since then no formal information has gone forward to the Government of Canada or any department of the Government of Canada which would give any indication that we were in fact going to enter into such an agreement. We have not opposed it nor said no, but we have not formally said yes. There may be a Bill introduced to the House, an enabling Act that will give the House an opportunity to consider this matter, in another session, but that is as far as I can go on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think we could go on to items No. 10 to 24 inclusive, excepting item No. 12.

#### First Readings:

Honourable the Minister of Fisheries asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Finance asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I would remind honourable members when putting a motion that these Bills be read a second time on tomorrow, when a day has been named for a particular business, strictly speaking, no earlier date can be substituted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are so many I doubt we could come to any of them.

On motion Bill read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Public Works asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber Over Streams and Lakes and for other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Premier asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Finance asks leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Provide for the Licensing of Insurance Companies Carrying on the Business of Insurance in Newfoundland." On motion read a first time,

ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

### Third Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

### Committee of the Whole:

On Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given yesterday that this Committee sit again today. I do now leave the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee was considering last night, clause 18, on page 10 of a Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

Clauses 18 and 19 carried.

Clause 20: Amdt. Sec. 32.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): This merely empowers the councils to adopt some building code, and make regulations in accordance with same.

Carried.

Clause 21: Repeal Sec. 33.

MR. BROWNE: That is a penalty section—is it not covered somewhere else?

MR. HEFFERTON: Oh yes!

Clauses 21 and 22 carried.

MR. BROWNE: At the moment I take it there is some provision for compensation where there is expropriation. This deals with expropriation of land. I am sure there must be, but I did not get a chance to check on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it is the recovery of public land or crown land there is no compensation.

MR. BROWNE: No this is the expropriation of land, it is assumed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, and the regular procedure follows and it is compensated for.

MR. BROWNE: The old procedure makes provision for damages to the owner thereof to be determined by arbitration. That seems to have been left out. Is the procedure found elsewhere here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is provided for, in this Act and in the Department of Public Works Act.

MR. SPENCER: No. 15, 1952.

MR. BROWNE: But according to this Act that section is repealed.

MR. HEFFERTON: To my knowledge it is covered by the Public Works Act and the Highway Traffic Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It has got to be covered in this.

MR. BROWNE: Surely Public Works does not cover municipal councils. It does not seem right to me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Public Works refers to land other than what is involved here. So that it must also be covered in this Act somewhere. This is not the whole of the Act, merely an amendment. It is covered in the original Act.

MR. BROWNE: The original Act here which is now being repealed does provide that damages be determined by arbitration.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We could let that stand and go on and then go back to it.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Before you move on, if I may be allowed to refer back to 19.

On motion Committee referred back to Clause 19:

MR. HOLLETT: This means that any taxpayer on his own volition may go in and demand to see the books kept by the clerk of the council. I wonder if that is the intention of that section?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It goes further, the assessments, voters' list, poll books and other books and documents in the possession or under the control of the clerk. Any taxpayer of the municipality—

MR. HOLLETT: I am just wondering, Mr. Chairman, whether or not it is wise to make it possible for any taxpayer on his own volition to go into the council office and demand from the clerk all the reports kept, all the records whatsoever kept by the clerk of the council, which can be looked into or inspected by any taxpayer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only that but he can ask for a copy at a cost of ten cents.

MR. HOLLETT: I foresee where you are likely to have a little problem on that.

MR. HEFFERTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the taxes to be paid are public property, and if any taxpayer feels he is being illegally or disproportionately taxed surely he has the right to go in and see the records etc., and see whether he is being treated rightly or not.



MR. HOLLETT: Has he a right to see what Bill Smith has paid or anybody?

MR. CURTIS: Of course, to compare with his own.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is done all over the earth.

MR. HOLLETT: On the same basis why does not the Federal Government permit taxpayers to go into the income tax office?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until a few years ago it used to publish every income tax paid. In the United States it used to be published annually.

MR. HIGGINS: I might say it is not uncommon for a citizen who feels he is unduly taxed to come to the city clerk's office, and say, for instance, I live on the corner of Livingstone Street and a fellow across the street from me pays less. The city clerk, I believe, on a payment of a fee will allow him to see the appraiser's books. So that there is nothing so unusual about this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is done all over the world.

MR. CURTIS: In fact, fairly recently when I was in the city living on a certain street, a person next door had a better house with a garage and paid less taxes yet had gall enough to go down and demand a reduction.

MR. HIGGINS: It is not infrequent to have some citizen come and complain, and sometimes something comes up and the councillor or clerk gets a rap on the knuckles for not performing their duties properly.

MR. HOLLETT: Can I go into the municipal office down here and demand to see what every person is taxed?

MR. HIGGINS: Yes, you can do that. Most people don't know that.

Clause 19 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 22 was permitted to stand.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I found the section over towards the end dealing with arbitration. I think it is connected insufficiently. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering as the Minister is a little hard of hearing, could he sit in the chair there—he does not seem to grasp what is being said.

Clauses 21, 22, 23 carried.

Clause 24: Amdt. Sec. 41.

MR. BROWNE: Has it been found necessary to do that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, it is a case again where we had regulations under two different Acts which were in conflict, the Municipal Councils Act and the Public Works Act. Here we have given the priority to Public Works because they are in control of public highways.

Carried.

Clauses 25, 26 carried.

Clause 27: Amdt. Sec. 44. Right to establish, run and operate cold storage.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while on that; I wonder if the Minister knows whether that is being done? I remember some years ago looking into the subject, and I found that in Europe it is quite a common thing, and they had thousands of small municipalities that bought the electricity, and then did their own wiring and extensions of services themselves

thereby making it cheaper for the municipality. Does the Minister know if that is being done here?

MR. HEFFERTON: We have had some requests for it to be done. I don't know if it is being done. But we have diesel plants under the control and management of councils.

MR. BROWNE: I remember when they had the right to extend the electricity to Codroy Valley I suggested to some co-operative society to do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But they did not, they are still shouting for electricity.

Carried.

Clause 28 carried.

Clause 29: Amdt. Sec. 47.

MR. BROWNE: This is a little different, Mr. Chairman, from the other. This is a business tax, and extensive authorization—the council shall fix any taxes imposed under this section, as a percentage of the value or magnitude, as estimated by the Council of business done by the person, partnership, association or company to be taxed, and the Council may vary the percentage of its application to different kinds or classes of business, trades or professions, and subject to Section 49 the estimate by the Council of the value or magnitude of the business done shall be final and the amount of any tax fixed under this paragraph shall not be less than five dollars or more than one thousand dollars; but

(ii) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order, direct that the Council shall fix any tax imposed under this section as a percentage of the assessed value of any or all of the

classes of real property used by every person, partnership, association or company in carrying on the business, trade or profession in respect of which the tax is imposed . . . .

I think I brought that matter up somewhere else, with regard to valuation of business. I thought it had something to do with floorspace, is that in this Act?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all subject to the tax rental agreement.

MR. BROWNE: Between the Provincial Government and the Federal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. There is a certain ceiling on all kinds of taxes we may impose or allow to be imposed.

MR. BROWNE: This is not government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is done under the Authority of the Act of this House, therefore we control it, and we are not permitted to authorize taxation above a certain figure in certain regards.

MR. HEFFERTON: On Section (i) the council, it is their official desire to carry out as they are doing now and fixing the business tax within the limits of the Act themselves. That is within the limits of \$5 and \$1,000, on a sort of arbitrary fashion based on the goods turnover and the magnitude, and it, of course, must be approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Now that is being done by many councils at the present time, but more and more of the councils were dissatisfied, and we have had many complaints from many people in these communities therefore this

section is there as an alternative for assessment of real property and a tax on same.

MR. HOLLETT: And the Lieutenant-Governor in Council says just what the percentage will be?

MR. HEFFERTON: It has to come to us for approval.

Carried.

Clauses 30 and 31 carried.

Clause 32: Repeal and substitution Sec. 58. Water tax.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is a provision for the imposition of a water tax where a water system has been installed.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a very ancient tax, is it not, a tax on water?

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Are you going to put a tax on water taps in the municipalities?

MR. HIGGINS: Not necessarily.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is just one of the ways it may be used.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister, is not this water tax provision very similar to one in the St. John's Municipal Act, it seems to be word for word?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is right. You merely provide alternative ways of payment.

MR. BROWNE: There is a provision in Sub-section 3, the council may impose the water tax on land or buildings not connected. Now that has raised a principle where a council may impose a water tax on a building not connected with the system.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can't have water systems in the outports otherwise.

MR. BROWNE: I am reminded of the past, I remember some years ago taxes were imposed on people living in the Mundy Pond Area and there were no facilities provided by the municipality.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But you have a different position altogether in the outports. It passes by a house where a man says he does not want it. He decides his wife should go on carrying water in a bucket. He is not going to have water. But the council has a right to take the taxes from him as though he did.

MR. HEFFERTON: It goes a little further. There might be a hydrant and they get all their water supply from that hydrant, and it is only right these people should pay these taxes.

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

Clause 32 carried.

Clause 33: Addition of new sections. Streets for purposes of subdivision may not be opened or made without consent of Council. Council may open new streets and subdivide land. Cost of improvements made under Section 58B may be assessed on the lands benefitting. Lands may be assessed in respect of the laying of water mains, sewers and the construction of curbs, gutters and sidewalks. Sums assessed under Sections 58C and 58D to be paid by instalments. Owners of lands may be requested to effect improvements at their own expense, or deposit with Council an amount equal to estimated cost.

MR. HOLLETT: This has been a very unpopular tax in some sections.

MR. HEFFERTON: I might say most of these things have been asked for by municipalities in the last three years.

MR. HOLLETT: I say it must be a very unpopular tax in some areas in Newfoundland. As yet the people are not used to these things. Councils may very well ask for it, but they won't find it easy to collect. I know for a fact a good many settlements where it is not popular.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is why it is absolutely basic the validity of the council in the first instance be beyond doubt, because when it is beyond doubt in the minds of the people concerned, then that municipal organization has an incomparably better chance of imposing these conditions and these taxes.

MR. HOLLETT: While the Premier is on that point could he tell us why, with an election carried out—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not going to discuss that.

MR. HOLLETT: He raised the point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not mention Bonavista.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier raised the point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman knows there is an Act coming in and he will have ample opportunity to debate it. Why not realize it is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. If there is an Act coming in to consider this specific point—

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is, I announced an Act last night.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh, very well!

Clause 33 carried.

Clause 34: Repeal Sec. 78A.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder why some of these sections are changed?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is something I cannot tell you, it is in the drafting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may be just a matter of re-numbering.

Clause 34 and 35 carried. Preamble and Title carried.

MR. HEFFERTON: I move the Committee report having passed this Bill with some amendments.

Carried.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance";

Clauses 1 through 8 carried.

Clause 9: Persons not eligible for social assistance.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, "Social Assistance shall not be granted under this Act or the regulations to a person whose only claim to social assistance is on account of his being unemployed"—

MR. CURTIS: I wonder if the Minister would explain that. A man may be utterly destitute and in good health.

DR. POTTLE: On second reading, Mr. Chairman, I think I indicated, at least in general terms, why we felt Newfoundland was probably not ready to have this Bill cover able-bodied unemployment. That does not mean to say the able-bodied unemployed are not helped. There is a scale of able-

bodied relief and it applies now and will apply after this Act is passed, but the able-bodied unemployed will be outside this, they will be in another category outside the categories included in this Bill. I indicated as clearly as I could from the point of view of sound welfare, there was in my view absolutely no reason why the able-bodied unemployed should not come under a Bill of this kind. There are two or three comments, however: (1) If the able-bodied were included it would conceivably happen that in a time, if there happened to be a time of wide-spread unemployment, then this whole Bill, the application of this Act could be quite upset. In the second place this Bill, if it becomes law, does for mothers and dependents and cripples etc., exactly what it is doing now, at least exactly what our legislation is doing now, but this Bill will tie the whole thing together in one neater package. I am sure the Opposition will appreciate that it requires a fair amount of departmental machinery to get a person put on a satisfactory allowance, and once he is put on he is here because he is incapacitated or disabled because of some good reason or other. Once that happens he goes on for a while, and you just do not have that kind of machinery, and that set of circumstances does not apply to able-bodied relief. A man may be out of work today but may get a job tomorrow. You can see what I am saying—the people who came under this Bill, once they come on, the tendency will be for them to continue on for six or twelve months, because they are that kind of persons. As I have just said, the type of persons who qualify, widows, or adults or families who are unable because of certain emergencies

to care for their families they are the kind of people who come under this Bill. But even with those their circumstances change so that they are no longer entitled to allowances. Then they are required by law to notify us at headquarters.

Again the point I am trying to make, with able-bodied unemployment the circumstances change overnight, but people who characteristically come under this Bill, when once they get on tend to be on for a few months. That is not the whole answer, but it is partly an answer. And I say, from the point of view of welfare there is no reason why they should not come under this Bill. Yet I think we are not quite ready yet, we are coming to it by stages. Practically the first step is to cut these things all down into classes, and the next step may be to take our place in public welfare, and I am not sure from the point of view of general public relations if they are ready.

MR. HOLLETT: You will pay under this Act to certain able-bodied unemployed, is that not so?

DR. POTTLE: But that will not be the only reason.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not merely by reason of the fact that a man is unemployed.

MR. HOLLETT: But will pay it to him while he has to remain to look after his children because he is unable to obtain the service of some person to look after them? I think you are going to have a little trouble there.

DR. POTTLE: It is not a new section. It has been in force at least a year, and we have had no trouble with it so far.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not generally known, I take it.

DR. POTTLE: There is no reason why it should not be, the welfare officers know it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I take it the Bill does not mean to exclude from relief those whose only claim for relief is that they are able-bodied and unemployed. That relief comes under different legislation. That is all it means. That is the short answer.

DR. POTTLE: And we want to deal with it in such a way we can deal with it again and again, but this is more cumbersome.

MR. BROWNE: Is there actually legislation under which relief is given?

DR. POTTLE: Well, the Health and Welfare Act, 1931.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That commits us.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have one question about that—the issue of social assistance in cash, would that be outside St. John's?

DR. POTTLE: Social assistance will be paid here by cheque.

MR. HIGGINS: By cheque rather than by cash?

DR. POTTLE: Yes.

Clauses 10 through 20 carried.

Clause 23: Action may be taken in name.

Clause 24: Regulations.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I have a point to raise there—the Attorney General asks whether it might not be advisable under regulations to provide a kind of escalator provision

respecting any other matters necessary or advisable to carry out this Act, as there may be other matters in the enforcement of the Act not explicitly provided for. I suggest it might be advisable to add a sub-clause (J) respecting any other matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the purposes of this Act. If we could let that stand, Sir, I could consult the law officers and see if they would not agree.

Clause 24 stand.

Clauses 25, 26, 27 carried.

Clauses 28 and 29 carried.

Clause 30: Date of coming into force.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, on this Clause, if this Bill comes into law it would mean the Mothers' Allowances Act and the Dependents' Allowances Act go out, but we would prefer to have the Mothers' Allowances Act and the Dependents' Allowances Act stand long enough so they would be there when this Act comes fully into force, because we don't want any payments interrupted as a result of the implementation of this Bill, so that it might be deleted.

MR. CURTIS: We cannot delete it. I think we could provide, Mr. Chairman, to have them repealed by proclamation. I suggest that would serve as well.

Clause 30 carried.

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee report having made some progress on this Bill, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election



of Members to the House of Assembly."

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might remind the Committee the following clauses were allowed to stand: Clauses 3, 4, 26, 36, 41, 65, 115, 145, 147, 148 and 150.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to report, the forms in the back which, as were mentioned last night, do not run consecutively. That was done. Three and four were found to be useless and had no application to the Act and were taken out. But if they were renumbered it would mean a big job of renumbering them all the way through, so that the gap was left there.

MR. BROWNE: Is that good draftsmanship?

MR. MURRAY: Well, it does no possible harm, and it would mean a tremendous lot of more work at this stage, as there are cross-references to forms all throughout the Act—and it can't possibly do any harm.

Then the honourable and learned member brought up the question of what is a Canadian citizen. I have the Canadian Citizenship Act here with me. Statutes of Canada, Volume 2; and very briefly a Canadian citizen would be one born in Canada or who becomes a citizen as a result of Confederation or, in the case of a female, one who married a Canadian and had one year's residence; British subjects, citizens of Erie and of the Commonwealth become citizens after five years' residence and filing a declaration of intentions and taking an oath of allegiance. In the case of aliens the procedure is somewhat different—an alien is one who is not a member of

the Commonwealth or a citizen of Erie; in that case he must file a declaration of intentions of becoming a citizen anytime within five years; after five years apply for citizenship, appear before the court, answer questions put by the court. A certificate of character is provided by the Chief of Police, and these documents are sent off to the Minister of Citizenship at Ottawa and after the oath of allegiance, renunciation of a foreign nation is done by the court, and he becomes a citizen.

MR. BROWNE: I was not concerned with that point. In our old Act a British subject who is a resident had the right to vote, and under the constitution a British subject has the right to vote under local government. Under our old Election Act a British subject had a right to vote, and I suggest he should be given the right to vote.

MR. MURRAY: We are prepared to do that.

MR. BROWNE: Say, as a Canadian citizen or other British subject.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because a Canadian citizen is a British subject.

MR. MURRAY: That is, section (b) of Clause (3) will now read a Canadian citizen or other British subject.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: The next point is under Clause 26: We have no objection to making that fourteen days, seven days.

Clause amended by changing "fourteen" to "seven."

Clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: The next is under Clause 36—A person to whom a writ of election is directed shall be the returning officer for the electoral district to which the writ relates. This is done deliberately. In the case of Carboncar, for instance, or Bay de Verde, Magistrate Sheppard, who might not be the electoral officer for Port de Grave, might be appointed returning officer for that district, and similar cases may arise. The idea was to be able to appoint a magistrate as a returning officer for a district.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was always a fact.

MR. BROWNE: But it says here—I see, yes—carried.

MR. MURRAY: The point raised in Clause 41 was covered, I believe by the references to Clause 3, Canadian Citizenship.

MR. HOLLETT: Clause 36 is passed, is it? I really can't see that yet. If he is not the electoral officer in that district how is he to cast a deciding vote in the case of a tie?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because he is given the right under the Act in another section.

MR. HOLLETT: I see—

Carried.

Clause 41 carried.

MR. MURRAY: The next point is under Clause 65: Strike out "at the time of application" in the last line of sub-section (6) and substitute therefor "on polling day." That is sub-paragraph (4) (vi). There is also a slight amendment, if you go back to (vi) in rule "v" should be "vi."

Clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: Now under sub-clause 12 of Clause 69: I have not the actual amendment here but we are striking out the words "in line at the door."

MR. BROWNE: That does not satisfy. You still have the door open and people coming in.

MR. MURRAY: If we strike out the words "in line at the door." The outer door of the polling station is closed.

MR. CURTIS: Supposing it is a very small home?

MR. BROWNE: While we are on the subject, I think the Premier may be aware, or other Ministers may be, that there was some considerable confusion between the polling stations on Mundy Pond. A man had his house rented and his name was not recorded for the place where the booth was located, but he had to vote at another polling station. There was great confusion between the polling stations on Pennywell Road at the Junction of Empire Avenue and Mundy Pond, Blackler Avenue, and people had to go to two or three places before they found out where they were to vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that arose from the distinction between rural and urban voters. If you live outside the city you are in a rural area and can vote in almost any booth. If you live inside the city you are an urban voter and have to vote where you are told to vote. And at that booth they were at the edge of the city, sort of.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: 110—that clause has to do with it being unlawful to pay an agent. All I can say to that is that the same provision, we checked this

morning, is in the Ontario and in the Federal Acts, and we had better leave it alone.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister promised to look up that Section 110.

MR. HOLLETT: There was something about 101 was there?

MR. MURRAY: Yes, whether the word directly or indirectly should not go in. I checked with the law officers and think it is pretty stringent as it is drafted at present.

MR. BROWNE: Under Clause 111, I asked the Minister to consider the reinsertion of the section that dealt with the employees of any department of Government or employed in any Department of Public Works. Section 151 of the original Act.

MR. MURRAY: We will make the necessary inclusion.

MR. HOLLETT: Did I understand 110 is now in order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was carried as is because that is the way it reads in the Federal Act and in the Ontario Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that Section 151 be made the second part of Section 111 there.

MR. MURRAY: I was also thinking that, so as not to disturb the numbering. The next section becomes (a) and the original one (b).

Moved that Section 111 be amended by inserting as (a) No person in the employ of any department of the Government, etc., and renumbering the preceding section as (b).

Clause as amended carried.

Clause 115.

MR. MURRAY: That is a debatable question, whether or not it is legal to hire a conveyance. After due consideration I think the clause should pass as is. You may never stop it but it is nice to be able to say, sorry but if I hire a car I lose my election even if I have a majority of a million. Do you want me to be elected?

MR. BROWNE: That is all right, but if the other fellow does it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, it will be at his own risk. If two men can be found to swear he spent money for that, he has had it! Out he goes!

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): We have a situation over in my district that will affect largely, and I think properly the Minister of Public Works as well as the question of men in the woods. Unless there is some arrangement for mobile polling stations it will be impossible for these people to vote, unless you had a polling station in every lumber camp.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is nothing in this to stop anyone from volunteering. For instance the two companies concerned could voluntarily move all their employees to the nearest polling booths. The only thing is a candidate or his agent cannot hire a vehicle, but anyone can drive voters free. That is the least the companies can do—drive their employees down to vote.

MR. HIGGINS: I agree heartily—Let it go.

MR. HOLLETT: There are a good many of us in this House not only on this side who do not like it. As a matter of fact I am prepared to make an amendment to Section 115—Every candidate who hires or promises to pay—

Strike out the word "himself" or by any other person on behalf of any other person—the candidate is not allowed to hire a person.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman explain his point—How difficult does he want it to be?

MR. HOLLETT: The point is that there are many people who have no conveyances, have no cars but are invalid and crippled but who would like to go and vote. Under this section you cannot ring up a taxi and say; "come down I want to take Mr. Moore to the polls." If a candidate does that he gets into trouble.

MR. MURRAY: He could take his own car.

MR. HOLLETT: And if he has not got one?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Tories surely all have cars.

MR. HOLLETT: You cannot make a Tory nor a Liberal joke out of this. I am thinking of the inconvenience to certain people who should go and cast their vote, but we are putting an obstacle there. I think the Government will agree with us for once, we endeavour not only to assist, but almost to insist, as my learned friend on my left said yesterday, that everybody get out and vote. But if you leave that section as it is these people who live a long distance away from the polling stations are just not going to get there. I would like to have these other words stricken out, and leave it to the candidate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The elections are costing enough as it is. Let us cut out this fantastic expense of cars and trucks and motor boats and wheelbarrows and everything that is movable.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all very well for some people to talk like that. He is getting out. He told us he is getting out of politics, and going to Roche's Line and residing there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think I said, I am getting out of politics when the industrial development programme is running absolutely smoothly and the fisheries development programme is running absolutely smoothly. I don't know how long that will be. But as soon as that time comes I am gone, I am out. I don't know how long it will be. Maybe the honourable gentleman is better able to tell us. Does he think all this is to happen in the next few months or a year or two? I think it will take some time longer.

MR. HOLLETT: I think I can tell the exact time that will happen. That is the exact moment the Honourable the Premier rises up from his chair and says—the new industries are working smoothly and the fisheries programme also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we are wandering afield. Will the honourable member read his amendment to 115?

MR. HOLLETT: That all words in the first part of the clause after the word "who" be stricken out, in the first and second line. Then it would read—Every candidate who hires or promises to hire a conveyance to carry voters—it penalizes the candidate if he does it, and we don't have to penalize Mr. Jones who hires a taxi to take Mr. Smith to the polls.

MR. MURRAY: This clause will be completely inoperative then, and there will be no sense in it at all.

MR. HIGGINS: This is, not letting your right hand know what your left is doing.

Amendment put—Motion lost—Clause carried.

Clauses 145 to 148:

MR. MURRAY: I checked up on these this morning. The point was brought up by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West. I checked this morning and was told it is the same in the Canadian Act—They have to report to somebody. In this case the report is made to the Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: It is in the Canadian Act, yes, because the Canadian House sits about nine months out of year.

MR. MURRAY: We have the Speaker here virtually every day. And if the Speaker happens to be out of the Province the Clerk of the House of Assembly may do it. This is in case a member is unseated and a new election writ is issued by the Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: I guess we need not worry too much about it.

Clauses 145 to 148 inclusive carried.

Clause 149:

MR. MURRAY: That is a matter of procedure, the charge has to be proven whether or not a corrupt practice was committed.

Clause 149 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman I drew attention to 142, that it had certain inconsistencies.

MR. MURRAY: The honourable member pointed out quite rightly that it must be done with intent to corrupt. But it was pointed out to me this morning by the law officers there are a number of corrupt practices covered by the Act, and it would be possible for a

candidate to commit one of these and assuredly it is just a saving clause.

Clause 142 carried.

MR. MURRAY: Clause 159 has to do with the making of regulations under the Act. It was pointed out to me this morning a flagrant mistake could arise in the Act, and a printer could make a clause absurd, but these regulations would give power to rectify it rather than wait for the House of Assembly to open. Another thing is that there might be deficiencies in the Act, as to the distribution of ballot boxes or forms or a thousand and one things in connection with election, and the regulations are to take care of that sort of thing. The regulations themselves must be consistent with the Act, and in order to carry out the terms, intent and meaning of the Act.

MR. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the Attorney General, who has said this on one or two occasions, where inadvertently a typographical error occurs there is power to amend, and there is some sound inherent power to amend a typographical error.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps there is.

MR. MURRAY: I could give a typical example. When the consolidation was made, that a woman could vote only when 25 was a misunderstanding; a correction could cover such an error.

MR. BROWNE: That is a very big problem.

MR. HOLLETT: If the honourable member suggests then that Acts passed by the House now can be amended by regulations of the Governor in Council.

MR. MURRAY: No, it is true intent being better carried out—

MR. HOLLETT: I remember there were recommendations in connection with voters lists in the old days, but I never heard of regulations relative to the Election Act. Where are we going to draw the line? One government makes one set and another government makes another. We are repealing now the Act which has been in force since 1913, and we are going to give each government which comes into power the authority now to make regulations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not regulations to change the Act.

MR. BROWNE: According to the illustration given by the Minister.

MR. MURRAY: It was a poor illustration, I confess.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we do not agree with this section at all, and it has not been in the old Act. It is not in the Canadian Act. There has been no evidence given to us to show it has ever been necessary. Therefore, I suggest it be dropped.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if there is an Act that ought to have the respect and concern of all the House it is the Election Act. No one in the Government would desire to be accused or even that it be suggested or suspected of monkeying with the Election Act, of stacking the cards in favour of the Government in office. No one would wish to be suspected of that. If we thought it is in the minds of any honourable member I think we ought to amend it, and not ask the Committee to give that authority to the Government. There was no thought in our minds—I did not even know it was in there and I am the politician of this crowd on this side of the House. I did not even know it was there, and certainly I have no desire in

the wide world to give the Government power to use the Election Act improperly by drafting regulations that would stack the cards in our favour. So that, if the Minister who is piloting the Bill is agreeable and all my colleagues on this side are agreeable that this is a Government measure then I would be agreeable to have the clause stricken out.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this clause in, not because it means the Government has any desire to use it, but as all members know, until an Act has been tried out we don't know whether or not there may be some very grave defect in it. Now this Act has been under consideration over a year and quite a lot of thought has gone into it. But when people get in a groove when talking about a thing they are very apt to overlook some very very important things, and it is quite possible, if we don't have that authority, it may make the holding of an election very awkward in some particulars. I personally urge that it be kept in although I have no anticipation of its every being used. But, as my honourable friend knows, if we had had a by-election in St. John's last fall we were up against a very serious situation which perhaps this Act would not allow us to amend, and there may be some similar provision which may be overlooked in this Act. I know the draftsmen, Mr. Greene and Mr. McCarthy with him, and I know these draftsmen suggested that. Having drafted that themselves they want to feel, if something has been overlooked there is some way of remedying it during an election without waiting for the House of Assembly to meet. I urge that the clause be kept in.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I regard very highly the remarks made



by the Honourable the Premier, and want to assure him that there is no thought in our minds that the section would ever be used contrary to the meaning of the Act. But I do think it is going a long way to allow any government to make regulations over and above this Act. For instance, when speaking of the intent of the Act, well the intent is in the Act, and if somebody violates, or is not carrying out the Act, the judge is there to interpret the intent of the Act, not the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, not the Minister, not the men of the Attorney General's Department, not the Attorney General. I don't think it is anybody's job in the Government nor out to interpret the Act, as far as making regulations, the Act is written there, there can be no regulations you can make, and unless an amendment is needed to the Act the Act is law. If we give authority to make regulations they can make regulations on anything. It is not a question of this government or that government, but all government. Is there any such provision in the Federal Act, I wonder? Could the Minister tell us that?

MR. MURRAY: No, there is not.

MR. HIGGINS: I may say that is a thing which occurred to me—Can the Minister give us any precedent in any other Act for a similar provision?

MR. MURRAY: No.

MR. CURTIS: No. That is an experiment, as this Act itself is really an experiment, it has not been tried. We think in my department that every point we can think of has been covered but we may dissolve the House tomorrow and may find there is some little clause which may change completely the holding of an election. It is purely a safeguard. I would almost be willing to cover with—"The Lieutenant-Gover-

nor in Council and the consent of the Leader of the Opposition in the House or anybody else." It is purely a case of not being stalled by some oversight on a point we all have overlooked. Frankly, I never expect to see it used, but I know the feeling of my department on the matter, that it is just an enabling clause to enable us—for instance we found out when we went to St. John's West that women under 25 were not allowed to vote and we could not alter that, but there are other little things we might have. It will work both ways. I just advise it be left in, but I will not push it.

MR. HOLLETT: When talking about the drafting of the Act, really the drafting consisted of cutting out sections hocus-pocus out of the old Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no hocus-pocus—holus-bolus, yes. Holus-bolus on this side, hocus-pocus on that side.

MR. HOLLETT: Really the only great change in this Act is the counting of the ballots in the booths. That is the only great change.

MR. CURTIS: Something about automobiles.

MR. HIGGINS: And not treating.

MR. HOLLETT: No treating was included under the old Act, but you did it though, the whole lot of you.

MR. CURTIS: I don't want to prejudice the position. I think we had better take the Honourable the Premier's advice and leave it out.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I move that section be stricken out, and the sections be renumbered to the end.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. HOLLETT: There was one other point I wished to raise, Mr. Chairman, that is in case of the death of any member, having been elected, or his resignation—Is there any provision, and if so where is it—I mean provision for a new election?

MR. MURRAY: I checked on that also, Mr. Chairman. There was an oversight, and a grave one, and it is proposed to correct that by putting in a sub-clause. If you go back to Clause 31 and put in a sub-clause (6) there.

On motion the Committee reverted to Clause 31.

MR. MURRAY: It was proposed to insert a sub-clause (6) there to cover by-elections. I could not find it actually in the original here nor in the House of Assembly Act. I did not have much time, and could not find it.

MR. HOLLETT: There was some reference to a difference of opinion as to whose duty it was to order the election, whether it was the Lieutenant-Governor in Council or the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. MURRAY: No, there is no question of that—It is the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. But in the old Act there was a provision which required having a by-election within six months. That is what I was trying to find this morning.

MR. BROWNE: There is a provision here, Chapter 5, where a member of the House of Assembly is seated in office and his seat becomes vacant, whenever a vacancy shall occur the Lieutenant-Governor shall within six months after such vacancy issue a writ—Then it goes on to say that where a member resigns and contests the district again—

MR. CURTIS: That clause is not practical in the case of Labrador. Supposing the member for Labrador dies at a certain season of the year, you can't have an election within six months then—I don't see how you can.

MR. HOLLETT: That can be taken care of.

MR. CURTIS: That is one of the cases where we should have some discretion. The Lieutenant-Governor there means, Lieutenant-Governor in Council according to the interpretation.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think there is any provision for death in that section—When a vacancy shall occur, that covers it.

MR. MURRAY: I take it then there is no necessity to include it in the Election Act, if it is already taken care of.

MR. HOLLETT: There is some doubt, I think. We ought to have some decision in regard to how long a government can withhold a by-election.

MR. MURRAY: Six months.

MR. CURTIS: The honourable member's predecessors went a year without filling a vacancy, and when Mike Vinicombe was appointed to the Board of Liquor Control they kept the seat vacant for two years or a little longer.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Honourable Minister think that is correct?

MR. CURTIS: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Well then there should be an amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was a matter of not doing what this Act said.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest the discussion be more relevant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us discuss the United Nations.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean to bring in and Act to amend that

Title of Bill carried.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report having passed the Bill with some amendments.

Carried.

On motion the Committee reported having passed the Bill with some amendments.

"An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act"—Report received. On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion the committee reported having considered the Bill, "An Act Respecting Social Assistance," made some progress and asks leave to sit again. Report received. On motion Committee ordered sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the Committee reported having passed the Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors, and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" with some amendments. On motion report received, said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor will arrive shortly after 3:00 o'clock to assent to certain Bills.

It now being 1:00 o'clock I shall leave the Chair until 3:00 o'clock this afternoon.

WEDNESDAY—June 9, 1954

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House do not adjourn at 6:00 o'clock today.

Motion carried.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of this Province has at its present Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The following list of Bills was read by the clerk:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Underdeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mother's Allowances Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953."

A Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insects, Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Ltd. and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty first Day of May, 1953."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

HIS HONOUR: In Her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a Bill for the Appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

The Clerk then read the following Bill:

A Bill "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

HIS HONOUR: In Her Majesty's Name, I thank her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence and assent to this Bill.

His Honour left the Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, if you would call the second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act." I think the second reading of this Bill has already been moved by my colleague the honourable member for Trinity North, the Minister for Municipal Affairs and Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable member continues. I have just located the Bill. The debate was adjourned by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. This will not prevent the honourable member from speaking.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, I might say, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking purely to explain the new Bill, and I understand in so doing I lost my chance to make any further speech on the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: May I interrupt. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the Bill on which I adjourned the debate is not at all the same Bill as this one. Therefore I would think that one is in the waste basket now. I should think if this is a new Bill coming in, I should speak.

MR. SPEAKER: I may point out the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will not lose his right.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a new Bill?

MR. CURTIS: The situation is a little unusual, Mr. Speaker. There were obviously some omissions in the Bill as it was originally presented to the House by my colleague, because it was not under our control. I may say this is not a government measure. This is a Bill that has been submitted to us by the St. John's Municipal Council. My purpose is to do what the Minister himself cannot do, since he has already spoken on the Bill. The Bill really, Mr. Speaker, is very much the same as the Bill originally introduced here. There are only two new features added to the Bill as it was when originally introduced by my honourable friend, at the request of the council. It provides for a poll tax not exceeding \$20 to be levied on all people who live in the City of St. John's and were gainfully employed, above the age of 21, and who were not paying property taxes. The Bill further enables the council to levy a tax on all people who reside within five miles of the City, and who were gainfully employed in the City.

Now when I discovered that an effort was being made by the council to tax people within five miles of the city, I took the matter up with His Honour the Mayor. I pointed out to him that that meant that everybody in Mount Pearl Park, Glendale, and other residents far removed from the council, who

were gainfully employed in St. John's might in addition to being liable for taxes where they lived be held liable for taxes in the City of St. John's. I pointed out to him that I felt such a tax would not be favourably regarded by the House. Consequently, with his permission, the present Act has been amended so that the right of the council to collect the poll tax is now restricted to people who live within an area of one mile of the City, which is a jurisdiction this House has given the Council in other matters.

The second point that we discussed, Mr. Speaker, was the principle of taxation without representation. I felt that this House would not like to adopt a principle of taxation of people within a mile of the City and at the same time not give them the franchise. So that the Bill before the House now gives the franchise to people who pay this poll tax, even though they do not reside within the limits of the City.

The third point, however, about which His Worship the Mayor asks the House to confirm is the fact that people paying this poll tax and not residing in the City being voters. They are not eligible under this new legislation to stand as councillors or to run for the office of mayor. In other words they have the franchise to vote but they have not the right to stand for membership in the council. That is a reasonable request, because I think the House will agree that any person who is to sit as mayor on a council or a councillor should have some stake in the City, and should be on the property list of the City.

These are the changes that have been made in the Bill, and with these changes I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of opposing this Bill, which is about a hundred years behind the times, and reminds me of the day when in England they taxed the pane of glass put in houses. This particular Act, for one thing, taxes you for the number of water taps you have in your house, the number of outlets you have for water in your house. But as to this proposal to put a poll tax on all the young people over twenty-one, but not only young people but all people twenty-one years and over, the poll tax there stated is, I believe, \$20. Now I admit under the original Act in the Revised Statutes, the Council has a right to impose a poll tax of \$12. But they have neglected to do that. I take it the reason they have not done it is that they discovered it was not at all a very popular taxation, and they probably did not need it. Then also I understand, or at least I believe, that they thought it would be very difficult to collect fairly, such a tax. It is all very well for the young people who are on the employers list of employees. There they can get it from the employer with the number of people who are earning wages and they can take the \$20 off them or attach their wages or what not. But there are a good many people here in St. John's of 21 years of age and over who are not property owners to any great extent for the purpose of this Act and who are working in other places outside of the City limits, outside the City of St. John's altogether. They too would be taxed to the amount of \$20. I would like to know how the City proposes to check that.

I oppose this tax on the grounds, Sir, that it is absolutely unnecessary, absolutely unnecessary. We have ample means under this Act to collect the necessary taxation. I was looking up

the Act and discovered that sometime in March of every year the council can get together and they can find out how much money they have collected so far or expected to collect from certain taxes. They also make an estimate or budget of what they are going to need in the coming year. The difference they can make up, according to the original Act, by imposing extra tax, City Tax, I believe, called Ground Landlords Taxes, Vacant Land Taxes, and now also what they call the City Taxes. These are methods by which they can have the amount of money necessary.

Now I also understand the amount of money deriving from these taxes is for the payment of all building incurred in connection with the erection of the stadium here in St. John's.

MR. HIGGINS: That is the poll tax.

MR. HOLLETT: One of the taxes, I don't know which of them it is—The poll tax, yes. This stadium, Sir,—and I am not talking against the stadium. I have had too much to say about the stadium, perhaps, in time past, when it was absolutely essential and the matter was raised by other people in the first instance. We have a stadium which has been erected in the East End, and while I agree the people of the West End of St. John's and for one mile outside the City limits will undoubtedly enjoy some of the benefits, it seems to me nearly every young person in St. John's who is employed, or a very large percentage of those who are employed, have contributed for over a year now, and possibly two years to the one per cent voluntary tax, or contribution if you like, and that was done through the employers in St. John's. A young man of 21 working with Mr. Smith on Water Street was contribut-



ing every month, or every week as the case may be, one per cent of his wages towards the erection of the stadium. On top of that now they are going to put a poll tax of \$20 on that individual. In other words where this young man or young woman has been satisfied all along to contribute voluntarily one percent of his or her wages for the building of the stadium, you now propose to arbitrarily collect from him or her, if necessary, attach his or her wages in the hands of his employer, in the sum of \$20 per year for the erection of this stadium. Now I maintain, Sir, if we in St. John's want a stadium there are other ways to get it. I agree the young people will probably benefit to a great extent by the stadium, and I hope some of the old people, on the other side of the House will enjoy the stadium too. But I maintain they are contributing towards the erection of the stadium.

There is one other point I wish to mention here, Sir. When I, myself, am contributing one percent of what I earn, outside what I get from this House, to a stadium fund, as I have been ever since the thing started, and I take it nearly everybody in St. John's has, we were told at that time the stadium was to cost \$400,000. It has gone up, I believe, to a million dollars, is that right?

MR. HIGGINS: I don't know—You are talking.

MR. HOLLETT: It will probably go to two million if my honourable friend on my left has anything to do with it. It is not a party measure. If the municipality has not more control over the funds of the City, than the Government over the control of the consolidated revenue then I will say the stadium probably is going to cost two million, and next year they will bring

in a Bill to charge our young people not over but under 21 as well not only \$20 but \$40. There does not seem to be any way that we can instil into the minds of the Government, and shall I say also the minds of the Municipal Council, a little caution with regard to spending or expending of government and municipal funds. The sky is the limit, Sir, and it has been the limit for quite a while. It is all very fine. We know the present Mayor and his councillors have done a very fine job with regard to balancing their budget. There is no doubt about it they have done a good job. But why should they not when they have a means under this very Act we are now discussing, a means to collect under the City Taxes, under the Ground Landlords Taxes and Vacant Land Taxes and other taxes, any difference to be made up between their expenditure and their income? It is there in the Act, I read it only today, since my lunch. Now they don't want to take advantage of that. They are afraid they might hurt a few of the St. John's merchants, I suppose, or a few of the people who have a lot of property, like my honourable friend on the opposite side. I won't mention names, but some on the opposite side have a lot of property.

MR. HIGGINS: And outside the City limits.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, and that brings something else to my mind. They are going to tax people too outside the City limits. Now you can do that under the original Act and I am not going to show my ignorance by saying it is wrong. But one thing I say is wrong; if you are going to tax, if you are going to tax John Jones outside the City limits, one mile or five miles, I don't see any reason, why he is not eligible to stand for mayor. Why

not? He is 21 years of age, a British subject, a Canadian citizen and a Newfoundlander and he is taxed every day of his life three per cent sales tax and is taxed on his liquor and everything, and now there is a poll tax, and if he happens to have a house or a shack that has a tap for water he will be taxed on that. Why has not that young fellow the same right to stand for mayor as has my learned friend on my left here, who lives within the City limits?

These are the objections I have, Sir, and I oppose very strongly this Bill. If we are to erect a stadium people will still contribute their one per cent until the building is paid for, and it will probably go along over a number of years. But there is no reason why the present generation of St. John's of 21 years of age and over have to pay the stadium's entire bill. Other young people of 21 will come along and they too will contribute the one per cent. There is no reason why we should get the \$700,000 to finance the stadium by putting the tax on the present generation of \$20 a year. I oppose this certainly. In view of the fact it is not a party measure I do hope some of my friends on the Government side will see fit to join with me on certain objectionable points in this Act. I won't go into any other points except these now.

**MR. FOGWILL:** Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two observations with regard to this amending Bill. I agree however that we cannot have public services without taxation. There is no doubt about that. But the property owner, I believe, is taxed very highly now, and taxed sufficiently, and the City Council does not provide in many ways what assistance they could provide with the taxation they collect.

With regard to the poll tax, Mr. Speaker, I paid a poll tax quite a long time ago. I think it was in effect one or two years and I paid it, and did have voting rights. If the Council really needs any money which they intend to collect under the poll tax those who pay that tax naturally should have voting rights, and the same rights as any other taxpayer. I agree with that principle. They should not be taxed unless they have a right to vote or be represented by themselves or by some other.

There is one other point in regard to the amount of poll tax. It says a tax not exceeding \$20. In other words the Council will probably impose a tax on a sliding scale in respect of the amount of earnings of such persons who come under the tax. I suggest to the House that that is wrong. If there is any poll tax imposed it should be a flat rate for everyone. If it were based on earnings it would be an income tax, and I don't think that is allowed.

There is very little more I have to say, Mr. Speaker, except that I believe the wage bill of the City Council, of those employed runs up to a high figure of somewhere around nine hundred thousand dollars a year. Most of the taxation the City of St. John's collects goes in wages. I don't know if it is the intention of the Council to impose a tap tax or water tax on the house. If so I do certainly register my disapproval of that tax. I am opposed to it. That is all I have to say on it.

**MR. HIGGINS:** Mr. Speaker, this is not apparently a non-party issue. With all due respect to the two gentlemen on my right I cannot see any substance in their arguments at all. A lot can be said about the stadium. Criticism has been made on the way the City affairs have been

conducted. I can say from personal knowledge that never has the City of St. John's been administered on a more businesslike basis than it had been since the present mayor was responsible for the administration of its affairs. It must be borne in mind when talking about new taxes that with Confederation lots of sources of taxation and revenue were denied to the City. The Municipality lost the right to impose the coal tax which had figured substantially in its budget.

MR. MURRAY: And what others?

MR. HIGGINS: The bank tax, and I could go on, but I don't propose to do so. It is true that the City is indebted to the present Government, and that debt has always been acknowledged, also for assistance rendered in allowing it to collect or impose certain other taxes, a tax on fuel oil and now this poll tax. It is not a new tax, as my honourable colleague from St. John's West has already stated. The poll tax was imposed before. Indeed the only reason for dropping it was the difficulty in collecting it, which made it impractical. But with the new and more efficient methods of collecting, by way of deductions by employers at the source, the difficulty of collecting the poll tax has disappeared.

Now I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that within recent days we filed here the 1953 annual accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council. At the risk of wearying the House I would refer to the breakdown contained therein. The gross revenue for the City for the year 1954 was \$2,000,011, 80% of which was made up of taxes, 8% sales of water (that is not sales of water to the City, but to ships coming in etc.) Grants and subsidies from the Provincial Government 2.75%, a total of \$55,000; rents and franchises 2.61%, licenses and

permits 2.6% and new services 1.45%; income from the Province with respect to the St. John's Housing 1.30% and miscellaneous revenue 0.85% and service charges 0.37%. The expenditure on public works was 44.94% of the total revenue and sanitation and waste removal 12.32%; recreation and community services 5.16%—so that it may be seen that over 60% of the total revenue of the City is devoted to actual business of keeping the streets passable, keeping the parks green, keeping the lights burning in the streets, getting the ashes hauled away, so that they won't clutter up the places, etc. I don't think it can be successfully argued, Mr. Speaker, that the City today is not getting good value for its dollars. Indeed it pains me to think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should adopt as narrow-minded a view of what is perhaps the most conservative administration of the City's affairs for a number of years.

To get back to the stadium: The stadium was a project that was not initiated by the present City Council. It was actually, I believe, the brainchild of an organization, of which certain members of the House, I believe, are members, known as the "Lions Club." It was too big for them and the project fell into a state of apathy. Then another organization was formed, which took over the project. They did approach the City Council at one time, when something like one hundred thousand dollars was needed to complete the project. The Council in its wisdom decided the City should not be denied the benefit of a stadium, and agreed to take over the matter of financing it. It was only subsequent to the City's commitments for financing the thing that it was found the original estimates of the original promoters were very much in error. So when the

Honourable Leader of the Opposition refers to the callous disregard of the City Fathers in the spending of the City's money he is again basing his argument on a false premises.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order. I don't remember saying anything about any callous disregard of money. I shall have to ask the honourable member on my left to retract that.

MR. HIGGINS: I withdraw the words certainly. But the meaning to be had from the words was that the rights of the citizens certainly had been treated with not quite the amount of deference he apparently felt should be paid to them.

MR. HOLLETT: Quite right.

MR. HIGGINS: And that there was a lack of concern about the expenditure of the tax dollars. That, I say, Mr. Speaker, is fallacious reasoning, and nothing would be further from the truth. If the honourable gentleman only knew the number of meetings the mayor and Council and permanent officials of the Council had over the business of the stadium there would be no question today as to the Council's action in the matter.

However, to get back to the poll tax: The poll tax has always been leviable by the Council. The purpose in this particular Bill is to see that the Council, which is raising and has been given permission to raise a loan of some seven hundred thousand dollars, conditionally upon applying the proceeds of the poll tax, for as long a period as is deemed necessary, directly to seeing that the debt is paid.

The other point, with respect to water taps, is not of any great importance. The power has already been there, as was mentioned in respect to

another matter this morning. There are various ways in which a water tax can be collected, I think it is a matter in which the House can have sufficient confidence in the people administering the affairs of St. John's to see they will apply the least painful methods of extracting the tax dollars. But it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, the City's tax field has been considerably restricted, and it has now to exploit to the fullest every legitimate tax field left open to it. It is, I think, quite apparent, as the Honourable the Attorney General says, that the mere fact that a man has a poll tax to pay does not give him a sufficient stake in the City of St. John's to entitle him to aspire to the office, say, of Mayor. It is simply a matter of common sense. Indeed it is only with the new House of Assembly Election Act that this House has seen fit to remove the restrictions on the qualifications of candidates. The City of St. John's sees no reason at this time to ask that any similar change be made. I think we were entitled—the City is entitled—to say who these people are who administer their affairs. They are not going to wrongfully bar any legitimate candidate. But simply because a man pays five dollars in any one year where he happens to be working that makes him a taxpayer or he might pay \$20 in any one year, but that is not regarded as being a regular tax, because it is only levied during the time the person is working, whereas the person who has a stake in the community, who has his property, has to pay his taxes and is what is generally recognized as a taxpayer—For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I probably won't have any opportunity of discussing this Bill in Committee, and I must say a word now.

We have a rather unusual and somewhat amusing situation here when honourable members on the other side of the House disagree with their own colleagues. I must say, however, there are things in this Bill which are not palatable to me. On the other hand after hearing the long and lucid explanation just given by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East, I must say that I have to take the things that he said as being the point of view of an expert.

This Bill is not a Government measure. It did not come in from any Government department, but it was passed along to us by the City Council. It is an enabling Act and I take it that the mayor and the city councillors have given that matter a great deal of thought and attention. I take it also that if it were not necessary they would not have asked us to give them the right to impose these taxes.

The honourable member who has just spoken has told us that the City Council has held a great many meetings and the principal topic of conversation was this Bill. Before we turn this Bill down or consider voting against it we will have to remember these things. The City Council is in a position, certainly more than I or any other member in this House, to know their position, and to know what they want. The honourable and learned member for St. John's East who has just spoken has given an opinion which we are all inclined to treat with a great deal of respect.

MR. JANES: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where I stand, Sir, on this thing. I am not sufficiently conversant with the administration of the City here to pass an opinion. Actually, however, there are a couple of observations I would make. We all agree in this

House as every citizen in St. John's agrees, that we need a stadium in the City. We all know that the stadium has to be paid for. We know too that the people should pay for it, or the citizens of St. John's, at least, principally the City of St. John's. If there is so, there is only one way to pay for it, provided there are no further economies that can be made in the administration of the City; and that is by imposing further taxes. I think the impression has been given somehow or other that the people who pay the poll tax will be the people paying for the stadium. I think that is wrong, because although this poll tax might be imposed and will be imposed upon a citizen living here in the City, he has enjoyed all the facilities of the City and he is not himself paying any taxes directly to the City. These are the people who pay the poll tax. The fact that the amount which is collected in the poll tax will be set aside to amortize the cost of the stadium does not mean these people who are paying that poll tax are paying for the cost of the stadium. The whole of the citizens of St. John's are paying for the cost of the stadium, and the poll tax is another tax to bring in revenue to the City. The price of amortizing the cost of the stadium is an expense upon the City. I don't know if I have made that clear or not. What I am saying is clear, but I am saying it because I favour a stadium and know the stadium has to be paid for, and the poll tax is not an increase in taxes upon people who already pay but a tax upon people who are enjoying the facilities of the City while not paying taxes.

As far as the water tax is concerned: I am not sure where the best method of collection is, a tax upon taps or whether we should have meters. It is probably not material and probably

not important. I don't know enough about it—But I will say, Sir, this is a Bill which imposes taxes upon the citizens of St. John's. One of the conditions of taxation is that taxes should be collected equably and easily. The people must have the ability to pay taxes. And, Sir, I have the feeling that we are reaching here in this Province of Newfoundland and probably in the whole Dominion of Canada, that the people's ability to pay more taxes than they are now paying, is probably reaching the saturation point, and whether the taxation imposed upon the municipal level and provincial level or federal level is probably immaterial.

Anyway I am going to support this measure. I have to say now, like I said before, I have come to feel that our ability to pay very much more taxes than we are already is becoming limited.

**MR. HEFFERTON:** Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to make one or two comments. Perhaps I had better say I am speaking as a citizen of St. John's in talking on this particular measure. May I point out first of all there are two kinds of taxation imposed here, entirely different and both of them have been made provision for under the original St. John's Act. For instance in 226 of the City of St. John's there is enabling power by which water taxes may be levied. And mind you these water taxes may be levied in two, three or four different ways. It does not say here even in the amendment we have before us that the tax is being levied on the number of taps or faucets a person has in his house. The way in which the tax is to be levied is still open. May I point out too, Sir, that although at the present time in St. John's people are paying no water

taxes, people in the town councils where water and sewerage have been installed, inevitably pay anywhere from two-fifty to five dollars a month in order to pay for the amortization of water and sewerage.

Now when we come to the poll tax, again there is nothing new, as the honourable and learned member for St. John's East has pointed out. There is a provision in the old Act, section 146 under which the poll tax was levied here many, many years ago, and discontinued because it was felt by the Council at the time—I presume if they want to take care of certain things, then they have to levy more taxes. The water tax is particularly levied and aims at paying off a debt of one million dollars which the Council has just incurred for the extension of water in the western part of the City. The poll tax is an endeavour to liquidate the moneys being raised for the construction of the stadium. May I say now that the original group who started work on the creation and erection of the stadium is one of the organized groups who adopted and put into power the pay-as-you-go principle, if you wish, in collecting the 10% and so on. As one of the members of the groups who bought some of the first shares in the stadium company of that time I am particularly interested in trying to see that this building nears its completion and fulfils the part it was destined to fulfil in the sporting life of this community. I know something of the difficulty of continuing to negotiate and pay for the stadium, particularly at the prices today under the system we have adopted and carried out up to now. For these reasons, Sir, I feel the arguments which have been advanced against this particular measure do not carry any particular weight nor



substance. When we look at the general good of the object attained in both the extension of the water services for the City and in the erection of a stadium which is going to contribute, I hope, to the health and welfare and recreational facilities of this City, then I have every desire to support this particular Bill.

I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: This concludes the debate on second reading, but before I put the question, in view of the fact this type of business is unfamiliar to the House I ought to say a word on procedure. When the House votes on the question it will be either a majority of ayes or nays. If the nays have it, all you have done is deny second reading tomorrow or the next day. If this Bill gets its second reading then the motion is that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow, which motion may be amended to that it be referred to a Select Committee, or the motion may be allowed to stand, and when the order is called on some future date for the Bill to go into Committee of the Whole House, it might be amended then, letting it go to a Select Committee. Or the motion might be allowed to stand. I merely point that out to show that, I cannot make any comment on a Bill without taking part in debate, but merely to show the matter is not closed and there will be ample opportunity for further debate on another motion.

Motion put—carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Divide.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House wish a division?

MR. HOLLETT: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker.

On motion ordered this Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently:

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

Slauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. Section 20 of the said Act is amended

- (a) by deleting the period at the end of paragraph (c) and substituting therefore a semicolon followed by the word "and"; and
- (b) by adding to the section immediately after paragraph (c) as paragraph (d) the following;
- (d) is the owner, lessor, lesser, tenant or occupier of property listed in the appraisalment books of the City."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is something missing at the end of that clause. I wonder if the Minister would check on that. It seems to have some reference to those liable for poll taxes.

MR. HEFFERTON: No, qualifications of candidates for mayor or councillors.

MR. HOLLETT: I have been told, I believe, that simply because they pay the poll tax does not make them eligible for mayor. I certainly must oppose that. You see a man over 21 is not only paying a poll tax but he is paying every time he puts on a pair of shoes or a shirt or walks out and buys a drink or anything else. He is paying taxes to the country in general, to Canada, to the Province of Newfound-

land and to the City in which he lives. If he goes into a restaurant he has to pay a tax on the food, if he is admitted to a picture show he pays a tax; under this amending Act he is as much a taxpayer as a man who has children, in all probability in a good many cases pays more taxes, and why should we deny him the right? I call it a right for anybody over 21 years of age, the right to become mayor of this town. I think it is highly unfair. If you are going to tax a person, especially by a tax like this, then you should give that person who ever he be the right to put his name to be mayor. It certainly should not be necessary for him to have a palatial residence or a big piece of land in St. John's or what not. I think if he is paying taxes at all he has as much right as the other fellow has who has a house. I think it is highly objectionable that you should disqualify any man who is paying taxes from enjoying the privileges of democracy, and in this present age we like to think it is a free world and that John Jones is as good a chap as Bill Smith. But here you are making an exception. You are going to make him pay a poll tax, this year it is \$20, last year it was \$12, next year it will be \$30 and so on. I think it is time for this House to wake up to the fact we have been hi-jacking. As a matter of fact we have at present here a deputy mayor and in my opinion a deputy mayor has no right to vote in this particular circumstance. He is a man who is a Progressive Conservative member of this House, a very fine fellow, well liked and everything else, but he is here now speaking for a tax in which he is definitely interested as deputy mayor and a member of the Council, and he is going to vote to deprive John Jones and Bill Smith in our West End, for instance, from becoming a mayor. I think we have as

good men in the West End to become mayor in the East End, and a lot of these young fellows, good fellows, fine fellows, and they come back from a war perhaps tomorrow and go into the municipal office and pay down \$20 taxes, after they have been overseas and fought, and when they come in and put up their \$20 and say, now we want our name put down for mayor; and then they are told, we are sorry but we cannot do it. "I think" the whole thing is screwy. I advise the members of the Government to give it some consideration before insisting that a man cannot become mayor simply because he has not got any property inside the City limits. And he can't become a member of the Council?

MR. HIGGINS: No.

MR. HOLLETT: He can't even become a member of the Council—It is getting worse. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be very careful, we are destroying democracy and we are doing something which we ought to be very thoroughly ashamed of, depriving a young man anywhere from 21 years up to God knows what age from becoming a mayor of the City, simply because he is not a private property owner inside the City limits. I feel we ought to think of that carefully, and we ought to oppose that.

MR. HEFFERTON: Only a couple of days ago we wiped out similar qualifications for the House of Assembly. We can't expect the City of St. John's to be as progressive as the Government.

MR. HOLLETT: No, I do not.

MR. HIGGINS: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition slashes away at this Act, but he quite forgets that there are very good and sufficient reasons for that qualification being put in the Act. It is a matter of, I think,

and fairly reasonable persons will agree, that the proper people to protect the interest of the taxpayers are people who themselves have a stake in the community. Now the time may come when the City of St. John's will be ready for the same degree as is going to obtain for the House of Assembly, but that day has not yet dawned, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the House should be a party to rushing along the emancipation of the City of St. John's when they themselves have shown no great desire for it—I cannot subscribe to the principle that simply because a man pays a tax which can be imposed one year and remitted the next and is not a permanent one but a temporary tax only the council has the right to impose under certain conditions—It is not a tax voted every year. Next year a majority of the councillors may not want the poll tax and then it is thrown out. Then we have the situation where persons who had to pay the poll tax last year are sitting and presiding over the affairs of the Council without having paid any taxes. The situation is ridiculous.

MR. HOLLETT. It is not ridiculous. That very same man can become Premier of this Country, and sit where the Attorney General is sitting now. He has the right to his vote and the right to become Premier of this Country and yet here we deny him the right to become Mayor in the little City of St. John's. I think that is ridiculous, it is not an argument at all, and I am surprised—My learned friend on my left should be up in arms and not arguing that this very man from whom \$20 is taken for poll tax is not allowed to become Mayor of this town or any other town, but he is allowed to become Premier of this Country and become the Leader of the Government, and might even aspire to

be the Leader of the Opposition, but certainly he can become Premier. Yet he cannot become mayor of St. John's. Should we make the office of Mayor so "sacrosanct" that a man has to have property qualifications of thousands of dollars? Surely that is the very thing on which democracy is based. We have the right to vote if we are taxed, and if we are taxed we have the right to aspire to any office which voting creates.

MR. CURTIS: I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, before the vote does carry, although it was due to my negotiations with His Worship the Mayor that we proposed giving the vote to those who pay poll tax, I might say, in fairness to him and I think to the members of the Council that they thought that they were qualified. In other words there was no intention when they drew up the original amending Act to penalize them. It was their intention that these people should vote, although that Act did not so provide, and they understood that it did.

Clause carried.

Clause 4 read and carried.

Clause 6:

6. Section 162 of the said Act is amended by adding to paragraph (g) thereof the following:

"And to apply any such rules, regulations or by-laws within one mile outside the limits of the City as well as within the limits of the City and any existing rules or regulations of the Council so applied shall be deemed to have been validly made and applied."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, in connection with that section. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition refers to some people who

have developed land, and he suggested that they were the ones who should pay the taxes not the poll tax people as suggested now. I would like to just say I think he was referring to me. There was a wicked look in his eye when he referred to people on this side of the House who had land. I would like to tell him my land, developed by me, is outside the City limits. We developed it. It has cost a lot to build roads through it, to put water through it, and cost a lot to develop it. When the development was completed His Worship the Mayor and the Councillors asked this House to extend the limits of the City to take in that area, and, incidentally, they took those people in who built that property. So I might say they have gotten back anything they put into that a hundredfold, in fact, they put in nothing, so that what they got they got free, and they got an awful lot, and they are getting an awful lot of taxes for very little. It cost them nothing for the water or for the streets. When everything was done the tax collector walked in. I just want to tell that because, I think, he referred to me.

MR. HIGGINS: That was a very good deal.

Carried.

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8:

8. There is inserted in the said Act as Section 199A thereof the following:

"199A. The Council is empowered to make available any land of the City for the purpose of the erection thereon of a stadium or rink building in the City upon such terms as the Council may deem fit and, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, it is empowered .

- (a) to erect, or complete the erection of or join with or assist any company or association in the erection of a stadium or rink building, and to develop and improve land surrounding the said stadium or rink building;
- (b) to finance or assist any company or association in the financing of the erection of a stadium or rink building;
- (c) to borrow moneys by the issue of bonds or through bank or other loans and to apply such moneys for the purpose of the erection of a stadium or rink building or to advance, loan, or contribute such moneys to any company or association undertaking the erection of such a building or to guarantee any bond issue or loan of any such company or association, and to make such advance or loan upon such terms as to repayment, interest, and security as the Council may deem fit;
- (d) to apply, for such period as the Council may deem necessary, the full proceeds of all poll taxes imposed under this Act towards the repayment of any such moneys borrowed by the Council and interest thereon and specifically to charge, for such period as the Council may determine, the proceeds of all such poll taxes with repayment of such borrowed moneys and interest thereon or as security for any guarantee by the Council of any bond issue or loans of any such company or association;
- (e) to acquire from any such company or association on such terms and conditions as the Council may deem fit any lands, buildings or assets or any interest therein for

the purposes of a stadium or rink building."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, is there any reason for that 199 in there. I think everything in 199 is in 199 (a).

MR. HEFFERTON: They have power to borrow for a public library.

MR. HOLLETT: That would be the only thing not in this—all the other stuff is there.

MR. CURTIS: If the honourable gentleman keeps on like that we are going to have to make room for another man over here.

Clause 8 carried.

Clauses 9 through 11 carried.

Clause 12 read:

12. Section 257 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following:

"Every electric coin-operated music box or juke box \$25.00."

MR. HOLLETT: Is that payable to the stadium fund too?

MR. HEFFERTON: That, Sir, I could not answer.

MR. HIGGINS: Just the ordinary revenue of the Municipal Council. It is not specifically earmarked here as that.

Carried.

Clause 13 read:

13.—(1) Subsection (1) of Section 264 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(1) The Council is empowered by resolution of the Council to levy and impose on and collect from every person (other than those expressly exempted from payment

under this section) of the age of twenty-one years and upwards who, at any time during the twelve-month period preceding the 31st day of December in any year, resides in the City or within one mile of the limits of the City, and who is gainfully employed in the City or within one mile thereof, an annual Poll Tax not exceeding twenty dollars per annum payable on the first day of June in the year 1954 and in each year thereof in respect of the annual period January 1st to December 31st in each year."

(2) Paragraph (a) of subsection (2) of the said Section 264 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(a) any person who is the owner, lessor, lessee or occupier of property listed in the appraisalment books of the City;"

(3) Subsection (3) of the said Section 264 is amended

(a) by substituting the words and figures, "30th day of April in the year 1954" for the words and figures "30th day of June in the year 1952"; and

(b) by substituting the words and figures "December 31st in the year 1953" for the words and figures "May 31st in the year 1952."

MR. CURTIS: I don't like that clause, Mr. Chairman. I think perhaps this section should stand. You got a tax here payable on the first day of June, 1954. Now we are all in arrears. I think perhaps this might be a good time, Mr. Chairman, for the Committee to take a recess for ten minutes, and figure out just what to do with that section.

Clause 13 stand.

Committee recessed for ten minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order: Section 13 had been allowed to stand. Would the Committee wish to consider that now?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable and learned member for St. John's East was to get in touch with the Council and I think we ought to change this: In the first place I don't like this section "who is gainfully employed in the City or within one mile thereof" I don't mind taxing a man who lives within a mile of the City when he works within the City. But why should we tax a man within one mile of the City when he does not work in the City. That is a bit too tall, and I think we ought to strike out these words—"or within one mile thereof" and limit it to people who live within a mile and work in the City.

The poll tax is payable on the 1st day of June. We don't want to put anybody into arrears. I think we should make the first of June read as the first of July.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. HIGGINS: The next amendment is to (a), 3rd line; 1952 there becomes 1954. Then the word June to be deleted and the word July for the word June.

Clause as amended carried.

Clauses 14 through 17 read and carried.

Preamble carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. Report received; said amendments read a first time,

read a second time and concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time tomorrow.

Honourable the Minister of Finance moves the House into a Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, in rising to discuss the financial statement as laid before the House by the Minister of Finance I could not help but notice that the Minister received a very favourable press. The newspapers seem to be pleased with his budget. I regret that I am unable to agree with the principles that have been expressed. I see nothing original in it. It follows the pattern of the budget delivered here last year, and it has been delivered over a month later than last year when it was delivered at the end of April. It makes one wonder why it was delayed so long. When I look at the answer which was given to a question asked by my Leader in the early days of this session as to what the current revenue was as at the end of February, I find that the answer was \$30,328,000; a little over \$30,000,000. When the estimates are brought down and the budget we are told the actual revenue for the year was \$36,095,300. In other words, for the busy month of March the revenue amounted to nearly six million dollars, although the average for the previous eleven months had been a little over two and a half million dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can understand what the Minister is going to say; that certain payments fell due and came in very nicely at that particular time. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that they did not come due at that time, but were made to fall in with that pattern so that he could show this substantial surplus at the end of the financial year.



HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): They were in arrears.—Paid in arrears.

MR. BROWNE: Exactly—That is just what I said—They did not come in in time.

Now the minister refers to the financial prosperity under which the country has been living during the past few years. Well I submit that this is a fact; that the country has experienced phenomenal prosperity for more than the last four years. The Minister himself has recorded the increasing revenues of the Government and the increasing earnings of our people since the Americans first came here in 1941, in fact giving us a list of surpluses. We showed a surplus, I think, every year except 1949-50 when this Government first took office. Then he went on to say that the people will pocket \$230,000,000 during, I am not sure whether he meant the fiscal year or whether he meant the current calendar year.

MR. POWER: The fiscal year.

MR. BROWNE: Well then this honourable gentleman is a prophet unlike any other prophet that we know of, because when we hear that the Canadian Government has had to bring down its price of wheat and that plants like Ford has had to close its new plant at Oakville and pay off twenty-five hundred men for a period of something like two weeks and when it resumed operations will leave eight hundred and fifty men unemployed; then we have very little justification in assuming that in this country prosperity is going to carry on at the accelerated rate that has existed for some time now. In fact I question the accuracy of the figures and I challenge him to produce the source from which he derived these figures. I have been

unable to check on them. But for what I can, I question the one regarding the paper, pulp and wood; and I suggest to him his defense figures of twenty million dollars is about five millions above what it should be; I question his figures for mining; and in regard to the amount which he has down for family allowances it is at least a variation of about six hundred thousand dollars from the figures quoted by the Minister of Finance at Ottawa for this current fiscal year. He estimated expenditure as twelve millions. Now I can understand he puts it down in round figures, and what is six hundred thousand dollars. He might as well put down twelve million as eleven point four million. Then he has the most fantastic statement to make in regard to unemployment insurance, which he estimates at five million dollars. And he says that during the past year he underestimated when he thought the amount expended by the Unemployment Insurance Commission would be a million when actually they had the figure of four million three hundred thousand. Then we have this fantastic statement: "Paradoxical as it may seem, these are encouraging figures. They do not indicate great unemployment, but rather a high degree of employment. Very large numbers of men obtained enough seasonal employment in the summer months to qualify themselves for unemployment insurance in the winter and early spring. If the figure had been much lower it would have meant large numbers of men remaining idle throughout most of the busy season of the year. My forecast shows that I expect an even greater number of men obtaining employment of an insurable character this year, with the certainty of drawing unemployment payments resulting from this seasonal employ-

ment." Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that is the most fantastic statement ever made in this House. More people are to be employed, therefore more people will draw the unemployment insurance benefits.

MR. POWER: A reasonable explanation.

MR. BROWNE: My honourable friend the Minister of Finance seems very unsettled when he refers to that. But it seems to me a Minister of Finance looking to prosperity derived from the payment of unemployment insurance is not placing his estimates on a sound basis.

The Honourable Minister then went on to deal with the policy of development which he stated the Government had carried on since it came into office in 1949. It had not been merely an economic development, he said, although it included industrial development, and not merely an agricultural development although it included agriculture. Well I will agree that it included the industrialization programme, but I would like to see where the agricultural programme is to be found. It is certainly not anything the Government has done during the past five years. If, to mention in the Speech from the Throne in 1953, that a Commission is to be appointed to investigate the problem of agriculture, and to appoint it a year afterwards, and wait another year before it is going to report, if that is an agricultural programme then it is certainly one which is unique to this Government, and nobody else would be bragging about it.

The Government's industrial programme started out with socialist enterprises and the Government got afraid, and it was a good thing for the country it did get afraid, it was

getting too far involved in socialistic enterprises. The cement plant, the gypsum plant and the birch plant were unsound from the start, and the events of recent weeks have tended to show that the Government has lost considerable money by the investment and suffered considerable losses by going into this sort of thing.

The Honourable Minister then referred to the economic survey, the greatest economic survey any government ever made.

MR. POWER: So it was.

MR. BROWNE: The IBEC Survey! May I remind the Honourable Minister that the IBEC Survey cost the country somewhere, I believe, in the vicinity of a quarter of a million dollars. What did that benefit the country? If it is to the advantage of the country to be told it can't do something, it is that much benefit. A waterpower survey which cost, I believe, six hundred thousand dollars; if it is to the benefit of the country to know we have water-power on the southwest coast then that is valuable. But I think everybody knew it before, and I don't see that there is anything new about it.

MR. POWER: Did they know how much horsepower was there?

MR. BROWNE: I don't think it should take six hundred thousand dollars to find out.

MR. POWER: That was not only on the southwest coast.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary for this Government to do that. The Federal Government promised to do that very thing, and if asked they would have done it and supplied the information.

MR. POWER: You did not get them to do it, and you were up there.

MR. BROWNE: The honourable gentleman gives me credit for too much influence with the Federal Government. I was only one of forty Conservative members in opposition, with a majority on the other side of something like 120 members, and my voice was very weak indeed in the halls of the House of Commons, shouting for Newfoundland, as I did on many occasions. But I am sorry to say I was not listened to with the attention which I think my remarks deserved. But here was a Term of Union, signed by the Premier and by the Prime Minister; saying that they would undertake an economic survey. Why was not that done? Why did not this Government see to it that the Federal Government fulfilled all the promises that it had made in the Terms of Union? That was not the only one—Why did not the Government see right along since 1949 that this Government got the benefit of all the things they could have gotten, the benefits to be derived out of joining up with Canada?

MR. MURRAY: Where are these benefits? We did not think there were any benefits.

MR. BROWNE: Now I am not going to go into the details of that question, which my honourable and learned friend and the Premier himself would like me to do. We have taken Confederation as a fact since 1949, and are now working for the benefit of Newfoundland—and the Federal Government has facilities and advantages which we can get if we want them. And I say the Provincial Government failed in respect to economic surveys and in regard to other things, especially in the department

presided over by my honourable friend, the Minister of Labour. They are getting benefits now, but I say they could have gotten them right from the beginning of the thing.

My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, goes on to deal with NALCO, which was formed to promote prosperity and conduct a mineral survey. Other provinces have found it more advisable to leave mineral surveys to the private prospector. It is only today, I think, I read, or yesterday, that in the area north of Lake Ontario, prospectors were flocking by the thousands into an area which they believed there was iron ore to be found. The same thing happened again in New Brunswick with the discovery of ore which was made in the neighbourhood of Bathurst. Thousands of prospectors flocked there. The same thing has happened in other parts of Canada when a discovery of uranium was made. This NALCO was formed, and the chief thing, I think, which it did was to interest the Javelin Foundries, who have taken the best slices of what they recognized to be the assets controlled by the Government. It is still running as NALCO. The manager, of course, is under arrest. His salary of \$30,000—I don't know whether anyone receives it at the present time—

MR. POWER: He has not been general manager for some months.

MR. BROWNE: He was general manager, I take it, until he was asked to resign because he set up an office.—Was it not a terrible thing for the general manager of NALCO to set up an office in the City of Montreal? What was he doing in the City of Montreal with an office? Did he have an office in a private home to conduct this great NALCO, Newfoundland

Labrador Corporation, from a private home? It seems extraordinary to me that he should have been dismissed for having an office.

Then my honourable friend referred to the establishment of BRINCO, which he said was the brainchild of the Premier, and had been conceived by Rothschild.

MR. POWER: No, I did not say it.

MR. BROWNE: Well there was some mix-up between Rothschild and the Premier. I think it was sired by the Rothschild out of the Premier or something like that. Anyhow the public was very interested to learn that BRINCO, this corporation, was going to make a survey of the Hamilton River. Now I think the whole world, and certainly all interested concerns know that there is a tremendous water power development awaiting somebody on the Hamilton River. The question is to what is it going to be harnessed? There are undoubtedly millions of horsepower, and it seems to me that some industry like a smelting plant or like an aluminum industry such as in Quebec or British Columbia that required a large amount of power would have to be established there. I suggest to the Government and perhaps to BRINCO too that they might consider this aluminum corporation of Canada in putting on the Hamilton River an industry such as they have at British Columbia.

MR. POWER: I know the BRINCO people will be delighted to have the honourable gentleman's advice.

MR. BROWNE: There is a suggestion for what it is worth.

Then my honourable friend went on to talk about the fishery development. I know of no government that

speaks so lightly of millions. My honourable friend speaks of that as likely to cost a hundred million. Of course the words were put in his mouth by the Premier, because these were the figures the Premier used. But I wonder if the Minister really seriously sat down and calculated where these hundred millions were going to be spent, in a section of the island which we were told yesterday is so hemmed in with ice it is not safe to predict you could get any more than two months of the year that you can call free of ice.

MR. SPENCER: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: I know it is not so, but that is what we were told yesterday.

MR. SPENCER: Nor that it will cost a hundred million for that area.

MR. BROWNE: I must thank the Honourable Minister of Public Works for drawing to my attention the one hundred millions. Now in fact I had intended to mention that out of the original three millions voted in the budget now one and a half millions are to go to the firm of Fishery Products Limited, to spend it where they like. They will, of course, spend some of it in that area, but will also have some earmarked for Trepassey and some for Bay de Verde and some for Catalina, etc. We see the beginning of this great fisheries programme, and we are wondering where it is going to end, where it is going to go. We hope, for the sake of the country and all the fishermen who are being encouraged to think that a solution to the fisheries problem has been found, that these plans will be successful.

The honourable gentleman then referred to loans which were made to the companies. Now these have been

on a rather high scale for a small country. Newfoundland had available when this Government took office a huge surplus of money comparatively, out of which they could make these loans. But one wonders if it is sound financing to put so much money into things which have always been recognized as speculative. Everyone knows that the fisheries, whether it is fresh or whether it is frozen or whether it is salt, heavy salted or light salted, has been a speculative venture. The Premier himself has stated that it has a fifty-fifty chance of success. Well the Government have done it, and if it is not a success they know who is going to get the blame; and they have taken that chance.

Now the Minister has told us that his revenue is going to be 39.2 million dollars, and his expenditure 35.5 million dollars. We have a population of 380,000 people, which means our expenditure on current account for the coming year is going to be \$90 a head. Yet near us is another province, an old province, and its expenditure for 1954-55 is going to be 44.6 or \$80 a head for a population of 660,000 people—Nova Scotia. They have a public debt of one hundred million dollars. Here we are with a public debt of not much more this year than twenty-five millions, and our expenditure is \$20 a head more than Nova Scotia's on current account. My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works brought in a budget for his department that included the expenditure on roads of five million dollars. Last year he brought in a budget for the expenditure of two and a half million dollars. Yet in an answer given to me I found out of two and a half million only \$243,000 had been spent. Now if the Minister is going to spend in the same proportion this year as

last year there is going to be very little of the Trans-Canada Highway done this year, because it only means that about six or seven hundred dollars of road work will be done. Let us believe that the Minister is going to put more energy and more drive into the building of that road than he showed during the past year.

Now my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, dealt with the creation of fifteen entirely new industries. I must thank him for dealing with those because we had such little information about them. It was nice to know what he had to say, although unfortunately the Premier did not agree with him. He told us that three of them were in full running order, working full time on full production—of the fifteen new plants, three are in full production. I wonder which one he was referring to because the Premier came along next day with a correction and said only one was in full production. Now I wonder does the Minister know very much about these plants. Well I hope to enlighten him a little about one of them before I finish this address.

The Government started its economic development programme in 1950 with high hopes and a surplus of forty-two million dollars. The available surplus is gone and even the high hopes are no longer high.

The Minister of Fisheries is starting his fisheries programme with high hopes and a loan of twelve millions, out of which three millions at least will be assigned to him. I wonder where he will be in regard to that in four years.

The greatest asset of the Liberal Party since 1949 has been the unfailing optimism of the Premier. But

what is the greatest asset of the Liberal Party may well prove to be the greatest liability of the country.

Now, Sir, it seems to me, from following these new industries since they were first advocated, as well as I could, they were very hastily conceived. I think I know the mentality of the Premier. The Premier is anxious that some day a monument will be erected to him for the tremendous work that he has done for Newfoundland. And I have no doubt that he stays day and night at his desk working for the benefit of Newfoundland. The only thing about it that seems to me wrong is that he goes the wrong way about it. I think he went into this economic development programme very rashly. I don't think it was the part of the Government in 1950 to start a cement plant nor a birch nor a gypsum plant. That was the part of private industry. It was the part of the Government to get information and give as much assistance to private capital as possible and help them to get started in industries. The second phase of industrial development was very much better than the first one, as I propose to show. Now we have in this community a very distinguished gentleman and Honourable Senator who has given, I think, more thought to the financial and economic future of Newfoundland than anybody else in the country, and I don't except the Premier—I mean Senator Pratt.

Senator Pratt was the inspiring voice and soul behind the formation of the Newfoundland Industrial Development Board. He is a big merchant. He is interested in the fisheries, and he is interested in the economic development of Newfoundland. I think he has a broad sense of proportion. He has, through the years, presided

over the destiny of the Newfoundland Industrial Development Board, until it went off the map. During that time I believe he acquired a great deal of valuable statistics. He engaged the best assistance that he could get to advise his Board upon the possibilities of establishing industries in this country. He left on record his experiences in his story of the Newfoundland Industrial Development Board, that I can recommend very heartily to every member of this House to read. Probably most of them have read it. I have found it very interesting. I am going to quote two sentences from that book at the present time: In his report he said: "Industrial Development of a proportion commensurate with our need can only be by a long range, flexible programme. Such a programme must be evolved by careful and painstaking study of our resources and facilities." And again I quote: "It is a fact that the trend is to place a burden of research directly on government and public institutions and less responsibility is being directly taken by industry in this respect."

So it follows it is the duty of the Government to make available to people who have capital to invest the necessary information that would help them build sound industries. It seems to me that it was the chief duty of the Government, if it was not going to carry on with the Development Board, that it should have something to take its place, and it should be the one to take the lead now in establishing some kind of organization similar to the Industrial Development Board to consider the problems that now exist as a result of the creation of these new industries. The Premier was a great admirer of the man who was responsible for most of them. But the establishment of an industry is



only the beginning. The problem is not then solved, it is only the beginning. Unfortunately, the thing looks to me either as if the people who came out here and set up these twelve new plants about which we heard yesterday were deceived into coming here with rosy promises of the prospects or that conditions have changed in some fashion to make these chances of success less sure than when they were conceived, when those people were invited here. Whatever the explanation, there can be no doubt that some of them are now in great difficulty. Many millions of dollars belonging to the people of Newfoundland have been invested in these plants, and unless we are going to accept the risk of losing most of the money it is imperative and vitally necessary that the Government should do as I have suggested and establish some kind of advisory board where they will get assistance on the economic and financial market problems involved in the formation of these industries.

Now, Sir, we have in this community, as I have stated before, a class of men who are not represented in this House. We have none of them in this House. But I think men like Senator Pratt have experience and knowledge that is beyond the capacity of most members of this House, and it seems to me therefore that it is helpful and necessary that as soon as possible a board of that kind of assistance should be organized, and they should be consulted in regard to the future of these industries. I know that, in spite of all the abuse that has been heaped upon them repeatedly, in spite of the appeal I made here the other day, which I know was a reasonable one, it might be very difficult to get any man to leave his own business to

give his time to advise the Government, which has been abusing them. But I would suggest to the Premier to show that they possess the humanity of which he boasted the other day and go to these people and ask them to help. As far as I am concerned, and I am sure all of us, and as the Minister of Finance has said, all the people of Newfoundland, now their money is into this, want to see the industries flourish in Newfoundland—Any Newfoundlander would be a fool to think otherwise. I am speaking especially of those twelve industries to which I referred. There they are now; we got to make the best of it, and therefore as much as can be done to help them should be done.

The Government has lost the services of the man who conceived them and one begins to wonder if he was as able a man as he was represented to us to be. Perhaps the Premier was too naive, and many people give him credit for being naive, and that if the honourable gentleman or rather the gentleman who now has to stand trial on charges of wrong-doing had been as brilliant, superlatively brilliant as he was represented to be, if he had been the great promoter, great organizer and the great industrial planner, perhaps he would not have left the other side, and certainly he would not have accepted such a humble position as we know he occupied in the capital at Ottawa. Besides what could be done in Germany under a controlled regime cannot be done in a free nation—it was not feasible here.

The haste with which these industries were formed left most people gasping. I remember the Leader of the Opposition saying at one time on a public platform—The Premier is back now with another (I think he said) suitcase full of new industries.

Well there is no doubt about it, he had them there in the bag, and we have them now. But I think we are entitled to ask if sufficient thought was given to the problems that would arise once these industries were established. Was thought given to their location, to the question of transportation, the question of finding adequate and suitable markets for the sale of their products? The Honourable the Premier, the other day, pointed to that table and said : "See that table. Do you mean to tell me we cannot build a table as good as that in Newfoundland?" Well, has anybody got a cigarette? Would anybody like to tell me we can't make cigarettes like that in Newfoundland? Yes, we made them, but where are the cigarettes we made here fifteen years ago?—Gone up in smoke. I hope that does not happen to the new industries. The point is this : We can make them, but can we market them at a cost which competes with articles of the same kind or a similar kind made elsewhere? Our market here is very limited. I am sure that all of us were interested to see that flamboyant little advertisement that had been given out in thousands of copies, I imagine, at the Toronto Fair, advertising the Eckhardt Mills Limited. I know now that the people in my honourable friend's district of Placentia West are rushing mail orders to Eckhardt Mills Limited for the latest in skiing costumes.

MR. POWER : Is that helping these industries?

MR. BROWNE : I am not saying a word against the industries. But I am drawing attention to what everyone who has given any thought to it must recognize—These are problems connected with these industries which were not thought of at the beginning when these people who are in charge

of them were invited to come out here.

Why were the tanneries built in Carbonear; the shoe factory in Harbour Grace; and the Eckhardt Mills at Brigus; the rubber plant at Holyrood and the battery plant at Topsail? Now I can understand the principle of decentralization. It has been preached by many people that it is not a good thing to have all your industries concentrated in one place. But if we figure it, Carbonear is almost at the very end of the North American Continent. Yet we are hoping that the manufacturers at that place by road, by railway and by ship will be able to get into the markets of the big cities on the Mainland. It is a big hope, and we do hope it will be successful. But it almost looks as if when these industries were being established, they were established where they were for political reasons. Is it because the honourable member for Carbonear and the honourable member for Port de Grave and Harbour Main-Bell Island were Liberals that these industries were routed along the route coming along—

MR. MURRAY : How about the one on James Lane?

MR. BROWNE : I will come to that too, as I believe I can. That reminds me, we have the new industry of United Textile and Cotton Mills—But where are the Newfoundland Clothing Factory and the White Clothing Factory? Their doors are closed. Their machines are silent. For several months the machines were silent in the White Clothing Factory. These gentlemen from Germany now are going to take over a portion, or have taken over a portion of it and are running it a couple of days a week. I don't think it is running full time.

But these were factories which flourished here for many years.

It is usual for people when establishing industries to require proximity to tidewater. They have that. Nearness to a large supply of labour, and trained labour if possible—I am not so sure they have that. Cheap electrical power—I don't believe they have that. In most of the places around Conception Bay I don't see how they can ever have it. They are subject to the handicap of competing with industries established in places where these conditions are favourable. Then again, and I have said this before, but will repeat it—Nearness to good markets is always of paramount importance when people invest in industries.

Now the problem to me seems to be this—Many millions, the Minister said seventeen—but I think if we add up the figures given yesterday we would find it is nearer to twenty millions of our money that has been invested in these fifteen industries. Whether we like it or not these industries are our babies, and we must try and help them as much as we can. And these good people from Germany, Austria and Switzerland have come over here and put money of their own into them as well, fifty-fifty, I know some of them, and I believe 40% in some others. It may not be possible to save them all, but they certainly need all our help. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see in the newspaper, I think it was today or yesterday, how a delegation from the Board of Trade with two visiting engineers had visited these plants, and inspected them. Now that bears out the suggestion which I made earlier. All the help and all the advice of experienced businessmen should be available to these new industries. After all they are strangers here, and it cannot be expected that

they would have the necessary knowledge that other people in business for many years in this country have. And it is necessary that they should get the benefit of these other people's experiences. I have no doubt that these people have come here possessing a fine technical knowledge. The reputation of the working men in European countries is very, very high. Our people are quick learners and in time would learn from these people the techniques necessary to produce good, high-quality products.

I have another suggestion to make in that line, that is, that at the present moment, or I believe for the past week or so, we have had an exhibit at Toronto, the Industrial Trade Fair. Now I have been to that Trade Fair several times. It is not the exhibition which is held in the summertime. It is principally for business people and all sorts of manufactured articles are there to be shown chiefly to business people and not to the public. There is not a great attendance by the general public. But businessmen go there and see the latest designs. I have no doubt that our exhibit last year and this year has created a great deal of interest. I would suggest that this exhibit of Newfoundland's should next be taken to some of the larger cities in Ontario, like Hamilton, Windsor and Ottawa and then to Montreal and Quebec and perhaps to Halifax and St. John, and then should be taken to St. John's and perhaps Corner Brook. If that is feasible, I would suggest it would be done in order to enlighten the public in those large centres of the products that are now being produced today.

The Premier the other day in answer to a question put forward by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition explained to us the failure of the

Benno Schilde concern to establish a steel mill at Bay Roberts. He said that the Government decided to make an exgratia payment of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars to Benno Schilde who designed the plant for the gypsum mill, on condition that it be spent in this country. They were to put up a steel mill, which they did not put up—a steel mill they never intended—it was not a steel mill, it was a sheet metal plant which they were going to put up. According to the explanation given here the other day it was forgotten for months. When we heard of the steel mill we thought it was a plant that would smelt the ore from Bell Island and convert it into ingots or into steel. I understand now from my colleague here the explanation given the other day was that it was a sheet metal plant.

Why did Dr. Sennewald back out of the Optical factory? Dr. Sennewald we well remember over here, came over here in 1951 ostensibly to give information on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party about the things that were going on in the promotion of new industries. He had a tale to tell if he had been allowed to tell it. But he was not allowed to tell it. He was kidnapped and his mouth was closed with a promise to supply him with sufficient funds to start an optical factory. A building was found for him through the kindness of our present tourist director, which the Government very obligingly bought. So he never gave any explanation. He was given a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now he has given it all back. Why did he give it all back? I don't know whether he worked it out as an intern at the General Hospital where he was employed. At any rate he has given it all back. Why? Did he give up the idea of an optical

factory? It seems to me, on the face of it, it might be the soundest scheme of all. Here we are paying \$25 and \$30 for a pair of eyeglasses which are only a piece of glass and plastic. And we all believe we are being gypped when we buy a pair of glasses. The combines investigating board investigating the combines in the eyeglass manufacturing business discovered a few years ago that the people were being gypped. It does not seem to have made much difference. But there seemed to be a big field in this country, where so many of the people wear glasses—Yet he backed out. Here was a man who over and over again was refused a plant, then he was granted a plant and he turned it down. But I believe that Dr. Sennewald sleeps more soundly at night than any other of the industrialists that have come to this country. He does not have to worry about work or transportation at all. And it seemed to me he was the one who saw the whole affair in its true light and thus he was able to evade the instalment of the new romanticism and economic nonsense that was accepted for economic development policy in government political circles.

MR. MURRAY: Very nice.

MR. BROWNE: On addressing the House on this occasion I wish to register my firm and emphatic protest against the manner in which these estimates were introduced. They were introduced on the 31st of May and rushed through in four days with prolonged sittings, and with due deference, contrary to what I thought were the Rules of the House. We had no time as a party to get together and consider what was involved. And if we did not give proper consideration to these estimates it is because we did not have the time. It is no use for

the Premier to say: you can take all the time you like. We could take all the time we liked on any one of the insignificant little Bills that might as well be introduced next year as this year, but when it came to important things like the estimates then no time was going to be allowed. The Government had had these—I would be willing to bet these have been prepared for several months—They could have been introduced weeks ago, and the Government deliberately held them back. There is no date on them to show when they were printed, but I am willing to bet they were printed a long time before they were brought in here. Here we get the two documents together. I suggest in the future the estimates be brought down and considered as soon as they are ready. Then we can see what the government programme is and can discuss it more intelligently in debate on the budget, which may be introduced afterwards. I see no necessity at all for bringing the two documents in at the same time.

This budget gives evidence, on the face of it, that it was written by a poet; a poet for whom I have considerable admiration as a poet. It took a man of considerable imagination to appear all as one material.

I want to return to the question of the industries. I want to speak particularly about one industry. I note from the document tabled yesterday by the Premier that the cement plant was contracted for in August and the birch plant in December of 1950. Was anybody else consulted at that time besides the Director of Economic Development? The Premier, in one of his speeches, stated that wherever he went everybody knew Dr. Valdmanis;

the heads of states, the heads of big concerns, everyone; I am beginning to wonder now if it was not to the Premier himself all this respect was being shown as head of the Government of Newfoundland rather than to the other gentleman.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with the question of the birch plant — the birch plant, which according to the Auditor General last year in his report had cost one million seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand six hundred and forty-eight dollars; and which up to that time had received as advances \$906,000 and which yesterday, according to the figures brought in here, is to receive another half million dollars. That would be \$1,200,000 for the birch plant. And according to the Premier the industry is prostrate right across the North American Continent.

MR. POWER: That is not so.

MR. BROWNE: That was stated.

MR. POWER: But it is picking up now.

MR. BROWNE: That will be good news for us all. I have here the agreement, and I must say it is a very interesting document. I am not sure if any members present know about it. Well I want to give them some information about it. This is a document. I think if I were to ask most of the members on the other side of the House, with whom this agreement was made, they would not be able to give me a correct answer. I doubt if the Minister of Finance could give me a correct answer.

Who was to build or was supposed to build that plant? The Attorney General might be able to tell me. Who was it that was going to operate that

plant? I doubt if any of the other members could tell me. I will tell them now. This is an agreement made with Mr. Chester Dawe himself, between the Government and Chester Dawe who is called the operator. The Government had a plan to encourage a birch wood industry and proposed to erect and equip a modern plant for the processing and the manufacturing of birchwood products in Newfoundland, and to encourage production of four saw mills, and not less than twelve small factories for the sawing and preliminary manufacture of birch. Now in passing I would ask—Where are the four saw mills, and where are the twelve small factories? Perhaps the Minister of Finance could tell me that. And whereas the Government has agreed to lease the said plant when completed to the operator at a rate and for the terms hereinafter appearing, now this agreement witnesseth as follows—The operator, Chester Dawe, will acquire a site for the erection of the factory, will erect the factory, will acquire and install modern machinery in said factory and put it in operation at the expense of the Government—I must say Chester Dawe has done that—

Now there is a provision later on which gives him power to turn over to a joint stock company the right that he has here and the duties he has here, or as this grand document says—The benefits and burdens—I think he has kept the benefits and got new ones and passed over the burdens to Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited.

The second clause in this contract says—The Government will lease the factory to the operator for a period of fifteen years from the date the factory is in readiness for operation at an annual rent of what? How much

rent did he get? Could the Minister of Finance answer? One half the net profits of each year's operations plus the depreciation mentioned in sub-clause 2 thereof.

We did not even get any depreciation which I believe must have been very considerable on a plant of that kind. How are you to get the net profit? The net profit shall be computed by deduction from the gross profits each year a payment to the Government equal to the full normal depreciation on the building, plant and equipment allowed by the Taxation Division of the Department of National Revenue. I suppose Mr. Dawe could say we have had no net profit, therefore we did not put in any returns. I wonder did they put in returns? But in any case I believe it is the practice in buildings of that kind to allow five to ten per cent depreciation on the building and from ten to twenty per cent depreciation on the machinery. Well if we took the cost of the building at say, two million dollars, it would amount to a considerable sum which would have to be paid to the Government. But the Government has not had anything in nearly four years now, not a cent has been paid in, only what has been paid out.

The ordinary operating expenses are to be taken out, for instance, maintenance and upkeep of the plant and equipment.

Now the operator under Clause 3 agrees to pay to the Government depreciation, as in Clause 2. Now, why has he to pay that depreciation? I would like some one to answer that. The Minister, when he closes the debate, might tell me why Mr. Dawe has not been compelled to pay the depreciation agreed on. I know what I will be



told—conditions not so bad, the industry got so bad in 1952-53, but it is beginning to pick up now—until the election is over—

Now here we come to another part—I am going to read Clause 2—"The operator may assign all benefits and burdens under the lease referred to to a joint stock company, but any dividends, salaries, bonuses or other payment from such company will be deemed to be a payment on account of his share of the profits and shall not be an expense deductible before the division of the profits." In other words the company must make a profit, because before Mr. Dawe would obtain a cent—By the way, may I ask what is the salary paid Mr. Dawe? What was the answer we got when we asked for a statement of expenses—What answer did we get? "It is none of your business—It is a private company—Go in and ask Mr. Dawe, the manager."

Three millions of the people's money went into it, and we are not allowed to ask a question. What a wonderful Government you got—

MR. POWER: Did you ask Mr. Dawe?

MR. BROWNE: No I did not but I have something else to say about Mr. Dawe—You wait—and you ought to be asking Mr. Dawe before this is finished for information and certainly there are other people who ought to be asking Mr. Dawe for information too.

Clause 3—Here is a very important one—"The Government shall not be liable for any operating losses incurred in any year in the operation of the factory during the duration of the lease"—Who has been liable for losses of this concern since it went into

operations if not the Government? Who? The Minister of Finance is the watchdog of the treasury. Has he enforced this clause against Mr. Dawe or against the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, and if he has not, why has he not done it? Why should we have had to pay, the people of this country, in addition to nearly two million dollars to put up a plant for Mr. Dawe, these expenses and supplying them with working capital year after year, which really means paying deficits on the operation of the factory?

Clause 6—"The Government will from time to time make advances to the operator for the purchase of stock, such advances not to exceed four hundred thousand dollars."

And this is the agreement. Well if there is any other agreement it has not been tabled in this session, and has not been produced for us who have asked for it. I presume, therefore, that is the agreement under which the plant is being operated at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: In ten seconds—It being now six o'clock I will leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

The House then recessed until 8:00 of the clock.

---

WEDNESDAY, June 9th.

#### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment at six o'clock I was speaking about the Birch Plant

and I had given the honourable members a review of the terms of agreement for the construction of the Birch Plant. I think it is necessary for us to consider what are the prospects for the Birch Plant during the next year, the next two or five years. When is it likely to get on its feet? What is the matter with it? Is the defect a defect on the part of the business and the way it is built and the way it was conceived and the way it is being operated or is its failure to turn over a profit and get into the black, as the Premier says, due to circumstances beyond his control? I contend that it is due to the way in which it was built and the way in which it is being operated. Birch plants seem to be decided between the Premier and Mr. Dawe. Mr. Dawe was an experienced lumber man and operated a birch mill before. He built this plant, but as I was stating this afternoon, he did not build it as Chester Dawe. He formed a company which became known as Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited and he assigned to that company all his rights under the agreement of December 1950 and that company then continued with the construction of the plant along the terms that were mentioned and this company today is operating that plant.

In answer to some question which I asked here in this House, I was informed that the company has about twenty-five thousand shares. I do not know what the value is but there is no great rush to buy them I don't imagine, and they are held by the Government and now leased to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited because Mr. Dawe either leased it or he gave over the right to lease it to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited and they are lessees at the present time. Mr. Dawe runs that plant and

seems to have no responsibility at all for its operations. It is Mr. Dawe by another name and it does not matter whether the Government holds twenty-five thousand shares or one share. Mr. Dawe runs the plant and he built it.

The money of the Newfoundland people has gone into the construction of this plant and the money of the Newfoundland people is paying off the bills and keeping it going. If Mr. Dawe owned that plant himself it would have been built in a different way and if it was losing money like it is at the present time and has been it would have been closed down long ago. How much longer can the Government afford to advance the country's money to the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited and have it going down the drain? How much longer will it be necessary for the Government to keep on priming the pump to keep this industry going? The Government has put a great deal of abuse upon the shoulders of business for lack of enterprise but Mr. Dawe is one of those enterprising young men and what is he doing? What is he doing? A man who has been given nearly two million dollars to play with. Is he turning it into a profit for the Government, is it, say, to take charge of a great industrial programme and put it through?

I think the Government was over-optimistic when it put this operation through. I want to draw to the attention of the House this extraordinary phrase in Clause I of the Agreement, "All at the expense of the Government." What does that mean. In the minds of honourable gentlemen here what does that mean? What prices were to be paid?

As is well known, Mr. Dawe is also managing director of a lumber mill

right alongside, Chester Dawe Limited, and he was entitled to put across into the property next door all the lumber and timber that was required and all the material he had in his possession which he could sell to this Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited. What prices did he charge—anybody knows? Does anybody in the House know? Does the Premier know? The Premier should know because he signed so many of the bills, approved them and nobody else could approve.

I have here a memorandum, a slip from the Department of the Auditor General's files. I asked to have the vouchers produced here and I was referred to the Department of Finance. They did not have it, they were in the Department of the Auditor General and I inspected some of them and found it very interesting. Mr. Carter, the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources, the previous Deputy Minister, now a member of the Civil Service Commission, sent a bunch of bills to Mr. Short, Deputy Minister of Economic Development, and he sent them back to Mr. Carter and he said "I am sorry I can't pay them because I have no vouchers for them. You should certify these prices, are they correct and true?" He asked to have the bills certified by someone qualified to do so. That was April 5th, 1951. There is a letter from another Deputy Minister, Mr. Haynes, asking him to certify the bills. On March 21st a letter from Mr. Parsons back to Mr. Haynes—"I do not know anything about it, I can't certify them." Who was to know? There are four high officials in three departments and none of them was willing or able to certify the bills for the materials that went into the construction of the Birch Plant. Nobody knows today actually how the money was spent for the construction of the

Birch Plant. I am going to substantiate the statement I have made. I am going to tell a story first, a true story. I believe it to be a true story. About three years ago, not quite three years, I was talking to a representative of a manufacturing firm in the city of Montreal who went to Mr. Dawe to sell certain machinery and Mr. Dawe said, "What is in it for me?" and the representative said, "I do not know what you mean, I can give you a ten per cent discount." And he said, "No, that is not enough. I want more than that." And he said, "That is all I can do," and Mr. Dawe rang up someone on the telephone and said, "I want you to buy certain machines and you can sell it to me and we will split the profits. You can sell it to me for ten per cent more than you get it for." Bear in mind there is no one who supervised the cost of these machines, nobody. I know what these articles were and I went to the Department of the Auditor General and I saw the vouchers for them and I have a couple of vouchers here. Here is a copy of the voucher. J. C. Pratt and Co. Ltd. and I believe Mr. Pratt is a brother-in-law of Mr. Dawe. (Reads from voucher) No. 225 (a) 12" wide, semi-portable flat conveyors, broad width, one and a half horse power motors, maximum height twelve feet, minimum seven feet, and forty tons per hour or more. Each machine \$1,508.67, total cost \$3,017.04. Social Security Tax \$90.52, total cost \$3,107.86. Approved by J. R. Smallwood. I believe the Premier when he approved these as Minister of Economic Development did not know what he was signing because, if he did according to the statements he has made in this House, he would never have done it and he charged that if we had any

complaints to make to make them and he did not care who it was, he would prosecute them.

This arrangement was apparently made around November 19th because it says "Messrs" Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited on account of J. C. Pratt, paid \$1,500.00 on account" and I presume the balance was paid afterwards by J. R. Smallwood. I took the trouble to go to the Plant recently and I saw those two conveyors. One of them has not been used since last fall and the end of it projects from a saw mill and anybody can see the word "Jeffrey" on it in black and white letters and the other one is down in the furnace room next to the veneer plant and I do not believe they are expensive as portable conveyors because neither of them seems to have the equipment which portable conveyors carry. I have the catalogue from the company of Jeffrey, "Portable 12" flat belt conveyors. Capacity forty tons or more per hour, length 20 feet, head and foot, height twenty-five feet and minimum 3 ft. 9 ins., one and a half horsepower motor totally enclosed." I do not know what is on the Jeffrey conveyor that is in the saw mill but I believe it is the same type as the one I saw in the furnace room, which was in the furnace room when I went there. There is the number. I had a friend in Montreal and I asked him to find out. He was practically a lumber operator himself and he has this letter from Jeffrey Manufacturing Co. Ltd. dated May 27th, 1954.

Dear Sir,

This is to confirm our telephone conversation requesting that information be given you regarding one of our portable belt conveyors. Type 225 (a) is described on Page 3 of the the catalogue.

It comes complete with one and a half horsepower, electric motor, fifty foot cable. This machine comes on three wheels and is priced at \$1,180.00, sales tax extra and terms ninety days." I have been advised by the Department of Customs that there is no sales tax payable on goods sold to provincial governments.

The price seems to be much higher than the one sold you in 1951 but we estimate the cost of these conveyors has not increased more than 5 or at the most 7½ per cent. It is \$1,180.00, catalogue price of rubber tire machine. I do not believe that is a rubber tire machine. The invoice says, supplied by J. C. Pratt not by the manufacturer at all. So I believe you take \$50.00 off for steel wheels, supposing they came with this piece of machinery which I do not believe. The price today is higher than it was in 1951. Mr. Dawe was given ten per cent or was offered ten per cent which makes it ten per cent or a net cost of \$966.15. I have a letter from the shipping company as to the cost which is \$826.00 per hundred pounds and the weight of the machine is given in the catalogue as forty tons. \$1,066.00 spent here in St. John's. The total profit would be \$975.00 which, according to my information was to be split between Mr. Dawe and Mr. Pratt. Is there anything extraordinary about this? It depends on how we look at it. Was Mr. Dawe entitled to share any profit with his brother-in-law, Mr. Pratt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was not entitled to share the profits with anyone and he was not entitled to make one cent. Would the honourable gentleman furnish me with that data?

MR. BROWNE: Of course. As the Premier says Mr. Dawe was not entitled to any financial profit. This is a simple machine. One is not in use since last fall and if that happened with one machine it could happen to others. There are profits of 35 per cent to 40 per cent on machines. Who is getting these profits? It is a pretty hard position Mr. Dawe was in, to build a plant, see all this money around, one million eight hundred thousand dollars and he had to be Simon Pure not to get a cent for all his services. It is true he hired his office for fifty dollars a month, but there is nothing in this. He sold desks for \$50.00 each. It is true he sold lumber, nails and cement. I do not know what price he was allowed to charge but the Auditor General says he was allowed to charge retail prices. The Government were derelict in their duty when they did not make it definite what Mr. Dawe was to charge for the articles in this plant. They were also derelict not to supervise the articles as they were delivered to the plant to see what the quality was and to compare with those that were ordered. I want to come back to the clause in the contract which says that the Government or its assigns shall not be liable for any loss incurred in any year. There must have been a minute of coercion we know nothing about that relieved Mr. Dawe of this responsibility. That is his responsibility in this contract. That he shall pay the normal depreciation on the building and plants and if we put depreciation at five per cent on two million dollars he should pay the Government one hundred thousand dollars a year on account of depreciation on machinery and the plant. He should pay the net operating loss. The Premier as Minister of Economic Develop-

ment signs this contract, and approved what was done and sits on the board of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited as representative of the country, and we are not told what the losses were. All we know is that in the Auditor General's report of 1953, nine hundred and six thousand dollars were advanced and guarantees at the bank of \$106,000.00 and this year we are asked to advance five hundred thousand dollars. That is almost \$1,500,000 which the Government has had to pay which by this agreement Mr. Dawe agreed to pay. The Minister of Economic Development is the person who signed this agreement with Mr. Dawe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is missing the point: Surely in the nature of things it is better that the House make it than that I make it personally or privately.

MR. BROWNE: I have no objections to who makes it. It will be appreciated, I think, that in examining hundreds of bills, including many thousands of items neither the Premier nor I is competent to pass upon the prices. It only just happens that I know of that business for three years. I was waiting for an opportunity to check on it. These are the results of what I found. There may be some explanation—I don't know. But there is the information! If the Premier thinks that a Committee of this House should go into it, I certainly would not be the one to make any objections to that. I would welcome some sort of an inquiry. I believe that is the precedent no government should follow—to give a man "carte blanche" to build a building of the price of that one.

Now, sir, I have dealt with the construction of the birch plant. I don't know anything of the construction of

the cement plant nor the gypsum plant—But the whole world knows the Premier has charged that man—I think there has been enough information brought to the public notice to make us realize that these were mad ventures on the part of the Government, and that the Government was not justified in going into the business in such an extensive way. What is going to be the prospect for the country? These three plants have cost the country pretty well twelve million dollars so far, if not more, and none of them is paying any dividends or any interest on that twelve million dollars that has been invested in them. I contend the Government have been extravagant and wasteful in the management of the finances of this country. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that the Government should realize that they hold a position of trust, that they are in charge of public money and not their own money. It is all right for the Premier to be gambling with his own money, and to do what he likes with it, but when in charge of money belonging to the people, there are factors coming in which make it absolutely necessary to take the greatest care. It is not sufficient that he should do with it as he would do with his own. Yet these things, these schemes—All it means is that the country has spent the surplus which has been saved by the Commission of Government between 1941 and 1949, and they have gone into these ventures from which there has been no return.

Now, of course, it will be answered—But there are many people employed there. It is true that there are many people employed in these industries. But I think that that is not the criterion. The criterion is, how long will they be employed? If the thing is not sound then it is likely to go to the

wall and become a failure, and the capital cost will be lost.

This year in the budget the Minister of Finance has brought in very little new taxation, but he has brought in some, without telling us—I don't think he did—how much he realized from the Cancer Tax. I think it was about a quarter of a million. We were not given very much information as to how it was spent. He has stated that he expects to get a half a million from that source this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, he has not stated any such thing—The honourable gentleman is quite wrong.

MR. BROWNE: Let the honourable gentleman speak for himself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I remember vividly, as everyone else does, he did not.

MR. BROWNE: Five hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no such figure available. It is not there to get.

MR. BROWNE: I will check—Five hundred thousand dollars—I have seen it in print.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now the honourable gentleman is repeating it—Where is it?

MR. BROWNE: Cancer Control Tax 1953-54, \$250,000—1954-55, \$500,000. That is in the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not in the budget speech.

MR. BROWNE: Well, these are his figures in any case—I feel sure he said it. And when I saw it in the newspaper I said; that is what I thought he said. Perhaps he did not. I am quite prepared to be corrected on that point.



Now in regard to gasoline tax he puts a cent on a gallon of gasoline, from which he expects to get \$170,000. He is budgeting for a surplus again this year. The Honourable Minister of Finance thinks it is virtuous to budget for a surplus. But what does it mean? It means he is taking more money from the people than he needs for carrying on the affairs of the country.

MR. POWER: Do you think I should budget for a deficit?

MR. BROWNE: But not for a large surplus. I think it is unsound financing to budget for a large surplus. If fortunately the budget turns out to be larger than expected there is some excuse for a Minister. But to deliberately put on extra taxation when there is no need, seems to me to be not only unnecessary but was described by a member of this House some years ago as being immoral.

Now, Sir, in view of the fact that this Government has not shown due regard for economy in the operating of these government plants; and insofar as the Government has seen fit to disclose the fact it is going to have a surplus on its current account, and has seen fit to impose higher taxation. I believe the Government is overcharging the people and in that way is putting up the cost of business and making business harder to operate.

I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for St. John's East, that all the words after the word "that" be struck from the motion, and the following words substituted— "Therefore this House regrets the Government has failed to reduce taxation which now rests heavily upon all sections of the population."

Motion put by Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support that motion it is not my intention to take up too much time of this Honourable House, because the motion has been so ably introduced by my honourable and learned friend on my right that I do not think it will be necessary for me to say very much.

We do deplore, I think the whole of the people of Newfoundland deplore, and I think the Government deplores, the fact that they have not been able or have not seen fit to reduce taxation upon our people, who in many many instances are in very poor positions to pay increased taxation.

I believe that shortly after we went into Union with Canada the sales tax at that end was increased from 8% to 10%. That was an increase of 25% on sales tax, which immediately, of course, reflected upon the economy of our people, upon their expenditures, upon everything they bought practically. The present Government imposed a taxation of 50% upon motor car licenses, and later they brought in the Social Security. Taxation of 3% on practically everything except food, and later then they increased that tax or brought other commodities under that taxation, even food. Last year they raised on that tax alone close to \$6,000,000 and this year I believe they hope to raise close to \$7,000,000 or around there. In addition to that in this present year they propose to increase the gasoline tax, and so it goes. From having seen fit to reduce taxation they have increased taxation to such an extent that they will take in probably anywhere from seven to ten million dollars more by increased taxation which they themselves have put on since they came into office.

We were of the opinion, sir, that the Liberal Government would endeavour

to relieve a large number of our people, particularly those in the fishing centres, of the burden of taxation which there has been so much talk about; these vile customs duties on the fishermen's gear and on everything they used in connection with the fisheries. The whole talk was that it was a vile taxation imposed by a more vile government in those days, who made it impossible for our fishermen to live. Naturally we expected that one of the benefits which would derive from our new association with the Mainland of Canada would be a relaxation on these excessive duties which we were told had been imposed upon the people of this country, particularly upon people who least could afford to pay heavy taxes. Now we find that even our fishermen and our farmers, everybody has to pay on the bit of floor they eat, the garments they wear, taxation equally as great and in many cases greater than they had to pay prior to the association which we now enjoy, I say advisedly, with the whole of the country.

We do deplore the fact that the Government have not seen fit to reduce taxation, but rather that they have seen fit to increase it to the enormous extent that they have. On the face of it, if one could see the reason for such increases in taxation—I believe, if my memory serves me right, since the present Government took over office they have collected over and above the amounts which were needed for current account some eleven or twelve million dollars—I believe that is the figure given us by the Honourable Minister of Finance. Now if that much money had been used for the purpose of assisting the people who were badly in need of assistance, and I refer chiefly to our fishermen—the fishermen and not the fish merchants—I say; if that

eleven or twelve million dollars had been used to that end, for that particular section of our people they would be in a much more prosperous state than they are at the present time. Why even last year we had a surplus of two and three quarter million dollars, and this year we are budgeting for an increase of three million six hundred, thousand, approximately three and three quarters. In other words nearly six and a half million dollars in two years on current account expenditure of some thirty to thirty-five million each year. Now that to me seems to be a huge surplus. Even the great Dominion of Canada in comparison to that had not surplus at all, I know, last year. There were other years when they did have big surpluses, but there are fifteen million people to contend with in largely industrialized areas, whereas here in this country we have a large section of our people badly in need of some sort of assistance if we are to keep them happy in the occupations they and their fathers enjoyed before them. We do think if this Government had seen fit to keep a watchdog on the treasury that there would have been ample funds to pay ordinary running expenses and to pay out moneys on capital account for roads and bridges to quite a liberal extent, I say the word "Liberal" advisedly, without having to increase taxation, which they have done since they came into office.

My honourable and learned friend on my right has told of one instance in connection with the expenditure of money by this Government, between three and four millions of dollars have been spent in connection with that particular plant. We do believe, and I believe, the Government will agree, there were certain expenditures there which, if they had been properly

looked after would have meant that we did not need to put on this extra taxation. I have instances which I hope to relate in connection with my talk on the budget, which will also prove to the Government and to the people that not sufficient care has been taken by the treasury, by the people who looked after the treasury—And I am not blaming any one man in the Government—No one man in the Government can watch over the expenditure of thirty, forty or fifty million dollars and keep everything just so. But I do say that someone is responsible for the ill-expenditure of too much of the public funds, which after all comes out of the pockets of the people, comes out of the pockets of those who go down to the sea in ships, go down into the mines to dig out the ore and who chop down the trees and do all sorts of things in connection with the economy of this country or any country—the money comes out of the pockets of these people.

The Honourable Minister of Finance has spoken about the earnings which went into our peoples' pockets during the past year, and I believe he arrived at the figure of some two hundred and thirty million dollars.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** That is for this present year—It is a forecast.

**MR. HOLLETT:** A forecast for this year is right, thank you! I won't go into that now. But I would point out that a large amount of that money which went into the peoples' pockets had to come out of their pockets in the first instance. There is no question about that at all. Take the earnings which the Minister says our people will get from family allowances, some eleven or twelve millions. I have to point out that some six or seven millions of that next year will be taken out of the

pockets of the people right here in this country by the 3% sales tax on food and other commodities. There are certain increases in taxation—With regard to the Cancer Tax my honourable friend is certainly right when he said that last year the collection for the Cancer Tax—a tax on the sporting activities of our people, a percentage on gate receipts and on recreation—

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** It is a percentage.

**MR. HOLLETT:** No? It is a heavy percentage in some instances to persons who go regularly to baseball games—if they collect it on baseball games—I don't know—but on whatever games it is collected on—to the people who go regularly to the theatre it is a heavy, a very large percentage. But last year they took in two hundred and fifty thousands on that so-called Cancer Tax, put it in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and probably spent it on one of the new industries. Next year they will make that tax apply on various other items, and collect half a million dollars—What the Government will do with that, Sir, is anybody's guess.

We have no scruples in saying that not sufficient care has been taken by the Government over the public moneys. We can prove it. The people know it. The Government also know it. That is why this motion has been made, to draw it to the attention of the Government and of the people of this country—If public moneys had been spent in accordance with the proper manner of spending government moneys during the past five years it would not have been necessary nor indeed at all essential to increase taxation in any way, shape or form. After all we have to remember that we are just a small province. Our entry into

Union with Canada did not make us any larger materially or/and I think did not make us any larger as far as our earning power was concerned. Certainly, Sir, it made our fishermen's earning power much less because apparently we have now lost considerable of our markets which we did enjoy a fair time. And today we are unable to market our fish in the accustomed markets, and indeed we have experienced, and are experiencing today, some difficulty in marketing some of our fresh fish in various forms. But, we are still a small country with some three hundred and sixty or seventy or eighty thousand people as the case may be. And when you think that some three hundred and seventy or three hundred and eighty thousand people are going to have this Government spending next year thirty-five million dollars on current and on capital account then surely we know that we are spending more than our people can afford. In order to spend that the Government are going to borrow twelve million dollars, which will make an expenditure of three quarters of a million dollars for supervising that twelve million dollar loan an annual event. Nearly a million dollars will have to be taken out of the pockets of our people in order to pay the interest on that loan and the sinking fund on that loan of twelve million dollars and on the ten million dollars borrowed two years ago. Each year the people will have to dig down into their pockets and pull out four hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars on interest payments and three hundred thousand dollars sinking fund which has to be provided. When we think that just a mere five years ago we had altogether in cash and in realizable assets some fifty million dollars or thereabouts, when we realize that forty millions of

that is gone, and when we realize that we borrowed ten million dollars and that we will this year have to borrow another twelve million dollars we have no hesitation whatsoever, Sir, in supporting the motion which has just been made by my honourable and learned friend; and I do hope we shall get some support from the opposite side of the House on that motion.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would only like to answer one point the honourable gentleman made—I think he said that our taxation now lies more heavily on the people than the taxes in existence before Confederation. Well now, I think either one of the people who supported the return of Responsible Government right there—I have the customs tariffs for Newfoundland for 1925, and that was in force with minor changes up to 1933. Instead of 3% sales tax on food here is what you have: I will give a few items: On meats 30% on canned meats 50% on biscuits and bread 50%.

MR. HOLLETT: That does not mean a thing.

MR. POWER: On fruit 70%, on tinned fruits 50% on lard 40%, pickles and preserves 40%. There is an awful lot of difference between that and 3%.

MR. HOLLETT: Look at the end results.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, look at the end results—and we went on the rocks.

MR. POWER: That does not take into consideration—

MR. HOLLETT: We are on the rocks now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some rock—The big Rock Candy Mountains.

MR. HOLLETT: Mostly candy for kids.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Is the House ready for the question? If no other member intends to speak to the amendment I shall now put the question:

HON P. J. LEWIS (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, with the exception of the honourable and learned member who represents St. John's West I think I am the next senior member of the House. I had the privilege (I believe it was one, still I doubt it) of having occupied a seat in this chamber in the days of Responsible Government. I was here in 1928 and until the curtain was rung down on us in 1932.

During that time I listened to budget speeches delivered by finance ministers, some of which forecast rosy pictures and foretold in somewhat glowing terms of surpluses, but unfortunately they were never realized.

I was here in this House to hear a Finance Minister haul down the blinds on Newfoundland and surrender our people to the hands of a financial receivership. At that time I came to the conclusion that I have never changed then; that Newfoundland as a unit could never survive.

I was not at any time an enthusiastic Confederate, I was one, however, who considered that Confederation might be invaluable to Newfoundland and I was one of those who supported a movement in this country that was called Economic Union with the United States of America which is today and has been for some years facetiously referred to as the "comic union" movement. I have lived, however, to see the day when one who now occupies the position of Secretary of State in the Government of Canada is responsible for the statement that the late Prime Minister MacKenzie King looked upon

the movement of economic union of Newfoundland with the United States as a very serious matter and was one of the great motives that impelled him to make overtures to this province to become part of Canadian confederation. There were others of us who did not claim to be in the same category as MacKenzie King who felt the same way about it, I felt then and I still feel that had Canada not taken advantage of the opportunity that was held out, that other thing might have happened to Newfoundland. However, be that as it may Confederation is now a fact. It is a fact and it is just as well for us to become reconciled to it. What is the position resulting from this fact. It may seem that I am departing somewhat from the amendment or the motion before the Chair, but I am not. I am coming back to the question of taxation and the budget. I did not think I would live to see the day when we could forecast for Newfoundland a financial commitment or expenditure of fifty-three million dollars and that is the position we are faced with today. Fifty-three million dollars expenditure is foreshadowed by the Finance Minister for 1954, notwithstanding the fact that on current account he shows a substantial surplus. My honourable and learned friends on the opposite side have deplored the fact that it is necessary to increase taxation in order to sustain that position. What is the position? The position today is that Newfoundland is part of a Canadian federation and being part of a Canadian federation our people are entitled to comparable services as those existing in that part of North America known as Canada.

What is the position here with regard to our surplus. Take a glance at it and compare them with the position as we see it existing in our neighbour-

ing provinces. What is the position in regard to roads? We are one hundred years behind the times. Our people around the coastline today with the exception of the Avalon Peninsula, and limited sections of the west coast, are existing in the dark ages. They have no roads, they have no electric light facilities. In the neighbouring province of Nova Scotia they have spent, since they became part of the Canadian federation, one hundred and fifty million dollars on road construction and that stands as part of their public debt. In Nova Scotia they have fifteen hundred miles of paved roads and we have two hundred. As for secondary roads there is no comparison.

With regard to the medical position, we have a General Hospital in St. John's, a hospital in Corner Brook and we have half a dozen cottage hospitals, only pretences for hospitals, scattered around the island.

Regarding education facilities what have we got? It is true we are up to our necks so far as the educational vote is concerned but when you consider the type of buildings we have, when you consider the percentage of school buildings in this country that have no such thing as a toilet in them, where do we stand? When we remember that seventy-two per cent of our children have to go to outside houses for ordinary toilet facilities, what is the position? When we realize that hundreds of miles of our coastline are isolated and the only means of communication is that provided by boat, the salt water, what have we to say? The position is, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, and I was not a part of it when it came into existence in 1949, has done great things.

When we consider the road situation today as it was in 1949, this Government

has a record of which it is entitled to be proud, insofar as the facilities which it had available, it had shown remarkable results.

The same thing applies to health facilities and I may say, insofar as public welfare is concerned, to the credit of the department particularly and to the Government generally, we have as a result of health improvements, public welfare that is ahead of the Maritime Provinces.

Every sensible man must recognize we are still one hundred years behind the times and if our people are to continue to live in Newfoundland, we must get facilities for them that are, at least, comparable to those that the ordinary residents of North America look upon as commonplace.

This Government has been criticized, with some justification, as to its policy in relation to the establishment of new industries. My honourable and learned friend, the member for St. John's West, has made a little speech here in regard to the budget and in moving this amendment, a speech of which all ordinary and reasonable people must regard as being well-reasoned and in some cases justified, but as regards to the policy of this Government in instituting a new industrial development programme, I, for one, submit with all respect that no other course was open to it. When, in 1949, this province came into Canadian federation it came in as a backward island. It came in without the things to which I have referred and unless something radical was done, radical and unorthodox from the standpoint of financial administration, what would have been the position? There was only one course open or there would be an exodus from Newfoundland as was never seen in the history of the North American



continent, an exodus of our people to other places in Canada. What was to keep our people in Newfoundland?

We are told by our honourable and learned friends, with some truth, that the fisheries of this country had reached such a state that they could not provide a reasonable and decent living for those following it as an avocation.

We saw the salt codfishery of this country diminish from the prominent position of being the soundest branch of our industrial economy, we saw it shrink to a mere shadow of its former self. We saw the position in regard to the deep water fishery of which my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is very well aware, a branch of industry that for one hundred years had been the backbone of this country, disappear until today we have not one solitary fisherman on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland.

I and my people before me have been the people of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, with the deep water fishermen of this country. For almost half a century my father sailed and fished on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and side by side with him sailed Tom Hollett and Will Hollett, men who would lower their flag to no man on the western ocean and whose names were household words from here to the fish ports of Boston and Gloucester. What happened to them? Where are they? They are gone and what would have happened if this Government had not been prepared to take a bold and unorthodox stand with regard to the industries of Newfoundland? I will come back to that.

I sailed out of this port when I was nineteen years of age when we had one hundred and twenty deep water schooners carrying our fish to the four

corners of this world, where salt fish could be sold. I was in Barbados in 1919 when we had twenty sailing vessels of Newfoundland all housed in the port of St. John's to bring back molasses from the West Indies, having brought fish to Brazil. Where are they today? What was the position when this Government came into office? We were left with the remnants of a small codfishery, carried on as the deep water fishery. A few shore fishermen operating a codtrap and motor boat from our shores. That is the salt codfishery. We had no fresh fishery and where were we going to get it? To go from salt to fresh we needed capital and where were we going to get it? The people who carried our fish to market in the early days were not advanced enough or interested enough to switch from sail to steam. We lost our carrying trade to Scandinavian countries and today we do not move a quintal of fish in our own boats. Our mercantile people have switched from an economy of fish to canned goods and if the fishery had to be saved it could be done in one way and that was by calling on this surplus we hear so much about to help finance the change-over from shore fishermen and line trawlers to druggers.

MR. HOLLETT: Not by taxes.

MR. LEWIS: I will come to that in a few minutes. We were fortunate at that time to have a nest egg in Ottawa of fifty or forty-five million dollars. We were faced with the alternative of letting it rust and go on from year to year until such time as we found ourselves with nothing left. This Government decided instead of leaving that money in Ottawa, it would take it and take a gamble on those few Newfoundlanders who were progressive and enterprising enough to take a chance on the fishery of the county and to the

eternal credit of men like Arthur Monroe and others who were prepared to gamble their own money first, the Government of Newfoundland was prepared to back a note and to back them and the result of the gamble is that today this Province of Newfoundland is geared to a dollar production, a fresh fish production second to none in the North Atlantic. If it is successful and we hope it will be, then the success of the fisheries of Newfoundland is assured. If it is a failure then charitable people at least, and people who are prepared to be just, will say that those who took a chance did it with the best interests of Newfoundland at heart.

It is only right to pay tribute to the enthusiasm and faith which the Premier of this country has in the future of Newfoundland because if his faith is misplaced and if it is unjustified there is no future for us. Let us go to the new industries which represent a drain on the so-called surplus we had at Ottawa. What is the position in relation to these new industries? I heard it said today by my honourable and learned friend that in the set-up of these industries political considerations took the primary places and rather overshadowed economic consideration. But I wonder if my learned and honourable friend is familiar with the economic position as it exists in those areas where these industries are located as some of you on this side of the House are aware. Let me point out to him that in the Conception Bay area, which includes the district. I represent in part, we have no such thing as basic earning power for our people. Our people, and especially and particularly in the District of Harbour Main, are a most independent people from one angle. They are very industrious. They are very independent. But

their independence has been the result of their having to leave their homes for almost a century now to seek employment in the United States of America. Every skyscraper in Manhattan has had a Newfoundlander take part in its construction. And possibly we would find that some of the loftiest buildings ever constructed claim heritage in the royal old district of Harbour Main. So it was for many years, our people had available to them Montreal and Sydney and New York but not today. Today our people are not as dependent on outside employment as they were years ago, but the same avenues of employment are not open to them. The truth is they have to change their mode of activity.

MR. HOLLETT: I rise to a point of order. My honourable friend is making an excellent speech but it is not on the motion we are now speaking on.

MR. SPEAKER: This amendment lends itself to a very wide scope. I do not uphold the point of order.

MR. LEWIS: On the question of my honourable friend's objection on a point of order, he moved an amendment against the question of taxation and his reason for doing it, as supported by the Leader of the Opposition, was that the money for the industries was used for other purposes. I want to point out the justification for having used the surplus for which so much reference has been made. What I point out is that we have in Conception Bay a chain of buildings financed out of the surplus my honourable and learned friend makes so much reference to. They have been put there for the purpose of providing a basic economy from which our people can obtain a source of sustenance and employment. I submit that no better use could be made of this surplus.

The birch plant to which reference has been made is tied to the natural resources of this country and while it might have been constructed for less money than the actual cost, the fact remains that today many of our people, particularly in my own district, do obtain work in that birch plant.

The machine plant and the rubber plant which have been constructed in Holyrood and to which more derogatory references have been made in this House, is giving employment to one thousand— to fifteen hundred people. It is the first time we had in our area a source of employment where people can go to their homes at the end of the day's work. With reasonable success this should double itself in two years, I hope.

The necessity for increased taxation is evident when we regard the vulnerable position in which we stand in this country. First of all we require a development of our resources and secondly and most important of all we desire and require a base from which our people can obtain a source of livelihood within the four corners of this province. If the last cent in the treasury, in the surplus, is spent for that purpose, it will be spent in a very worthy cause and if, as my learned and honourable friends have said, we have reached the position, Sir, that was Newfoundland, well then we have reached the position, sir, that was contemplated by the terms of Union when they were formulated in 1949 because under these terms of Union the people who were responsible for formulating them, forecast a position within eight years from the date of Union when it would be necessary for somebody to review the entire financial position as it reflected Newfoundland. Somebody was wise

enough to put a clause in which I submit is the saviour of Newfoundland. We can listen to speeches and make a lot of speeches about our financial position but Newfoundland is in the most fortunate position of any self-government in the western world and the position is this, under Term 29 of the Terms of Union with Canada which is the contract signed between the Provincial and Federal Government, the Federal Government of Canada is on the back of the note. The position is this, that it does not matter what the cost of administration of this province is provided it is reasonable, having regard to the necessities of our people. Newfoundland can never go back to them so long as the Dominion of Canada is back of it and sound. The contract is written into Bills and confirmed by the Federal Government of Canada and ratified by the Imperial Government of Britain, that the cost of administration of this country must be within the capacity of our people to pay. That is something that this House and our people should always be conscious of. If the cost of the public service of this country tomorrow were fifty million dollars and not thirty-two, or thirty-three, or thirty-five or thirty-nine million—I do not know what the figure is—

The actual position is this, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the cost of administration of our public services and the ability of our people to pay must be underwritten by the Federal Government; and the incidence of taxation in Newfoundland can never be raised higher than it is in the neighbouring Maritime Provinces. What is more important still; and it has been said by people who pretend to know, and I think said by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and I think with a great deal of justification, that

we are rapidly reaching the limit of our taxation capacity in Newfoundland. If we are, as the member for Fogo says, and well, I associate myself with him—If we have reached now or are about to reach the limit of taxation capacity in this Province, well we have our yardstick and know where we are. The thing for us to do is to provide our public services as quickly and expeditiously as we can when it does not mean anything to us at all. It means the only thing we have to pay is what we are obliged to pay; what we are capable of paying and nothing more.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I submit that the taxation as visualized and reached by the Honourable Minister of Finance should be supported and sustained; and I think he is to be complimented on being able to bring into this House, after five years of Confederation, a budget that is as hopeful and as sound as the one that he has brought in. Sir, I for one oppose most unqualifiedly the amendment proposed by my honourable and learned friend.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I want to occupy perhaps five minutes and perhaps speak to the amendment because I propose to reserve the opportunity to speak to the motion itself. The amendment, as I understand it, is that the Opposition deplores and asks the House to deplore the fact that we have raised taxes in this budget.

MR. COURAGE: Failed to reduce taxes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, failed to reduce taxes—There are one or two facts that are brittle and hard as cut diamonds, that you cannot get away from. One of them is that in the year upon which we have now embarked the total amount of taxation upon the people of Newfoundland proposed in

the estimates, proposed in the budget, for this House to vote is eleven million dollars.

MR. FOGWILL: The overall total?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the total. I will read out the items.

MR. FOGWILL: What about the Federal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman could not have heard what I said—What about the United States? What about Soviet Russia? What about China?

MR. FOGWILL: They don't put taxation on us but the Federal Government of Canada does.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is either stupid naturally or pretends to be; one or the other, because I said—That is the total amount of taxes which the estimates and the budget speech impose upon the people in the current year, and the amount which the Government asks this House to appropriate is eleven millions. We are not talking about the taxes by other governments now. I propose to read the amounts:

Gasoline \$2,370,000; Social Security Asseccment, that is the 3% Sales Tax \$6,700,000; Sales Tax on Fire Insurance premiums \$170,000; Inland Revenue Stamps \$70,000; tax or license on gasoline vendors \$3,800; tax on insurance companies \$4,600; tax on insurance agents \$1,300; License for Saw Mills \$40,000 Inland Fisheries and Games Licenses \$148,000 (this is for the privilege of catching fish and salmon, shooting game, we can call it a tax); Mining Prospectors Licenses \$500; Dog Licenses \$3,000; Timber Lease Rentals \$31,400; Timber Royalties \$40,000; Water Power Rentals

\$6,000 (I am stretching it now, if you can really call this a tax) we charge people for the privilege of having water power and timber and tax minerals out of the land; if one is to call that taxation—I am calling it a tax and including it here. Agricultural Grants and Lease Rentals \$2,200; Mineral Leases \$5,000; Mineral Royalties \$495,000 (That is royalties on Bell Island Ore and Buchans ore and the ore in St. Lawrence; a tax on the mineral products that are taken out of the earth and shipped away by the owners. We collect a small tax and that runs to \$495,000). Motor Vehicle Licenses \$830,000; Drivers Licences \$120,000; fees for examination of drivers \$8,000 and Food Vendors Licenses \$14,000—Total \$11,072,800.

Then the question arises—If we are taxing our people in Newfoundland only eleven million where do we get the thirty-nine million we are spending on current account?

MR. HOLLETT: You forgot the Cancer Control Tax there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is left out—Add that to the total and make it eleven and a half million dollars. It is still less than one cent of every dollar we spend on current account. I will come back to that one cent in a moment. Now we are increasing taxes—Before we come to the increase let me deal with this eleven and a half million dollars towards an expenditure of thirty-nine million, which we are making in this current year. Where does the rest of it come from? From the Government of Canada write off twenty and a quarter million dollars.

MR. HOLLETT: Where do they get it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the moment never mind that. They don't get

it from Newfoundland for the most part—For the most part they don't. I gave the figures here in this very House showing the total amount they took out of Newfoundland and the total amount they paid in. I showed the amount was two to one—They paid into Newfoundland almost two dollars for every one dollar they took out.

MR. FOGWILL: Nonsense!

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend said that once in the National Convention; and he was ashamed to be seen for two days when I got through dealing with it. He came to me outside and said, you certainly landed me.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I was not at any time ashamed to be seen for two days; and I sat through every session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then you had a hide like a rhinoceros.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FOGWILL: Blame him—He started it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am bringing the House to order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, from the Government of Canada we will receive towards this thirty-nine millions the following amounts— In the Department of Finance \$17,900,000; In the Department of Provincial Affairs \$17,500; In the Department of Education \$19,600; In the Department of the Attorney General \$30,000; In the Department of Mines and Resources \$45,300; In the Department of Health \$966,400; In the Department of Public Welfare \$1,127,500; In the Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives \$10,000. In the Department of Labour \$23,300, making a total from

the Government of Canada of \$20,235,700. Now that twenty and a quarter million plus the eleven and a half millions is thirty-one and a quarter millions of the thirty-nine millions.

Where does the rest of the thirty-nine millions come from? The rest of it is here in the estimates, scattered through the various departments in fees and other types of income; and the profit on our liquor which is over half the balance.

MR. FOGWILL: That is a tax.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case the biggest taxmaker is on Water Street because if a profit on goods sold is a tax on the people—God in Heaven how are they taxed! How are they taxing us on Water Street? 70% to 100% on drygoods, or 70% to 150% on drygoods—That is some tax—the Water Street tax. The friends of the honourable gentlemen opposite—they want more of these Water Street merchants in here in this Chamber—God forbid! God forbid! And the people too forbid more Water Street merchants from coming in here.

Now we come to the one cent, the one cent my honourable friend the Minister of Finance proposes to increase in taxation on this Province of Newfoundland, one cent a gallon additional taxation on gasoline.

MR. FOGWILL: That is 3%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman may stand on his head and one cent a gallon is one cent a gallon, and it is a cent a gallon on people who can well afford to pay it.

MR. FOGWILL: They will not admit it is 3%.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Admit one cent? All right it is 3%. One cent a

gallon and 2%—Smart—He worked it out himself too, with a pencil and paper and a ready reckoner—3% —It is a cent a gallon and will bring us in \$150 000, that is what the budget says. That is what the estimates show—\$370,000 is accounted for and then the cent a gallon additional taxation and the normal increase in the number of cars, and therefore the normal increase in consumption of gasoline which has been increasing very rapidly year by year since we came into power and the prosperity we brought with us which enables those thousands upon thousands of people to buy cars and consume millions upon millions of gallons, more gasoline than was ever consumed before. All right, that is a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Now in addition to that we have a quarter of a million on the Cancer Control Tax. That on the thirty-nine millions is less than a cent per dollar as we are increasing taxation in these two ways, a cent a gallon or 3% on the price—my honourable friend opposite, it does not please him, he insists on my admitting it—So when I admitted it he must have been charmed to have his opinion confirmed by the Premier, he won't be fit to talk to for the next two days—the Premier actually confirmed that his mathematics were correct. Now that is one cent to the dollar increased taxation, and this is what the resolution is about. This is what is giving the Opposition sleepless nights. They can't sleep for worrying about the state of Newfoundland — We are putting another cent a gallon increase on our gasoline tax on the people.

Now this Cancer Control Tax, what is it? I am probably out of order in discussing it. There will be opportunity given the House to debate this increase in taxation. My understanding of parliamentary rules makes me think that



it is out of order to discuss a matter which an opportunity will be had for discussing on another occasion, especially if it is an opportunity specifically provided—Perhaps I am out of order—But if I am not out of order in discussing the Cancer Control Tax may I say this: Like the tax of an extra cent on gasoline the five cents you pay when you go to a movie or a bingo game or a ball game and most other forms of entertainment, the five cents you pay extra on your ticket, which in the aggregate from all of us all over Newfoundland in a whole year, with millions upon millions of attendances, in the course of a year, because some people go to the movies say twenty or thirty times a year, and the average person goes to three or four or five events a year and pays five cents each time—approximately fifteen to thirty cents a year is paid and some even pay the tremendous sum of a dollar. You have to go twenty times in a year to the movies or bingo or ball games or something of that order. All of us paying that five cents a time will give the Government a half million dollars—But what for?

MR. HOLLETT: Running expenses on the birch plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is very clever—it just fits—a half a million dollars—and he can prove it—He can turn up a page in the estimates or he can turn to the guarantee in the Bill and he will find an amount of five hundred thousand dollars for the birch plant—But why bring up the birch plant? There is \$125,000 for Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited. There is \$1,600,000 for Bonavista Cold Storage Company, Limited. There is \$3,187,000 for Fishery Products Limited. There is \$120,000 for Hanning Electric. There is \$50,000 for

Northeastern Fisheries Limited and there is \$100,000 for the St. John's Stadium. They could say this Government are taxing everyone, every little child and their faithful followers would see it is properly reported. Every child and widow has to pay five cents tax. For what? So as to give this Government—this outport Government can give one hundred thousand dollars to the stadium for the sports of St. John's—What a chance they are missing.

MR. HOLLETT: To give Dr. Valdmanis.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman may have a transitory triumph in his reference to Dr. Valdmanis—But I assure him it is very transitory, very transitory, his triumph.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no percentage in it, no political future for the honourable gentleman in any reference to that gentleman.

MR. HOLLETT: Nor for you either.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whatever political advantage there is gone for the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, I think I might say at this time that the amendment lends itself to a very wide latitude of discussion, but there are limits, and I think when Dr. Valdmanis gets into this we have reached the limit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I deeply regret these interruptions.

MR. SPEAKER: I deprecate these interruptions—They tend to generate heat in debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I personally agree, and could not agree more to Your Honour's reference to impropriety, to say the least, of dragging in at every opportunity now and then, here and there, in this debate and other debates, reference to Dr. Valdmanis. I suggest that Dr. Valdmanis be left where he belongs—in the courts of justice to deal with,

MR. HOLLETT: That would be nice.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: If I might suggest, the Honourable the Premier is speaking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague from Harbour Main has covered some points I intended to make, and covered them so magnificently that I am reminded of the fact that we hear all too rarely from him. Because if I ever heard a speech containing burning sincerity it was his. There was nothing political about it, nothing at all. It was right out of the man's heart. I believe it came out of his heart because of his work recently as Chairman of the Commission we have set up to prepare Newfoundland's case for the Royal Commission.

May I before I sit down develop just one point, and it is in this connection. In a speech in this House during which Mr. Russell resigned and crossed the floor, he delivered a speech, a very stupid speech, because he advocated, in fact he made a motion, a ridiculous motion, that the Government now forthwith call upon the Government of Canada to appoint a Royal Commission, the Royal Commission provided for in the Terms of Union. This was

two years after Confederation—It could not wait, in his view—The Royal Commission had to be called for at once. I remember a brilliant reply that came from the Attorney General. Mr. Russell, if he did not feel intellectually cheap after hearing the argument of the Attorney General ought to have felt it, and no doubt he did feel it. He is a very bright man whatever else he is. The Attorney General said that to call now, two years after Confederation—and the honourable and learned member for St. John's West will see this if his colleagues don't—He will see it, have no fear of it, he will see it. It was not for nothing that I said; at least we have an Opposition—At least he is a worker, and he is bright—He is always bright.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not your usual stuff.

MR. BROWNE: You called Russell both brilliant and stupid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said a stupid speech—But he is a brilliant man—Is that inconsistent? Cannot a brilliant man make a stupid speech, especially if he has just done something which he to this moment cannot explain—leave the Government, which is the greatest Government Newfoundland ever had—and way go over there—and wonder ever since he did—No wonder the speech he made was stupid—He could not make a brilliant speech having done a stupid thing like that. My honourable friend the Attorney General made a short and devastating reply to Mr. Russell's arguments—His speech was this; he said that to call now, two years after Confederation, for the appointment of the Royal Commission means that we accept the existing standards and levels of public services in Newfoundland as the criterion, yardstick, whereby the

Royal Commission will measure the amount of additional subsidies, if any, to which we are entitled. There is a yardstick. My honourable and learned friend must be aware of that in the terms. There is a yardstick set up. The Royal Commission is to decide, to recommend to the Canadian Government what additional subsidies if any Newfoundland shall get—What for? To enable Newfoundland to do what? To maintain the level and standards of public services reached. When? At the time the review is made. Now if that review had been made three years ago, we would have been stuck with the level and standards of our public services that existed at that time.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask a question? I pointed out today, you were not here, that our expenditure in the coming year is \$20 per head more than that of Nova Scotia.

MR. MURRAY: It should be \$100.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman may or may not be correct, if he is it may or may not be a point—

MR. LEWIS: The yardstick has nothing to do with expenditure. The only yardstick is in relation to taxation.

MR. POWER: May I say a word, Mr. Speaker? That figure does not reveal a true picture, because a great many things that we pay for here out of our current revenue is paid by municipal government in Nova Scotia—One main item is protection from fire, for which we pay three quarters of a million here in St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But my Honourable and learned friend from St. John's West knew that when he spoke just as well then as he does now. He was well aware this afternoon—just as

well aware this afternoon as he was yesterday afternoon, and he is at this moment, well aware of this fact, that what the Government of Nova Scotia spends must have added to it what the municipalities of Nova Scotia spend, and the total of the two, whether they be urban, rural or municipal together with the expenditure of the Government of the province, what these two together make up then is to be compared with what the Government of Newfoundland and such few municipalities and town councils as we have spend between them. That is why I said I did not want to go into that. I said my honourable friend may or may not be correct, and if correct may or may not have a point, I think that is what my honourable colleague had in mind—But I do not intend to go into that.

What we have to compare is not at all the amount of taxation levied on the people of Nova Scotia with the amount levied on the people of Newfoundland, that is in the comparison—It is the burdensomeness of taxation—That is what has to be compared—the burdensomeness of taxation in Newfoundland with the burdensomeness of taxation in the three Maritime Provinces. And that is not all; The burdensomeness in each case must be related to the capacity to pay.

If Mr. Russell's motion of three years ago had been adopted the Royal Commission would have been appointed. Because all we would have to do would be for the Government of Newfoundland to ask to have it appointed by the Government of Canada, and the Royal Commission would have come here to determine what additional subsidies, if any, the Government of Canada should pay to the Newfoundland Government. What for?

To enable the Government of Newfoundland to maintain the level and standard of public services that we had succeeded in reaching only two years after Confederation. Now, we have had another three years, and in these last three years we have raised the level and standards very much above what they were three years ago. But we still don't want the Royal Commission here. We don't want them this year. We want the Royal Commission to come to Newfoundland only at the last moment within the constitutional limits, within which we can operate to get our level and standards raised. Because these are the criteria; these are the yardsticks by which the Royal Commission are ordered, are instructed in the Terms of Union, to measure the amount of additional subsidies we ought to get each year from the Government of Canada.

Now one of the levels of public services is the control of cancer. We have decided that as this is one of the most deadly diseases of all humanity in the world today, we, this Government, ought as a government, in duty bound, to do all we can in the matter of cancer control, so we imposed a tax. We could have increased the three per cent sales tax, but we did not do that. We could have made it four or five per cent. It is five per cent in at least one province not less than three in any province.

MR. HOLLETT: Ontario?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ontario has no sales tax. Not less than three per cent in any of the five provinces with a sales tax—there are five of the ten. It runs from three to five per cent. We have three per cent. We could have raised it. We considered that and we decided against it for this reason that a sales tax, we call it a Social Security Assessment because it was imposed at

a time when we were introducing one law after another to give new social security benefits to our people, old age pensions, widows, mothers' allowances and crippled persons and so on and as we introduced these new laws we knew we had to raise the money to do it so we introduced this tax known as Social Security Assessment. We could have increased it. It is like an ad valorem customs duty, the revenue from sales tax goes up as prices go up and comes down as prices come down, the total amount we get from the tax swells or shrinks according as the general price level in the province or in the world swells or shrinks. The volume of the price level—if it swells we take in more revenue and if this ad valorem customs tariff or tax which is what tax is, and if this goes down then we get less revenue and we could have a precipitate fall if a depression should materialize which I do not anticipate. Attendance at ball games and bingo may rise and fall in the same way but not as precipitate, unless people do a tremendous thing, lose their taste for entertainment. That is not likely to happen. They may lose their means to pay for entertainment. We will face that if it comes. We want to raise the standard of education and services in regard to cancer.

The teachers asked for a raise in pay and we give them a million dollars. We gave the civil servants a million dollars. All over Newfoundland this clamour for more attention to roads, more existing roads to be improved. We are doing it, spending millions of dollars, more than we have in previous years. That is to win the election this year.

I listened with great interest to my honourable friend's broadcast and he asked the people all over the island to

suggest candidates. I would suggest he have it as a prize in a bingo game, a candidacy in his party or he might put it up as a prize not for two or three or four thousand dollars but the privilege of being the candidate in this next election.

MR. HOLLETT: Or a beer license.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is called to order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In this year there is a noted rise in the standards and levels of our public services. We hope next year there will be an equally great rise in standards of public service because we feel—and if my honourable friends could forget about this election in 1955, if my honourable friends will forget about this general election they have decided to hold and how could they hold an election without us. We ought to be consulted in a thing like that.

MR. HOLLETT: Not we, you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I ought to be consulted. All I could tell him was to get busy, get cracking, because he lost so many elections his party said I never gave them enough notice. I said to them "get busy for the coming elections, when that election is."

This year and next year we want the standards and levels of public service to increase and increase considerably because probably next year 1955, let us say at the end of 1955, which is March 31st, 1956, let us say at the end of the next financial year following the present one we get the two financial years during which to raise the levels and standards of public services until, instead of the thirty-nine millions, and I will not attempt to forecast what the budget will be next year, say instead of thirty-nine millions our expenditure

goes to forty-five million on current account then this forty-five million will mean more cottage hospitals than we now have to maintain, more nurses and doctors than we now have. Forty-five millions will mean more for the Honourable the Minister for Public Works to spend annually on roads and bridges in this province. More for the Minister of Public Welfare to spend on welfare. More for the Minister of Education to spend on teachers' salaries. More for the Minister of Finance to pay the civil servants. More for all Ministers. More for housing and municipalities and water and sewers in outport communities. That will be the yardstick, that is the yardstick which the Royal Commission are obligated, not because they like us, but because they are obligated in the Terms of Union to accept as the measure of how much additional subsidies the Government of Newfoundland will require to enable the Government to maintain those levels without imposing taxation on the people more burdensome than the burdensomeness of the taxation in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, having regard to capacity to pay. It is because my honourable friend from Harbour Main-Bell Island is immersed in this problem day and night, with Mr. Grouchy, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Perlin and Senator Pratt who is confined to the hospital in Toronto—He and his associates are engaged day and night in preparing Newfoundland's case. Is this Government going to be so stupid? No one will call us stupid. They can't call us stupid or lazy, they can say we work too hard and long and we work on Sundays and they can say we are too energetic but they can't say we are stupid.

MR. HOLLETT: Who said you can't be called stupid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said it,

MR. HOLLETT: Nothing to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. We would be stupid though if entitled to call for the appointment of the Royal Commission and having set up the Commission to prepare our case and we sabotaged our own case by failing to provide the right yardstick for 1956. Would not that be stupid?

MR. BROWNE: But this is what puzzles me. I have comparative expenditure between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and I find that our expenditure is way ahead of Nova Scotia at the present time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is what? That is not the comparison. Will my honourable friend take Term 29 and read it some time. As he is a member of our Legislature instead of the great Parliament, it is his duty to familiarize himself with this very important term of the Terms of Union.

MR. HOLLETT: Is my honourable friend, the Premier, arguing for increased taxation, for further increased taxation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am arguing for increased expenditure. I am arguing for higher levels and standards of public services. I am arguing that our Newfoundland people ought to have them as in New Brunswick. I am arguing that they ought to have them as in Nova Scotia. I am arguing that they ought to have schools as good as they have them in New Brunswick. I am arguing that our Newfoundland people ought to have hospitals as good as they have in the Maritime Provinces.

MR. HOLLETT: So we have them, what we have of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even that is not correct. It is more correct to say we

have as many as they have. Our people—as a matter of fact this thing is so big it is cheap to have a cheap debate on it. It affects the life of every Newfoundlander.

MR. HOLLETT: Do not make it cheap.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend has made it cheap. His follower who moved this resolution wants to reduce taxation to reduce expenditure. This means to sabotage Newfoundland, the lowering of our public services.

MR. BROWNE: I do not think the Premier is implying he is trying to sabotage Newfoundland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say he is trying to sabotage Newfoundland but I repeat, to reduce taxation is to reduce expenditure and to reduce expenditure is to sabotage Newfoundland. The honourable gentleman is very sincere. His sincerity is sometimes so sincere it is known by another word with the letter F. I think he is a patriotic Newfoundlander like all of us but like all of us he can get a blinker on him and he can't see up or down or on either side of him but straight ahead. It is the plain duty of this House to raise the levels of the standards of public services for two reasons, one, because our people need it, and two, because these levels and standards in 1957 will be taken by the Royal Commission as the yardstick for measuring the amount of additional subsidies they think Ottawa should pay into the pockets of Newfoundland. Are not the honourable gentlemen opposite a little bit ashamed at the petty character of this amendment? Are they not a little bit regretful that they should have sunk so low as to suggest



we stop raising the standards of our public services, of schools and other public services?

MR. HOLLETT: That was not suggested by my learned friend or by me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not written in the resolution. The amendment is that this House regrets that the Government has failed to reduce taxation which now rests so heavily on all sections of the public. I can hear them groan. We are reeking with prosperity such as Newfoundland has never known before and all the honourable gentlemen can say is people groan under the burden of unemployment.

MR. HOLLETT: Eighteen thousand people unemployed and twelve thousand fishermen not fishing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does he even know twelve fishermen who are not fishing, let alone twelve thousand? Who invented that figure? Who counted it? Who invented it? Twelve thousand. He must have read it in a paper. Who counted them? That this House regrets that the Government has failed to reduce taxation.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes and cut out waste and expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If we take them at their word and reduce taxation we get less revenue. If we cut the Social Security Assessment tax out altogether we lose 6.7 million. The only revenue we collect is 11½ million.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He flies in the face of estimates and the Auditor General. A Cornwall bull. If we abolish that tax and we lose the 6.7 million what does that leave us from 11½

million? 5.1 million. The total taxation we are then levying will be 5.1 million. What will we stop? We are out 6.7 million. Will we stop building roads?

MR. HOLLETT: If you want to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the honourable gentleman opposite wants to lose the 6.7 million. What will we stop spending? Stop spending on building roads?

MR. HOLLETT: We had a surplus of six or seven million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is how we get it. Could we spare it on roads, hospitals, schools and on economic development, on fishery development? Which of these would my honourable friends say we should not do? They say, reduce your taxation, and we ask them for an example and the example is the Social Security Assessment but we say that gets us 6.7 million dollars. What will we economize on to the extent of 6.7 million?

MR. HOLLETT: Cut out waste and extravagance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On roads?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On schools?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On hospitals?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the vast bulk of what we spend. Are they not thoroughly ashamed of themselves? If they are not I will leave them to the tender mercies of the Minister of Finance and I hope the Minister will not take the honourable member seriously but unseriously and deliver an unserious speech about unserious men. Mr. Speaker, is not all this a waste of words? There is no election this year.

MR. HOLLETT: We have your word for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman does not know whether I am referring to municipal election, in Bonavista for instance. His job is to find out and mine not to let him find out. There may be one in some congressional district of the United States. I have some other points but I think I will save them for the main debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is that these words do stand part of the motion. "That this House regrets that the Government has failed to reduce taxation which now rests so heavily on all sections of the public." All in favour say "Aye," Contrary "Nay." The motion stands as is.

Amendment defeated.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if my honourable friends want to proceed, but it is getting a bit late—Perhaps they would prefer to wait until tomorrow. In that case, unless we have any other business, we might adjourn until tomorrow. We have a Cabinet meeting in the morning and cannot very well meet in the forenoon.

MR. HOLLETT: We are ready, but it is hardly worth it.

MR. CURTIS: We might find a small Bill to go on with for a quarter of an hour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not for the purpose of securing a position, but I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when we had a Committee on the Social Assistance Bill it was disposed of with the exception of one

minor amendment. I understand that has been circulated. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the House might resolve itself into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

MR. MORGAN, Chairman of Committee:

Committee of the whole on a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Social Assistance Act."

DR. POTTLE: Mr. Chairman, there are two amendments, which we have not yet considered. The first is an amendment to Clause 24 providing for a paragraph (y) to sub-clause one and reading: "Respecting any other matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the purposes of this Act" I move that amendment.

Motion carried.

DR. POTTLE: The second proposed amendment, Mr. Chairman, has to do with the present Clause 29, which proposes to have an amendment as follows: "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by proclamation, repeal the Mothers Allowance Act, Chapter 63 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1953 and the Dependents Allowance Act and the purpose of this amendment is to avoid the possibility that people receiving allowances might find a gap between the coming into effect of this Act and their getting their allowance under the old Acts. In other words we would like some time to lag so that when this Act comes into being we will not repeal the existing statutes until we are quite sure that the people concerned are covered by social assistance who now are covered by the Mothers' Allowances and Dependents' Allowance. I think this is quite essential, Sir, to protect the people who would be receiving

Mothers' and Dependents' Allowances as the case may be.

JUNE 10th, 1954

I move the amendment as read.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that the Minister cannot move the amendment.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment.

Amendment carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. Report accepted. On motion amendments read a first and second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to ask that I may on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada."

I also ask leave that I may on tomorrow introduce a Bill "An Act to Provide for Regulations of Ferries Used in Transportation of Persons for Compensation."

MR. CURTIS: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Thursday, at 3:00 of the clock.

On motion the House then adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1954, at 3:00 of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

The House met at three of the clock, in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I would call to the attention of honourable members the copy of the journals of parliaments on decisions. Honourable members might have some interest in that. It contains the Speech from the Throne delivered to the Australian Parliament. As I say, it might have some significance.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, last night in a speech in this House the honourable and learned member for St. John's West made a series of charges against Mr. Chester Dawe and J. C. Pratt and Company, that these two persons had committed what would have to be regarded and treated as criminal actions or offenses against the criminal code.

I wish to inform the House that in that matter I have followed the course that I followed on another inquiry into the irregularities in the Mental Hospital reported to me, and in the Valdmanis Case. That is to say I called in the R.C.M.P. and requested them to make a complete police inquiry, police investigation, I think perhaps, is the better word for it.

The investigation has begun. Last night the honourable and learned member for St. John's West who made the charges offered, at my request, to furnish me with the evidence he gave in his speech. I would be grateful if he would pass that evidence to me without delay so that I can pass it over immediately to the police whom I have asked to investigate the matter.

I have informed the R.C.M.P. of all the allegations made last night by the honourable and learned gentleman. I have informed them in such detail as my memory allowed me to do, of the exact nature of the evidence given last night in that speech. It would, I think, be most helpful now if the honourable and learned gentleman would pass the information to me without any further delay even in an hour if he could arrange to do it that quickly, so that without any delay I could put these letters and catalogues and the like in the hands of the R.C.M.P.

Last night when I was taken quite unawares by the honourable gentleman's charges, because I never had the slightest reason in the world to suspect Mr. Dawe of any dishonesty, and beyond the allegations of the honourable gentleman I still have no suspicions in the wide world of Mr. Dawe, because, as I say, I was taken unawares last night and before I had time to think the matter over I suggested, out of hand, the appointment of a select committee of this House to investigate these charges. On further reflection I came to the conclusion that an inquiry conducted by this House through a select committee would be a proper procedure if allegation had been made against a member of this House.

The allegations however were not made against a member of this House but rather against a member of the general public for which reason it appears to me that the normal procedure is the one I followed, that is to call in the R.C.M.P. and request them to institute at once, without delay, a proper and official investigation. Mr. Speaker, may I in the meantime make one further statement.

When the honourable and learned

gentleman stated in his speech that my signature appeared on the invoice in question my immediate reaction was to state that it did not. But I was informed this morning, this forenoon, by the Treasury Department that the Auditor General had come to me with a considerable number of invoices of goods purchased for the birch plant for my signature which I gave in his presence at once and delivered the invoices back to him. I had forgotten that I had even done that—Certainly I know no more than that about the matter.

I hope I made that clear—the only invoices I signed were those brought to me in a considerable number, possibly hundreds, possibly dozens, I don't really remember that. In fact I have not, even now that I have been told by the Treasury that the Auditor General brought me these bills for my signature, even now, I still don't remember the occasion, because the House will of course realize I have lived a pretty busy life; thousands of details have occurred in the last five years and have gone completely out of my memory although other thousands are still fresh in my mind, and the only invoices I signed were those brought to me by the Auditor General in a bulk, a large number, which I promptly signed and handed back to him. That is all I know about the signature on that or any other invoices.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. J. R. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the St. John's Butchers' Association which reads as follows:

"To the Honourable House of Assembly: Whereas your petitioners represent more than 90% of the licensed

butchers in the City of St. John's, and whereas butcher shops deal in extremely perishable goods and whereas the closing of butcher shops on Saturdays will cause considerable loss of business to the trade and great inconvenience to the public particularly during the summer months of the year, and whereas the butchers and their employees are in complete agreement on these matters your petitioners therefore humbly pray that butcher shops may be allowed to remain open on Saturdays until the hour of 6:00 p.m. and that the said butcher shops keep Wednesday as a whole holiday instead; for which your petitioners will ever humbly pray."

This petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by the St. John's Retail Butchers Association. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition of the St. John's Retail Butchers Association in representing more than 90% of the butchers in the City of St. John's. The employers and employees of these butcher shops number about 170 persons, and as the petitioners state, the employees are in complete agreement with the employers in holding that Wednesday would be a better day for their whole holiday then would Saturday. They pointed out also that meat is something which has to be pure. If the butcher shops close on Saturday the meat has to be purchased on Friday and thus has to be kept throughout Saturday and part of Sunday. This would mean great inconvenience for the people who do not have refrigeration. They pointed out also the great loss in trade to them, which was proven by facts and figures last year.

I think, Sir, that in a case where hardship will be done to the employees and where there is complete agreement

that the matter should be given some consideration by the government. I therefore recommend this petition to the House and ask that it be laid on the Table of the House and referred to the department concerned.

Motion carried.

### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

None.

### **Giving notice of motion**

HON. L. R. CURTIS: (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, there is a bill before the House for second reading: A Bill, "An Act to Provide for Licenses of Insurance Companies carrying on business in Newfoundland." I would ask leave to introduce a new bill replacing that—"A Bill An Act Further to Amend the Insurance Companies Act." I give notice I will later on today ask leave to introduce that.

### **Giving notice of Question**

None.

### **Answer to questions**

MR. W. R. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the Minister of Public Works, No. 71, April 30, the number of contracts let for plumbing and electrical installations etc. I have not as yet received any answer to that. I wonder if the minister could tell me.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in reply to my honourable and learned friend, Question 71, referred to by him, has been duplicated and repeated as the request for information is practically the same in Question 98, asked by the honourable member for St. John's West. I have received the information this morning. It is now being typed, and I hope to be in a position to present it to the House tomorrow.

### Orders Of The Day

Third Readings: A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Social Assistance"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly"—On motion—

MR. CURTIS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, perhaps that order might be deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable member leave to withdraw the motion?

On motion order deferred.

A Bill, "An Act Further to amend the City of St. John's Act"—On motion, read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Second Reading of Bill:

"An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor amendment to the Public Utilities Act. It is designed to give the Board of Public Utilities Jurisdiction over buses which are plying in areas not franchised; and which gives the Board the right to issue writs in such processes. The only buses which will be affected are buses which have no franchise granted to them under the Motor Carriers Act. I don't think any explanation is needed. It is merely that the word "buses" is added to other things. I move the second reading of this bill.

On motion bill read a second time—Ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium:"

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply) : Mr. Speaker we have already in this House given certain powers to the St. John's City Council for the raising of funds for the erection of the stadium. This particular bill gives the St. John's City Council the powers to set up a commission to look after and run the maintenance, operation and control of the stadium. Provisions are set there for members of the council: The powers given to the members deal with such things as safety and decorum, seats etc. Then the final section deals with financial control of the stadium council, and auditing. It also provides that any reserve which may be built up, may be used by the Council towards the Council's terms of operations.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion bill read a second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association:

HON. P. FORSEY (Minister of Health) : Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to point out that the Act presently in existence which this bill was designed to replace, was passed some forty years ago and has consequently become outmoded and quite outdated.

The present bill differs from the old bill in two respects: The present bill



will allow the Association to prescribe courses of training and periods of training for members of the Association. In the second respect it gives the Association some disciplinary supervision over the members of the organization. For example, in the old Act a man or a pharmacist would dispense dope, and the Association would have no authority to revoke his license. The present Act, as I said before, is designed to enable the Association to have disciplinary action over its members. I might say that any of the rules and regulations which the Association may pass in the interest of the Association will have to receive the assent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

These are the two main changes in the proposed bill, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the honourable minister a question—I did not hear whether he stated, that the Pharmaceutical Association in existence at the present time has seen this and approved the draft before the House now?

MR. FORSEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill has the approval of the Pharmaceutical Association. As a matter of fact they have collaborated with the department on the actual drafting of it.

On motion bill read a second time, and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland:"

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the second reading of

this Bill. It is being done at the request of the Newfoundland Historical Society.

The position is that in common with other countries it has been a long established practice for a country to have a floral emblem, such as the Rose of England and the Shamrock of Ireland, etc. In accordance with this practice the Pitcher Plant has long been regarded as the floral emblem of Newfoundland, and there was a supposition that it was so designated by Queen Victoria. But in the last year or two we have had numerous inquiries from abroad and upon looking into the matter we found this supposition did not have too much substance. What did happen was that in 1864 an Act was passed in this House that copper coin of this country be put on a proper basis, and an order was then passed to the Minister in England with a request that some floral emblem be put on it. The copper coin of that day had the pitcher plant placed on it, or as the proper name for it is, the "Sarracenia, Purpurea."

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, although there was not much substance to the tradition that Queen Victoria had designated it as the national floral emblem, it has long been requested to be our floral emblem. It is therefore at the request of the Historical Society we are bringing in this Act to make it law.

I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I should say a word in this connection—There are so many plants in process requiring money I don't know what they will do in the future now that this is to become law that there is a floral emblem of Newfoundland.

I take it, it would be the minister's desire that we walk with ceremony and circumspection.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only in that but in every connection.

MR. HOLLETT: I get the point, Sir. I take it the Premier has something in his mind—if he would care to express it I would yield to him.

It is too bad in one way that the honourable minister had to upset the tradition in the matter. As a matter of fact I did not know the tradition relating to Queen Victoria. Anyway I am very happy, as I am quite sure we all are, to have a floral emblem by way of law. I shall in future do my best not to trample too many of them underfoot.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, there is one further point about this plant that I did not bring out; it is predaceous, and can devour a fly hovering over it. It could be symbolic of our economic history.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually, Mr. Speaker, it is a perfect piece of symbolism of the mercantile system. In fact the flower is sometimes known as the Indian Drinking Cup. There is within this cup-like part a sweetish fluid that would be the bait. The fly enticed by this bait goes into the cup, and then like a flash the cup closes and the fly is devoured promptly, and it is through this means that the life of the plant is sustained.

Bill read a second time, on motion ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, an Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

it is beginning to be appreciated in Newfoundland that jurisdiction in fishery matters is divided between the Parliament of Canada on the one hand and the Legislature of the Province on the other. The jurisdiction of Canada as Canada, of the Parliament of Canada, extends to fish in the sea, extends to the act of taking fish out of the water and extends up to the moment the fish is landed on the coast, and it then ends until that fish later is exported from the province whereupon it comes under federal jurisdiction again. But in between those two points, i.e. when the fish is landed in Newfoundland until the fish reaches the point of being exported it is simply a piece of property, and as property and civil rights are provincial in jurisdiction so the fish during that period is under the jurisdiction of the Legislature of Newfoundland; and the Legislature have given the Government the necessary authority.

This is a bill, which if the House passes and it receives Royal Assent, authorizes the Government to exercise the necessary jurisdiction over fish as property. It does that by enabling the Lieutenant-Governor-in Council to prescribe grades, quality and standards of fish for marketing, regulations respecting the handling, processing, storing, packaging, marking, transporting, making and instituting of fish regulations respecting the quality and specifications for containers, the making and inspection of containers and the making of regulations regarding the registry of establishments, and regulations providing for the issue of licenses and requiring the licensing of persons handling, processing, storing, transporting and marketing fish and of vehicles and establishments, and prescribing and attach-

ing conditions, and attaching different conditions of licenses in respect to different areas of the Province. Then to make regulations prohibiting the handling, processing, storing, grading and transportation of fish in accordance with regulations. Regulations for the sanitation in connection with fish; and prescribing fees and prohibiting the marketing of any fish or containers under any grade name or standard prescribed by the regulations unless all the requirements of the Act, and these regulations with respect thereto, have been provided for, nor under any name calculated to mislead or deceive. The rest of the Bill deals with conciseness of detail, but the hearing of the legislation is giving the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council jurisdiction in fact, in law, by giving it power to make regulations over all phases of the handling of fish as property, as fish rather than as fishery. As fishery the jurisdiction is already in the possession of the Parliament of Canada.

It may come as something of a surprise to the House to learn that no legislation exists presently giving the government the undoubted authority that it exercises within provincial jurisdiction. It is undoubted that the province has the jurisdiction, and it is rather surprising that no statute has been enacted up to now and that is exactly what this Bill does.

Now it is at least possible, and it is indeed more than possible, it is quite probable that some if not all of the powers of the Government that this Act would confer will be carried out by federal agents appointed for the purpose by the Government of Newfoundland to be provincial agents, just as certain provincial agents act as federal agents by appointment of the Government of Canada. In other

words what frequently happens is that one government works through the civil servants of another government; one government exercises its own powers and jurisdiction through the instrument of the civil servants of the other government. We have a number of instances of that in Newfoundland at the present time. For instance, the Fishery Loan Board are a provincial board, but are the agents of the Government of Canada in certain matters. Similarly we might well appoint civil servants or employees of the Government of Canada to be our agents in connection with some of the activities envisaged in this present bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't see anything very much in this bill to object to at all. But it does seem to me, speaking for myself, that there seems to be considerable conflict or danger of conflict between the government's claim that fish which comes from the sea up to the time it is marketed comes under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, of the Legislature.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the Provincial Government, I take it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the Legislature, the House of Assembly. If the honourable gentleman will allow me? The Legislature by passing this Act might pass its own authority to that extent over to the Government, but the authority lies with the Legislature.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all very well in one way, Mr. Speaker, but we must remember, and it is becoming more and more apparent every day, the marketing of our products in the fisheries, all branches of the fisheries,

certainly come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It seems to me, therefore, that the people who are going to be responsible for the marketing of codfish, salmon, lobster, etc. should have some connection with the grading and inspection of the article for the marketing of which they are responsible.

The Honourable the Premier has said that undoubtedly they will have to assign inspectors appointed through this Legislature. But I am always afraid when there are two people to do one thing nobody does it properly. I think we have all had experience of that nature. Whilst we don't want to give up too much, we don't want to give up any authority over property rights, still I think that—and while I have no objection to the bill, I still think a very close collaboration will have to be kept with the Federal Department of Fisheries. Undoubtedly it is a fact that a more particular inspection of all our products for export will have to be made if we are again to enter into markets which we appear to have lost at the present time. One of the reasons, I believe and know for a fact, why we lost considerable of our markets in both Portugal and Spain is the fact that on occasions our fish arrived there in pretty much of a decomposed condition. Whether that was the fault of the people on this side or whether it went bad enroute is another matter. But we do know that when an article turns up in a rotten condition there are very few people going to buy it.

I notice under this Act that the inspector may seize any fish, and he may sell it, and the money from it goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I suggest that is a very good way for the fishermen selling the fish, have the inspector come and see the lot and

sell it to the Federal Government, if you like, and the proceeds go back into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I am sure the Premier must have thought of that when the section was put in there.

We have no objections at all to this bill, Sir. We do believe our fish is being inspected in a much more thorough way than it has been in the past. I am wondering—Under the Federal Fisheries Act, I believe there were inspection rules, and I believe they were carried out by the Federal Inspectors. Perhaps the Premier will be able to tell me whether or not these inspectors will also insist on their own inspection relative to these fisheries which are meant for export. I have a feeling that they will. I have a feeling that, if they are going to be responsible for the marketing, as they have already announced—I think today I heard where they have signed an agreement to sell, I think, five hundred thousand dollars worth of fish to Italy—if the Federal Department signed an agreement to sell that much fish to Italy it stands to reason they will have to certify the condition of the fish when it leaves here. I am pointing that out because I am quite sure everybody is most anxious to do everything possible to assist our fisheries. I have seen fish in all stages of decomposition being inspected, Sir, by what we used to call in the past, cullers, and I have seen fish so high they smelled to high heaven, as the fellow said. On the other hand I have seen some very excellent fish, at least in my opinion, being thrown out by the culler. I won't go into reasons given for that. But it is most important, if we are to have inspectors, that we have consistency, men who know good fish from bad, and know how to suggest to the fishermen just what to do to make

better quality. I notice it says here; "Fish" means all sorts of fish. I think that is breaking another tradition, because "Fish" has always been known as codfish, and nothing else. So it seems that this government is out to break traditions. We support the bill, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point—My honourable friend referred particularly to the matter of marketing. He ought to remember that marketing comes under two headings, foreign marketing and inter-provincial marketing. Marketing that goes outside the province, inter-provincial and foreign marketing, marketing to the other provinces of Canada and inter-provincial marketing within the province. Now within the province undoubtedly the government has jurisdiction and in the other case the Parliament of Canada has it.

Now, another point, the Government of Canada under the Terms of Union, have up to now inspected our fish as part of the terms of union. That will be so until the Canadian Fisheries Act is proclaimed whereupon Canada ceases as Canada, i.e. the Parliament of Canada ceases to be responsible for the inspection of our fish as it is now inspected. But at that point the Meat Act and the Canned Foods Act of Canada, Federal Statutes of the Parliament of Canada, will come into effect. Under authority of that Act the Government of Canada, through its agents can and will inspect fish at the point of export for export purposes so as to maintain the standards and quality of Canada, because at that point it has in a sense ceased to be a Newfoundland product and it becomes a product of all Canada. It must, therefore, as it goes out to foreign markets, carry the prestige of Canada as Canada. So

under the Meat and Canned Foods Act, the Government of Canada inspects it before it permits it to leave Canadian soil and go off to a foreign soil.

MR. HOLLETT: That applies to bulk fish too?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Fish comes under the Meats and Canned Foods Act. That I believe is the only Act of Parliament of Canada which vests in the government some of the authority that lies in parliament to inspect fish as an article of export, because Trade and Commerce are federal in jurisdiction. Just as they inspect wheat or any other food stuff designed for export from Canada so, to maintain the standard of Canadian prestige as a great exporting nation, so similarly they already in other provinces inspect fish under the Meat and Canned Foods Act, whereas in Newfoundland they inspect it under one of the Terms of Union, which will cease as and when the Canadian Fisheries Act is proclaimed to have come into effect in Newfoundland. That has not happened yet. I don't know if my honourable colleague who has now come into the Chamber is aware of when exactly the Canadian Fisheries Act is to be proclaimed.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): It has not been decided as yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will be a matter of months, maybe before the year is over and maybe not until next year. Meantime it is really essential we get our own legislation to get authority to step into the vacuum, the gap.

MR. BROWNE: I draw the attention of the minister, as a matter of fact

there is one Federal Act, the Pickled Fish Act, I don't know how far it affects this.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, an Act to Amend the Dog Act:

HON F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources) : Mr. Speaker, it seems every minister of Agriculture or of Mines and Resources of this Province and country has had something to do with a Dog Act either introducing a new or making amendments to the old. It would be my hope, and I may as well confess it, I would have the pleasure this time of introducing a new Dog Act, one which would I hope outdo all other Dog Acts for a number of reasons which I don't think I need give here now

MR. SMALLWOOD : Do give us the reasons.

DR. ROWE : That Dog Act has not been introduced, but we are introducing an amendment to the Act, and this amendment affects only Labrador, it does not affect the Island of Newfoundland.

I might say that since the day this was circulated my honourable friends on the other side wished for a postponement of discussion on this. It is perfectly all right with me and this side. However, it may be that there will not be any need for that postponement of discussion on this. It is in it, Section 13, which is very short, and it reads: In all towns, settlements and villages in that part of Labrador between Cape Harrison and Cape Chidley (I might interrupt to say; that is the part commonly referred to

as Northern Labrador today under the jurisdiction of Labrador Affairs). In that section all persons being the owner of or having the control of dogs must have them penned or chained up between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. when not under the immediate control of the person capable of controlling them. In other words the dog-owners in Labrador are to have their dogs under control between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.

MR. COURAGE : If the honourable minister will allow me, how will the dogs know the time?

MR. BROWNE : Watch dogs?

DR. ROWE : What happened there, of course, is that dogs have always been roaming around in the daytime, and because they are roaming around in the daytime they are also for the most part roaming around at night as well. When we speak of dogs in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to bear in mind that, I suppose, the average family in Northern Labrador has about a dozen or probably more dogs. That has its humorous side, I might say, but it also has its serious side. During the past few years a number of people, mostly children, have been eaten by dogs in Labrador. The House may not be aware that during the past two years at any rate, attacks on human beings by dogs have occurred in the Northern half where no such scheme as I have just read applies. In the Southern half of Labrador, dogs are subject to some control, at least, to the same laws and regulations as in Newfoundland, and I know personally in the majority of cases in the Straits of Belle Isle the dogs are under control in the daytime either in



pens or chained up. In the Northern Labrador that is not the case. As a result, only last year, at least two and maybe more children were eaten by dogs, and several others were attacked and were seriously mauled and mutilated. In fact one child had to spend several months here in the hospital in St. John's.

The amendment to the Dog Act, which I am introducing here on behalf of the Government, calls for the repeal of that section I have just read, and for the substitution of a new section, which will make dogs on Northern Labrador subject to the same laws and regulations as are dogs on all other parts of the Province. I might say I have received considerable representations from the citizens of that Northern part of Labrador on that matter, from people who are dog-owners themselves, and practically every one is, and people who have written me only in the past week saying that they have not allowed their children to go outside unattended by adults during the last ten months because of dogs.

There is one other amendment, in Section 14 of the Old Act, which gave a ranger or someone designated by him the power to shoot dogs in Northern Labrador. That is repealed and we recommend that in its place we should have a section saying: "Any dog found at large contrary to the provisions of Section 13 may be destroyed by a constable or any person generally or specifically authorized by the Minister of Mines and Resources in that behalf." I think the need for that will be apparent, when I point out the RCMP detachment at Fairhaven has four or five hundred miles of coastline to cover, and naturally there must be parts of the district

they cannot visit more than once or twice a year. That will be giving the minister power to appoint and designate persons with the authority to shoot dogs that may be roaming around.

I move the second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: I think we ought to say something on that one. I think we ought to make a law that every minister of Mines and Resources henceforth should bring in a Dog Act. That has been traditional.

I see in this Act the political demise of the Minister of Mines and Resources. A minister who gives a man orders on the Labrador to shoot the dogs is finished politically on Labrador. I always try to look into every Act and see for what reason it is introduced. It has always dawned on me, the reason for this Act is based on an amendment made by the Honourable the Premier. He stated he is intending to take a trip to Labrador. Naturally, therefore, they want all dogs tied up. Certainly we support the bill.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited:"

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, for the past four years or so this government has made a number of agreements with large mining corporations and companies whereby those companies could do exploration work in this Province. The Crown Mines (Lands and Quarries) Act gives the Lieuten-

ant-Governor-in-Council the power to make these agreements, and does not obligate the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, does not place on them the responsibility of submitting these agreements to the Legislature for confirmation. That power is in the Act. However, it is becoming the practice on the part of this government to submit those agreements to the House for confirmation for two reasons (1) because it is one way of giving the House and the general public an idea of what is being done and (2) because most of these companies are very large corporations such as this one for example, and they like to have, I think it can be said, their agreements ratified by the Legislature.

This agreement here which I am introducing today is one which was made last year between the Government and New Jersey Zinc. It is what we might call a small agreement compared with the ones made with Falconbridge and Frobisher etc. Nevertheless we feel it should be introduced here. It follows the pattern without any deviation in any particular or any principle of all the others which we submitted to this House. There is nothing actually new in it at all. I introduced several last year, one, I remember, American Metal. The exact wording is followed as in that. The only difference is in the delineation of the areas and the amount of land involved. This gives the New Jersey Zinc the right for two years to explore some twenty-five square miles of land in the interior of Newfoundland. At the end of these two years, in accordance with the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act they then have the right to select for development license a maximum of four square miles from that twenty-five and for two years they have the right, and incidentally

for those two years or for however long they maintain the right, not in excess of two years, they must pay the nominal Royalty amount of rental, which is fifty cents an acre. At the end of these two years they then have the right to apply for a mining license. That follows the pattern set out in the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act—First an expiration lease on a large area then a development lease on a reduced area and then, if their findings make it desirable for them to do so, they apply for a mining license.

This area is twenty-five square miles to begin with. What they have to spend is slightly less in proportion to that which is being spent for exploration by other companies, such as Falconbridge and American Metals, who have larger areas. They have to spend twenty thousand dollars, of which not less than ten thousand dollars shall be spent in any one year.

I am very happy to be able to advise the House that during the last year New Jersey Zinc spent considerably in excess of the maximum amount they have to spend. They have made their report to us, as they are compelled to do by this Act, and I believe that so far their exploration there has given some promise. That is as far as we can say—I move second reading of this Bill covering an agreement with New Jersey Zinc and the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker—

DR. ROWE: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that bill was only circulated this afternoon and if our honourable friend would like to have it deferred it is all right with us.

On motion debate adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act";

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the National Flag is Chapter 272 of the Revised Statutes. It is an Act which has been on our statute books for a number of years. The present enactment deals with section 4 of the Act, which I will read for the benefit of all the members. I might say this Act, too, is only now being circulated. But it is such a simple Act I think perhaps the House will follow it without needing time to consider it. Of course if anybody does want time to consider it, it is all right.

Section 4 says: "The Union Jack with the badge of Newfoundland, (as described in the schedule) emblazoned in the centre thereof on a circular white ground and surrounded by a green garland shall be flown by the Lieutenant Governor or other officer administering the Government when embarked on a ship or vessel."

Then in the schedule: The badge consists of a replica of Mercury, the God of Commerce and Merchandise, presenting to Britannia a Fisherman who in a kneeling attitude is offering the harvest of the sea; all as described in the Great Seal of the Colony. Above the device in a scroll are the words "Terra Nova" and below, the motto "Haec Tibi Don a Fero."

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has asked us if we could amend this Act by adding the words "on land or at sea." So that the new section shall be—"as flown by the Lieutenant-Governor or other officer administering the Government on land or when embarked on a ship or vessel." The new words are "on land or."

In the present Act the flag shall be flown by him when embarked on a ship or vessel. He has asked that he be permitted to use the same flag on land.

I would move the second reading of this bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Attorney General a question: Is the background the Union Jack or is it in the centre or in the corner or any place?

MR. CURTIS: The Union Jack. It would be in the corner.

MR. BROWNE: Does it say that here?

MR. CURTIS: It says the Union Jack is hereby declared to be the National Flag of the Province of Newfoundland and in Section 4—The Union Jack with the badge of Newfoundland as described in the schedule emblazoned on it in the centre thereof on a circular white ground. I presume the flag used would be the red Union Jack, the Red Ensign with the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland emblazoned on it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the Union Jack with the Coat of Arms in the dead centre. That is also on a circular white ground.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest the only principle that seems to be involved there is that: "Shall the Lieutenant Governor be permitted to use the same flag on land and sea." We might pass second reading and discuss the details in committee.

On motion bill read a second time—Ordered referred to a committee of the whole House at a later hour this day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, at this time perhaps it would be appropriate if we had a short recess of ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: If we have no further orders I shall adjourn.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of a Bill. "An Act to Amend the Companies Act."

Mr. Speaker this bill has only now been circulated, but it is really a very simple bill, so simple that I do not think that my honourable friends would object to our asking for the second reading now. It is an Act to Amend the Companies Act. The principal section is Section 2 which makes provision for the incorporation of insurance companies only after the Superintendent of Insurance has agreed that such company shall be registered. There has in the past five years since we came into Confederation been a number of companies applying for incorporation in Newfoundland to carry on the insurance business, and it is understood that these companies have not strong financial backing, and that they do not propose to operate in Newfoundland but simply to use Newfoundland as a point at which they might get registered.

We have been asked by the Department of Insurance at Ottawa, representing all companies, if we would investigate such companies before granting them incorporation under our Companies Act. They find it very awkward to refuse a provincial company, and they feel that their refusal might be misunderstood, and in some ways might be looked upon as a reflection upon the province. For that reason they have asked that we have a new clause inserted in the Companies Act which would provide the registrar

must get the consent in writing of the Minister of Finance before registering a member or article of association in any such company. The Minister of Finance will, of course, be able to get in touch with the Department of Insurance and find out who the people are who are looking for incorporation, and will be able to satisfy himself before incorporating them that the companies will be capable of carrying on the business, and will not let Newfoundland down in any way.

The next clause is a clause that has been added at the request of the Law Society, and provides that in the case of a company being incorporated the solicitor engaged in its formation shall file a statutory declaration setting forth that all the requirements of the Act have been complied with.

The other clauses referred to in section (4) and (5) are merely amendments in form to the present section 25 in the revised statutes. The new Section 25 is set forth in the Act and adds the proviso set forth in Section 26 of the Act whereby the proviso referred to in section 25 should have been attached to section 26. It is nonsense read in connection with section 25, and is purely a printers' error when the revised statutes were being printed.

There is nothing new in the legislation except that proviso referred to intended to belong to section 26 of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I know we have not had time to study this bill, but the explanation given by the Honourable Attorney General seems to be a reasonable one. Cer-

tainly as far as the new Section 17 (a) is concerned I did not know of the fact when he stated it this afternoon. The only thing I knew was of an insurance company called "The Farmers Insurance Company," of some state in the Central States, was down here collecting money from farmers, going around amongst farmers and collecting money and the agents, Newfoundlanders, were prosecuted for obtaining money under false pretense. I was engaged by one farmer to try and recover his money. But it was hopeless. I understand they were prosecuted and punished.

In regard to the other section, the first one seems to be a very formal one. It gives power to the solicitor to make a statement of declaration. I think it must be all right. In regard to the other two sections I am not in a position to say how much effect it would have on the previous section to which they refer—but we could look into that when it comes to committee.

On motion bill read a second time—Ordered referred to a committee of the whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act:"

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the House or the members have had sufficient time to review this amendment. But in looking it over now for not exactly the first time, but it is the first time I have had an opportunity to study it a bit carefully since the draft, I imagine there is very little of any serious or contentious nature there, and I think possibly if there should be some points that require an explanation it would be a very simple matter.

Under Section 2 the report is referred to as being delivered by the court to the minister. And after such reports have been delivered to the minister or to his agent, the minister had discretionary power with regard to the suspension of licenses.

Section 5 deals with the removal of vehicles which may be left by the licensee along the highway for any purpose whatsoever. If it becomes an obstruction the courts are authorized here to remove the obstruction, and says its involvement might become a charge against the vehicle or the owner of the vehicle.

Section 6 deals with the suspension of a license by the minister on notice of accident. That paragraph is self-explanatory. If in the case of an accident such as a collision the matter appears to be so serious to the people that it might warrant immediate suspension of the license they have power to do so, and to suspend the license of the driver and the vehicle.

Section 7 refers to repossessing. That applies in cases where there are people operating cars for hiring business. Should a car or vehicle belonging to such a firm become involved in an accident and being taken in or impounded by the authorities, the owners of the vehicle, if it was clear to them that their driver was not involved and there was no fault on their part, they would have a right to apply to the minister, and after satisfactory proof of their case could be given, the police may be authorized to release the vehicle to them. In the meantime the Justice Department is protected there under this clause.

The balance of the bill is merely the content of the notices which are sent out, and the last paragraph refers

to payments due the government for money payable out of the fund. That paragraph too is self-explanatory, and I don't think very contentious.

Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving second reading of this bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of this debate to have the opportunity to study the bill. There are very important provisions in this, and if the minister would be agreeable?

MR. SPENCER: I have no objections.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Society Act."

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, the intent in introducing this amendment is to correct an error made last year. Last year the Newfoundland Co-operative Union asked the Government to amend the Co-operatives Society Act so as to provide for the incorporation of their organization. That the Government undertook to do, and in due time introduced an amendment to the Co-operatives Society Act to the Legislature in the words of Section 2 as set forth in this Bill now before us. However, when the thing was finalized (it was not discovered until subsequently) an error was found to have been made. The words where they appear in this bill, "The Newfoundland Co-operative Union," appeared in the bill of last year as "The Co-operative Union of Newfoundland."

Some months ago the co-operative union again approached the government and requested that we make another amendment so that their organization would be designated as the

"Newfoundland Co-operative Union" and thus brought into line with the designated form of address used for similar organizations on the Mainland.

That is the only change in the bill. This may look like a pretty long-winded amendment to effect a composition of new words. However the Department of the Attorney General wished to have it in this form in order to take care of some numbers, I believe, also incorrect in last year's Act.

I move the second reading of this bill.

On motion bill read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the whole House at a later hour this day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side would be willing in connection with at least some of the bills that received second reading today, to go into committee of the whole now. Any that they are not willing to proceed with we are not proposing to proceed with, but any that they are; we might go through with. We have today given second reading to quite a number of bills. Some of these no doubt the House is not ready to proceed with as to committee of the whole stage, and some the House may be willing to proceed with.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the Premier indicate if we are meeting after 6:00 o'clock, and if so, what he plans to take up then.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was thinking we would meet after 6:00 o'clock and take up the budget, and we would meet tomorrow morning and tomorrow



row afternoon but not tomorrow evening because a good many of us have to attend a function being given by or for the National Research Council.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a luncheon, is it not?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, a luncheon and dinner. The government gives one and are invited to another—Which is which I don't know at the moment. We could go on with the budget tonight. So perhaps the honourable gentleman would indicate whether they would care to go ahead now with committee of the whole on some of these.

MR. CURTIS: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we might have some of the first readings:

#### First Readings:

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada."—Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Ferries."—On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths"—On motion read a first time—Ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act"—On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could now go into Committee of the Whole on Items 6-7-8-10, 11, 14, 16, 19—

Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills:

Committee of the Whole on a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

Clause 1 carried, Clause 2 read:

2. Section 2 of the Public Utilities Act, chapter 249 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as amended by the Act No. 30 of 1953, is further amended by striking out subparagraph (i) of paragraph (e) and substituting therefor the following:

"(i) the transportation of persons or property by tramway, street railway, bus, truck or ferry for the public for compensation, but not including a bus operated under and in accordance with a franchise granted under The Motor Carrier Act or by the City of St. John's or by a Town, Rural District or Local Government Area established under the Local Government Act or under any of the unrepealed Acts set out in Schedule A to The Local Government Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the Attorney General tell us why the Motor Carrier Act is brought into this?

MR. CURTIS: Under the Motor Carrier Act all franchises have been granted.

MR. BROWNE: The Motor Carrier Act, I believe, was the one which licenses the bus service, for instance, the companies from outside St. John's—But that does not license the buses operating in St. John's, the Capital Coaches even though they run outside St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are licensed to operate outside by Public Utilities.

MR. CURTIS: I think the one inside can come under the Public Utilities Act if a request is made that they do administer them.

MR. BROWNE: I was wondering why—The two Acts seem to conflict.

MR. CURTIS: These are two distinct Acts, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: I have it here—Page 1267 in the second volume. I am fairly familiar with it. I think, Mr. Chairman, that has been repealed too, if I am not mistaken or some of the sections of that by the bill we had today.

MR. CURTIS: That deals with the Motor Carrier Act, under Section 2, substituting some provision there.

MR. BROWNE: Why is it necessary to bring it under this Public Utilities Act?

MR. CURTIS: The Public Utilities Commission fixes the rates to be charged and unless they come under that Act the rates cannot be fixed. I don't think the Motor Carrier Act deals with rates, but more or less with a general franchise and physical examination of buses. But then I have the amendment amending this.

MR. BROWNE: I think the position is this, is it not, that under the old section those people operating vehicles came under the Motor Carrier Act—Came under the direct supervision of the Public Utilities—But the Motor Carrier Act takes certain ones out—So this takes it away from Public Utilities rather than puts it under that.

Clause carried. Bill passed without amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An

Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium Act 1954."

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read:  
2. In this Act

- (a) "City" means the City of St. John's as defined in the City of St. John's Act;
- (b) "commission" means the St. John's Memorial Stadium commission established by this Act
- (c) "council" means the St. John's Municipal Council as defined in the City of St. John's Act;
- (d) "member" means a member of the commission;
- (e) "stadium" means the stadium or rink building presently being erected on King's Bridge Road in the City and intended to be transferred to the City by the St. John's Memorial Stadium Association.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would like to draw attention to—Clause 5 sub-section 6—Each member shall serve for a period of appointment—In other words there is no specific time of office. I presume there must be some reason for that. The next point is: The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall appoint one member of the Commission—I presume that if a vacancy occurs the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint one to take his place. Now would the Attorney General explain the position where there is no definite time stated?

MR. HEFFERTON: I presume that they may be able to do that under regulations, if they want to set the time of office. I may say if the St. John's City Council were setting it up should they not determine terms in incorporating the Act?

MR. BROWNE: All right.

MR. CURTIS: I might say this bill was prepared by the City Council.

Clauses 2, 3, 4 carried. Clause 5 read:

5. (1) Immediately after the close of each financial year the commission shall prepare and submit a report to the council containing

- (a) a complete, detailed and certified financial statement of its affairs, including revenue and expense account and balance sheet; and
- (b) a general report of the operations of the commission during the year.
- (2) The commission shall also furnish such information as from time to time may be required by the council.
- (3) All the books, documents, transactions and accounts of the commission shall be audited annually by the Auditor General.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there is any provision for publishing this report. I don't see any such provision there. I think the Municipal Council themselves under their own Act will do that.

MR. HEFFERTON: I take it they would have it in their power at any rate, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 5 carried. Clause 6 read:

6. (1) The commission may accumulate and maintain a cash reserve in an amount determined by the council from time to time and shall pay over to the City on or before the 31st day of December in each year for the benefit of the City's current account all funds in excess of such reserve.

(2) The financial year of the commission shall commence on the 1st

day of July in each year and end on the 30th day of June in the following year.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder could the minister explain why—the 1st of July to the 30th of June. That is the old fashioned way.

MR. CURTIS: It would be because they are just beginning them now.

MR. BROWNE: I thought it was because the winter season begins the 1st of July and ends the 30th of June.

Carried. Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill,  
"An Act to Amend the National Flag Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Carry the flag.

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill,  
"An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act."

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read.

2. The Companies Act, Chapter 168 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended therein immediately after Section 17 as Section 17A the following:

"17A. Notwithstanding anything in this Act or the regulations, the Registrar shall not without the consent in writing of the Minister of Finance register the memorandum of association and articles of association, if any, of any company seeking incorporation for the purpose of carrying on the business of insurance whether within Newfoundland or elsewhere."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, has the Minister of Finance at Ottawa any departmental representative here at all?

MR. CURTIS: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, I think we have our own Superintendent of Fire Insurance, the Deputy Minister of Finance and his assistant Mr. Channing. They work together very closely and they do attend the conference every year.

Clause 2 through 4 carried. Clause 5 read:

5. Section 26 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following:

"Provided that, if at any time all the issued shares in a company, or all the issued shares therein of a particular class are fully paid up and rank *pari passu* for all purposes, none of those shares need thereafter have a distinguishing number so long as it remains fully paid up and ranks *pari passu* for all purposes with all shares of the same class for the time being issued and fully paid up."

MR. BROWNE: I have the Act here, and I was wondering how that proviso got adrift—it really belongs to Clause 26:

MR. CURTIS: It was just a printers' error, I think, in the consolidation, unless the person who cut out the Act pasted it in the wrong place.

Carried. Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish."

Clause 1 carried. Clause 2 read:

2. In this Act,

(a) "container" includes any type of receptacle or package used in holding, storing, packing, or marketing fish.

(b) "establishment" means any place where fish are handled, processed, graded or stored

(c) "fish means any fish including shellfish and crustaceans, and marine animals, and any parts, products or by-products thereof;

(d) "inspector" means an inspector appointed under this Act;

(e) "marketing" means buying, selling or holding in possession, offering or advertising for sale;

(f) "Minister" means the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives;

(g) "processing" includes cleaning, filleting, smoking, salting, icing, packing, freezing, cooking, pickling, drying, or preparing fish for market in any other manner;

(h) "regulations" means regulations made under this Act;

(i) "vehicle" includes any steamship, vessel, boat, railway car, truck, carriage, car, aircraft, or other means of carriage used for the carriage of fish.

MR. BROWNE: How did it happen, Mr. Chairman, that there was no provision for the inspection of fish? I do remember that there used to be an Act under which the magistrates, and I was one of those, used to go and inspect boxes and cases of tinned salmon and lobster. It was my duty to have them destroyed if any of them should not prove to be in good condition. I have frequently done that—I won't say frequently but I have done it several times.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the fisheries laws in Newfoundland came under administration by Canada for the first five years of Confederation with the constant surveillance of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

MR. BROWNE: They still have that provision?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have the Fisheries Laws of Newfoundland, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Then according to the observations made by the Premier and the Minister; it is provincial civil rights and the Federal Government has no authority to do anything about it—But that does not apply really—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Until the Canadian Fisheries Act is proclaimed, and that may not be until next year.

MR. BROWNE: I see they still have authority.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I draw the attention of the Premier to an Act Respecting the Inspection of Pickled Fish and Fish Oils—

MR. SMALLWOOD: All fishery laws of Newfoundland are administered up to this moment by the Department of Fisheries in Canada.

MR. BROWNE: I know—This one will be too I guess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, unless we appoint them to do so.

MR. BROWNE: That is the only way you can have the inspection, through the Federal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You can have fish inspected for two different purposes.

MR. BROWNE: What are these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: One for export and one for local consumption.

MR. BROWNE: That is surely not intended.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not two sets of inspectors, no.

MR. BROWNE: That does not only apply to domestic consumption?

MR. KEOUGH: As of the date of union the fisheries laws of Canada continued in effect for Newfoundland and are still in effect. The Government of Canada is contemplating making the fisheries laws of Canada effective for Newfoundland. For some time past there has been the Fish Inspection Act; the Fisheries Act; Canned Foods and Meat Act; which have been under study in relation to the fishery laws of Newfoundland still in effect. Now you can see that undoubtedly some change in the regulations under this Act will be necessary in order to have it cope with Newfoundland conditions. These will be determined by consultations between the representatives of the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada. These conversations are to take place later this month. Sometime subsequently the Government of Canada will decide to make the Fisheries Laws of Canada effective for Newfoundland, and the old fisheries laws of Newfoundland will then be repealed. So that this Act is necessary in order that at that stage the Government of Newfoundland may be able to enable the Government of Canada to continue its inspection.

MR. BROWNE: That is in collaboration?

MR. KEOUGH: Definitely. Inspection regulations will only be brought

into effect after consultation with the Government of Canada.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Every step of the way there is close collaboration.

Clauses 2 through 5 carried. Clause 6 read:

6. The Minister may refuse to issue any license required under this Act or the regulations without assigning any reason for the refusal.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Chairman, on that, I wonder—It seems a little bit high-handed—The minister may refuse to issue any license without assigning any reason for his refusal—What position is the fisherman going to be in, or the fish merchants, if you like, if the minister can refuse to issue a license without assigning any reason for refusing to do so. I wonder if the minister would explain what is intended there?

**MR. KEOUGH:** I don't know if I can give much of an explanation. I had a look at it myself when I saw a draft of the Act first, and it seems if the minister has the power to issue licenses he won't refuse provided the applicant meets the conditions in the Act. There is special authority contained in the Act to enable him to refuse. It is just there for a safeguard in case for some reason at some time a minister may wish to refuse to issue the license but does not wish to give the reason. If the clause was not in there the applicant, who had to fulfil the conditions of the Act, would just simply have to get the license—I cannot give specific instances.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Why should the minister refuse if the applicant meets with the conditions prescribed in the Act?

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** You might

have all kinds of things arise which cannot possibly be covered in the Act. That is a claim fairly common in our statutes. There is nothing easier than to imagine reasons which might lead him to wish to refuse a license in the public interest. Now it is not a thing that is going to be used loosely—because the minister does not like the colour of a man's hair or the shape of his nose or his politics or religion. If the minister refuses it has got to be for a very good reason. There will be very few refusals.

**MR. BROWNE:** Will the minister be asked to issue licenses, for instance in that so difficult of access district of St. Barbe—or White Bay. If down there a man wants a license to pack lobsters how does he approach the minister, what is the machinery?

**MR. KEOUGH:** Through the inspector.

**MR. BROWNE:** Well, the inspector can't issue licenses.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** But the contract is through the inspector.

**MR. BROWNE:** It is on the inspector's report the licence will have to be refused and not on the minister's knowledge. The Minister would not have any knowledge in 95% of the cases, very likely, so that he would rely on the information from the inspectors.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** But if the inspector refused the recommendation then the minister will make further inquiries.

**MR. HOLLETT:** I still don't understand why it is necessary to make an order like that without any reason for it. I, John Jones, come in and want a license—

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Does not the honourable gentleman know that even



the Chairman of the Liquor Board may refuse a license and not give a reason for it. That is not a minister but a Chairman of a Board.

MR. HOLLETT: Take any fisherman—he has confirmed to all regulations laid down and issued by the Department, the FDA, he comes in and expects to get a license. Then the Minister says; "No, you are not going to get a license." Then the man says, "Why?" He is then told by the Minister; "I am not going to tell you." Does not that seem ridiculous? It seems so to me.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if there might not be some modification of that rigid rule—That there might be an appeal to the minister—Because as it reads now—

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the Minister?

MR. BROWNE: No, for reconsideration by the minister?

MR. SMALLWOOD: From the minister to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council

MR. BROWNE: No, to the minister—He would I take it make known his refusal on the recommendation of the inspector or in other words on a prima facie case put forward by the inspector, and on that he could refuse. Should there not be a provision here to enable the fisherman to have the thing reheard? I believe that under the Citizenship and Immigration Act an application may be turned down but may be reconsidered by the minister.

MR. CURTIS: We would not need to amend the Act to give the minister the right to reconsider his own decision. It might be awkward to give a reason for turning down a man. He

might be a poor handler of fish. I know it would be awkward to have to give a reason. I think if he has the right to give the license he has the right to consider a refusal without putting it in the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is it in there at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has that right anyway to reconsider, without having to put it in the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is it in there at all? How about the poor man in White Bay or Long Harbour who goes to the inspector, and the inspector tells him, no, he cannot get the license, the minister has refused. Then when he asks why, the inspector does not know. What is the man to do, come to St. John's to see the minister? It is no use talking to the inspector.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It seems to me he ought to have an appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. BROWNE: I think that is too elaborate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, a man refused by the minister would write to the Premier, and that would be an appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you want that to happen?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not? It is happening all the time.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the type of thing.

MR. BROWNE: Are not the inspectors qualified to issue licenses? As it stands today it is the inspector, I take it, who recommends that a license be issued. The Minister takes the responsibility for the decision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We cannot formally give the power to the inspector. That can only be given to the government through the minister. But in actual physical fact it is the inspector, in the absence of any serious obstacle,

MR. BROWNE: There is a provision that he may appeal to the minister who on his own decision—The Attorney General must be aware that frequently a Supreme Court hears an appeal on its own decision. The minister just takes the case put forward by the inspector and may not hear it fully because the person appealing for a license may not feel it necessary to put everything he has forward—That is why I think there should be some provision whereby he may appeal to the minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that is not done he can come back two or three times and the minister can reconsider two or three times. I would go further and have an appeal to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but I don't think even that is necessary.

MR. KEOUGH: There is one thing on which I would like to have the assurance of the Attorney General. Under the Act as it stands as agreed by the Government of Canada it was necessary to certify inspectors, that would not alter it?

MR. CURTIS: That would not alter it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All that can be done by the Government of Canada is, it is our Act and this House must authorize us and we deputize them to do it, that is the story.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Honorable minister think there is too much red tape with the fisheries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have not enough.

MR. HOLLETT: You want to have every fisherman in the country filling in a dozen forms. Under this Act he has to do all sorts of things before he establishes a place where he keeps fish. He goes to all that expense and trouble and then applies for a license—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is probably because he does not that he is refused.

MR. HOLLETT: Then why not give the reason.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ninety-nine times out of a hundred the inspector would be there at his elbow guiding and expostulating with him — but sometimes a man just gets pig-headed and won't co-operate.

MR. BROWNE: I do remember now when I come to think of it, under the Foods and Drugs Act Regulations made by the Department of Public Health persons were refused licenses because their premises were not in good sanitary condition. Then they go to work and clean up their premises and come back again and look for a license. But the refusal is there. Is there power to re-open the matter? That is all I am anxious to see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A cat can look at a queen—anybody can ask—and if refused can ask again—then if refused still ask again, and keep on asking the minister, or write letters to the paper or write the Premier or write the government, write the Queen. It is not because the Minister says no, and won't say what that it is ended. We are living in a free land.

MR. BROWNE: We are not all as courageous as the premier about writing the minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Everybody does that. I get an average of two hundred letters a day, every day of my life, as all the other ministers do. Our people are not backward about writing the minister. The minister does not command the respect in this Province he does in the United Kingdom, for instance.

MR. HOLLETT: It looks like they are looking for more letters according to this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a right very largely exercised. Ministers are human and they are politicians too, you know, and are not trying to build up enemies.

MR. HOLLETT: It should not be in the Act at all. The House should not legislate to give the minister authority to refuse a man something without giving the reason, especially after the man goes to \$500, \$600 or \$1,000 expense to put his premises in a proper condition. I am not saying the minister will deliberately turn down, nor vindictively turn down a man or anything of that nature, but he might. It is possible that some inspector around in different places in the country might. You know we have seen inspectors and ministers—I don't need to go any further than that.

Clause carried.

On motion the committee rose and reported progress.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed an Act Relating to

the St. John's Memorial Stadium, without amendment.

On motion report received—ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the Whole have passed the Bill, An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act, without amendment.

On motion report received, ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have passed the Bill, an Act to Amend the National Flag Act, without amendment.

On motion report received, ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have passed the Bill, An Act to Amend the Companies Act, without amendment.

On motion report received—ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the Bill, An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish, have made some progress and ask leave to sit again:

On motion report received—Committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair for recess, may I ask the Honourable and learned member for St. John's West if he can inform me as to when he will be able to hand me the material offered last night in his speech?

MR. BROWNE: Now that the Premier has stated that the matter is in the hands of the R.C.M.P., if the R.C.M.P. should come to me I will give them the information.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock I will leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

House recessed until 8:00 of the clock.

June 10, 1954.

### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, during the recess the firm of J. C. Pratt & Co. have issued a public statement denying categorically the allegations made in this House by the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West in his speech last night, and charging the Honourable and Learned Gentleman to make the same statement concerning them outside the House where he would not have the privileges attaching to members of this House, so that they could sue him in the courts and enable themselves to establish their innocence or enable him to prove their guilt. I wonder whether the honourable gentleman would now say whether he intends to do what that firm have invited him to do? Does he intend to repeat the statement outside the House?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, no. That is in the hands of the police now, is it not?

The Honourable Minister of Finance moves the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means ::

MR. SPEAKER: Debate was adjourned:

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, this budget, which the minister of finance delivered here a few days ago

is the sixth budget speech which I have listened to in this Honourable House. And generally, as the minister pointed out in his speech, this year he reviewed the events of the past few years in regard to what, in his opinion, and in the opinion of the government, was done and the result of their activities during that period. He also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, and expressed an opinion and the opinion of the Government in regard to the present fiscal year in relation to public expenditure and the earnings which may or may not go into the pockets of the people.

Before going on to the budget, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have heard on many occasions in this House many remarks in relation to governments of the past. I have heard it said of this government that they are not a sit-down, do-nothing government; they have done and they have accomplished great things during the past five years. Mostly at these times they have expressed opinions of the governments of the past, prior to the Commission of Government. Many slurs, Mr. Speaker, have been cast upon the people of Newfoundland and the peoples' representatives in this House. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, now, that no government of the past ever had the opportunity nor the privileges that this government has, wherein they have been able to spend the savings of the people, saved up by the Commission of Government — millions of dollars which they are not responsible for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this present government have, I will agree and I will admit, done several things. But, Mr. Speaker, if this government had been faced with what governments of the past had been faced, I doubt if they could have accomplished as

much as they have boasted of. I don't like to hear people cast reflections upon others who did their best in the time in which they lived. I know just as well as every other member in this House, that Newfoundland always had a very difficult time to carry on economically, mostly in the years when they had to depend upon one industry, the fishery. It was only after the advent of and the introduction of the paper mills into Newfoundland that governments of the past tried and attempted to get out of the one industry economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance said in his budget speech that he was very proud, and the government was very proud, to announce a surplus for fourteen years of \$41,429,000; \$11,831,000 of that collected by the present government since 1949. The remainder of it was collected prior to their coming into office. I don't think this government should try to take credit for surpluses which were collected before they came in here.

I want to turn, Sir, to a table which the Minister of Finance had prepared where he predicted that in the present year the people of this island would pocket \$230,000,000, and he also said where earnings would come from. He did not break down into various sources of income except in one way, which he did. The Minister said that from paper, pulp and wood industries together with the mining, manufacturing and fishery, both salt and frozen fish, we would get a figure that can not help but impress us, an amount of \$83,515,000 which the people would pocket in these three or four industries out of a total of \$230,000,000. Mr. Speaker, that does not seem very impressive to me. Because the amount of \$83,515,000 which the

Minister claims will go into the pockets of the people is coming from Newfoundland's basic industries, is only 36% of the total. I don't think, as far as I am concerned that does not indicate to me a very buoyant or prosperous economy, to find only 36% of the total earnings going into the pockets of the people will amount only to \$83,000,000 from our basic industries. I have broken it down, Sir, into three classifications—Government spending—production, and national resources—And I find, Mr. Speaker, and I will be a little more charitable than the minister himself—And I find from government spending including defense; Government of Canada, Unemployment; Government of Newfoundland, road work and so on will account for 37.2 productivity. Natural Resources including paper, pulp, wood, mines, fishery, construction in general, frozen fish industry, dividends, interest etc. which I presume would be on Newfoundland's Natural Resources, motor vehicle trade and miscellaneous, which I feel should be put in that category, account for 45.2% of the total. The non-productive amounts which go into the pockets of the people, include transportation, agencies, etc. account for 16.89%. I don't know, Sir, if that should show to anyone here that we have a very prosperous economy, when only 45% of the total economy which was predicted by the minister is going into the pockets of the people this year comes from our basic industries. It does not show it to me, Sir, that we have a very buoyant or prosperous economy.

The minister also pointed out in his budget speech that the Newfoundland people this year would receive possibly the amount of five million dol-

lars in unemployment insurance. And he went on to say: "Unemployment insurance is shown at \$5 million, which appears to be an increase of \$4 million over last year. In actual fact last year's estimate of \$1 million was far too low. The amount actually paid out for the year was \$4,300,000. Paradoxical as it may seem, these are encouraging figures." Mr. Speaker, in respect to that the minister, I believe, pointed out to the House that, in his opinion, this would show that there would be a greater number of people employed in insurable employment. It indicates to me, Sir, an entirely different view. It shows me, on the minister's own figures, we will this year have twenty thousand people, if this is based on averages of amounts paid each week as unemployment insurance benefits, we will have twenty thousand people out of work for a period of four months. That is for those people employed in insurable employment. In addition we will have another great number of people who possibly may be employed at the fishing industry during the fishing season and naturally will be unemployed during the fall and winter months. In total, I believe we would have thirty thousand people out of work for four or five months. That does not indicate to me either, that we have a very buoyant or prosperous economy.

Now, Sir, on page 9 of the minister's speech he says: "We believe that no loans or investments that the Government can make will produce sounder results than those made in the fisheries. In the calendar year 1953, for instance, the plants to which we had lent the \$7 million employed some 3100 workers and paid them  $3\frac{1}{2}$  million in wages, they bought fish from 439 dragger fishermen to the value of  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million, and from 2900 other fish-

ermen to the value of \$1.3 million. Thus these plants paid out in cash, in 1953, in wages and in fish prices to the fishermen, the handsome sum of  $6\frac{1}{4}$  million."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? Here we have according to the minister, where they invested somewhere around about \$7 million in the fisheries, and he claimed that all of these people which he enumerated here in this paragraph would receive the handsome sum of  $6\frac{1}{4}$  million. That divided, Mr. Speaker, amongst the number of people employed in the particular trade which he refers to, would mean only \$81 a man, a very pitiful sum in respect of this item which he seemed to be so proud about.

Then, Sir, he goes on to say: "Thus we find that by lending \$7 million to a number of private companies operating in the fishing industry we have caused improvement that employs 4000 workers and buys fish from 4000 fishermen. The total of the wages and the amount paid out for fish will be a little over \$8 million a year."

I think in this section he refers to this present year. If eight thousand people employed as fishermen will receive \$8 million in this fiscal year, it means only one thousand dollars a year each. It only means to me they will receive the pitiful, the very small and miserable sum of \$83 a month. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out here, if a person is not working and receives unemployment benefits at the high rate he would receive that without working at all.

I want to make some little reference now to some of the new industries. The Premier said, in 1952 I believe it was, in reference to the new industries, the Premier said at that time that



in his opinion these new industries would employ from seven to eight thousand people at full time and another one thousand five hundred people part time. He said at that time, that this would have the effect of resulting in such a volume of employment that it would result in another one thousand persons getting their living indirectly out of these industries, and the total number of Newfoundlanders involved would thus run perhaps as high as thirty thousand, and the annual wage bill should run to something around ten million dollars a year.

Now, Sir, these are far-fetched statements. The Premier said that in 1952 and this is 1954. The Premier said in 1951, Sir, in respect to some of these new industries, he said at that time when he made some remarks in respect to the building of the cement plant at Corner Brook—This plant could be built for a very low figure of \$1,100,000 whereas in fact it cost more than four million seven hundred thousand dollars. And he said at that time, Mr. Speaker—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that is not so. It did not cost that.

MR. FOGWILL: Four million seven hundred thousand dollars. The Auditor General says so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No he does not. The Honourable gentleman, I am sure, does not wish to misrepresent the Auditor General or even misrepresent me. I think the honourable gentleman is now including working capital with the cost of the building.

MR. FOGWILL: That is the cost.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The working capital, part of the cost?

MR. FOGWILL: To the taxpayer, Sir. When the Honourable the Premier made that prediction he said it would be built and put into operation, ready to operate for a very low sum of \$1,100,000. Of course I realize just as well as the Premier and other members of this House that it would require certain sums as working capital. Nevertheless, the guess or gamble on the cost of the plant at that time has been shown to be so far wrong as to be almost ridiculous. The actual cost including working capital was \$4,700,000 from \$1,700,000. Now at that time the Premier also pointed out, or he implied that the Government was flooded with letters from all over the mainland asking for delivery of cement from that plant. And he seemed to be in great doubt at that time whether the government should sell the plant at a profit, which they did not. They sold it at a loss—Whether they should sell the plant at a profit or whether they should lease it or whether they should hand it over to the Newfoundland Labrador Corporation for operation.

Now, Sir, another thing in respect to these new industries was the gypsum plant. The Premier said at that time that the gypsum plant when ready to operate would cost \$2,100,000, and its actual cost to date, on this plant is now in the vicinity of \$2,900,000 and that does not include the amount in the present estimates of \$100,000 as a token vote. So Mr. Speaker, the estimate for the building of this plant was very far wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surely the honourable gentleman does not wish to misrepresent—I am sure he does not.

MR. FOGWILL: Is the Premier on a point of order?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman yield—He just persists in misrepresenting—But it is his privilege.

MR. FOGWILL: No I have to quote, Sir, from the Premier's remarks in 1951 when he said: "It is widely known by now that we have in recent months launched three important new enterprises, these are the cement factory, the gypsum plaster and plaster board and the birch veneer plywood and plywood door factories, thanks entirely to the genius and skill of Dr. Alfred Valdmanis, our new Director of Economic Development and Mr. Ernest Leja, our chief engineer. Under him we are erecting at Humbermouth a magnificent new cement mill at a cost which represents a cash saving of several million dollars on the basis of costs applicable to factories being built elsewhere. Let me say in the first place that this cement mill will be one of the most efficient in the world and will produce portland cement of even better quality than the highest American and Canadian and British standards." By Golly! we were to have a Newfoundland standard and do it at a production cost to equal that of any mill in North America. "Two very distinguished European Cement Engineers have pronounced themselves as being greatly impressed by the quality and efficiency, and the site and plants have been examined by famous American Cement Engineers with exactly the same result. Mr. Leja, our supervising engineer, was for twenty years one of the most distinguished cement men in his native Latvia, and in Germany was managing director of several of the large cement mills, as asbestos cement and gypsum mills. The cement mill which is now nearing completion is being built by William J. Lundrigan of Corner Brook

while the machinery has been manufactured by the great German Firm of MIAG. "The whole project on the date it commences to operate this summer will have cost Newfoundland the incredibly low figure of \$3,100,000."

The actual cost to date, Mr. Speaker, is \$4,700,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman does not want to persist in his misrepresentation, surely—

MR. FOGWILL: The Auditor General says in his 1953 report in respect to the cement mill, North Star Cement Company, the cost was \$4,700,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the capital cost, which the honourable gentleman is talking about. Mr. Speaker it is unscrupulous, downright lying, lying, deliberately lying.

MR. FOGWILL: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. FOGWILL: The premier went on to say in 1951—"This includes the limestone quarry and gypsum quarry, the modern steel framed machine shop, the chemical laboratory building, the garage, the administration building the emergency power stand-by plant—

MR. SMALLWOOD: But not the working capital.

MR. FOGWILL: In other words this three million one hundred thousand dollars according to this included all these things, the garage, the building, included everything, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The plant, not the working capital.

MR. FOGWILL: All right! The premier went on to say; "I am aware of two other cement mills of exactly

the same size now being built in North America and each of these other cement mills cost almost exactly double what our cement mills are costing, a very pleasant fact for which we owe all our thanks to Dr. Valdmanis and Mr. Leja. We have been flooded by firms outside Newfoundland asking us to sell cement from our mill. The market for cement was never more brisk. We have it on incomparable authority that the cement market will continue brisk."

I believe it will be brisk from now on because, I understand from the press and radio, the St. Lawrence Hydro Development is going ahead. This, no doubt, will require large amounts of cement. And I am just as happy as the premier will be to know that this project will require large amounts of cement. And, no doubt, Mr. Speaker, our cement plant will be able to supply some of it.

The premier went on to say: "The Government is now giving very careful consideration to the question of what would be the best thing in the public interest to do about the cement mill. Should we sell it outright at a profit? Should we sell a part interest to private enterprise? Should we lease it to private enterprise? Should we create a Crown Corporation to operate it? It is a very important decision that we have to make and our only test is our concept of the public interest."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the cement mill has been sold. It has been sold, as I understand, for the sum of \$4,623,213. That amount, I understand, was not paid to the government for the mill, but the people who bought the mill were by agreement bound to pay that part of the interest and sinking fund of the ten million dollar loan which

was negotiated by the government in 1952. This is the agreement, and perhaps I had better read it in respect to the cement mills. As I understand it there, Section 6 says: (In respect to the sale of the mill and the mortgage on the mill) "The said mortgage shall bear interest at the rate of four and three-quarter per cent per annum, and the principle sum secured thereby shall include the cost of the bond issue of ten million dollars floated by the government July 15, 1952. Total amount includes such charges and amounts due under clause 4 and 5 thereof fixed at \$4,740,000."

Anyway, Sir, the cement mill has now been sold, and up to this present time, to my knowledge at least, they have not paid any part of the principal and I don't think they have paid any interest.

Now the Premier went on to say in 1951: "We have been almost equally fortunate in the contract made for the erection of the large new gypsum plaster and plaster board and plaster lathe factory. These two factories at Humbermouth will, I believe, be the most efficient gypsum plants in North America."

Always the best, Mr. Speaker, nothing but the best. Better than the best. "Embodying in their design certain new principles never before employed on this side of the Atlantic. The two factories which will need twenty full loads of raw gypsum rock will cost, when ready later in the year, two million one thousand dollars. Mr. Lundrigan is erecting the mill and the machinery is being manufactured in Germany by the firm of Benno Schilde, whose impressive plant certain of my colleagues and I had the pleasure of inspecting last fall."

"We have," the Premier said, "in our contracts for these two factories saved the best part of a million dollars."

Now, Mr. Speaker, where is the saving? I would like to know. I see no sign of that million yet. In fact the million is gone with the other millions for both of these plants.

"We have in our contracts for these two plants saved the best part of a million dollars."

A million dollars, Sir, is a lot of money, better than \$3 a man in the pockets of the fishermen.

Then the Premier continued: "We shall have factories that will turn out a quality of gypsum plaster and plaster board not excelled, to say the least, in North America."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this gypsum plant is not now operating at all at full production. It is operating only at one-third production, which I believe is the inference I gathered only a few days ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which is incorrect.

MR. FOGWILL: I understand that for a gypsum plant of this sort to operate at a profit it must operate at full production, and that is for twenty-four hours a day. In the words, of the I will say, retired doctor of economic development, whom I am confident brought into being this plant—But it is the Premier who is responsible for it as Minister of Economic Development. And I have in my possession the books which were presented in this House on the operation of such a plant as a gypsum plant, where it was brought to the attention of the Members of the House that a gypsum

plant such as was proposed to be built from it a profit of seven hundred thousand dollars a year could accrue to the government on that operation. Up to the present time they have not made a cent nor paid any interest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will continue: The Premier said in 1951: "In many ways the most impressive of the three new industries is the one now being erected at Donovans beside St. John's. The cash outlay on this factory is in the neighbourhood of one million dollars, but it will provide employment for far more men and it will be far more wide-spread throughout the province. Like the cement and gypsum plants the birch plant will be the most modern." The most modern, the best for Newfoundland—The most modern—But no advice from anybody—only a thought—take it right out of the air. We have the birch. We must have the factory—Therefore we will have a factory. "Most modern, efficient, streamlined production mill of this kind in North America, the very last word in modern industry—the very last word—It will be served by the only large stand of healthy birch left anywhere in Canada east of the Pacific."

Now I would like to ask at this point, and would like to make reference to the statement—"It will be served by the only large stand of healthy birch left anywhere in Canada east of the Pacific Coast. The Premier in 1952 said in this House we should all of us thank the Almighty God for his kindness in giving us such splendid forests of good birch timber.

Now I will ask you this: Where are our birch forests? Have we got one? No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have one birch forest in all of New-

foundland and Labrador. I agree, and I will admit, that we may have good stands of birch in the soft-wood forests. But we have not forests of birch. And anybody who knows anything about birch, Mr. Speaker, will know they will have to go to the soft-woods forests and find birch, find good stands of birch, and will have to be very careful in the selection of the trees to cut. That is a well-known fact. There has been no evidence produced in this House, Sir, by anyone since we came here five years ago to show me or any member of this House that we have a birch forest. Where is the birch forest, or where are they?

Then the Premier went on to say: "This birch is to be found in fourteen of our twenty-nine constituencies." I will mention later facts to illustrate the wide-spread nature of the stands and the wide-spread character of the payments made for the purchase of raw material for the factory. Then the Premier went on to say this, "There would not be the slightest difficulty in selling at a profit the output of four other groups of mills the same size as those at Donovans."

Now Sir, how are they going to sell the products of the Donovans Mills operating now for quite a while, and as far as I understand has been operating in the red. It has never operated in the black. I would like to see it operating in the black. But if there are any birch forests in Newfoundland the birch mill should be where the birch forests are. Why build it in St. John's? The birch mill at Donovans is thirty or forty miles from birch, I think, and it has to be hauled in by truck. If we have a birch forest, Sir, no matter where it is the birch mill should be as near as possible to it and not miles and miles away.

This birch mill, in the opinion of the Minister in 1951, was only to cost one million dollars, and up to the present time the birch mill, instead of costing one million dollars cost one million seven hundred and eighty thousand, six hundred and forty eight dollars. Besides that, in working capital they have been advanced certain amounts of money which brings the total cost of the factory to the taxpayers to over three and a half million dollars. Now this was the worst guess of the Premier, and I am sorry for him, I sympathise, I am sorry for the government to have rushed into economic development without finding out all the facts about it. Because there were other people living in this world of ours, before the Premier was ever born and this plant came along. But this man came along and he believed he was the last word in deciding costs and what was to be done and what not, and he took no advice from anyone.

In the words of the Premier himself, mostly I believe in 1951, in speeches here in the House he inferred to me at least that in the spending of that large amount in financing these new industries were more or less just a gamble on the part of the government to try and fasten the attention of the outside world on Newfoundland and on what Newfoundland had to offer.

The government did spend large amounts of the peoples' money. They invited people to come in here not only from the mainland of Canada and the United States, which they could not get, and I am very sorry they could not do so, but they invited people from the other side of the water to come in here and had to finance these industries brought in

here, and had to show to the financiers on the Mainland of Canada and in the United States that we had great possibilities here where these people could invest money. Up to the present time we have no evidence at all that people from the Mainland of Canada or the United States have come in here with any substantial amounts of capital to try and develop our natural resources.

The same thing applies, Mr. Speaker, to the fishery—a fifty per cent gamble. I am not going to say much more in this debate, because after all, the estimates have been passed, supply has been passed. I will say this much; generally, the estimates were brought in much earlier than at this time of the year, and the Opposition at least had a reasonable chance to look at the estimates and pass an opinion on them. This year we had no such chance. We were rushed right through. They came in on Monday. We worked Tuesday and Tuesday night and were almost forced to go on after 11:00 o'clock on Wednesday night, which is not even ordinarily a sitting night.

I want to make some reference to the Minister of Finance's figures on the last page of the budget speech. The Minister of Finance said, on page 21: "We began as a Province of Canada with a cash surplus of \$41,232,663. To this the following amounts have been added since 1949-1950 by turning the non-cash surplus into cash:

1950-51	\$1,798,358
1951-52	862,949
1952-53	225,777
1953-54	184,566
Total	\$3,071,650

Making a total surplus for five years of \$65,985,428." And he goes on to say, or to refer to Economic Development that the amounts spent on economic development and the extension of public services amounted to \$51,418,209 and the Liquidation of pre-union liabilities \$252,374. Then he says, having taken in a total of \$66 millions and spent \$55½ millions of that we have still an amount of approximately \$10½ million. This amount, he said, lies on deposit with the government of Canada to our credit, and draws interest at the rate of 2-5/8%. And he says; we are permitted by the Terms of Union to withdraw it only for the purpose of meeting any deficits we may incur on current account revenue, but it will become a free balance on the first of April 1957.

Now no matter in what way you compute these figures, I find—I would like to point out here at the moment before I go any further that our provincial debt at 1949, our net debt, was \$3,700,000. That was at the rate of \$10 per head population. If the government borrows twelve million dollars this year, which they have signified they are intending to do, at the end of the present fiscal year our provincial debt will stand at \$70 per head per population, and an increase over a five year period of \$60 a head. Now I want to say this: If the present government had started in 1949 with no money, without any money, they would be in this position at the present time. They would be in the position at the present time that they would have at the end of the present year equalled the Newfoundland National Debt at 1949. The present government have overspent on all accounts. They have an overall deficit of \$42,226,00 over the six year period



under review. The surplus at the date of union was \$41,232,699, and they have turned, in surpluses, since that date, \$11,831,000. Thus we have a nett, Mr. Speaker, of \$53,063,798. Added to this must be the ten million dollar loan realizing \$9,850,000. That leaves us, Mr. Speaker, today at the end of the present fiscal year ending March 31 next year, with an overall deficit of \$42,226,420 just on this now. Then if the Government should borrow in this present year the amount of \$12,000,000 as they say they are going to do, that will add another \$12,000,000 to the amount of \$42,000,000. So that, at the end of the present fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, we will have spent an amount of \$54,000,000 over and above the revenue which we took in on ordinary account. That is what we will have done.

There is one other thing, Sir, in closing I will say—The Transitional Grant is in as revenue in the ordinary sense, but it is not. This government did not collect it. It is a grant given to the Province of Newfoundland to try and get us over a difficult period for the eight, nine or ten years of union. This amount at the end of the present fiscal year will be \$3,950,000. So that I conclude this, by saying, with the exception of the assets which were turned into cash of \$3,071,650 we will at the end of the present fiscal year have spent an amount equal to the national debt of Newfoundland in 1949, and that amount was \$84 million just prior to union. At the end of the fiscal year we won't have a provincial debt but we will have over-spent eighty four million dollars more than we took in in ordinary revenue. This does not show me a very buoyant nor prosperous economy in Newfoundland—It does not.

Now Mr. Speaker, we here on this

side of the House never hamper the government in any way. We ask them questions and try to get answers to questions. We have asked questions of the government and have had answers given to us but on other questions we have asked we have not had answers given to us. And in respect to all of these new industries I don't see any reason why, Mr. Speaker, the government should hide or not give all the information necessary so that the people of this country, and the members of the government and we in the Opposition, will be informed of what is going on, particularly when there are such large amounts of money spent, the peoples' money, spent on these industries. I don't see any reason why they should not give us that information. Because where the government has estimated the building of these industries at a low figure and it has cost so much more, in fact over fifty per cent more than these estimates we should know the reason why the cost was so high. Wages never went up that much, Mr. Speaker. Wages are still low, and supply has not gone up that much, not to the extent that these industries cost so much more than estimated in the first instance. It is ridiculous to expect people to accept that fact. If the government would admit its mistakes in the estimates in the first instance I think they would have more understanding from the Opposition.

I want to make reference, Mr. Speaker, to one more item, if I may—Last evening in speaking to the amendment to the budget speech—I don't know if I am allowed to talk of that, but I want to make a correction to what the Premier said. He made some reference to something I said six years ago in the National Convention in regard to some figures I presented at

the National Convention in 1948, and that I was ashamed to show my face for two days because he wiped the floor up with me. Now, Sir, I presented figures in the National Convention of 1948 and they were derived from the customs returns of 1946 of that year. The Member for Bonavista Centre, now the Premier of this Province, presented other figures contrary to mine. But he computed his figures on customs returns of 1947, which he admitted in the National Convention at the end of his talk, the difference was over three million dollars in the 1946 and 1947 customs returns. So how could you arrive at the same answer? I will say this much too, Sir, the figures I presented in the convention in 1948 were gone into by a very competent committee composed of citizens of St. John's and were commented upon by a full page in the Daily News shortly after Mr. C. C. Pratt, now Senator Pratt, when he said at that time, that the committee which compiled the figures of revenue going to Canada under Confederation were a very competent committee. The committee which at that time worked on these figures was represented by myself in the National Convention. I just want to correct the impression which was given by the Premier last night, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am at a disadvantage not having heard the debate—One should not refer to a debate on an amendment on which he did not speak.

**MR. FOGWILL:** The Premier made a reference to something which happened six years ago, and I think I should make reference to the same thing and try to make a correction, if I can, Mr. Speaker—That is all I have to say.

**MR. S. DROVER:** Mr. Speaker, it

is a pleasure to note that the Fisheries Development will be carried on in White Bay this year. I have nothing to take back from anything I said earlier in this Assembly concerning development of the fisheries in White Bay, but I would like to add that we have a large number of fishermen from Conche, Englee, Harbour Deep, Jackson's Arm, Westport and Seal Cove where there has been no development apart from Englee and a very small plant. I hope that when the time is opportune the needs of these people will not be overlooked. In White Bay we have more fishermen than in any other district in the Province. The people there produce more salt bulk fish, than in any other district in the Province of Newfoundland.

**Roads:** There is a great need for roads in White Bay. We pride ourselves on one road in White Bay which leads anywhere, and that is a road which was built by this government since 1949 from Seal Cove to Baie Verte. Thousands of people have found that road to be very convenient. All parts of the district are clamoring for roads so that they can break away from their isolation. White Bay can be divided into four sections as far as road connections are concerned. It is impossible, I know, to build roads throughout the entire district. The section where road construction can be carried out is in the Englee-Cooks Harbour Area, Roddickton, Englee, Main Brook, Jacksons Arm, Sops Arm, Westport, Fleur De Lys, Baie Verte and La Scie. Road construction must come in White Bay with fishery development. It will be a means of the fishermen getting their catches to the various plants, and it will also open up land in the area which I have mentioned, and it will also be a means

of getting sick people to hospital or nursing centres.

**Health Problem:** The health problem of White Bay is, I would say, the most important, by far the most important. We can classify the problem under three headings: (1) Hospital facilities, (2) Extension of Nursing Services and (3) Cheaper hospital rates. In connection with these three, Mr. Speaker, I make a strong protest to the government on behalf of the people of White Bay regarding the government's policy in administering medical services to the district of White Bay. This is not a new protest. It is the same one expressed by me four years ago. The only hospital in White Bay is at St. Anthony. The district of White Bay is 220 miles long, a coastline of 220 miles. We have one doctor at Baie Verte in the southern part of White Bay. For the people of Conche, Roddickton, Quirpon, to get any medical assistance they must come into the town of St. Anthony for medical treatment or hospitalization. There is not a nursing station north of St. Anthony. In the southern part of the district, for the past years, the nursing station at Jacksons Arm was closed as also was the nursing station at LaScie. Just picture the people of St. John's having to take a mother or a small child in an open boat, and sometimes being lucky enough to get a canvas tent to go over it, and take them around Cape St. Francis facing the angry waters of the Atlantic Ocean and carry them up to Holyrood or Bay Roberts. It is true that the government has an air-lift service, which the people of White Bay. I am sure would wish to thank for. But that service is inadequate. There are times when planes cannot operate from Torbay or Gander. There were times and years, as most of you in this

House will remember, when people were marooned on islands in Fogo District and a plane could not fly to drop food supplies. People who understand the rugged coastline of Newfoundland, and even if they travel sometimes just to Bell Island, can tell you how stormy it was crossing the tickle to Bell Island. Well that would probably give an idea what the people of White Bay must go through in order to get medical assistance or hospitalization in the northern part of Newfoundland.

In the southern part of the district there is the same problem. The only thing is that there is not a hospital within one hundred and fifty miles. There is one doctor and one nursing station at Baie Verte. The cost of hospitalization for White Bay and the cost of transportation, comes to quite a bit, and the hospital fees are quite high. Mr. Speaker, as to the doctors on the northeast coast I will again refer to the south coast as a comparison. I will take from Grand Bank to Port aux Basques or Channel. I am not saying that the people of Grand Bank and the settlements along the South Coast should not have hospitals and doctors. I don't think for a moment that they have too many. But I will just use it as a comparison. There is a doctor at Grand Bank, one at Belleoram, one at Harbour Breton, one at Hermitage, one at Rose Blanche, one at Channel. Cost of hospitalization in these places is fifteen dollars per year for a family. The cost in the White Bay area, if they ever get to a hospital, is five dollars a day, apart from transportation. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a list of the people who were presented with bills for hospitalization. They were picked at random, some of them I have received begging me to ask the Department of Health if they

would have them paid. After all the White Bay people are mostly fishermen. If they clear, or make a thousand dollars in the run of twelve months to feed a large family they are pretty lucky. I have here one from Hampden, a widow. She has \$20 outstanding and had to pay fifty dollars before she was admitted at the Western Memorial Hospital.

(2) A patient from St. Leonards, International Grenfell Hospital, 13 days board at \$5 a day.

(3) From Hampden \$420.36.

(4) From Baie Verte \$630.

(5) Harbour Deep 9 days at St. Anthony and \$20 for an operation. \$65.

(6) A little girl here at the General Hospital from Baie Verte about \$325.

(7) A little chap from Sops Island who is now dead, and his father had to pay \$980.

(8) From Wild Cove \$150. A total of \$2,644.36 for eight persons in White Bay. Elsewhere there are cottage hospitals and it would cost eight persons fifteen dollars a year, \$120 for eight of them, if they were from eight different families. That fifteen dollars would cover an entire family no matter if they averaged eight or nine in family. That is just \$120 in comparison to White Bay \$2,644.36. I consider this unfair Sir, to the people of White Bay in comparison to services given to other parts of the Province.

In 1949 I asked that a cottage hospital be built in White Bay. That was before I went out as a candidate with the Liberal Party. I have asked repeatedly since then for a hospital. I was told since 1949 that there would

be three hospitals built in the Province and without doubt one of them would be built in White Bay. The hospitals were built, one at Channel. They needed a hospital—One at Fogo, and I am sure my honourable friend thinks that in that constituency they needed one very badly—One in the District of Green Bay at Springdale. Two of the hospitals were built outright from funds provided by the government. The other was built by the government, apart from \$35 thousand approximately, which was collected by the people. When we could not get the government to build a hospital I asked the Department of Health what they were prepared to do if we tried to collect what we could among the fishermen of White Bay and friends of White Bay. They told us that if we could collect one hundred thousand dollars they would give us one hundred thousand. You know as I do and as every member of this side of the House or in this House knows, it was an almost impossible task to collect amongst the poor people of this country, of White Bay district, one hundred thousand dollars. In other words the people of White Bay won't get a hospital until we collect one hundred thousand dollars. The people of White Bay must still go over the trails and the meadows, they must still brave the angry waves of the Atlantic Ocean, and most expectant mothers have to leave their homes in the Fall and go to St. Anthony or Corner Brook when they have friends there to go to, to wait until they expect their babies. They have done it before and are doing it now and will have to continue to do it. They have given birth to their children on coastal boats—and they have done it since 1949.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, I was expelled from this party for making a statement in 1949 similar to the one I have made tonight. I spent seven months in the Opposition. I was asked back to this side of the House, but at that time I asked a question: I asked if I came over on behalf of the people of White Bay who elected me, would I be guaranteed that the rights of these ten thousand seven hundred people who lived in White Bay, and whom I had the honour to represent, if their rights would be respected? If I remember correctly, I was told, yes.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the rights of the people of White Bay have not been respected. If they were we would have cheaper hospital rates and extension of medical services and better hospital facilities. And, Mr. Speaker, tonight—I hate to say it—But after looking at these hospital bills—I would probably stop and would consider—but the more I look at and the more I read the more my nerves can't stand it—And tonight I make a statement. I shall walk out of the Liberal Party—I did not intend it when I came in. But I shall walk out of the Liberal Party—It is not my intention to keep the people of White Bay in Opposition. But within reasonable time I shall resign my seat in this House and give the people of White Bay a chance to elect another representative who will be able to get them the necessities of life which they are clamouring for and which they want. I still tonight make a strong protest, and I believe every mother and every father in White Bay will back me up for making that decision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I suggest we now go into Committee of the Whole on items No. 9, 10, 11, 12.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills—

On Motion Mr. Speaker left the Chair:

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish:"

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Chairman, we were discussing Clause 6, and were about to come to Clause 7:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee was discussing Clause 7:

Clause 7 carried:

Clause 8 carried:

Clause 9: read.

9. For the purposes of this Act, inspectors may administer oaths and take and receive affidavits, declarations and affirmations.

Clause 10 read:

10. (1) Whenever an inspector believes on reasonable grounds that an offence against this Act or the regulations has been committed, he may seize all fish and containers by means of or in relation to which he reasonably believes the offence was committed.

(2) Subject to sub-section (3), all fish and containers seized pursuant to sub-section (1) may be detained for a period of two months following the day of seizure, unless during that period proceedings under this Act in respect of those fish and containers are undertaken in which case fish and containers may be further detained until the proceedings are finally concluded.

(3) Where fish is seized under sub-section (1) the inspector or other person having the custody thereof may sell it and shall pay the proceeds of the sale into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(4) Where no proceedings are taken following a seizure under this section or where they are taken and the person charged is acquitted of the charge made against him:

(a) the inspector or other person having the custody of the fish and containers seized under subsection (1) shall return them to the person from whom he seized them;

(b) Where the fish is sold under sub-section (3) the Minister shall pay the proceeds of the sale to the person from whom the fish and containers were seized under sub-section (1).

(5) Where a person is convicted of an offence against this Act or the regulations or of a violation of any of the conditions of any license issued under this Act or the regulations the court before whom he is convicted may, in addition to any penalty imposed under this Act, order that the fish and containers by means of or in relation to which the offence was committed or the proceeds of any sale under sub-section (3) forfeited to Her Majesty to be disposed of as the Minister directs.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that seems me to be a very peculiar section—Sub-section (3) it does not make sense—What is the purpose of detaining it for two months?

MR. KEOUGH: I presume the purpose is to give them time for prosecutions to take place. Magistrates in Newfoundland may not be able to

get around very rapidly and it may take longer than a week or two to move in certain territories.

MR. BROWNE: This is to be dovetailed into other regulations under the other Act operated by the Federal Department of Fisheries, I take it. I am thinking especially of the inspection of lobsters, for example, they give inspectors power to go in and take samples. But they have power under other regulations under another Act to inspect these lobsters, and if found bad to declare that they be all destroyed.

MR. KEOUGH: Under the regulations of that Act they would have the necessary authority. If lobsters were found to be contaminated, they would have such power, yes.

Clause 9 and 10 carried;

Clause 11 read:

11. (1) No person shall falsify or unlawfully alter, destroy, erase or obliterate any declaration, inspection certificate or other document made or issued under this Act or the regulations or any marks placed on any containers pursuant to this Act or the regulations.

(2) Every person who violates sub-section (1) is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of not less than fifty dollars or more than five hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term of not less than two months or more than six months or to both fine and imprisonment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr., Chairman, I wonder what is meant there by the word "unlawful" "Falsify" I understand, but to "unlawfully alter?"



MR. SMALLWOOD: Well unlawfully alter or destroy any literature he ought not to, any declaration of an inspector or other document.

Clause 11 carried:

Clause 12 carried:

Clause 13 read:

13. Every person who violates any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations or any condition attached to any license issued under this Act or the regulations for which no penalty is elsewhere provided in this Act is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to both fine and imprisonment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, these fines in this section and the previous one seem to me to be very heavy. Supposing a person does make fish which is not wholesome, and not fit for human food—He might not be the most intelligent man and he might not realize what he is doing, and quite easily he might be fined one hundred dollars. It seems to me this is a very heavy fine, particularly for a first offence. It may be all the money the man has in the world is a hundred dollars, and that is just the same as if you took away his livelihood from him, because he might have to go to jail for three months. Now nobody approves of selling unwholesome fish. But I say, it may be done inadvertently or without complete knowledge—And according to the way it reads here now, that is all there is to it, if he makes it and sells it then he is fined—he has had it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If marketing any fish intended for human consumption.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me that where somebody has been injured by it, certainly then there would be a very grave offence, but supposing nobody is injured by it at all, it is detected quickly, is noticeable as soon as a person opens the fish or examines it, it then seems to me the thing is not as serious. I have in mind the case of a gentleman who sold me some fish—Say you buy two or three tins of salmon or lobster, the man selling them did not know it is bad—I might not realize it. I feel that he would not do it deliberately and yet if you have that there and you go to the court or the R.C.M.P. who are in favour now, and say, look, here is a tin of rabbit, or some article, I just bought it for human consumption. Look at it. Smell it—All right. He issues a summons and brings the chap to court, and what can he do about it? Suppose he says he did not know? It does not say here—It says: no person shall market—So I would suggest that, "Who shall wilfully or knowingly market any fish intended for human consumption and which is unwholesome and unfit for human consumption." Put it in that fashion. I also suggest the fine be lower than one hundred dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not wilfully—and then lower the fine?

MR. BROWNE: Lower the fine too.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For a man convicted of knowingly marketing rotten fish.

MR. BROWNE: I know that sounds terrible, but a hundred dollars for even a person like that. I say he might do it knowingly but yet without completely appreciating it. There may be a case that could be made for a man like that, if he is a

very poor man, and it must be taken into consideration that fishermen, as we have been told here time and again—Why hardly a day goes by that we are not told how hard the fishermen have it to make a living, how low their income is, and a hundred dollars is an awful lot of money for some fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is overlooking the fact that this hardly refers to the fishermen at all—Marketing is defined in section (5). The marketing that refers to is marketing within the province. Now, how much marketing within the province is done by fishermen?

MR. BROWNE: What is meant by marketing? A fisherman shipping fish to a merchant, is he marketing it?—Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say no. I would say the man who markets it is the man who puts it on retail, consumers market.

MR. BROWNE: Look at the definition in clause (2) Marketing means buying, selling or offering or advertising for sale. Possibly that is not tight enough. I think here in the case of the fisherman, and there are twenty thousand fishermen who take their fish along to the merchant—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think that can be called marketing the fish. That is not putting it on the market. The market surely ought to be defined there—

MR. BROWNE: (a) refers to marketing within the province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Act deals purely with the purpose of marketing of fish and containers locally within the province.

MR. BROWNE: May I point out to the Premier that there are different kinds of fish, not only codfish but all the other kinds of fish. There is not only fishermen sending fifty quintals to some friend of the Premier's and the Water Street merchants, but also all the stores right across the country sell fish in their stores, and fishermen from all the different fishing villages go to the nearest town to peddle fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend is talking about shops and merchants now. Surely he is not worried too much about a hundred dollar fine for a shop knowingly—wilfully selling stale and unwholesome fish—He is worried about the fishermen. I am trying to point out that fishermen don't market fish except in a very broad sense of the word, they merely ship it. I know that is marketing in a very broad sense of the word. Also a tiny fraction of fish will be sold by fishermen, in fact by anyone within Newfoundland. And of the small fraction that is sold within Newfoundland an even smaller fraction is sold by fishermen in actual fact today. I am talking of all kinds of fish. What proportion of fish produced in Newfoundland is marketed and sold to the consumer within Newfoundland today? A negligible amount. How much is sold by fishermen? It is even more negligible—Not one half of one per cent.

MR. BROWNE: That does not make any difference—it is the principle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the Act is made to govern a situation in general—And because some poor fisherman may be caught by it, are you going to lower the barriers in favour of merchants, of fish firms, and of

shops all across the island—Are you going to lower the barriers to them because by chance you may catch some poor individual fisherman? That does not sound reasonable to me.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable the premier has a mistaken idea of this whole thing. As a matter of fact he read a section here sometime ago where no fish may be marketed until the government inspector has inspected and passed on it—How then can a merchant market bad fish?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might get bad afterwards.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not the government doing it—The inspector passed it and it has gone on the market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is doing it?

MR. HOLLETT: Probably the inspector.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is making it rotten?

MR. HOLLETT: Probably on the other hand you have all sorts of fish sold around town, and undoubtedly there have been cases known of fish been sold in stores and fishshops which was to say the least a bit high. I would suggest strongly that the word "knowingly" might very well be put in there—If the minister would consider that, without reducing the fine at all—

MR. I. MERCER: Mr. Chairman, I believe the honourable and learned member for St. John's West will reconsider that section, and when he does I think he will agree with me that there is no necessity whatsoever for the word "knowingly" or "unlawful-

ly"—Because my understanding of the Law is that no person can be convicted of a criminal offence without the prosecution showing an intent on the part of that person to commit an offence. In order to convict any fishermen under this it must be proven by the prosecution that he had done so knowingly or with intent.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think that is the purpose of the section. I must say, with all due deference to my learned friend—Once it is shown as a fact he has marketed for human consumption fish which does not turn out to be wholesome then he has committed an offence and is liable—I think my honourable friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs agrees with me on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In view of the arguments I am prepared to accept the addition of the word "knowingly" to be placed before the word "market."

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend opposite is aware in dealing with the Pure Food Laws and the Food and Drugs Act, that sort of thing, the mere commission of the offence makes a person liable for a fine, without a guilty intent. I think you will find that prevails in that sort of legislation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is very delightful to have these lawyers expressing opinions, but we are not getting any business done. Let us put the word in and go on—We have about twenty-five other bills to pass yet.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we don't agree with the Premier—We are making laws here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a question you are still not satisfied?

MR. BROWNE: My honourable and learned friend raised a point which I am sure the minister can appreciate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that the word "knowingly" should be inserted there before the word "market."

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend the Minister of Finance wants to know if the word "sound-minded" should go in there—No person of sound-mind—

Clause as amended carried.

Clauses 13 through 15 carried.  
Preamble carried.

Bill passed with some amendments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At this point, Mr. Chairman, I suggest a recess for ten minutes.

Committee recessed for ten minutes.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland."

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Dog Act."

Bill passed without amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report having passed these Bills.

On motion the committee rose to report having passed the Bills as follows:

"An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish"—With some amendments.

Report received — First and second reading of said amendments—Ordered concurred in. Ordered read a third time tomorrow.

"An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland" — without amendment—Report received—Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Dog Act"—Without amendment.

Report received—On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited":

(Adjourned debate).

MR. SPEAKER: The debate was adjourned by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, very little needs to be said in connection with this Bill. We only got it this afternoon, of course, and have not had much time to study it. But in the time we have had I see it is practically the same as other bills which have been brought in for the same purpose, i.e., to give confirmation of an agreement to explore for minerals. One objection I do make is that the agreement was entered into apparently January 1953, and the government apparently neglected to bring that in before the House until this late date.

If we are to believe what it says in the preamble I would like, when the Premier replies, that he would explain to us just why the thing has been left over since the first of January last year, the House being open last year.

The company is a new company, as far as I can see, one we have not heard of here in this House before. Apparently they don't intend to spend

very much money—a total of twenty thousand dollars, I believe, in a period of two years.

Sir, there is nothing new in the Act except that it gives this company the right to explore for minerals in an area of 25 square miles—I am surprised to learn the government did find another twenty-five square miles somewhere in the country. We remember that NALCO was given some twenty-five thousand square miles and the balance of Crown Lands were handed over to BRINCO for exploration. I wonder just how the government managed to squeeze out the twenty-five square miles to allow the New Jersey Zinc Company of Canada to come in. It is apparent they must have been on the ground before the BRINCO Act was passed. That is the only reason I can see how the government found the extra 25 square miles. I have nothing against this Bill which gives a mining company a small amount of land on which to explore for minerals. In my opinion that is the best way. I do not hold with the rights in connection with either NALCO or BRINCO in giving them such huge amounts. I don't want to talk about BRINCO, but nobody knows the exact square mileage they were given, but it must be well over a hundred square miles. They are supposed to find out by next December, I believe it is, just how much of that land they want. It seems to me rather ridiculous to expect any company or group of companies to thoroughly explore such large areas. Here you have a company to whom you give twenty-five square miles and they will thoroughly explore that area, and if they find anything within the next two years they ask for a licence. The government here agrees to give them such licence. I think that is the

right type of agreement. If we had four hundred of these instead of one big one like BRINCO we would have an awful lot of people on the ground, although they would not have such high-sounding names. We have nothing against the principle of this Bill, Sir.

On motion Bill read a second time—Ordered referred to Committee of the Whole presently.

MR. BROWNE: Why not go into committee now?

On motion the House now went into committee of the Whole on Bill, An "Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited"; and a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operatives Society Act."

A Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada Limited):"

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, is that company registered in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know, but I don't think so. It is a Dominion company with a charter from the Federal Government—

MR. HOLLETT: Are we sure of it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sure of it.

Clauses 1 carried; 2 read:

2. The agreement made between Her Majesty the Queen in right of Newfoundland represented by the Honourable Frederick W. Rowe, Minister of Mines and Resources, of the

one part and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Ltd. of the other part, dated the first day of January One Thousand nine hundred and fifty three and forming the Schedule to this Act, is hereby approved, confirmed and adopted, and all and singular the several clauses and provisions thereof are hereby declared to be valid and binding upon the said parties thereto, and each of them respectively, and to have the force and effect of law, and all and singular the several acts, matters and things therein provided to be done or performed by or on the part of the parties respectively are hereby declared to be proper and lawful, and the parties shall have full power and authority from time to time to do and perform the several acts, matters and things in and by the said agreement provided to be done in the manner and with the effect and under the conditions stipulated and provided in the said agreement.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, does the minister feel at the present time that this company has been doing good work?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no question of that. That is a famous company, New Jersey Zinc, one of the biggest mining companies in all of the United States.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is—I am not saying it—It is, and that is all there is to it. It is one of say fifty of the biggest mining companies in the entire United States—New Jersey Zinc is a name to conjure with in the mineral world. Now they have formed a Canadian wholly owned subsidiary. They have done excellent work and will do excellent work

wherever they go in the world, and they have gone everywhere in the world.

MR. BROWNE: Can you tell us what kind of mine they are exploring for there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, base metals, copper, lead, zinc.

MR. HOLLETT: Can the minister tell us if they have spent very much?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they are obliged to spend ten thousand dollars — They have spent several times that, and it was on quite a small area.

MR. HOLLETT: That would not be very much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is very little for so large a company—Their spending will depend on how encouraging are the results. If they find a mine and it took a million or five million or fifty million to develop, they have the money.

MR. HOLLETT: Did they get that before BRINCO was formed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: The reasons I am asking is because a company could do very little. Are they working in there at the present time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if they have arrived in Newfoundland for the present season—They may be just about arriving or may be just about to arrive.

MR. BROWNE: Could the minister tell us—Are there any other strips around that could be leased now for exploration purposes?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there are many thousands of miles.



MR. HOLLETT: In what area?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Reid Newfoundland Company has thousands of miles which they would be delighted to lease to prospectors—No Crown Lands until the end of this calendar year.

On motion agreement read:

#### SCHEDULE

THIS AGREEMENT made as of the FIRST day of JANUARY 1953, BETWEEN Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Newfoundland, represented herein by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources of the Province of Newfoundland (hereinafter called "the Government") of the one part AND New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited., a Dominion Corporation (hereinafter called "the Company") of the other part WHEREAS The Government is desirous of furthering the economic development of Newfoundland as rapidly as possible, consistent with world markets and general economic conditions; AND WHEREAS the Company has requested the Government to enter into an agreement as hereinafter appearing, and in order to further economic development in the Georges Lake Area of the said Province of Newfoundland, the Government has expressed its willingness to facilitate and assist the Company provided it demonstrates good faith in exploring, developing and equipping for ore production the mineral deposits thereon as rapidly as permitted by good exploration and mining practice, the financial position of the Company and economic conditions relating to mines, as hereinafter appearing.

#### NOW THIS AGREEMENT WITNESSETH AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Government shall forthwith withdraw from the operation of the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, and subject to Clause 14 of this agreement reserve from the operation of the said Act for a period of two (2) years from the 1st day of January 1953 (hereinafter called the exploration period) all minerals on, in and under that part of the Georges Lake Area in the Province of Newfoundland described as follows:-

All that area of land situate and lying between Reid Lots No. 23 and 25 bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point being the intersection of the southern boundary line of Reid Lot No. 25, with the westerly limit of the right-of-way (100 feet wide) of the Canadian National Railway; thence running west by the said Reid Lot No. 25 and Crown Land for a distance of forty-seven thousand six hundred feet, thence turning and running at a right angle by Crown Land South fifteen thousand eight hundred and forty feet more or less; thence turning and running at a right angle by Reid Lot No. 23 East thirty-six thousand four hundred feet, more or less, to the aforesaid westerly limit of the right of way of the Canadian National Railway; thence turning and running along the said westerly limit of the Canadian National Railway for a distance of twenty-one thousand two hundred feet, more or less measured in a general northerly easterly direction to the point of beginning, containing an area of twenty-five square miles, more or less, all bearings being referred to the true meridian; excepting out of the above described area of land such portion thereof as the Government has heretofore granted to parties in fee simple (the area mentioned as

being withdrawn in this clause from the operation of The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, with the said exception being hereafter in this Agreement referred to as the "reserved area".)

2. Notwithstanding anything herein contained should the Company acquire or obtain options from owners other than the Government of lands of known mineralization within the reserved area, it shall have the right to stake under the provisions of the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, in force at the time of such staking, additional claims covering potential lateral or depth extensions of the mineralization of lands so acquired or optioned up to a maximum of two miles of the borders of said lands provided that the claims so staked shall not extend in any direction for more than a maximum of two (2) miles from the nearest border of the lands so acquired or optioned, and for the purposes of this agreement the claim so staked shall be deemed to be outside the reserved area.

3. Subject as aforesaid, during the exploration period the Company shall have the exclusive prospecting and exploration rights in and over the reserved area, upon the terms and conditions contained in this agreement, and shall be entitled to enter upon and survey the reserved area or any part thereof and prospect and explore the reserved area or any part thereof by all such means as may be necessary to prove the existence, value and extent of the minerals thereon and thereunder, whether by geological or geophysical survey, diamond drilling, surface or subterranean prospecting, excavation or works pertaining to the execution of an active exploration and development program, making com-

pensation for any damage or injury sustained by the owner of any surface rights or the holder of any timber licence within the reserved area and such compensation shall, unless settled by private agreement be determined in the manner provided in Clause 13 of this agreement.

4. The Company shall expend during the exploration period a total sum of not less than twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000.00) in prospecting and exploration of the reserved area, of which not less than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000.00) shall be expended in any one year. Expenditures in excess of the minimum in the first year can be credited to the second year.

5. Any person thereunto authorized by the Government shall be given by the Company every reasonable opportunity to inspect the field work and subsequent compilation in order to correlate the work of the Government with such geological work as may be done by the Company to satisfy the Government that the required expenditures are being made and that the exploration work is being adequately performed by the Company.

6. The Company shall furnish to the Government on or before the 31st day of March in the years 1954 and 1955 a reasonable detailed report of the prospecting and exploration work done by the Company under this agreement up to the end of the preceding calendar year, and the Government agrees that any such information will be treated as confidential so long as the Company retains any interest in the reserved area.

7. The Company shall submit to the Government on or before the 31st day of March in the years 1954 and 1955 an account of its expenditures

during the preceding calendar year in connection with the work of prospecting and exploration of the reserved area, which account shall be certified by a reputable firm of auditors, provided that the Government upon request shall grant to the Company an extension of time for a period of three (3) months for the submission of any such account.

8. The Company shall be entitled during the currency of this agreement to select an area or areas not exceeding four (4) square miles in the aggregate and the Government shall, subject to the making of the total expenditures provided for in Clause (4) of this agreement issue to the Company a development license in the form prescribed under the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act 1951, over each area or areas so selected and minerals thereon and thereunder. The shape and orientation of such area or areas shall be in conformity with the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, and the area or areas may be located anywhere within the reserved areas and need not be contiguous.

The said development license shall be for a term of one year renewable thereafter annually for a maximum period of two additional years and the Company shall pay yearly to the Government the sum of fifty cents (50c.) per acre while the development license is in force and the said development license shall be issued with the benefit of Clauses 11, 12, 13, and 17 of this agreement.

9. The Company may at any time during the subsistence of a development license apply to the Government for a mining lease or mining leases for all or any part of the areas covered by such development license, and pro-

vided that all obligations of the Company under the development license have been fulfilled the Government shall forthwith issue such mining lease or such mining leases in the form prescribed under and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, and with the benefit of Clauses 11, 12, 13, and 17 of this agreement, the Company paying the amounts specified to be paid for mining leases in The Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951.

As long as the said mining leases resulting from the development licenses are retained as a unit by the Company or its assigns they shall be treated as a single unit in respect of the operating obligations of a mining lease so that the Company's obligation to operate shall be discharged by the operation of one mine should one or more leases in the units be sold or transferred to another company such lease shall no longer have the benefit of being considered part of the unit for operation purposes.

10. The Company shall during the exploration period have the right without payment to remove reasonable quantities of rock, ores or minerals from the reserved area or any part thereof and to export the same for the purpose of sampling, bulk sampling, metallurgical testing and assaying thereof.

11. The Government undertakes and agrees to grant to the Company from time to time such surface Crown Lands as may be reasonably necessary in connection with its mining operations, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, such lands as may be reasonably necessary for rights of way for telegraphs, telephones, electric power transmission

lines, railways, tramways or roads, or sites for mills, works, factories, warehouses, townsites, wharves, piers, docks or other shipping facilities for the purpose of the efficient construction, maintenance or operation of any mining undertaking of the Company under this agreement or for any other purposes incidental thereto, on such terms and conditions as to rental or otherwise as may from time to time and as to each particular request be mutually agreed upon as reasonable and equitable between the parties hereto. Any such grant may be by lease, license or as may be agreed. The undertaking and agreement of the Government under this Clause shall not have the effect of preventing the Government after prior consultation with the Company from granting at any time to any person any surface Crown Lands when any such surface Crown Lands have not been granted or specifically agreed to be granted to the Company.

12. If the Company shall be desirous at any time of acquiring private lands or any rights thereover for telegraphs, telephones, electric power transmission lines, railways, tramways, or roads or other sites for mills, works, factories, warehouses, townsites wharves, piers, docks or other shipping facilities for the purposes of the efficient construction, maintenance or operation of any mining undertaking of the Company under this agreement or for any other purposes incidental thereto, it shall be lawful for the Company, with the prior assent of the Government, which assent shall not be unreasonably withheld, to enter upon and assume possession of and appropriate any lands belonging to any person or corporation or any rights thereover that may be required for the purposes aforesaid or any of them and the

compensation to be paid by the Company to the owner for and in respect of such lands or rights or the damage or injury sustained by the owner through the exercise by the Company of its rights under this Clause shall, unless settled by private agreement, be determined by arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided.

13. For the purpose of ascertaining the damage that may be sustained by any owner and of determining the compensation to be paid by the Company under Clauses 3 and 12 of this agreement, the Company shall appoint one arbitrator, the owner shall appoint another and the two arbitrators so appointed shall appoint a third umpire, and in the event of the Company or the owner failing to appoint an arbitrator after seven (7) clear days' notice by the owner or the Company, as the case may be, so to do, the Company or the owner may apply to the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof who shall, after due notice to the Company or the owner, as the case may be, appoint such arbitrator and the arbitrators — so appointed by the Company or the owner or by the Court or Judge thereof shall thereupon appoint a third arbitrator or umpire and in the event of the last mentioned arbitrators failing to appoint a third arbitrator or umpire after seven (7) clear days' notice from the Company or the owner so to do, the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof shall, on the application of the Company or the owner, as the case may be, appoint such arbitrator or umpire and the award of such arbitrators or any two of them shall be final and binding upon the parties.

14. In the event of the Company failing in any year to submit any account in accordance with the pro-

visions of Clause 7 of this agreement, or in the event that such account shall fail to show an expenditure required by this agreement in the preceding year, the Government may notify the Company and the Company shall remedy the omission and submit accounts as provided by this agreement to the reasonable satisfaction of the Government, and in default thereof the exclusive prospecting and exploration rights of the Company under this agreement shall thereupon wholly cease and determine.

15. Unless otherwise expressly provided in this agreement none of the provisions of the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act, 1951, or of the Crown Lands Act, 1930 as amended, shall have effect so as to limit or restrict in any way the rights, benefits or exemptions expressly granted to the Company by this Agreement.

16. The word "minerals" as used in this agreement shall have the same meaning as in the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act 1951.

17. The Company shall not at any time be liable to pay and taxes other than taxes of general application.

18. At any time during the currency of this agreement the Company has the right to cancel its obligation and rights over the reserved area after having given three (3) months prior notice in writing of this intention. It is understood and agreed that the Company shall have the right to assign, transfer, or set over this agreement to a subsidiary or the parent company of the Company or to another subsidiary of the parent company and the right to assign, transfer, set over, or otherwise dispose of in whole or in part its rights under this agreement and/or any rights acquired by it in pursuance hereof.

In WITNESS WHEREOF the Honourable Dr. F. W. Rowe, Minister of Mines and Resources has hereunto his hand and seal subscribed and set and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Ltd. has caused these presents to be executed in accordance with its regulations the day and year first before written.

SIGNED on behalf of the Province of Newfoundland by the Honourable Dr. F. W. Rowe, in the presence of:  
(Sgd) CLAUDE K. HOWSE.

(Sgd) F. W. ROWE.

THE COMMON SEAL of New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Ltd. was hereunto affixed, in the presence of:

(Sgd) WILLIAM D. McCAIN

(Sgd) C. H. GEORGE

Vice-President and Director.

(Sgd) WALTER R. ANYAN

Secretary.

(The Common Seal of New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Ltd.)

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, before we pass that I wonder if the Honourable the Premier would inform us if any information or detailed report has been forthcoming so far?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, a complete report of the work they did last year has been filed with the Department of Mines and Resources.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the honourable the Premier care to make any comment on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I would not—Except that it is somewhat encouraging—It would not be fair to a company to say anything more than that, and not even that much, I don't

know that it would be fair to them to say more than I have said, or even perhaps to say as much as I have said.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I take it that no area has been picked yet by the company, but that they are still exercising their rights?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so.

MR. HOLLETT: What taxes are they to pay?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No special taxes, taxes of general application.

MR. HOLLETT: Ten cents a ton?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All taxes of general application.

MR. HOLLETT: They have some latitude?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they have no latitude except to pay all the taxes of general application.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not customary to make an agreement with each individual company? You are doing it with Bell Island, you hope.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so. The Monroe Government did it with Buchans and some government did it in regard to St. Lawrence. We have not. This government has not, except NALCO.

Agreement carried. Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act":

Clauses 1 through 4 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, when the honourable minister was explaining this Bill this afternoon I regret that I may have gotten a wrong

impression from his remarks. I understood that the only change to be made was in the words "Newfoundland Co-operative Union." I find now this is an entirely new section.

MR. KEOUGH: Last year we passed an amendment to the Co-operative Societies Act—I don't know if it is referred to in this or not, but it was certainly passed.

MR. BROWNE: I have the last years' here. I will look it up.

MR. HOLLETT: It says the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations governing proceedings of the meetings of the union.

MR. KEOUGH: That question did arise actually last year as to whether it should be done in this form—The alternative was to incorporate and set forth in the Act the complete constitution as they wished to have it. That provided for certain flexibility which they wished to have. Any changes could be done by order in council instead of having it come to the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They themselves did it.

MR. KEOUGH: I may say, since the passing of the Act last year the union put forward a constitution to the Government and asked them to enact the constitution as regulations.

MR. BROWNE: I must apologize to the Minister for not having followed him very well. I did think there was only one slight change. Now I find there was an Act last year.

MR. KEOUGH: I think section 8 of this one mentions last year's Act.

MR. BROWNE: I know that it does, but usually it is mentioned in



the amending section. I can see now that what the minister said was substantially correct.

Clauses 2 through 4 carried. Bill passed without amendment.

On motion the committee rose and reported having passed the Bill, "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an agreement between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited," without amendment.

Report received—on motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow, and, a Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act" reported passed without amendment. Report received. On motion ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 11.00 a.m. of the clock.

As I remarked here earlier today I don't anticipate a session tomorrow night because of the fact that all members of the Cabinet and I believe Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition are attending a dinner, which means we just can't be here.

MR. BROWNE: We could get along without you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps Newfoundland can't, at least politicians always like to think that they can't be got along without. For that reason we will have sittings only in the morning and the afternoon. Then it has been indicated by gentlemen opposite that they hope we do not meet on Saturday—I am wondering what

the Opposition would feel on the matter of suspending the rules after the debate is concluded on the budget. I may say in this connection that in the last five years I don't believe we have suspended the rules at all. And if we did, we did it in one session only. We have the reputation of forcing our legislation through under suspended rules. But if we have suspended them we have done it in one session only. Now the Opposition has been most co-operative down through the last five years in this matter, and have been just as anxious as members on this side to expedite matters and not waste time. For that reason we have not needed to suspend the rules. I wonder if the Opposition would consider the matter and come back and indicate their desire later as to what they feel about the necessity and desirability, after the close of the budget debate of course.

MR. HOLLETT: Incidentally, is it the intention to go ahead with the budget debate tomorrow morning?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We can, if that is desired by the gentlemen opposite. I would be grateful if the Opposition would consider that point and make known their desires.

MR. SPEAKER: To avoid any misunderstanding, it is quite in order in this House and a long established practice in the House of Commons of Great Britain and in the entire British Commonwealth to move the suspension of rules at the end of the session. It merely applies to the passage of bills, and does not affect the rules governing debate. A Bill may be advanced two or more stages in one day. In the House of Commons after committee stage a bill is given a third reading immediately and they don't wait until next day.

MR. BROWNE: That is when rules are suspended.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe they do that from the beginning of the session to the end.

MR. HOLLETT: Do I understand there is a re-distribution bill to come in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That has been drafted—It may be withdrawn.

MR. HOLLETT: We need some time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You will get all the time possible. Rules are suspended not to shorten debate but to telescope the steps, that is all, and not take a day each.

MR. BROWNE: We could not make any more progress than we did in the last couple of weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree.

MR. HOLLETT: There is plenty of time to go to Labrador yet. There is ice down there yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 11:00 of the clock.

FRIDAY, June, 11th

#### MORNING SESSION

The House met at 11:00 o'clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will at a later hour today ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act;" also:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Act;" and

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952 "

A Bill "An Act to Make Provisions for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases," also

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act," also

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

MR. BROWNE: That is a tall order.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think any of these Bills are important.

#### Orders of The Day

Adjourned debate on the Budget:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Honourable the Premier moved the adjournment of the debate.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): With no intention of speaking—I very frequently move the adjournment of a debate when nobody else does.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—When a man moves the adjournment of a debate is he supposed to go on?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has the right but he is not obliged to do so.

Mr. Speaker, if my Honourable friends opposite are not ready, as I understood last night they were, perhaps I can adjourn the debate again, and find other work to do. There is no desire in the world to rush the Honourable gentlemen. I sincerely believed last night they were ready to go on with it this morning. But let them please themselves entirely. It is up to them what they desire to do.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have no desire to hang up the talk on the budget, but like anyone else in the House I don't think I am at my best at 11:00 o'clock in the morning to make a public address. However I am forced to do so with all due respect to what the Honourable the Premier just said. I am quite prepared to go on now. It is just as well to go on now as at any other time. After all we have to acknowledge that the Honourable the Premier is the Leader of the House, and his plan is that we go on at this time—and if it is not so suitable to us as other times, then we must take it as read.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of delaying the House any longer than is absolutely necessary. I don't think I should go on any longer than five days, or five afternoons, and I hardly think I shall go on as long as that. But I shall have to say certain things which I hope will not offend deeply the political nor other susceptibilities of my honourable friends on the opposite side of the House.

Getting down to the budget speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance, with all due respect to him as a poet, I think that this is probably one of the finest pieces of doggerel I have seen in many a day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is clever!

MR. HOLLETT: Only on one occasion do I believe the Honourable Minister came up to his noted ability as a poet and as a writer, and that was in the last line or two in the debate where he said: "Newfoundland has great and valuable natural resources of fish and minerals and timber and water power and soil". Imagine, we have soil too, Sir!

HON G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): I am competent to say—I have made a living that way.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought you were chicken raising. But they are raised on soil too.

"Newfoundland has valuable resources of fish." Can you imagine our poetic Finance Minister, getting that off in his accustomed style.

"She has stout-hearted people of unsurpassed racial and national origins. She has joined in union with a great British nation. She has a Government that is moved by unshakeable faith in Newfoundland's destiny. The combination is irresistible. Greatness is her due, as surely as the sparks fly upward."

Now, Sir, that is poetic.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it not true?

MR. HOLLETT: But I would say, Sir, the remaining 24 pages were just a matter of doggerel. And I am sure it must have gone against the grain of the Honourable Minister of Finance to have to put down the very things he put in that budget. Surely it must have galled his very poetic soul. "Greatness is her due, as surely as the sparks fly upward." I have often seen sparks fly downward, Mr. Speak-

er, especially when there is a lot of wind—And there is plenty of wind on the opposite side of the House to make the sparks fly in any direction whatsoever—hot air.

MR. POWER: It is a wonder you are not scorched to death with it.

MR. HOLLETT: It must have been painful, I say, to a poetic genius, very affable and friendly and likeable as is the Minister of Finance. I have great regard for his ability as a poet. I like poetry—I love it. I know very much how he was seared by having to issue such a ridiculous doggerel type document as this.

The budget speech, Sir, forecasts a surplus on current account of two and three-quarter millions, and listed the arrived at surplus over the year's spending of two and three-quarter millions against the two million surplus forecast last year, and we had a revenue of thirty-six million dollars, according to this document and an expenditure of thirty-three and one-quarter millions—I had intended to compare these figures, but I have not brought along these notes—But I can bring them along.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can give the honourable member some notes. Here are mine.

MR. HOLLETT: I have them on other years. I left them somewhere, probably in my safe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Last years' notes?

MR. HOLLETT: I would ask the Honourable Minister and all the members on the opposite side to look at the figures which are quoted on page (1) and (2) relative to the surpluses of the various years from 1940-41 down to 1953-54, and they will find,

Sir, there, all our great surpluses as indicated by the Minister. I will congratulate him on what I believe to be most accurate figures because I checked a column of the figures and found the great surpluses were from 1941-42 to 1945-46. That is worthy of note, and then in 1946-47 \$108,000. I hope everybody in this House has noted that the years from 1940-41 up to 1945-46 were the years Newfoundland, Canada, Great Britain and the great British Dominions overseas, the British Empire, and the whole world were involved in one of the bloodiest of wars, in which hundreds of thousands, and, yes, millions of people gave their lives, I won't say, Sir, that is why we and Canada and other countries in the world could build up surpluses, but by reason of the fact that they were fighting and giving their lives in a bloody war we had these surpluses from 1941 up to 1946. I note again in the year 1941-42 we had a surplus of seven millions, in 1942-43 three and three-quarter millions, in 1943-44, five and three quarter millions, in 1944-45 seven millions and in 1945-46, four and three-quarter millions. Then immediately we go over the precipice, the war is over, and the surplus is \$108,000.

MR. POWER: What other country had a surplus during the war?

MR. HOLLETT: Nearly every country in the world had surpluses in some form or another. I am not talking about debts. We created debts too which we shall never pay—I quote again 1946-47, \$108,000 a deficit and in 1948-49 one million dollars. Then in 1949-50, the first year the Liberal Government took over, we again had a deficit of three and three-quarter million dollars. Then, Sir, blood began to flow again in Korea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman allow me? He is surely not arguing that this prosperity is due to the war, seriously arguing that?

MR. HOLLETT: Do you want to ask a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I just want to be clear as to what it is my honourable friend is saying. Do I understand he is arguing that the prosperity indicated by these surpluses was caused by war?

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly. Mr. Speaker, I allowed a question and do not want to have a talk. The next thing the Honourable Minister will be reminding me I said that Newfoundlanders were too lazy to work—I am getting fed up on that. I make no wonder that the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare was angry the other day because somebody brought up that he said a certain area of this country—He is not here and it would not be fair to say it—But certainly these things gall, particularly in my own instance where I never said any such thing. The Honourable the Premier is so fond of standing up and trying to attribute something to some person, and putting words in people's mouths—I do wish he would get over that. I do attribute the prosperity of this country during this period 1941 to 1946 to the war, bloodshed. Where else did it come from? Did it come from Canada? Could the Honourable the Premier or the Minister of Finance give me any other reason for it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree with the honourable member.

MR. HOLLETT: Then why not say so in the first place?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not

the point—Why does the honourable gentleman not agree—

MR. HOLLETT: That is right—you can make "No" seem "Yes" and "Yes" seem "No." Now it seems the people will be asked to say "Yes" or "No" by just an "X."

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the election?

MR. HOLLETT: In November. You would have had it in June if things had run right—I repeat the Honourable the Premier would have had his election over this month if things had gone right. But, Sir, the best laid plans of mice and men go oft awry. I believe that is right.

We went into another war, Sir, in 1950-51 and immediately got a surplus of three-quarters of a million dollars and one and three-quarter millions in 1951-52 and six and three-quarter millions in 1952-53 and in 1953-54, two and three-quarter million dollars. We are still in the war, and it is not too 'cold' in some of the nations of the world nor some of the areas in the world.

MR. POWER: This year's surplus you attribute to that?

MR. HOLLETT: The war is not over. They may be able to even declare a new war, in the Newfoundland Cabinet. All I know is that there was a war there a short time ago—Want me to tell about that?

But in this case it is due to the present state of the world, and the Honourable Minister knows that exactly as I do. On that we got the surplus. We should not be proud. There was a war and bloodshed—We ought not to forget that, Sir, when we are talking so glibly of our huge surpluses.

Let us look at what this Government has done—Look at what we have done. I am quite sure if the Honourable Minister of Finance would get on that, if he were left alone, Sir to draw up a budget, I expect he would put one there that would go down in history as one of the masterpieces of Newfoundland, oratorically, poetically. But he is not left alone, Sir, because yesterday in answer to a question he practically admitted the Premier told him, and the Premier got up and responded. I think we would be showing discourtesy to the Honourable Minister if we did not go carefully into this budget. I will certainly go into it but I may not get the things out of it that some politicians get out. I don't hope to be a politician myself, but do the best I can.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear! An honest confession is good for the soul. I agree with the honourable gentleman—he is not.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier said here that he is not a politician—What is he, if he is not a politician? "I am the man" he said that, and I will come to that later.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Discuss that case too?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes every case I can think of. I shall not be put off by any tomfoolery about not being allowed to say this or that. This is the people's House, Mr. Speaker, and where men like you and me, Sir, have been elected by the people and where we can say practically everything we deem correct and which is certainly prudent, and when we always adhere to the letter of the law.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is going to be interesting.

MR. HOLLETT: Now let us go on to page 3 where the Honourable Minister refers to the peoples' pockets. This Government, Sir, has been picking peoples' pockets since 1949—But the Honourable Minister referred to what the people themselves pocketed. Let us take a look at that. But before I do, let us ask ourselves how well off are our people after all these tremendous surpluses—How well off are they? How well off are the people along your district Sir, or in the area of White Bay. Incidentally that brings me to something I have to say about White Bay and Green Bay areas and other areas on the South Coast, Sir, where we have these draggers, and where I am given to understand men who toiled all winter in these draggers had to receive able-bodied relief last winter. It is all very well to talk about peoples' pockets, but we should also think of what is taken out and for what the money is spent. But I was reminded when I mentioned White Bay, and asked a question—How well off are the people? Naturally I was thinking of public services, hospitals—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Drover, when it comes right down to it.

MR. HOLLETT: I was suddenly reminded of an occurrence which took place in this House yesterday, if I may refer to it—I refer, Sir, to the statement made by the honourable member for White Bay. On the face of it I would say, probably the ablest speech the honourable member has made for a long time—to the point—to the core of his difficulties and the difficulties of his district. He told us of the unheard of, I would say, conditions along the one hundred and fifty mile coast line of his district—At least it should be unheard of with



this Government in power—This Government that has done so much—Who have praised themselves to the skies for all the great public services which they are bringing in—Perhaps they have left White Bay as an example to show the Commission on Terms of Union. I don't know. I don't know the inner minds of the Cabinet, Sir, as such—they are such that it would be absolutely impossible for mere men to fathom or to read—But it has just struck me that maybe they are leaving the District of White Bay in that particular condition with no hospitals, very little medical services, although there were promises made, although the honourable member, as we remember, did walk out of the Government some years ago because of what he declared neglect of his district, and although he was, as he himself said, invited back into the Government and into the Liberal Party again on the promise that the needs of his district would be attended to. We heard him say yesterday, Sir, that this district has been absolutely neglected, and that consequently in deference to his people and their needs he deemed it his duty to walk out of the Liberal Party in order to bring to the notice of the people not only of Newfoundland but the whole of Canada the conditions of the people whom he was elected to serve. I say, Sir, how well off are our people?

The Minister, in his budget, indicated that we are in such a state of prosperity as we have never seen before. Now, who are the ones who are in this state of prosperity? Who, may I ask? Oh yes! I look across this House and see some people who are in an excellent state of prosperity. I can look along Water Street and find merchants who are in a great state of prosperity. You can look in many

places and find people who are in a state of prosperity which they never dreamed of—We only have to look into our estimates and find where loans have been given to this one by the Government and loans to that one and loans to the other one—These, too, are in an excellent state of prosperity. But, Sir, does that prove anything?

I refer again to White Bay—What has this Government done there to improve the public services of these people? I shall probably have to come back to that again.

We will get back to the figures on page 3 "I give now," the Minister says: "a table showing the various sources of the income. The table covers the years 1951, 1952, 1953 and the present year, 1954." And he goes down through the list and finally it adds up to \$102,000,000 as the amount our people earned last year, Sir, according to the Minister. I ask everybody to take 3% off \$210,000,000 and what do you get? \$6,300,000. That is what they did collect, Mr. Speaker. Was it not six million and some odd thousand—I advance this argument, Sir, if we pocketed \$210,000,000 last year as such for our people, then they paid it all out in food and clothing and the where-with-all to live—Otherwise how could this Government collect over six million dollars. Did they have any savings, the people as a whole? If you are going to take averages you must take averages. How much therefore went into the savings bank, how much was put in the sock? Every cent the people earned Sir—

MR. POWER: They put twenty six million dollars in the savings bank.

MR. HOLLETT: That has been there for years and years and years.

MR. POWER: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. There has been twenty odd millions in the savings bank for years—That is the Newfoundland Savings Bank.

Now then he read the details for defence last year—From defence there went into the peoples' pockets twenty-four and a half million dollars. I ask the Minister where that twenty-four and a half million came from? I admit paper, pulp and wood, the thirty-nine odd million that came from that is new wealth, new wealth from our forests—Truly that can be called earnings. But getting down to defence, twenty-four and a half million—Does the Minister mean to tell me that if that went into the peoples' pockets that it first was not taken out by the Federal Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Most of that was American.

MR. HOLLETT: Well the American Government—But a lot of it was taken out by the Federal Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the United States.

MR. HOLLETT: The Government of Canada, seventeen million—Will the Minister tell me that that did not first have to be taken out of the pockets of the people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The people of Canada.

MR. HOLLETT: We are Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So we are—That includes us.

MR. HOLLETT: The Government of Newfoundland thirteen million. Will the Minister say that that thirteen million did not first have to be

taken out of the pockets of the people before it went back in again? Mining twelve million, yes twelve million dollars, more new development. That is more new wealth, real earnings. But, in the name of Heaven, if I take \$20 out of the pocket of my friend and give it back to him to build a road—There is no new wealth in that—Fisheries again ten million dollars—That is not very much from the fishery. I shall come back to the fishery later. That too is new wealth. Family Allowance eleven million dollars—Family Allowances of which I have been told I should be ashamed to speak—I raised a family, and was a member of a family—I don't know why I should be ashamed. I am a Canadian now—You may laugh—But I am a Newfoundlander, Sir. By Family Allowance slightly over eleven million dollars. That too has to come out of peoples' pockets before coming back. Old Age Pensions eight million three hundred and seventy-seven thousand—the same. Frozen fish industry—that is new wealth. Unemployment Insurance that also has to come out of our pockets first. So we could go on down the line—Mother's and Dependents Allowances and Road Work and Veterans Department and Old Age Assistance etc. When he says that \$210,000,000 went into the peoples' pockets in earnings last year it is not a fair picture, then the 3% would not amount to the exact sum practically as was collected in Social Security Taxation because surely that amount collected by the Minister last year indicated that plainly every cent which our people put into their pockets last year had to be spent in order that the people might live. It is a grand thing they had it, I admit that.

How well off are our fishermen? I think anybody who reads the pap-

ers, anybody who follows our present day history must know that our fishermen cannot be classed as well off, they cannot be classed as prosperous. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I will go further and I will say that any man or any family man who has to live by the sea, or by the soil for that matter, cannot be classed as prosperous. Why, Sir, you and I and most of us, I think, remember when this time in the year the ocean around our shores was spattered with sails, with ships going into harbour, with ships coming in from the Southwest Coast, and coming up from the Northwest Coast.

MR. POWER: My Honourable friend is poetical too.

MR. HOLLETT: I told you in the first instance that I was fond of it. And St. John's Harbour was filled, Sir, with shipping. Just look at it today. I spoke with a man the other day who came from Burin on a vessel—He was a coaster—and he told me he sailed in clear weather—he was lucky to get clear weather—he sailed from Burin and never sighted a sail. That was the first week in June. He spoke of St. John's Harbour being filled with ships, as it was. But what sort were they? That shipping came, Sir, from the very people to whom our people supplied the fish which they have to eat to live. They have, I think, the finest vessels that one could possibly turn out. It does my heart good in some ways to see these vessels coming here with their able crews. They are only men of small stature but I will say this: The crews of these Portuguese and Spanish ships are the best behaved men that I have seen, who sailed the seas. I think everybody in this House will agree with me—If you see them walking around town, and you have, Mr.

Speaker, they will be well-behaved and well-dressed, and I think they have some of the finest ships that ever sailed the seven seas. Where do these ships come from? Now these governments of Portugal and Spain did not fail to aid the fisheries, they did not fail to assist the fishermen, if you like the merchants, to build these ships. No. They put money into things which were important to the very livelihood of the people whom they governed. We, Sir, in this country are part of the sea. From Cape Race and right around to Cape Ray and back again our people and their ancestors lived by the sea and the soil. They lived by the fishery. They lived by the ships which they sailed, the boats, the dories. I have in my own home a picture (bought down on Duckworth Street, from Maunders, and he took many very valuable photographs in his time) of Burin Harbour about forty years ago, and Ship Cove, Burin is crammed with sailing vessels with mainsails hoist and foresails hoist to dry. They are waiting for their first bait of caplin—about thirty-five or forty of the fishing bankers, Sir. Look at Burin Harbour today and what will you see? You will see no ships—a few draggers owned by Fishery Products and financed by this Government. But you don't get the sailing ships and the sailors. I put it to you, Sir, if you want a banker crew in Burin or Grand Bank today you would not be able to pick them up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What gives Burin the greatest amount of prosperity?—These bankers that used to be there in my honourable friend's time or the modern fish plant and draggers that come into the same port now, to the same people—Which gave Burin the greater prosperity? The

honourable gentleman is the only one in this House who can answer that—

MR. HOLLETT: I would point out to the Honourable the Premier that prosperity is a relative term. In the days of which I speak practically every man was a fisherman or he worked in the sailmaker's shop or forge or something else which was connected with the fishery; but most of the men went to sea in ships which they themselves constructed. They went into the woods and cut the timber—That was work—They built their own boats—There were men there to make the sails and there were men to tan the sails, if necessary men to forge this and do that and other things. Whereas now where will you find any of them in Burin? A sailmaker, a forge, a tin shop—They have to use tin occasionally—and you don't find the ships, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the answer?

MR. HOLLETT: It is the ships that make men and men that make ships.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the answer to that question?

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know exactly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a fair question—The honourable gentleman is the only one in the House who can answer it. He knows Burin as it was and is — Which of the two has given Burin the greater prosperity?

MR. HOLLETT: As to the prosperity angle of it—Everyone of these men who sailed in these ships, had his own home, his own garden, nine times out of ten had a cow and a few sheep, grew his own vegetables—In those days he was an independent

man, or yeoman, if you like, but an independent man—And mind you as an independent man he had a hard time at times as every independent man does—But ninety-nine times out of a hundred he was independent and he grew his own vegetables, had his own cow and sheep and his own wool to knit his own socks, etc. You have none of that now. You got new loans for woolens. You got no loans for bankers, you have to have trawlers—As to which is the more prosperous time, whether it be that day or this is a matter, Sir, which I say we can only speak of relatively. Is the man who worked on a dragger all last winter and living in Marystown with a family and had to take able-bodied relief last year, is he prosperous? Is he prosperous today because of the draggers to be found in Burin? I wonder if the Honourable the Premier will answer me that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would like to have an answer to my question first—Why not answer it. The honourable gentleman knows the answer.

MR. HOLLETT: I have answered it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which gives the greater prosperity?

MR. HOLLETT: I have told the Honourable the Premier prosperity is a relative term. If he is speaking in terms of the number of dollars, then there are more dollars now. If he is speaking of the standard of living?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Physical living, sure.

MR. HOLLETT: Sir, I have heard people decry the standard of living in my own boyhood days, and I am a little older, Sir—I say, Sir the standard of living in those days was far

beyond anything they have in Burin today. Every boy went to school in the winter time, and in early spring and summer he helped his parents. Every girl did the same. The standard of living was high, the standard of morals was better and people, was my mind, were just as healthy as they are today.

What is prosperity? What is prosperity?

My honourable friend, the Minister of Finance knows what prosperity is, and he knows what an independent peasantry or yeomanry, is if you like—Which is the better, the sailor in his own craft or the one on wages?

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many men in Burin owned their craft, say in 1900, how many men sailed their own craft?

MR. HOLLETT: How many sailed to Labrador in the 1900's. Have you seen that excellent photograph taken in 1905, I believe, of a large fleet of vessels in Twillingate? I believe it is one of the finest photographs I have ever seen of that day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How many schooners were around Burin then?

MR. HOLLETT: In Burin? About twenty-eight bankers apart from small boats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So there were some twenty-eight men who sailed their own boats, and some of the captains who sailed on them did not own them.

MR. HOLLETT: What have you got today—You got one man in Burin today who sails his own craft, if you like, Arthur Monroe—And all the rest of the people have to cluster around him, and he is supported by the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which has given Burin the greater prosperity?

MR. HOLLETT: I am talking about independence—How long can you keep pouring money into the hungry maw of Fishery Products?—That is how long that prosperity will continue in Burin or elsewhere. Under the present set-up how long can you keep pouring money into the hungry maw of Hazen Russell, Bonavista Cold Storage or into the hungry maw of Messrs Crosbie and Sons and so on—That is how long the prosperity which presently has been created will continue. When you take away the independence of the fisherman—

Now, Sir, as I say, prosperity is a relative thing. Yes I can tell the Premier when I became a magistrate away back in 1923 I was pretty badly smashed up—Do you know what I got as a magistrate, Mr. Speaker? I got \$96 a month. And I will state here now, Sir, and will state and prove emphatically that I lived better on \$96 a month in those days than I live on what I am getting now, and I am getting many times that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is hard to believe. Twelve hundred then was as good as ten thousand or more now.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not saying as good as what.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Your income now must be close to ten thousand and it was twelve hundred then.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say it is as good as six thousand now. I could save a few dollars over the years—As a matter of fact I saved on \$96 a month and the Honourable the Premier must have saved on less at the time. I dare say he saved as much on that or more than he is saving today on his salary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I never saved anything then or now.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the answer to prosperity as given by the Honourable the Premier, Joseph R. Smallwood, he lives no better today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am living much better today, and I admit it. I am earning better money than I ever earned in my life before, but I am living better.

MR. HOLLETT: I doubt it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know I am.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say that in those days the Premier had a bit of peace of mind—And happiness is part of the prosperity the Premier talks about. When you have no peace of mind but your mind is upset and disturbed, as his is and must be at the present time, Sir, all the money in all the universe is not worth a single dollar if you have an upset mind, or it is not worth a dam, Sir (which is an old Italian coin worth 1s. 8d. in case somebody thinks I am using bad language).

Now somebody has put me off—I can't remember what I was saying, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A good thing too!

MR. HOLLETT: I got on something worthwhile.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Certainly, you got to talking about me.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that what I was talking about?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, when I last heard from—

MR. HOLLETT: I said, Sir, that if money was put into the peoples' pockets that money was just as rightly

taken out of the pockets of the people, not only by this Government but by the Federal Government. Taking it all together, the present standard of living, I don't think people are much better off—But what I was talking about is this item here in the estimates. That has a relationship to the people. It will be remembered that two years ago or less this Government, perforce had to borrow ten million dollars. We know, Sir, that today to assure that that ten million dollars will someday be paid back and to satisfy the people who loaned it to us, we have to collect from the people of this little Province seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to service the ten million dollar loan. While I am on that point; we know that the people who now own the cement mill were supposed to take care of four million, seven hundred thousand of that loan as to service. They have failed to do that and the responsibility again falls back on the Government, so that the Government has to take it out of the pockets of the people to service that ten million dollar loan.

Now this year we are told they are bringing in another Loan Bill, another twelve million dollars, which certainly will cost the people, take out of their pockets, something close to a million dollars to service that \$12 millions loan.

Talk about prosperity—The Minister of Finance should be ashamed to bring in this budget—Then every one of the members gets up and talks about the prosperity of the districts.

MR. POWER: They are better off than ever they were.

MR. HOLLETT: That might well be—As well off as they should be?



MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the present Government doing anything to assist?

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, lots.

MR. HOLLETT: What services are being supplied? I have a total of the services here. Yes, it is easy to laugh off a thing like that—I am telling the Government they jolly well should be ashamed of themselves, Mr. Speaker, but they know that.

There was one place there where the Minister spoke of 'Economic Nonsense.' This is worth reading. "As I have been dealing in figures that touch on the economic position of our Province it might be useful if I gave here a brief description of this Government's policy in the whole matter of Newfoundland's economy. Opponents of the Government have been successful in at least one of their efforts; they have succeeded in distorting that policy into a totally unrecognizable caricature of the reality." "Opponents of the Government," I take it that means us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not mean any such thing—it says "opponents" it does not say which.

MR. HOLLETT: I can assure him, Mr. Speaker, we are opponents.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You may be the opponents—but when the word "they" is left out the gentlemen opposite are not necessarily included.

MR. HOLLETT: That leaves us out—does it?

I wonder who wrote this—I wonder. Now, Mr. Speaker, don't forget they have been successful—We have been successful. "They have been success-

ful in distorting that policy into a totally unrecognizable caricature of the reality." "Totally unrecognizable"—it is poetry. I am sure the people in White Bay and Green Bay and all over the country must be impressed by "totally unrecognizable caricature of the reality."

Then he goes on: "It is to the eternal credit of this Government that from the moment it came into power five years ago it was able to evade entanglement in the age-old romanticism and economic nonsense that has passed for economic policy in Government circles. It is to their eternal credit that they were able to go straight as an arrow to the vital truths of economic common-sense."

Let us see what they were: I jotted down one or two of these economic truths: The Icelandic Boats—"They went straight as an arrow"—That was going to save the fishery, bring prosperity to every fisherman in the country, show us how to fish, catch all sorts of things—They caught seven herring in two years—I believe that was the amount. Olsons Whaling—Does that revive any heartaches? Economic nonsense—The Clarendville boats—I remember three boats were left over and someone went out to make a quick dollar—What did the Government do? They gave them to a one-time member of this House and a one-time Leader of the Opposition—They gave them to him for nothing, but in five years he was going to pay a hundred thousand dollars—He could do what he liked with them in the meantime. These three boats cost this country—

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is a very serious charge the honourable gentleman makes, and there is not even a

syllable of truth in that statement that we gave the boats to a one-time Leader of the Opposition and he was to pay nothing for five years.

MR. HOLLETT: I said, Mr. Speaker, that they gave the boats to the man for nothing, but he was to pay for them in five years—Yes, one hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not correct—There is not a syllable of truth in it.

MR. HOLLETT: He might have given a note or something like that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is not a syllable of truth in what the honourable gentleman said, except one—We sold them—That is all—as for the rest there is not a syllable of truth in it.

MR. HOLLETT: Every word I have spoken, Sir, is true. An arrangement was made with this gentleman for the disposal of these boats, three boats, which cost this country two hundred and fifty thousand dollars each, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and sold for one hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sure the honourable gentleman does not wish to persist in his misrepresentation. To begin with these boats which were sold to Mr. Peter Cashin had nothing whatsoever to do with the Icelandic Boats. They were Clarendville Boats. The honourable gentleman was talking about the Icelandic Boats—

MR. HOLLETT: So I was but at this moment of the Clarendville Boats.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the second place the boats sold to Mr. Peter Cashin, these Clarendville Boats were

not sold on five years terms, not even on three year terms.

MR. HOLLETT: I will get the agreement bring it in and table it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That will be more like it.

MR. HOLLETT: At any rate they were sold for a hundred thousand dollars—That is correct—Then somebody else wanted them but did not have money to buy them and they went to work and loaned to the other party one hundred and twenty-five thousand to buy them off the other gentleman who has not passed the Government five cents. So we lost the Clarendville Boats for \$125,000. That is not all paid up yet, although I believe most of these boats have now gone to the bottom—That is economic nonsense, Sir, where you sell Government property and you lend the man the money to buy it from you—Economic nonsense.

Well I won't mention the Seigheim deal—Then the steel plant at Bay Roberts for instance, we heard an awful lot about that. The honourable member for that district, Sir, who is not here now, said it was going to be the greatest thing in the world, it would take all the iron ore practically on Bell Island and turn it into steel and ship it to the rest of the world to build ships. Was not that one of the projects in this economic nonsense idea?

Then the IBEC Report—I just mention these—I don't want to enlarge on them all—That only cost two hundred odd thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It cost eighty thousand dollars. We had the cost here long ago.

MR. HOLLETT: Why have to pay eighty thousand dollars for something we are not allowed to look at?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman said it cost two hundred thousand dollars—

MR. HOLLETT: All right, what is a hundred thousand dollars in the eyes of the Government? All right, let us take eighty thousand dollars for the IBEC Report. The people of this country are not allowed to see it, we of the Opposition are not allowed to look at it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Might it still not be worth eighty thousand dollars as long as the Government has it—We are the Government and we have the report.

MR. HOLLETT: Why not tell the people—No—It is not "we are the Government" but "I am the man."

Then there was a commission on the price of food and one on fishery and now one for forestry and agriculture. Sir, these commissions are just like plaster. They are put on to remove the immediate pain and that is all, nothing ever comes out of them—Although I do hope something comes out of our fisheries committee.

I find in the Minister's budget speech that the ramparts of poverty have been assaulted and taken and they have fallen in this country of ours—I would like to know when—We had a short time ago most of our fishermen on the northeast coast, so they said, on strike, and we have the report which I have read from Ottawa which says, in Newfoundland, in January, there were eighteen thousand Newfoundlanders looking for work—Yet the ramparts of poverty have been beaten down.

Dole—Yes we have had to give out dole, 20 cents a person per day. And if you take the 3 per cent off that and the merchants profit it does not leave very much for the individual—"The ramparts of poverty," "Economic common-sense."

The Minister then goes on to describe the impressive record of this Government from the first day of Confederation—That is a report of the five years, according to the Minister. Why we want all that in a budget speech of last year I don't know. But the Minister seems to give us the Government's record for the past five years.

"The greatest programme of economic survey ever seen, this included the retention of great companies to make water-power surveys, timber surveys and mineral surveys. This whole programme was conducted on a far-flung scale, and has cost over a million dollars up to this time."

What have we got out of it? Where is the report which shows that it was economic common-sense to conduct these surveys when in the very Terms of Union when we went into Confederation we find that the Government of Canada would assist in making these surveys—No effort whatsoever, Sir was made to get the Federal Government to assist in any of these surveys. No—We had forty or fifty millions in the bank so we will do it—

"We organized the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation, popularly known as NALCO." Was that economic common-sense? Gave away twenty thousand square miles of territory to NALCO; which was under the presidency and guidance of Dr. Alfred Valmanis, who everybody knows made \$80,000 a year. First they had Sir

William Stephenson but he disliked NALCO so much he got out in four months—Nothing doing, he said, I am not going to have anything to do with a thing like this. So they put Valdimanis there and gave him \$80,000 a year—Yet the Minister says this is a quite unique organization in North America—It is unique all right. Also don't forget, Sir, it cost us nine hundred thousand dollars.

Then the Government instigated the organization of the great British Newfoundland Corporation, popularly known as BRINCO "This new body is in the direct line of the great development bodies of the British Colonial Empire of great days, now, for the most part, no more."

That must have saddened the heart. With all the other greatness this Government has seen fit to revile that, and give them over a hundred thousand square miles for prospecting — Then they call that economic common-sense. Only yesterday we had a Bill brought in here where one of the biggest firms in the whole of North America came in and took a little bit of twenty-five thousand square miles and spent ten, twenty or thirty perhaps a hundred thousand dollars on that twenty-five square miles. Yet the Government in its economic wisdom has seen fit to give these great British Corporations we hear so much about all that. That has been alienated from us. They gave it to BRINCO and called it economic common-sense. I am not saying anything about these directors of BRINCO whoever they are. But I do know this; one of the shareholders and one of the directors on BRINCO who control now some one hundred thousand square miles is the representative of the AND Company and another of Bowaters. These are directors on BRINCO, and we must not

forget that Bowaters and the AND Company have a great interest in Newfoundland and in the forests of Newfoundland and consequently they will undoubtedly have some interest in some of the wood on Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there anything wrong with that?

MR. HOLLETT: The whole of the Seigheim territory. I am not talking about what is wrong, but "economic common-sense."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there anything unique or unsensible about that?

MR. HOLLETT: There could very well be.

MR. POWER: Mr. Churchill thought it a good idea.

MR. HOLLETT: I am sick and tired hearing that about Mr. Churchill. Because Churchill says something it is okay. He is a man, with all due respect to him, a great man, and one of the men that we all have looked up to and will continue, I hope, to look up to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: But I say we have the admission by the Government that this is a British thing—"great British firms" controlling a hundred thousand square miles—What did Churchill say? "A great Imperial concept." He would be a fool to say anything else.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course he would be a fool and so would anyone be a fool if he disagreed with Churchill on that. Does the honourable gentleman disagree with it?

MR. HOLLETT: Who wants to be imperialistic in these days?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not imperialistic—"A great Imperial concept." That is what he said—Get a dictionary.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't need a dictionary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Imperialistic and Imperial concept—There is a great difference.

MR. SPEAKER: I draw to the attention to the honourable members that it is now 1:00 o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the honourable gentleman moves the adjournment: Does he wish to continue his speech at 3:00 o'clock? If so it is not necessary to move the adjournment.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 1:00 o'clock we leave the House until 3:00 of the clock.

---

FRIDAY, June 11, 1954

AFTERNOON SESSION

---

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—Hon. the Minister of Finance to move the House into a Committee of Ways and Means: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition was speaking:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, just having returned from a sumptuous repast as a guest of the Government, Sir, I suppose I should be very careful not to upset either by my own gastronomic nerves or those of any member on the other side of the House. I represented the Opposition at this

luncheon tendered to the National Research Council of Canada, and it was, in addition to being a very excellent luncheon indeed, a privilege to be able to sit down and talk to some of these men of the industrial and scientific world in Canada. They are fine men. Those I met and chatted with, which was only about two or three, came from Iceland from where we had boats some time ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One of the crew?

MR. HOLLETT: He too is up in the air somewhat, but not as much as the boats which we had. The Premier certainly gave a very excellent address of welcome. I did not notice any measure of welcome in his speech, but he did divulge the fact that we are in need of advice and help from these people relative to our fisheries. I was very much impressed by the able manner in which he laid the case of Newfoundland, for research into our fishing industry, before these men, who undoubtedly must have also been impressed as much as even a more humble soul like myself. I am very grateful on behalf of the Opposition for the invitation to attend that luncheon and to chat with some of these men it was my pleasure to meet.

Now, Sir, to get down to the business in hand, that is the speech of the Finance Minister. I believe I was at the point where I was relating his summation of the achievements of the Government during the past five years, not the past year but the past five years. I think I had just dealt in a very small way with BRINCO. The next thing we go on to, I believe, according to the Minister, is that relating to the fisheries—And what does the Minister say?

"We were successful in inducing the Government of Canada to join with us in the creation of the Fisheries Development Committee. Working for nearly two years under the Chairmanship of the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, Sir Albert Walsh, this Committee conducted the most painstakingly thorough survey of the fishing industry, of the fishery potential, and of the needs of the industry that ever was accomplished in the history of British North America." Then he said: "We have been busy in this present session of the House enacting legislation to launch our great fishery development program."

Now the part I am greatly interested in, and did not know before, is the next part of the paragraph: "This will be by far, indeed it will be incomparably the greatest development programme ever known in the fisheries of the northern half of this continent. The Government of Canada has agreed to participate with us in bearing the costs of this great development, which I expect, is likely to cost as much as one hundred million dollars on all counts over a period of twelve or fifteen years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something which I was not aware of. I was not formerly aware that the Government of Canada had consented to bear the cost with us of this one hundred million dollars expenditure. I don't know whether this can be taken as it reads. If it can then the Government of Canada has said: "Yes, go ahead and we will go ahead along with you, and we will both carry out the fisheries programme which is likely to cost a hundred million dollars and we will go fifty-fifty with you or seventy-five-twenty-five as the case may be." That is the interpretation an ordinary person would put on that

paragraph. As I said; I was not aware of the fact that the Government of Canada had agreed to that extent of implementing the fisheries programme. If that is so then I am delighted to hear it and I will read it again. "The Government of Canada have agreed to participate with us in bearing the costs of this great development, which, I expect, is likely to cost as much as one hundred million dollars on all counts over a period of twelve or fifteen years."

Then the Minister goes on to relate what they have done themselves with regard to the fisheries and he says: "We have followed consistently a policy of assisting the fishing industry with loans to enable them to expand and improve their facilities. We have extended financial assistance in excess of seven million dollars to some fourteen Newfoundland fishery companies, while loans of two other companies, totalling the best part of another three million dollars are pending and are more than likely to be approved."

I am tempted to ask if these men are fish merchants, and I presume they are. I am also tempted to remind the House of some statement made just recently with regard to these fish merchants. I take it these here—For instance I have brought along with me a number of these—I have Bonavista Fisheries Limited. That, I believe, is Hazen Russell; Fishery Products, Bonavista Fish Meal, Fishery Products, Gaultois Fisheries, and North Eastern Co-operatives, which I believe is in the process of liquidation; Trépassey Fisheries, Alberto Fisheries, Andrews Labrador which appears again and again, Arctic Fisheries, Bonavista Cold Storage again, Dunphy's, that is an old one also, then Fishery



Products for several more hundred thousand. I believe altogether Fishery Products has some three million some hundred thousand. Olson Whaling, Penney & Sons, Richards Limited—I think that is in liquidation, if I remember correctly. I won't go into it. I take it that was one of these big developments which the Minister spoke of as the romanticism of the past. Getting down to the heart of things in the new economic approach, I believe that was inspired by three men who came to the Premier's door one night and managed to get in and have a talk over the things that should be done. Then we have Northlantic Fisheries six hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars—In regard to their other three millions we have been told where that goes. I believe that is the three million dollars cut out this year for fishery development, and which has to be administered by the Fisheries Authority, that is the most of it. But I must not pass over the last opportunity in this House for this season. I hope, to refer to this Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority.

First I would say that of the three million dollars, one million, five hundred thousand will go to Fishery Products for the setting up of plants in Bay de Verde and Change Islands, Joe Batts Arm, Twillingate, Catalina, Trepassey etc, which leave a million and a half of that three millions. Then Mr. Dustan, Mr. Young and Mr. Winsor will draw down another salary of seventy-five thousand dollars for three of them, and will set up an office which will cost another ten thousand making eighty-five thousand five hundred dollars altogether, and other offices will cost another twenty-five thousand. Then there is the matter of LaScie which was the one around

which most of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority was to exert most of its energy. I believe this will get \$353,000.

With regard to that Fisheries Development Authority I might say, Sir, that after this interesting address of the Honourable Premier today he put me off a little on certain things, which I might have said, because it has come home to me that there might be a possibility of this FDA getting hold of some of these men who are here on this Research Council and seeking some advice from them. I do not think, and I say this frankly and bluntly, that without any idea of hurting, or any intention of hurting anybody's feelings, I do not think we have in Mr. Dustan, Mr. Winsor and Mr. Young, with all due respect to them and their achievements, I do not think we have in them under the present set-up, the authority which is necessary or the necessary experience or knowledge to make even a fifty-fifty chance of success with this Fisheries Authority. The Honourable the Premier has undoubtedly praised them to the skies, and I do hope that they will live up to his expectations. But we do and must realize, we must be practical, and see that the fisheries problem of Newfoundland is also the fisheries problem of Nova Scotia as it is the fisheries problem of Iceland and all other countries whose basic economy is based on the fisheries. I don't see in either Mr. Dustan who is a banker or in Mr. Young who was an office man or in Mr. Winsor who is also or was an office man—I don't see in these three gentlemen the necessary experience, without some such help as I have referred to in order to make a success of this scheme. It is one of the greatest basic problems which any government could tackle.

I am quite sure the Government will make some mistakes. I believe if we were the Government we might make some mistakes. But it is a problem and no question about it, Sir. The thing that has been worrying us on this side of the House is the amount of authority which is being given to these people, unlimited, practically unlimited authority to go ahead. Well now, without being unkind, if Mr. Dustan were the man, and he may be the greatest man in the country, as the Premier apparently thinks he is, but if he were that sort of a man, I don't visualize the Bank of Nova Scotia parting with him. I cannot see Job Brothers and Company parting with him, and I can't see Hazen Russell dispensing with his services, or shall I put it the other way—I don't see Hazen Russell giving up his services, neither do I see why Mr. Crosbie would want to lose Mr. Young if Mr. Young is the man the Premier says he is. And I am quite sure the FAO would not want to lose Mr. Winsor if he had all the attributes ascribed to him by the Honourable the Premier. Of course any of us who have been in this House as long as I have—shall I say—at any rate I have not been here too long yet, but we are used to hearing the Premier describing everybody, not only men but plants of all kinds, industries of all kinds, construction companies from the United States and away across the world, describing them in the highest possible terms, everyone, every organization, these are the biggest and best men in their field—they are the greatest industrialists in Europe, they are the greatest men in the United States, like Rockefeller, etc. Now we have three men at the head of this Fisheries Authority who are undoubtedly, according to the Premier, the biggest and best men in that

field that he could obtain in this country.

While we are on fisheries, Sir, I think I should say this: That while we are all anxious that this scheme or plan for the northeast coast should succeed, as we sincerely hope it will, I think we must be practical, or at least I think the Government ought to be practical, and apply some of the acquired skill of such a body as the National Research Council of Canada who have committees on every conceivable subject in the whole range of Canada's economy. I think we ought to have some ideas from abroad like that say as to what indeed really actually are the possibilities of success in the fisheries along that shore, or anywhere in Newfoundland for that matter, before we spend one hundred million dollars. I take it fifty million dollars would be the share of the Provincial Government in such a project. After all, Sir, we have to remember every time we borrow ten million dollars we saddle ourselves with an annual charge which is anywhere from six hundred to seven hundred thousand dollars annual charge for every ten million dollars we borrow. If we borrow fifty millions then, of course, that would be quite a burden which has to be collected from the people year by year. In addition to that we have to set up a sinking fund which will take care of the loan at maturity. So I think that it might have been perhaps wiser if the Government had seen fit to get the opinion of these men who met today or men of that type. That is their job to find out the possibility of success in any field of industry anywhere in Canada. As far as I can gather from what the Honourable the Premier said today, no approach was made to these people, no approach was made to anybody. But the Hon-

ourable the Premier and the Government looked around and picked up three men and said, you are our Board, name your price—What is your price? Twenty-five thousand dollars a year, pensionable at the end of ten years at five thousand dollars a year, if anything happens we take care of your wife and children. What authority? We give you full authority to go ahead and do what you like, but be sure to make a success, and see that everything is done to make certain the possibility of success.

We have to be practical. I quoted some figures some time ago with regard to the price of fish, and I quoted the prices paid to fishermen at North Sydney in June 1954, to fishermen who brought in their schooners, vessels and draggers to North Sydney,  $3\frac{1}{2}$ c. a pound and in Halifax  $4\frac{1}{4}$ c. per pound. That was inshore cod; haddock in North Sydney  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 5c. Newfoundland 3c. I forgot St. John's  $3\frac{1}{4}$ c. Halifax  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , St. John's, Newfoundland  $2\frac{1}{4}$ c. Haddock North Sydney  $4\frac{1}{2}$ c. to 5c. and Halifax 6c. to  $6\frac{1}{4}$ c. St. John's, Newfoundland 3c. That is quite a difference, Mr. Speaker. I therefore ask myself if we are going to put up fish in LaScie or anywhere on the northeast coast area by means of fish plants in that area—we have to ask ourselves what it is going to be worth to men who catch the fish, the fishermen. These are the men we are out to help. If there is this much difference between the prices of cod and haddock and other fish between Halifax and North Sydney and St. John's, Newfoundland, I think that is a subject we ought to go into before we commit this country of Canada and particularly this Province of Newfoundland to the tune of one hundred million dollars. Take hali-

but, Sir, halibut in North Sydney or Halifax sold for 28c. a pound. What is it selling for here in St. John's? 15c. per pound, and so it goes. That is a question I think should be determined before voting three million dollars to be spent on such a venture.

Getting back to the Minister's speech—He goes on to say that these same loans to which he had referred, including the three million dollars will this year create additional fishery plants to employ seven hundred and fifty more workers and one million dollars in wages. I say if that is so it is sound business. But you must remember he is referring there clearly to fishery plants which will be created in areas where the draggers can't get in in all seasons of the year. Even at that, Sir, as I pointed out before luncheon, we have been told a story, and unfortunately I am afraid it is correct, of fishermen going out in Fishery Products draggers all the winter and on occasions during these trips had to go on relief to get able-bodied relief. The honourable member for Placentia West will probably confirm that, or otherwise he can correct us on it. At any rate it was brought to me from Marystown. Now that is being brought into an ice-free port which I believe has one of the finest fish plants in the world, and certainly they have the finest draggers and they certainly have the finest fishermen, most of whom, or a good many of whom do come from Marystown area, where they have the finest fishermen in the world.

Now, Sir, the Minister then in his budget speech, he leaves that and goes on, that is one of the achievements, so he goes on to the next achievement of the Government during the past five years:

"We have directly brought about the creation of fifteen entirely new industries in Newfoundland. I refer here, of course, to the new industrial plants. Three of these—the cement mill, the gypsum wallboard mill, and the birch veneer, plywood, flooring and door mill—were built by the Government at the Government's expense. The cement mill has since been sold, the birch plant has been leased to a private company and the gypsum wall board plant is being operated by a Crown company until a satisfactory purchaser is found for it."

"The other twelve plants have been launched by European companies by means of cash loans made to them by us. These loans, all of which bear interest, are for periods which vary between ten and fifteen years."

"Of the fifteen new plants three are in full production, eleven are in part production, and one has not yet finished construction of its plants. Most of the eleven that are in part production, began production within the past few weeks or months, and can scarcely be said to have commenced operations as yet."

I would like while on that particular item to refer to the cement plant. The cement plant, Mr. Speaker, was built by a firm called MIAG and by a sub-contractor Mr. W. J. Lundrigan. I have here the agreement which was made between the Government and Mr. Lundrigan, W. J. Lundrigan Limited, relative to the building of the cement plant and also the gypsum plant, and the amendments made later. First the agreement made with Mr. Lundrigan was on the 7th day of August 1950. That was an agreement between the Honourable Joseph R. Smallwood, Minister of Economic Development, in

the Province of Newfoundland, hereinafter called the Government and William J. Lundrigan Limited.

The work is defined and shown in the said plants—The Government agrees to pay to the contractor the sum of money set out. It is agreed and declared all provisions, plans, specifications and additional plans and specifications referred to shall be binding on the Government. That is signed by Joseph R. Smallwood; Witnessed by Leslie R. Curtis, signed by Mr. Lundrigan and the specifications are as follows: Concrete and masonry work—concrete for factory and foundations for the machinery to be used in plant — That includes forms and concrete aggregate—Payment will be made to the contractor at the price of \$40 a cubic yard. Then it goes on to tell about the main masonry work, etc. I find that the total involved under this contract is \$525,500. I have discovered in the vouchers held by the Department of Finance that we paid Mr. Lundrigan under the same contract and under the heading, cement plant construction, \$982,956. Remember the contract called for an expenditure of \$525,500 and the amount paid under the same contract and charged to the cement plant construction was \$982,956. Included in that cost were the cubic yards of concrete which were paid for at \$37.40 and up to \$56 per cubic yard. On further search I found charged to the cement plant construction re-charges to cement plant construction a total of \$168,181, bags of cement, most of it sold to the Government by Mr. Lundrigan, at \$1.30 per bag or a total of about \$218,642. That was \$1.30 a bag. Incidentally in connection with that \$1.30 I find exactly the same time, almost the same month, Mr. Chester Dawe who built the birch

plant charged up \$1.60 per bag. That is quite a difference, that is a difference of 30c. per bag.

Now what I want to know, and have not yet been told—Why did we buy all this cement from Mr. Lundrigan for construction of the cement plant when according to the contract he was to supply the concrete at a definite price anywhere from \$37 up to \$56 a yard, for which we paid him, and for which we received receipts for the construction of the cement plant? What I am asking the Government to tell me is why did we have to buy from Mr. Lundrigan that cement for the construction of the cement plant, 168,186 bags of cement—almost enough to keep the cement plant going after they did get started for a while. I don't know whether anybody on the Government side can tell me how that is. If they could do so I would appreciate it. Right now, Sir, I cannot go any further into the argument. It seems to me if a person signs a contract to put up foundations, build a building, for a contractor to put in 7,400 yards of concrete, which I think it called for, and for which they were paid from \$37 to \$56 a cubic yard, it seems to me rather strange to find 186,000 bags of cement charged up to the same job. I don't know if anybody would be able to tell me the explanation. I have not been able to find one.

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works) : If the honourable gentleman would allow me. I am afraid I missed part of the discussion he is dealing with. But I thought as I returned to the Chamber I understood him to say that the contractor was contracting to pour 7,400 yards of concrete and there also was 168,000 bags of cement?

MR. HOLLETT : What I said was that he supplied us with concrete that is to be paid for by the Government at \$40 and went as high as \$56 per cubic yard. The 6,000 cubic yards was to be paid for and was paid for at a rate of \$58 per cubic yard. That was to erect the plant. In addition to that Mr. Lundrigan sold the Government 168,000 bags of cement. I am asking for information. What does the Minister know?

MR. SPENCER : I would say, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable gentleman's question, I happen to know that Mr. Lundrigan was appointed agent for the North Star Cement Co., distributing agent, and it could be, naturally that he sold, or cement was sold, to the Government through his firm, which could be for some other purpose. I don't know exactly—the thing is too vague. Anyone who knows anything about concrete, you use roughly four to six bags per yard, any common-jack could tell you that. I would say the two prices referred to \$37 a yard and \$56 a yard, if these are the prices quoted—I can assure the honourable gentleman and the House that you cannot get a contractor to place concrete in any form today at prices below that. We have bid prices and I have been in a position to collect quite a few of them in the last few years. We have had bid prices for bridge construction—I would say that \$37 is a very good price. We have had at the same time bid prices for \$60 for super-structure work and reinforcement and special forms which go as high as \$120 a yard. I don't know if this has any bearing on what the honourable gentleman was saying. In reference to the large number of bags of cement sold to the Government I would say it was sold to the Gov-



ernment for other jobs elsewhere, and transported some place else, I don't know just where.

MR. HOLLETT: Why charge it to cement plant construction?

MR. SPENCER: That again I would not know.

MR. HOLLETT: I have the contract here which calls for a certain amount of concrete.

MR. SPENCER: If there is any question about it at all—

MR. HOLLETT: There is a question.

MR. SPENCER: I assure the honourable member nobody would use that much cement in six thousand yards of concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: I know that. I took the trouble to find out all that. In fact I went to a big concrete firm in St. John's, that is Concrete Products—They assured me \$37 to \$56 was reasonable. I am not questioning that — The contract calls for 46,000 yards. But what I am questioning is the 168,186 bags of cement charged to the cement plant construction.

MR. SPENCER: It must have been for more than six thousand yards there. It must have been some other part.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): I might say, Lundrigan's firm only did part of the construction—That was only part of the construction of the plant. The remaining part was done by the contractors themselves. That may be the explanation—I know that happened.

MR. HOLLETT: I mean, why does it not show somewhere? Any person going to look at the bills and vouchers would say that Mr. Lundri-

gan used it. According to the contract he was to supply all these things and he got paid for them, and also for 168,000 bags of cement under the same heading of the cement plant construction. I want to know what it is for?

MR. SPENCER: Again I may be able to help the honourable gentleman, if he wishes me to try. The 6,400 yards, I would say the number of bags of cement required for that would be part of the 168,000 referred to because \$37 does not cover the cost of cement, rest assured of that, our contract price would prove that to you. The honourable gentleman mentioned the name of a very prominent concrete firm. A few months ago we had bids from that very self-same firm to complete a lot of work for us. I hope they can do more as they have done a very excellent job. They built the Gander River Bridge for us last year. In no case have we got contracts for concrete work at \$37 to \$40 or even \$50 which includes the cement. The cement has to be added. In Public Works as we provide contracts we supply the cement and reinforcing steel. The actual making and placing of it is what we pay \$37 a yard for.

MR. HOLLETT: You mean to say the Government paid \$37 a yard just for—

MR. SPENCER: With the aggregate and placing and form work, yes, and more.

MR. HOLLETT: You can buy concrete anywhere in St. John's for \$17.50 a yard.

MR. SPENCER: Form work has to be laid—

MR. HOLLETT: That is specified in the contract.



MR. SPENCER: The form work is not paid for in that \$37 a yard. I don't think the honourable gentleman will find the form work is specified and charged for clear of that.

MR. HOLLETT: The quantity of concrete required is estimated at six thousand yards, which will be paid for, including forms and finishings where needed.

MR. SPENCER: Exactly what I said, including the forms, exactly.

MR. HOLLETT: What else would put the price up?

MR. SPENCER: The \$37, as I have said, is the price per yard of concrete, the price for which the contractors just provide the forms and workmanship to put the forms there, get the aggregate and mix the cement, which is provided with the aggregate and place it in the form at \$37.

MR. HOLLETT: Which is provided by somebody else?

MR. SPENCER: Yes, the cement is provided by the owner, in our case, exactly the same thing applies there. I am not sure, but if it did not the price would be more than \$37 a yard.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean to tell me Mr. Lundrigan is getting \$58 for reinforced concrete, and that he provides everything except the cement?

MR. SPENCER: And the steel.

MR. HOLLETT: Cement is \$1.30 a bag. That does not account for 168,000 bags.

MR. SPENCER: No, the honourable gentleman is missing the point there. May I endeavour to clarify that a little further. The honourable gentleman is quoting that the concrete is \$37 per yard. First of all I

would say that we have not yet gotten the price down to that figure. We cannot get a contractor today to place concrete, build the forms and do the job and put it in place for \$37, even by the firm the honourable gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago. We had their bid price on concrete and many other firms at \$60 a yard and still higher. The point is simply this: The contractor who contracts to build, say a bridge, for the Department of Public Works, on the Trans-Canada Highway, if you like, so that it is checked by the Federal Government, our partner in the Trans-Canada Highway, and our contract is that we ask the contractor to put in say five thousand cubic yards of concrete. What is the quoted bid price? Cement is supplied by us and steel is supplied by us, and he quotes his price \$37, \$40, \$60 whatever the price may be. That is the price that he gets for making, providing the aggregate, sand and stone and water and equipment to mix it and form, the workmanship to put the forms in place, mix the concrete and bring it along and pour it in the different forms for the five thousand yards. He then gets \$37 a yard and we would supply the cement—So you may add nine dollars to that, roughly.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't question these prices at all, but the honourable gentleman must understand—for the amount of concrete required, 6,400 yards, multiply that by six, about 38,000 bags. I want to know why the 168,000?

MR. SPENCER: I would say it has no bearing on it at all.

MR. HOLLETT: It is charged under the contract.

MR. SPENCER: Then it was used over and above for some other purpose.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to know why?

MR. SPENCER: I don't know. I did not provide the reports.

MR. HOLLETT: Why is the honourable gentleman interfering if he knows nothing about it?

MR. SPENCER: I take exception to that Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—The honourable gentleman asks why I interfere if I know nothing about it—I think he has been honest enough in the past to admit I do know something about it. I think he knows in his heart that I do. The point of order is, Mr. Speaker, I made the statement that I knew nothing about it—I consider I know my job and know about concrete, a little more perhaps than the honourable gentleman, and I will help him a little further if I can. I am capable of doing it, and glad to do it—But the point I am making now is that the 168,000 bags referred to could definitely not have been related alone to that six thousand cubic yards of concrete.

MR. HOLLETT: That is why I am trying to find out.

MR. SPENCER: I merely said then, it was not my job to provide the contract so that I do not know where the rest went. But I submit to the honourable gentleman and the House it is a very simple matter to find out if he wishes—Let us ask the contractor.

MR. HOLLETT: I want the honourable gentleman to understand—I don't know anything about his knowledge of concrete. I will say what I please.

MR. SPENCER: I will check you on anything I do have.

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition continue, and that the Honourable Minister of Public Works would refute his remarks later.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable Minister apparently has spoken now to the budget. He has done more talking than I have since I came in from lunch.

MR. POWER: Perhaps the honourable gentleman will table a question on that?

MR. HOLLETT: I might. What I was about to say, Sir, is that I am not questioning the knowledge of the honourable gentleman in regard to concrete, I am questioning his knowledge with regard to this contract. I have told you, Sir, that under the contract with W. J. Lundrigan for building—I am not implying nothing wrong nor dishonourable to anybody. I am stating facts under that contract. As I have added it up we were to pay William J. Lundrigan \$525,500 under that contract. I have added up the bills in the Finance Department charged to that contract and I find that we paid him nine hundred odd thousand dollars. Now that is quite a difference, and I wonder why. Then I discovered that in addition to his supplying the concrete, he had sold to the Government 168,000 bags of cement. What I am anxious to find out is—For what? The Honourable Minister of Public Works now tells me part of it was for that concrete.

MR. SPENCER: I am only assuming.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not the information I got from a firm which deals in concrete, at that price at any rate—That is the point—It is something for the Government to find out

about. First there was an Order in Council made for William J. Lundrigan for \$75,000, not saying what for, paid over \$75,000 without appearing in the Act nor in the Department of Finance to show what it is for, and in August 1952 Mr. Lundrigan submitted a final statement of his account for the construction of the cement plant and I presume that was paid. Yet two weeks later there is another final statement for a claim of \$35,468.00. I may point out here, Sir, that Mr. Lundrigan has not done badly at all since this Government came into power. Altogether his firm has been paid by the Government for the construction of the two plants and other government work since 1950 an amount of \$3,200,000—I consider that is not bad for one firm. However, if the government can give me the explanation for that 168,000 bags of cement—mind you it is charged to the construction of the cement plant and is not charged to anything else—Even if it were meant to go into the concrete there were only 6,400 cubic yards altogether in both. Anyway I submit that to the Government to see what it is all about. As I say; I am imputing nothing dishonest, nothing crooked nor anything like that although some people might think I am, I am not—I just want to find out.

Speaking of the gypsum plant — I don't want to say very much about that for various reasons. Mr. Lundrigan was to build that too. The contract is here, and it is pretty much the same as the other, but the amounts spent, of course, were very much less or were supposed to be much less. In this particular case I believe there was a slight up-grading of price. Incidentally I forgot to mention that in the building of the cement plant the first thing the Government, who had

abandoned the age old romanticism, did was to build a road out to the site or some site or other costing thirty thousand dollars. Then they had to abandon the road altogether and put the plant somewhere else. That does not indicate the arrow going straight at that time, this arrow of economic direction.

The next thing the Minister praises the Government for during the past five years is the setting up of a Royal Commission on Forestry and then on Agriculture. In all, he called it, a great and noble contribution.

Then he goes on to the expenditure: According to the Minister's speech, Sir, expenditures last year on current account were \$3.4 millions and revenue \$6 million, giving a surplus 2.7 millions. This year we are expected to get a surplus of \$3,600,000. Here again I refer to the abandonment of the economic romanticism of the old governments, and the new system envisaged by this Government. Speaking of a surplus of \$3,600,000 on current account; that looks good on paper, sounds good going over the air, especially when you have the mike in front of you when saying it—a surplus of \$3,600,000—Boy what a government! I might point out, when we borrow twelve million and take away or subtract the amount of the surplus then the statement as shown might mean we will show a considerable deficit. As a matter of fact the Government have been running on deficit budgeting ever since they came into power, with deficit budgets every year in my estimation, over-spending at the rate of ten million dollars a year compared to our earning capacity and running our national debt from \$3,400,000 up to thirteen million and now we are about to bring it up to

twenty-five millions— Economic Romanticism—And remember, Sir, they had to borrow money. Last year we had to give a few dollars advance to the fishermen.

In regard to taxation—We are to increase our taxation this year on gasoline, one cent a gallon, thirty-seven thousand dollars, SSA tax about six million and the cancer tax five hundred thousand.

Getting back to the budget speech, the minister called that sound business, very sound business. I have a note here, Sir, to see page 21. I did not know what was on that until I looked. I think the House will remember that since the budget was brought down we have kept very, very busy. Yes, what I was going to say there was to congratulate the Minister on the clever and distinguished manner in which he set forth the expenditure of surpluses since the Government came into power. I think it is the best exposition of the surplus expenditure which has been made. On page 22 he said:—"Having taken in a total of \$66,000,000—I don't know where they took in \$66,000,000. I have an idea it was forty-four million they inherited—"Having taken in a total of \$66,000,000 and spent \$55,000,000 of it, we have still an amount of approximately \$10,500,000. This amount lies on deposit with the Government of Canada to our credit, and draws interest at the rate of 2.5/100." That, Sir, we could not touch.

Another thing which was brought out by the budget, when the Minister was speaking of the pattern he said that we had spent \$17,500,000 on capital account, \$17,500,000 as against \$11,000,000 last year. I wonder what is the meaning of "Manufacturing De-

velopments?" Does that refer to new industries? I take it that these are the new industries, some \$2,763,100. A quite amusing thing is on page 24: "It will probably come as an even greater surprise to some people to learn that \$23,000,000 of the amount expended is recoverable and will return to the Treasury, most of it paying interest to the Exchequer in the meantime." Then he goes on to figure out how it is made up.

Housing: I have no doubt about that—It is being recovered. Loan Boards: \$772,000, that is to say the Fisheries Loan Board, the Agricultural Loan Board and the Co-operative Loan Board—\$72,000—He hopes to get that back. Crown plants \$11,161,000, that is, cement, gypsum and birch—The Minister calls them recoverable assets.

I made a few notes here, Sir, and if the House will bear with me I will read them: In his analysis of the revenue as forecast in 1954-55 he says the total is \$39,200,300. An increase of \$28,000,000 in the Department of Finance; Health just over \$3,000,000; Welfare \$1,500,000; Board of Liquor Control \$3,000,000; Public Works just over \$1,000,000 and of the \$28,000,000 in Finance Department there comes from Canada about \$18,000,000. Then there is the Statutory Subsidiary \$1,500,000 from year to year. Tax Rental Agreement \$12,500,00 and the Transitional Grant \$4,000,000. Now the Tax Rental Agreement, Sir, which is based upon the gross national product has naturally increased ever since union, and I hope that we shall see a steady increase in that because it is a natural reaction from increased population and increased prosperity in the whole of Canada.

The Transitional Grant is something, I think, of a very serious nature to which we ought to give serious thought. As we remember, Sir, the first years of union that turned in in revenue some six and a half million dollars. Now in the sixth year of union the Transitional Grant is less than four million, in fact, \$3,950,000. That has been decreasing at the rate of \$550,000 a year. Now there is only one way to make that up, and that is by increased taxation, unless, of course, the Federal Government revises the Terms of Union upward.

The remaining \$10,000,000, Sir, under the heading of "Finance" comes largely from taxation, tax on gasoline is increased by 1c. a gallon and is consequently expected to bring in \$2,370,000, and the SSA tax estimation is to yield an amount of \$6,700,000.

I have pointed out already how dependent our income was, during the past few years at any rate and during the years of Commission of Government, on a war economy. I have also pointed out, Sir, that the references to prosperity are not entirely too hopeful as far as I can see. Prosperity, as I pointed out this morning, is relative—

MR. SMALLWOOD: You still have not answered that question.

MR. HOLLETT: The question being?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You might answer that.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the question again?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did the system of schooner, fishing vessel and by individuals that used to exist at Burin produce prosperity or does the

present big plant and modern deep-sea draggers produce prosperity — Which of the two would produce the greater prosperity in Burin for the people, the community, the town?

MR. HOLLETT: In this present day and generation, I hope the Honourable the Premier is not doing what he has so often accused us of doing—Living in the past—He knows as well as I do, and as I pointed out this morning, the question of prosperity is a relative matter. He knows the dollar today is not worth as much as twenty-five cents was ten or twenty years ago, and certainly must less than it was forty years ago, the period to which he referred.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you for an answer.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I hope it is quite clear.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is now perfectly clear.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder what the Honourable the Premier calls prosperity?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the honourable gentleman want to know?

MR. HOLLETT: I have no intention of yielding. I have heard the Honourable the Premier talking. I have heard him talk today, and he gave a very excellent talk. I believe he was all of fifteen minutes, and all he said was—We need you men down here with all your brains to make our fisheries prosperous. These are the words that he spoke. I believe he even forgot to welcome the men here—But he made an excellent speech. I have already praised him on that, but must not give him too much.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One might use up five minutes with a little paraphrase on my speech.

MR. HOLLETT: I can stay here days and days and days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go ahead.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not going to be shamed into sitting down. I shall take my time. I might go over five years, but God forbid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that time the honourable gentleman might say something by accident.

MR. HOLLETT: I have said something already, and will not be laughed off, it cannot be laughed off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, sir!

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Sir, actually, apart from the eighteen million that comes in to the Treasury from Canada the only real money that comes in comes in from what we call new taxes, comes in from gasoline \$2,337,000, Sales Tax \$6,700,000 and Liquor \$3,300,200 and a million from the people for registration of vehicles and drivers licenses, etc. Trading Profit Board of Liquor Control, 1950, where it was estimated \$1,650,000, or that was in 1949—That is something I want to refer to—The estimates of one Mr. Thompson. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier remembers Mr. Thompson. I believe they had him engaged at the time they were discussing the Terms of Union and they got hold of this great firm of Peat, Marwick and Mitchell who sent Mr. Thompson who was to estimate what would be the probable revenue that would accrue to the Government of Newfoundland if it became a Province of Canada. Now just look at this, Sir, and then smile at it, if you can. I am referring to the year 1954

and I am going to compare Mr. Thompson's estimates of our revenue in 1954-55 to that of the Honourable Minister of Finance for the same year. For instance Mr. Thompson estimated for the year 1954-55, and I am sure the Premier will recognize these papers — On gasoline, he said that we would—And I remind you, Sir, it was on the recommendation of Mr. Thompson that the committee who went to Ottawa signed the Terms of Union. It was largely on the basis of his findings and recommendations that the committee signed the Terms of Union. I want to show you how right he was about our probable revenue estimates. He estimated for 1954-55 a collection on gasoline of \$1,500,000. The Minister of Finance estimates that we will collect \$2,370,000. And we are all quite sure we prefer to take the figure of the Honourable Minister of Finance. Mr. Thompson told the committee that went up to sign the Terms of Union that we would in this year, 1954-55 get \$1,717,000. What we are going to collect, according to the Minister is \$2,895,800, nearly a million dollars on liquor. Mr. Thompson estimated we would collect this year \$1,636,000. Mr. Power's estimate for this year is \$3,320,000—So you will see, Sir, it is more than double in some cases and double in connection with the liquor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is remarkable how our prosperity has increased.

MR. HOLLETT: It is prosperity he harps on—The word "Prosperity."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Remarkable! Remarkable!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have some letters in my possession which I also may take out and read to the House, one in particular is



from a poor woman down in Mr. Premier's own district, with ten in family whose husband is ill, crippled and can't work. Some of the children get the family allowance. On able-bodied relief \$51 a month, and the conditions which that poor woman described under which she lived would make the Honourable the Premier and the Minister of Welfare actually shed tears. We might have to remember then there are twelve people, a crippled father and a mother, twelve people including the ten children. They get a certain amount in family allowances. They get \$50 a month dole order—Does that family exhibit any of this so-called prosperity?

HON. DR. H. L. POTTLE (Minister of Public Welfare) : Rehabilitation of families is not entirely a matter for government responsibility, not in every case, and everywhere.

MR. HOLLETT : If the Honourable Minister wants to absolve the Government it is his affair. I maintain it is the responsibility of any government to look after the afflicted and sick—And I have already paid a tribute, I believe, to the Honourable Minister's department — But I am pointing out there is no such thing as prosperity as such. There can be that most abject poverty right in the midst of the highest level of prosperity in our or in any government.

MR. SMALLWOOD : Would the honourable gentleman clarify that—I am a little puzzled—He has me puzzled—I know he does not want to see me puzzled, and would like to set me right. That is why he is speaking—He wants to change the policy, he wants us to adopt his policy. He, therefore, wants us to agree, but all he has done is puzzle us.

MR. SPEAKER : Is that a point of order?

MR. SMALLWOOD : No, Mr. Speaker, it is not even a point of privilege. I merely asked the honourable gentleman to set me straight there—There is no prosperity because of a poor woman somewhere — therefore, there is no prosperity, is that the point?

MR. HOLLETT : I did not say there was no prosperity. I said prosperity is a relative term, and poverty can exist in the midst of prosperity. Take the case I cited of men in Burin district fishing at the highest level on draggers, draggers in which the Government has invested millions of dollars and in the plants. Yet fishermen fishing on these boats have to go on relief when they come to the land, and their families have to go on the dole while they are still out there. Mr. Speaker, that is not prosperity. There is prosperity there? And here are the men working at what is the best part of the fishing industry—

MR. POTTLE : Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition mind indicating where this family is, whether in a rural or an urban area?

MR. HOLLETT : A rural area—That should not make any difference. Take the case, Mr. Speaker, of the honourable member for White Bay, the case which he himself mentioned yesterday, and there is no need to repeat them—To me those people are not undergoing too much prosperity—But I am getting away from the point, Sir.

I was speaking of Mr. Thompson—What I want to drive home, Sir, is this : If it is possible to drive it home : The very man whose word was accepted for the signing of the financial part of our terms in 1949,

that very man gave an estimate of our revenue and expenditure for this Year of Our Lord, and as he also did for other years up to 1955-56—He gave these estimates, and, Sir, they are no more like what has actually happened than chalk is like cheese. I want to point out, therefore, how unrealistic might have been the advice which he tendered to the committee who were sent up by Newfoundland to sign the Terms of Union. For instance he forecast a total revenue for this year, that is 1954-55, of \$12,844,000, if we went into Confederation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tax revenue.

MR. HOLLETT: He placed the transitional grant of \$2,450,000 this year. Actually it will be \$3,950,000 or \$1,500,000 greater. Therefore if we add this we get Mr. Thompson's forecast as \$14,344,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From all sources?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes. The Minister of Finance has estimated for this year, and I have no doubt he has made a very good estimate. His estimate for this year was \$39,300,200. Mr. Thompson's estimate was \$14,344,000. I have been very careful about these figures, Sir, because it strikes me that figures, like prosperity, can be very unrealistic. Mr. Thompson however, and rightly so, I think, did not add in the amount to be received from Canada on account of Health, Welfare and Public Works this year. This last amount, I believe, is something of the order of six million dollars. Therefore, in justice to Mr. Thompson, Sir, let us add on to his estimate this six millions and get a revised estimate of \$20,344,000 for this year, 1954-55. Taking everything into consideration, he has estimated that would be our revenue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The rest came from additional prosperity.

MR. HOLLETT: As against the Minister's estimate of \$39,300,200. In other words that is a difference of nineteen million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Extra prosperity.

MR. HOLLETT: Can we call it extra prosperity? I am talking in figures. It may be inflation. I am not concerned what you call it. I know we have some prosperity and I know we have too much poverty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOLLETT: And I think that cannot be avoided to some extent in any civilization. Now then, how is that being made up. How did the Honourable Minister of Finance actually make up the difference, Sir, of \$19,000,000, the difference between Mr. Thompson's estimates and his for this year:

Social Security Taxation \$6,700,000  
—Invested in liquor sales \$1,600,000.  
Increase in Motor Vehicle Registration \$650,000. Increase in gasoline taxation \$1,370,000. Then there are smaller receipts, Sir, that account for nearly \$10,000,00, which makes up the amount of \$19,000,000 including an amount of \$500,000 on a tax called Cancer Control. So you will see, Sir, having taken everything into consideration, Mr. Thompson did not visualize that this Government would have to impose a three per cent taxation. He did not realize we would have to put on a cancer tax. He did not realize we would make such a high profit out of liquor. More than that he did not think the taxes, if I may put it that way, on gasoline and motor registration would be so high.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—I wonder if we can have a recess now—It is half past four o'clock.

House recessed for ten minutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, when we recessed I was referring to the unreality of the forecast made by Mr. Thompson, the expert. Incidentally, Sir, Mr. Thompson is the expert who I believe presently will be employed to assist our own committee now investigating the situation further for an increase upward of our Terms of Union. I am pointing out the unreality of his guess of what we would have in this Year of Our Lord 1954-55 by way of estimates. I point out that he was nearly \$19,000,000 out. But, of course, Mr. Thompson was not in a position to see that this Government would tax the people of this Province to the extent of nearly seven million dollars in three per cent sales tax, and there were other things of course which his power of vision could not foretell. As far as I can see, if we had Mr. Thompson this year as Finance Minister our people would be taxed less than they are at the present time, by eight or ten million dollars. That may be a little bit high so I will put that down to seven million dollars, which I think would be more realistic. When we consider, Sir, the difference between the estimates made by Mr. Thompson and the estimates made by the present Minister of Finance we are apt to ask ourselves why the difference? What is all the trouble? As I have gone more into it, Sir, I have come to the conclusion the answer is in the extravagance and waste and ill-expenditures of the present administration. I could point out thousands and thousands of

cases where I, at any rate, deem it to be an actual waste of expenditure. Then again, there does not seem to be any attempt made by the present Government to keep within bounds the administration which is set up to rule the destinies of our country. I mean it when I say we have the most extravagant Province in all Canada and I base it on an examination of one item alone, for instance, civil service salaries. Now we know we have an adequate civil service, and know they have to be paid an adequate wage. In Newfoundland next year we will pay out in civil service salaries \$9,235,000. We have a population of 380,000 people. Nova Scotia, with a population of over 700,000, will pay out \$6,500,000 in civil service salaries. In other words we in Newfoundland pay out in civil service salaries some two and a half million dollars more than they do in Nova Scotia.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Will my honourable friend allow me? On that point surely he is leaving out in the case of Nova Scotia what the municipalities pay in civil service salaries. These are paid in Newfoundland by the Provincial Government. To get the comparison it would be necessary to add the two together in Nova Scotia, in order to compare with Newfoundland.

**MR. HOLLETT:** No, I am not leaving out a thing, as far as I know.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Has the honourable gentleman quoted the figure?

**MR. HOLLETT:** We have municipalities in this country to whom we are paying out large sums of money.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Not for schools and hospitals. They are included there but they are not in their

estimates of salaries. Here the Department of Education is included.

MR. HOLLETT: No teachers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not the teachers.

MR. HOLLETT: Teachers you are talking about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the Department of Education, the salaries of teachers.

MR. HOLLETT: I make a statement here now we pay out \$9,235,000 and Nova Scotia \$6½ millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We pay out less than Nova Scotia. The honourable gentleman means the Government of Nova Scotia and not the Province of Nova Scotia—because in Nova Scotia he has to include—

MR. HOLLETT: I am talking about both governments.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case the comparison is unrealistic, the comparison is simply ridiculous. To get a comparison he has to include the provincial and municipal salaries of each province.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not including the municipalities of either.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case the comparison is just silly.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense—I always notice, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier gets up against a hard point, he gets up and endeavours to contradict. If he wants to bring in the facts, all right, let him bring them in.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is just trading on people's ignorance.

MR. HOLLETT: All right! Does the Honourable the Premier know

what the revenue of Nova Scotia is this year—I am talking about the Provincial Government, and that is what I am dealing in, Provincial Government—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is where the honourable gentleman is going wrong. To have a comparable position when you compare governments you must compare all expenses in Newfoundland with government and municipal expenses in Nova Scotia. You have got to include the municipalities of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland because in Nova Scotia the municipalities look after hospitals, look after schools, look after fire brigades. There the municipalities do many things which in Newfoundland the Newfoundland Government do and not the municipalities.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to point out I have included in Nova Scotia the expenditures made by hospitals etc. I have taken care to have them in both countries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the honourable gentleman has not included the health expenditures of the municipalities of Nova Scotia.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not talking about municipalities.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To make a comparison you have to take them into account.

MR. HOLLETT: You do that when you get a chance—You compare city by city, town by town. Nova Scotia this year, Sir, has a revenue of \$50,000,000 they have seven hundred thousand and some odd people, what the odd is I don't know. We are supposed to collect a revenue of \$39,000,000 from 380,000, practically half the number of people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Add the municipalities of Nova Scotia to these figures.

MR. HOLLETT: Let the Premier do it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But the honourable gentleman does not want to deceive the people of Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not trying to deceive anyone. I am talking about provincial governments. Is that deceiving the people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know what else it is.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to know who deceived the people a good many years on the northeast coast including St. Barbe District.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I must ask the honourable gentleman to leave my district out of the debate. I cannot speak in the debate to defend it. I know it is unintentional. But please leave my district out of debate. Any point made by an honourable member speaking can be repudiated by a succeeding speaker.

Honourable member will proceed with his speech:

MR. HOLLETT: I want to point out also, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Newfoundland last year had travelling expenses of nearly five hundred thousand dollars. What did Nova Scotia have? Now I know Nova Scotia is somewhat different, and yet I am not sure it is so much different. A short time ago I travelled down through and saw the small villages and towns scattered down the Nova Scotia coast, and I could quite see it is difficult to get to some of them except over a very rough and muddy road. But there is a significant dif-

ference. The Province of Nova Scotia spent, or the Provincial Government, spent \$46,000,000. Newfoundland is scheduled to spend \$53,000,000. It just does not make sense to me, Sir, it does not make sense at all.

Take the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority—We pay our Mr. Dustan \$25,000 a year. We pay Mr. Young and Mr. Winsor \$25,000 and on top of that, Sir, we pay Mr. Planta \$15,000. These four men are being paid \$90,000 by this small province. Incidentally Sir, while I am on that question of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, I am distinctly worried about that situation, and the relationship in financial connection between the Deputy Minister of Fisheries and the Newfoundland Hotel plus Crosbie, H. B. C. Lake, H. A. Russell, J. R. Smallwood (I take it that is the Premier) and the Department of Fisheries. I am deeply worried that any deputy minister should become so involved, and I might say, Sir, I am not too happy over the situation relative to Mr. Dustan and Mr. Young both of whom have been closely associated in the past years with firms to whom this Government has loaned many millions of dollars. Now I say that with all due regard to the honesty and integrity of these men. But I say, I am not happy about the situation.

We have twelve Cabinet Ministers. It takes \$120,000 to look after them. Nova Scotia has eight.

DR. POTTLE: Cabinet members, Mr. Speaker, not Cabinet Ministers.

MR. HOLLETT: There is \$7,000 plus \$3,000 to each man, I understand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They don't get that as Cabinet Ministers.

MR. HOLLETT: They get \$7,000 as Cabinet Ministers.



MR. SMALLWOOD: And that is \$84,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Plus \$3,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't get that as Cabinet Ministers. Why not add in the salary of the Leader of the Opposition with the Cabinet.

MR. HOLLETT: Make your own comments later—don't lie.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Don't lie?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not lying—don't lie.

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind honourable members about the use of that word. Yes, I will say it—The other day I told the House to have care for the dignity and reputation of this ancient colony and new province. It is futile to say there is no Hansard—The world has ears—I can show honourable members a clipping from a newspaper in Maine, which has a great reputation, which, when I read it, raised my ire to the highest point, and at the same time made me blush because it was founded partly on fact. I am just citing that so that honourable members will make an attempt to control their tempers, shall I say, and not use those unparliamentary words—Please resume the speech:

MR. HOLLETT: I checked on the total of 94 of the highest paid civil servants and Cabinet Ministers and I found, Sir, that the 94 men cost us in salaries \$750,110, averaging approximately \$8,000 each per year. Altogether, Sir, we have 3,974 civil servants costing \$9,235,000, an increase of 600 civil servants since the year 1950.

DR. POTTLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, while the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is looking for his notes—He has been known in this House to

plead for higher salaries for civil servants.

MR. HOLLETT: Has that any bearing? Surely they should be paid properly. But you don't want two people to every job like in some departments, in some administration departments in this Government, and I won't mention any one.

Here is another — We have these three men getting \$75,000 and one man getting \$15,000—In that connection, Sir, I would like to point out here, and it is worthy of note—From 1909 to 1920, a period of eleven years the total amount of money spent by the Government was 15¼ millions, in eleven years. The present Government will spend that this year and more. In addition to the departments which we have now we then had the customs, postal telegraphs and we had the railway and a dozen-and-one and how it was done I don't know. I am just making the comparison.

During that period, Sir, we as a Dominion, if you wish, borrowed eighteen million dollars in the ten or eleven year period, and four million dollars of that was used in the construction of branch railways and the remaining twelve million dollars was for maintenance of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment during World War I. Last year or the year before we borrowed ten million dollars and this year will borrow another twelve million dollars. I recite these things, Sir, because I am concerned about them. I am concerned for several reasons—We know that some time between now and 1957, I believe it is, a Royal Commission will be set up to see what about our financial Terms of Union—Will they be sufficient to allow us to supply the necessary services and carry on the Government and supply the



services on a basis with those in other Provinces of Canada having regard to the ability of our people to pay taxation?

We know that at this time we have around this coast certain areas which are sadly neglected, and which the Government have been unable to or at least have not made any improvement insofar as public services are concerned. I realize, Sir, it is not easy for the Government to make additions in public services everywhere and at any time. I realize how difficult it is. But we must face the position that the public services in certain areas of our country are far below those in other provinces such as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and P.E.I. The Royal Commission will be set up to decide just what the Government of Canada is going to do about it. If they come down here, Sir, in a couple of years time and find that we are paying \$25,000 and \$30,000 a year salaries to individuals—That we are paying travelling expenses comparable to those in Nova Scotia, that we are flinging out money here and there, borrowing it to dish out to certain industries, I wonder what the reaction will be. I throw that out as a suggestion to the Government. It might be well, within the next couple of years, to sort of cut the garment to the cloth, improve all possible public services and bring our living within our public finances and by our living so be able to show that Royal Commission when they come that we actually and really need an upward measurement of our financial needs.

I pointed out, Sir, some time ago that we are still in the midst of a war economy. In 1939 and 1940 our revenue was of the order of \$11,221,242. Then the war broke out and in 1940-

41 it jumped to \$16,000,000 and in the next year to \$23,000,000, in 1943-44 it jumped again to \$29,000,000 until in 1945-46 our revenue was \$33,000,000. And if we cast our minds backwards, and I had occasion to go through the financial report which was made to the National Convention, and I found there from 1897 to 1946 a period of Sir, this Government spent a total of well over \$200,000,000 and by the fiscal year will have spent \$253,000,000. In other words they have spent in the five years just past practically half as much as was spent by all the governments of Newfoundland during the fifty-year period between 1897 and 1946. We have to remember, too, Sir, that during that period they too established new industries, they too advanced or guaranteed loans, they built a railway and they did all sorts of things, loaned money to the fisheries and assisted the fishermen, paid bounties on boats and various other things. Of course, they built more roads than this Government is doing, but did not spend as much money.

In spite of all that, Sir, we have many thousands of men today looking for work—In spite of all the Government spending and all the prosperity which the Honourable the Premier talks about. I would suggest, Sir, that it might be advisable for the Government, and it might be advisable for the Honourable Minister of Finance to cut out the boasting about past achievements during the five years just gone—don't let us boast too much—I can assure the honourable gentleman that they will not be boasting when that Royal Commission comes down here to make its inquiry as to our financial needs—It won't be any good to boast then of our achievements unless we have achieved more than we have in the past five years.

I turn now to economic development, on the capital side. I was going to quote from that, but I don't think it is necessary. I wished to refer to the \$3,300,000, and already I find \$1,885,000 of it being allocated—a good bit of that has already been spent—But there are a couple of them to which I wish to refer now, in an agreement which was signed by the Minister of Economic Development, and the one I wish to refer to is the one in which I shall read section 2 (1) The Government shall lease the factory to the operator for a period of fifteen years from the day the factory is in readiness for operation at an annual rent of—(and so on down to the end of Clause 2 here-of) Then—The net profit shall be computed by deducting from the gross revenue a payment to the Government equal to the full normal depreciation on the building, plant and equipment allowed by the Taxation Division of the Department of National Revenue.

Now I know that has not been done—"Payment to the Government equal to the full normal depreciation on the building"—If we take the cost of the building and the value of the building at a mere \$3,000,000 or \$2,000,000 what would the depreciation be over a period of years? I should take it it would be one-fifth or one-sixth on that set aside for depreciation. Nothing of that nature has been done. Then again in sub-clause (3) of Section 4; The Government nor its assignee shall not be liable for any operating loss incurred in any year in the operation of the factory during the continuance of the lease referred to in Clause 2 of this agreement. Now who is going to be liable? I wonder who is going to be liable for any operating losses. Certainly there has been no operating profit since the

factory started. Why could we not have been enlightened on the exact financial relationships between the Government and Newfoundland Hardwoods and Mr. Dawe? Was Mr. Dawe entitled to a ten per cent fee on labour in the building of that plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: He was not! I have here copies of a bill—Chester Dawe Limited, sold to Newfoundland Hardwoods—To labour, putting in safe, complete particulars \$103—ten per cent fee—total \$113.30—If he is not entitled to it make him pay it back. How much more I don't know—But I take it, and Mr. Speaker, at the drop of a hat the Honourable the Premier now runs to the RCMP—That brings me back, Sir, to a certain arrest which was made.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In connection with the Bill just read—Was that a service or salary rendered by or made by Mr. Chester Dawe or Chester Dawe Limited to the Government? Or was it made to the Newfoundland Hardwoods, and was it made during the period of the contract, or just an ordinary business transaction made subsequent to the period of construction, Merely to throw that into the debate without clarifying the point could be a very unfair thing to do towards Mr. Dawe.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to do nothing unfair towards Mr. Dawe — This is a copy of a bill in the files of the Finance Department, dated March 1, 1951—Was the building being erected then? That was March 1, 1951—Chester Dawe Limited—Sold to: Newfoundland Hardwoods—To labour putting in safe and completing partition \$103.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any bill to Newfoundland Hardwoods is not payable by the Government.

MR. BROWNE: The biggest joker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't owe the Newfoundland Hardwoods anything—we never did.

MR. BROWNE: All the bills are addressed to Newfoundland Hardwoods. You have forgotten all the bills.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The bills for what?

MR. BROWNE: For the construction of the birch plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That may be so certainly if—

MR. HOLLETT: I cannot allow an argument to go on between my honourable and learned friend on my right and the Premier—One has spoken and the other has not—Both had an opportunity — I will read the bill again so that the Premier will get it clear—You understand, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to do any harm to Newfoundland Hardwoods, the Government nor Mr. Dawe—But this is a matter of absolute fact which I am entitled to quote—In March 1951 Chester Dawe Limited sold to Newfoundland Hardwoods—To labour putting in safe and completing partition \$103—fee 10.30—total \$113.30. The bills are up there—I take it the RCMP will look into this one too.

I spoke too, Sir, of the price of cement paid, about the same time or exactly the same time the Government

paid for cement bought from William Lundrigan, 168,000 bags at \$1.30 per bag—I don't know whether the Honourable the Premier was here this morning when I made that statement, but I am repeating it — During the erection of the cement plant, Mr. Lundrigan sold to the Government and charged to the account of the cement plant construction 168,000 bags of cement at \$1.30 a bag. I asked that that be explained. What I want to point out now is that, if the Government paid for all that cement from Lundrigan for \$1.30 a bag and bought it at the rate of \$1.30 a bag, why did they want to go to Chester Dawe and buy cement for construction of the birch plant and pay \$1.60 a bag, and they paid this for every bag they had from him. That looks like looking after the Government funds. I am asking this—These are facts — 300 bags of cement at \$1.60—I could mention other things but the RCMP are to make investigation, and I should not, I suppose say much about it. I don't know the price of hack-saw blades but they cost us \$5.52, one dozen hack-saw blades @ \$5.52 from Chester Dawe—1 dozen (same size) 1" hack-saw blades \$6.60. I bought ~~hack-saw~~ blades before myself but have no recollection they were costing even \$5.60 a dozen, certainly I never heard of anybody charging \$6.60 a dozen for 1-2" hack-saw blades. Yes a lot of things can be mentioned and dragged out, all that sort of thing, there in the closet—lots of them.

Getting back to the RCMP and Benno Schilde and the \$150,000 ex gratia award to Benno Schilde and the \$260,595 ex gratia award to the firm of MIAG and the \$21,520 for the firm of William J. Lundrigan—In reply to a question the Honourable the Premier yesterday informed me that

these were made on account or in respect of increased costs of labour and material in connection with the cement mill, and in connection with the increased cost of labour and material in connection with the gypsum plant, MIAG \$260,590, increased costs on labour and material in connection with the cement plant—and Benno Schilde, I repeat, \$150,000 ex gratia payment in respect of increased costs of labour and material in connection with the gypsum plant. Did they attach any strings to the payment of that amount to MIAG of \$261,590 for the purpose mentioned? That was in the year 1952. No, it was a straight cheque right off, paid in four or five cheques in U.S. and Canadian funds. Why U.S. funds nobody will ever know. But they paid it over. We realize that labour had gone up to the extent that you are charging so we will make an award of \$261,590. Then along comes Benno Schilde, that was in 1953—I suppose they probably heard MIAG got something and they made a claim for \$150,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they did not.

MR. HOLLETT: They made a claim for much more. I know the amount exactly—the same as a matter of fact as MIAG or I think a little more. Anyway they got an award of \$150,000. That is all they got. But what did the Premier say? They made the award but there was no condition attached to it I ask myself—Why? There was a condition to Benno Schilde's \$150,000 but no condition to MIAG's \$261,590—But they attached a condition to Benno Schilde and that was that they should invest it within the Province of Newfoundland in a plant which they would erect for the manufacture of sheet metal, to be constructed at Bay Roberts. Then, the

Honourable Premier stated, they went ahead and incorporated a company and called it "The Eastern Machinery" or some such company—But the Premier was so busy for several months that time went on, and he forgot all about it—Suddenly it was brought to his attention by somebody and he got on the telephone and began to press them. Then in February 1953 he wrote a stern, stiff letter reminding them of the conditions of the payment of \$150,000 and demanding they build the plant or return the money to the Treasury. That letter startled them—To what extent I do not know. That may or may not have startled them, but, as I say, I do not know to what extent. But in reply to a supplementary question the Honourable the Premier informed me they had later turned over the \$150,000 to a company which he called the Western Concrete Products, or some words to that effect—Now I have not checked as to whether that company has been incorporated or not. I take it it was, and I am prepared to take the Premier's answer that he instructed the firm of Benno Schilde through their then manager up there, I believe his name was Hergs—He instructed that man on behalf of Benno Schilde to pass over \$150,000 to this company. Now, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as being a very funny business—Here you have MIAG claiming \$261,590 on account of increased cost of labour and material and getting it without any strings tied.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does my honourable friend realize that the plant, the five million dollar plant which was built has some connection there, that we do not perhaps need to impose conditions in the one case whereas we did in the other.

MR. HOLLETT: Tell us the conditions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: My honourable friend knows that I cannot—Knows it as well as I do.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, resume the argument.

MR. HOLLETT: He is in a better position, if MIAG got the \$261,590 without any conditions whatsoever and Benno Schilde got \$150,000 with conditions—We know that was for additional costs of labour and so on—But you say, you have to invest it in something else in this country here—What kind of fools are Benno Schilde if they did that sort of thing? Does a man when he accepts payment for a bill give a guarantee he will invest the money where somebody else directs? That is what the Premier tells us. I think it is the most ridiculous statement I ever heard in this House. With regard to that payment of \$150,000, Sir, who recommended the payment of that amount and who recommended the payment of \$261,590? If I add these two amounts I get \$411,000. It seems to me I have seen figures very similar to that in other matters—I don't want the Honourable the Premier nor anybody on the opposite side of the House to think that we of the Opposition don't know exactly on what grounds we are standing. I don't want, Sir, the Government to think that we know nothing about transactions which went on in connection with many of these new industries. We would not have been doing our duty to the people of Newfoundland, to the people we represent as well as the members on the opposite side, unless we had taken pains to find out everything possible even though the Government would not give us the facts we needed. We went ahead, Sir, and we found out facts, a lot of facts.

A year ago I told about a fishery plant on the Mainland, a year ago, and the last occasion I went on the air and told about a fishery plant—Does the Honourable the Premier or his Government think we pulled that one out of the air? Did they not think we had sense enough to go to places where we could get information—and mind you the information was given to us on the Mainland of Canada and in the United States of America. Yet the Premier will say "I am the man, the man that did this and did that and something else." The authorities, Sir, on the Mainland of Canada and the authorities in the United States of America are not asleep—they are not asleep—and if any member on the opposite side, or at least, if the Government wants some more information I will be able to give it to them at any time they ask for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I ask for it now.

MR. HOLLETT: This is not the proper place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whenever the honourable gentleman thinks it proper I will ask, and be glad to have it too, as will the RCMP and the Attorney General's office and the Courts—any information—it is the patriotic duty of honourable members of the Opposition who have any knowledge of a criminal nature. We will be glad enough to prosecute any criminal high or low.

MR. HOLLETT: Now I believe that—anytime, does the Honourable the Premier mean to tell me that nothing was known by the Government about some of the transactions taking place when I knew it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What transactions? How can I answer that?



MR. HOLLETT: Does he not think if they knew on the Mainland of Canada and in the Unites States—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Knew what? What transactions?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not under cross-examination—I am asking; does he not think that they knew something about it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About what?

MR. HOLLETT: Does he ask me to believe the Government knew nothing about it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About what?

MR. HOLLETT: I am talking about Benno Schilde and MIAG and your famous Dr. Valdmanis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is not the honourable gentleman willing to leave that to the Supreme Court.

MR. HOLLETT: Was there anything mysterious?—We told about the fishery plant—was there anything mysterious about that?

MR. SPEAKER: I must interfere—The turn of this debate is becoming unparliamentary. It does seem to me to contain insinuations and innuendo, getting on very thin ice. I think the honourable member might proceed—

MR. HOLLETT: Why Mr. Speaker, what I started to do was to urge the Honourable the Premier to call in the RCMP. When anything turns up which would in anyway tend, shall I say, to cast a cloud—Call in the RCMP!—What are the RCMP coming to?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have I done right or wrong—Is it wrong for me to call them in?

MR. HOLLETT: Everything the Honourable the Premier does must be right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have I done wrong in calling them in?

MR. HOLLETT: What I say is this, Mr. Speaker, if any man deprived Benno Schilde of anything and did it fraudulently or otherwise of \$150,000, Mr. Speaker, Benno Schilde were the ones to make a complaint and not the Premier. Did he do right? That is not for me to decide. I am saying what I am saying. If I am robbed of \$150,000 I am the one—

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to a point of order—I think this is a subject which should not be discussed. I am the last man in the world to limit debate—I don't think it is fair either to the accused nor the accuser.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already made that point of order and must uphold that point of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed with the law, and I am not in any way questioning your ruling that in the people's House matters touching the welfare of the people could always freely be expressed.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is quite wrong and is thereby twisting the ruling of the Chair, with this piece of jargon—It is the people's House, yes, but the people are bound by the people's rules and this is the people's law. The gentleman in question, Dr. Valdmanis, is one of the people whether we like him or not—He is one of the people.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not saying anything against Dr. Valdmanis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Heaven forbid!

MR. SPEAKER: The debate is to contain no insinuations nor innuendo,



and matters *sudjudice* are not matters which are subject to debate in this House—That is the law of the people and must be upheld.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Sir, I can pick up a paper anywhere and find these things discussed. Only I am not going to discuss them myself—I refer you, Sir,—

MR. SPEAKER: I have not the slightest interest in any newspaper. And I must warn the honourable member there. The honourable member may continue but not on the subject mentioned in the House nor newspaper comment on the same.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, it amounts to this—a paper on the Canadian Mainland can say the thing much more so, if I may put it that way, than I have dared to say here. And that is no later than May 11, 1954. Yet, I, a member of the House and a representative of the people, am not to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is forbidden to say so or to do so by the people.

MR. HOLLETT: I made the point, Sir, that if any person is charged with an offence the right and proper person to make the complaint is the one who is injured in his person or in his goods. If I did an injury to any firm or any new industry or if I committed an indiscretion would it be the duty of the Premier to make the complaints?

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—The honourable member is simply ignoring Your Honour's ruling in suggesting that in this case the people prosecuting have no right—trying to indicate what should have been done and should not have

been done—It is improper, and I object.

MR. SPEAKER: I again uphold the ruling—The insinuation is incorrect—That line ought not to be proceeded with.

MR. CURTIS: Trying to kill time—If you want an adjournment call it six o'clock.

MR. HOLLETT: I thought so—Someone wants to get out around five-thirty—Well, Mr. Speaker, may I move the adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER: I must warn the honourable member, his speech must be continuous. We cannot stop and go into other business and then have the honourable member speak again—If he is not finished and the House calls it six o'clock he may resume at the next sitting hour.

Is that the wish of the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 of the clock because we have a Cabinet meeting Monday morning. I hope that we can refrain from all further Cabinet meetings next week so that we can meet in the mornings as well as in the afternoons and at night.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow Monday, June 14th, at 3:00 of the clock.

MONDAY, June 14th, 1954

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The House met at three of the clock

in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question

None.

#### ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I directed a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. I wonder when I may expect an answer?

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): It will be ready tomorrow.

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night the honourable and learned member for St. John's West delivered a talk on the radio, and in that talk he made the statement that I had denied signing any bills from J. C. Pratt and Company to Chester Dawe Limited or to Newfoundland Hardboards Limited. I made no such denial whatsoever. I did not even mention a denial. I said nothing—I did not deny it. The honourable gentleman, I think, ought to make a retraction and proper amendment.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would not mention it at all if the Premier had not actually stated that he had made a mistake himself when he said, that last night—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is, the following day.

MR. BROWNE: Referring then to that incident the following day the

Premier said that last night I had denied that he has initialled—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say I had denied—I said I would have denied.

MR. BROWNE: If that is what the Premier is referring to, I am sorry. I understood him to say he denied signing these documents. Then he said; "I had forgotten all about it, but now that it has been brought to my attention that the Auditor General brought me a great number of documents," (and he showed how big the pile was) "I signed them but later forgot them."

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman said on Saturday night that I had, on the night of his speech, denied signing them because on the following day I said that I had denied them—He is then making a statement on a broadcast speech on no better evidence than he has understanding of what I said the next day of what I had said the previous night. Now, on no occasion, neither on the occasion when the honourable gentleman spoke nor on the following day when I referred to his speech—on neither occasion did I deny having signed the invoices in question. But the honourable and learned gentleman in his speech on the radio made the categorical statement that when he made his speech here that night I had denied signing the invoices. Now he tells us his reason for that: He understood I had said on the following day that I denied it. Why then did the honourable gentleman on the night of his broadcast say that I had denied it on the night of his speech?

MR. BROWNE: I did not say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is precisely what he said. He spoke, made

the charge, whereupon I, not the following day but there and then, denied having signed the invoices. When the fact of the matter is it was the following day—I did not deny but stated I would have denied it except that this morning the Auditor General reported to me. He brought me several hundred I had signed. He brought in two hundred and fourteen invoices in a large pile and while the Auditor General personally waited in my office I signed and then he took them off. I had not seen them before and not since.

The point is that the honourable gentleman on Saturday night in a radio speech stated, told the radio audience, he had made the speech and I interrupted to deny I had signed the invoices. That is what the honourable gentleman said and the speech record and script would be at the radio station—

MR. BROWNE: I have a script.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So has the radio station—by law. The honourable gentleman now tells us this afternoon the reason he did that was that on the following day I denied it; which in fact I did not do. And I hold, although it happened outside the House it happened by way of comment on what happened inside. I think the honourable gentleman should take the most public manner possible to withdraw the statement—It is a most damaging statement.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I don't remember the Premier having stated the night that I was speaking here that he did not sign these documents. I remember the Premier stating the next day—my memory may be at fault—but I remember the Premier stating the next day that he said that

he had not remembered signing these statements. I remember the Premier stating that he could not remember signing those papers. That is the situation as far as I know. I had no intention of misrepresenting the Premier in this manner. I think that what he did was sign two hundred and fourteen documents without ever having seen them before, which is serious enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman has not yet told the House why he stated in his broadcast Saturday night that I, on the occasion of his making a speech, on that occasion and not the following day, but on the occasion of his making a speech here, I had denied it, but that on the following day had admitted. Then on the occasion of his making his speech in this House I had denied signing the invoices but on the following day had admitted it. That is the statement made in his speech on Saturday night on the radio—Now that is the speech on which he ought to give me some redress, or perhaps he wants me to sue him for libel, for it is libel. Now if the honourable gentleman values his good name he will make it perfectly clear that, if he had not lied in that speech, then he was completely wrong and mistaken. He ought to say that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Premier values his good name let him have an investigation into what is going on in the birch plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The first inquiry will be an enquiry into the honourable gentleman opposite and now on his feet, and some inquiry.

MR. BROWNE: You have to be inquired into first. You are the one denied—

MR. SPEAKER: Order—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest we get the Hansard of what the Premier said on the night I spoke.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the script of what the honourable gentleman said in the speech of which I now complain. Because, it was a lying speech. I am now convinced the honourable gentleman lied deliberately.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must ask the Premier to take back these words—He accused me of lying deliberately. I put it to you, Sir, it is completely out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I repeat—The honourable gentleman lied deliberately in his speech Saturday night. Now I am convinced he lied deliberately.

MR. SPEAKER: I have pointed out to honourable members before—If a point of order is taken and honourable members insist on arguing to and fro in the House it makes it not only difficult for the Chair to rule on it but almost impossible. Now I do not see that this can be settled by losing tempers and argument to and fro. Certainly complaints made on speeches made outside the House are not privileged in the same way as speeches made inside the House. The words accusing the honourable member of lying in that speech ought not to have been used. It remains to be proved. Conceivably, it is within the bounds of human frailty, the honourable member stated something not true. It does not follow therefore it is lying.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable the Premier accused me of lying deliberately — That is unparliamentary, and I feel he must withdraw it. A person may make a mistake—I had no intention—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before withdrawing I would move to have the script of Saturday night. On two previous occasions I have dropped, backed down from charges of lying. I am now going ahead to prove—I will now move that his remarks on the night in question in this House be tabled, which will show if I made any such admission that I had not signed the invoices; that my remarks on the following day be produced, and the script of his speech on the radio on Saturday night be produced, and then see who is deliberately lying—Then I will apologize, if I am wrong.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, is this the proper procedure when an honourable member complains of something that has happened outside the House?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Commenting on what has happened inside this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The whole problem is very difficult and very thorny. I might suggest the only way to solve it is to refer the matter to a Committee on Privileges. I believe the Committee will see Hansard, the exact words used by both honourable members and the script from the honourable member's speech on the radio can be given the Committee. I don't think it is necessary to use terms such as "lying" in arguing the matter here. The honourable member will correct his statement if it is incorrect, certainly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes—I do move, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of this Select Committee which Your Honour suggested.

MR. BROWNE: Put that motion—But I require the Premier to withdraw his accusation that I lied deliberately,

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't withdraw the statement that the honourable member lied and lied deliberately in his speech on the radio on Saturday night.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member makes it impossible for the Chair to rule. Now I am being asked to use the Authority of the Chair to ask an honourable member to withdraw a complaint made by a speech made outside the House. All I can say is that the word "lying", the statement "The honourable member lied deliberately" ought not to have been made in the House on this occasion, and I do not think the Honourable the Premier should have used the words.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In deference to Your Honour I withdraw the remark, but I do insist on a Select Committee to find out if there has been any lying.

MR. BROWNE: Deliberate?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a Committee of Privileges already in existence from some weeks ago. Motion is that this question might be called a question of privileges and is now referred to that Committee.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee, of course, will have the right to see Hansard and the honourable member's script.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Speaker, who is in charge?—not have it postponed like the so-called Committee set up to investigate some other charge—Who is the convener? I would like to know because I would like to have it convened as soon as possible.

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I resent that

from my honourable friend. I am the convener of this Committee. I did not convene it because the honourable and learned member for St. John's East was not in town and he is a member of the Committee. If I mentioned I was going to call a Committee and leave out the Opposition, the members of the Opposition would say something else—if we met without it.

MR. BROWNE: Well he is absent today and may be tomorrow. But we can have someone else on it.

MR. CURTIS: We asked for the last election so there would be enough to make an Opposition. Now that they got them they don't even turn up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee, due to the delicacy of the matter, will of course meet at the earliest possible moment—Is that satisfactory to both parties?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources. I have heard a report that the sheep imported from Scotland have been sold. Would the Minister tell us whether there is anything in that report or not?

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Is it in order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Minister so wishes.

DR. ROWE: Under ordinary circumstances I would naturally want notice of question. But I say, speaking from memory, I know we have from time to time during the past two years sold sheep here and there of that breed to farmers for breeding purposes etc, but to my knowledge the flock,

as such, has not been sold. But I would like to check on that—If the honourable gentleman would remind me in case I don't reply. I know it was not sold a week ago. As a matter of fact a week ago I had one of our officers go down to make a report to us on it and he did come back with a report, which is now being written and might well be on my desk. The flock was not sold a week ago. I regret for obvious reasons I have not had time to attend to things on my desk, but I will check on it.

### Orders of The Day

#### Third Readings.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act"—Read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium" — On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspecting of Fish"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland" — On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to An Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, in moving the third reading of this Bill, just for the sake of the record I would like to make a statement so that it would appear in Hansard just why the Bill was introduced:

"The Union Jack is the flag to be flown by British subjects on land and may be flown in all Her Majesty's realms. With the shield of the Provincial Coat of Arms it is the Official flag of the Lieutenant Governor of that Province.

2. The Canadian Red Ensign as the National Flag. The result of several Orders-in-Council is that the Canadian Red Ensign may be flown from buildings owned or occupied by the Federal Government within and without Canada, and may be flown at the discretion of the Officer Commanding on buildings occupied by Canadian Forces in Canada.

3. On Confederation we did not cancel our National Flag Act so the Lieutenant Governor's flag is the Union Jack with the Great Seal in the Centre rather than the Shield of the Coat of Arms.

4. Before 1942 the Newfoundland Act was based on the Dominion and Colonial Regulations which ruled:

(a) that the Governor, or Officer Administering the Government, flies the Union Jack at Government House, and a special flag, namely, the Union Jack with the Arms or Badge of the dependency emblazoned in the centre, etc., when he is embarking in a boat or other vessel.

(b) On the 11th February, 1942, it was brought to the attention of the Home Government that the Union



Flag had become closely associated with the person of the Governor, and that the result had been to create a certain reluctance among private bodies and individuals to display the Union Jack, the apprehension being apparently that in so doing they might be encroaching, or have the appearance of encroaching upon the Government's personal prerogatives. It was decided that it was most important that all such apprehension be dispelled, and that any person who desired to fly the National Flag should be given every encouragement to do so.

There (c) With the concurrence of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, a recommendation was submitted to His Majesty the King that Governments should be authorized and required to fly on all occasions on land as well as afloat the special ensign as at present used only on board ship, namely, the Union Flag charged with the Arms or Badge of the territory. His Majesty the King was pleased to approve this recommendation and the Governor of Newfoundland (at that time, Sir Humphrey Walwyn) was notified in a despatch dated 11th February, 1942.

(6) Sir Humphrey Walwyn acknowledged the correspondence and agreed that Newfoundland would conform, but he took no steps to amend our National Flag Act accordingly."

I just quote that, Mr. Speaker, so that it will be on the record when this Act goes through.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT: (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder if the Honourable Minister would give that publicity?

MR. CURTIS: I will, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a third time,

ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

"An Act Further to Amend the Authority Guarantee Act, 1952." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act." On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

#### First Readings:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act." On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases." On motion read a first time—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—Should not this be brought in as a resolution?

MR. CURTIS: It is not an Act, Mr. Speaker, that votes any money, just makes general provisions.

Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Third Reading of a Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors

and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before this Bill is read a third time I would like to make a few observations. This section to which I refer, Section 31 sub-section (4) you will remember is the one that provides that the Lieutenant Governor-in-council made by proclamation referred to in sub-section (1) or by a further Proclamation, may at any time thereafter and before polling day, order that an election be deferred in any of the electoral districts of St. Barbe, White Bay and Labrador and in any of the electoral districts into which the electoral district of Labrador as at present constituted may be divided, but when an election is deferred under this sub-section it shall be held on a date not later than twelve months from the date on which the election was deferred and where an election in an electoral district is deferred after a writ of election has been issued the writ may be withdrawn.

The point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that during the consideration of second reading and in Committee of the Whole on this Bill it was pointed out on behalf of the Government that the reason for this provision was because—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—Is it in order to go over the second reading debate again? What may lawfully be done on third reading? Can we debate the Committee of the Whole stage again and the second reading again, revive the arguments and answer them — is that permitted?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to that point of order—I intend to move that this Bill be sent

back to Committee with instructions to amend or at least give consideration to amending this particular section. I was only making an introductory statement. I did not intend to debate it. I was going to explain—The Electoral Officer is reported to have said, and I think it was generally stated that there are only two months in the year—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—is the honourable gentleman permitted to debate the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: At this stage, no.

MR. BROWNE: I was only saying because where conditions were the reasons given for the postponement — I beg leave to move this Bill be not now read a third time but be sent back to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions that Section 31 (4) be amended to provide elections in any of the said districts be deferred except on a certificate of the Electoral Officer that due to the weather conditions it is impossible to hold such election in the district concerned. I make that motion, Mr. Speaker, and I feel sure I should be entitled to say something on behalf of it. I hope it will be accepted by the Government. I feel it is a reasonable request to have made.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is moved by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, seconded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to say just a few words on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is the motion debatable?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am seconding the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand that a speech is to be made at this stage because the matter was discussed in second reading and in Committee of the Whole and a report has been received by the House. So that the motion is that this Bill be now read a third time, to which the honourable member offered an amendment—"The Bill will not now—" The motion is that the word "Not" be inserted between the words "will" and "now." Motion is now put. Those voting "aye" will be voting for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Bill now read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Committee of the Whole:

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association";

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees in the Chair:

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is quite a long Bill—I don't think it is very controversial—Would the Committee care to have it called by numbers or have the clauses read?

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Attorney General if he is in charge of the Bill or is the Minister of Health? And, does this repeal another Act?

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): I am, Mr. Chairman—It does repeal another Act, an Act passed forty years ago. There are only two new additions to the Act, that is, prescribing the course of training and

giving the members of the Association some disciplinary powers over the membership.

On motion agreed to call the numbers of the sections slowly:

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have here before me an Act called "An Act Respecting the Pharmaceutical Society and the Sale of Drugs". I don't know if that has anything to do with this. If it has it seems to be somewhat different from the Bill which we are now considering. I don't see a similar section to the one we are now on in this Act. In that Act there are only 19 sections whereas in this particular Bill there are 47. There must be some difference between the two. Perhaps the Minister might care to make a statement giving us what he considers to be the chief difference?

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I already explained that in second reading. There may be more clauses to this particular Bill, but they are certainly not of a controversial nature. There are only two differences in principle, that is, the Society has power to prescribe courses of training and a period of training in keeping with modern educational trends, and also that it has disciplinary powers over its membership. These are the only differences in principle between this Bill and the one it supplants.

Clause 2 carried.

Clauses 3 through 6 carried.

Clause 7:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us how many

members constituted the council previously?

MR. FORSEY: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, I think it was the same number.

MR. BROWNE: It does not say how many members constitute the Board.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I am pretty certain it is twelve.

Clauses 7 through 17 carried.

Clause 18:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister has any idea about the disciplinary measures to which pharmaceutical apprentices are likely to be subject?

MR. FORSEY: Under the present Act it is possible for a pharmacist to dispense dope in any drug store in St. John's and the organization has no power under the old Act to revoke his license if he does not conform to the ethics of the profession. The Association now has power to revoke his license under the old Act.

MR. BROWNE: Apprentices are going to get licenses under this Act—or do they get licenses under the old Act?

MR. FORSEY: They will get licenses on completion of their training.

MR. BROWNE: Become druggists then, and they can dispense drugs. Do I understand the Minister to mean they cannot dispense drugs as apprentices?

MR. FORSEY: They dispense drugs in conformity with their length of training, under the supervision of other druggists — But the Association

has not power now to suspend or revoke the license of any druggist who might, as I say, be dispensing dope.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but this deals with apprentices. I was asking what are the rules in regard to discipline.

MR. FORSEY: They would be rules and by-laws drawn up by the Association.

MR. BROWNE: You have no idea what they are?

MR. FORSEY: No.

Clauses 18 through 23 carried.

Clause 24:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that one provides to have the names of persons stricken off the registry, but I have not seen any offense so far. I wonder could we let that stand until we go through the offense section and then come back to it?

On motion Clause 24 stand—

Clauses 25 through 28 carried.

Clause 29:

MR. BROWNE: I take it the Minister did not examine this at all but consulted with some medical authority about it?

MR. FORSEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the medical health officers of the Department of Health.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask one question, a drug that is in popular use now in this country and which is permissible in certain forms, known as "222," I believe it consists of an empirin compound with a grain of codein—Is that one of the things exempt from this, do you know?

MR. FORSEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

Clauses 29 through 35 carried.

Clause 36:

MR. BROWNE: Mr Chairman, is that something new, or was that in before?

MR. FORSEY: I think that seems to be a new provision.

MR. BROWNE: Is there some reasons why that is introduced here—I know under the Alcoholic Liquors Law it is usually the duty of the Crown to show the accused has committed an offense—But under this particular section the duty is on him to show he is authorized—the burden is on the defendant to prove he is entitled to operate establishments. Now it seems to me that is not a difficult duty for the Crown to fulfil, unless there was some reason for varying the formal procedure — I believe that should be left out.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think there is any harm in having the ounce of proof—after all if a man is selling drugs and is supposed to have a license I suppose he should have it on exhibition really in the shop. Surely if it is a matter of producing it, it is easier for him to produce it than any prosecution to find out.

MR. BROWNE: That ought to apply to any innocent person—It is easier for him to prove his innocence than to prove him guilty therefore it is all right to make prosecutions. It seems to me if a person is improperly prosecuted—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Prosecuted or innocent persons sometimes charged.

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, exactly.

MR. CURTIS: Suppose in Twillingate there is a man—It is easier if a question should come up as to

whether a man has a right to sell drugs or not to put it on him and ask; "Where is your license?" That is easier than sending to St. John's to prove it. I don't know how you would prove it in St. John's anyway—It is much more difficult.

Clauses 37 through 40 carried.

MR. BROWNE: This provision on here exempts wholesale druggists and dealers in drugs from the provisions of the Act—Does that mean they can sell them to any person in business, or does it mean that they must only sell them to drug stores?

MR. FORSEY: No, Mr. Chairman, they can sell them to any person in business—that is certain types of businesses. But all these drugs dispensed by wholesalers come under the supervision of the Federal Department of Health, and they have inspectors.

Clauses 41 carried.

Clause 42:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't know enough about it, but I have known doctors in the past who did not know too much about drugs. They probably have to know all about drugs now.

MR. FORSEY: It amounts to medical doctors in Newfoundland who have no drugstore in the community and have to dispense drugs.

Clauses 42 through 46 carried.

Schedule carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 24 was allowed to stand.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is all right now, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 24 carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment—Report received, on motion ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works) : In connection with this Bill "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act," on the occasion when we raised this topic, request was made for a little additional time to review it, which was readily given. Now I take it we are ready to go into second reading?

MR. SPEAKER : The debate was adjourned by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when this was before the House previously the Minister was good enough to give us an explanation and afterwards showed me the first draft and analysis of the various provisions in the Bill. I notice one to which he made no reference, and I am wondering if he overlooked it. That is in the second section and it seems to me it involves an important principle. Therefore, with permission of the House I should like to read a section of it—It is an amendment to Section 36 of the Highway Traffic Act which says: "When a license has been delivered to the court under sub-section (1) and the court has not disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license the court shall, where the holder of the license has been convicted of any offense under Section 284, 285 or 377 of the Criminal Code involving the use of a motor vehicle, thereupon transmit to the Minister a report setting out the nature of the conviction and the circumstances of the offence."

There are four or five offences under the Criminal Code—"Thereupon the court must transmit to the Minister a report setting out the nature of the conviction. It may be stated in connection with a breach of Section 285, section (4), I believe, where a person convicted of driving, while impaired the magistrate does not cancel his license but the Minister does. the magistrate has no right, my honourable and learned friend says, but the Minister does sometime subsequently. The court must transmit to the Minister—

Now the point is that upon every conviction the owner must submit his license to the court to have the conviction enforced. But on these three or four offences under the Criminal Code the courts must transmit a report of the whole circumstances and order of conviction to the Minister. Now when that has been delivered to the court and the court disqualifies a license, Sir, or has not disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license—and where a license has been suspended under Section 91 the Minister shall publish, or cause to be published, in the Newfoundland Gazette and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides, the name of the licensee disqualified or whose license has been suspended and all other particulars as to the disqualification or suspension that he deems fit.

Now it seems to me that involves an important principle in that it is a departure from the regular practice. A person may be convicted of all the other offences under the Criminal Code but I don't think there is any provision for his name to be published in the Newfoundland Gazette but when convicted of any of these his



name must be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides. Therefore, in addition to a person suffering the normal penalties for his offense, for which he can be fined or sent to goal and lose his license for a certain time, he must have his name published and all the other things as to this disqualification that the Minister deems fit. That may result in the Minister saying John Jones committed robbery—His license has been suspended for six, twelve months or two years for having stolen a car for having committed a breach of so and so section of the Criminal Code. The question seems to me whether that is an advisable thing to do. It is a departure from the usual practice for all other offenses. Why should this be picked out? I think in answering that question consideration should be given to this one: What benefit is going to result? What good is it going to do? Is it going to deter others from committing the offense? I think if we look at it from the point of view of any benefit to anybody else, I don't think we can see any benefit in it. But will it deter others? I suppose if it were considered that it would deter others from committing similar offenses then it would be a good thing. But can we say with any certainty this publication of the names of persons committing these offenses in the Newfoundland Gazette will be of any benefit? Certainly as far as the Newfoundland Gazette is concerned I don't believe it would do one bit of good. Apart from lawyers' offices and high officials of the Government, I believe the Minister will agree nobody else looks at the Newfoundland Gazette except perhaps, I suppose, the people interested

in bankruptcies and estates may look at it. But outside of a very narrow circle of people nobody looks at the Newfoundland Gazette. We are therefore left with the proposition that his name should be published in a newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides.

Now in what areas are newspapers circulated? We have from the highest authority that there are very few newspapers circulated. So that if John Jones comes from Roddickton or some isolated place the fact that his name appears in the Newfoundland Gazette and in newspapers circulated in his area is not going to do much harm among his friends. But it would mean that for people in large centres at any rate, a man having his name published before the public would get the effect of such a publication. Now, Sir, is that to be a good thing or not to do that? I doubt very much if it will have the effect of preventing any further offenses being committed. I don't believe that the publication of the names of 69 persons convicted of these offenses would have any effect in preventing others.

Now I don't know what the purpose is in regard to Section (1) dealing with licenses suspended nor what effect that would have, nor what benefit that would be. I cannot see. Perhaps the Minister when replying, if he has the answer, may be able to give it.

The other sections of the Bill seem to be perfectly normal—There is only that new principle which is involved here.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I don't attach quite so much importance to the publication of the names that my honourable colleague does, although I agree to some extent with

his question as to the effect it might have. I remember some years ago one of our daily papers used to publish names and it might have had some effect because certain it was that pressure was brought to bear on the paper, by one or two influential citizens who happened to run afoul of the police, to have that amended. But there is one aspect of this thing to which the Minister might be able to add some enlightenment, that is, the provision for publication in the Newfoundland Gazette and at least one newspaper the name of the licensee disqualified or whose license has been suspended, and all other particulars etc. Now amongst the privileges which a man has is, quite frequently when he is convicted he gets a suspension of his permit to buy liquor. The practice has been hitherto that the Board of Liquor Control was notified and he was put on some sort of a list. He cannot go into any establishment known by the Board, and they always notify the various licensed houses. But I must say it seems to me a bit rough to placard that fact in the newspaper. It is bad enough to say—"You have made an ass of yourself—You are not allowed to drive any more." But it seems rather like carrying it to extremes that a man is not even allowed to take a drink. After all a man might have just one or two drinks too many when driving a car and have the magistrate say; You lose your license. But according to this he has to have his name published which says he is to be held up to all other men as a man who goes around drunk half the time. It seems a bit rough. I wonder if the Minister would tell us whether or not it is contemplated if he has a right to buy a drink.

MR. SPENCER : Mr. Speaker, I

appreciate very much the interest that both honourable and learned gentlemen of the Opposition have given to this Bill. I will review briefly, if I may, and answer as well as I can the points touched upon, first by the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West in connection with Section 2, sub-section (3). The reference there, as the honourable and learned gentleman has very correctly worded it, is merely to now make it mandatory on the courts to supply to the Registration Department or the Motor Vehicle Highway Traffic Section, if one cares to call it that, any convictions registered. The honourable gentleman has pointed out and it has been commented upon by his colleague the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's East, that the purpose merely is—rather that the magistrate has not power to cancel licenses as he does not issue them, but does give him the authority and/or power to disqualify a person from driving a vehicle if he has been proven guilty of an offense of driving while under the influence of liquor or impaired driving, as he cares to classify it—The Department of Public Works, under the Highway Traffic Act has made the regulation which covers this point—as soon as they are notified by the court, which as I said before is now mandatory, the court must notify the department and then the department automatically suspends the license of the offender. I don't need to go into any long discussion as to the necessity for the protection of the general public, and that is what this Act is meant to do. I am sure that both my learned friends from the other side know more about that than I do as they have had it from experience. For that reason they know this Act. I do not profess to be able to understand

some of the legal phraseology or terminology which might be used here, and it is not up to me to go through that any further.

Now with regard to the latter point raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West and again stressed by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's East the matter of publication of names; I regret to say that our experience has been that where licenses have been suspended in accordance with the Act that the driver whose license has been suspended has more or less forced us to take some action to help prevent such a recurrence. Unfortunately people losing licenses have been, not all, I am proud to say, but a very small proportion it is true, continuing and persisting in driving. Now it has been very well explained to this House that we have not sufficient police to take care of all these things, and the many other laws which we need to enforce. But if the public has been informed that I have had my license suspended and I persist under cover of, or by virtue of my prominence in the community, or the brass in my face as the case may be, to drive my car when I have no license to do it John Citizen has a perfect right to report me. And if my name is before the public that John Citizen will no doubt assist the law in being carried out to proper effect, and thereby possibly save the life of some innocent child and/or person as the case may be. That is the main reason for this particular publication of names.

I would like to refer to one comment the honourable and learned member for St. John's West made—He said it was a little out of the ordinary. That is quite true in this Province. But I am also quite sure that the honourable gentleman knows that

the names are being published in certain other provinces of the Dominion, and possibly that is one of the reasons why it is brought in here.

Now with regard to the comments raised by the honourable and learned member for St. John's East as to the disqualification or suspension that he mentioned. I would like to assure the honourable gentleman and the House that there is no intention whatsoever on the part of the Department of Public Works which I happen to represent here now to publish such little details, or such incriminating details, as one would care to call them, as my honorable friend referred to. It would be my personal opinion that the mere publishing of the name is really all that is required so that the public may know I have been an offender and may not go out and drive in secret, perhaps, and escape the eyes of the police. I may not go out and drive a car when my license is actually in suspension.

These, I think, were the only points referred to. As the honourable gentleman has been kind enough to say, the other sections of the Act are very clearly understood and are merely a matter of enforcement such as removal from a right-of-way or highway any obstruction which may be placed there and collecting the cost of having done so from the owner of the vehicle, in cases where they fail to do it. There are a few other little things of that type, which the honourable gentleman was kind enough to say are quite satisfactory.

My explanation then, Mr. Speaker, in connection with that is that it is the only reason for the publishing of names, merely to try and prevent these people who have forestalled the law and have persisted in driving their

cars. Now one may very well ask if we have any *prima facie* evidence of those facts? In one or two cases it has been reported to us. I can assure the House that is so and that is the main reason for it.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, that is a Bill which arises from discussions which took place in the House here some days ago, when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition raised the question of Sunday opening of clubs that have licenses to sell beers and wines and liquors.

Now the Government have since considered the matter very carefully and as a consequence this present Bill is brought before the House. There are two points in it and two points only. I believe one is that cases of beer may be as low as a dozen bottles but not lower. At the present time they may be as low as two dozen bottles but not lower. Now we have had complaints that two dozen bottles are too many to the case, the case is too big. We are therefore putting the case at a minimum of one dozen bottles. Then those persons who want two dozen bottles can get two cases and ten dozen bottles can get ten cases, but can buy as few as one dozen bottles by buying just one case.

The other point is with regard to the opening on Sundays. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment will meet with fairly general although I won't say unanimous approval but pretty general approval of our New-

foundland people. It may be argued that the Bill ought to be mandatory, outright, and should say nothing should be open on Sunday, (period). The Bill does not do it that way. It says that on Sunday these places, hotels, clubs, military messes, railways or steamships shall not open if they are licensed premises except under and in accordance with the terms and conditions contained in a permit issued by the Board. In other words it is up to the Board to decide whether or not these places shall open on Sunday. My belief is that the Board would probably discriminate, not unfairly, not unjustly, but discriminate to distinguish between different types of premises. There are premises which no doubt, it seems to me, they would permit to open on Sunday and there are premises which no doubt they would not permit to open on Sunday. I think if the House considers the matter carefully, members will in their own minds distinguish here between hotels, clubs, military messes, railways — we can't very well distinguish between railways because there is only one system, the CNR, but they might distinguish between steamships—At all events it is proposed to leave it to the discretion of the Board of Liquor Control—That is the decision of the Government, and that is what we recommend to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we partly agree with the principle involved. As far as I myself am concerned I feel the Bill does not go quite far enough. I say that, of course, with all due respects to the man who likes to go to a club and hotel and get a drink whenever he wants it. I might add that I have received some dire

threats over the attitude I took some time ago with regard to my future politically. I told these people it did not matter a hang to me, if I agreed with the principle. I do agree with the framers of the Aot and I do know the Government has to go by easy stages in making any amendment. I really think that should be an improvement on the whole. A lot of that, of course, will depend on the Board of Liquor Control. The Board of Liquor Control, I believe, will take into consideration the feelings of the Government and of the people and even sometimes of the Opposition. I congratulate the Government on making this change.

**MR. HIGGINS:** Mr. Speaker, there is just one comment made by the Premier, if I heard him rightly—He said there may be need for the Board to differentiate between hotels and hotels and clubs and clubs, that some may be allowed to open and others may not. Now, Sir, if I understood the Honourable the Premier correctly, that seems to me to state a very unfair position. Surely the law is applicable with equal force to all Her Majesty's Subjects. The fact that one particular club (and I hold no brief for any of them) may cater to a more exclusive element than another need not necessarily mean that the license is not just as valid, and that they have not just as much right to say that if one club in one place can be opened from 2:00 o'clock to 6:00 o'clock why should we not be allowed to be open from 2:00 to 6:00 o'clock. I suggest, Sir, it is a somewhat novel departure that there should be grading in the application of the law. I think that is a point which I, for one, would like to have clarified.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, I think I can see what the honourable

gentleman who introduced the Bill has in mind better than my honourable friend who just sat down. There are institutions which call themselves clubs but do not come within the definition of the Alcoholic Liquors Act. A club means a co-operative society or association of persons which is the owner, leasee or occupant of an establishment used solely for objects of social or at least not for pecuniary gain, and precludes a premises occupied for any such purpose. Now we do hear of clubs that are not clubs. I believe that is what is in the mind of the Premier when he said there were clubs and clubs, and the distinction would have to be made by the Board.

There is one omission I noted in regard to the new sub-section (3), but it may be somewhere else in the Act. I have not had a chance to look—But it says the holder of a license granted in respect of hotels, clubs etc.—I wonder if the omission was accidental, to leave out TCA at Gander where there is a bar and where they sell liquor. That does not seem to be covered by either railway or steamship. I would certainly, Mr. Speaker, be against the idea of selling liquor on a commercial basis on Sunday.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, the differentiation I had in mind was that I thought the Board would probably respect the difference between the Airlines Hotel at Gander for example and Archibald's Hotel at Harbour Grace or between the Airlines Hotel at Harmon Field for example and the Newfoundland Hotel. I was not aware TCA had any hotels in Newfoundland nor indeed anywhere else. But I do understand that at Gander the Department of Transport

owns a hotel which they have leased, in part at least, to private operators, and that that hotel operates twenty-four hours a day, three hundred and sixty-five days a year, a bar which in fact never closes—The Big Dipper. It sells both retail and wholesale. It is said in the United States citizens are permitted when they return from visits abroad to bring with them up to one gallon of liquor or wine. At this bar in Gander a fairly considerable quantity of liquor is sold. It seems to me that the Board would not hesitate to permit that hotel to operate on Sunday and all through the year for the convenience of the one-half million passengers who fly through Gander annually. Whereas they would undoubtedly close the bar on Sundays at least on Sundays, as well as these other days such as Good Friday and Christmas Day, in any other type of hotel.

Clubs are of many kinds. I am not going to follow the point made by the last speaker, but without following it and without agreeing with him I think I can see some difference in some at least of the clubs that exist in Newfoundland. I would hesitate to say to the communities for example in St. John's, in Gander, in Grand Falls, in Corner Brook, in Bell Island and elsewhere in Newfoundland, you shall not open your clubs on Sundays. I would hesitate to say that. I think that in all probability the Board would hesitate similarly. On the other hand, and again I think of the City Club for example—I don't know their hours nor do I know if in fact they open on Sundays—

MR. HIGGINS: I don't think they do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, suppose they changed their rules and they

decided to open on Sundays, I really doubt that the Board would say to them, "You must not open on Sundays." Not because it is feared by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's East that they may be a little more refined, let us say, than the persons at some other clubs. No. But because it is a residential club, a club in which you can go and get a meal and at which, if you want it, a glass of wine, a bottle of beer with the meal. It seems to me we have not yet reached the point where the drinking of a glass of wine or a bottle of beer has been reduced by any propaganda to such a depth of disgrace that the Board should refuse to permit the serving of a glass of wine at the City Club if the City Club wishes to do so on Sunday. Similarly with the Golf Club, the Bally Haly Golf and Country Club and similarly Murray's Pond Club. I don't know if they open on Sunday. I don't know, I don't go to them. But far be it from me to wish to stop them, and far be it from this House to stop them if they wish on Sunday, and being open to serve a glass of wine or a bottle of beer and if some prefer a dash of whiskey or rum, even this stinking, smelling stuff, if they wish to and if they are foolish enough—On the other hand I have myself seen clubs on the highways open on Sundays, with a great number of cars parked in front of them. I have at such times wondered whether it was entirely safe on a busy highway on which are to be found many thousands of cars on Sundays to have these same roads frequented by cars driven by perhaps hundreds of people who dropped into these clubs. I am always a little scared myself when driving over some of these roads. I am sober and I think I am a careful driver. But I



do wonder if the fellow coming towards me has had three bottles of beer and does not quite see straight, or that he is quite confident he is on his own side when in fact a third of his car is over on mine. I am always a little worried by that. For that and other reasons I can see why some clubs might be denied the right to sell intoxicating drinks on Sunday. The same thing applies to all these other classifications. What are they? Hotels, clubs, military messes (I will not speak of the U.S. Clubs because they are on leased territory) but if the Canadian Army or Navy or Air Force operates messes and clubs and the like here in this Province I doubt that the Board of Liquor Control is going to say to them; "We are sorry but you can't have your bar open on Sunday." I doubt that they will say that.

At all events, in the Government's opinion, it is better to leave it to the Board. They are pretty sensible people. The Chairman, Mr. Mallowney, is a man of rock-bottom commonsense with nothing flighty or excitable about him. He is very calm and cool and fair and highly anxious to administer the Act so as not to cause scandal or give offense. I think in his hands the question of operating or closing Sunday may very fairly and very safely be left.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in this Bill the number of amendments involved relates to only a word or two yet the whole section or clause has

been printed, and it makes the thing longer than it actually is. I would say we now have an Act on our Statutes; "An Act Respecting Crown Lands, Timber and Water-power", a long and involved and most complicated Act on our books, I think. But this amendment here today does not involve any drastic amendments or changes to that for this reason: As this House knows we have now a Royal Commission on Forestry and one on Agriculture. The one on Agriculture is of necessity giving some attention to land title and other problems connected with our Crown Lands. It is common knowledge that the Royal Commission on Forestry will be making to the Government, before the end of the financial year and possibly by the end of the calendar year, a report which we feel sure will indicate the necessity for very extensive revision of the present Act. However, in the meantime while we are waiting for these reports the Government recommends certain changes, most of them, I think, minor changes and most of them for administrative purposes, to simplify or facilitate processes, and these we had incorporated in this Bill which is now before us.

I will just refer to two or three of them. I might say that I am quite sure that my honourable friends on the opposite side have not read this Bill through as it was only distributed this afternoon. I do feel, however, that most of the points they would want to raise would probably come up best in Committee because of the very nature of the Bill and the fairly large number of small revisions. However, if they feel, when I am finished commenting on second reading, they would prefer to study it longer, we, of

course, have no objections on this side to having it deferred.

There are just one or two sections I would refer to—Section 8, for example—the word “Unoccupied.” That is a word that could have very serious repercussions. Unoccupied land is the only one kind of land to which the Government have been able to give any title. What that meant in effect was that people who perhaps lived for one hundred years on a piece of land could not get a title as long as that word “unoccupied” was in there. As a matter of fact, I myself, only the other day, bought a small parcel of land which had been occupied for eighty-five years by one family yet had no title. I did not mind. I know occupancy is a good thing in Newfoundland and stands in law. Nevertheless there are many cases where people have been living on land for a long time and have no documentary title to the land other than occupancy.

Under Section 6 that is being extended a little to take away the element of compulsion.

Section 8, page 4 of the Bill has an amendment there which is so very obvious. We recognize the fact that our people have long been entitled to acquire wood for fuel. However, we also recognize the fact that especially in certain communities in certain parts of Newfoundland, we have to be protected against wholesale destruction of remaining timber and wood assets. So that while any person is permitted without obtaining any authority from the Department to cut up to twenty cords of wood for his own use—and I might point out the average household would burn anywhere from six to ten cords in a year, so that the figure of twenty is quite liberal. Never-

theless, any person who wishes to cut more than twenty cords must obtain a permit. The reason for that is obvious. We could have a community which might have a thousand cords of wood left for the Community as a whole which could last for years with proper use. On the other hand there was nothing in the past to prevent a man going in and cutting a thousand cords at one time and selling it a hundred miles away for firewood.

Also under that general section (8) permission is given for the use of tenders under certain circumstances. That is something which applies all over Canada but has never been here in Newfoundland. Cases could arise sometimes where it would be a very useful authority to have. Now last year we issued ten thousand permits, which meant we had to have ten thousand accounts, and which meant too that from time to time, human nature being what it is, we had considerable trouble in collecting. Because a man cutting say a hundred or a thousand railway ties, when he gets it cut and sells it, is supposed to pay his royalty. Some people have neglected that. So we propose here that the purchaser will pay for the royalty. That will facilitate the matter in many ways. But consider the CNR for example, one of the biggest purchasers who may be purchasing from perhaps three thousand of the ten thousand permit holders. If the CNR pays us we have the one account with the CNR and that would eliminate some of the most undesirable legal actions from time to time. Perhaps honourable members of the Opposition will remember some persons dragged before court to pay up some small account.

Section 11 is not new. It is merely in the parent Act, here and there,

Authority is given to make regulations. These have been consolidated under Section 11.

Section 12 has to do with penalties and employees, I believe, the penalty up to one hundred dollars. The reason for that is that in certain cases the values involved may be very very high and might even go up to tens of thousands of dollars.

Section 13 and 14 are purely formal changes to correspond with new changes. I think I have covered all that is there of any significance, Mr. Speaker. I might say that Section 4 has been slightly revised to take away some of the rigidity in the past with respect to persons obtaining licenses to land for certain purposes. A man, for example compelled to clear a certain portion of land over a period of comparatively short time — That is brought in from one legislation on the Mainland. However, conditions do vary very much here. We know, for example, a man in Alberta or Saskatchewan who has a hundred acres has a hundred acres of continuous arable land whereas in Newfoundland to get that a man may have to go over four or five hundred acres of rock and bog. It gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council a little more leeway there to deal with some of our permits.

I move, Mr. Speaker, this Bill be now read a second time.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister consider moving the adjournment of second reading, or may I do it, Mr. Speaker. We would like an adjournment until tomorrow. We have not had the Bill, you see.

On motion second reading of Bill adjourned until tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Ferries."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there has been a little change there, and I was wondering if the House would be prepared to agree to change the wording of this Bill. It is true that the short title of the Act is "Ferries" but the long title is "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation." I wonder if the House would be willing to change the name of the Bill? I would move the amendment thereof.

MR. BROWNE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—Does the honourable gentleman mean a change in here in Section (1)?

MR. CURTIS: No, in the Order Paper.

House agreed.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, for some time past, the last couple of years, we have operated a Motor or Carrier Act and we have found that its operation has proved most satisfactory. The Government now proposes to do to this Act for ferries what the Motor Carrier Act has done for motor buses. In other words the proposal is to put under the Board of Public Utilities the power to give, upon such terms and conditions as it deems fit, and subject to the payment of such fees as it deems fit, the right to issue a franchise to any persons in respect to operations of ferries. The Bill provides that a franchise cannot be transferred except with the approval in writing by the Board and a franchise provided otherwise is void. The Board may regulate the fees and base the fees for a franchise upon a portion of the receipts or the mileage travelled or the number of passengers or the amount of property carried or upon any other basis which the Board

deems advisable. It provides that fees and other moneys collected shall be applied towards the defraying of the expenses of the Board in accordance with the Public Utilities Act. That the owner or operator of a ferry under franchise shall not refuse to carry any person or property offering at any regular stopping place or at any terminus of the ferry unless the accommodation of the ferry for passengers or property, as the case may be, is fully occupied, but the operator may refuse transportation to any person who is intoxicated or who is conducting himself in a boisterous or a disorderly manner or is using profane or obscene language. It also provides that ferries under the franchise shall not charge any toll until a tariff of tolls has been filed with and approved by the Board. It provides further that the holder of a franchise shall not operate a ferry in a manner contrary to the provisions of the franchise or in excess of the limits set forth in the franchise. It provides that any person who contravenes any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations is guilty of an offense, and that every fine collected under this Act shall be paid to the Department of the Attorney General and shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Board may make such regulations as it deems advisable for carrying out the spirit, intent and meaning of this Act or for supplying any deficiency therein, or for meeting cases which may arise for which no provision or inadequate provision has otherwise been made.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this Act will have the general support of the House, and I move second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I notice that now the Minister is referring to the Act Respecting Ferries, I imagine that is where the title came from. I am not aware of many ferries existing in the country except the ferry at Placentia and the ferry between Portugal Cove and Bell Island. I don't know to what extent the ferry between Portugal Cove and Bell Island comes under this Act or whether any attention was paid to its existence at all. I believe its present function is to carry the mail and at the same time carry passengers and freight for the benefit of people doing business with Bell Island. But recently, with the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway certainly, it has become very important to make provisions for the carrying of motor vehicles over rivers where there are no bridges. Certainly some regulation is necessary, according to reports I have received. The Honourable the Attorney General has made reference to the fact that the Act called "The Motor Carrier Act," which is a similar Act, deals with transportation by land and which has worked satisfactorily. I am not sure whether he has given that much thought or not, because I understand it is not working satisfactorily, and that many people were delighted when they found out that the Canadian National Railways were going to operate a bus between here and Carbon-ear, because the service as given by the motor carriers under license from the Government, the Board of Public Utilities, was not satisfactory. I have heard several complaints that the Board is not very exacting about the operators of motor buses and motor carriers operating along Topsail Highway. I don't know whose duty it is to investigate, but it seems to me once a license is issued conditions are laid

down and then they should be carried out. If it is unsatisfactory to the public or to the operators it should be adjusted formally and not just break the law because it is convenient.

Now in regard to this particular one, I don't know how far I should draw that to the attention of the Government, but I understand that at the present time there is very great inconvenience in the operations of the ferry service between Portugal Cove and Bell Island. Now I don't think that arises out of the fact that the new construction is going on there but because of the increase in the motor traffic. I believe now sometimes you are there an hour and sometimes longer, many hours before the boat is ready to go especially on weekends, that you are not likely to get your car brought across to Bell Island. I have heard of fifteen people with cars lined up waiting for passage and only one boat operating and that steamer only able to take six cars. To me, if people have the privilege of operating ferries, they should have sufficient accommodations to take all these who are offering, and if they can't do it they should withdraw.

Now I have also heard that some company has purchased a river boat which operated on some part of the St. Lawrence River for transportation of cars across there. Now there is a big difference between crossing the St. Lawrence around Brockville or Cornwall in smooth water and crossing the tinkle between Portugal Cove and Bell Island. It can be very rough crossing there, and unless the steamer is seaworthy it should not be allowed to operators. It would be a great tragedy if anything should happen in transporting people or vehicles to Bell Island resulting in a disaster. I am sure the Public Utilities Board would see

to it that when dealing with vessels engaged in ferry service on the high seas as between Portugal Cove and Bell Island they would have a different thing from what might occur when crossing a river or an inland waterway. Therefore, strict supervision must exist and they must be well found in all kinds of safety equipment and be seaworthy in every respect.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, if I might add something to that. I would say that the registry of the boat would not be the responsibility of the Public Utilities Board. That would come under the Department of Transport, and they have rules and regulations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the proceedings of the House, but I think I ought to make it quite clear that the ferry boat to which reference has already been made, the one that is going to ply between Portugal Cove and Bell Island, or I ought to say one of those that will ply, is not a river boat although she operated last on a river. She was a salt-water boat, operated on the Atlantic Coast of North America in fact, and on the Atlantic Coast of the United States and was then taken to a river and operated. Since then she has come down here under her own power, in very rough weather. It would be very, very misleading and the cause of some misgiving perhaps and uneasiness amongst the general public that will be using her to have it spread about that she is just a river boat. She is no more a river boat than I am.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Act provides under Section 10 that this Act does not apply to a ferry operated under a franchise issued by either St. John's or by a town or rural district. Can the Hon-

jurable Minister tell us whether or not it is intended to apply this to the boats that ply for hire in the Harbour of St. John's?

I have one other question—There was a ferry that used to operate to Holyrood Pond. I don't know if it is still operating.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I may—It is not—But the Minister of Finance ought to answer that.

MR. POWER: We intend—it has not come before the Government yet—but I have spoken to several of them and the Premier and I think everyone is in agreement that we will put a ferry on Holyrood Gut.

MR. HIGGINS: Is there not one there now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If one whistles and hawls and shouts someone comes.

MR. POWER: What I mean is one capable of bringing cars and trucks.

MR. HIGGINS: It is a good idea.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister when he replies to explain to the House just what is the meaning of "Ferry." There is no interpretation to say what a "Ferry" is. In some places and harbours in Newfoundland, especially in Notre Dame Bay and perhaps Placentia Bay and many other places small boats operate with passengers and perhaps take a small amount of freight. What I would like to know is if these small boats or ferries, if they are called ferries, come under the scope of this Act. If they do will the Minister set the limits in respect to size, carrying capacity of boats such as I have just mentioned? I think per-

haps the Minister would consider putting in an interpretation as to what a "Ferry" means.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, of course as far as the Bell Island Ferry is concerned it will be subject to the Canadian Shipping Act. In particular with regard to the definition of "Ferries" I don't know—I think perhaps—

MR. SPENCER: It is better not to have a definition at the moment. The Board can take all ferries under its jurisdiction. A ferry might be a small boat such as the one which goes from Lewisporte to Twillingate, or a larger one such as goes from Portugal Cove to Bell Island or a smaller boat such as would go across Holyrood Pond. I think it is just as well not to have it defined. However, it is a matter for discussion in Committee.

MR. FOGWILL: A two-hand dory, for instance?

MR. CURTIS: I suppose strictly. I don't think there will be any trouble on that score. I might say I will be glad to bring to the attention of the Board the points raised by the honourable member for St. John's East. I am sure they would be glad to look into it.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths":

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill. For some time past the Government have on several occasions had difficulty in finding authority under which to appoint Commissioners who can take oaths. The Supreme



Court has power, as my honourable and learned friend will know, to appoint Commissioners for the Supreme Court and these Commissioners can take oaths. But the judges of the Supreme Court don't like to appoint Commissioners except for the Supreme Court. The result is that in many cases we have had difficulty in finding people who could administer oaths. For instance when we last had the by-election in Bonavista we wanted to conduct it very fairly and we wanted to enable returning officers concerned to take oaths, and we had to appoint them on a temporary basis. Well, that was a nuisance. Likewise all the Welfare officers and many others throughout the country from time to time, we want to enable them to take oaths. We find we have to appoint them JP's. And a JP is a far more important man than just a man to take a oath. That is only one of the functions he has. Another is that he is supposed in an emergency to sit with another on the bench and between two of them constitute the powers of a magistrate.

MR. BROWNE: A half-magistrate, in other words?

MR. CURTIS: Half, yes. So we have followed the procedure followed in other provinces, and we propose to have Commissioners for oaths. We intend to give the Mayors and Chairmen of Town Councils the right to take oaths, and also Members of the House of Assembly. When we are in our ridings we are sometimes called upon to sign documents. Now my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition already, and his colleague too, has the right to administer oaths, but us poor unfortunates to the left of them cannot take oaths. I have no doubt it will be a great advantage to us all when going through

our districts, fortunately I have been able to take oaths myself. I think—Remember we ought to get it through before the fall, the November election—and I think it would be a great convenience for those who represent the outside constituencies to be able to take oaths because we are called upon, as everyone knows, to assist people with signing applications in one form or another.

There is just one little innovation here—It is provided that these appointments are for a period of five years, then those who receive such appointments are to write after their names, such as they do in some places in Canada—My Commission expires on such and such a date—That assists him to know just when his commission expires and at the same time protects the people whose papers he signs.

MR. HIGGINS: That does not apply to barristers?

MR. CURTIS: No, not to barristers and solicitors. They can take oaths too, which will be acceptable in court.

MR. HIGGINS: There is just one question, Mr. Speaker. Barristers hereafter will be entitled to administer oaths. What about those unfortunates who previously paid out \$25 in order to become notaries public—Are they going to be recognized?

MR. CURTIS: No, Sir.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour to-day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Ship Building (Bounties) Act":

HON W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, there has been on the Statute Books

of Newfoundland a Ship Building (Bounties) Act for quite a long time, I believe since the latter part of the last century. The present Act was one placed there by the Commission of Government in, I believe, 1938, when they defined certain new bounty scales and bounty payments for vessels. The rate of bounties laid down then in 1938 were, on fishing vessels from twenty to one hundred and fifty tons, \$40 a ton and on fishing vessels built under a different schedule of twelve to thirty tons, \$30 a ton. On vessels built for use in the trade of Newfoundland, according to certain schedules, \$20 and \$30 a ton.

In 1947 the Commission of Government took a look at the rising building costs and effected a new scale of bounties and amended the Act in 1947 providing a new scale, on fishing ships of twenty to one hundred and fifty tons a rate of \$80 per ton and on ten to thirty tons a rate of \$70 per ton. I believe the trade bounties at that time were upped from \$20 and \$30 to \$30 and \$40 according as built on full schedule.

The Commission of Government also at that time provided for bounty payments on ships of the dragger type in Newfoundland and they added a new bounty payment on engines of the diesel type for fishing ships of \$15 per horsepower and for freight and trading ships \$10 per horsepower. These provisions continued in effect until 1949 in order to give the incoming Government a chance to look at them and either drop or continue them. The Government have continued the high rate bounties ever since by amending the Act each year and extending the authority to pay these rates of bounties for one year. It has been our hope before now to introduce

a new Bounties Act to clean up some anomalies in the existing Act. As a matter of fact this year, after getting out of the woods as far as the Fisheries Development Committee and programme are concerned, we did get around to drafting a new Ship Building (Bounties) Act. The Attorney General's Department put up a draft of about thirty-six pages for us. But the department is still not quite satisfied with some sections of the Act, and we have decided to hold it over until next year. But it is necessary to seek authority, and it is sought in Sections (2) and (3) of the Bill, to continue the higher rate of bounties instituted by the Commission of Government. It is provided here the highest rate will continue until June of 1955.

Section 4 of the Bill has to do with a change that is considered desirable this year, that is that the bounties upon engines shall henceforth be paid upon the nominal horsepower instead of brake horsepower. As I have said the present rate is \$15 on brake horsepower for fishing ships and \$10 for freighting ships. It is proposed in this section in future to pay only nominal horsepower instead of brake. I hope nobody asks me to explain the difference, because I am not very clear on that one at all. But the rate of bounties it is proposed to pay is in respect of fishing ships a rate of \$100 on nominal horsepower and in the case of trading ships \$75, which I am told by my personnel down there is the equivalent in terms of money and horsepower—In other words there is very little difference, but there may be a slight deviation, but it is practically seeking authority to continue paying the same rate of bounties upon engines, except that for the future the bounty will be paid on nominal horsepower.

These are the essential things in the Act which are new, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister to read out that formula on page 2.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder does this avoid paying other bounties which hitherto have been paid? Are these to be paid now wholly and solely on horsepower of the engine? I think, certainly we are in favour of any Bills of this nature, and I don't think anybody in the House would know exactly what the particular formula means. I expect the Minister will tell us that in his reply. Also how the bounties compare on fishing boats say of twenty, thirty, forty or fifty tons with bounties heretofore paid on the same tonnage. That is the only thing I am concerned with. I am in favour of the Bill apart from that.

MR. KEOUGH: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to duck the question on the formula. As the honourable gentleman suggested, probably nobody in the House can explain it.

As far as bounties are concerned the authority sought is to continue exactly the bounties as they have been in respect of tonnage and hull of fishing ships, and with respect of the engines will be paid on a nominal instead of brake horsepower, but the equivalent with perhaps a slight variation of \$1 or so on the basis of calculations by this formula.

Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act."

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the preliminary remarks I made about the Crown Lands Bill apply also to this case. There are no serious nor drastic revisions here. But there are a number of points which have been a sort of thorn in the flesh, and have not been clear in the past. Several legal points and definitions and things of that kind have been checked up on and as interim legislation this year we submit this Bill, this amendment to the Act. I will just refer to one or two of them:

The old definition of Crown license to have a saw mill, for example, gave the impression very definitely that only timber cut on Crown land could be sawed in that saw mill. This is altogether wrong because that saw mill might be adjacent to Bowaters property and Bowaters might want that saw mill owner to saw some lumber. He could not do it because of the definition of the old Act.

Section 5, we will say, takes away some of the stiffness of the old section, which said that any person who had any beneficiary rights or interest in any land could not be given a saw mill permit. Now the revision is that such person cannot be given a saw mill permit by the department as an ordinary person can, but the application may be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and it can be considered on its merits.

Section 7 is another interesting thing. The old Act said that the granting of these permits does not give a person any rights to waterpowers. We now have widened that to say it does not give them any other rights except those specified in the clause. People sometimes assumed they had a lot more rights because they had the right to operate a saw mill, and that it

gave them a lot of other rights which were not intended in the Bill.

Section No. 10. From an administrative and legal standpoint we found the practice in vogue in the department for many many years, from Commission of Government days etc. may perhaps have not been quite legal, to put it that way. This is intended to rectify the situation insofar as the collection of royalties are concerned, the collection of money owed the department.

Then Section 11 removes the statute of limitations which existed from one year under the old Act. If a person owes the department money for a saw mill license, if he did not pay it within one year, or if he did not take action within one year, the department was then outlawed. That is a really ridiculous situation, because in the course of things it might be a good many months sometimes when we have hundreds of licenses and perhaps a year before the delinquency would be discovered. So that this section takes away that limitation of one year which applied in the past. So if a person owes us money, let us say for two years before it really comes to light, we can still take action against him to recover it.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my honourable friends on the opposite side would like to have a chance to look over the Bill before closing the debate.

On motion Bill now read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing very complicated about this Bill. Its prime purpose is to give dignity and importance and prestige formally to the appointment of the Commission we have recently appointed to prepare Newfoundland's case for presentation to the Royal Commission which will sit later to revise or to review the Terms of Union, and on the financial side to recommend what additional financial assistance, if any, we may require, find out what it would take to enable us to maintain our levels and standard of public services as reached at the time the review is made.

There is a preamble setting forth the fact that Term 29 of the Terms of Union provides for a Royal Commission. It goes on to say that; whereas it is deemed desirable and in the public interest to appoint a Commission to prepare the case to be presented to the Royal Commission on behalf of Newfoundland, we therefore ask for the appointment of this present Commission of Enquiry which shall be known as the Terms of Union Commission, and shall in addition to preparing a case as referred to in Section 2, carry out such other duties as the Lieutenant Governor in Council assigns to them.

Section 4 has some importance. The Lieutenant Governor in Council may pay, and each member of the Commission may accept, such remuneration, if any, as the Lieutenant Governor in Council thinks fit, notwithstanding the Legislative Disabilities Act, if a member of the House of Assembly is a member of the Commission his seat does not become vacant by reason only of his appointment and acceptance of remuneration as a member of the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be paid all reason-

able travelling and other expenses incurred in performing his duties under this Act.

Now most if not all of those citizens who are members of this Commission and are not members of the House of Assembly have signified to me their desire to serve as members of the Commission without pay. I have agreed that if they don't wish to accept pay they don't have to. On the other hand we feel that the Chairman, who will have to attend all sittings and who will have to guide and consolidate the work of the Commission and the Commission itself, and who may be the person to represent Newfoundland personally on behalf of the Government at the hearings of the Royal Commission itself later, ought to be paid, and ought to be in a position to accept payment without vacating his seat in the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, this present Bill, which I now have pleasure in moving—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a Bill on which I should say a few words, because the Commission which is being set up by this Bill will, I take it, have such importance, or its decision will have such importance in its effect upon the financial status of this country in the years to come, and I think it is absolutely essential that we should give plenty of thought to it, and we should give that Commission all the assistance which they desire from us whether we are on the Government side of the House or on the Opposition side of the House.

I could go on at length and deplore the fact the Committee which arranged the Terms in the first instance did not take sufficient care, but that, like Confederation, is water under the bridge. Sufficient terms were not put

forward, not brought out, not obtained from the Federal Government. We have to accept that fact. We also have to accept the fact today that the time is fast approaching when these financial terms under which we are now existing as a Government will be outmoded and any government who tries to operate on them will be bankrupt. As a matter of fact, Sir, that has been proved to us time and again, twice at any rate in the last two years, that it was absolutely essential on both occasions for the Government to indicate that they would require a loan in order to carry on certain aspects of Government, and to carry out the principles which are involved in the Terms of Union, relative to the enhancement of our public services.

There is not much point to be gained in crying over spilled milk. Therefore, we are definitely in favour of this Bill to set up this Commission. I am not so sure, and I say this with due deference to the personnel involved here, I say, I am not greatly impressed by the personnel. It seems to me that the personnel of such a Committee should be experts in matters of Government and in matters of finance and in matters relevant to the welfare of the people as affected by government finances. Now these are admirable men — As it is now 6:00 o'clock—perhaps we could call it 6:00 o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock, I do leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock tonight.

---

MONDAY, June 14, 1954

#### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order — Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada": Honourable Leader of the Opposition:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, at recess time I was speaking on the Bill relevant to the appointment of a Commission in connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union.

I think it would be well for us to first ask ourselves just what do we mean by public services if we read this preamble first and ask ourselves what are public services. Just what do we mean by public services? The main thing under consideration there is the ability of the Province to maintain the public services that may have been established at some time subsequent to or following Union with Canada. Public Services, I hold, are those services which are supplied under the Departments of Health, Welfare, Education, Public Works, maintenance of roads, and under Justice. Generally speaking these are all public services and will be included under particular headings. I maintain therefore that it was the duty of any government which took over at the time of Union with Canada, having knowledge of that particular section No. 29, I maintain it was the duty of that government to endeavour to raise the standard of public services throughout Newfoundland compatible with the amount of revenue collected and the taxation which may have been imposed. If we ask ourselves to what extent has the Government carried out that obligation, fulfilled that obligation, I fear that we are going to get quite a disappointment.

As we know in that particular sec-

tion there are a number of intangibles, I call them: For instance public services—Who knows just what is the proper standard of public services? Are we going to have a public service equal to that of Toronto or Ontario as a whole or to that of any other province? Or are we to have it on the same basis as that of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or, if you like the Northwest Territory? I think that was left with the Government. That was left with the Government where they said: "that may be required by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland to enable it to continue public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of Union." In other words, how much more financial aid is Newfoundland to need in order to keep the standards at which we have arrived in the 8th year of Union? How much money is it going to take to maintain these services? I hold therefore it was the duty of the Government to raise the standards of the public services every year, year after year, to the limit within the scope of the revenues received. How has this Government done that?

The member for White Bay the other day told us to what extent the Government has fulfilled its obligations in that particular district. What public services have been established in White Bay? Ask the honourable member:

MR. SPEAKER: That refers to another debate.

MR. HOLLETT: I shall not make any reference to that debate, Sir, but I will say this: We all know in this House that public services in that particular part of the country or if you like, Sir, from Cape Bonavista right around to Cape Ray—let us ask



ourselves how high has the standard of public services been raised, and how much financial aid will be needed to keep the public services in that area to the point where it is now? For instance: What public services are there along the southwest coast from Cape Ray right to St. John's? Health and Public Welfare, oh yes, there have been a good many improvements largely, we know, by moneys which come in from the Dominion of Canada, and largely through efforts made by the present Government. I will grant that in the field of health and welfare generally some improvement has been made, and considerable improvement has been made in certain areas. But, there are long stretches of our coastline in this country where the standard of public service has not in any way improved since we went into Confederation.

Now, where are we going to be at the 9th year of Union? How is that particular area of the country going to be effected? Mind you, the Commission to be appointed by the Federal Government is the Commission to decide the amount of financial and other aid and not this particular Commission set up by this bill.

Now I have every regard for the members of this Commission which is being set up. I will say this for the Chairman, although he is present in the House—He has got to take it as well as I—I don't take it usually—But I will say that as Chairman of that Commission we could not have found a more appropriate man nor a man more fitted for the job than the man named here, and I refer to the honourable and learned member for Harbour Main-Bell Island. I say he is a good Chairman, and I am quite sure he and his Committee under him will assemble the facts. Well, are these

members going to take a trip around White Bay? I am quite sure the honourable and learned member for Harbour Main-Bell Island will have to go even to Fogo, and I am quite sure the honourable member for Fogo would not object to his going there to see how the public services have been improved there. The same would apply to White Bay and Green Bay, and if I may, Sir, in your district, and down the southwest coast, and might come right here in St. John's Sir, to see how the public services have been improved on Blackhead Road, how it has been improved up in Mundy Pond. I believe that Commission under the honourable and learned member for Harbour Main-Bell Island will have to visit these areas and find out by asking questions—"How is everything going on? Has your status been any better since this Government than prior, if you like, to Union? Has it been improved?" I maintain it was the duty of any government which came in, knowing that particular section was there, particularly when having a surplus of some forty odd million dollars—I think they very well might have used that money in a large part towards the building of new hospitals, schools, etc. Then having put on extra taxation they could have used the surplus they secured thereby to help maintain these services. I mean, the Government knew, and everybody knows there are very little public services in certain areas of this country. The Government, in my opinion, has neglected to do that. If I were the Government at the present time I would say: "Let us, before the Royal Commission is set up, let us, in the name of goodness, do something to try and improve the public services of this country far beyond the standard which they have reached at the present time.

We must improve our public services, Sir! The whole idea is suggested here in this particular section—"The Government of Canada will appoint a Royal Commission within eight years from the date of Union to review the financial position of the Province of Newfoundland and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance if any, that may be required by the Government of the Province of Newfoundland to enable it to continue public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of Union, without resorting to taxation more burdensome, having regard to capacity to pay, than that obtaining generally in the region comprising the Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island;" What date does it say? "Subsequent to the date of Union." I presume that means within that eight year period.

HON. P. J. LEWIS (Minister without Portfolio): Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition limit it to the eight year period?

MR. HOLLETT: Well, you see, Sir, the Commission will be set up within the eight years. I take it they will want to make a decision as quickly as they can. When they want to come to a decision they will say "Well, here now is this Government, a fine Government, a Liberal Government who built roads in White Bay, hospitals down there and schools somewhere else and have done this and that in other places around the coast. They must have some money to keep up that level of public services. We must help them". But what are they going to do when they find out nothing has been done in White Bay, Green Bay and certain other parts? They are going to say; "Well, you have not raised the level of public ser-

vices. This says we are going to find out how much to pay you in order to continue at the level to which you raised them." When they find the Government have not raised the level of public services — they are only bound by that—And if I know the Federal Government or any Commission they set up, they are not going beyond their terms of reference. So that I say, if I were with the Government today I would argue strongly that every surplus dollar the Government could get hold of from now on would be used to build up public services all around the country, particularly in these areas which are backward. To see you have hospitals, roads, schools to be kept up in various places around the country and then the Federal Government must grant assistance because the Government can't afford to tax the people enough to keep up those services, but would have to over-tax them. "Without resulting in taxation more burdensome than that obtaining generally in the region comprising the Maritime Provinces."

MR. LEWIS: Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition permit me for a moment? Suppose that it is impossible to complete a road project in St. Barbe District within the period limited by the term, would the honourable gentleman restrict the power of that Commission to that, granting aid to that portion which is complete?

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Speaker, certainly not. If this Government had had such good intentions five years ago they would have had the road finished now in that particular district or in other districts as well. I think the Government may be judged probably by its good intentions, if they had some, and I believe they did, but got off the track somewhere along the road, and they used a lot of the

surplus in things other than raising the standard of the public services in this country. I think the honourable member will admit that—it is not a question of what it should be limited to, or what I should limit it to or the honourable gentleman. It is whether the Royal Commission will agree on that limit.

MR. LEWIS: If I may? I think the honourable gentleman will find, if he looks at the record which was compiled at the time the Terms were negotiated that the surplus of which he speaks, Mr. Speaker, was not to be devoted towards the raising of public service; that two-thirds was for other purposes.

MR. HOLLETT: Was it not two-thirds for public services?

MR. LEWIS: I don't mean that, Sir. I am talking about the minutes of the meetings that preceded the finalization of the Terms of Union. I think it was clearly understood at that time, Mr. Speaker, that the surplus as it then existed was to be available for economic development of the Province.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe even the surplus itself, if I am right, and I am not by-passing the suggestions made, I believe it was laid down in the Act that the surplus, which was forty-two million dollars or some such amount, should be used two-thirds as to improvement of public services and one-third as to payment of deficits on current account—if my memory serves me right. Can the Government say today that they have used two-thirds of that surplus for the improvement of the public services? Can they say that the surpluses which they had on current account were used to improve the public services? I know some improvements have been made. I am

only suggesting that it is most important, even if the Government did not do it heretofore, or even if they did so heretofore, that every last dollar they can spare to improve our public services and get up to as high a level as possible so that when this Commission comes down here from Canada they will see what has been done. Mind you they are going to see what you did not do, but they can then see what you have done and so recommend to the Federal Government that you need these moneys to keep up these public services. Then there is a possibility that we may get some more assistance, which I am quite sure and everybody is quite sure you need. If you only look at the estimates brought in last week sometime, which were made by this man, Mr. Thompson of the revenue and expenditure of this particular year, 1954-55—I pointed out there that he was some nineteen million dollars short on his estimate as to what we should spend this year and what we should take in—

MR. LEWIS: He was wrong both ways.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, he was wrong both ways. I am not going to say now, and I don't believe the honourable member for Harbour Main-Bell Island is going to say that their estimate when they make it will be a good seven or eight years hence.

I am sorry in one way to see that such fine men as are listed here should be put in the position in which Mr. Thompson is placed, or had placed himself in 1949 when he made these estimates. Still, somebody has to do it. The point I want to get across is that I am not criticizing too badly—The Government, I know, were young, they were inexperienced when left to carry on by the demised Commission

of Government, and I don't think they used all the money they should have or could have in the improvement or extension of the public services in this country.

There is not much more I have to say on this, Sir. Of course we do not object to this Bill. As a matter of fact we support it. I don't know that it is absolutely essential because the Term 29 says the Government of Canada will appoint a Royal Commission to investigate—And I don't think for one moment the Commission which is to be appointed to investigate are going to pay too much attention to what a purely local Newfoundland Commission offers them. They are going to investigate themselves, and they are going to decide—We are in their hands. But I do submit that it is right and proper for the Government to appoint good men like they have to try to get all the facts. As I say there are so many intangibles in this particular clause that it is essential that much work should be put in upon it, very much work. I don't envy the people who have to do it, but it has to be done, and I hope they make a good job of it.

I won't say anything about Clause 4. I don't like that. I don't like it at all. "... As the Lieutenant-Governor in Council thinks fit." We have heard the Government on the other side say: "Well, write your own ticket. What do you want? Write your own ticket." Suppose these men should come along tomorrow or the next day and write their own ticket and we find ourselves charged twenty-five thousand dollars or thirty thousand dollars apiece! Why I heard—I don't know how true this story is—A certain man in the Federal Government of Canada was offered, in the fishery branch of the Government of Canada,

was offered a hundred thousand dollars by one of the Cabinet Ministers on the opposite side, to come down here and look after our fisheries. That might have been right too. But here they have the same opportunity to make the sky the limit and pay any of these men any amount. They may be justly deserving of it. I am not saying anything about that, but I really think that when the House is asked to pass an Act there should be some stipulation when it comes to paying out money, there should be some limit beyond which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may not go without getting the further assent of the House. I don't think it is right, and I believe there are members on the opposite side who will agree it is not right to be giving any government, and I mean the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Cabinet, the right to tell people to name their price or to give them the right to pay what they deem is fitting. I think it is the House who has to decide that. I am quite sure the Honourable the Premier will probably agree with me that it is really the business of the House, at least the House should be given some idea as to the amount of money which is to be expended on this item—I believe already fifty thousand dollars has been voted.

Now, Sir, without wasting any more time, and I say wasting advisedly, I can assure the Government that they have in this particular Bill and in this particular Commission the blessing of the Opposition, if that is of any value. I do deplore the fact that it is found to be necessary to appoint a Commission almost every other day. The Government seems to be devoid of certain skills to do certain things and appoint commission on commission—Royal Commission on Fishery

Prices—Royal Commission on Prices—Royal Commission on Forestry—Royal Commission on Agriculture — Royal Commission on Fisheries and now a Royal Commission on this. I expect to wake up some morning myself and find myself on a Royal Commission. But I believe there is a lot of work being done on Royal Commissions today that should be done by the Government and the various departments under the Government. Who has better knowledge of the public services in this country today than the departmental heads and the members who represent the various districts? I don't know anybody. I am quite sure all the members here, apart from the honourable and learned member for Harbour Main, will have to be told the state of the public services in most of this country. Every member on the opposite side knows what services they have in his own district. We know here. We know what is lacking and wish we could supply it. However, the Commission is appointed and has our blessing. I do hope when the Commission comes down here within eight years after Union, whenever that is, that they will listen to the appeal of this Royal Commission—Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, there is just one point in connection with this Bill that occurred to me. Section 3 provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint such additional persons to be members of the Commission as is deemed fit. That ties in with the comments of my honourable colleague on the question of remuneration of members of the Commission. Now I understand that the gentlemen presently comprising the Commission, or some of them, intimated quite publicly, indeed unless I am misinformed, one or two of them

made it a condition of acceptance that they would not accept any remuneration. But, is it contemplated that additional members might be added, say, technical men or specialists with specialized knowledge or skills, and if so, we could conceivably—you might have the position arise where you might have two, three, four or five additional members, with remuneration fixed in the rather haphazard manner it now appears to be, and there would not be enough in the vote to cover it. That may not of course be a valid point at all. But I think that perhaps the Minister might enlighten us as to whether there is any probability of any increase in the present membership of the Commission. Provision is made for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable gentleman who has last spoken I may say there is no intention to appoint additional members to the Commission. The right to do so is contained in the Bill because there might possibly be resignations and there might be vacancies from other causes in the next year or so. So that in case of a vacancy we take the right to make another appointment. Apart from that we have not thought of appointing additional members.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the change in the attitude of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition since dinner. He thinks it is a very good Commission. Before dinner he thought it was a very poor one. He has changed since dinner.

MR. HOLLETT: Oh no!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh yes! The honourable gentleman took a very dim view of it before dinner. He must have had a good dinner. He took a very poor view of the position of the

Commission before dinner. He spoke up to the recess at 6:00 o'clock. But since we resumed at 8:00 o'clock he thinks it is a very good Commission. Perhaps we should arrange it that the honourable gentleman make his pronouncements after he has had dinner, he may then speak better of our various points.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a nice point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a good point. I always welcome the honourable gentleman's support. Any support of our policy of raising the level and standard of our public services is welcome. This is the first time he has done it since he has been in the House. That is not worth repeating though, is it? But the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, for the first time, commended the Government for raising the standard of the public services, and asks the Government to do it. It is the first time he has done that.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Except here or there in some particular district, his own for instance. He has demanded once or twice that within his own district there should be some improvement and has commended us for some improvement we made. But tonight, for the first time since he came into this House, he has asked the Government to raise the level and standard of public services generally throughout the Province and commended the Government for the extent to which it has done so and he blames the Government to the extent to which it has failed to do so. Now this is an entirely new attitude.

MR. HOLLETT: There is nothing wrong with that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, there is nothing wrong. It is a good attitude and I welcome it, and welcome the change in the honourable gentleman. At the same time I want to remind him that it is not quite as bad as he has made out.

He says that when the Royal Commission comes they are going to look into things and they are going to find that the Government have failed to raise the level and standard of public services, and cites White Bay District.

MR. HOLLETT: If they come now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And he cites White Bay District. Let us take a look at White Bay District. Let us take a look at it. Before Confederation and in the five years before Confederation in the White Bay District: The Government spent, under all headings, for everything in those five years before Confederation \$570,000, half a million and over in the five years. That is not half a million a year but it is one hundred thousand a year, \$577,066. The breakdown of that is as following: Take it down! Roads etc., \$73,341, in five years; Welfare \$199,078, just under two hundred thousand dollars; Municipal Affairs, \$46,717; Health, \$220,000, a total of \$577,044, half a million or call it six hundred thousand dollars, it is closer to six hundred thousand dollars than it is to five hundred thousand, in five years on all the ramifications of Government.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the Honourable Minister a question? Did they not have any schools down there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes we have schools. But I am talking about direct government expenditure. The



same thing applied before Confederation, we had schools then and now.

Incidentally these are capital account expenditures, all of them. They are not only current account but are capital and not ordinary expenditures. Now, roads etc., \$418,519; Welfare, \$1,093,250; Municipal Affairs, \$120,197; Health, \$900,000 as against \$220,000. My honourable friend the member for Placentia West told us here in this House of the tremendous improvements made in the public services compared with the five years before. Now I have the figures for every district in Newfoundland. I had them ready on tap as soon as the five years were over. I instructed all departments to get those figures for me. It involved an enormous amount of work on their part. The Government as a whole spent in five years before Confederation, that amount, and the amount we have spent in the five years since Confederation. I got these figures so that we would have an exact comparison. Now the total is \$577,000 and \$2,573,000—that is five to one.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable the Premier allow me? How much of that is Federal?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not one cent of it. Not one single cent of it is Federal. This is Provincial. Furthermore, and I would remind the House of this fact, that in the \$577,000 spent before Confederation in five years in White Bay District are items which since Confederation are not in fact included in the Provincial figures because they are Federal figures and are excluded from this table. So that more has been spent by the Government of Newfoundland, since Confederation, which is responsible for fewer things in that district than the Government of Newfoundland was respon-

sible for in the five years before Confederation because there has been a division of jurisdiction and responsibility.

MR. HOLLETT: Talking about public services?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Even talking about public services too and even when allowance is made for the fact that dollars do not buy as much, that there is some inflation in the last five years, the fact remains that we have spent five dollars to one. As a matter of fact I have the figures for Humber District and for St. Georges-Port au Port District and St. Barbe District and these figures run between five to one and six to one. In His Honour's district it is about six to one. In St. Barbe District this Government spent six dollars for every one dollar spent by the previous government in the comparative five year period, five years before Confederation and the five years since. I have the figures, as I said a moment ago, and I have them for all the districts. I have the figures but they are not compiled for all the Province. But I have them compiled for White Bay and Green Bay and Grand Falls and Twillingate and Fogo—That is as far south as I have gotten from Cape Ray, from Port aux Basques around to Cape Fieels. The average is five to one. In the five years since Confederation we have spent five times as much as was spent in the five years before Confederation.

My honourable friend is forgetting something else when he says—they will find that the Government have not raised the levels of public services—Then I find him saying—The Government might have used a large part of the surplus to improve the public services, roads and hospitals and schools.

And I find him arguing in his attack a few moments ago what a pity it was the Government failed to raise the level of public services—They should have done this, might have done it and could have, but they did not do it.

Did we not?

MR. HOLLETT: Did we? Don't ask me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me tell the honourable gentleman: twenty-seven and a half millions from the surplus, taken out of the surplus, which was forty-two million, the two-thirds which was supposed to be spent.

MR. HOLLETT: Two-thirds was supposed to be spent for the improvement of the public services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me! It was no such thing. The Terms provided that two-thirds of the surplus would be devoted—one-third on deposit with the Government of Canada at Ottawa to draw interest at the rate of 2 5/8% and to be withdrawn only for the purpose of meeting deficits on current account.

MR. HOLLETT: And it included public services.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And the other two-thirds to be free, to be spent by the Government for public services and economic development. Exactly. But we have spent two-thirds of it on public services alone without one dollar of it on economic development because we have spent twenty-seven and a half million of it on the extension and improvement of public services. The honourable gentleman ought not to get off this kind of stuff, not while I am around, because I happen to have the facts at my finger-tips. He stands up there tonight facing me,

sitting opposite me, after his experience in the National Convention of two years and the last two years in this House and getting off that kind of stuff that the Government have not raised the level of public services — If the Government had spent the surplus or some of it raising the public services. What is two-thirds of forty-two million dollars? Twenty-eight million dollars. Here are the figures for twenty-seven and a half million: Grants and Loans to Town Councils, \$800,008; Public Housing and Slum Clearance, \$1,600,000; Schools, building and equipment two and three-quarter millions; Construction of Public buildings, \$574,000; Construction and equipment of hospitals, five and three-quarter millions; Roads, bridges and ferries fifteen and three-quarter millions; total twenty-seven and a half million to be taken out of surplus and spent on public services—two thirds—although the Terms of Union provided that two-thirds of the surplus should be spent on that plus economic development.

Now we also spent money on economic development. We spent roughly twenty-two and a half million dollars. But we did spend twenty-seven and a half million dollars on raising the level and standards of the public services.

White Bay: In White Bay District we have opened a nursing station at Jackson's Arm. That is new since we came in. We have stationed a district nurse at LaScie—That is since we came in. We have introduced an air-ambulance service and those aircraft have made over one hundred and thirty flights in White Bay. We did that—How many lives have been saved by one hundred and thirty aircraft flights in White Bay? How many lives? I don't know—I don't know. But this Government did that. One quarter of

all mercy flights in Newfoundland, twenty-five per cent of all aircraft flights made in the last five years by air-ambulances have been made to White Bay. More hospitals bills have been abated in White Bay District than in any other district of Newfoundland, and that has been done here in St. John's, the hospital at St. Anthony and the hospital at Corner Brook. In these hospitals, to White Bay patients who have been brought in from the District of White Bay, more bills have been abated and forgiven or reduced than in any other district of Newfoundland. That is in addition to having made twenty five per cent of all the air-ambulance flights made in Newfoundland to the District of White Bay. I ought to have added Gander Hospital also to these centres.

In 1951 we introduced a travelling clinic. We got the Grenfell Association to do it for us, but we paid for it, the Government of Newfoundland paid for it, and the "IGA" did it on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland. Last year during the open season this travelling clinic made over one hundred and thirty visits to settlements in White Bay, and over two thousand consultations were held with the patients by the medical staff of that travelling clinic, over two thousand interviews last year. Funny? But not half as funny as the honourable gentleman telling us; if only the Government had spent a little more money to raise the level and standards of public services. Does he think this is an improvement? I got the impression that we should be ashamed of ourselves for not having spent money to raise the level and standard of public services.

MR. HOLLETT: So you should.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In spite of twenty-seven and a half million.

MR. HOLLETT: Where has it gone?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The travelling clinic included a dentist as well as a doctor. He did over a thousand dental cases last season—That is our travelling clinic in White Bay, that costs cash, money.

In 1951 this Government arranged to build a nursing station in LaScie, and the honourable member for White Bay stopped it, put his foot down, gave it a flat no, would not have it, kicked up murder, roared and bawled and slammed desks—no, he was not going to have it in LaScie. We said, all right, you should know what the district wants and needs. You should know. We won't put it there. But we had all arrangements made to build it when he said no. We were not going to build it in spite of him, so we did not build it.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the member for White Bay, when I stated a moment ago that more hospital bills had been abated and completely forgiven or greatly reduced for patients of White Bay than any other district, we have not a single instance of the honourable member ever asking for one abatement or one forgiveness. It was done without his ever asking for it. He never once asked to have the hospital bills of a patient from White Bay reduced or abolished or wiped out, not once in the five years he has been there. Yet we have abated or forgiven more hospital bills from White Bay than from any other district in Newfoundland, but no thanks to the honourable member for the district.

We have provided in White Bay District snowmobile trails. There are more snowmobile trails and snowmobiles operating in White Bay than in its history. I admit that is not saying a great deal. They are fairly recent, more snowmobile trails and snowmobile trails. We have begun the building of roads, a road extending from St. Anthony around to Corner Brook coming around the other way. We have announced that in two, three or four years maybe — We are not too precise—We have learned it costs a lot more to build roads and it takes a lot longer than than we thought it would take. We have learned there are tremendous difficulties in the way of road building in Newfoundland which we did not know about five years ago. In the light of this discovery we will not be pinned down, consequently we are saying that within the next three or four or five years the residents of St. Anthony will be able to get aboard a car and drive to St. John's, Corner Brook, Grand Falls or Gander and from these points on down to St. Anthony. I doubt if anyone now living in Newfoundland will live long enough to see roads built up through White Bay, through the bulk of that long stretch of coast up in the bay, because of the completely mountainous character of the coast.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition stated that the delegation went from Newfoundland to Ottawa to negotiate and sign the Terms of Union they were negligent in their duty. They failed to provide that the Terms of Union would give us sufficient income, sufficient financial assistance from Ottawa to enable us to do these things. He went on to say that this term in the Terms of Union is the proof of it, and the need to appoint the committee or commission

of investigation by the present Bill is the proof of the failure of the delegations. It is the exact opposite. The truth is exactly opposite to what he said. Here were the delegates in Ottawa. They were not immortal men, they were just mortal men. They could no more foresee the financial consequences of Confederation to Newfoundland than they can see now at this moment— I was one of them—no more than they can see now at this moment precisely what will be the financial consequences of so far away and remote an event as that which is now going on in Indo-China. I confess here now that perhaps I ought to be ashamed to confess, I do not know just what effect will be had upon the finances of Newfoundland by the events that are going on in Indo China tonight. I don't know what the consequences will be to our finances five years from now of what is going on in the United States today nor going on in Europe, these world affairs, these interesting events, I don't know. Now maybe the Leader of the Opposition does. But I don't know, and I admit it. Certainly Sir Albert Walsh who is now the Chief Justice of Newfoundland and Mr. J. B. McEvoy and Mr. Philip Gruchy of the AND Company at Grand Falls, one of our great companies, and he was one of our great industrialists, and the others of us, all of us who were on that delegation negotiating the Terms of Union, we confess quite frankly without any shame that we could not look ahead and tell with sufficient accuracy what would be the financial consequences of Confederation to Newfoundland. We admitted that. We were not ashamed to do that. That was an honest admission. I will go further and say, there was no man alive on the earth seven

years ago, when this was done, he did not wear shoe leather, did not have human forms in this world, who could look forward then six or seven years ago, look ahead to tonight, and tell what would be the financial consequences to Newfoundland of joining up with Canada. There was no human being on earth who could foresee that. If he said he could he was a liar or a fool or a bluff, or just a simple jackass. We admitted that. But we did a little more than that about it, we said as we cannot foresee just what the results will be, we cannot let it go at that. We have to do something about it. There was only one thing you could do about it and that was to provide for a second look, a later look, a second and later look. Well, we said, let us take a period of eight years, not later than eight years after Confederation. So we provided in the Terms of Confederation, and this is one of the terms, that eight years after Confederation a Royal Commission would be appointed to look at the situation freshly after the events had occurred, not try to forecast but look at events after the events had happened and not attempt to make a forecast. Now that was wise. That was not stupid. That was wise. That was a prudent thing to do, a farsighted thing to do. The inclusion of that clause in the Terms of Union is evidence not of our stupidity but of our brightness. It was evidence not of our neglect but of our great care for the future of Newfoundland. That clause is a credit to us and not a discredit.

Now the eight years are within three years of being up, five years of it are now up. So that means that within the next three years the Royal Commission must sit. Now what should Newfoundland do? What is the best

thing to do? The honourable member of the Opposition thinks the Government, the Cabinet Ministers, should prepare this case. Personally and speaking for myself, and being a little bit boastful and conceited in this matter, I believe surely that I would do as good a job as my honourable colleague the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island, I virtually believe I would do as good a job as Mr. Philip Gruchy and as Mr. Albert Perlin and as Mr. Gerald Doyle, I believe I would. I believe that the honourable gentleman who is Minister of Public Welfare, my colleague here on my immediate left would do just as good a job as either one. I believe the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives would do just as good a job as any of us. But we are too busy. That is one reason not to do it. We are too busy. We have Newfoundland to run in the meantime. We have many, many problems to grapple with, and we work late into the night, very long hours grappling with ordinary day to day problems, which is not just a matter of getting up in this House and gassing, getting up and talking—Good Heavens! we could do that until the crack of doom. We could do that all year around and never close here, every afternoon, every week-day, keep going just gabbing and talking. That is not governing, that is not managing Newfoundland, that is not administering the affairs of the Province. That is easy. That is just gas. That is just wind.

MR. HOLLETT: Hot air.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hot air, and some of it is foul wind, foul air, depending on what side it flows from. That is cheap, cheap, talk is very cheap. This Government is a government of workers. But that laugh,

especially in the way it is expressed, is fitting commentary seeing where it came from.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a good point.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Especially that sneer of a laugh. We are too busy. They say that if you want a thing done give it to a busy man to do. Suppose we decided that busy as we are nevertheless we will do it. Suppose we have done that. What will be the charge laid against me? I will tell you, the charge laid against me promptly by the Opposition would be that I was selling Newfoundland short, that I was pulling my punches, that I was not prepared to fight for better terms. That is what they would have said. Can you imagine them now—the arguments they would have used—Why this fellow Smallwood, sure, is not that the same one that advocated Confederation and was on both delegations that went to Ottawa? Wh., do you think for one minute that he is going to admit the Terms were not good enough? Do you think he is going to fight Ottawa. He is a Liberal and they are Liberals. I know what they would have said, and I know what they would have said about not only me but about every member of the Government if the Government had decided to prepare Newfoundland's case. So what did we do? We picked men who were no busier than we are, less busy. Now I don't think that Mr. Albert Perlin, hard worker that he is, is as busy as I am and I don't think he is as busy as my honourable friend, the Chairman of the Committee, not for a moment do I think so. I don't think Mr. Doyle is nor Mr. Gruchy. No, I don't think they are as busy. But why did we pick these men? We pick-

ed them because in Newfoundland, Mr. Gerald Doyle commands the respect of Newfoundlanders, because Mr. Philip Gruchy commands the respect of Newfoundlanders and because Mr. Albert Perlin commands the respect of Newfoundlanders. No one is going to say, no one, except an absolute fool and jackass, that these men are Liberals, that these men are out to try and protect the Government, Smallwood's Government, that these men are trying to protect Smallwood, these men are not prepared to fight St. Laurent. I know the Leader of the Opposition does not like Mr. Perlin, for instance, I know he sneers at him every chance he gets.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have heard the honourable gentleman do it in this Chamber.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am going to have to make the Honourable the Premier take back that statement. I have never said nor indicated that I do not like Mr. Perlin nor anybody else.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I will not take it back. I have heard the honourable gentleman not once but several times in this very Chamber refer to Mr. Perlin as Wayfarer and sneer at him, several times, at least on three different times.

MR. SPEAKER: Order — I don't think the remark should have been made in the debate—There is no earthly way to decide the honourable member's opinion of a private citizen, I don't think an opinion on such a subject ought to be expressed or attributed to another honourable member.



MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—Is the Honourable the Premier going to take back the words—I said I disliked Mr. Perlin?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say he said he disliked him.

MR. HOLLETT: What did you say?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman must be getting deaf, and not only deaf—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether a person is allowed to pass an opinion from me on somebody else and say I disliked somebody—He said he knows I dislike Mr. Perlin. How?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I heard the honourable gentleman say so.

MR. HOLLETT: You heard no such thing, and I want that taken back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is this, a frosty Friday? I am to take back what I heard the honourable gentleman say with these good ears?

MR. SPEAKER: I suggest honourable members drop the subject.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, that is not taking it back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not taking it back.

MR. HOLLETT: Every time you get up I will rise to a point of order until it is taken back.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I said to the honourable members today, when a point of order is made, with a sense of decency and decorum please allow the Chair to express an opinion. If honourable members talk back and forth it will usually be followed by

threats—"You will do this." "I won't do that." I do not think that expressions regarding private citizens should be attributed to an honourable member. I have not the faintest idea who is liked or disliked by the honourable member and for that matter personally I care very little about it. So I suggest, for the sake of decorum, the subject be dropped insofar as mention of the names contained in this Bill is concerned.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I won't detain the House very much more on this matter. I repeat what I said at the outset. I welcome the change in the Leader of the Opposition between the time before dinner and after dinner. Before dinner he took quite a dim view and since dinner has spoken very well of it. I welcome the change and I welcome his support of the statement I made in the House here the other day, that it is the deliberate policy of the Government to raise the level and standard of public services so that when the Royal Commission is finally appointed and comes to review our state of affairs they will have levels and standards of public services to use as a yardstick that are considerably higher than they are today and considerably higher than they were two or three years ago. That is the point I advocated. The honourable gentleman tonight, in his own words, has advocated precisely the same point—so at last we are in agreement, the Government on one side and the Opposition on the other are in agreement on this one point in view of the fact that in a year or two from now a Royal Commission will be assessing our whole position, reviewing our situation

it is a good policy to raise and to keep raising and continuously raising the levels and standards of our public services so that they will have a satisfactory yardstick from our standpoint by which to assess the amount of additional financial assistance they will see we need to enable us to carry on at these levels and standards of public services without imposing a taxation more burdensome, having regard to the capacity to pay, than that obtaining generally in the region comprising the Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

If the honourable gentleman has said nothing else I welcome that, and I congratulate him for saying it. He is absolutely one hundred per cent right. Tonight is the first time he said it, and I welcome his remarks all the more on that account.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Nos. 16, 18, 21, 22 and 23.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole on certain Bills—The House has given leave for those Bills to be deferred to a later hour this day.

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

Clause 1, 2, 3 read and carried.

Clause 4:

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, sub-section 4—As that section now stands, I refer to the second last line,

the name of the licensee disqualified or whose license has been suspended and all other particulars as to disqualification or suspension. I do insist, Mr. Chairman, the insertion of the name, which I presume would be preceded by a general statement that herewith appear the names of people who have been convicted of drunken driving or/and impaired driving, would be sufficient, without setting out any further details, and without setting out that the gentleman is no longer permitted to go in any club or tavern or anything else.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is my understanding exactly.

MR. HIGGINS: I know it is. But I don't know whether what the honourable gentleman says ought to be the case is in fact the case.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is my understanding.

MR. HIGGINS: That is fine.

MR. BROWNE: This afternoon, if I may be permitted to refer to a reply of the Honourable Minister of Public Works, he stated that he was following precedent adopted by other provinces. I wonder if the Premier, who seems to be in charge of the Bill might be in a position to say what other provinces have adopted this style of publishing the names of people so convicted?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't believe I am.

MR. BROWNE: I don't believe anyone has. I have never seen at any time in any paper coming here from any one of the other provinces, and I doubt if there is—there might be, but I have not seen it. Of course I have not seen all the papers recently.

but I have never heard of it, and it seems to me to be an insidious thing to be doing. If you are going to publish the names of all persons convicted of infamous crimes in the country it would be a long list, but here you are picking out three sections of the Criminal Code. Now the Minister did give as a reason that several persons, one or two cases, I think he said, I don't think it went beyond that, have been noticed driving their vehicles after their license had been taken away. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that is not sufficient justification for publishing the names of every person.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable gentleman is completely out of order now debating the second reading debate and the principle.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we will deal with this particular section.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not on the principle of it. That has been adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very difficult to define the principle. I really find it difficult to define the principle. There are several principles involved here. I think the honourable member might continue without repeating what was said. We are dealing with this particular section here.

MR. BROWNE: I want to draw the attention of the Minister to the previous Act. We are picking three sections of the six or seven hundred in the Criminal Code and publishing the names of the offenders against these particular sections. I don't see why they are picked out especially. If the reason is that because one or two persons have driven their cars without a license, even then I say it is not right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The point of order is that the honourable gentleman is not only arguing the principle of the Bill in Committee of the Whole but in doing so is taking up a point made by the Minister when introducing the Bill at second reading and answering these points in Committee of the Whole debate. Is that truly in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is exactly what the honourable gentleman is doing.

MR. BROWNE: No, now look, Mr. Chairman, the Premier, I know, is very excited tonight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In this House I have seen the honourable gentleman fit to be tied in a straight jacket, with foam flying out of his lips and sparks from his eyes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—This debate is out of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we are considering here a clause in the Bill. If I happen to repeat something repeated earlier today, surely that is not going to stand in the way of trying to get a sensible provision in the law dealing with highway traffic. Now I suggested to the Premier that it is insidious to publish the names of persons who have broken one of these three sections of the Criminal Code and leave all the rest of the Criminal Code violaters of the other sections without having their names published.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that principle was not adopted what did we adopt in second reading?

MR. BROWNE: We have—You can unadopt it again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't have to again in Committee—it has been adopted.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, surely when considering the particular section we are allowed to talk about the section involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I gave a ruling on that—I find it difficult to pick out of any specific clause there. There are two or three different matters under consideration in this Bill, as far as I can see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would insist that honourable members do not go over what was said in second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to keep on this section, Mr. Chairman. I am opposed to this section. I have given it a lot of thought since it has been passed to us this afternoon. Now if a man is convicted of drunken driving or impaired driving under the Act he has undoubtedly injured himself, and may have injured somebody with whom he collided. But the people he hurts most are those most closely related to him, his family and friends. He is probably a man who is over-addicted to alcoholic liquor and cannot control his drinking.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—I must insist, Your Honour, that this afternoon this House, not this Committee but this House adopted certain principles in this Bill. That is why we are now in Committee to deal with details such as—Should it be two instead of one newspaper, or three, but not to debate over again the principle of whether or not the names shall be

published. If that is so what is the point of having second reading debate and Committee of the Whole debate? What is the sense of those two if a member of the House may do those things in Committee that he did as a member of the House on second reading? What is the difference between Committee of the Whole and second reading? This clause, if it means anything, means that in principle the names shall be published. Now what are the details that may be debated (1) That the names shall not be published in the "Newfoundland Gazette" but that it should be the "Evening Telegram." That it should not be a weekly but a daily newspaper? But not that it shall not be published. Surely that principle was adopted at second reading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is, if there were only one principle in that Bill—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there anything to prevent two or three principles being stated in a Bill and adopted?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very difficult.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are detailed here in Section 2. What principle is there other than the principle that offenders names, on conviction shall be published? That is the principle of that clause. There are other clauses with other principles, all of which were adopted at second reading. At the moment we are on the clause the principle of which was adopted. Now are we in order to debate anything other than the details of that clause and not the principle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is pretty difficult to define the principle of this Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would Your Honour rule as to whether a Bill may contain more than one principle?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think this does definitely contain more than one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May they all be adopted at second reading, leaving it unlawful to debate them in Committee of the Whole?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, if I may, in order to get around that knotty question — may I offer this amendment to this Bill — That sub-clause 4 of Clause 2 of this Bill be stricken out, and may I speak on that amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am trying to point out that the principle of this Bill is very difficult because the Bill seems to cover several other things apart from this particular clause now under consideration. But I might be inclined to think that this might boil down to certain most important clauses in the Bill. The point is, if that clause were stricken out would the Bill then stand, would there be anything left in the Bill, or do the other clauses depend on that?

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, this particular clause has no reference whatsoever to other amendments here, absolutely none. This clause refers to the Criminal Code. The other clauses refer to civil liability. With the exception of one clause which refers to the Criminal Code and also one to the unsatisfied judgement fund, I believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on that point—This clause states a principle. The House of Assembly adopted that principle in second reading of this Bill. I hold it is out of order in Committee of the Whole to strike out a principle adopted in sec-

ond reading. I just ask Your Honour to rule on that—Put it to a vote and see.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to that argument?

The Premier has just asked your ruling on this point, that we are not allowed to amend any clause in the Bill already passed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not. I said to strike out a principle passed in second reading.

MR. BROWNE: This is an amending Bill, amending the Highway Traffic Act which has 123 sections, and which involves different features connected with the use of motor vehicles their operation, offenses committed by persons using them etc. It so happens that this Criminal Code provision also deals with offenders using motor vehicles. Therefore there are two Acts which have to be dovetailed in together in order to get at this particular section here.

I think the question of principle arose when I spoke about the novelty of this type of thing for which no precedent has been quoted. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I might submit, with all due deference, it is open to any member to move an amendment in Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not in order to move an amendment to change a principle in a Bill adopted at second reading. I hold, Mr. Chairman, it can neither be put nor carried and if it is done it is illegal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some Bills where it is extremely difficult and others where it is easy to define the principle of the Bill. We had before us in Committee today some Bills on

which it was extremely easy to define the principle, for instance, "An Act to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act" or "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act" but this puts me in a very difficult position because this Bill covers several matters; publishing the names of licensees when disqualified the moving and detention of motor vehicles when the owner or driver is arrested is another, and that the Minister may recover cost of removal and detention is still another, the protection of Minister, constables and officers is another; suspension of license on notice to Minister of action. It does seem to me in looking over this Bill that these clauses are independent of one another. Therefore it is very difficult for me to find just what is the principle of the Bill. Would the Bill stand if this were stricken out? I mean, every clause is not necessarily a principle although there might be a principle in every clause. It puts the Chairman in an extremely difficult position when honourable members cannot decide what is the principle and throws it on him to decide.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I say I read through this Bill and found fifteen or sixteen different principles, as you call them, there. And you will find the principle in that one section is one I am opposed to. I would like to move an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is that?

MR. HOLLETT: If you look at sub-clause (3) Where a license has been delivered to the court under sub-section (1) and the court has not disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license the court shall, where the holder of the license has been convicted of any offence under Section 284, 285 or 377 of the

Criminal Code involving the use of a motor vehicle, thereupon transmit to the Minister a report setting out the nature of the conviction and the circumstances of the offense; I agree with that. Then the next Clause:

"Where a license has been delivered to the court under sub-section (1) and the court has disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license, or the court has not disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license but the Minister has, after receiving the report forwarded to him by the court under sub-section (3), disqualified the licensee from holding or obtaining a driver's license, and where a license has been suspended under Section 91 the Minister shall publish or cause to be published"—That is the particular part that I object to, and I would like to give my grounds for objecting, and I thus move an amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to read out from Page 46 of our Standing Orders: "A Committee can negative every clause in a Bill and substitute new clauses provided they are relevant to the Bill as read a second time, for the Committee has no power to reverse the principle of the Bill even though they may nullify the provision of the Bill."

In speaking of the principle of the Bill, and not the principle of the clause now, I would think this Bill has a very broad principle; that the Highway Traffic Act be amended. I can't see that this clause we are discussing now, Section 2, although it may be of some great importance—I can't read that into principle, I am afraid I have to support—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, before you accept the amendment—



Before His Honour accepts the amendment—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, has assented to the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Premier has the floor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak to whether the Chair should accept the amendment or not. I wish to point out that if the amendment is accepted and the second clause is struck out the first clause is left in mid-air and serves no purpose. The whole purpose of the first part is to serve the second part in that it says the magistrate or the judge shall forward to the Minister the information that John Jones has been convicted of this or that and the Minister may publish the fact. That is the whole purpose of the clause. Strike out the second part of it and why does the judge or the court notify the Minister? It destroys the principle of the thing. Anyway let us have a vote on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that were the whole clause I could not accept. But there are other clauses which still can stand by themselves, therefore I must accept.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move against your ruling so that it would be referred to Mr. Speaker—Then I do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable the Premier wish to refer the matter now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, now Mr. Chairman, to the Speaker. It will be on a vote of the House then. In that case I will have to ask the Committee to rise.

Motion carried.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, during the deliberations of the Committee of the Whole a question came up as to whether the Chairman was justified in accepting an amendment to Clause 2 of the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act." The amendment was to sub-clause 4. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman found it very difficult to define just what was the particular principle of this Bill since it dealt with several matters; and was inclined to the belief that the principle of the Bill was that it was an Act to change the Highway Traffic Act. He was of the opinion that Clause 2 was merely one clause, and that if it were removed in part or in whole the Bill would still change the Highway Traffic Act. The Premier thereupon moved that the Committee rise and refer the matter to the House, as he disagreed with the Chairman's ruling.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my grounds for disagreement. This afternoon the House adopted the principle or principles enunciated in the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act." Without division the House adopted the principle or principles of this Bill and permission was given the Committee of the Whole to meet on this Bill at a later hour this day, and we are meeting on it here tonight.

A dispute arose Your Honour, as to whether a member of the Committee of the Whole might debate the matter, the principle, the question whether or not names should be published, the principle contained in Clause 2 of this Bill. I objected on the grounds that that was discussing the principle which had been adopted.

As the Honourable Chairman of the Committee has pointed out, there were several principles in the Bill, and I asked the question—Did that invalidate the general rule that principle or principles when adopted in second reading could not then be debated in Committee of the Whole and still less be stricken out by an amendment. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition submitted an amendment to Clause 2, which amendment was to strike out sub-clause 4, and His Honour the Chairman accepted that amendment. I objected on the grounds that it struck out a principle in the Bill, if not the only principle, a main principle, that is that the names of offenders should be published in the press. His Honour said he would accept the amendment. At that point I asked if he would refer it to Your Honour, the Speaker of the House.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would make note of this fact—The principle of every Bill that is passed in this House is passed in second reading as this one was, with objections or without it is immaterial, it passed second reading. That, surely Sir, does not offset the possibility of some particular section or part of some particular section in any Bill being amended or that a request or motion be made that it be amended.

In this Bill, Sir, there are many items which might be regarded as the principle of the Bill. As a matter of fact, even the first section of sub-clause (2) may be regarded as a principle. I do not like sub-clause (4) of Section (2) and moved that it be stricken out. Mr. Chairman accepted my amendment, which was objected to by His Honour the Premier.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker,

as I see it, there seems to be only one point at issue. It is a completely settled rule of procedure that matters of principle cannot be amended in Committee. In this case it happens not to be one but four or five are contained in the Bill. That does not modify the rule. That rule still stands; matters of principle cannot be changed or debated in Committee.

MR. BROWNE: It is not easy to get a precedent exactly the same as this. But, Mr. Speaker, I have here, if I may refer to it, Beauchesne, 3rd edition, page 568 where it is stated: "Any amendment can be made to a Bill in Committee of the Whole provided it is relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, or pursuant to instructions."

The Orders of the Day being read for the second reading of the Bill Further to Amend the General Acts Respecting Railways:

The Bill was accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

The House resolved itself into the said Committee, and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and Mr. Young reported that the Committee wished to be instructed by the House, whether it was allowable for an honourable member to move that the following section be added to the fourth section of the Bill: "All goods, wares, merchandise, commodities and supplies of every kind required for the use or purpose of any Government railway for a greater amount than \$1,000 shall be purchased only upon public tender and contract."

"It was in respect to that amendment two points of order has been made. The first was that it was not relevant

to the Bill and could not be properly moved in the Committee; secondly, that the amendment imposed a burden, and should have been first originated by a Resolution in a Committee of the Whole.

Whereupon the House proceeded to take the same into consideration, and Mr. Speaker having been requested to state his opinion said:

"With respect to the first objection, I have to say that there is no doubt that it is perfectly legitimate to make, in Committee, an amendment to a clause, provided that it is relevant to the subject matter of a Bill, or pursuant to instructions; but if any such amendment shall not be within the Title of the Bill then the Committee must amend the 'Title accordingly'."

MR. SMALLWOOD: And provided it does not violate another principle of parliamentary practice and procedure.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon in second reading we discussed the same matter that is being discussed tonight. We were then discussing the principle because if we had discussed it as clauses we would have been completely out of order. In as much as we were in order this afternoon in discussing the principle and consequently passing the principle, I hold they will remain as principles and cannot be nullified by this Committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Your Honour may I make two other points (1) that the Committee of the Whole would have been in order to amend Clause 2 to provide that the names of offenders be published in other, than in two, newspapers, which I think is provided, or in ten rather than in two; that instead of being published

in "The Newfoundland Gazette" the names be published in the "Sunday Herald" or in "The Evening Telegram" or in "The Newfoundland Quarterly." But to say that they shall not be published, and to pass an amendment that the names shall not be published is simply to destroy by amendment in Committee a principle which was adopted at second reading. That is my first point.

My second point is this: Your Honour, if His Honour the Chairman who is learned in the law and learned in parliamentary procedure, in the heat and excitement of debate was not able to devote his mind and time to a study of the situation, Your Honour may be in the same position. If Your Honour should prefer to take time to read up again afresh on the authorities I am sure the whole House will be content with that. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is the first time this has happened in the five years, so let us be sure that we are doing right—I can at least read the rules and spell them.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I agree I also can read and can spell, but we don't always insist on having our rulings enforced in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—That has no bearing on the question at all.

MR. HOLLETT: I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to this particular one there are other parts, principles if you like, such as one concerning the removal and detention of vehicles and one for the Minister to recover the cost. There is one for a special license by the Minister on notice of accident, and so it goes on. There are various things involved there, Sir, and surely to good-

ness the mere passing of this in principle on second reading, with or without objections from the Opposition, does not mean surely that a person may not offer an amendment to any particular section. I never heard the like before.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I regard his point as one of some importance. I have not been in the House for the past five years, but for the first time in the past three a debate like this has arisen. The principles involved are important, and the decision is an important one. I must say that for one I am very much of the Premier's mind when he says he regards this as a matter of sufficient importance not to call for perhaps a snap decision. There have been certain opinions expressed here which seem to be certainly at wide variance. I know for my own part I would be very much obliged, Sir if you would give us a consideration ruling on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for the means of, shall I say, saving face which has been offered to me. I might say at the beginning I do not look upon myself as anything nearly approaching an authority on parliamentary procedure insofar as Committees of the Whole are concerned. That does not mean by inference I consider myself an authority on ordinary procedure of the House. I could take a very easy way out and refer to a precedent quoted by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West. But the point is; that an amendment was offered and ruled on while the Speaker was not in the Chair. It is a rule of parliament, and I think we should hesitate before we break it, that when an objection is taken to a decision of

the Chair in Committee that it is properly referred to the decision of the House with Mr. Speaker in the Chair. From that it follows that we could submit this question to the House and have a snap decision. If the House wishes, I would for my part prefer, to take time to study the questions and give a considered opinion.

I will say this first: My recollection is that any amendment may be offered in Committee of the Whole on a Bill but may not be accepted if it calls into question a principle which has been adopted by the House because the Committee is the creature of the House and the creature is not equal to or greater than the creator. The whole thing seems to hinge on this question as it follows after sub-clause (b) Is that a declaration of principle? I would like the House to correct me if I am incorrectly quoting, because it would be very important.

At second reading today I heard this matter of the publishing of names of offenders—I heard it referred to as a new departure applicable alone in this section.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I was the one who used that expression. That is correct. I singled out that particular section as being something new—We were dealing with that particular clause in Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to call the attention of the House at this point to this: If an honourable member wishes to offer an amendment, which, shall I say he feels will not be accepted, he can achieve his point by asking the mover if he would consider this or that as an amendment. Failing

this, he could show his disapproval of the clause by voting against it in Committee. It would of course be impossible for the Opposition to carry an amendment unless the Government agreed, otherwise they would have to have a majority.

I would prefer not to give a hard and fast ruling until I have had time to read more authorities than I have heard tonight. I would suggest then to the House that it might be possible to carry on with further parts of the Bill or consider other matters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Your Honour. Perhaps it would suit Your Honour's convenience and the convenience of the whole House if we now took a short recess and resumed with Your Honour in the Chair, and then move back into Committee of the Whole.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes.

Pursuant to recess Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair:

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the Chair when we recessed is resumed. Since I have left the Chamber I have spoken to no honourable member of this House. I feel that I am in a position, if the House wishes me to do so, to make a ruling on the question.

First I would like to be sure the House wishes to decide the question, which it has power to do. Similarly the ruling which I make may be appealed to the House and upset by the House, or whether it will ask for and accept a ruling which I might give.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, on that point—Is it customary for Mr. Speaker to give rulings on such mat-

ters?—But I think Your Honour mentioned that point.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of that I will not give the ruling unless I have leave of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, as the one who has raised the matter I concur, Sir, completely in Your Honour's action. If Your Honour wishes to give a ruling it will be very acceptable to me.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me the whole point hinges on the question: is the declaration of this clause an intrinsic principle of the Bill or not? Now I find that the first thing that came into my mind was something that Sir Thomas Moore had said — No committee can destroy a public Bill—I may point out a Committee is bound by the decision of the House given on second reading in favour of the Bill and should not therefore amend the Bill in a manner destructive of its principle. While the Committee cannot negative a Bill by amendment it can do so by voting out clauses which the Minister in charge of the Bill would then withdraw.

"It is not in order," says May, "to leave out a clause as the proper course is to vote against that clause." "Consequently it is out of order," he said; "to leave out the only effective words of a clause, the words upon which the rest of the clause is dependent, nor to offer any other amendment which is equivalent to a direct negating of the clause."

It seems to me from that to be clear that if a member objects to a clause in the Bill he may speak against it in the hope of winning converts to his point of view and when the question is put to the Chair as many as are

of his opinion would vote against it. Therefore I do not think the amendment would be applied. The question as I see it is that this is a principle of the Bill agreed on in second reading.

In addition to "May," "Beauchesne" also states; "An amendment may not be accepted which is at variance with the principle of the Bill as passed at second reading." "May" goes into greater detail on that.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, there is just one point I would like to make. The reason why the amendment was made, Mr. Speaker, was that we were not allowed to discuss the section and give our opinions relative to a point which might afterwards be taken. The Honourable the Premier objected and said we were talking about the principle of the Bill because we objected to this particular clause about putting a man's name in the paper, and we were forbidden to discuss that hence we made the amendment, so we might discuss and talk about that section and give our reasons for objections. That is all we want.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. It seems to me Your Honour rules this could not be done because the principle was carried—It is because this is the principle and the principle cannot be debated in Committee.

**MR. HOLLETT:** There are a dozen principles in this Bill.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Neither one of which can be debated at Committee stage nor amended.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the most contentious clause in this Bill is this sub-clause (4) and it involves several different considerations. It involves where the

court has disqualified a licensee from holding a driver's license and where a court has not disqualified the licensee but the Minister has disqualified him, and it also involves where a license has been suspended under another section of the Highway Traffic Act. Then it involves, as the Premier himself drew attention to, the publication in certain newspapers including the Newfoundland Gazette. The Premier himself said we might discuss details of that kind, then objects so strenuously that the only alternative seemed to me to be to move an amendment.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I don't like to be misquoted. The only reference I made to publication beyond stating the principle of the clause was the fact the names of offenders were to be published after a certain procedure. The only reference I made to publication was when I said it would be in order in Committee of the Whole to debate whether it should be in 1, 2, 3 or ten weekly, daily or quarterly or monthly papers but that the point as to whether or not the names would be published was not debatable because that point had been adopted in second reading. Now don't misquote me otherwise—That is what I said and the whole House remembers it.

I move, Mr. Speaker, that the ruling of His Honour the Speaker is accepted by this House.

**MR. HOLLETT:** There is no need—We accept it gladly.

On motion carried.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** We will now go into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker, on the same Bills as before. Committee of the Whole on Bill



"An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act":

MR. HOLLETT: I move, Mr. Chairman, on Clause 2, an amendment that the words after "Newfoundland Gazette"—"and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides" be stricken out. Also in the second last line the words: "and all other particulars as to the disqualification or suspension that he deems fit."

I make that as an amendment and would like to speak to that, Mr. Chairman. The amendment made previously was that the whole clause be stricken out. I am asking now that certain words be stricken out.

The reason I make that amendment, Sir, as I wished to state in the first instance, is that although this is under the Highway Traffic Act it has to do with offenses under the Alcoholic Liquors Act, and as I was about to say; there are persons who will be greatly injured, the relatives of the persons who have broken or violated one of these sections, the wife or children or the parents and the immediate friends of the individual who has the misfortune to go before the court for such an offense. Now I don't want anybody to get it in mind that I feel because a man takes one too many and has had an accident that he has committed any unpardonable crime, but it would almost indicate from this particular section as it reads before these words have been stricken out that he has done something for which he ought to be hanged really. If he smells of liquor and has an accident he not only loses his license, he is not only disqualified but a report is made to the Minister and the Minister may order that his name there-

fore be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and at least one other newspaper together with particulars of the offence which he has committed. Now, Sir, the Minister gave us his reason for that. It is a very good reason in many respects. But it is one that I can't say I agree with. What this section would mean if a man's name and the particulars as to the offense were to be published in the Gazette and in at least one newspaper is that it would make every man an informer on his neighbour—"There goes John Jones—his name was in the paper yesterday. He is going up in his car now. I am going back to call the police. There is John Jones, whose name is in the paper for committing an offense, gone up in his car now—Get the police after him quickly." In other words making people who otherwise would not—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: The honourable gentleman is now arguing the principle as to whether the name should be published. That is exactly what the honourable gentleman is arguing—it would be a hardship on the family of the man whose name is published, etc. Mr. Chairman, that is out of order, I hold.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that he was discussing the amendment. " . . . and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides." I thought the Honourable Leader of the Opposition was developing the theme of the hardship if the name is published in the newspaper—Certainly that it should be published in the Newfoundland Gazette, the honourable gentleman cannot argue.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Sir,

The newspaper is something which everyone reads particularly in St. John's, Grand Falls or Corner Brook or any industrial area. And whilst we know a man deserves punishment for committing an offense of that nature he should not have the public and his friends and relatives see that his name is published as being a man who committed an offense under the Highway Traffic Act or the Alcoholic Liquor Act. I feel it is bad enough to put it in the "Newfoundland Gazette" but to put it in a newspaper I don't think is in the best interest and certainly is not in the best interest of his poor relatives who, God knows, are the ones that suffer most.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman: I must insist, I am sorry but I must insist—The point of order is that the honourable gentleman is obviously only on the principle of this clause. I hold, and I submit it to Your Honour, I hold he is not in order to do more than move the amendment and utter such words in support as not to attack the principle of this clause. That is as clear as daylight! It is absolutely clear! He cannot by subterfuge, by pretense, by any means, and be in order, discuss the principle of publishing names. He can only discuss whether it be in this or that or the other newspaper. But in so doing he cannot argue against the publication of the names.

MR. HOLLETT: Then all I can say, according to the Premier is—

MR. CHAIRMAN: It certainly is out of order to argue against publication. I take it that the honourable member will in future confine his remarks to publication in a newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides, and not publication

as such in the "Newfoundland Gazette."

MR. HOLLETT: I have said what I want to say, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the section in the clause as it stands is that the name of the person shall be published in the "Newfoundland Gazette" and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides. Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is that the publication be confined to the Newfoundland Gazette. I would like to point out that the Newfoundland Gazette has a limited circulation, and any harm which would be done by the publication in that paper would not be nearly so great as the harm that would be done by publishing a name in a newspaper. Therefore, if we have to accept publication, and I strongly recommend to the Government to reconsider this clause—I feel that many persons on the other side of the House, if they were to weigh up the good that is to come from this publication in the newspapers against the harm that they are going to do to the individual concerned and to his family, I believe they would be satisfied to have the thing taken out altogether. Now since the Premier insists so strongly that we cannot talk about the effect of publication, I will speak of the effect of publication, if it is published in one newspaper. It can then be taken up by another and taken up by the radio, because it is a matter of public interest. Then if a man goes to look for a job after losing his license and perhaps losing his job he would be asked: "Did I not see your name in the newspaper?" Then he goes to another employer who asks; "Are you the chap whose name I saw in the newspaper?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Is this in order? Was the honourable gentleman discussing the principle that the name be published or not? And if they are published he might lose his job and this might happen and something else might happen. Is that debating the principle of publication or not or am I just stupid?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If he confines his remarks to a newspaper—It is a very difficult position—

MR. SMALLWOOD: It seems to me, according to parliamentary practice and procedure the honourable gentleman, if he is in order, can do very little more than move the amendment. Any discussion almost invariably involves the principle. It is not because he is moving an amendment to the clause, it therefore puts him in order when he is out of order. Therefore in moving the amendment he can do little more than move it and stand or fall by the vote. But by moving an amendment it cannot put him in order on a matter fundamentally out of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I was deliberately trying to confine myself to this amendment. We are opposed to the position that the publication should be extended beyond the Newfoundland Gazette which is an official Government publication, which reports proceedings of the court and reports the statutes and reports insolvencies, etc. If we are to concede it is conceivable to publish the names in that order, we deem it improper to go beyond that, and therefore we have moved that all the words in that sentence after the word "and" should be stricken out. We do not agree that they should be published in at least

one newspaper. It should be "at most" one because that gives the Minister the right to publish it in all the newspapers, and newspapers are mentioned to include weekly, monthly and quarterly newspapers. Not in a magazine but in a newspaper that is circulated and will carry the details of the man's offense—his name—and that will be published before thousands of people. Now is it fair, Mr. Chairman, that the name and offense of this particular individual should be published in the newspapers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order—Is that debating the principle—That his name should be published—That was all settled at second reading. Am I the only one in the House, Mr. Chairman, whose duty it is to draw your attention to that—I am not the Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must sustain that point of order. It seems the honourable member was referring to publication.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that honourable members of the House who throw up the opportunity to debate a Bill at second reading cannot then resurrect the second reading by doing it in Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think very many members on the other side spoke on it at all. And I think the debate is due to the fact that I asked the Minister to postpone it until I got an opportunity to debate it.

However—circulated in the area in which the licensee resides—The Minister cannot pick a newspaper published in Corner Brook to advertise the offenses of persons committed here nor

you cannot advertise in the "Humber Herald" nor the "Western Star" nor the Grand Falls "Advertiser" offenses taking place in Trepassey nor other parts of the country because the newspaper is not circulated in this particular area.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition be prepared to move the amendment?

MR. HOLLETT: That the words following "Gazette" be cut out: "In at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides"; and following the word "suspended" in the last but one line—"and all other particulars as to the disqualification or suspension that he deems fit," also be cut out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Under the amendment, we now understand, all could be done is that the names might be published in the "Newfoundland Gazette." Why not that they had been convicted—just the names?

MR. HOLLETT: No the violation of the section should be there, of course.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does not say that—shall publish or cause to be published in the "Newfoundland Gazette" the name of the licensee disqualified or whose license has been suspended. That is how it would be if the amendment were carried, Mr. Chairman, that is clearly out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: I am perfectly satisfied to leave that there if the Premier objects to it—And all other particulars etc. I don't like the word "other", for instance he was found in the car drunk and had Mary Jones in the back seat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was stated here—the details were not to be given.

If the honourable gentleman would not include these words it would be in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that these words be stricken out "and in at least one newspaper circulated in the area in which the licensee resides."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is in order.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I think the whole amendment of the Opposition is entirely out of order. The only one I can see is in order is the one the honourable gentleman from St. John's East was talking about when he said that instead of saying "in at least" say "at the most" one newspaper. I think that would be in order. Otherwise I don't think anything else could possibly be in order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I rise to a point of order—The amendment was accepted by the Chair and we discussed it. Now my honourable friend jumps up and says it is out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I understand, if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will allow a change in his amendment and confine the amendment to "at least one" being changed to read "at most one" that seems to me to be a perfectly proper amendment.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier asks if I would be prepared to accept the change in the amendment by striking out the words "at least one" and making it "at the most one." The Bill is presented by the Government after due deliberation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we stand

or fall on it—they defeat us and we go out, that is all. The Cabinet has had the matter under discussion for weeks, and we stand or fall on it.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know that. I made the amendment and it stands. If the Government wants to vote against it then vote against it.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Public Works would tell us, now that he is in the House, if there is any precedent for it in Canada?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the point raised by the two honourable gentlemen on the opposite side of the House this afternoon I made the statement, while it has not been done previously it is done in the Dominion of Canada. I stand behind that statement for the simple reason that we have copied the idea from one of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. I gave reasons as to why we felt it necessary to put that clause in, and they were very clearly mentioned by me this afternoon. Possibly I would not be in order to refer to them again, and I don't want to prolong the House to that extent, but I repeat; it is the practice in the Dominion of Canada. I do not say all over the Dominion of Canada but it is the practice in some provinces to publish the names of offenders periodically. I have read them myself in the press and have called the attention of it to other members. There is no doubt in the world about that.

MR. BROWNE: What province?

MR. SPENCER: If my memory serves me right, British Columbia—I am speaking from memory.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman,

with the concurrence of my honourable friends opposite and the concurrence of my honourable friends here perhaps we could amend it to strike out the words "at least" which in a way was suggested by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: I don't remember making that suggestion, I thought my emphasis was rather on not having it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable member did in the course of the debate.

MR. BROWNE: I did not suggest it at all. I think this is a very undesirable provision.

MR. HIGGINS: May I ask how it is proposed to publish the list—one for each individual or a list every week or month or how long does a man's name stand on the unholy roll?

MR. SPENCER: The question is very fair, Mr. Chairman, I would say, speaking from my own knowledge that one publication is all that we had in mind. It is not the intention in recommending this Bill to the House to try and make this thing any more unpleasant than the very Bill itself. To be, personally speaking, it would be rather distasteful to publish details, and if it were a matter for my discretion, if I had to run the show, I assure you very little detail would be published. That is not my intention, nor is it the intention of the Department. As a matter of fact the wording is not mine at all but comes from other legislation, and that is why the wording is there. But as far as I am concerned in the Department of Public Works there is no intention at all to publish details. To publish the names of offenders is all, and we sin-

cerely hope we have not too many names to be published. I wonder if it is possible at this time to say a word or two to convey the reason? If that is out of order I will leave it at that.

I again repeat it is our hope that we will have very few names to be published. Unfortunately this drunken driving is becoming very serious to us in this province.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, one more question—if I may? Would the Minister advise us whether this discretion that is vested in him can be delegated to anyone else. Will it be the Minister who decides what details and particulars will be published or does he delegate this responsibility to anyone else?

MR. SPENCER: That is what the Act says—At the discretion of the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This amendment is that the words in the third line, final paragraph, Section 2 be deleted—"at least"—that these words be deleted.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about that. I don't suppose it was ever the intention of the Minister to publish in all the newspapers in the country so that is no special benefit gained by taking out that. It may be clarified a little certainly. I don't imagine that the Minister did intend to give it universal syndicate publication. I welcome what he has stated here—He is going to use some discretion in regard to this. I feel that if he is here next year he will come back and want to take it out again, because I don't think it is going to do any good.

Clause as amended carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. Section 38 of the said Act is amended by repealing paragraph (b) and substituting therefor the following:

"(b) where the licensee has been convicted of theft of a motor vehicle or of any offence under Section 285 of the Criminal Code; or"

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what offenses are covered by Section 285 of the Criminal Code, could the Minister tell us?

MR. HIGGINS: I might, Mr. Chairman, be able to be of some assistance to the honourable gentleman—It covers drunken driving, driving while impaired by drinking, and I think failing to remain at the scene of an accident.

Clause carried.

Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5 read:

5. The said Act is further amended by inserting immediately after Section 72 as Section 72A the following:

"72A—(1) A constable, or officer appointed for carrying out the provisions of this Act, may remove to and detain at a place selected by him any motor vehicle the owner or driver of which has been arrested or any motor vehicle which has been permitted to stand upon a highway in such a position that it may cause interference with traffic.

(2) The Minister may in any court of competent jurisdiction recover as a civil debt from the owner of any motor vehicle removed from a highway under sub-section (1) the costs and expenses of the removal and detention and the costs and expenses



are a lien upon the motor vehicle, which may be enforced in the manner provided by Section 31 of The Mechanics Lien Act.

(3) No action or other legal proceeding shall be taken or brought against the Minister, constable or officer in respect of anything done under this section."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we should have the word "lawful" in that last sub-clause?

Apparently officers carrying out the provisions of the Act may of course move the vehicle when needed, but there may be cases where it was not necessary to move a vehicle, and there may be some damage done to the motor vehicle when it is moved.

MR. HIGGINS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, does that quite meet the position. Let us assume that Tom Jones is arrested some winter's night. His car is taken and put up at Fort Townsend and freezes up. Now the constable has done his duty to put the car there. He is not a mechanic and knows nothing about it, and as a result the man suffers damages. Has he no redress at all? I would like the Minister to give us some further explanation. That seems a very sweeping provision and deprives a man of his rights.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As a matter of fact I know of a case which the honourable members for Harbour Main-Bell Island are certainly acquainted with. I am personally acquainted with a case like that, and perhaps the Minister would be able to think it over.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, as far as we are concerned the clause was very clear to us. If we find the

police have to remove a vehicle for such an offense as referred to here, it is merely for the safety and to take it out of the way of somebody else. It cannot be left as an obstruction by the side of the highway. I can assure the honourable gentleman who raised the question, if we had to take a vehicle off the highway it would have to be put in safety, there is no doubt about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move we rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is agreed the clause should stand for further discussion.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, have made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received—Ordered sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Tuesday at 11:00 of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, June 15, at 11:00 of the clock.

---

**TUESDAY, June 15, 1954**  
**MORNING SESSION**

---

The House met at 11:00 of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

**Presenting Petitions**

None.

**Giving Notice of Question**

None.

**Answers to Questions**

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines & Resources): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West, asked a question as to whether or not the flocks of sheep owned by the Government have been sold. The answer to that is "no."

HON. G. POWER: (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. John's West inquired yesterday about a question. I will have the answer this afternoon.

MR. W. J. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, some days ago I asked a question of the Minister of Economic Development — To lay on the table of the House a copy of the agreement with Chester Dawe. I have been given to understand there is another agreement that has not been tabled. I wonder if the Minister would let us have a copy?

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): If there is such a thing I will let you have it. I don't know whether there is or not, but if there is I will table it.

MR. F. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, there is a question I directed to the Honourable Minister of Public Works on the 6th. A similar question was tabled, I believe, in April by the Honourable Member for St. John's West. Both question were practically the same. I wonder if the answers would be forthcoming?

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): I believe the honourable gentleman refers to a question regarding the contract for public build-

ing, is that the one? Questions 71 and 98, I believe. I believe I stated in the House that has been typed, and I don't understand why I have not gotten it. Really I did not get into my office this morning nor yesterday afternoon. Maybe it is there. If it is there I will have it by tomorrow.

**Giving Notice of Motion**

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I gave notice I will later today, with the consent of the House, or otherwise tomorrow, ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act," 1952, also a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act," and a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

**Orders of The Day**

Adjourned Debate on the Budget Speech:

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): I believe, Mr. Speaker, I took as my text the other day a paragraph from page 5 of the Budget Speech which reads as follows:

"It is to the eternal credit of this Government that from the moment it came into power five years ago it was able to evade entanglement in the age-old romanticism and economic nonsense that had passed for economic policy in government circles. It is to their eternal credit that they were able to go straight as an arrow to the vital truths of economic common-sense."

I endeavoured to show, Sir, and I believe that without any doubt whatsoever that I did show clearly and plainly that the Honourable Minister must have a sort of a new idea of the words "economic common-sense." If

it were such a thing that the politicians of other days indulged in what is called the age-old romanticism and economic nonsense then I venture to say that the present government and its present Finance Minister must indeed be heirs to that particular policy which he described in his famous words "age-old romanticism and economic nonsense."

Of course, Sir, when we look back into the past we find that a good many of these governments who did engage in certain policies were indeed governments elected under the name of the Liberal Party and therefore, Sir, it is only reasonable to expect the present government should have inherited some of that age-old romanticism. I have mentioned a dozen and one different cases where indeed it looks like romanticism. I spoke of the Icelandic Boats and the Seigheim Deal and many many others which indeed do not indicate that this government were about to go straight as an arrow to the vital truths of economic common-sense. As a matter of fact the Honourable the Premier himself has called some of these schemes huge flops. I ask the Honourable Minister of Finance, therefore; how, in Heaven's name can he ascribe the words common-sense to certain items of government policy when his Premier described these very things as huge flops. I say, therefore, Sir, that this government must have inherited some of that so-called romanticism and economic nonsense.

Referring to various industries, Sir, we are not condemning all these industries in their entirety. We do not see how it will be easy for some of these to survive in the present-day competition which exists in the world and particularly in this part

of the world in which we are very fortunate indeed to have found ourselves. We know that competition, Sir, is the one principle which guides all economic endeavour and which damns or brings to prosperity any ventures which are made under that particular type of competition as we have, free enterprise. In a good many of these industries, Sir, ever since they were established, this government, this country, the taxpayers of this country, taxpaying people, have been making advances by the hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the industries going. Nobody told the people of this country that that would happen in the first instance. As a matter of fact, Sir, we were told not many years ago but back in 1951 and in 1952 of many many jobs which would be forthcoming from these industries. Indeed the jobs would be so numerous that people would have to be imported and Newfoundlanders who had left this country years ago would have to be invited back from the Mainland to look after the turning of the wheels in the various industries, and that after we had absorbed all the fishermen, taking them away from the fishery, after telling them to haul up their boats and come into the new industries, after that, even after that had been taken care of, we were still to have more jobs and would have to import labour. We have imported some labour, Sir, but unfortunately we are not privileged to see many of our own Newfoundlanders coming back.

I want to make a remark with regard to the gypsum plant, Sir, and I make this statement that, as of February 9, 1952 the directors of the Gypsum Plant were;

Hon. J. R. Smallwood, Premier.

Hon. L. R. Curtis, Minister of Justice.

Hon. E. S. Spencer, Minister of Public Works.

Hon. C. H. Ballam, Minister of Labour.

Dr. A. Valdmanis.

Mr. Ernest Leja.

These were the directors as of February 9, 1952, of the Gypsum Plant. They all held one share each and what I have—

MR. CURTIS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We don't hold any shares, Sir, at any time.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what the Registrar of Deeds tells me.

MR. CURTIS: I may be mistaken.

MR. HOLLETT: You will find that in the Registrar of Deeds. I take it they were—

MR. CURTIS: I thought, Mr. Speaker, we did not even have qualifying shares, but I know we have no financial interest, that is personal financial interest.

MR. HOLLETT: The statement, I believe, is made on the books of the Registrar of Deeds Office. At any rate they were directors. I am wondering if any of these men, any of these directors received fees, and and if so, I am wondering what was the rate—how much was paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is no—None.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier replies that the answer is none: I was of the opinion that all these, where the government had money invested or guaranteed in any

industry of any kind, that the Government were always requested, and indeed in most cases demanded that a government director be on the board of directors. I am now informed by the Honourable the Premier that even though they were, all these Ministers were directors, they received no directors fees.

In making some inquiry, Sir, relative to this plant, I find that on August 3, 1952 this plant showed a nett loss on operations of some \$58,745.10 for a period of ten months. I find that no provision has been made in the account for accrued interest owing to the government, and I found that no allowance was made for any depreciation whatsoever relative to that plant. But here is something which I cannot quite understand: During that period directors salaries were paid, and they were paid at the rate of one thousand three hundred and fifty dollars per quarter or five thousand dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—I have already informed the honourable gentleman that the directors were paid no fees. I now add, no salaries, except the Managing Director, and he was paid as managing-director, Mr. Leja. He is the only man, who has received one cent, of the directors of the company.

MR. HOLLETT: I welcome the Premier's explanation. I am merely making a statement of fact.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not making a statement of fact. If he repeats it he is making a statement of a lie. I just told the facts.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, is it safe for any man to rise in his

place in this House and make any statement?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not a statement of a lie.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, this is no lie. This is an absolute fact.

HON. C. H. BALLAM (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am one of the ones who is a director of the gypsum plant in Corner Brook, and I was only appointed and only accepted to look after the Government's interest. I can assure you, my honourable friend, that I have never received, Sir, never received one cent. And I do not want my name dragged all over my district as having received one cent even. I would like for my honourable friend to take it back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not received one cent.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker I have not said that they did. If anyone concludes from my statement I said that either the Honourable the Premier or the Minister of Labour or anybody else received anything—if they said I said that then they are the ones who are saying things which I did not say. I said that during the period, Sir, directors fees were paid on an average of \$1350 per quarter or at the rate of \$5,400 a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were not.

MR. HOLLETT: I named the directors, and the directors were as I have stated, four Cabinet Ministers and Dr. A. Valdmanis and Mr. Ernest Leja.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—If my honourable friend says that director's fees were

paid on an average of some amount of so much each the implication is that we received them. The honourable member said the directors fees paid were paid on an average of \$1350 a quarter—The use of the word "average" and the way the honourable gentleman puts it makes it absolutely suggestive that we did get directors fees when we did not.

MR. HOLLETT: There was no suggestion on my part that either one of the Ministers received that. I said that \$1350 per quarter on an average was paid out in directors fees or salaries. Now there is nothing wrong with that—Let us see the accounts—I made a statement of fact. There is no sense in getting up and refuting a statement I know to be a fact—Let us have the documents to prove it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I happen to be Premier of Newfoundland. I happen to be Minister of Economic Development. I happen to be Leader of this House. I happen to be a director of this company. I say now that not one cent was paid in directors fees from the moment it began to this moment, not one cent to anyone as directors fees. No directors fees have been paid out nor received, not one cent.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman should explain his statement. He has stated that a certain sum was paid quarterly to directors as directors fees, and the directors were; and he named certain honourable Ministers and that these Ministers received directors fees. I think the honourable member should explain what he meant.

MR. HOLLETT: There is no explanation I can give except that

amount was paid out in directors salaries and fees.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the point of order is, I say it was not paid out, not one cent of it. The honourable gentleman has to accept that statement from me. He has no choice but to accept it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement here of the gypsum plant's administration for that particular period.

Office Salaries .....	\$3,185.80
Maintenance.....	849.45
Stationery & Office	
Supplies .....	133.68
Telephone & Telegraph .....	137.29
Postage & Excise .....	77.29
Travelling Expenses .....	538.00
Staff Car & Taxis .....	123.90
Directors' salaries to date.	

MR. SMALLWOOD: Salaries, not fees.

MR. HOLLETT: Bank Charges \$73.60—so it goes on and give a whole statement with a nett loss of \$58,201.60.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that the explanation?

MR. HOLLETT: Of what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the honourable gentleman's lie. It was a lie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The word is unparliamentary.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not so unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, as the lie, as I now characterize it, a damnable lie. The gentleman has just given the evidence it was a lie. Out of his own mouth he has given it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. These words are unparliamentary in any parliament and it is not right for them to be used. Charges may be made

without the use of unparliamentary words and explanations may be offered.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order, the honourable member said that directors' fees were paid.

MR. HOLLETT: Or salaries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman did not say "or salaries" he said fees.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask you to say, Sir, whether I said directors' fees or salaries.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I don't see any need of having Mr. Speaker in this at all. My recollection was that the honourable member said directors' fees and mentioned the time, quarterly, and the sums, and he read the names of certain cabinet ministers as directors. To begin with I must draw the inference that fees were paid to certain honourable members, which fact was denied by the members. Now the honourable member read from the statement that they are directors' salaries. My recollection is that he used the word fees alone.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to ask that Hansard be produced. I am certain, as certain that I used fees or salaries as I am standing up here today. I don't intend to allow the Honourable the Premier nor the Honourable Minister of Justice or anybody else to accuse me of lies and saying I did not say it. I would like to have the Hansard now so that we could clear it up now. When may we have it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has a right to ask that. I ask the House for ten minutes' recess until the Hansard is ready.



MR. SPEAKER: I shall have Mr. Clerk read the excerpt from Hansard.

"MR. HOLLETT: I wish to make some remarks with regard to the gypsum plant, Sir, and I make this statement that as of February 9, 1952, the directors of the Gypsum Plant were the Honourable Joseph R. Smallwood, Premier; the Honourable Mr. Curtis, Minister of Justice; the Honourable Mr. Spencer, Minister of Public Works; and the Honourable Mr. Ballam, Minister of Labour; Dr. A. Valdmánis and Mr. Ernest Leja. These were the directors as of February 9, 1952, of the Gypsum Plant. They all held one share each, and what I have—

MR. CURTIS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We don't hold any shares, Mr. Speaker, at any time.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what the Registrar of Deeds tells me.

MR. CURTIS: I may be mistaken.

MR. HOLLETT: You will find that in the Registrar of Deeds. I take it they were —

MR. CURTIS: I thought, Mr. Speaker, we did not even have qualifying shares but I know we have no financial interest, that is personal financial interest.

MR. HOLLETT: The statement, I believe, is made on the books of the Registrar of Deeds Office. At any rate they were directors. I am wondering if any of these men, any of these directors did get paid directors' fees, and if so I am wondering what the rate, how much was paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The answer is no, none.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honour-

able the Premier replies that the answer is none. I was of the opinion that all these where the Government had money invested or guaranteed in any industry of any kind, that the Government were always requested, and indeed in most cases demanded that a government director be on the board of directors. I am now informed by the Honourable the Premier that even though they were, all these ministers were directors, they received no directors' fees. In making some inquiry, Sir, relative to this plant I find that on August 3, 1952, this plant showed a nett loss on operations of some \$58,745.10 for a period of ten months I find that no provision has been made in the account for accrued interest owing the government, and I found that no allowance was made for any depreciation whatsoever relative to this plant. But here is something which I cannot quite understand—During that period directors' fees were paid, directors' salaries were paid and they were paid at the rate of \$1,350 per quarter or \$5,400 a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order: I have already informed the honourable gentleman that the directors were paid no fees. I now add, no salaries, except the Managing Director, Mr. Leja. He is the only man, who has received one cent, of the directors of the company."

MR. SPEAKER: That is the excerpt from Hansard.

MR. HOLLETT: On that basis, Sir, I must ask that the Honourable the Premier, if he has based his statement saying I was a liar on the fact that I

did not use the word "salaries", I would like for him to take that back, based on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is clear as the daylight the honourable gentleman after I said that we had not received a cent in fees went on saying that we had.

MR. HOLLETT: I said fees or salaries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman went on saying that we had. And I said, and we know from my statement to him, that we had not, he then kept on saying we had. He was then lying, then saying what he knew was not true. Then he attempted to prove that it was true by quoting figures, which proved that he had lied.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I deny that I told any lie, and that I ever told a lie in this House on any matter. I must say, Sir, that I am getting sick and tired of being called a liar. Almost every day of my life since this House opened I have been called a liar by somebody.

MR. SPENCER: Who?

MR. HOLLETT: You shut up.

MR. SPENCER: I got more gump-tion than that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—I don't know what the intention of the honourable member is. I have read Hansards from all over the world and I can find nothing even remotely approaching this state of affairs. From the Chair the House is repeatedly warned of unparliamentary language and not the slightest attention is paid. Honourable members fling the word "liar" across this House and "You shut up" and speeches such as that. Not

even all the sages of the past, I argue, could possibly rule on such a question as is placed before me this morning. A statement is made. A point of order is raised. Hansard is called for, Hansard is entirely disregarded. I ask the House, what more can I do? I read myself the honourable gentleman's words for you during that period: "directors' fees were paid—directors' salaries were paid". But because an honourable member says something for which he has no grounds, no other honourable member has a right to say that he is "lying." There are other ways of saying it. That word is unparliamentary. Still however the point of order raised by the Honourable the Premier does stand. He objected to the statement that fees were paid. The honourable member who made the statement might have admitted that he could possibly have been in error, that his information did not distinguish between fees and salaries. Why cannot the House accept the words as said. It is a rule of the House that words offensive to an honourable member on a point of order is an offensive statement. When a statement is shown to have been untrue it does not follow, although I am not naive, it is within the bounds of human frailty that honourable members might lie, but we are not concerned with whether what the honourable member told was untrue or true, it was what words may have been used, that is all. Here the statement has been made and denied and then an honourable member denied he made the statement. The Hansard was produced to show that he did. Why not both honourable members retract their offenses and resume the debate?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my statement that the honourable

gentleman is a liar, but I would ask him to withdraw unreservedly any suggestion or hint that any directors of that company received one cent in any shape or form, with the exception of the Managing-Director—Now that is the truth. I ask him to accept it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to meet the Honourable the Premier half way almost any time. But I must say, Sir, that I did not say that any of the Government directors on that board received a salary. I merely asked a question. I ask it again. Who got it? The Premier said that the only directors' fees or salaries, or whatever you call it, were received by Mr. Leja. I am prepared to accept that statement, and I had already accepted it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I must now ask the House if the House is satisfied.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be just entering the Chamber when my name was read so I did not hear it. When the Honourable the Premier stood to deny that statement that the directors of the company named were in receipt of fees or whatever was the wording as put there, I am not going to try and classify that, but my name was read as one of the directors. I want to say now that I have been appointed by the Government as director on several of these companies during the early stages of their formation, I am still a director of one of these companies. It was made clear to me when I was asked by the Government to accept the appointment as a director and to have a share registered in my name that not one penny would ever accrue to me from that share as a director. It was very clearly made plain to me by the Government that I

would not in any way receive any fees and that the share was merely in my name in order that I might be in accordance with the Companies' Act to have a registered share, which share was only held in trust until such time as the company was properly operating or sold, as the case may be. The share was then passed over or signed out. That has been done in the case of the cement mill. I was director of that mill until it was sold. When it was sold I merely signed my name to pass the share which had been in my name over. I repeat that I have never received one cent as a director of either of these companies nor as a result of my name being used as owner of a share, I repeat also that that was made clear to me by the Government when I was requested to become a director of these companies.

MR. BALLAM: Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate, before the recess, I registered my objection to the statement made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I notice that it has not been read out in Hansard. Probably it was later on in it. I just like to have it on record that I objected to his statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure all honourable members that every word in the House is reported. I might further say I took the utmost precaution regarding Hansard in this instance. No honourable member was admitted to the clerk's office. I had a police officer sit near the reporter, for her protection. Not that she needed it from Members of the House. I would like to make that clear. Not even I read over her shoulder. Every word that every honourable member said is recorded although we did not write up the whole Hansard of today

as it was not necessary. Now if the honourable member will resume his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, thank you! I want to assure you, Sir, that in my position in this House I have the utmost confidence in the whole staff, and I would not even suspect anything. I have absolute faith and trust in the performance of duty of everybody, and I have no reason to do otherwise. It never even crossed my mind that the Hansard extract as read was not exactly as I said it. But Sir, nine-tenths of the little lapses here which crop up back and forth across the House are caused by the fact that heretofore the Government have not given us, the Opposition side, enough of the information which is necessary for us to form a proper opinion with regard to not only these industries but in regard to other matters. We have to remember, Sir, that all the money that was spent in the gypsum plant and by the government, and all the money in the cement plant and all the other new industries is the peoples' money and not the government's money nor the Oppositions money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman allow me to ask him a question—Does he know of any information being sought in the House about the gypsum plant which was not answered properly and in full?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, I do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will he tell the House what it is?

MR. HOLLETT: I do wish I—Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to tell. I do wish I could get along. I don't want to spend the summer saying the things I want to say, much of which

will bring down the ire and the wrath of the members on the opposite side. But I can't help that. I am prepared to accept it all.

I was saying, I think, Sir, that we must not forget it is the people's money, taken from the people by taxes in years gone by, that has been spent and is being spent now on certain new industries. Speaking of directors and directors' fees and directors' salaries, Sir, I believe it has been the custom all down through the years to have government directors—I said previously, on certain industries where the government was financially interested either by cash loans or by a guarantee, and naturally I would expect the Government would be on all these new industries which have been brought into being by the Government. I would not attribute, Sir, anything wrong to any Minister or director who was a member of the Government for his being a director, nor should I attribute anything wrong to him for receiving any salary nor fee. When I discovered \$5400 that year was paid out in directors' salaries naturally the question was who got it. I am told now it was Mr. Leja. I am reminded, of course, that Mr. Leja at the present time receives a salary apart from that. I presume so, I am not sure of that, but he has, I think about \$750 per month. And speaking of these directorates, Sir, it is a fact, of course, one person who was a member of this House, and I refer to Mr. Russell, who was at one time a member of this House, when he was also a director of the cement plant or at least of the birch plant. He was offered a job as a director on both the cement plant and the gypsum plant. My information is that he was offered a salary of \$2,000 per year as director of each of these two plants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The statement is completely wrong and unfounded.

MR. HOLLETT: It may be wrong, but that is what I am informed, that is correct. He was offered that by no less a person than Dr. Alfred Valdmánis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He had no authority any more than the honourable gentleman to do it. He had no authority.

MR. HOLLETT: I have nothing to say about that. I am making a statement which purported to make a statement. It was in Ottawa the offer was made—Perhaps the Premier will recall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the Premier does not recall.

MR. HOLLETT: Anyway, the celebrated doctor begged Mr. Russell to take on these directorates and stated a salary. I am informed also that the only reason Mr. Russell refused to take that, and it must have been a heart-ache for Mr. Russell as it would be for me or anybody else to have to turn down six thousand dollars a year; the only reason he refused was because he felt it would disqualify him under the House of Assembly Act.

We had directors too on the cement plant. When the company was first registered as the North Star Cement Company the directors were;

The Honourable the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Curtis.

Hon. Mr. Spencer.

Hon. Mr. Ballam.

Dr. Valdmánis.

Mr. Ernest Leja.

The same directorate as were on the

gypsum plant. I raised the matter, Sir, in connection with that plant, and two of the directors were at that time in the House, I believe, the Honourable Minister of Labour and the Honourable Minister of Public Works, who were directors and were in the House at that time when I raised the question of the purchase of 168,000 bags of cement which is charged to the construction of the cement plant. I was assured by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that most certainly it would not take anywhere near that amount of cement to do the construction which was called for in the contract with Mr. Lundrigan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The amount in fact was about 60,000 bags or of that order.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Premier, now having the knowledge that it took sixty thousand bags, could the Premier tell us why the 168,000 were charged to the cement plant as such?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will tell the complete detailed story at the right moment, which will be in this present session.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you. After all, we have to remember, Sir, 168,000 bags—I don't know what acreage that would cover, or how many inches or cubic feet, but quite a considerable amount—I have no idea at all—168,000 bags of cement, I repeat that statement, was charged to the construction of the cement plant, that is to say, that work done by Mr. Lundrigan was paid for, 168,000 bags of cement at \$1.30 per bag. Whereas I am now informed that the amount of cement required to carry out the work which he contracted to do was 60,000 bags. The Honourable the Premier will tell us about the rest later.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But may I say in the meantime, there is no mystery whatsoever about it. The only mystery is what the honourable gentleman or his friends on that side are managing to create. There is no mystery, but a perfectly honest, transparent, simple transaction.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is rather puzzling to me. I don't want to be continually made out as stupid. I read the contract the other day. It stated the amount which was called for and the amount of concrete which was called for. And the Honourable Minister of Public Works was good enough to tell me approximately how much cement that would take. I found 168,000 and odd bags charged to the construction work going on at the cement plant by Mr. Lundrigan under contract.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It could be a simple matter. The honourable gentleman dealt with it earlier today. It would be that and all the puzzle might exist only in his own mind.

MR. HOLLETT: I must admit there is some puzzling going on in my mind at the moment in that regard. I have gone carefully through the vouchers and bills. I don't want to make any mystery. I want the true facts. I will get the truth. I have no doubt about that. I want facts. If there is any mystery about it, it should have been cleared up before today.

I presume there are directors on the other new industries, that is to say those that were brought in from Europe. I know there are, of course.

Here is another point which I have to state—it is my duty. Sometime ago the Honourable the Premier gave us certain figures concerning wages paid

out at this gypsum plant from April to December 1 of last year, a period of nine months. The amount was \$373,623.12 and of this amount he said some \$67,204.00 were paid out to non-Newfoundlanders, so called, and \$306,418 to Newfoundlanders. The Premier stated that some eighteen of the men or of the employees were not Newfoundlanders and that 162 were Newfoundlanders. Now I have taken the trouble to analyse the figures, and I know there are people who have done exactly the same thing, having some knowledge of what is being paid. This is how it works out 162 Newfoundlanders averaged per day \$8.01.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For the period during which they worked.

MR. HOLLETT: For that particular period—April 1 to December 1 last year. There was one manager, not a Newfoundlander, averaging \$28 a day. The superintendent who was also not a Newfoundlander averaged \$22.88 per day; another assistant, not a Newfoundlander \$17.16 per day. There were fifteen other workmen who were not Newfoundlanders who averaged \$14.41 per day. That is to say these fifteen ordinary workmen who were not Newfoundlanders averaged \$14.41 per day while 162 Newfoundlanders averaged \$8.01 per day.

I find that the gypsum plant, Sir, cost nearly three million dollars up to December 31. As I have stated the manager gets \$750 a month, the superintendent \$600 and the chemist \$450. I suppose the same scale will apply in connection with the cement plant. Sir, the sale of this cement plant, and I think I dealt briefly with that the other day, and do not want to go into that now—but the sale of the cement plant is another puzzler, and



I think even the Honourable the Premier admitted it is so. What puzzles me is how he managed to sell that plant to Canadian Machinery Holding Trust for \$4,749,000. I doubt very much, Sir, whether so far, that is a year and a half ago, if five cents has ever been paid into the Treasury on that account. As a matter of fact we have been told, Sir, that the interest which has been paid has been returned by the Government to this company.

I come now, Sir, to a question which has been troubling us for some time, and troubling the country and every country, i.e. the question of liquor. I know that we hope to get a revenue of \$3,320,000 and I have no doubt we shall. I find that last year there were over three hundred odd licensed beer taverns and agents in various parts of the country selling beer, and that was for beer alone, Sir. I raised a point some time ago which I asked every member of the House to consider carefully, i.e., the question of the connection of members of this House, particularly the members of the Government, with beer taverns and beer parlours. I pointed out that I felt it was most important that every member of the House who is elected by the people to serve them should keep his hands free and keep himself free from being connected in any way with making a profit in any way by the sale of alcoholic liquors, beers or otherwise, from which the government collects such huge amounts of revenue, \$3,200,000 next year. I think it is absolutely awful for any of us to have been mixed up in this. I don't want to mention any names, Sir, although I can mention the names of people in this House who are deriving what I believe to be profits from the sale of liquor or resulting and arising from

the sale of liquor. I could and I did at one time mention one tavern here, the Green Lantern here in St. John's. If there are no members on that side of the House who have an interest in or are making money by reason of the operations being carried on in the Green Lantern then I will be happy to know, and the same thing applies to the beer operators and liquor operations at Beck's Tavern in Swift Current—I would be only too happy. I now ask every member of this House to dissociate themselves from such a business. There is the Piccadilly, Bella Vista, the Old Mill and the Ringside, Mr. Speaker, I do know that honourable members are associated with those places in a financial way, and I could name some, but I don't want to do that. But I will say this; it is most important that the honourable members on this side of the House, if you like, or on the other side should disassociate ourselves completely and entirely from the operations of these places which help to raise such a tremendous amount of revenue. You see, Sir, the liquor business is a problem all over the world wherever we look, in the United States of America and on the Mainland of Canada, and I suppose in every country in the world peoples' Houses of Assembly have been known to be controlled by liquor industries, and they in great measure can control certain industries by those people who are greatly interested in the sale of liquor. I do know, Sir that even in this country today certain liquor interests contribute largely to certain funds having to do with the election of Members to this House. I could state some facts and some figures, but that would bring in people who are not in this House and also some who are in this House, and so I refrain from

doing it—I merely throw it out as a suggestion—I remember when I raised the point before there were only two members on the opposite side who got up and said they disassociated themselves completely from any liquor interest, the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Member for White Bay.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable member would allow me, the Honourable Member for White Bay three days before he made that statement in this House applied for a license for a beer tavern, and that was only one of the times that he did apply, and I dare say he will continue applying in writing.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise to a point of order there — The Honourable gentleman just said only two members stood up and said they had no interest in liquor. I think that was the statement. I trust the inference is not meant that because a member did not stand up and publicly disassociate himself that he did then have some connection with the liquor interests. I am quite sure that no member of the government has any connection, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to have myself on record right now. I made a statement here in the course of my remarks on the address in reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has no point of order, and may not make a speech.

DR. ROWE: I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, I am not associated in any way with any liquor interest of any kind whatsoever, and as far as I know never will.

MR. HOLLETT: Open confession, Mr. Speaker, is good for the soul, they

say. As to the two members on the opposite side who did deny any connection I am rather surprised now to know that even one of these two had fallen from grace.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He had fallen when he made the statement, if there is any falling in it.

MR. HOLLETT: Terrible! Terrible! I don't know—On this liquor question, Sir, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not refer to the position particularly with regard to the petition which was supposed to be referred to the Board of Liquor Control, if not to this House. We heard nothing from it. That is the petition from certain residents of St. John's West. Apparently no action has been taken whatsoever. I would like to have some statement relative to that from the government, or is it to be treated like some other petitions of which I know, which have come in to the Ministers of the Crown and have not been presented in this House. I refer to one which was presented on the liquor question from a district in this country to a Minister of the Crown and has not been presented here in this House. That was two months ago. If we in the West End, Sir, have been treated in that respect in that regard then I think something will have to be done about it.

I fail to see how any member or any members or any Minister can afford to neglect to present to this House a petition which is signed by seven or eight hundred people. That has been done Sir, and I know it for a fact, and I have refrained from saying anything about it. But this is probably the last opportunity I shall have to remind that Minister that I would like him to take the necessary

action and at least present the petition to the House and hence to the department to which it properly belongs.

I come now, Sir, to the fishery. I would say at the outset that I am concerned about the fishery because as I know and as every member on the opposite side of the House knows, I am deeply concerned about reports which have recently come out from the South West Coast with regard to dragger operations. To be frank, Sir, I felt that if we could not put all our draggers fishing we would not have a prosperous industry and prosperous fishermen. I have felt that for years, and now, by the statements which have come by way of the press, relative to the possibility of some of these draggers being tied up, very much perturbed over the whole matter, and I am quite sure the Government does also.

In the budget speech of a year ago, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance made the following statement—It is my profound privilege to announce today (that over ten months ago) that a great and far-reaching programme of fishery development is to be launched in this Province. We call upon all fishermen and all merchants to join unstintingly in that great development. There is ample room and great need for all progressive and energetic fish concerns to play a strong part in this programme—

Now, Sir, I am quite sure that the Minister was sincere when he made that statement over fourteen months ago. I am quite sure that he hoped that something concrete would have been done. Now what is this programme? We have heard the Honourable Premier speaking here for four or five days or afternoons on the programme. To us it seems that he really had something there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—I rise to this point of order as much out of curiosity as anything else, because I would like to have Your Honour's ruling. In a debate on the address in reply and in a debate on the budget speech very great latitude is obviously allowed, and must be allowed to members of the House. But, where a bill is to be debated and members are to have opportunity to debate that matter thoroughly on a special occasion set aside for that debate and nothing else but that debate, or where that occasion has already been provided and the debate has been thorough and all the time that members wanted was given; in either case is it in order even in the debate on the address in reply or the debate on the budget to discuss the matter, when the member knows and the House knows opportunity is to be given or that the opportunity has in fact been provided in that same session; is it in order to have the fisheries debate all over again, and under this heading?

MR. SPEAKER: That is a very important point raised there. True it is that great latitude is allowed in debate on the budget speech. It is true also that past debates, questions decided by the House may not be revived. It is also true that in the budget speech, the chief topic for debate, extensive reference is made to the creation of a fishery development committee. I therefore would say that while the honourable member is debating this motion, i.e. the budget speech, he may take notice of the fisheries development committee in this case elaborated in the budget speech, and make comment thereon.

Yet it would have to be done within fairly narrow limits because the House cannot re-debate a question which has come before it as a bill and the motion debated on second reading and debated in Committee of the Whole and passed by the House. Therefore I cannot forbid any honourable member referring to the fisheries development committee but he really cannot make a speech on that point because ample opportunity has been given, as I have already said, and the principle decided by the House, and that issue is closed. He will find himself in the position where he can debate only in so far as the general effects on the position of the province and that in a narrow limit. If the honourable member will endeavour to keep within the rules he may continue his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to know just where we are in this House these days. The Honourable the Premier is likely to object to anything.

May I read from page 8 of the budget speech which we are debating now? "We were successful in inducing the government of Canada to join with us in the Creation of the Fisheries Development Committee. Working for nearly two years under the chairmanship of the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, Sir Albert Walsh, this committee conducted the most painstakingly thorough survey of the fishing industry, of the fishery potential, and of the needs of the industry that ever was accomplished in the history of British North America. We have been busy in this present session of the House enacting legislation to launch our great fishery development programme. This will be by far, indeed it will be incomparably, the

greatest development ever known in the fisheries of the northern half of this continent. The Government of Canada have agreed to participate with us in bearing the costs of this great development, which I expect, is likely to cost as much as \$100,000,000 on all counts over a period of twelve or fifteen years."

So it goes on, Sir, for nearly three pages, on the fisheries, which concerns a greater number of our people than any other industry in Newfoundland. Yet the Honourable the Premier gets up here in this House and endeavours to stop me from talking about the fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interfere there. That is incorrect. I gave the honourable member a loop-hole. He refused to take it, and is insinuating now the Premier is making the rules of the House. That is absolutely incorrect. Whilst I am sitting in this Chair when an honourable member has a right to speak for an unlimited time, he can be sure he will have that right. In so far as the Chair is concerned this bill was brought in and passed. The honourable member has been speaking on it for five minutes, therefore, it is unfair, against the ruling of the House, for the Honourable Member to say that an attempt has been made to stop him from joining in this debate. I had already pointed out that great latitude is allowed.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask what the Honourable the Premier is trying to do?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not concerned. I am merely concerned with the rules of this House. It is my unfortunate position to have to enforce the rules of this House. I have already said I am not concerned with what

any honourable member says. The rule has existed from time immemorial. If the honourable member wishes to try my patience—I do not flatter myself when I say I am the most patient person that I know. I can enforce that rule. I can enforce the rule of tedious repetition in the budget debate. Yet I have allowed the honourable member for the fourth time in this present speech to refer to cement. I made a note of it. If that is not latitude in debate I don't know what latitude is. Now a bill has been brought in on certain matters of fishery development and discussed and all the time any honourable member wished to take within the rules was permitted. There was no limitation. If the honourable member does not avail of his opportunity then I cannot have this rule set aside. It is not right to revive a past debate for the purpose of further debate. I shall have to ask, in view of the honourable member not accepting my previous ruling that he refrain from re-debating the Fisheries Development Committee. He will now continue his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I do understand that I must refrain from saying anything relevant to fisheries development committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not joining in debate.

MR. HOLLETT: I am shouted at from one part of the House; every once in a while someone jumps up to a point of order saying you are not allowed to talk about this and that and the other thing—I wonder where are we tending.

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure the honourable member that the Chair wonders that too.

MR. HOLLETT: The question is as

to whether I can refer to the fisheries at all. Well I don't think anybody is going to stop me from referring to the fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member persists in twisting and distorting the position of the Chair and defying the Chair I will ask him to discontinue his speech.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not attempting this deliberately, but I must say you have a misunderstanding about my attitude. I have obeyed since being here all orders issued by the Speaker, but I am now at logger-heads. I mean I find it difficult to know just what I shall say. The best thing, I think, is to say nothing but leave it alone, leave it at that.

There is one other matter I want to refer to, i.e., the highroads. That is another worry. I have had a considerable number of complaints from people in various parts of the country with regard to the amount of wages paid to them for work on the highroads. The information I get from all of these letters is that these men are working on the highroads, digging ditches, now for the wages of 60c. per hour and in cases they have pointed out to me, they have been working for a number of years on the highroad, and were working in the Commission of Government days and received at that time 55c. per hour. Today they tell me, after five years of this government, they are getting 60c. per hour. That is in certain areas. This year this Government has the unprecedented gall to boast of what they are doing for certain parts of the country and for certain people. They are the greatest government in the world. They have dispensed their largess

hither and thither and everywhere but not in the right places. We have fishermen in this country today half starving, we have men working on the highroads who are half starving on 60c. an hour. What I am wanting to know Sir is, where is all this largess which the government has been distributing. I want to appeal right now on behalf of these people who are working on the roads with a pick and shovel digging ditches, out all day, ten hours a day, and getting 60c. an hour, five cents an hour more than was paid in Commission of Government days in these particular areas. Railway section men, I am told, are getting \$1.20 an hour for doing the same kind of work.

Now, Sir, I was going to say some things in regard to certain matters, but in view of what has happened I refrain. I want to say that always, as long as I am here, I shall endeavour to respect the ruling of the Chair whether it be in Committee or in the House, and I don't think, Sir, that I shall ever attempt to twist a ruling or distort it. If for some reason I don't understand a ruling, there again I beg Your Honour's Pardon. I realize, Sir, unless there is a Chair and a Speaker and one who is all-powerful over debate to decide such questions then we could have no House and no argument at all. I must now, Sir, point out that there has been considerable disorder, no order at all. I shall endeavour, Sir, to go on probing into the expenditure of some twenty millions of dollars in new industries, we shall keep our noses to the ground, so to speak, as a good setter should, to endeavour to find where the government are spending their money, in all areas in this country. If we express ourselves in this regard and it unfortunately injures or hurts some

member of the government then I am sorry, but we cannot refrain on that account.

I have great respect for the individual members of the House. I have little respect for the government. I say, that Sir, advisedly, and I don't mean the individuals in the government. It is unfortunate the state to which this country has come at the present time in the eyes of the world. These things that have been disclosed recently are unfortunate. Let us, in the name of goodness, try to work together and pull together to make this little province in which we live respected and honoured throughout the whole of Canada. I can assure the Honourable the Premier and the members of the House that we on this side of the House will do nothing which will lower the dignity of this country in which we live.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate, to a later hour this day so that the debate might be revived at a later hour this day.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 1:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 3:00 of the clock this afternoon.

---

**TUESDAY, June 15, 1954.**  
**AFTERNOON SESSION**

---

The House resumed at three of the clock in the afternoon.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before the House resumes I wonder if I might have permission to give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas."

I wonder if I might also have permission to table a report, the Annual



Report of the Industrial Development Loan Board, together with a letter from the Chairman which contains the following paragraph:

It will be observed that Section 14 of the Act requires the submission of this report not later than the 30th of May and that the report should be laid before the Legislature within fifteen days thereafter. In expressing the regret that the report is a little late, I should like to add that the audit of the accounts of the Board took somewhat longer than expected, and the financial statement was received here only yesterday.

Yours faithfully,

G. M. Drover, Chairman,

Industrial Development Board.

#### QUESTION NO. 108

(1) Statement of Current and Capital Revenues and Expenditures for the Month of March, 1954, including Revenue and Expenditure for April applicable to 1953-54 Account.

(Subject to Final Audit))

Department	Current Revenue	Capital Revenue	Current Expenditure	Capital Expenditure
Consolidated Funds				
Services	—	—	1,479.58	—
Executive Council	—	—	65,671.95	—
Legislative	—	—	8,545.32	—
Finance	3,959,436.51	—	177,388.18	—
Provincial Affairs	1,096.76	—	7,136.85	—
Education	61,177.30	—	461,499.02	9,307.28
Attorney General	9,130.00	—	163,729.14	615.36
Mines & Resources	107,811.25	4,981.07	208,717.99	770.30
Public Works	16,963.05	77,838.39	528,553.26	330,623.69
Health	638,338.45	27,757.50	964,379.99	4,151.24
Public Welfare	324,738.35	—	699,102.87	—
Board of Liquor Control	295,000.00	—	22,153.63	—
Municipal Affairs &				
Supply	95,455.89	10,277.23	99,017.02	179,041.02
Fisheries & Co-operatives	22.25	10,260.60	158,078.77	74,726.63
Economic Development	—	19,324.04	220,897.19	50,585.36
Labour	1,932.84	—	10,585.11	—
	5,511,152.65	150,438.83	3,796,935.87	649,820.88

The letter is dated June 11. I found it on my desk when I went back. It was only on the 10th that the audit of the accounts of the Board was received, which is why the Board is so late in tabling the report, as the Act requires. I offer my own apologies, as the Minister responsible for the Board, for the lateness of the receipt of the report.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will ask leave to introduce a Bill, entitled, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953."

I might say, Mr. Speaker, a lot of these bills I have given notice of are just really formal bills.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to table answer to question to 108.

### Third Readings :

A Bill, "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

### First Readings :

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act"—On motion read a first time—On motion ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act". On motion read a first time—Ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

### Orders of The Day

#### Adjourned Debate on the Budget :

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, before I take up the particular points in this debate that I desire to take up, I should like to extend my very sincere congratulations to the Honourable Minister of Finance for a most excellent budget speech. Sir, a budget speech is and can be excellent in one of two ways or in both ways. In the first place it can be an accurate and clear description or picture of the financial state of the jurisdiction, that is to say, of the state or province or country or whatever the jurisdiction may be. Then secondly it can be an encouraging report, a report giving good reasons, acceptable reasons, reasons that do not violate the mind, reasons that do not violate logic, good reasons for being hopeful and optimistic about the position as it is in prospect. Now on both counts the honourable gentleman's speech was most excellent. That is to say, it does give an accurate and a crystal clear picture of our financial position and in

addition to that it does give abundantly believable, reasonable arguments to convince us, unless we are blind with prejudice, unless we are so partisan that we prefer to think that all is ruin and disaster, to persuade us that Newfoundland's future is not stormy but bright, that the prospects for Newfoundland are encouraging not discouraging.

Now it seems to me that the functions of a budget speech cannot be more than twofold. Its first function is clearly, is obviously to give us an account of the finances of the period in review. The period is the year just past and the year just about to come. To give a clear review of the finances of that year. The other function is to give a review of the economic jurisdiction, the economic area in question for the period under review, the period just past and the period just coming. On both counts, I submit, the Honourable Gentleman's speech was a most excellent one. It has never been bettered in the history of budget speeches in this House, and I have read every one of them without exception. I have read all the budget speeches ever delivered in this House. I have read them carefully and studiously, and I have compared them. Some of the members here may remember a very notable occasion when I took all the budget speeches between the two world wars and listed them and showed what the forecast was and then showed what the result was in each instance at the end of the year for which the forecast was given. I showed the completely ridiculous and ludicrously absurd attempt of most Finance Ministers of that period between the two world wars to forecast accurately what the revenue and expenditure would be for as

much as one year in advance, one year ahead. Now that was not because the Finance Ministers of those days were less bright, less intelligent than the Finance Ministers of today. That was not because the Finance Ministers of those days were less informed than is the Finance Minister of today. It was not because they were less capable than is the Finance Minister of today, and it was not because they were less honest than is our Finance Minister of the present time. It is not greater ability or greater intelligence nor superior education nor more honesty on the part of the present Finance Minister that enables him to produce a document which can be described truthfully as a most excellent one, and as one of the best ever delivered in this Chamber. It is rather that times are different, the circumstances are different, the conditions are different. It is now quite a different task for a Minister of Finance to deliver a budget speech from what it was when Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Harry Brownrigg and Sir Richard Squires and Mr. Peter J. Cashin were Minister of Finance. The times have changed. Newfoundland herself has changed. Newfoundland now is part of the great Canadian Nation. Newfoundland's boundaries now economically and financially extend to the Pacific Coast, from the great Atlantic to the Pacific. We have pushed our boundaries westward. We can leave St. John's now and go for thousands of miles in a straight line to the west coast without leaving our country, we are still in our country, our land, our nation of which this island forms so wonderful and so valuable a part and to which this island with its glorious history, its richness contributes ideologically and in culture so much as to make us all

feel intensely proud indeed. That is why a Finance Minister now can present a budget speech which would leave the Finance Ministers between the two world wars quite breathless if they could come back now and hear the Honourable Minister of Finance deliver the figures he did in this speech here a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, having paid that well deserved compliment to the Minister upon the excellence of his budget speech, and that compliment to Newfoundland upon the excellence of her standing today, I now pass on to some comments on the debate as it has occurred up to the present time.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that the honourable gentlemen opposite, the Members of the Opposition, appeared to be quite convinced that there is to be a general election in this province this year. They appear, indeed they give all the appearances of honourable gentlemen who have made up their minds that there is indeed to be an election this year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in a radio speech announced not only that there is going to be an election this year but he announced also that he was convinced that the election this year would be held in November. Indeed the honourable gentleman went on with what I thought was very poor taste, with very questionable taste, to say that the Premier was determined to hold this general election before the trial of Dr. Valdmanis is held and he used the name Dr. Alfred Valdmanis. He made the statement that the Premier determined to hold the general election before the trial of Dr. Valdmanis is held. I thought that was in very questionable taste, not that I mind the reference

to myself, and not that I mind particularly any reference to Dr. Valdmanis. But I did think it was in very questionable taste in relation to the general principle that when a man is charged with an offence or with a crime he ought not thereafter until the matter is settled in court, until the evidence is produced by the prosecution and by the defence, he ought not until that is done form part of a political broadcast, as he did in fact in the broadcast in question.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the first point I wish to make in this speech today is that the Opposition appears to be quite convinced that there is to be a general election this year. They are so convinced indeed that the Leader of the Opposition has called the date of that election as being early in the month of November. They are so convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition party have launched upon a radio propaganda campaign on each Saturday night for some weeks past, when members of the Opposition have taken to the air to make political speeches. Now in these speeches they have not discussed the United Nations nor the Theory of Relativity nor the imminent destruction in the world through the hydrogen bomb, and I have heard them discuss no part of the Indo-China War. All they discuss in these radio speeches, the common theme running through, is attack the government. Their speeches on the radio have this much in common with all their speeches, nearly all—perhaps I am being unfair there—with many, I will say, of their speeches in this House—Attack the government. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition are convinced that there is an election coming, and they have begun their election campaign already. They have

begun it in two forms, radio speeches and speeches in this House. I think, therefore, that the general public of Newfoundland might be on guard against talk from the Opposition Party because it is political talk, it is election talk.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, to a point or order. Is the honourable gentleman entitled to deal with speeches made outside this House except on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member has infringed the rule.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to call attention to the last sweeping statement made by the Honourable the Premier which included speeches in this House, to say they were made for political purposes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the speeches to which I refer, that is to the speeches made over the radio by honourable gentlemen of this House who are Opposition Members of this House; these speeches on the radio in every instance without exception referred to the business of this House, commented on the business of this House, commented on the actions of the government and were political speeches, propaganda speeches, electioneering speeches. I think the public ought to know.

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Whilst I don't want to stop the honourable gentleman from talking, as he has the privilege of talking on the radio, but I suggest this is not the place to debate what is said over the radio.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of debating what was said on the radio. I am merely

pointing out to the House the fact that the honourable gentleman opposite, the honourable gentlemen of the Opposition, are obviously quite concerned that there is to be an election this year, a provincial election, and that from the moment of that conviction they have indulged in political propaganda and that therefore the public of Newfoundland, the general public, ought to be on guard against their arguments because of course it is just political talk, just electioneering, just propaganda for election purposes. That is my first point, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I have made the point crystal clear. The honourable gentleman opposite for several weeks past have been talking straight election talk.

MR. HOLLETT: What have you been doing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have been assisting my colleagues to carry on the business of this province. I can assure my honourable friend opposite if there is one thing above all other things about which I am not thinking and to which I am giving no thought it is an election this year. That is the present tense. Now I will also use the past tense: There has been no topic to which I have given less thought or less attention at any time in the last calendar year than the matter of the election this year. That is past and present. The people convinced of an election are the honourable gentlemen opposite, the Opposition. So as I have not been thinking of elections since I took part in one in July and August of last year, the Federal Election, since then I have not even given any thought to an election not even a by-election, no, not even the by-election in St. John's West. I could have given some

thought to that by-election, could have gone out, the Liberal Party, and just won it. We had won it a few weeks before and we saw no reason why we could not win it again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will pass this point over, but will come back to it. I want to deal with one or two points brought out by honourable members opposite. There was one point brought out by the Honourable Member for St. John's East, not the Honourable and Learned Member, but the honourable member for St. John's East, i.e. the honourable gentleman who is sitting presently in the House to the immediate left of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I hope that when the redistribution Bill is passed, if it is, and when it is passed, that it will have the effect of—

MR. BROWNE: Out of order—

MR. SMALLWOOD: My belief is that I am not out of order. My belief is that the honourable gentleman is wrong when he thinks I am out of order.

MR. BROWNE: Discussing a bill to come before the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not. I am making a passing reference to it. I am not debating it, not discussing it. I say, I hope that bill will be of such a character as to eliminate the need in this House of distinguishing between honourable members, that it will be simply "the honourable member for such and such a district" that there won't be duplicate membership in the constituencies represented by two men, but only by one man. I hope that will be the case. Having made that point I return to my honourable friend from St. John's East. His speech requires some little attention, little, but some. He said there

were no birch forests in Newfoundland, but there are no forests. It sounds like, "Yes, we have no bananas today." We have this and that and the other thing but "We have no bananas today." There are some stands of birch but there are no birch forests. Now to begin with, I am not sure that I understand the difference between a stand of birch and a forest of birch unless the difference is one size: Perhaps a stand is smaller than a forest, or to put it another way, perhaps a forest is larger than a stand. Is a forest larger than a stand or is a stand larger than a forest? I confess I don't know. My quarrel is with his statements that there are no birch forests, no forests of birch, when in fact there are, when in fact I have been in them, when in fact I have seen them, when in fact I have travelled through them. I could take the honourable gentleman on the highroad between Deer Lake to the West and Springdale or Oxford Brook to the East, the road say between Deer Lake in the West, where it turns to Halls Bay in the East. I could take him along that highroad in the vicinity of Oxford Brook and I could show him a birch forest twenty miles long. Would he call that a forest? With not a tree in it except an occasional pine but birch trees. Is that a forest? Prudently he does not answer, prudently he does not commit himself. He prefers to be esteemed a wise man by holding his tongue, the Bible says so, so he holds his tongue and hopes to be esteemed a wise man. He does not want to bite on that one. There are twenty miles of growing trees, is that a forest? He does not bite on that. If he says, yes it is, then his statement is obviously wrong when he stated there were no birch forests in Newfoundland.

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Go to the Northern Peninsula.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have alluded to one of many birch forests. I could take him up to the head of Bay D'Espoir, to the head of Fortune Bay, the head of Hermitage Bay into great forests of birch. I could take him to an area roughly in the centre of Newfoundland to a forest of birch measuring hundreds of miles. I could take him between St. Georges to the east and Codroy to the west where he would see thirty miles of birch forest, thirty miles of it, where it grows almost monotonously as I have travelled through on the train—Yet the honourable gentleman tells us there are no birch forests in Newfoundland.

Now I come to the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West. He boldly and fiercely challenged the budget figures in the part of the budget that gave the Minister's estimate of what the people would pocket in Newfoundland this year from their earnings and other sources, boldly and fiercely and energetically challenged these figures. He said he knows that in the budget speech the Minister's estimate of what the people will pocket this year from woods, the paper and pulp industry, I have the speech here—Forests, paper, pulpwood \$43,350,000. Then he challenges the Minister's figure for mining etc. Mining is shown here at \$13,365,000. I don't know what he had in mind when he used the word "etc." but he said—Paper, pulp, wood, mining, etc. I cannot take him up on the "etc." I can only take him up on paper, pulp, wood and mining which he specified. Anyhow, he challenged the figure of



\$43,350,000. That is the figure of what will go into the peoples' pockets from that source in 1954. He challenges the figures of \$13,365,000 that the Minister says will go into the peoples' pockets this year in respect of mining. He challenges these figures, and he says they are too high. He challenges the figure for defence. I prefer not to deal in detail with that, but I will deal with it in a general way. I will deal in detail with the other figures. He challenges these figures and says they are too high. Now I don't want to be offensive to the honourable and learned gentleman, but I am reminded of Peter Finley Dunne, the American Humorist, who wrote a lot of his writings during the Spanish American War. In one of his works he had one of his characters, I forget the name now, saying he is going to destroy the Spaniards with one blow, and he is to deliver the blow. Now the honourable gentleman said that \$43,350,000 is too high—throw it out—It is too high. But why is it too high? Does he give any hint? No. Does he give any reasons? No. Does he give a substitute figure? No. Does he quote any sources? No, he is the source. It is too high. The Minister of Finance has ready access to the private information of virtually every company in Newfoundland but it is not a good source. The honourable and learned member, he knows—like the "Shadow." Who knows? The shadow knows. The Minister of Finance could not know but the shadow knows the figure is too high. It is just that, too high. That is all—it is too high. Dare we ask him to tell us why? Is that questioning the honourable gentleman's veracity? Is it throwing into doubt his omniscience? Now if he quarrels with the figure of \$43 million he is quarrelling with the AND Company, with Bowaters and he

is quarelling with the fourteen hundred saw mills that operate in Newfoundland and he is quarrelling with the Department of Mines and Resources and its detailed statistics kept in the department there of logging operations and lumbering. These are not figures the Honourable Minister of Finance merely plucked out of the air. These are figures for which he has gone to Bowaters, to the AND Company and to other sources, this is the total of these figures given to the Minister by these people. Now the only possibility that these figures are wrong is the possibility that his additions are wrong, that he did not add them correctly.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder would the honourable gentleman answer a question? Would he give the breakdown of the figures there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He would not—of course he would not. Let the honourable gentleman ask Bowaters himself. We got it on confidential terms.

MR. BROWNE: May I give you some information from the Canadian Bank of Commerce Report for January 1954 where it says we are 9% below 1953.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So what? The honourable gentleman can get up and read from the Encyclopedia Britannica and give all sorts of casual information that has nothing to do with facts—And the honourable gentleman is not going to get away from it, not by reading casual scraps of information. The firm of Bowaters have given their own figures of what they will spend and they have given that figure in confidence to the Minister of Finance. That is not getting away from the facts. The AND Company has done

precisely the same thing again in confidence. The Honourable Minister has added these two figures together so that the identify of each is lost and then added to the result and the total certain other figures showing the sources of income in other wood industries. Now, how is the honourable gentleman going to get over that? How is he going to get over it? It is a bit of a dilemma is it not? It is so brave to stand with a great air of knowledge as of a great economist and say patronizingly that the Minister copied out a nice dinky, little speech. It is not bad in fact. But I disagree with the figures on pulp and wood, it is too high—It is too high—Why I can imitate the Oxford Accent too. I can do that too. But that does not fool me. The accent does not fool me. Then he says that the figure for \$13,365,000 for mining is too high—too high—But is it too high? The figures came from Buchans Mining Company from the two mining companies in St. Lawrence, from DOSCO, and they have been added up and that is the total. Now, is it too high?

MR. BROWNE: You don't give the details.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These figures were asked for in confidence and given in confidence. Does the honourable gentleman want the Government now, having gotten the figures in confidence, to reveal them to the House?

MR. BROWNE: It is very difficult for us to have precise information on things like that—"We have it in confidence." We can only go by the general trend, and I can show you that on other production as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, read it out from the Encyclopedia. These are facts, not theory. Hard brutal facts. The honourable gentleman cannot get

away from that. To do that he has to doubt the word of Bowaters and the AND Company and say that he does not believe DOSCO, the Aluminium Company of Canada, the St. Lawrence Corporation and Buchans Mining Co. That total is the total of four firms, that is what it is. Now unless the figures are incorrectly added, unless the addition is inaccurate, that is a correct figure because it comes from the one class of people who ought to know, the people who are going to pay it out in hard cash in payrolls. They ought to know.

Now defence: On this I am not in a position to talk so frankly. He said it is five millions less. Of course he should know. He has got a secret source that is not open to the Minister of Finance and not open to the government. He knows—Again the "Shadow knows." Perhaps Little Abner gave him the information. The honourable gentleman never heard of him, never heard of Little Abner?

MR. HOLLETT: I have seen him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh the honourable gentleman has seen him himself.

MR. HOLLETT: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think he has seen him for several days, has he? Oh I have seen other Pandemics with and without accents. He airily dismisses these figures. Again, "The Shadow knows"—He knows—the Shadow knows—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable gentleman needs a question to answer. Relating to what he stated, would he or the Minister of Finance give us the values of these particular industries for the last year? The actual earnings and not an estimated one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, certainly not. Do you think the Minister of Finance who sent out thousands of letters to firms to give information to be blended and classified into these tables would have any luck when he came to do it again if he blabbered out the figures for the various firms here in the House, surely not—surely not.

Now the honourable and learned gentleman was just as accurate in his rejection of these figures as he was in his giving of certain figures. He said the IBEC Report cost a quarter of a million dollars. That was said in his speech. The cost in fact was \$80,000 so that he is \$170,000 out on that, about 200% out.

The honourable gentleman then took up this great question of water power and water power surveys, and again he was wrong. He said it should not have taken six hundred thousand dollars to find out how much power we have up there where this survey took place. Well, the point is that it did not. It cost a quarter of a million dollars. Now the difference between \$600,000 and a quarter of a million is \$350,000—less than he said it was. He said it was \$600,000: It was \$250,000. Now can we accept very many more figures from that honourable gentleman who has been hopelessly wrong.

Now there has been a lot of discussion of the industries. I was intensely interested to know that the honourable and learned member of St. John's West spoke of Dr. Sennewald and this is what he said. "Why did Sennewald give up the idea of an Optical Plant. Why did he give it up?" This seemed a good idea (quoting from the honourable gentleman) yet he backed out. Now this is most interesting to me because this is the first time any mem-

ber of the Opposition has described even one of these proposed industries as good, and the only one they admitted as good is the one we did not start. The only one in which they can see anything is the one we did not start at all, Dr. Sennewald's. Now that is one of the funniest things I have ever heard or ever saw in all my life since I was born. That is positively funny. From the coming of Confederation, from the first general election, of all the members who have sat on the Opposition side, the one and only one who said a good word at all for the new industries, actual or proposed, is the honourable and learned member for St. John's West, and the good word he has is for an industry that did not start at all. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the only good word the honourable gentleman has for these industries is for an industry that did not start reminds me of something else—A certain medical doctor left St. John's a good many weeks ago and went to Europe on business and he returned a few weeks ago and he made this remark when he had been back two or three days—That an astonishing transformation had taken place in St. John's. He had noticed a most astonishing transformation, he said. Before he went away the most unpopular man in Newfoundland amongst the Tories of St. John's, the most unpopular figure, the most hated, the most despised figure of a man in all Newfoundland amongst the Tories of St. John's was Dr. Valdmanis. What happened in the meantime?

The only industrialist who has come to Newfoundland for whom as yet up to this moment any member of the Opposition have had any good word to say is Dr. Sennewald. He is the only one. There is not a solitary good word for another, only Dr. Sennewald.

MR. HOLLETT: He paid back the money you gave him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable and learned gentleman said he thought it was a good idea and that he did not understand why he did not go ahead. He can't understand that.

Now I am going to leap ahead for a moment because it is advertised in a remark of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition as his remark. I made a note of it. It also was published in the papers. But it is my own notes that I am going to quote and not the one in the papers. He said; "How long must we go on? How long can you keep pouring money down the hungry maw of Fishery Products Limited? How long can you keep pouring money down the hungry maw of Hazen Russell, of Mr. Crosbie." Mr. Speaker, I have noticed because it is very noticable, I have noticed that any businessmen in Newfoundland who has any dealings with the Government is extremely likely to be singled out by name by the Opposition any businessman who has any dealings with the Government — Arthur Monroe — "How long can you keep pouring money down the hungry maw of Fishery Products Limited." That is Arthur Monroe, Hazen Russell, Ches Crosbie, Spencer Lake, William J. Lundrigan, all of them highly reputable businessmen, all of them without exception. Is there a businessman in Newfoundland today from one end of it to the other who is a more reputable businessman than Arthur Monroe? Is there one? But the Honourable Leader of the Opposition asks how long can you keep pouring money down the hungry maw of Arthur Monroe?

MR. HOLLETT: Answer it. Do, Come on!

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the spirit. But for Dr. Valdmanis, for Sennewald respect and even affection, but only since they fell into disfavour with the Government. While they were or appeared to be in favour with the Government nothing was too bad to say against them. The Chamber rang and reverberated with denunciations of these men, bitter, savage denunciations. They were attacked, ridiculed, calumniated, nothing was too bad, too vile, to say so long as they appeared to be in favour with the Government. But the minute they appeared not to be, they became the friends of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How is the darling of the Tories? It is not reserved for Arthur Monroe, Hazen Russell, C. A. Crosbie, Lundrigan, Andrews, for the other men of energy, of progressive outlook, of dynamic personality, the men who wish to build up Newfoundland. There is a man sitting in the gallery here today, a stranger. He is a small man who has come and gotten a loan from us. We are delighted he has done so to build up the fishery in the area where he has his business. But he is in danger. He had better know right now that he is in danger. The Tories will get after him, the Opposition will turn the heat on him. He will be the victim of Tory propaganda—His hungry maw will be referred to. He will become a victim.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West in his speech in the debate compared expenditure of Nova Scotia

with ours in Newfoundland, current account expenditure in Nova Scotia with current account expenditure in Newfoundland. What he said was this: Newfoundland's current account expenditure is \$90 a head, Nova Scotia's is \$70, \$20 less than ours. That is what the honourable and learned gentleman said. I have here the report of the Bank of Canada in this very matter. The Bank of Canada is the great central bank of the government of Canada. It is not the Royal Bank of Canada. It is the Bank of Canada. It is the great central bank headed by Graham Towers. They have a department attached to it gathering statistical information for all Canada. They have taken the trouble, amongst other things, of taking the Provincial Government expenditures across Canada and the Provincial Governments revenue across Canada. In addition to that they have broken these down under very many sub-headings and they have taken great trouble to classify them, to make a common classification all across the ten provinces. In addition to that they have taken great trouble to gather the figures of municipal expenditures and municipal revenue in these provinces, and they have reduced them to a common denominator, obviously confusing. It is no use to compare the figures in one province with another province unless they are comparable figures. They must have a common denominator. How can you compare the salary of a man who is getting five thousand dollars a year with the salary of a man getting fifty thousand unless you reduce it to a common denominator. So they have reduced it to a common denominator and have given the nett figures. Here is the result, the nett figures. Last year Nova Scotia—This is current ac-

count expenditure—That is what the honourable and learned gentleman was talking about when he made his wrong comparison—Last year in Nova Scotia on current account the municipalities, the various town and city councils and rural and urban councils, the municipalities, spent \$20.3 million, \$20,310,000. The province spent \$41.1 millions \$41,100,000 a total of \$61,410,000 last year—That is Nova Scotia.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the date of that report? I have here the estimates produced in the legislature this year in Nova Scotia.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am talking about last year, the latest year for which I have accurate figures, not estimates.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal explanation. I have here the estimates given in the Legislature of Nova Scotia for this year, which I got when I was there, giving the actual expenditures last year, and these figures are less than what my honourable friend has given, \$40.1 instead of \$41.1 actual expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sixty-one and a half million dollars. Now Newfoundland in the same year on the same thing, i.e. current account expenditure: Municipalities \$1,700,000 the exact figure is \$1,733,000 and the province \$32,105,000.

MR. BROWNE: Here are the figures of the Minister of Finance..

MR. SMALLWOOD: These are the nett figures, as I have already told the House. If the honourable gentleman cannot follow me it is regrettable but it is not my fault but his. I have already told that these are nett fig-

ures. The water has been squeezed out, nett current account expenditure. We eliminated the grants and receipts of Federal receipts in health grants and the like.

Nett expenditures by the Province \$32,105,000 and the total is \$33,838,000 i.e. \$81 a head; in Nova Scotia it is \$94 a head. \$81 a head in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: How did you find that out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: By dividing by 370,000 population. It was in Nova Scotia \$94 a head or to be exact \$94.9.

MR. BROWNE: Anybody can check your figures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If necessary yes. These figures were checked by the Minister of Health, a former teacher and a very good mathematician.

MR. BROWNE: It is over \$90 a head?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe the House can amuse itself by working on the same figures. Excuse me, the nett figure is \$28,300,000; I gave the wrong figure there.

MR. BROWNE: You made a mistake too?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Only a very small one, the figure is right. The second figure is \$28,300,000 and the total is \$30,330,000.

MR. BROWNE: How did the honourable gentleman arrive at the nett figure of \$28,000,000, what was deducted from the total?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Federal Grants.

MR. BROWNE: All of them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All of the current account, naturally, as we are dealing only with current account that does not include the Trans-Canada Highway. It includes the health grants and the like, vocational education grants in the Department of Labour and quite a number of grants from the Government of Canada are all eliminated as they are in the case of Nova Scotia figures. That is in order to get the proper comparison. In other words, to compare like with like. These are the figures of the Bank of Canada to make a comparative figures, to make a realistic comparison.

MR. BROWNE: Only estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are not.

MR. BROWNE: If my honourable friend is reading a report made last October how can he think that can be more accurate than what has been given in the Legislature this year, in March or April?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not time to go through all this—It is in very small type, and in the middle of my speech it is not practical to do it. I have to continue.

Now I have to turn to another point. I saw the headline in the Evening Telegram the other day. I did not jot down the date, but it was within the last few days. The headline reads as follows: "Hollett" and that word is underlined with a black ruler. Then there is a colon at the end of it. Then in black type—cement missing—Then a question—Is work on cement mill? Then the story goes on, "The question of the missing cement was flung in the House of Assembly yesterday in the third straight day of Opposition attack on what they term



the questionable activities in connection with setting up the new industries—168,000 bags of cement went somewhere."

I will read that again: "168,000 bags of cement went somewhere, during the construction of the cement mill." "Opposition Leader, Malcolm Hollett wanted to know where." I should think he would and so would I, if 168,000 bags of cement went somewhere I would like to know where it went, if it happened in Newfoundland. "The cement," he charged, "was bought by the government from the firm of W. J. Lundrigan, Limited at the price of \$1.30 a bag, a total of \$218,400."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that the government did not pay W. J. Lundrigan Limited \$1.30 a bag. The government did not pay 30c. a bag. The Government did not pay .03c. a bag because the government did not buy 168,000 bags of cement from them. They did not buy 68,000 from them. They did not buy eight—they did not buy six—They did not buy any.

MR. HOLLETT: They paid for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No they did not.

MR. HOLLETT: It is up in Finance, Oh yes!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh no! We did not buy and did not pay for it. Oh no! We did not buy any cement from Lundrigan. We did not pay him one cent for cement. We did not buy any cement from him.

MR. HOLLETT: I will find the vouchers for it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the honourable gentleman is very welcome

to go on another hunt for vouchers, all he likes. But I tell him now the government bought no cement from Lundrigan and paid him nothing for nothing, nothing for cement. They did not buy any cement and did not pay them for any cement. I can tell the Opposition now that less than 60,000 bags of cement were used and bought by Lundrigan. I don't know what he paid and care less. It did not concern us. Now he had to put that cement into concrete under his contract, and he did so, and he was paid for doing that, from \$37 to \$58 per cubic yard, the standard price in the agreement. I was talking today on the telephone with Mr. Lundrigan, at lunch time, and these are my notes as I took it down.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that the authority for saying the government never paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am the authority, if the honourable gentleman knows a better authority than I to say the government of Newfoundland bought no cement and paid for none let him go and find a better authority.

MR. HOLLETT: The Finance Department.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Better than the Premier? The honourable gentleman is quite welcome to that belief, may it serve him well. Now in the agreement that Lundrigan made the standard price for concrete was \$37 per cubic yard in place—I hope the honourable gentleman notices the word "in place." The price of the concrete was \$37 a yard, in place. Now will the honourable gentleman try and remember that William J. Lundrigan, even if he is a friend of this government, is an honourable Newfoundlander and an honourable

Christian gentleman. Will they try to bear that in mind. In all of Newfoundland there is no more decent Christian gentleman than William J. Lundrigan; a very successful industrialist, a very successful businessman but none-the-less a gentleman, a decent, honourable, Christian gentleman. His contract required him to put standard concrete in place for \$37 per cubic yard. Now that price included supplying the cement, supplying the aggregate, supplying all the preparations, supplying the forms, supplying the pouring. That was all \$37 per cubic yard of concrete in place. I think my honourable friend, the Minister of Finance, will agree and I think that anyone in this Chamber or out of this Chamber will agree that at that time that was a reasonable price.

MR. HOLLETT : We did not dispute that.

MR. SMALLWOOD : The honourable gentleman does not and did not, and I hope he still does not dispute it. Now as to re-inforced concrete, which is a horse of another colour, it ran \$40 to \$58, where the variations depended on the amount of steel. That was all set forth in the specifications of the plant. Lundrigan had in addition to supplying the cement, aggregate, making all preparations, providing the forms, putting them in position and pouring the concrete, as in the case of standard cement, in addition had also to buy re-inforcing steel, and had to buy it in the quantity required under the specifications of the MIAG plans and blue-prints of the mill. The amount of steel varied between twenty and two hundred pounds of steel. I regret that I did not jot down twenty pounds to what and two hundred pounds to what per

cubic yard of concrete. That is the main explanation of the fact that re-inforced concrete prices ran from \$40 to \$58 per cubic yard. The difference was accounted for by the difference in the quantity of steel, but it had to be placed in position and had to be bent and fastened and screwed and secured and it all had to be treated in that way. The more of this that had to be done the more time and labour was required. It naturally required more time and labour for two hundred pounds of re-inforcing steel than it did for twenty pounds, indeed there was ten times as much labour and ten times as many expenses of all kinds.

MR. HOLLETT : Before the Honourable the Premier gets off that subject would he mind stating that against that the government paid for no cement, paid Lundrigan for no cement? Because, Sir, I must advise him that I hold in my possession copies of vouchers I got at the Finance Department showing, for instance — here are some of them—15,274 bags of cement at \$1.30 and then 9,520 bags of cement, and on down the line, 14,208 bags of cement, giving the prices, and the vouchers were up there where the man was paid. I am afraid the Premier was misinformed.

MR. SMALLWOOD : No the honourable gentleman is misinformed. The honourable gentleman is proving once again that he is not capable in this instance at least of taking a document and understanding it.

MR. HOLLETT : Ridiculous.

MR. SMALLWOOD : It is not ridiculous. It is rather, ludicrous. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition tables a question, gets the answer and does not understand but jumps to the

wrong conclusion, and a later explanation to the honourable gentleman won't guarantee that he understands. At least I will explain. William Lundrigan, Limited had a contract to erect the mill, to do certain excavations, to build certain forns, to make and pour certain concrete, to insert re-inforcing steel and generally to construct and erect a certain large building, amongst the largest ever erected in Newfoundland this great cement mill at Corner Brook. He was paid a certain rate. He did not have the money to finance it from the beginning. He could not just lay out the entire cost of that great enterprise from a construction standpoint and when it was all done send a bill to the government to get paid. Obviously he had not that kind of money. What he got was progress payments. Obviously that is once again a common-place procedure in construction circles. He got progress payments, and the progress payments were related to the amount of the progress made, I think, monthly—I am practically certain that payments made to that firm were made monthly.

The amount of each payment was related to the amount of expense to which the firm had gone up to that point. The expenses to which they had gone up to that point consisted, of course, of labour that they had paid or contracted to pay, cement they had bought and contracted to use and pay for and other materials and equipment that they acquired for the purpose of putting them into the plant. Now the fact that there is a relationship in the amount of progress payments made to the firm in the two years or so of the construction period, on progress made month by month, that the size of the monthly payments bore a relationship to the

expenditure that Mr. Lundrigan, or his firm rather, had made, does not by any stretch of the imagination mean that the government was buying the cement, except in the very broad sense in which you might say the government was buying the plant. If we were paying to have the plant built then we were buying the plant, in a very loose sense of the word. But if I make a contract with my honourable friend, the Minister of Public Welfare to build a house for me or a barn or poultry house or a pig house, a ten thousand dollar poultry house and if he is a relatively small man, as small to the thousand as William J. Lundrigan was to half a million or more, then my honourable friend may say to me "Well now, what amount is it going to take me per month to get that building erected? I just can't find that amount. Will you pay me so much when I start and so much say at the end of every week so that I can continue with so much on account? If you do not do that I have to get some financial assistance. I said, all right, I will pay you say at the end of every fortnight. "How much will you pay me?" I will give you progress payments. How will we decide the amount of progress payments? It will have to be according to what you spend, because what you spend will determine what you need. That means I will give you an inventory every fortnight of what I have spent, so much for concrete, so much for glass, so much for nails, so much for sand, so much for aggregate. He presents his bills and I give him a progress payment.

MR. HOLLETT: Then you did not pay for the cement, but it was in the bill you got.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In a list of expenses the contractor had incurred.

He bought the cement and paid for the cement and I paid him for the building, out of progress payments. He did pass me bills, labour bills, lumber bills, glass, cement and bills for anything else he had to buy to perform his contract—We are not buying his cement from him. We bought the concrete in the form of a building. We bought a building. No, we did not buy a building, we paid to get a building built. Now if the honourable gentleman wants to stretch that in any form he likes, and if any newspaper wishes to stretch it in the headlines such as—Cement Missing—

MR. HOLLETT: It is still missing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is still missing because it is still mythical cement. That is missing. You can take, the House can take any figure it desires; they could say it is 68,000 bags missing, they could say it is 1,680,000 bags missing or say three million or four million bags of cement were missing, and that would be just as accurate as to say there are 168,000 bags missing because it is purely mythical. It does not exist and never did exist. It is only a figment of somebody's imagination and nothing else.

MR. HOLLETT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I must state that together with a clerk of the Finance Department I went through all the bills and arrived at these figures. I admit I don't want to drag any clerk into it. The clerk was there assisting with the vouchers and getting the amount paid for any bill and check for money paid out. I want to explain that so that the Honourable Minister may be sure, because I shall go into that again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do by all

means. I don't have much faith nor hope that the next digging in will enable him to understand. I hope that by seven or eight times from now, and if he gets a good bit of help he might then begin to get a glimmer of understanding of what these figures are about. I don't think that he will from just looking at them once more. I have so much experience of that gentleman I don't think that will happen.

MR. HOLLETT: I must say the explanation was explicit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the outset I said I was going to explain but I was not quite sure the honourable gentleman would understand.

MR. HOLLETT: I still don't understand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have no difficulty in realizing that. If the government did not buy any cement from W. J. Lundrigan they did not pay.

MR. HOLLETT: Why did you pay?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We didn't.

MR. HOLLETT: You did—Why did you?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You did. You did not. The honourable gentleman can go on ad infinitum like that. We did not buy any cement therefore we did not pay for any cement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and wearisome session and much public business has been contracted and the members, particularly the outport members and us farmers and poultrymen are very anxious to get away from this House to our more interesting business of raising

poultry, getting eggs laid, and I dare say cabin owners are very anxious to get out to their cabins. So it is no intention of mine unduly to prolong the closing of this Legislature, for which reason I don't intend to go on any longer, I end as I began.

(1) The Opposition are absolutely convinced there is to be an election this year. I know why they are convinced, know all the steps that happened to bring about their being convinced. That is a trade-secret. I won't go into that. That is a trade-secret belonging to the party. Nevertheless the fact remains that they are decided and as a matter of fact they are determined that there is to be an election. They have even named the date, early in November.

MR. HOLLETT: We could name the date now if we wanted to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go ahead.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't intend to say but could if I wanted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I ask the honourable member not to keep it secret from me too long when the date is to be. I think I ought to know this. Maybe they have not decided on the final date, but it is to be early in November. We have that clue to go on. The honourable gentleman said it cannot be June because the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources and myself are going to Labrador. We are leaving on the boat the "Bonnie Nell" on the 22nd if the House is closed and if not the "Bonnie Nell" is going to be out of luck. After the House is closed the Honourable Minister and I are going down to Labrador and I hope to get back sometime in July. So the election won't be before we get back in July. I understand from the honourable gen-

tleman it won't be until about the first week in November. So we will all have to be ready say some time between the middle of July and the first week in November.

Now point No. 2 is that the Opposition are girding their loins, and what a set of loins. Anyhow they are girding themselves, Mr. Speaker, and pulling up their socks and girding their loins and donning their armor and getting ready for the election. They are starting now. The campaign is on as far as we are concerned. Talk about Don Quixote and his windmills battling the very elements. They are there in this very election. It is to be the battle of the century, "Battle Malcolm" "Battle Billy."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker—

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is unparliamentary, I withdraw it. Anyhow it is to be a famous battle.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is this battle to win this election this year, that the Opposition have called. It is to be a famous battle. Their grandchildren will tell about it, the Battle of 1954—The famous battle of the election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I go on to a serious point, and this is very serious. I think I have noticed something developing in this present session of the House. I think I have, and I believe I am not alone in this thought. I believe there are other members of the House who think the same thing. I think I have noticed something new in Newfoundland. I think I see the beginning, the deliberate beginning, deliberate with malice aforethought, deliberately purposeful, a decision to bring into Newfoundland and to copy

here in Newfoundland some of the worst aspects of McCarthyism as we have seen it in the United States; the technique of the smear, i.e. McCarthyism.

MR. HOLLETT: Who smeared there a moment ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The smear is to take this form—Somehow or other this government, somehow, there is no accusation, no direct charge, but the hint is conveyed, the insinuation—

MR. BROWNE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—The honourable member is using innuendo here if he is referring to honourable members of the Opposition. If he is, I don't think he is justified in carrying on this conversation or this speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I will have to uphold the point taken.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sir, I had not mentioned the Opposition. I had mentioned them and moved on.

MR. BROWNE: Innuendo.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I said the technique is the McCarthy technique.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

MR. SPEAKER: My ruling upheld that point of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Speaker ruled, as I understand it, not to apply that description to honourable members of the Opposition. I have not done so, Mr. Speaker, I have not done so. I said it is the technique of McCarthy, the McCarthy technique of the smear, and the suggestion is a suggestion of graft, of corruption.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the honourable gentleman to whom he is referring?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know that I can name anybody by name.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask the honourable gentleman to what body or group of people he refers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Tories" in St. John's.

MR. BROWNE: To the Opposition?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not necessarily.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I must object to the honourable gentleman going on with accusations of that kind. We are doing our duty, and if we have reason and grounds for certain investigations what are we to do? Are we to drop them or go on with them?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As far as investigations are concerned I take second place to no one in Newfoundland. I act with promptness when I order investigations to be made. I have nothing to hide, nothing.

MR. BROWNE: Neither have we anything to hide.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a delicate matter. Of course such charges ought not to be made against the Opposition. However it is not the business of this Chair to defend a political party.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I think the Opposition opposite would flatter themselves if they think they represent all the opposition to this government or even that they represent all the "Tories." I think if they believed that they would be kidding themselves. In fact there is far more opposition to this Government than I see across there and far more



"Tories" than I see there or see represented there. So I say, Mr. Speaker, I ask the people of Newfoundland to take notice—I am the first to do that—I am the first to ask them to take notice of the beginning of McCarthyism in Newfoundland, the technique of the smear, the suggestion of graft, of corruption. Let us see that it does not grow. There is no place for McCarthyism. There is no place in Newfoundland for the "Smear." If there is graft let it be investigated and no one spared, no one, no one.

MR. HOLLETT: Good.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Absolutely no one spared, if there is graft. I have no reason in the world, none whatsoever, not a scrap of reason to believe there is graft, none at all, not a scrap, on either side of the House.

MR. BROWNE: What about the question mark? What about the man you cannot mention?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is he a member of the government? Is he a member of this party? Was he ever a member of this government?

MR. BROWNE: The right arm.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And implicitly trusted. But he was not a member of this government nor of this party nor of this House. I cannot guarantee that amongst four hundred thousand people there will never be a Judas, someone to betray us. I can't guarantee that when I place my confidence in John Jones that John Jones will be worthy of the confidence I placed in him. I cannot guarantee that the public chest will not be robbed or that people associated with it would be robbed, but I can guarantee that if I hear of it, if I get the slightest hint of it, if I get the

slightest suggestion of it, all I need is the slightest suggestion and let it be my nearest and closest friend and I will call in the R.C.M.P. I don't know any better. I have called them in. I am not at liberty to say but the R.C.M.P. are not the only ones. I can say that the sky is the limit. We will get at the bottom of it and the evidence will be produced in the court where it ought to be, without smears, without hints, it will all come out, every scrap of it will come out and we will see if, for instance, I will need to hang my head. We will find that out and it won't be many weeks before we will see if I am just full of bravado or whistling to keep up my spirits, and we will see if anyone here is whistling to keep up his courage. We know what we know. What we know is a lot more than the honourable gentleman knows, a lot more.

MR. HOLLETT: You should.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am quite certain, I was never surer of anything in my life than we are of this that we know a lot more about what is known than the honourable gentleman knows about what there is to know.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not our fault.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am not blaming the honourable gentleman for that.

MR. HOLLETT: That is a matter of opinion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a matter of hard brittle fact. If the honourable gentleman thinks he knows as much as the Attorney General about this whole business—

MR. HOLLETT: Knew it before he did.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman did not. If he did he was terribly derelict in his duty not to report it to the police. He was not a friend of Newfoundland if he knew and did not tell. The first hint I ever got of this in my life was that same day the R.C.M.P. were called in, that very day. I got evidence that night and I got them out of bed at half-past midnight, and delivered the evidence that very same day.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member just must not allow himself to be inveigled into talking about something it is not proper to discuss.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I am afraid we have gone a little too far in this direction. But I repeat—I warn the Newfoundland people—I warn them seriously and sincerely to be on guard against the technique of the smear. That is something we are not used to in Newfoundland. In Newfoundland what we are used to is jack-blunt talk and we call a man a crook and that is that. We call a man a crook and if he chooses we have to prove it or he proves it is a libel, but there are no wasted words about it, there is no stabbing in the back about it, no slitting a man's throat. In Newfoundland if we think a man is a crook we call him a crook, if we think he is a grafter we call him a grafter, that is our style and not the smear. I warn the Newfoundland people to beware of it, or organized McCarthyism against this Government.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may rise to a point there—The Honourable the Premier said; "When we think a man is a crook we call him a crook." Now I have to refer to being called a crook by the honourable the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A crook? If I called the honourable gentleman a crook I apologize now, this year, last year or the year before. If I ever did call him a crook it was not in the sense of being a robber.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has no recollection of such word applied to any honourable member this afternoon. If honourable members are to go back to years past to bring up points of orders—But that is ridiculous—Will the honourable member continue his speech.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is all, Mr. Speaker, except just one point: If we have an election this year, and if we don't have it this year, and if we have it next year, and if we don't have it next year, we must have it the year after, but when the election is held God knows there are enough honest issues separating these two parties about which to fight.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Without going McCarthying, not American, because he is an insult to America, but going McCarthy. We don't want to do that. We have eliminated from our politics, and in that I have played my part, one thing that was always a disgrace to our politics, always a disgrace. I played quite a part in eliminating and it does not exist any more. It is not an issue any more. Don't let us replace one filthy technique with another. Let us keep the smears and let us keep McCarthyism out.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister of Finance, and I hope that before the debate is over we will have the pleasure of hearing from him even at the risk of prolonging the session of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: If no other honourable gentleman wishes to speak, I will put the question.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion carried.

On motion the House recessed for ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Before resuming the Orders of the Day I have some answers to questions—Is it the pleasure of the House to receive them now?

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 98 on the Order Paper of May 26 in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's East. The question was almost identical with one on the Order Paper from the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West, and this answer purports to serve as a reply in both cases.

Answer tabled—with following comments:

In the case of electrical installations the work for the year 1953-54 was divided amongst some ten or eleven different electrical firms or operators or companies. In the case of plumbing and heating the work has been divided amongst some twelve or thirteen or more contractors.

What was the extent of Electrical, Plumbing and Heating repairs (improvements and new installations) made in all Public Buildings, Hospitals and Institutions, during the fiscal year 1953-54.

Were tenders called for such work, if so, table details.

Who were the individuals, firms, companies or persons, performing this work?

What was the amount paid to each individual, firm, company or person concerned?

Answer:

It is the policy of the Department of Public Works to invite tenders for works in all cases where it is practicable to do so, but this can be done only to a limited extent on ordinary works of maintenance and alteration, as it is not possible, as a general rule, to prepare a firm specification on which competitive bids may be obtained. In the case of new buildings or additions, contracts made are all inclusive and cover plumbing, heating and electrical installations as well as erection of structures.

It had been the practice over a very considerable number of years to have one firm attend to repairs to plumbing, heating or electrical installations, as the case may be, in a particular building, and this practice has been continued under the present Government. A firm completely familiar with all the details of the service concerned in a particular building is in a better position to effect repairs with despatch and economy than would otherwise be the case.

The following amounts were paid to firms listed here under for electrical works:

Name	Amount	Where Services Rendered
Joseph D. Ashley .....	\$19,344	LeMarchant Building Central Pharmacy General Hospital Fever Hospital Government House Burin Hospital Orthopaedic Hospital King George V Institute Harbour Breton Hospital Grand Bank Hospital Doctor's Residence, Burin Colonial Building Nurses' Home General Hospital St. John's Roads Depot
Nfld. Light & Power .....	162	No. 1 Sanatorium
City Service Co. Ltd. ....	7,544	Mental Hospital Markland Hospital Doctor's Residence, Mental Hospital Department Building Central Fire Hall Boys' Home, Whitbourne Savings Bank.
Modern Electric Company .....	4,342	Court House War Memorial Orthopaedic Hospital Placentia Hospital Roads Garage Vocational Training School General Hospital Central Stores, Southside Government Services Building No. 1 Sanatorium King George V Institute.
Locke's Electrical Service .....	1,509	Residence, Corner Brook West Coast Sanatorium Stephenville Crossing Hospital
Lloyd Hann .....	281	Brookfield Hospital
Basil Fearn Ltd. ....	2,386	Bonne Bay Hospital Springdale Hospital Brookfield Hospital Salmonier Prison Camp
United Towns Electric Co. ....	108	Boys' Home, Whitbourne
Snowlight .....	6,875	Roads Garage Cabot Tower Home for Aged & Infirm Memorial University Memorial University Annex Public Building, Bay Roberts

Name	Amount	Where Services Rendered
		Salmonier Prison Camp
		Central Laundry.
Electrical Utilities Ltd, .....	674	Superintendent's Residence,
		Mental Hospital
		Memorial University Anex.
	<b>Plumbing</b>	<b>Heating</b>
E. J. Learning .....	\$4,501	\$2,219 Markland Cottage Hospital
		Come-by-Chance Hospital
		Placentia Cottage Hospital
		Memorial University
		Memorial University Annex
		Miller Building
		Fort William Buildings
		Govt. Services Building
		Govt. Savings Bank Bldg.
J. H. Lakin .....	1,497	(Plumbing Stephenville
E. H. Gullage,		and Cottage
Corner Brook .....	5,750	Heating Hospital
A. Walsh .....	4,511	Court House
		Memorial University
		Law Chambers
		Government House
H. Hunt .....	1,660	Merchant Navy
		Orthopaedic
		Fever Hospital
		General Hospital.
J. J. Taylor .....	2,760	77 Poor Asylum
		Central Fire Hall
		Ebsary Estate
		Public Building
		Ferryland
		Constabulary
P. J. Edstrom .....	849	H. M. Penitentiary
		A. A. Club
W. T. Ryan .....	370	Court House
		Departmental Bldg.
R. W. Barnes .....	7,386	2,480 Mental Hospital
		Court House
		No. 2 Sanatorium
		No. 1 Sanatorium
		Central Laundry
		Fort William Bldgs.
C. A. Hubley .....	2,058	Government Services Bldg.
		Board of Liquor Control
P. J. Donnelly .....	11,101	7,830 General Hospital
		Orthopaedic Hospital
		Vocational Training School

Name	Amount		Where Services Rendered
	Plumbing	Heating	
			Central Stores, Southside Fort William Buildings Highroads Garage Fever Hospital H. M. Penitentiary Central Fire Hall (Stables) Central Fire Hall Colonial Building Dept. of Supply.
William Tiller .....	10,950	1,260	LeMarchant Road Building Boys' Home, Whitbourne General Hospital Fogo Cottage Hospital Mental Hospital Central Laundry Public Building, Placentia Forest Fire Patrol Whitbourne East End Fire Hall

Resumed Orders of the Day:

Committee of the Whole House on the following Bills:

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act."

Chairman of Committee (Mr. Courage):

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act:"

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I presume it is not necessary for people who have timber in fee simple to get any special license to have someone to cut the timber on their land?

DR. ROWE: Of course not. No. The significance of that, Mr. Chairman, and I am speaking from memory—The Old Crown License definitely said that a Crown License was a License to operate a saw mill on Crown

Land, to saw timber taken from Crown Land. It was restrictive, whereas now the restriction is removed, and the timber does not of necessity have to come from Crown Land, but for instance different companies such as Bowaters might ask a man to saw—

MR. BROWNE: Do they have a license for that?

DR. ROWE: If they are to operate on Crown Land.

MR. BROWNE: But on Bowaters Limits which they own in fee simple he would not need a license.

DR. ROWE: Not if cutting on Bowaters Limits.

MR. BROWNE: Is this a sort of protection?

DR. ROWE: This is to liberalize a little more, if the mill, for instance was right on the border he could not saw any timber for Bowater, it had to be cut on Crown Land.

Clauses 2 and 3 carried.



Clause 4 read :

4. Section 10 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor :

"10. A Crown license entitles the licensee to erect necessary mill buildings on Crown Lands at a location to be stated in the license and to saw thereon timber, wherever obtained, and this right continues as long as the license or any renewal thereof continues in force."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is a considerable difference from the old section which I have in front of me. Is there some reason for that change?

DR. ROWE: It makes a more clear-cut statement of Section 10 in the parent Act. The amendment provides that with a Crown License a person can erect a mill on Crown Lands to saw timber from any source. The original permitted mill owners to saw timber cut only on Crown Land. Most mill owners sawed on Crown Land and land privately owned—

Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5 :

MR. BROWNE: If he has land of his own don't give him a license?

DR. ROWE: Yes, that is to make sure that they get the timber from their own holding and don't get it directly from Crown Lands.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6 :

MR. BROWNE: Not that this section takes away the right of private license, and does not entitle the licensee to cut timber on Crown Land. Is there anything a substitute for that?

DR. ROWE: The earlier clause will do that, Mr. Chairman. There is

nothing whatsoever in this Act to prevent a man from getting a saw mill license for any legitimate reason.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is to protect the Crown Lands.

DR. ROWE: Yes very much so. It also makes sure that a man has a large timber holding on private land. That does not confer upon him the right to go on Crown Land and get it as well.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I notice here, and draw to the attention of the Attorney General, that a section of the Act is struck out and nothing has been substituted for it. It seems to me the amending Act should be so drafted that something should be inserted. It does not have to be similar.

MR. CURTIS: Would the honourable member suggest putting in anything at all just for the sake of making a section?

MR. BROWNE: There are twelve. One of these could be put in.

MR. CURTIS: I will have a look at the Act.

DR. ROWE: I take it that is a matter of drafting.

MR. CURTIS: Maybe when the committee rises we could ask leave to sit again and I could look into it. It may be just a matter of renumbering.

Carried.

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8 :

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman on that point I should say that the penalties have all been brought together instead of being scattered here and there.

Clause 8 carried.

Clause 9 :

MR. BROWNE: Under that clause the licenses are issued for the calendar year.

DR. ROWE: We make a practice, Mr. Chairman in the making of any changes that while this is going on— If we make any changes such as here, in all fairness we should give them a reasonable amount of notice.

MR. BROWNE: Who brings it to their attention

DR. ROWE: These instructions are all sent out in a monthly letter to every one of our forestry officers throughout the province and they are in turn requested to bring it to their attention. In addition to that saw mill owners are always listed and any changes like that are sent out to them.

Clause 9 carried.

Clause 10:

MR. BROWNE: Why was that made retroactive for four years?

DR. ROWE: That is a point I made yesterday. That refers to a practice which came to us from Commission of Government days. I don't know, Sir, whether it is perfectly legal. At any rate the practice is to hold money to pay for past debts. In order to make sure the Attorney General's Department have gone back to four years. Why it is four instead of five I really don't know, but may be some technical reason.

MR. BROWNE: I directed a question to the Honourable the Attorney General yesterday on this particular section here, which entitles the Minister to collect fees which were not in effect, at least so it seems to me. I am not sure it was in effect.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It probably indemnifies against the possibility of

action for something that happened years ago.

DR. ROWE: I think this is to enable us to collect from people who since the 30th day of January 1950 have been operating. They are liable for fees but due to a defect in the Act we were unable to collect for over one year. This is to wipe out that provision in the Summary Jurisdiction Act which does not allow us to take action after one year. It says, "all actions must be taken within one year." We have found it so in this case and in another Act, a bill which I will be bringing in in the present session.

MR. BROWNE: Was the reason for it delinquency on the part of the department officials in not collecting or taking action?

MR. CURTIS: Apparently there was no provision in the Act whereby they could sue. The only punishment they could inflict on persons who sawed without a license was to take them before court for operating without a license. This is to rectify that by making the payment retroactive. In other words if a man operated a saw mill without a license he can be sued for breaking the law but he cannot be sued for the license he should have paid. I understand the object of this is to recover as a debt the amount the licensee avoided paying by operating without a license.

MR. BROWNE: The word is not defined in the clause — the word "Fees." It is usually assumed to be a license.

DR. ROWE: Perhaps I could explain it. As I said repeatedly, after one year had elapsed from the time a man becomes delinquent in his fee we could not collect from him, as the

Honourable the Attorney General says. Well this is to correct that defect. Now you might wonder how a year could elapse. Well sometimes, of course, especially in more isolated places in the province it might be a long time, where you have thirteen or fourteen hundred saw mills. The most of these men would be basically honest but then we find some person who after futile attempts on the part of the official was not coming across, until finally the bill was outlawed, so to speak, after one year and we could not collect. We want to get some of these persons in a position where they have to pay that and make sure that they will pay us.

MR. CURTIS: The fact is there is no limitation of time to actions taken by the Crown. Therefore if we don't put in a limitation there a man may be sued in twenty years time for something he did this year. I would suggest we put this bill through as it is, and the Committee will ask leave to sit again, and I will go through this matter, if I can once get to my department.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know how you can now.

DR. ROWE: I may say, Mr. Chairman, we don't want to be vindictive in any way in the department. We just want to be reasonable about it. I think one year is too short. I think we would be quite happy in the department if it went back to 1950, or five years.

MR. BROWNE: In the future what would you do?

DR. ROWE: That is what I mean—for the future.

MR. CURTIS: We could make it the same as the Statute of Limitations, six years. I will take that up.

Clause 10 carried.

MR. BROWNE: That is one point I wish to make and bring to the attention of the Honourable the Attorney General as far as the drafting is concerned. I think a great deal of confusion will arise if this practice is to be followed: section 25 and 26 are repealed and Section 26 is put back, then the next section is 27, so that there is one gap there. It seems to me it would not be too difficult to—

MR. CURTIS: It would be better to split section 26 up into two. I will check up with the draftsman and see.

MR. BROWNE: I think in the future it would be advisable to tell the drafting gentleman that in so far as possible it would be better to keep the numbering conventional.

MR. CURTIS: Surely there is no reason in the world to have section 24 and then 24A and no section 25. I will have to stop somebody's wages this week. I think it is wise to have the clause carried and then ask leave to sit again.

Clause carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, do we have to make the fines so heavy?

DR. ROWE: What we have done on that is to raise the maximum from \$100 to \$500 and from one month to six. The reason is that some offenses could amount to or could involve tens of thousands and in fact sometimes have involved tens of thousands of dollars. That is put there to take care of some of the heavier cases where there might be some large sum of money involved. It is still left to the discretion of the judge.

Carried.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, could I have the permission of the committee to refer back to Section 7. Would it not be more advisable to say Sections 2 to 7 inclusive?

DR. ROWE: Since we are on that section—that date was set consulting with a number of saw mill owners.

MR. CURTIS: I will bring in the revised version. We will let it stay as it is and when I come back it is quite likely then the entire Act will be renumbered and adjustments made.

Moved and seconded the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act."

Clause 5:

MR. HIGGINS: It was my understanding that the Honourable the Premier suggested that that might be allowed to stand because of some disagreement on sub-clause 3.

Agreed the committee leave Clause 5 stand and consider Clause 6:

MR. SPENCER: What was the point, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HIGGINS: The position was, Mr. Chairman, that I raised the point and was subsequently supported by the Premier. I questioned the wisdom of this particular section. You could have a situation arise where a man would be arrested for, say, drunken driving, and his car moved off the highroad, say for the purpose of argument, to Fort Townshend. A couple of days later when he is released and goes to get his car he finds the cylinder block is frozen, and he has

no redress. The constable may have carelessly left it out in the open. Under this section as it now stands he has no redress and no action or other procedure can be taken against the Minister, constable or overseer in respect of anything done under this section. Or it may be pushed over and left somewhere and somebody gets in and releases the brakes and it runs over a hill and is smashed up. It seems to me the rights of the public are completely ignored.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, another consideration is that a man may not be arrested at all. He may for some reason or defect in the car such as it being suddenly stalled, and then someone comes along and says this ought to be removed and takes it away. He is perfectly innocent as far as any offence goes yet through some negligence of the person who takes the vehicle away from the position it was it is damaged subsequently. Now I can understand the position where it is necessary such as where it is blocking traffic, but I feel there should be some obligation on the part of the person taking the vehicle. That is a fairly important provision because we are dealing here with property rights, and a vehicle may be worth \$300, or \$4000 and it is not fair that a man, without his knowledge, should have his vehicle taken away and subsequently damaged through somebody's fault, and he has no right of action.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the honourable gentleman has possibly some merit. There are so many ways these little things can possibly be twisted around. Yet how the honourable gentleman can say a person who has deliberately left a vehicle on the highway is innocent, in the light of the present Highway Traf-

fic Act, is something a little beyond me. He cannot leave a vehicle there and be innocent. If it is a case of a man being picked up and arrested it follows the people arresting him must have the vehicle removed or put out of the way. It cannot be left in the traffic, as an obstruction to traffic. It is just a case of ordinary common-sense. Now I cannot see how any innocent person could deliberately leave a car there. I can also see a hypothetical case where a car may be left there and be frozen before the law enforcement officers arrive. I don't see the significance of anything further. It is merely meant to clear the highway and to permit the authorities to do so and recover the cost from the negligent person.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, only this morning I saw a van with a flat tire outside the entrance to the Cathedral yard in a congested area. I don't know what else was the matter. It certainly would have been beneficial to the public to have that vehicle removed. Now then supposing that it is removed, and in the course of removal or subsequently, due to the neglect of the police officer or the person in charge, it should be damaged. Is it fair or unfair that this person who is mentioned should be responsible?

MR. CURTIS: Is it fair that the police or whoever is doing the moving should have to be responsible? Who is responsible for having the car there? He should call and get the car out.

MR. BROWNE: I notice the Honourable the Attorney General showed some heat there.

MR. CURTIS: Just interest.

MR. BROWNE: Most intense interest. On Saturday all garages are closed and you cannot get anyone to

come. Your car is moved and subsequently damaged—That could happen right here in the City of St. John's.

MR. HIGGINS: The explanation given by the Honourable Minister of Public Works deals with Sections 1 and 2 but does not deal at all with sub-section 3. I do suggest to the Honourable the Attorney General that Sub-section 3 is a direct abrogation of the common law rights to any owner. Surely when the police or any official take over a car like that—

MR. CURTIS: It is to protect them that section is there.

MR. HIGGINS: I am talking about a man who may subsequently be acquitted. Then he goes back and finds his property damaged or destroyed through the neglect of the police. I suggest it would be manifestly unfair to leave the thing in, and I move it be stricken out.

MR. CURTIS: I, of course, look at it from the standpoint of the police. If a man were drunk in charge we would have to take the car on a frosty night and look after it. I don't think it is fair we should have to look after someone else's car. Let him or his friends do it. He should never be in that position. I think it is only a normal protection the police should have when they have a car dumped in their lap at two or three o'clock in the morning on a frosty night.

MR. BROWNE: On a frosty Friday.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know. My honourable friend knows the police well enough to know they don't go looking for work. No police officer is going to take a car away unless the thing is an obstruction. If he has to do that it is unfair that he should

have to be responsible for it. I don't think it is fair. There will be no voluntary neglect.

MR. HIGGINS: But a lot of involuntary. That is the point, Mr. Chairman. With all due respects, once we start whittling away the rights of individuals then we are heading for trouble. It is all right to say no police officer shall be liable, but you are going to meet the odd one, human nature being what it is. There is Bill Jones car. They don't know what to do with it. They back it in front of a wall and smash the lights. That happens. The police park a car and does not pull in the brake and a poor fellow in the cell knows nothing about it, until he comes back, releases it and smashes the back fender, and the police are not liable.

MR. BROWNE: May I ask if the Attorney General knows whether there is any precedent for this in any of the Traffic Acts in any of the other Provinces, apart from British Columbia?

MR. HIGGINS: The reference to British Columbia this morning had no bearing on this clause. I have just asked the Honourable the Attorney General myself if he knew if this is the only Act on our Statute Book where there is a protective clause for the department in such cases. I am quite certain he was not able to tell me actually.

MR. SPENCER: I would like to add I am quite satisfied the clause has been adopted from legislation elsewhere, not just at our request, but in the light of different opinions. I think we should have it stand and investigated.

MR. CURTIS: Rather than that I think the committee might ask leave

to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, on the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act," the committee made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

Report received. Committee ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. COURAGE: On the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act," the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred, have made some progress and asks leave to sit again.

Report received. Committee ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, it being now two minutes to six I move the House do adjourn until tonight at 8:30 p.m.

Motion carried. House recessed until 8:30 p.m. tonight.

---

TUESDAY, June 15, 1954.

### NIGHT SESSION

---

The House resumed at 8:30 of the clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before we proceed with the business I would like to move that the House do not adjourn at 11 o'clock tonight to get through the business we have.

MR. BROWNE: I do not agree.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved that the House be not adjourned at 11 o'clock tonight.



MR. BROWNE: Can the Premier just get up and move a motion to vary the rules on the spur of the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is in order during the sitting. The motion may be made that the House may not adjourn. It is in order.

MR. BROWNE: Supposing it is in order, it seems to be a rush drive the Premier wants to put on, with so much legislation on the Order Paper and we can't do very good work if we are going to work from eleven in the morning to twelve at night.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am accustomed to working from 11 a.m. to 11 p.m.

MR. BROWNE: There are not many people like you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The people of Newfoundland seem to agree on that. It is the feeling of the members of the House that we should work to get the business done.

Motion carried that the House do not adjourn at 11 o'clock.

House moved into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Baxter Morgan took the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act." This afternoon we reached Clause 5.

MR. CURTIS: In connection with that section I have thought it over and checked it over with the staff. I have not been able to get in touch with the people who drafted this section but it will be remembered that some time ago a man was arrested on Topsail Hill and while he was gone his car slipped its brakes and went

over the bank. He sued the officer who made the arrest and the late Mr. Fox gave judgment against the police. But in an appeal the decision was reversed. The court held that the police arrested the man and it was not up to them to look after the car. A man accepts responsibility for his car left on the road after the police have arrested a drunk driver or if they have to move a car that is blocking traffic. So many things might happen in either event. If the car is left on the road and some one steals from it, the police can't accept responsibility. If the brakes slip we can't accept responsibility. If the man who owns the car is foolish enough to get drunk and be arrested it is his hard luck. If a car gives out it is a simple matter to get somebody to give him a push off the road but if the car is left where it is a menace to traffic the police have the right to move it or pay somebody to move it. We cannot accept responsibility and I am not prepared to accept an amendment to this law.

MR. HIGGINS: The Attorney General is referring to cars left on the road that may fall over a cliff or into a ditch. The point I made this afternoon is that when the police take over the control of a man's car and put it somewhere for safekeeping while in custody, if anything happens to that car through over-negligence on the part of the people in whose possession the car is, there should be some redress to the injured party.

MR. BROWNE: May I point out an ordinary case where the police make a search of property and seize goods under a Warrant and they bring them to the Police Station. The man goes to trial and the case against him is dismissed. He is acquitted and he

goes to look for his property, maybe jewellery or watches. It is not there. Who is responsible? The police have come in and taken it under authority. It leaves the way open for a great deal of abuse.

MR. CURTIS: But that is not in this section.

MR. BROWNE: But it is similar. The police take charge of property.

MR. CURTIS: They are forced to take a car.

MR. BROWNE: A man is punished by process of law but he should not have to suffer for someone else's negligence. Negligence is a wrong done to a person and if we can imagine various ways by which one person gets charge of another's property, there are many ways of doing that, and if he has charge of that property he is responsible for it while it is in his possession. This is a great departure from the ordinary law of the land. Where a person has property and if any one interferes with it he should be able to take action against him. It is all right for my honourable friend who represents St. John's East and may have many clients.

MR. HIGGINS: That is a monstrous thing to say.

MR. CURTIS: If people are going to get drunk in charge of cars and are going to get arrested, I do not want to accept responsibility for anything the police do. We are always very lenient and we would not stand on this thing but it is nice to have it there. We have acknowledged liabilities. We might hide behind it in a lot of cases but in a proper case we would not take advantage of this section. It is nice to have it there.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister feels he should get every protection for police officers, one hundred per cent. He says the Crown won't take advantage of this particular section. He may not always be Attorney General. "No action or any other legal proceeding," whatever that means. I suppose he can't even get possession of the car. No legal proceeding may be taken in respect of anything done under this section. I do not know what other legal proceeding is meant there. I suppose no prosecution either. Suppose the police officer should be under the influence of liquor when he takes the car, then he can't be prosecuted. That is not novel and it is not impossible. It is not beyond the realm of imagination.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me my learned friends on my right and left certainly have established a case. If I were to be the judge there, which I am not, I would say some little time had to be taken to consider it. The plea has been put up by my learned friends on my right and left that if damage happens to the car where the police leave it, it is too bad for the man who owns the car. The police take no responsibility. The car might have been taken to a dangerous place. It might be dangerous to park or house a car there and yet the Crown is not liable. The man may not even be drunk. He may not even commit a breach as regarding liquor but the police arrest him on a charge and they are allowed to take his car and put it where they like, maybe in a garage or the police garage which might burn down and this man has no right of action against the Crown. I think some saving clause might go in there.

MR. BROWNE: The tendency now in the widest jurisdiction in Can-

ada is to grant the citizen greater rights than he formerly possessed. He does not have to get a pass from the Attorney General to take action against the Crown. I would draw the attention of the House to provisions of the Alcoholic Liquors Act which are similar. Clauses 97 and 98 called the Protection of Officers:

97. When a tribunal before which a proceeding against an officer has taken place, for anything done by him under this Act, has certified that there was a probable cause for the action of the officer, and that it was not malicious, a verdict or judgment shall not be given against the officer for more than five cents damages, nor for any costs of suit.

98. Where in the course of prosecution under this Act, it appears that an officer has acted in good faith under the powers conferred by this Act, the magistrate shall, if requested so to do by the officer or on his behalf, give a certificate if the case be so that there was probable cause for the action of the officer and that it was not malicious.

I did cite an instance where the officer who is supposed to carry out this provision is himself committing an offense under this section. It is a hypothetical case but it might happen and in such a case should the officer get punished? If he did have an accident as a result of being intoxicated or driving carelessly he would be prosecuted by superior officers. Suppose he does damage while committing this offense should he not be liable?

MR. CURTIS: But the difficulty is to determine the condition of the car when it is left there. A man who

leaves his car on the road or is drunk in charge of the car when arrested, and when he is in the custody of the police something happens to the car and you will get a tremendous number of disputes as to what condition the car was in. I do not think the Crown, who are the people, should accept the liability of a car the condition of which is not made clear. I am a policeman and I go to a car and try to get it in. How do I know there is no water in the radiator and should not start the engine or I should not drive it because of some defect in the engine and I drive it and ruin, say a gear. We have to protect the people who are forced into this position. I could add to the end of it "In respect of anything done in gross negligence." A man could say, "Oh this car was wonderful when I left it there." It might be in the last stages of dilapidation. I do not know what to say.

MR. BROWNE: I would say "Unlawful." I would say if he commits a breach himself.

MR. HIGGINS: I would suggest the Honourable the Attorney General submit this sub-section to two draftsmen who might put it in a more acceptable way. If you refer back to Sub-section 2 of 72 (a) you will find the minister requires the right to get from the owner the cost of removal and detention of it. One would believe that it is going to be kept in some place where one might expect nothing would happen to it. I would suggest that the Attorney General put a better polish on that.

Item stand.

Clause 6 read:

6. Section 93 of the said Act, as amended by the Act No. 677 of 1953, is further amended as follows:

(a) By repealing subsection (1) and substituting therefor the following:

"(1) Subject to this Act, where bodily injury to, or the death of, any person or damage to property in an amount apparently exceeding one hundred dollars, results from an accident in which a motor vehicle is in any manner directly or indirectly involved, if the motor vehicle is, or is required to be, registered under this Act the Minister, after receipt of notice in writing of the accident, if he is satisfied from reports of the accident submitted to him that the owner or driver may be liable or responsible for the accident, may suspend the license of the driver and the license of every motor vehicle registered in the name of the owner and/or the driver but, notwithstanding anything in this Act, where the driver's license or car license of any person is suspended under this section that person may, upon notice in writing to the Minister, appear before a magistrate in the district in which the accident occurred—for a certificate that he is in no way liable or responsible for the accident and if the magistrate is satisfied that the person is not liable nor responsible for the accident he may give him a certificate to that effect, and the Minister shall on receipt of the certificate reinstate the driver's license or car license, or both, of that person."

(b) By inserting in subsection (4) immediately after the words and figures "pursuant to subsection (1)" the words "which has not been reinstated under that subsection."

MR. BROWNE: I take it that where a motor car is involved in an accident causing damage say, exceeding \$100.00 the Minister on receiving notice of the accident shall suspend license of the driver and license of every motor vehicle granted in the name of the owner. He has two cars and both are suspended and that person may give ten days notice to the Minister to come before the Magistrate and show he is innocent or a certificate that he is in no way liable or responsible for the accident. If an accident occurs while the House is in session, somebody's car is outside, a valuable car and someone runs into it and does some damage, the owner of both cars have their licenses suspended and an innocent man must go to the trouble of going before the magistrate ten days afterwards and during that time he has lost his license, although he is innocent.

MR. HIGGINS: Was this amendment drafted in the office of the Attorney General or the Minister of Public Works?

MR. SPENCER: The drafting of legislation is first prepared by officials of Public Works who handle that business and is then checked and put in legal form by the Department of the Attorney General. The clause to which my learned friend has referred and of which he has skipped a bit, its twofold really. The clause is to protect the innocent person. Whereas now under the Act that innocent person has no redress, and this particular clause was put in to give that person some redress to get out of the dilemma in which he gets. As to the hypothetical case which my learned and honourable friend has cited that is quite true. It has happened on the street and the person who

owns the other car, which we might term "A" for purposes of this section, might be at fault. The innocent gentleman in here might not be at fault, nevertheless under the law as it stood up to now, that car could be impounded as well. The honourable gentleman in referring to it did not clearly, I believe, point out that the only case where the license is suspended automatically is in the case of bodily injury or death. Subject to this Act where bodily injury to or the death of any person or bodily damage, it is to prevent the person from operating his vehicle after he might have been involved in an accident which may have caused bodily injury or death. The innocent person under the law would have his license suspended as well and he would have no redress but he would be given ten days to make an appearance before the magistrate and have himself reinstated. I am informed that it is generally being done elsewhere. We do not want to push anything through that is not satisfactory.

Clause stand.

Clauses 7 and 8 carried.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister has any explanation for sub-section (e)? It seems a very strange thing that an insurance company should back out of an insurance policy and let the unsatisfied judgment fund take over. I can't imagine how it could happen.

MR. HIGGINS: And might recover his payment. Would that cover, Mr. Chairman, the position where an insurance company pays a claim for its assured and subsequently under the subrogation clause recover it again from the guilty party. If that

is what it means I think it is a very wise application. I don't see why we should have an unsatisfied judgment fund to re-imburse insurance companies.

MR. SPENCER: I questioned that and asked for an explanation. It is to make sure that an insured person cannot obtain money from the unsatisfied judgment fund and so reimburse an insurance company. That is to enable the Minister of Finance where an order has been made directing the payment of moneys out of the fund to retain from such moneys and pay into the Exchequer Account the amount of any indebtedness by which the judgment creditor might be indebted to the Government. To give you a slightly clearer example of that, I can cite a case where a certain person was injured, went to hospital for a considerable period of time and received a judgment against the offending person to the extent of several thousands of dollars. In the meantime the hospital fees were due, and had assumed quite a sum for several months. I don't know the exact amount. Although the unsatisfied judgment fund had paid the amount then the Government department approached the insured and sought to collect their bill. The person said; I am sorry my money is all spent. That is an actual case that definitely happened right here within a few miles of the city of St. John's when a certain individual was injured, went to hospital and collected the amount from the unsatisfied judgment fund. Yet when the Department of Health endeavoured to obtain the amount to cover hospital expenses the individual said "I am sorry but my money is all spent," that is what (c) means.

MR. BROWNE: My impression of section (c) (ee) was that it was intended to provide, or to prevent rather, a case where a person who is insured with an insurance company and has collided with some other person whose insurance company now pays the injured party's damage. In other words John Smith is insured, we will say, with the XY Insurance Company. He is the aggrieved party and the insurance company pays him and then uses his name to sue the person who is responsible and recovers in his name. As I interpret this section this is to advise the Minister that the application although it is in the name of John Smith is really the XY Insurance Company. I think, if that is the case, the Minister is to be congratulated on it.

MR. CURTIS: It looks to me as if the section is to protect against insurance companies — have the insurance companies pay their bills.

MR. HIGGINS: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the section I wonder if the Minister would tell us how the idea of the unsatisfied judgment fund is working out, and how it stands today.

MR. SPENCER: From what I have learned from the records of the department it is working out very well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPENCER: Perhaps that is the briefest way to put it. We have been collecting a dollar a year from each person getting a license up to now. The collections, if I remember rightly, were of the order of \$60,000 during the past two years, about \$35,000 each year. The total amount paid out, I believe, is something less than

\$30,000 thus far. That is my understanding, speaking strictly from memory, something like \$30,000, unless I am very greatly mistaken.

MR. HIGGINS: I am very happy to hear that. I was under the impression—I know three or four maximum claims to have gone to the \$5,000 mark.

Carried.

Moved the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on this Bill.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act."

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder why it is that the Board of Liquor Control does not differentiate now between what is a club and what is a business establishment. Under the definition of club in the Alcoholic Liquors Act—I referred to this before, and I do it again—club means a co-operative society or association of persons which is the owner or lessee of an establishment used solely for the purpose of a social or athletic nature, but not for pecuniary gain and includes the premises occupied or used for any such purpose.

Now we have clubs here operated solely for pecuniary gain, so-called clubs. I submit this is illegal. I don't see how it is that the government can justify giving licenses to such institutions. The intention of the Act was obviously to give licenses only to associations of persons for objects of a social or athletic nature. Yet the government does not seem to be ashamed of it nor does it seem to pay any atten-



tion to it. Why is it that the government has persisted in doing this? Even in localities where people have protested and have petitioned the government to take a referendum or a plebiscite in the area, the government still ignores the petition and ignores the wishes of the people. I am referring to the locality of Kilbride and Mount Pearl where the people protested with all the strength in their power against the establishment of the "Old Mill." Is there a nigger in the woodpile? Is there somebody with influence in the government stronger than the wishes of the respectable people who live in that area who have put that petition in to the House?

I feel the Government should give an answer to that petition. What are they going to do about it? Are they going to have a plebiscite? I think they ought to give a definite answer. There is sufficient time gone for the government to have given it consideration, and they should know now what they are going to do about it, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could divert his attention from the interesting magazine he is reading and pay attention to the business of the House for a moment, and answer the question I have put before him, speaking on behalf of the people who signed that petition put into the government?

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I must say I support very strongly my honourable and learned colleague's objection. Again I would like to revert to the statement made by the Honourable the Premier yesterday in introducing this particular bill. He said, as I recall it at the time, it might be found necessary for the Board to differentiate between clubs and clubs,

or between hotels and hotels, and as I understand it, that there might be no reason at all why the Board of Liquor Control would refuse to allow the Bally Hally Golf and Country Club to stay open on Sunday or various clubs operated by the Canadian Legion; but that there might be very good reason why certain other clubs, recognized as such apparently by the Board, should be closed. Now that, I hope, Sir, is not going to be recognized as a principle for the Board to follow. Because you cannot have that situation obtain in this country while preaching democracy. It would mean preaching one thing and practising another. Either the law is to be applicable with equal fairness to everybody or it is not to be applicable at all. We can't make flesh of one and fish of another. Because a club may not have the amenities or constitution of, let us say, the golf club, is no reason why the golf club should be allowed to be open on Sunday and sell the same kinds of spirits as the club on Topsail Road does, which is not to be allowed to open. The principle, Sir, is wrong. I think we should be very careful before we go ahead with that idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall this clause carry?

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not going to be carried for a little while, if we can do it, until we get some clear-cut reply from the government as to what the intentions really are. The definition is given in the Alcoholics Liquors Act. It excludes the premises occupied or used for pecuniary purposes. Now we know, Sir, and I have looked up the registration of some of these so-called clubs and find that some of them not only can sell alcoholic liquors but

they can do all sorts of things in the particular building which is the club, a building is part of the club. Nobody can tell me, Sir, that a place like the "Old Mill" or "Picadilly" or some such place or other is not there for pecuniary gain. What is it there for? Just for the sociability and lots of it. There is also pecuniary gain in all these clubs. I happen to know the Bella Vista was taken over with a mortgage of \$20,000 and that was cleaned up, so that there must be some pecuniary gain for the people who own and operate such clubs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would remember, these matters are hardly relevant to this clause under consideration, which has to do with hours of opening of the clubs. I don't think the mortgage on Bella Vista is relevant.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I bow to your decision. The holder of licenses granted in respect of hotels, clubs, military messes. The word "club" is there. That is why it was raised by my honourable and learned friend. I think we should have some clear-cut explanation from the government as to just what they do mean by clubs. It is conceivable that there could be some clubs under this particular section, Sir, which are really clubs in name and in spirit. But there are clubs, so-called, which are not clubs at all. They are there operating for pecuniary gains made by the sale of alcoholic liquor. I think the objection raised by my honourable and learned friend should be taken cognizance of and some explanation should be given on the matter. You cannot simply, by by-passing that condition form clubs in every nook and corner of this island and then say they are not there for the purpose of

pecuniary gain but are only there for social purposes.—It is nonsense, absolute nonsense. I think the government is stretching its conscience in order to interpret the word club in the way they have done it. We would like to have some clear-cut explanation of the word "Club" there apart from what is in the Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, since nobody on the opposite side seems to be interested in the debate, I wish to direct my remarks to the attention of the Minister of Finance and ask him if he would put away his magazine he is reading with such interest. He is the one who is responsible for the administration of the Board of Liquor Control. We are dealing here now with a very serious and fundamental matter, the definition of the word "Club." I have stated that the government has given or allowed—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Any honourable gentleman dealing here with the definition of "Club" is clearly out of order. I don't think the definition of "Club" appears in this clause at all. Therefore the discussion of that definition is not in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must uphold that point of order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is meant by a "Club"? Does it mean an institution for pecuniary gain. The definition says it is not for pecuniary gain so how can we here permit them to carry on business for pecuniary gain?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—The clause in question is not that there shall be clubs. It is not to define clubs and

not to describe them. It is that clubs as well as other things, that is hotels, military messes, railways, steamships and the like shall under the conditions described here do thus and so, that is the principle of the clause. That has been adopted and is not now debatable. What is debatable is whether it shall be before or after 11:00 o'clock or before or after 9:00 o'clock, in the mornings, on week days, and then again what is debatable appears to me to be whether it shall be open on Sundays and holidays including Christmas Day and Good Friday, and under what terms and conditions. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, all else is out of order in the debate on this clause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed that out to the committee. The clause under consideration has to do with the opening of clubs on certain days and hours and does not deal with the definition of clubs.

MR. BROWNE: I am quite satisfied that arrangement is all right when applied to a bonafide club but as to non-bonafide clubs it does not apply to them at all, Sir. With regard to closing and opening surely it is fundamental whether a club should be in existence at all. We are dealing with the Alcoholic Liquors Act, and a petition had been put in to the government from a particular section and nobody on the government will give an answer as to what happened to that petition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is debatable is that whether it shall be open before or after eleven o'clock in the evenings or after nine o'clock in the morning on Wednesdays and whether they should be open Good Friday and other days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out that the section had to do with opening of clubs on certain days and hours.

MR. BROWNE: I am quite satisfied that an arrangement is all right if applied to bona fide clubs and if not then it does not apply at all. Regarding the time of opening and closing it is fundamental as to whether the club is in existence. A petition has been put in to the government for a plebiscite and nobody will give an answer as to what has happened to that petition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is out of order in discussing petitions. This clause does not cover the discussion of petitions. He cannot debate anything he likes regarding liquor. He is tied by Laws of the House and Parliamentary procedure to discuss the matters in Clause 3.

MR. BROWNE: I will be fit to be tied if this keeps on. Why do we not get an answer? The Minister of Finance reads a magazine.

MR. POWER: You are out of order. Is he out of order or not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is out of order.

MR. POWER: Then I will ask him to sit down or I will sit him down.

MR. BROWNE: Are we going to get an answer?

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Honourable Minister of Finance know to whom he has to address a question? I would point out he has to address it to Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER: I have sat here the most of the day listening to all kinds

of remarks and the like. Let us get on with some business.

Clause carried.

"An Act To Provide For The Regulation of Ferries Used In the Transportation of Persons and Property For Compensation."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read and carried.

Clause 5 (2) read.

(2) The board may at any time revise a tariff of tolls approved by it and after a revision an operator shall not change any toll except in accordance with the revised tariff.

MR. BROWNE: That is rather abrupt, is it not? The Board shall revise tolls at any time. Is there any provision for that as to how it is done. Who is in charge, the Attorney General? It seems an abrupt way to deal with the matter.

MR. CURTIS: It gives them the right. Obviously there will be a hearing.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any provision for the hearing? It seems to me that it does not cover the situation sufficiently. There should be some hearing. There is no provision for a hearing at all. Even under Clause 5 (1). The operator of a ferry puts in his tariff and they consider and let him know and after that they can change it any time. Should there not be provision for a hearing if necessary.

MR. CURTIS: Does it not say the Board shall at any time after a hearing revise the tariff? I wonder does not the current Act cover that?

MR. BROWNE: What section covers that?

MR. CURTIS: Section 248 and 249, Chapter 249.

Clause 5 stand.

Clause 6 read and carried.

Clause 7 read:

7. (1) Every person who contravenes any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine for the first offence not exceeding one hundred dollars and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one month, and for a second or subsequent offence within two years of the commission of the first offence, to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars and in default of payment to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months.

(2) Every fine collected under this Act shall be paid to the Department of the Attorney General and shall form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Attorney General can say whether the fees collected by the Board of Utilities—whether the amount collected is sufficient to pay for the operation of the Board.

MR. CURTIS: Generally yes, they just about balance. When the Board started, the government gave a small loan of \$20,000 and they paid back \$10,000 and they are ready to pay back the balance now.

Clause 7 carried.

Clause 8 read and carried.

Clause 9 read and carried.

Clause 10 read and carried.

Clause 11 read and carried.

Clause 12 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: There are two sides to it. The public may want lower rates or the Ferries may want higher rates.

MR. CURTIS: The practice of the Board has been to advertise it and set a day and hear counsel for both sides. That plan is properly covered by the regulations.

MR. BROWNE: Could we look through that before we take it up again.

Clause 5 carried.

"An Act Respecting Ministers To Administer Oaths."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. (1) The Lieutenant Governor in council may, on the recommendation of the Attorney General, appoint such persons, being British subjects, as he thinks necessary to administer oaths and take and receive affidavits, declarations and affirmations within Newfoundland.

(2) The persons appointed under (1) shall be styled commissioners for oaths in and for Newfoundland, and every such person shall write or stamp below his signature on every affidavit, declaration, affirmation or certificate made before or given by him the words "A Commissioner for Oaths in and for Newfoundland."

Clause carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. (1) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Attorney General, appoint such persons as he thinks necessary to administer oaths and take and receive affidavits, declarations and affirmations without Newfoundland for use in Newfoundland in or concern-

ing cause, matter or thing whether depending in any court in Newfoundland or in anywise concerning any of the proceedings in any court in Newfoundland or otherwise.

(2) The persons appointed under sub-section (1) shall be styled commissioners for oaths without Newfoundland, and every such person shall write or stamp below his signature on every affidavit, declaration, affirmation or certificate made before or given by him the words "A Commissioner for Oaths without Newfoundland."

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Attorney General can tell us if it is the intention of the Government to appoint many such officials?

MR. CURTIS: Only where such an application is so made.

MR. BROWNE: Any cases in mind at the present time?

MR. CURTIS: No, we thought it just as well to cover it while amending the Act.

Clause carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. Every barrister while he is entitled to practise in Newfoundland is a commissioner for oaths and may exercise, either within or without Newfoundland, the powers conferred by this Act and on every affidavit, declaration, affirmation or certificate made before or given by him under those powers he shall write or stamp below his signature the word "Barrister."

MR. BROWNE: I have just looked at the clause about the power, "A Barrister within or without Newfoundland may be a commissioner for oaths." I can understand, with all the necessary documents to be signed now

and barristers are often asked to sign documents, but outside of Newfoundland, it would not happen very often and it would not be very necessary for a barrister to do that. Why give such wide powers there?

MR. CURTIS: This Act is a draft of the Ontario Act. They give the right to barristers outside and we do not see why we should not. I do not anticipate it being used very much.

MR. BROWNE: Will these oaths be good for taking all sorts of documents in the Registration of Deeds and in the Supreme Court?

MR. CURTIS: They are acceptable in the Supreme Court.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To illustrate the effect this clause will have. If and when my honourable and learned friend should run again for the Federal seat and a miracle happens and he would get elected, and he would sit in the House of Commons at Ottawa as before, he would be a Commissioner for oaths under this Act and he could take oaths in Ottawa. Is not that worth working for?

Clause carried.

Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 read and carried.

Clause 12 read:

12. The provisions of this Act are in addition to and not in derogation of the provisions of any other Act.

MR. BROWNE: Can the Attorney General tell me whether this bill was submitted to the Law Society at any time?

MR. CURTIS: No, not to the Law Society but to the Judges of the Supreme Court.

MR. BROWNE: I asked about that a minute ago. What about the registration of deeds?

MR. CURTIS: It does not cover deaths.

MR. BROWNE: Would you read Chapter 141.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, it says: "This acknowledgement within the Province by Registry of Deeds or Judges of Supreme Courts and Commissioners of the Supreme Court and J.P.'s and magistrates or notary public." I would say this will not cover deeds for registration.

MR. BROWNE: A notary public oath is accepted in Supreme Court. You think it will be acceptable in Supreme Courts in matters of estates.

MR. CURTIS: It says so here. I would refer to Section 7.

7. (1) Every appointment made under subsection (1) of Section 2 or subsection (1) of Section 3 expires at the expiration of five years from the thirty-first day of December of the year in which it was made unless it is revoked at an earlier date.

(2) An appointment made under subsection (1) of Section 2 or subsection (1) of Section 3 may, on or before the date of its expiration, be renewed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council for a period of five years from the date of its expiration and a renewed appointment may in like manner be further renewed.

MR. CURTIS: I think that is an amendment we made last year.

MR. BROWNE: So they won't be eligible. Now you think they would be accepted in the Supreme Court as photographic evidence?



MR. CURTIS: The Act says so. "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the Attorney General appoint such persons as he thinks necessary to administer oaths and take and receive affidavits, declarations and affirmations without Newfoundland for use in Newfoundland in or concerning any cause, matter or thing whether depending in any court in Newfoundland in any wise concerning any of the proceedings in a court in Newfoundland or otherwise."

MR. BROWNE: That means outside Newfoundland—It is in Clause 2.

Clauses 12 and 13 carried.

Motion carried that the Committee report having passed this bill without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could tell us on what advice these amendments have been made and for what purposes?

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Chairman, the amendments are being made on the advice of the Director of Vessel Construction and Inspection of my Department, who is a Lloyds Surveyor and a naval architect in his own right, and an engineer in his own right. I doubt if there is anyone more qualified in Newfoundland at the moment to make such recommendations.

The purpose for which they are made I described yesterday. It is to give authority to continue paying the higher rate of bounties that were set down by the Commission of Govern-

ment in 1947, and to in future pay bounties on engines on the nominal horsepower instead of on the brake horsepower.

MR. HOLLETT: Is it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Harvey paid Holland, Denmark and other countries in Europe a visit last summer in connection with this very thing?

MR. KEOUGH: No.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would give us a statement as to how this would be worked out? It is not as complicated as it appears, obviously. Has he worked out this formula to see how the answer is arrived at?

MR. KEOUGH: I have not myself. But I have asked the Director of Vessel Construction to provide me with one. He provided me with the figures. The constant of an engine 6 cylinder  $\times$  6 multiplied by the constant of the engine would be  $36 \times 5 \times 6$  or 1080. I think that is right.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly we are not so clear.

MR. KEOUGH: The track is 9 inches. Divided by the number of cylinders which would be 6 plus 5, I think, divided into 1080 would give you the formula.

MR. HOLLETT: That is very clear, very explicit.

MR. KEOUGH: It is very clear to me too.

MR. HOLLETT: Some of the rest of us have taken the trouble to make some investigation on that. After all when we see a Bill like this and if we have the interest of the country at heart, naturally we have to take some little interest in it, and try to see what

it might mean to the next fisherman. I did take the trouble to find out what it meant. I think when the minister hears, and I think he has the interest of the fishermen at heart, I think when he hears he would like to hold this up to make further inquiries. Now, Sir, I had an investigation made to find out exactly what will happen under this particular formula. Take a 60 h.p. Buda Engine which is manufactured in the United States of America and under the old rate and Act, before being amended that engine could be \$900 or at the rate of \$15 per h.p. Under this proposed new rate here, the bounty rate under this schedule, the bounty will be \$1,080 a rate of \$17 per h.p. Now there is not much difference, I admit. In other words the bounty is increased from \$900 to \$1,080. Then take a 44 h.p. Kelvin manufactured in England. I believe under the old rate the bounty on that engine, under the Act would be \$660. Under this new amendment it will be \$700. In other words an increase of from \$14 a h.p. up to \$16 a h.p. Then I went across to Europe, to Norway and picked up a diesel engine, a Ratt. 29 h.p. manufactured, I believe, in Norway. Under the old Act the bounty on that engine—and incidentally these engines, I think, are something of the type of those which were used in the boats that were brought out here, the Icelandic boats—Under the old Act the bounty on that engine, 29 h.p. was \$435 and under the proposed bounty rate the bounty on that 29 h.p. would be \$821 or a rate of \$72.20 h.p. We took a 45 h.p. engine manufactured in Norway—The old rate \$675 and under this new rate as it worked out under this particular scheme was \$2800 or at the rate of \$62.20 per h.p.

Now, sir, I do not raise that point

at all with any view of upsetting the bill. I take it that everybody has the interest of those people who go down to the sea in ships at heart. But I thought it would be wise to let the honourable minister know that you are, by making that not simple but complicated amendment, giving engines from Norway and Sweden and such places an advantage over and above those engines manufactured in England and the United States of America, and giving the incentive to purchase engines from Norway and Sweden. Indeed, Sir, it would be so great that I fail to see how any Newfoundland fisherman would buy anything manufactured in England or in the United States or in our own land. I want to draw that to the Minister's attention. I would like the minister to take that into consideration and have it checked by his department before this particular section is passed. I don't think that is an unfair thing to request.

MR. KEOUGH: Well, Mr. Chairman, naturally in bringing this Bill into the House I have been guided by my technical staff. The reason they have given me for putting the section forward is that certain manufacturers of the engines today by sticking on extra gadgets like boosters are able to jack up the horsepower, etc., on brake horsepower and therefore can claim a greater bounty payment for the engines. To give something specific: We had an engine recently installed for a boat for bounty. It was, at the rating of nominal horsepower, the bounty on it would have been \$2,600 and rated on brake horsepower it was \$3,000. There will be some variations one way or the other, I understand from the inspector. He gave me three or four other instances here in the change over from brake horsepower to nominal horsepower. For in-

stance he said a six brake horsepower four cylinder, five inch diameter, 9 and 7 ins. engine on the old rate would be \$1,020 and on the new rate proposed would be \$1,000. For a 4 brake horsepower (2 cylinder, diameter 6 ins.—the old rate \$760 and the new rate \$700 and a 55 brake horsepower engine 4 cylinder 4½ ins. diameter—the old rate \$795 and the new rate \$800.

MR. BROWNE: How much for a 35 horsepower?

MR. KEOUGH: The old rate \$795 and the new rate \$800. I feel quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that my department has considered this matter pretty thoroughly, and I am afraid I must insist that it stand.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am only asking a reasonable request of the minister and he could bring in the result tomorrow. I merely asked him to check the figures and if he finds that I am wrong I am prepared to abide by it or by the decision of the House. If the chief inspector comes back to say that these figures are wrong then of course everything is all right. All I am asking is that this section stand over until the honourable minister can check them, that is all I am asking.

MR. KEOUGH: Not necessary, if the honourable gentleman would supply me with the information that he has. I will have it checked. I would like this to go through Committee of the Whole, and when I find out I will inform the honourable gentleman whether the inspector agrees or not with those figures, and I will ask for the Bill to be recommitted, on third reading of the Bill. That is if the inspector agrees with your figures. If there is cause for taking

what is suggested into consideration I will ask on third reading to have the Bill recommitted to Committee of the Whole. I am perfectly satisfied to do that.

MR. HOLLETT: It will come back to the Committee if you find these figures are wrong?

MR. KEOUGH: Not necessarily if they are wrong, but if there seems to be a reason on the basis of the figures for recommitting the Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: For instance, Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of the Bill may be to give a distinct reference to the type of engine which is manufactured in Scandinavia, which is a very massive thing of low grade power, low speed. That is not low speed through the water but low speed compared with high speed engines, the number of revolutions on speed horsepower, RPM with equal speed of the boat through water, with great power, great massiveness. One can almost hit them with a sledge hammer. They are very simple with very few parts compared with other types of engines. It may be a deliberate policy of introducing the use of that kind of engine. I am familiar with a very strong feeling in the Department of Fisheries that favours precisely that viewpoint. That is why the Minister is wise in wishing to refer back to his advisers before going ahead with it tonight, and before giving it the final reading.

Motion carried that the Committee report having passed this Bill without amendment.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to

Provide for the Regulation of Ferries used in the Transportation of Persons and Property For Compensation," without amendment.

Report received. On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act," without amendment.

Report received — On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed a Bill, "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths," without amendment.

Report received. On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act", without amendment.

Report received. On motion bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and made progress on a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act," and asks leave to sit again.

Report received. On motion committee ordered sit again.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred

and made progress on a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act", and asks leave to sit again.

Report received. Committee of the Whole ordered to sit again tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada":

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is meant there by the words " . . . shall carry out such other duties as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council assigns."

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, that is just a general clause which would perhaps enable the government to suggest a line which they might follow or pursue in addition to what they do themselves. The government might think that perhaps they might investigate a certain aspect of the situation. That is just to really authorize them to do that. It is just more or less a safeguard.

Clause carried.

Clauses 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read and carried.

MR. BROWNE: Speaking of the preamble to this important clause, this commission is to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance, if any, that may be required by the Province of Newfoundland to enable it to maintain and improve public services, I would include roads. I take it the transinsular or trans-Newfoundland road would be of great importance and that seems to me to be a public service of a high order and

I trust the government will do all it can this year to expedite work on that highway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is this in order?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to hear what the honourable gentleman was leading up to.

MR. BROWNE: Not very much except to say that this is the most important part of this bill. This is the purpose of this bill, appointing a Royal Commission to investigate the financial situation of the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was discussed and approved at second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: I might say something that is not in order. I anticipate being called to order. Whether I shall incur displeasure or not I am not sure. It speaks here of public services. I don't know whether public service would include a rate of pay by the government Department, but if it does I wonder would the Minister of Public Works care to comment on the fact that workmen on the public roads are getting not more than 60c. an hour?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think the honourable gentleman is as dense as that. I think he is pulling our legs and he knows he is out of order.

Report received.

MR. CURTIS: When the Committee on Supply last rose, through an omission, they did not ask leave to sit again and consequently it does not appear on the order paper. I would move with the consent of the House

that we go into Committee of Supply to deal with the Supplementary Supply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is that I now leave the Chair and Committee of Supply sit.

Motion carried. Committee of Supply; Mr. Courage in the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Is there a special grant for these amounts? Are these amounts in addition to the thirty-three million the other day. Is the sum one million included in the expenditure figure of thirty-three million given the other day.

MR. FOGWILL: Does that amount include the treasury bills issued by the loan boards?

MR. POWER: The object of this bill is to sweep up all these special warrants and these are all the warrants issued before. If you want to have an explanation of any of these amounts I will gladly do it. There was another amount paid to the Director of Manual Accounts and another amount paid to the War Office in England.

MR. BROWNE: These are matters arising out of the war?

MR. HOLLETT: Was there an order in council sought for that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: A warrant.

MR. HOLLETT: I have the others but I have no warrant for that. Would it be included in the other amounts?

MR. FOGWILL: Did I understand the Minister to say some of this was due to wrecks of vessels?

MR. POWER: No. I said in respect of merchant vessels. That was our liability at the time during the

war. Whatever vessels Newfoundland registered at the time. If they were registered in Newfoundland. This was a pre-Union liability.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And there will be little bills turning up for years to come arising out of transactions before Union.

Item 4 carried.

Item 6 read and carried.

Item 7 read.

MR. HOLLETT: There was special warrant issued for that of \$25,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes but that is to keep it up.

MR. HOLLETT: If the last government in Council knew so much that they could ask for \$25,000 and get it, surely they could put in for more than \$100 shown here. Is the \$25,000 used up?

MR. POWER: The cost was \$615, and that was the total vote.

MR. BROWNE: Would it include the new warden's house. This is an expense in connection with maintenance of the house.

Item stand.

Item 8.

MR. BROWNE: Will not the Minister give us some details? \$27,000 is a very substantial amount.

DR. ROWE: The Royal Commission on Agriculture has been in office since June last year, just a year. Two of the members receive salaries, the third does not receive a salary. The salaries are ten thousand and eight thousand for the two members for part of a year. Dean Shaw is being paid at the rate of \$8,000 a year. He

is not full time. Professor Drummond is the Chief Commissioner. He gets \$10,000. They have some technical men on their staff and they are travelling and this would account for the \$27,000. Dr. Carr is a member of the commission and I believe he gets about seven thousand a year. It could be eight thousand. They have had other help from time to time, short time help.

MR. BROWNE: Have you had an interim report from this committee at any time?

DR. ROWE: On special aspects we have had reports. The number of amendments we had have come in from either of the two commissions. We have not got reports to publish yet.

Item carried.

Item 9:

MR. HOLLETT: What I cannot understand is why the total vote? The Minister has told us what it is for. Why not put in the actual amount that has been paid out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The other amounts have been paid out of savings.

MR. HOLLETT: The Minister did not say that. We had the same vote with this object in view on the 18th day of March. Why put the cost in?

MR. BROWNE: The Leader of the Opposition referred to an Order in Council in March of \$200. Why was not this amount spent while \$42,500 has been spent. How is the amount passed by the legislature?

MR. POWER: That is the total vote.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the money is spent, hard cash that came into the



Treasury in the ordinary course of revenue over and above the necessities of that Department then under the Revenue and Audit Act, surplus in one account may be spent to meet expenses in another account in the same department. We have to have authority nevertheless. First we have to have a special warrant. Later when we come to the House we get Legislative authority for the same thing. Authority to spend for an item for which there was no vote. We get authority from the House.

MR. BROWNE: Why two, two hundred votes?

MR. POWER: Because the money was wanted for two different jobs.

MR. BROWNE: Are the jobs finished now?

MR. SPENCER: At the end of the year we have trouble in that area and it is never possible to estimate the amount required to take care of it. It can't be said to be a completed job. We may have another severe storm there and we could be called immediately to get out there and make some temporary repairs. This includes the one in Sandy Bay.

MR. BROWNE: You had an emergency in Lance au Loup? Where is Lance au Loup?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Down in the Straits.

Item carried.

Item 7:

MR. CURTIS: That represents expenditure we made on the proposed Warden's Home in Salmonier Prison Camp. It is to be large enough to accommodate six or eight wardens who live there for a week at a stretch and it was decided to build a new home

and the work will be done mostly by prisoners. This was just a normal vote. They will spend enough to put in a saw mill and get it operated in the Spring. We get the wood on the island and cut it there and I hope the prisoners will do most of the labour. So far we have spent \$615.

Item carried.

Item 10:

MR. POWER: The provision was for adjustment of salaries. The balance of the sum required under this vote in the budget speech was for construction of additional hospital accommodation.

Item carried.

Item 12:

MR. POWER: I think during the session last year while considering the estimates we increased the salaries for Managers and Assistant Managers and salesmen. While the House was in session last year, we increased the vote during the consideration of the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We increased the salaries without increasing the vote.

MR. HIGGINS: I remember the time. I raised it and the Minister undertook to see what could be done.

Item carried.

Item 13:

MR. BROWNE: What was the \$38,000 for?

MR. POWER: That was for printing.

MR. BROWNE: Have we any details for this amount? Will the Minister of Supply tell me what the details are?

MR. HEFFERTON: I don't know the details. Last year we drew up estimates based on advertising and printing for the year and it was reduced against our wishes. We found during the year our expenses were as anticipated and consequently we had to go for more money. All the printing required by the Government is done by the Department and must be done through our department, all the printing, all stationery, all advertising, everything, all the machinery of the Government must come to us in our department.

MR. BROWNE: And also goes to the Minister of Mines and Resources now?

DR. ROWE: That was last year.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the vote here for last year was increased by \$56,000 over the previous year. How could it be said to be very low—Well, if the estimates are printed properly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the previous year but the previous year to that again, surely.

MR. BROWNE: No the account for 1952-53 is \$177,256 a vote for printing, and there is one statutory and another of supply \$106,763, for 1952-53, an increase of \$44,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the estimate.

MR. BROWNE: Well then I take it the actual expenditure ran the figure up to \$188,000. But why? That is \$88,000 over the previous year. Were there so many needs of printing, stationery and office supplies last year.

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes, but the Honourable Minister of Finance in-

cluded advertising in that as well as stationery.

MR. POWER: Printing, stationery and office supplies.

MR. HEFFERTON: If advertising is included I think it is the same.

MR. BROWNE: It does not say anything about advertising.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the term "Printing."

MR. BROWNE: I noticed the vote for advertising in the estimates this year is only \$85,009. If it were so much behind last year why not increase it? Was printing, stationery and office supplies increased by \$57,000? The one for advertising has not increased. That is a substantial amount over the the estimate, over 25%.

MR. HEFFERTON: I can get the details tomorrow, but at the moment I cannot.

MR. BROWNE: Could we let that stand?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is agreed this item should stand.

Item 14—Fisheries & Co-operatives:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us where that \$900,000 was spent?

MR. KEOUGH: That was spent, Mr. Chairman, for the advance of \$1.50 per quintal for fishermen on the sale of codfish. \$75,000 was advanced to take care of expenses of the Fisheries Development Authority.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the Minister of Finance. In future if there were some sub-heads given to those

titles here it would save a lot of trouble and questions. We would know what they were without having to ask. The \$80,000, what is that?

MR. POWER: For loans to the fishing industry.

MR. BROWNE: The vote now is \$902,200, how is that made up?

MR. POWER: The \$902,200 is made up in amounts of \$20,400, \$80,800—The first one is for an experimental grant.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know if that is for a boat, that \$20,000.

MR. KEOUGH: I have an idea, from memory, that it was mostly for experimental fishery equipment supplied to firms for Danish seines and fishing equipment of that nature.

MR. BROWNE: Could you get that tomorrow? I am not asking to let it stand. I am asking for the information.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any information produced will have to be produced tomorrow. But we are not letting the items stand. We are here to vote them through. The honourable gentleman has 98% of the information and can't wait until tomorrow to get the 2%.

MR. BROWNE: The minister was going to tell me how that was made up.

MR. POWER: \$20,400 for experimental fishing and loans to fishermen, and \$850,000 was required for advances for fishermen.

Carried.

Economic Development: \$385,300.

MR. POWER: That is in respect of refund of interest actually paid by

industries assessed by the government and conforms with the policy, details of which have been placed before the House. Revision \$385,300. The Gypsum Plant with a total vote of \$100,000, which has been provided, required \$498,000 of which \$92,000 was provided in supplementary supply, the balance was from savings in the department. The additional amount for the Atlantic Hardboards, \$156,000 proved to be inadequate by \$243,500, and \$100,000 of this was provided under savings.

MR. HOLLETT: The total amount of all these items is \$385,300.

MR. POWER: No, the total amount required including the amount paid out in countervailing savings.

MR. BROWNE: Take one plant at a time—Take the Gypsum Plant. That was \$498,000 was it not?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: What was that for,

MR. POWER: That was for working capital.

MR. BROWNE: Working capital for what?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To work with.

MR. BROWNE: Do you mean to say the industries had not any cash on hand. That is quite a large amount of money and not the first grant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Total five hundred thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: How much did they have before this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five hundred thousand less this amount.

MR. BROWNE: This is not the first amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the first.

amount is all of this less that, or all of \$500,000 less the amount.

MR. BROWNE: Does the minister mean to say that the Gypsum plant did not get any previous grant of working capital apart from this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They got it, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: And the year before?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The year before I think a very little, yes. Five hundred thousand dollars has been paid to them in working capital.

MR. POWER: The \$92,000 is coming out of countervailing savings, the rest out of this. The total amount for that industry is \$490,000, or the total voted on Economic Development \$385,000 of this \$498,000, \$92,000 is asked for and is part of this \$385,300. The rest came from countervailing savings in the Department of Economic Development.

MR. BROWNE: What mostly was it saved on?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will read the list, if he has last year's estimates there, I think probably it came out of the vote for the textile mill. I think a vote of half a million dollars was spent for that purpose and this came from countervailing savings.

MR. BROWNE: There was \$2,561,000 estimated last year. I don't know what the exact picture was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't remember the actual figures.

MR. HOLLETT: I think I can tell you. This is the gypsum plant

you are on now. There was \$160,000 voted for the coming year. That is correct, is it not?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Over and above the five hundred thousand you had to pay last year. Is this included in the Special Warrant of February 10, 1954 for \$300,000 in favour of the Department of Economic Development covering expenditure on new industries? That was a vote for \$498,000 and the balance came from countervailing savings and you did not have to vote it again.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where the savings were made.

MR. POWER: On the textile vote. You will see textile had a large amount over.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister will explain. The total vote for the Department of Economic Development was \$2,581,300. Now that was overspent, was it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: I have the figures here for expenditure. There was a total expenditure of over \$2,800,000.

MR. POWER: That would not have any effect on this. The money must have been there. We took it for this purpose. If we had this amount available in this vote at that time and later on the whole vote was overspent that has no effect on that transaction because if we had the money available then the vote was not overspent.

MR. BROWNE: Where did you get the money then for this?

MR. POWER: At the time this money was paid to the gypsum plant

the vote for economic development was then not overspent.

MR. BROWNE: Where did you get the money to overdraw, or is it overdrawn by \$300,000?

MR. HOLLETT: The Special Warrant on February 10, 1954, under authority of Section 37, authorized an amount of \$300,00 in favour of Economic Development to increased expenditure on certain new industries. That, I gather from the honourable minister, is what you could not get from countervailing savings for that particular plant, or for that particular purpose. You took it from this order here, this special warrant.

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. HOLLETT: I also understand some of this money under this special warrant went to refund interest payments which some of the firms had made.

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Not all firms that paid interest last year, on account of their indebtedness to this government, had these amounts returned to them. Is that right?

MR. POWER: The amount is \$193,300.

MR. HOLLETT: And all the interest that was paid last year and the year before and up to date on all the new industries was \$193,300?

MR. POWER: That excluded the return of interest due from the cement mill. That was covered under another minute.

MR. HOLLETT: That is right. I have that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, referring to the statement of the Prem-

ier that \$498,000 was all the working capital which the company had since the beginning; in the Auditor General's report for 1952-53 he says that in addition to the cost of the plant \$400,000 in advances were made for working capital. Do I understand then that only another \$100,000 has been advanced as working capital?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know the whole total amount advanced as working capital was \$500,000.

MR. BROWNE: Can anyone tell us how much was spent on the gypsum plant for 1953-54?

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I think I could explain that. 1953-54 is what I am supposed to do at the moment and not going to 1952-53. That is something else again. Expenditure in 1952-53 has nothing to do with 1953-54. Legislative authority has already been passed for it. I am asking for \$385,300 under this sub-head. The actual money paid out to the Gypsum Plant was \$498,000.

MR. BROWNE: When?

MR. POWER: In 1953-54. Then we covered that from countervailing savings with the exception of \$92,000 included in this \$385,300.

MR. BROWNE: In other words there was \$406,000 paid out of countervailing savings and \$92,000 as a special warrant, which you are going to recover now.

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Well, then \$498,000 was the loss on the gypsum plant for 1953-54?

MR. POWER: Not necessarily. That was working capital, and some of that may be covered by inventory.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know what their position is at the present time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have a lot of their capital tied up. They must necessarily always have a very large amount tied up. In fact the great bulk of their working capital so long as it remains at the figure of \$500,000 must be tied up in the form of oil. For instance they have three large oil tanks, or whatever you call them. They bring in a shipload at a time, and small tanker loads at a time. Then they have stocks for which labour has been paid and raw material for which large amounts have been paid and operating expenses have been paid. That represents working capital tied up in the form of actual inventory. At this moment they have between three and four million feet of board in inventory in the warehouse for the market. So that at any given moment virtually all of their half million covering working capital is tied up in the forms I have suggested.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, is the minister of Economic Development able to give us any kind of a statement. I mean a very general statement, or any figures that we can examine. After all this is the one that can be called a public corporation. Now should we not have some more information about that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will be very glad. If I had known about it a day or two ago that we would be debating this I would have had the information here tonight. But I will bring in the information.

MR. BROWNE: This, I believe is the only opportunity we will get to talk about this one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. It can

be talked about before this legislation is final. I can table it as a public statement at the opening of the House tomorrow or the next day, explaining pretty thoroughly the breakdown of these amounts.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, how much interest has been returned, \$193,000?

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: That was returned to all of them? Can you give a breakdown of how that is made up?

MR. POWER: No, I can't.

MR. BROWNE: Which of them have paid interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The tanneries, cement plant, the first interest payment by CMIC, I think, had been paid, and that was returned. I think only three had actually paid or were due to pay it.

MR. BROWNE: Was the cement plant one?

MR. SMALLWOOD: North Star Cement; Newfoundland Tanneries, William Dorn Limited; and these are the only ones, I think, with the exception of United Cotton Mills who have paid and I believe Atlantic Films had paid a couple of thousand dollars—I believe that was repaid.

MR. BROWNE: There is a balance here of \$100,000. Who gets that?

MR. POWER: So far I have asked for \$193,300 and \$92,000. Then the provision for Atlantic Hardboards also proved to be inadequate by \$245,000. A hundred thousand of that amount is provided under the bill now before the House. So that if \$100,000 is added to the amount that is it so far.



MR. BROWNE: What is this for, the hardboard plant now, working capital?

MR. POWER: It is not working capital.

MR. BROWNE: It is another loan covered in another Bill?

MR. POWER: I am asking for \$100,000 out of this amount.

MR. BROWNE: That will leave altogether how much?

MR. POWER: \$243,156 of that \$399,000. Some of that is for working capital. But most of it went to build a huge warehouse that was necessary and also to build a staff house, etc.

MR. BROWNE: I understood this supplementary supply was to supplement the vote that went through last year. The vote was \$2,561,000, and that is short by \$300,000. How was that made up?

MR. POWER: You can't get at it like that.

MR. BROWNE: The whole vote.

MR. POWER: There was a special warrant for \$300,000.

MR. BROWNE: And you look for \$385,000 now. Therefore the figures which you gave me cannot be correct. Here is what I am talking about. The figures you made your budget on are here, \$2,561,000 and I now show you figures that bring it up to \$2,860,000.

MR. POWER: You suggest I submit something that I do not know is correct?

MR. BROWNE: I am sorry if I suggest too much. I have here the figures you gave today in which you said, for the month of March \$220,000 spent for Department of Econ-

omic Development and for the previous eleven months \$2,667,000. That makes nearly \$2,900,000 and the vote was \$2,561,000. There is a difference of \$340,000 between the estimate and the actual expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What has that got to do with the budget? The budget figures tell what was spent, not what was estimated and what was spent and the difference between the two.

MR. BROWNE: This \$385,000, is that an addition?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. All this supplementary supply is taken into account in the budget.

MR. BROWNE: Should not the figures add up to that? That is the annual grant. If I add \$385,000 to it do I get the annual expenditure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pretty well.

MR. BROWNE: There must be money outstanding. Is there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is meant by that?

MR. BROWNE: Expenditure for March is \$220,000 which added to this gives me \$2,900,000. The vote was \$2,561,000, short by \$340,000. Subtract \$2,561,000 from \$2,900,000. This \$385,000, is that in addition to the \$2,900,000? Does the \$2,900,000 include this \$385,000?

MR. POWER: Obviously, yes.

MR. BROWNE: You had voted \$2,561,000. You did not spend that \$385,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not all the \$2,561,000 was in fact spent on the things for which it was voted by the House. It was spent but not on identically the same things. It was spent,

and more was spent, but not on the things named in the estimates. Not on the things for which they were voted.

MR. BROWNE: How much was spent in the Department of Economic Development last year?

MR. POWER: There was a vote plus a warrant.

MR. BROWNE: Was this \$385,000 spent?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Was it added to the grant last year?

MR. POWER: Obviously.

MR. HOLLETT: You might have underspent on some items?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not looking for the \$385,000. We have spent it and we look for authority to spend it, and now ask the House for that authority.

MR. BROWNE: Should not the grant voted by the House last year plus the Supplementary Supply keep within the expenditure for the Department of Economic Development?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not necessarily.

MR. FOGWILL: The actual vote was \$355,000 not \$385,000. In March you got \$220,000 and the estimate for the year was \$2,561,000. On this vote \$385,000, that is Capital Account Expenditure. I notice in the Current Account Expenditure, the total estimated amount is \$170,300 and at the end of February they had spent \$145,683 plus what they spent in March \$220,897 on current account, a total of \$366,000. I would like to ask the Minister was there any special war-

rant for this additional expenditure? This leaves an over expenditure of \$195,000 or \$196,000. It says so in the various details in the answer we got today on Current Account for the month of March and the month of April to 1953-54 that was spent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not over spent. Over spent on what?

MR. FOGWILL: On current account if these figures are correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sounds very odd.

MR. FOGWILL: It seems fishy to me. The actual expenditure the previous year was \$154,000 and this year \$170,000. Is the \$385,000 capital account?

MR. POWER: That does not say it was an over spending.

MR. BROWNE: It must be because the vote was only \$170,000.

MR. FOGWILL: The answer to this question was—statement of current and capital expenditure for March 1954 including revenue and expenditure for April under Economic Development—was \$220,897.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Statement of Current and Capital Revenues and Expenditure. Current and Capital.

MR. FOGWILL: Current is left at \$50,000. I would like to point out also we already got an answer sometime ago that this Department did spend on Current Account up to the end of February \$145,683.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that answer is in error.

MR. BROWNE: I would say it should be the other way around.

MR. HIGGINS: It says for the month of March. Two sets of col-

umns could be transposed in some way.

MR. POWER: This includes the \$170,000.

MR. FOGWILL: The Minister means the \$220,000 listed here has been spent since.

MR. POWER: I did not say that. This Current Account means Current and Capital Expenditure including revenue and expenditure. This must be wrong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Obviously it must be wrong. I have here in front of me the expenditure of my department for last year. I have not got the total but I have checked the estimates for the current year we have passed with the expenditures for last year and they are not totalled up. The expenditures are nearly all below the estimates. There could not be an over expenditure. I would be happy to give it to you tomorrow. The money is spent. We are only seeking authority for it. It makes no essential difference. The House is entitled to the information and I guarantee to bring it.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to see it tied in, an explanation.

MR. HOLLETT: One point I would like the Minister to make some statement on, I think a statement has been made before. I am referring to the Special Warrant in which the Minister of Economic Development says he hereby requests the amount of \$200,000 to permit his Department to make payments for certain new industries with payment to be deferred and to continue it to operate its existing service for 1954. Would the Minister tell us how this fits in here with this, "In order to permit my Department

to make payments without certain interference." Why should it be done and how should it interfere with the government's economic industries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It might have crippled the industry. To have paid the interest might have crippled the industry.

MR. HOLLETT: But they have paid it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And they might cripple it. They might be reduced in working capital to where they were crippled.

MR. HOLLETT: You paid no interest. Did you give them back any amounts?

MR. POWER: We did not pay any interest until there was a return.

MR. HOLLETT: If they had to make a payment of interest in two years time, this might be a hardship.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it gives them two years longer to get on their feet.

MR. POWER: I have explained the two hundred thousand. The other amount is an entirely different matter.

MR. BROWNE: You added the grants to your supplementary supply to get your total expenditure for the year, but if you do that you do not get your total expenditure. These figures here were given in reply to question.

MR. POWER: We might have them tomorrow. It would be a good idea to have them in more detail. \$92,000 is the amount, we got it by special warrant.

MR. BROWNE: Where did you get it?

MR. POWER: We got it from the Bank.

MR. BROWNE: Then you had to borrow it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Supposing we did. It is already paid. It is already paid. Whether we had the funds lying around or whether we got it from the bank, we now ask the Government to confirm it.

MR. BROWNE: It might have been borrowed from the bank.

MR. POWER: We might have been in credit at the bank a couple of million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Department of Economic Development might have been in credit at the bank.

MR. POWER: \$193,300 in respect to refund of interest to the new industry. \$92,000 is part of \$498,000 we paid to the Gypsum Plant. \$100,000 is part of the payment we made to Atlantic Products.

Item carried.

Item 13:

MR. HEFFERTON: During the year we also put in extra equipment in the Health Department. We had a heavy printing bill and there were several new offices during the year. We put in a rotary machine.

MR. BROWNE: Is the rotary machine all they had during the year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the Government paid for by Supply.

Item carried.

Committee rose. Report received.

Bill read a first time, ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that

the House adjourn to sit again at eleven o'clock tomorrow. With regard to the undertaking I gave tonight to give information on Gypsum Plant and regarding the spending in the Department of Economic Development which I believe is shown erroneously, I will get the information tomorrow and it may be a day or two before I get it, but I will get it before the House adjourns.

MR. HOLLETT: Will you give us information as to whether there will be an election this year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not do that. It would be better for them not to know when there is an election so they will pull up their socks.

House adjourned 12 midnight.

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1954

The House met at 11:00 of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

MR. DROVER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Coachman's Cove, White Bay, requesting that a snowmobile be supplied. We now have a link between Coachman's Cove and Baie Verte there that will be made passable for motor vehicles so that in stormy weather it will be possible to get into Baie Verte and Fleur De Lys for medical assistance. In the early spring and later fall that is almost impossible, especially when the coast is blocked by ice. The petition, Sir, is signed by 151 voters and I heartily support their request. This is not the first request which comes from that section of the coast. That section of the coast is very isolated and not only are the people clamouring for communica-

tions from Coachman's Cove and Fleur De Lys but also have asked for a connection from central Baie Verte to the Trans Canada Highway, which is only a distance of twenty-one miles.

I have much pleasure, Sir, in supporting this petition and ask leave to have it tabled in the House and forwarded to the department concerned.

#### **Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees**

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 4th annual report of the Fisheries Loan Board and the Co-operative Loan Board for the financial year ending March 31, 1954. In each case I believe according to law, I should have tabled them before this time, but they only yesterday came to my desk and so I did not see them until this morning. I may say the reports were forwarded to me under a covering letter from the chairman to the effect that he was delayed in submitting these reports due to the fact that he had to wait on the auditor to finish statement attached to them. I must ask pardon of the House for the delay, but I am afraid it was unavoidable.

#### **Giving Notice of Motion**

None.

#### **Giving Notice of Question**

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): To ask the Honourable the Minister of Economic Development to lay on the table of the House a report from the Department of Finance and Auditor General on the following:

(1) On all transactions between the Government or any of the Government Departments and the firm of W. J.

Lundrigan Ltd. as to the purchase of cement, showing the number of bags, the prices charged, and the total amounts charged for each listed amount of cement appearing in the various invoices on the following Accounts:

(a) Cement Plant Construction.

(b) Gypsum Plant Construction.

(2) An itemized account of W. J. Lundrigan's claim for the sum of \$177,123.54 as final claim, and also a similar account of another final claim for \$53,468.68 dated 25/8/52.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Premier has had a chance to remember the copy of the second agreement with Chester Dawe, I mentioned yesterday?

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): I have a chance to remember, but unfortunately no chance to do anything about it. We did not adjourn until midnight yesterday. The Cabinet was in session until half a minute before coming into the Chamber at 11:00 o'clock so that I did not have any opportunity before lunch time.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask the Minister for Provincial Affairs (I believe he is the one who looks after the matter) if he could explain in reference to a petition for a plebescite for Mount Pearl-Kilbride area.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): The petition was laid before the Cabinet. I think the receipt was acknowledged—was it not?

MR. BROWNE: What I want to know is whether they are to hold a plebescite or not?

MR. MURRAY: It is under consideration.

MR. BROWNE: Well, when can we expect a definite answer?

MR. MURRAY: If there is a meeting of the Cabinet before the House adjourns I will undertake to bring it before the Cabinet. That is as much as I can undertake to do.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the Premier is in a position to say?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I am not in a position to say. It might be considered within the next six months, then again it might not.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could say whether or not it is the intention to present to the House a petition from Burin whether or not there is to be a sale of alcoholic liquor in that area? The Minister is not present.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What Minister?

MR. HOLLETT: The member for Burin District. I think he is the Minister of Health.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps it would be a good idea if the honourable gentleman were to ask the Minister concerned. He is not in the Chamber. He was at the Cabinet meeting up until 11.00 a.m. I imagine he is doing some departmental business on the telephone. When he comes in later today perhaps the honourable gentleman would ask him.

### Orders of The Day

#### Third Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may the members say anything on third reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Except to move to send it back to Committee of the Whole.

MR. BROWNE: This third —

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker to a point of order. My understanding of Your Honour's ruling is that no debate may take place but only that a motion may be made and made without debate. Is that my understanding?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is the Bill be now read a third time, to which an amendment may be offered that it may be read a third time six months hence. There is no debate on that. Or on another amendment that the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House. The honourable member may state the amendment he proposes.

MR. BROWNE: Is it debatable?

MR. SPEAKER: I doubt if you can debate it.

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada".

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation":

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General promised to answer a question as to the powers of the Board under the regulations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speak-



er, if the House is agreeable we might defer this third reading until later today. I ask that so that the Attorney General may furnish the honourable member opposite with the information he promised.

On motion ordered deferred until a later hour this day.

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths":

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

#### First Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952":

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act":

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953":

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act":

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas":

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

#### Second Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act":

HON. I. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that is designed to amend and to make workable the Social Security Assessment Act which has been found in practice to be defective in some particulars and on that account the enforcement is made more difficult.

It will be noted that the first paragraph is an amendment of Paragraph (k) of Section 2 dealing with the question of interpretation. This amendment is to provide that interest and other charges involved in financial instalments for a purchase are not to be subject to assessment if those charges are additional to the ordinary retail price of the property purchased. For example, if in respect to the purchase of a car priced at two thousand dollars, for cash or instalment payment, the assessment should be on that two thousand dollars and should exclude the additional costs of interest etc. which would enter into the cost of financing the purchase of the property on the instalment plan. I think the House will agree that is proper.

Clause 2, on the other hand, affords an avenue which would permit retailers to break down the ordinary price for buying some separate item which might arise prior to the retail transaction for the purpose of reducing the amount of the assessment.

For example: A washing machine is priced at \$200, and a vendor undertakes the instalments at no additional charge or the servicing for a period. The assessment then should be upon the \$200 and no deductions would be allowed as a proportion of the figure which might have been intended to cover the labour of car-

ing for or for the installation, whether or not the vendor did install the machine or find the servicing.

This clause provided for the exemption of assessment in respect of installations or supervisory charges which are additional to the ordinary price, and which are shown as separate items in the invoice, but it disallows any deduction from the ordinary price because of the element of cost to cover installations or servicing which is included in the ordinary price to be paid by the purchaser whether or not he avails of this service.

For example: A machine is ordinarily priced at \$200 and the sale is made on the basis of \$200, plus cost of installation. The vendor's invoice shows \$200 as one item and several items of expenditure for installations and servicing. The assessment then shall be upon the \$200. If the invoice were to read \$256 installed then the assessment would be upon the \$256. This provision for exemption in respect of installation is also intended to be applicable to cost of labour for servicing and the supervision and technicalities in the case of construction and engineering projects.

Clause 3 is amended by adding the following as (1A): "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act every purchaser who turns in to the vendor as part payment of the purchase price of tangible personal property any other tangible personal property on which he has paid an assessment under this Act, shall pay an assessment only on the difference between the purchase price of the property he is purchasing and the value placed on the property turned in."

Clause 4 provides that municipal tax will be added and that an assess-

ment will be upon the total cost to the consumer: Example: The tax of one cent per gallon on fuel oil in St. John's will be added to the purchase price, and the assessment will be calculated on the total cost to the consumer. So that it is very clear, I think, from what has been said that municipal taxes are being added. The original Act included charges for servicing etc., but now these are being excluded. I think that is in the interest of the consumer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you read the original Act, you will find that if you bought a motor car and turned in your last year's car you are strictly liable for a sales tax on the entire price of the car. But that has not been the practice in operation. In operation the Department has allowed credit for a car that was traded in provided that car had paid the assessment put on it. On the other hand if the car traded in was a car that was bought prior to the SSA Act coming into force then there was no credit given for it. I think that is clear. In other words Section 3 is to legitimize what has been done in the past. In other words, if you traded in a car which had paid the assessment you only paid the assessment on the difference between the new price and the value of what was turned in. That covers not only motor cars but washing machines and other items traded in.

Section 4 is just a change, Mr. Speaker, which throws on the purchaser the responsibility for getting a copy of a certificate issued by the Deputy Minister to the vendor to the effect that all assessments collected or owed have been received, rather than on the person who sells. That is just an administrative difference.

MR. BROWNE: Would you illustrate it?

MR. CURTIS: Well, I can illustrate it, I think: The existing provisions of Section 5 require in effect that the Deputy Minister must issue a certificate to a vendor before that vendor may proceed to consummate a sale. It is now intended to provide that a person wishing to make a purchase in bulk will incur responsibility for the assessment due and payable and not remitted by the vendor, unless he obtains from the vendor a copy of the certificate from the Deputy Minister to the vendor setting forth all assessments due and payable by that vendor had been received by the department. It just throws the onus on the purchaser to see that the vendor has the authority to make the bulk sale, rather than throwing it on the vendor to get it. Actually the vendor must go to the department in the case of a bulk sale and get authority to sell. Now the responsibility is on the purchaser to see that is done before he buys. I think that is clear enough.

MR. BROWNE: He has to go to the Deputy Minister and get a certificate before he buys?

MR. CURTIS: He is liable to pay it unless he secures from the vendor a certificate from the Deputy Minister allowing the vendor to make that bulk sale. It just shifts the onus to the purchaser.

Now in paragraph 5—the amendments to Section 5 which is an amendment of Section 6 of the original Act, changes two hundred tons to three hundred tons with a view to bringing it into alignment with paragraph (g) and delete the qualifications—for human consumption. “Boats, etc. used in catching and processing fish for human consumption”—those words are being dropped—“For human con-

sumption.” That is to include larger boats.

Section (d) is amended by providing that orthopaedic appliances don't need a certificate from a doctor to become tax free or SSA free. Actually a man goes in to buy a cork leg—I don't see why he should need a certificate from a doctor to say he needs one. It should be sufficiently obvious that he does. So that sub-paragraph is being amended to show that you do not need to have a prescription to get an orthopaedic appliance without paying the tax.

Section (f) Tangible personal property shipped by the seller for delivery outside Newfoundland, including ship's stores delivered to commercial vessels that normally operate in extra-territorial waters. Suppose a man from Sydney bought something in Newfoundland and it is shipped by one of our vessels, there is no sales tax payable if it is shipped from Newfoundland to Sydney, even if the vessel is under five hundred tons.

Prepared meals: Tangible personal property sold at a price of less than 17c. Prepared meals consumed on the premises when sold at a price less than 17c. Originally the Act said 15c., but 17c. divides up properly. The assessment is 3% and there is one cent payable on an assessment of 17c. instead of on 15c. I think that is clear. Now on prepared meals the original Act provided that the assessment would not apply on prepared meals sold at a price of less than 51c. That is now being made 17c. to equalize the tax paid or the assessment paid by private citizens in their own homes.

The next amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to Section 10—“Every vendor who fails to make returns to the Deputy Minister or to keep records in the

form and substance from time to time prescribed by the regulations is guilty of an offence."

The present Act says that every vendor who fails to make returns and to keep records—so you had to have both to get a conviction. You had to prove that a defendant both failed to make returns and to keep records. Now it is either. Anybody who fails to make returns or to keep records. The only change is to change the "and" to "or."

Section 20: "Before taking any proceedings for the recovery of any assessments that are due and payable under this Act or that have been collected on behalf of Her Majesty, the Deputy Minister may give notice to the assessment payer or collector of his intention to enforce payment, but failure to give notice in any case does not affect the validity of any proceedings taken for the recovery of assessments or moneys collected as assessments under this Act."

Under the original section the Deputy Minister had to give notice. This makes it "may" because in any event the failure to give notice did not affect the validity of the proceedings.

Section 25 is an improvement: That is purely an administrative amendment. The over assessment of property which includes the amount of the property involved is an offence. Under Clause 9, an amendment to Section 26 is to provide in effect for inspection.

Section 29 deals with penalty and interest upon any amount collected under this Act at the rate of one half per centum per month from the date that the amount should have been remitted to the Deputy Minister. The object of this amendment is to save taking every person to court. It is a provision that is adopted from the

former Newfoundland Income Tax Act, which gave the assessor of that day the right to impose penalties and to charge interest under the Act. Under the Act as presently drafted, that can only be done by a court, which means there is a lot of publicity and notoriety in a case where a fine could be levied. But provisions have been made, Mr. Speaker, for an appeal and Section 13 of the amendment provides for an appeal from the Deputy Minister to the Minister and from the Minister to a Judge of the District Court or a Judge of the Supreme Court. Interests of the vendor are safeguarded, and he can appeal if he does not agree that the assessment made by the Deputy Minister is equitable. At the same time by having the Deputy Minister able to make the fines and charge the interest, which he could do under Section 10 or 11 and again under Section 12, and thus avoid a lot of publicity—but if the vendor or guilty party wants an appeal and wants the publicity he can have it.

The last clause, Mr. Speaker, remedies what we have found the most difficult of all, that is the fact that under the Summary Jurisdiction Act prosecutions for any offence had to be taken within one year. When we started to collect we found that if a man had not paid any returns for two years we could only prosecute for the last year and could not for the first year. The effect of this section is to take away that clause and provide that proceedings may be instituted at any time. This is a necessary amendment, Mr. Speaker, to put teeth into the Act. I am sure the House will agree that if some people are going to pay this assessment all people should pay it, and if some people are escaping they should not be al-

lowed to continue to escape. For these reasons this amendment puts teeth into the Act and makes it possible to enforce it.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, this House will appreciate how difficult it is to give proper consideration to important legislation of this kind of thing under the circumstances under which we are working, coming here morning, noon and night. There is not very much time left to consider a Bill, which in my opinion should have been brought in earlier in the session so that we could get time to compare it in detail.

I am grateful to the Attorney General for the detailed explanation which he has given. But some of the provisions in the Bill are important and need serious consideration and the general extension of this sales tax to certain articles such as food and other necessities of life requires, I think, consideration by the whole House. This Bill is bringing in the bulk of the revenue which the Government gets through taxation, and each year, it seems to me, the Government is enlarging the scope of the Act.

Now one of the provisions that the Attorney General referred to was the question of the prepared meals consumed on the premises. Formerly the application was to meals of less than 51c. and now all meals in between 51c. and 17c. are included in the tax. That, of course, is going to bring in a great deal more revenue, because anyone who goes into a restaurant, if he buys a cup of coffee and toast and pays twenty cents and he is covered here now. I am not so much concerned about the meals consumed

in restaurants as I am concerned about the food. Every article of food is taxable, except, I believe—I don't see any articles of food here—but I know flour and pork and beef were, or just milk and flour—but they don't seem to be exempt under this section. Perhaps the Minister can inform me how that exemption is made. But people live on more than flour, pork and milk. I believe it was through a liberal interpretation by those responsible for carrying out the Act that tinned milk was excluded from the provisions, but that in the Act itself or in whatever regulations milk was mentioned, tinned milk was not referred to especially.

MR. CURTIS: Tinned milk is milk, is it not?

MR. BROWNE: Tinned milk is the most important article of food, and tinned milk is the form in which milk is most generally consumed.

Now I appreciate the regulation regarding the exemption of servicing and insurance, etc., on the purchase price of an article sold on the instalment plan. That is only fair. When we consider the tax that is put on by the municipality as again being taxable. The Municipality of St. John's say, puts on a cent a gallon on oil that is delivered to the householder then the Government comes along and puts a 3% tax on that. Now it does not seem to amount to a great deal, but why is there a tax put upon a tax? Is that fair? Is it fair for the Government to tax taxation which the Municipal Council is receiving? It seems to me that it is not fair. I presume that customs and excise are lumped together and the tax of 3% is added to that. That is to say the Government is imposing taxation on taxes. Then we are told that taxation

is not very serious or is not very high in this country.

I notice that the provision, when this Bill comes into effect, at the end of Section 3: The purchaser pays assessment only on the difference between the price of the property purchased and the value placed on the property turned in. This is made retroactive. Then there is a provision regarding bulk sales. I understand many persons do come to town and buy a case of beans, a case of peas, a barrel of pork, and a sack of some article, beans or whatever the case may be, they now can pay the 3% right there on that wholesale price. It seems to me that is the price on which they pay it. You cannot take a case of beans and turn them all into tins and say: you must pay 3% on each tin. If he buys a case of beans at a wholesale price, I submit the purchaser should not have to pay whereas the individual buying his goods wholesale should only have to pay 3% on the price he pays.

MR. CURTIS: That is all he does.

MR. BROWNE: I am not so sure.

MR. CURTIS: Might I just interrupt. I think, Mr. Speaker, the position is, bulk sales are really these bulk sales to people who are reselling, and the idea of having it go through the Deputy Minister is that if the person who buys in bulk consumes it himself then he pays the assessment on the price of the bulk sales. If on the other hand he buys it to resell then he becomes a vendor and in turn gets a vendor's license and resells.

MR. BROWNE: I know from personal experience that the wholesaler is very reluctant to sell to any individual now because of this. But it seems to me there should not be any-

thing to stop the wholesaler selling because so many people in our out-ports require large quantities of food. They can't be going to the grocery store every day to get their groceries but have to buy in bulk, not in very great bulk but still in bulk, and they should be entitled to get it without having to pay 3% on the price which they pay.

MR. MURRAY: But they don't under the section.

MR. BROWNE: My understanding is that a man comes in here from say Ferryland and buys twenty-five cases of milk from Mr. O'Leary. Mr. O'Leary is liable for the 3%, and if not the person who buys is liable to pay unless he protects himself by making certain that Mr. O'Leary pays the tax. I am only speaking generally now. But the idea of people buying from the wholesaler and paying the tax whether he is a vendor afterwards or a consumer —

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, the sale in bulk is defined in the interpretation section. I think my honourable friend should discriminate between the sale in bulk and a wholesale purchase.

MR. BROWNE: I thank the Attorney General for drawing my attention to the definition.

Well now I must say that definition puzzles me because it does not apply to this at all. I thought it was sales for bulk.

MR. CURTIS: No bulk sales.

MR. BROWNE: In other words, if my honourable friend bought out a business as a going concern that would be a bulk sale.

MR. CURTIS: I may not have



made myself clear, but that is what I meant. You are getting mixed up with wholesale.

MR. BROWNE: I was thinking of wholesale sales. However, it seems to me that the Government ought to give consideration (I know it is not going to do it) now to the exemption of other things in the list of those things which are taxable. According to the list here the only things exempted are gasoline for boats and vessels, natural water including ice, medical and X-ray pictures and plates, tangible personal property sold to the Dominion of Canada or the United States of America and goods shipped by seller for delivery to vessels of more than three hundred tons, goods sold at less than 17c. and meals of less than 51c. I am still puzzled to know where flour, pork and milk come in. It is not in as an exemption here. Now there are many thousands of articles, heavy machinery and articles of that type, in use by the Government and in use by municipalities and by churches, all of whom have to pay the 3% sales tax. It seems to me it is very sweeping, in fact it is the most sweeping tax I have ever heard of. There are other enterprises besides the fishery and medical equipment deserving of consideration.

I appreciate the necessity of having some penalty for those who don't pay the tax, and the provisions here do not seem unreasonable. But I do not think that the provision which gives the Government no limit for time in which to take proceedings as far as criminal proceedings are concerned is right. I believe that should be altered in Committee. I think there should be a time when a man can feel himself clear of any offence which he may have committed in his youth.

Certainly he should not have to go on for the rest of his life always with the dread that some small matter which he had omitted to perform may still lay him open to charge, and knowing there is no limit to it. He may be ashamed to do anything about it or he may not know how to go about settling it up. I think we ought to change that.

But, Mr. Speaker, my chief objection to the Social Security Assessment Act is that it is too general and hits people who have not the means to pay taxes, and upon whom a 3% tax is a very substantial levy, especially when it is on every item of clothing they wear and on every article of food they consume.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, it is useless I suppose objecting very much. We have this 3% Social Security Assessment and it is going to remain. The Government is collecting quite a lot of money through this means. But my chief objection to the collecting of this tax, Mr. Speaker, is the taxation imposed on anything sold at 17c. or over. I think the tax should not be imposed until an article reaches 30c. I don't think the amount of money collected on articles sold between 17c. and 30c. would amount to a great pile.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite a bit.

MR. FOGWILL: It may be quite a lot. But I think the Government could afford to release the people from paying 3% tax between these two amounts and take the sales tax at the amount of 30c. I think that people would appreciate that very much because in a number of cases today families are smaller. On articles of food like bread, for instance, which is, I think 19c. a loaf and on

that they have to pay this one cent. This puts them in the position of paying 5%. On a 17c. article they would be paying 6% tax. That is what it would amount to, I think, Mr. Speaker, the Government should consider that when we go into Committee of the Whole, and have this changed to 30c. After all take some of the young people today, after the picture show etc. they go into a snack bar and have a hot dog which only costs 20c. Why should they have to pay an additional cent if they only need a hot dog or a hamburger on the way home. I think that is where the tax becomes more or less a nuisance when it applies to such small payments under 30c., I think the Government should give consideration to that, and perhaps they may consider it in Committee and we may persuade them, perhaps, to accept that principle.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think the principal objection of the Opposition to this tax is the fact that we have to pay it, and I think that applies not only to us but to the Government and anybody in this country. Taxes are dangerous sort of things we don't like to approach and certainly don't like to have to pay. But we do realize taxation has to be imposed to pay the necessary bills of the Government. We do regret that the Government has found fit to tax practically everything. I suppose if we went down to get a birth certificate we would have to pay a tax on it. Every way you turn now, every way you part with money you pay 3% taxation on it. It is a nuisance tax. There is no doubt about that. I wonder if the Government have thought of it along that line and thought of the repercussions as far as putting up the cost of living. You know when that tax was imposed very

few of the small stores in the country and very few of the large stores were staffed to the extent that they could handle this thing very easily. They had to increase their staffs. That applied also to the small stores which means, of course, that the overhead of the small stores and the large stores has increased and they have to make more money, and consequently they charge more on their goods. That in its turn puts up the cost of living to that extent. It is undoubtedly a tax which has to be handled, from now on at least, very carefully. It is on everything over 17c. now. I hope it does not go beyond that.

I think it is rather ridiculous, as my honourable and learned friend on my right suggested, to have to pay a tax upon a tax. Taxpayers have to pay municipal taxes and then they have to pay the Government 3% on the tax. Persons who import stuff from the United States of America or from England have to pay a tax on the duty, to pay a tax on other taxes under Section 2 (i). Then if I happen to buy an electric stove and it costs me five hundred dollars, and the man from whom I purchased it comes in and installs it, and the cost to install it is forty-five or fifty dollars, as the case may be, and probably more, I have to pay 3% on that as well.

MR. CURTIS: No, it is the very opposite. That is only if it is incorporated in the price.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words then from now on if I purchase anything like that I have to purchase it at the installed price and not with a view to getting someone else to put it in or putting it in myself, is that right? I am not quite clear. "Where the regulations so provide, the charges

for installation or servicing of the thing sold." I take it then if I went in to buy a thing of that kind, attached to the bill would also be an amount for servicing or installation, as the case may be, of that particular item. That would be added to the whole bill and I would have to pay 3% on that. Is that right? The Minister will explain, I suppose, later.

We all realize, as I said before that taxation has to be paid by us all. If we are going to improve the public services and benefit our people we have to collect taxes. We know that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Taxes are a cheap price to pay for civilization." As David Thoreau said.

MR. HOLLETT: Civilization, as everybody knows, Sir, is a general term and could mean one thing and could mean another. We have had civilization all down through the ages and sometimes it has not been so hot. I suppose the Honourable Premier is suggesting the higher the taxation the better the civilization?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very often. And the lower the taxes the lower the civilization.

MR. HOLLETT: He will not find the people amongst whom he has to live and move and have his being agree with him—The higher the taxation the better the civilization—I am quite sure he is not going to get anybody to agree with that. Take in Thoreau's time. I don't think they had to pay on bread and butter or on anything purchased at 17c. today, which would not be even 2c. in Thoreau's time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On the other hand in Thoreau's time poor old people who were worn out were left to

rot in the manure heap. Today we have a better civilization, and today we pay more for it.

MR. HOLLETT: There is something to be said for that I will admit. I don't think there were so many people who had to be paid for in their old age in those days, they just died off before they became old.

MR. SPEAKER: I assure the House nothing pleases the House better than to hear a debate on civilization. But may I suggest it be at some other more opportune time.

MR. HOLLETT: I think, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's point was well taken. Civilization does to some extent depend upon taxation—The words rhyme very well "civilization" "taxation." So if we want civilization we must be prepared to put up taxation. The Government today, Sir, are right on the job. We have no great objection to this particular amendment, Sir.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, just in reply to one point made by my honourable friend from St. John's West. The exemptions are provided under Section 36 of the original Act, Sir, which provides that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations specifying particular items to be exempt from the provisions of this Act.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that all taxes are a nuisance and of course a tax like this is a particular nuisance, and there is no getting around it. The Government has done everything in its power to have this tax collected at the source. There was a Dominion-Provincial Conference on it which my colleague on my left and some others of us attended, and we thought that we had succeeded in getting per-

mission at that conference to get this tax collected at the source, but the Premier of one of the Provinces reneged on his undertaking and we have not been able to do it.

MR. BROWNE: What conference was that?

MR. CURTIS: The Dominion-Provincial Conference on Taxation, the last but one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was on constitutional matters.

MR. CURTIS: I think not. I think it was the tax one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was the constitutional conference, the Dominion-Provincial Conference to discuss Ways and Means of Changing the Constitution. It was held in the House of Commons Chamber. In that the Premier of Ontario proposed the sales tax at the wholesale level and everyone agreed except Mr. Duplessis.

MR. CURTIS: However, Mr. Speaker, throughout the year we have had the tax I have heard absolutely no criticism. I have not heard as much throughout the country as I have heard in this House. As a matter of fact I have often heard people say "Here is a cent for Joey, God bless him" — That is nearly always added—"God bless him."

MR. SMALLWOOD: The second word is not always "bless."

MR. BROWNE: The Minister does not buy his groceries then.

MR. CURTIS: However, Mr. Speaker, I had one other point I was going to mention, but I think it will more properly belong in Committee of the whole.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Debate on that has already begun, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The debate was adjourned by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I must say that since we have been on the job morning, afternoon and night I have not had an opportunity to read this. I am prepared therefore to let the thing go into Committee of the Whole. I take it the Honourable Minister has not brought in anything so very terrible. I must say I have to admit I am agreeably surprised to find we still have some Crown Lands.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): More today than we have ever had before.

MR. HOLLETT: Ever before? More than in the last five years. There is not much Crown Land. I admit we own the Crown Lands all right, but if I wanted to get a license to explore for minerals today the Government would not be able to give me that license. But I would know exactly where to go and find a mine right now, but it is NALCO I would have to go to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That mine that the honourable gentleman knows about is early in November, where he can go right and lay hands on it.

MR. HOLLETT: The mine in early November. We will get a bright product from that mine, Sir. I hope that we on this side of the House will

have a plentitude of nuggets resulting from that mine. I can predict that the Honourable the Premier will be greatly surprised at the small number of nuggets which will accrue for the Government side from that particular mine. But that is not the one we are talking about. We are talking about Crown Lands. I think it is tragic, Sir. Any government should have absolute control over all the land which they govern and they should be in a position at any time to grant to John Jones or Bill Smith, an old friend of the Minister's by the way, licenses to explore for minerals of any kind. They have given that over to somebody else, to BRINCO and NALCO. So that if today I want to go and explore for minerals I must go to BRINCO or to NALCO and if I want to go and explore for timber I have to go to BRINCO and probably to NALCO too. I am not sure about that. But, as I said, I am surprised to find out that the Minister still has sufficient authority to bring in this Bill to amend the Crown Lands Act which governs Crown Lands.

I have not, Sir, had time to read this Bill. I must admit that, and I have nothing against the principle in it therefore.

DR. ROWE: If no other honourable member wishes to speak I might add: The very nature of the amendment is such that the Committee of the Whole is the obvious place to make comment. So I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill ordered read a second time. Read a second time. Ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act":

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in moving the amendment to this particular Act I would point out that last year this Act was introduced in order to improve health services in the control of this specific disease. The House will recall that this Act was altered in the Committee stage, providing for numerous exemptions so that the amount of tax we had hoped to collect was considerably reduced. This particular amendment is designed to lessen the number of exemptions that can apply and that the only exemptions that shall apply will be purely church functions and school functions.

I might further point out that three years ago this Government spent \$120,000 in the control of cancer. In the next year that amount went up to \$200,000 and during the past year that amount was increased to somewhere around \$300,000. That money is being spent in the transportation of the people afflicted with disease, in paying board and lodgings, in the payment for operations at the General Hospital and other institutions and for burial and in giving abatements to people who have not been able to pay all their bills at the hospital, but have been able to pay some. It has also been spent in the provision of equipment and in giving specialized training to persons in Canada and the United States of America.

I would also like to point out that three years ago the number one killer in Newfoundland was TB and number two was heart failure and three was cancer. Two years ago the number one killer was heart failure and number two was cancer and number three was TB. Last year cancer came to the top as the number one killer in Newfoundland seconded by

heart failure and thirdly by TB. The disease, Mr. Speaker, is rapidly on the increase, and paradoxically enough in those countries which have the best and most improved health services such as Denmark, England, Canada, the Scandinavian Countries and the United States, cancer is also either the number one or number two killer in these countries, while in those countries which have little or no health services such as India, cancer is practically unknown. It seems as the mortality rate increases so also does the longevity of life increase and the mortality rate from the disease of cancer also increases proportionately. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the position three years ago with respect to deaths from cancer in this Province was a shame, I submit that two years ago it was tragic and I submit that last year it has been appalling. I also submit we have to look forward and face the situation that the incidence of this disease will increase in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this disease approaches somewhat to the status of a national emergency I have no recourse but to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, there is not very much to say. I am glad to hear the Honourable Minister introduce the Bill in such an excellent manner, although I think some of the statements he made are entirely contradictory to the statement made by the Honourable the Premier this morning as to increasing taxation to improve civilization and as civilization grows and everything else grows taxes grow. I am inclined to think that taxes are probably one of the things that can be attributed to the existence of cancer. We are not opposed to the tax, of course. I do think

though that any money collected for such a disease as cancer should be placed in a cancer control fund and not in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The Honourable Minister admitted that last year only \$120,000 was spent—Was that what I understood?

MR. FORSEY: No, that was three years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words you increase the taxation so you will have more money to spend. In the next year you hope to collect five hundred thousand dollars, I believe. Cancer today is in first place. It almost looks to me the more you increase the taxation the higher the incidence of the disease of cancer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is dynamic reasoning.

MR. HOLLETT: That word dynamic could be used in so many ways, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The fact is it is explosive reasoning.

MR. HOLLETT: Cancer, Sir, is a dreaded disease in this country. I don't know if I should prefer to die of cancer or heart failure. I am quite sure the Speaker will tell me in a moment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can tell the honourable gentleman a more pleasant way of dying—striving to become Premier. It is a very pleasant, long-lingering death and takes an awful long time. It should take twenty-five years.

MR. HOLLETT: That is very interesting. I could make some remark about that but probably the least said the better. I do hope the Honourable the Premier will never be



afflicted with cancer or any other of these diseases. I would like to see him removed henceforth and be seen later off the hook in connection with cancer or any other disease. I certainly shall not pass out from over-worry because I cannot have the honour of being Premier, and it is one of the highest honours the country could give anybody. I might say here and now that I have never yet aspired to that high office. I might say further, Sir, that I came into this House, I think everyone in this House knows the conditions under which I came into this present position I hold as Leader of the Opposition. It was something unsought for.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But having now become Leader of the Opposition surely the honourable gentleman is fighting to have the equivalent job on this side of the House?

MR. HOLLETT: I am certainly fighting to remove that which is there presently—I am fighting for that—Or I could put it a better way—I am fighting to endeavour to get those on the opposite side of the House either to mend their ways as to financial affairs of this country or get out. Now that I know it will involve some little trouble for some members on the opposite side, but I hope it is not cancer. But, Sir, I am quite sure that cancer—or I might tell you a little story—Sir, about two years ago, following the re-election which took place up in the West End, for about two and a half months after that I knew I had cancer. I felt I had it. This is just for the benefit of the members on the opposite side who sometimes smoke too much or do anything too much, it does not matter, smoking, drinking or what not. But I went to the doctor and the doctor said there is not much to get excited about, you

have been working hard during the election, living on an election diet etc. But I was losing weight and having all sorts of pain in a particular part of my lung and began to worry. So I went to the doctor again and he said; go into the hospital and have X-rays. I said not—if that is it—no, I am not going into hospital. But, Sir, as luck should have it, and perhaps the Almighty God designed it—A certain man came to my house and said—Have you increased your smoking lately? I told him, yes, I had during the election, about doubled it. That is your trouble, he said. He was just a lay friend and not a doctor. Well I said, if that is so, this is all—That was two and a half years ago, I have not had a smoke since. Forty-eight hours afterwards the pain went and I have not had it since. I venture to bet that if I had not stopped smoking I would have been dead in six months from cancer. It was probably Heavenly inspired. That is just a moral for everybody—Do not do anything to excess.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You can't scare me. I gave up smoking in January.

MR. MURRAY: I suggest the moral is that you should not take things so pessimistically.

DR. ROWE: I gave it up too.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think I had actually been pessimistic, but cancer is a serious thing. I favour this Act. But we hope every cent brought in from it will be spent in the control and eradication of that disease, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the figures given by the Honourable Minister. \$120,000 spent three years ago and

\$200,000 spent two years ago and \$300,000 last year. But when he gave the particulars he said it was spent on hospital expenses, transportation, operations and burial expenses. But this is a Bill for the control of cancer. I would have liked to hear from the Minister as to what measures are being taken to control the spread of this disease in this country, if it is the number one killer, and this is a national emergency. Then I ask what is the Government doing about it? What steps have they taken since this was introduced to control cancer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman should not get too angry nor too worried by this talk of his Honourable Leader about cancer.

MR. BROWNE: I am not angry, but concerned. I know how serious cancer is. If there is something the Government should do and don't do, they are remiss in their duty if they don't do it. This is a cancer control Act. There is no preamble that says what it is for. The only thing I can see it is for is a means of getting more revenue to help defray the expenses of the Department of Public Health. If it were called a tax to help defray the expenses of the Department of Public Health then it would properly be labeled. It is not properly labeled at the present time because the Minister has given us no information that the money has been used for the purpose for which the tax was imposed.

Now, Sir, there must be many ways by which cancer can be controlled. The Department of Public Health can assist by keeping proper statistics and by clinical examinations, by publicity. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company of New York has continuously advertised the desirability, in fact the

urgency that people who get pains in certain regions, their lungs or that sort of thing, or a lump or anything, should go to a doctor to get examined. But I have not seen very much information of that kind here in Newfoundland. It seems to me that is the most important thing about cancer, to get it early, and get early treatment. Some people become pessimistic if they have some foreign lump in their body and are afraid to go to the doctor. Medical science is such today that with the equipment which doctors have their lives can be prolonged, even though a person is suffering from cancer, by surgery and by X-ray and by the cobalt bomb and by radium. It seems to me there is not enough information given to the public along these lines.

Now I have known several persons who were given up to die because they were supposed to have cancer, who lived for months and years. I know in my own family, my second wife was told in 1935 that she only had three months to live, told by a doctor in a clinic in Boston. Then she went to a clinic in Providence and the doctor treated her down there with X-ray therapy for a malignant growth and she lived for eight years afterwards. I had a great deal of association with doctors dealing with cancer. I think it would be a good thing if the Government would get people to realize that when they have something the matter with them they should go as quickly as they can to a doctor and get advice.

Now the Government can also help in another way, by creating some kind of fund for specialists in that sort of thing so that a doctor may go and learn the latest technique in treating

these cases, such as scholarships. We are only a small country and have not the facilities or experience here. But if there is a doctor here interested in that particular disease I think he should be encouraged to follow it up by visits to every place. It is not every doctor who will be interested in studying the disease. It seems to me if we can find one he should be encouraged. I do feel the Government should do something. They have a big field there if it is the number one killer, and if, as the Minister says, it is a national emergency. I hope by this time next year the Minister will be able to bring in a more interesting report as to what the Government is already doing to control the spread of this disease.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman had been in the House when the Act was brought in he would have heard precisely what the Government are doing and proposing to do. I don't think there is any necessity of saying that all over again on this occasion when the Act is merely being amended. The full description was given of what the Government are actually doing and it is quite an activity down in the General Hospital.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister did not say so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He did indeed when introducing the Act. This is merely an amendment, and there is no necessity of doing it all over again. He has brought us up-to-date since the Bill was introduced last year, on which occasion he told exactly what the Government were doing and proposing to do in connection with the diagnosis and cure of cancer. But today he brought us up-to-date on the peril of cancer.

MR. BROWNE: That has been going on a long time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He informed us today that cancer has gone to first place as a killer in three years.

MR. BROWNE: It was ahead of TB many years ago.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): Not in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: I challenge the figures because I have observed them. I have studied these figures for many years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Newfoundland?

MR. BROWNE: Yes, and I challenge the figures of the Minister of Health as he gives them here today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister will of course close the debate and will have an opportunity to accept the challenge.

MR. BROWNE: It is not a very serious one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Quite serious.

MR. BROWNE: Anyway I may as a personal explanation say I am greatly interested in cancer. I have watched the increase and growth of cancer month by month as the statistics came out from the department. I could see ten years ago that cancer was growing gradually to first place, and it is more than three years ago since it did.

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on that. I had a little experience with the Department of Health during my time of office when this Government spent millions of dollars, yes, millions of dollars on cancer control with assistance

from the Federal Government in Federal Health Grants.

MR. BROWNE: Millions?

MR. HOLLETT: What were they doing last year when they spent only \$300,000?

MR. CHALKER: We had pretty well nothing when we started. We now have deep X-ray therapy machines and very excellent doctors, Dr. Murphy, and Dr. Higgins. I should imagine in the last five years that our services for the prevention of cancer in this country have gone up about 200%.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just a brief word on that—A few months ago my boy happened to have to go to the General Hospital. On one of my visits there I happened to run into a doctor who very kindly took me right through the hospital and included in that was a tour of the X-ray and cancer control division. I must say I was very much impressed, Mr. Speaker, I had no idea we were doing so much as we are. I had a long talk with Dr. Higgins, an old friend of mine whom I had not seen since graduating from college. He gave me some figures, which I don't remember. We talked for an hour, Dr. Higgins, Dr. Wilson and a couple of other doctors. I was very much impressed and was highly gratified to realize this Government was spending so much money on such an important matter. I believe everyone of us is greatly concerned because there is no one who has not had some personal bereavement in his family with regard to that. By the law of averages three or four perhaps five or six of us here today will be dead in the next ten years from Cancer.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Speaker, I did

mention in my remarks that money has been spent in the purchase of equipment, deep therapy equipment and X-ray machines, and also that money had been spent in sending people away for courses in the treatment of cancer and in the operation also of radiological machinery. As a matter of fact in the estimates the honourable member for St. John's West will see a department of radiology at the General Hospital, the staff of which is being increased. This was not in existence four years ago.

Now with respect to propaganda: There is a voluntary organization here which does carry on propaganda in connection with the control of this disease, in collaboration, of course, with the Department of Health. These are voluntary citizens who are doing, out of a sense of public duty, a very good job. My figures incidentally were obtained from statistics compiled by a committee of the Department of Health of the Federal Government who have been down here for the past three years compiling statistics on the incidence of the various diseases in Newfoundland. If my figures are wrong it is due to the fact they made wrong calculations.

MR. BROWNE: They may have taken different periods. I watched them month by month for months.

MR. FORSEY: As far as early treatment is concerned; there are various forms of cancer. It is possible to contract cancer and die as rapidly as one week with no possibility of treatment. Some people don't feel the effects of cancer until they are seventy-five and eighty. I am informed that these people who die of cancer at that age may have had it as early as forty, and there would be no possibility of

their having any indications that the disease was inherent in their system.

MR. HOLLETT: That is helpful anyway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a mysterious disease.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour this day.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 1:00 o'clock I will leave the Chair until 3:00 of the clock this afternoon.

---

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1954

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with its normal business I rise to a point of privilege, to invite the attention of the House to an account of some of last night's proceedings of this House that appeared in today's edition of the "Evening Telegram." I will read it:

"An attempt by Opposition Leader, Malcolm Hollett to prove that some members of the Government received directors' fees from certain of the new industries was dubbed a damnable lie by Premier Smallwood yesterday. The Premier retracted his remark only after Hansard was produced. It began with the gypsum mill which Mr. Hollett showed made a net loss of \$58,000 in ten months. Directors as of February 9, 1952 were the following, he said: Joseph R. Smallwood, Leslie R. Curtis, E. S. Spencer, C. H. Ballam, Dr. Valdimanis and Ernest Leja. These had one share each. He wondered did they

draw any fees. "No," said Premier Smallwood, "None."

The Opposition Leader then went on to point out an amount set aside for "Directors' Fees and Salaries" of fifty-four hundred dollars a year."

Then, Mr. Speaker, in black-faced type:

"Only Mr. Leja got any of them, said the Premier."

Then resuming in light-faced type:

"Mr. Hollett continued to argue the point and read an itemized list of the gypsum plant expenses, one of them being "Directors' Fees or Salaries." Premier Smallwood pounced upon this claiming that Mr. Hollett had specified directors' fees and not salaries. It was at this point that the Premier dubbed Mr. Hollett's statement a "damnable lie," Mr. Hollett demanded a retraction. The Premier refused. "Produce Hansard and prove it," he said."

Then in black-faced type:

"Hansard was produced. It proved Mr. Hollett right." Mr. Hollett then again demanded that the Premier retract his remark. He was getting tired of being called a damnable liar, he said. The Premier refused to apologise, however, and claimed that the lie consisted in making the charge that the members of the Government got fees or salaries from the gypsum plant.

The Speaker interrupted to explain that the use of such terms as "liar" were unparliamentary, quite apart from the truth or otherwise of the charge and ought not in any way to be employed."

Then in black-faced type:

"The Premier then withdrew his remark."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that any member of this House including Your Honour who was present here last night when this debate took place will recognize at once that this is a most dastardly, a most false account of what took place—dastardly and false—written by a rat, a literary rat named Horwood, a literary abomination, a loathsome scavenger, a man who was once a member of this House and who since then has used the columns of the "Evening Telegram" to conduct a personal campaign of his own against this Government and particularly against me. He was a member of this party. He sat on this side of the House. He has never forgiven me and never will forgive me because I did not take him into the cabinet.

Let us examine the piece in question:

"An attempt by Opposition Leader, Malcolm Hollett to prove that some members of the Government received directors' fees from certain of the new industries was dubbed a "damnable lie"."

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition did not make any attempt to prove some members of the Government had received directors' fees from certain of the new industries. He did appear to be attempting to prove that some government members received directors' fees from one of these industries, namely, the gypsum plant.

Now that is lie No. 1. It is wrong. It was written by the author, Harold Horwood, he knowing it was wrong, therefore, he lied deliberately and consciously.

"Mr. Hollett demanded a retraction.

The Premier refused. 'Produce Hansard and prove it,' he said."

The Premier did no such thing. It was the Leader of the Opposition who demanded Hansard. That is another lie. That is a Horwood lie, deliberate and conscious. He lied deliberately, knowingly, consciously. He deceived the public. He deceived the owner of this newspaper. He deceived the editor of this newspaper. He deceived the readers of this newspaper. But he does not deceive the members of this House.

"Hansard was produced. It proved Mr. Hollett right."

Mr. Speaker, it did no such thing. It proved Mr. Hollett wrong. That is another lie, a deliberate and conscious lie, a purposeful lie told to deceive the editor of that newspaper, to deceive the owners of that newspaper, to deceive the readers of that newspaper, but it does not deceive —

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt for one moment. I would like to point out, in my opinion — I had nothing to do with an article printed in the "Evening Telegram" nor the actual nature of it, but I would like to say that in my opinion the point at issue was whether I had used the word "fees" or "salaries". Hansard proved that I did use these words. In that respect I believe it was proven I was correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was proven the honourable gentleman was wrong, and Mr. Speaker, himself, pointed out that fact.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. It is not competent to argue a point settled yesterday. The point is one of privilege. After the Honourable the Premier has made a complaint it is my duty



to declare if in my opinion a *prima facie* case, of breach of privilege exists or not. Then honourable members may speak to the motion but they can't join debate at this stage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In short, Mr. Speaker, this whole thing is written by this dastardly clown, this loathsome literary scavenger, this filthy rat, that cut-throat—I have never cheated at cards. I have never been detected in embezzlement of funds. This rat here in this account as in many previous accounts is using the columns of the "Evening Telegram" to carry on his own personal grudge against this Government because he hates this Government as the devil hates holy water. He hates me with a deadly and undying hatred because he was brazen enough to think that he ever had a chance to be taken into my Cabinet. He discovered there was not a chance in the world so he, and another former member of this House, and another, a third who has recently crossed the floor, all three of them, for over a year have been meeting regularly and faithfully talking and concocting ways and means to get at me and to get at this Government. I don't mind any of that. I don't particularly and very much mind even this, but I am quite confident that the owners of the "Evening Telegram" are not aware of what a rat, what a scavenger they are nursing to their bosoms and allowing to use their columns.

Mr. Speaker, I have remarked in this House recently that the House might have to ask itself whether it would or should or indeed in the circumstances could continue to give the privileges of attendance here and to continue to provide facilities that are provided for those ladies and gentlemen of the press and radio and to a representative of a newspaper whose

accounts befoul the great tradition of the press, of a free press, who befouled it as that man Horwood is doing as a writer for the "Evening Telegram"—and whether the House won't have to bar him from coming inside the door as a newspaper man, as a press representative. Whether the House might not have to take a particular step to bar a man named Horwood from entering here as a newspaper man on the grounds he is a filthy literary rat, a scavenger not fit to have the privileges of a newspaperman, because he is a literary assassin.

I do suggest that the Evening Telegram, which is a great newspaper, would ask itself if it is being fair to itself, if it is being fair to its readers and the public to allow this man Horwood to continue to use its columns to report the events of this House so that the only report that the readers of the Evening Telegram get of the proceedings of this House are reports written by a man with such a bias as he has. In other words, is it the deliberate policy of the Evening Telegram to have its report of the proceedings of this Chamber written for it by a man who is an active partisan in politics? A man who will slant his reports by the suppression of relevant words and complete omission of entire speeches. For instance when the Minister of Public Welfare speaks, Horwood stands up and noisily walks out of the building. I have seen him do it on three occasions, and we have all seen it. When the Minister of Public Works whose shoes Horwood is not fit to wipe nor lace his boots, speaks, he will get up noisily and walk out of the Chamber. When the Minister without Portfolio spoke here, and made a notable contribution to the debates of this House, a most notable one, he contemptuously dismissed

him, and did not even say in his account that the Minister had even spoken at all. Loaded, slanted, full of bias, full of prejudice, political prejudice against this Government. I say, the Evening Telegram might wisely and might profitably consider whether it wants to continue in the position where the only account it gives its readers, the only account, the one and only account it gives its readers, of the events of this House is the account written by a man overflowing with political hatred of the Leader of the House and of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I bring these things to the attention of the House. I could go all over the page, Mr. Speaker. The whole page is full of the missing cement. This whole thing is written to cast doubt, it is a piece of clever slanting in writing to cast doubt on my word, to suggest that there is graft in it somewhere—slanted writing—"He" (that is the Premier) "deplored the fact that the cement had been turned into headlines by the newspapers." Now he adds a new twist, an editorial comment of himself. He mentioned the Premier did not explain Mr. Hollett's figure of 168,000 bags of cement against the less than 60,000 bags which he said actually went in to the erection of the plant. Although even his own account up to that point has quoted my stating that there never were any such bags, that these just did not exist, that they were entirely mythical. He quoted that, but ended up with a purely editorial opinion of his in the editorial column. "He did not explain Malcolm Hollett's figures of 168,000 bags against the 60,000 which he said actually went into the erection of the plant." He left it to the reader to explain, to make that charge and say, yes, Smallwood is caught there. Yes

he is forced to explain what happened to the difference. It is clever. I admit it is clever in a filthy kind of a way. This man Horwood is carrying on a one-man political campaign of his own and is getting paid for it by the Evening Telegram which newspaper throws its columns open to him to carry on as a supposedly accurate newspaper man who is used to letting the chips fall where they will, whose only concern is to give the facts, all the facts and nothing but the facts. Instead of which he picks and chooses which speeches he will report, he picks and chooses which parts of which speech he will report. He picks and chooses which parts he will omit and which parts he will put in black-faced type so there is less chance the reader will miss it because it is in black-face type. A piece of foul and filthy political bias on the part of a disgruntled former politician whose ambition it is to somehow crawl in on somebody else's coattails into the House of Assembly as he once crawled in on my coattails.

Mr. Speaker, I deem this account written by this man Horwood to be of sufficient importance, and these are only the latest in a long series of similarly slanted, biased and prejudiced reporting of the events of this House by this same writer, Horwood, whom I understand was recently investigated for communism on the score that he was possibly a communist or had possible communist affiliations or connections. This is what the readers of the grand old Evening Telegram are being subject to.

Now I submit the case to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me say first the honourable members are, if they intend to consider this complaint of breach of privilege, to do so on the

facts before them, namely the article in the newspaper. The privileges of any House, any parliament, have been hardly and dearly bought. They are a precious heritage and honourable members will do well to think of them as such for remember, privileges may be lost but no new privileges may be created either in Canada nor in Great Britain, and we have therefore to safeguard those we have.

In this instance complaint is made of a piece of reporting in a daily newspaper of a sitting of this House. Is it in the opinion of the honourable members a fair, even a fair, we do not expect a meticulously accurate one, but is it a fair account of what took place in this House yesterday morning? I want to point out too that although the complaint has been made by the Honourable the Premier, a breach of privilege in reporting, is a breach of privilege against the House.

The first part of the article read stated that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition attempted to prove certain members of the Cabinet had received directors' fees. Later on the same article stated that the honourable gentleman's question was proven to be right in that he had not mentioned fees. That in itself is, of course, a contradiction. The House might well ask itself what is the public to deduce from that?

Apart from the privilege of reporting proceedings in the House, I would ask honourable members to notice this (and I attach the greatest importance to this) yesterday a statement was made based on certain alleged facts which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition had made. A reply was given by the Government. An argument followed, and in the heat of debate expressions were used which

ought not to have been used. Hansard was demanded by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and not, as the article states, by the Premier. What was decided by reading Hansard I submit to the House is of no concern to anybody but the honourable members themselves. We are not to revive the debate as to who was right or wrong. On a ruling from the Chair both honourable members made honourable amends to each other, and it is so reported in Hansard; the unparliamentary words of one withdrawn and the words which lent themselves to misinterpretation withdrawn by the other. The incident was closed. An article like this, which revives the debate, I do not think is conducive to the dignity and prestige of the House. These are the things that honourable members should consider. While all allowance might be made for the honourable member in lodging his complaint, the personal attributes of the reporter in question really ought not to be considered but merely the account of the reporting itself, as far as the accuracy which the House has a right to expect and the constituents to get is concerned. Actually I can do no other than declare that in my belief a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege does exist. Now it is for the House to deal with it, either now or to deal with it in committee set up for that purpose.

Does the honourable Leader of the Opposition wish to make a comment?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to associate myself with any agreement or disagreement over any rule which was made yesterday by this House or Mr. Speaker. Moreover, I do not wish to associate myself with any newspaper or radio

in this country, I don't wish to associate myself with any reporter in this country, and I don't want this side of the House to be associated with any move which may be made to debar the press galleries from any citizen of Canada be their reporting what it may, be it correct or incorrect. I do submit that if any breach of privilege has been made, in the future there is a way to deal with it. I certainly don't wish to associate myself with any of the language which was used in this House this day against any person who is not entitled and has not the privilege to reply thereto, I regret it very much. I can quite see that the Honourable the Premier in the heat of his complaint would probably use the words which I know he might be sorry for afterwards. I might do the same thing. I think it is unfortunate that this things should happen. We on this side of the House, Sir, could many a time and often have complained about the reporting which certainly did not favour us politically. If any statements were made in the press or in any particular place which were wrong, and I myself detect one, I must detect two, but I could not say, Sir, that they were done deliberately. I must repeat there is no political association whatsoever between this side of the House and any newspaper or any radio station. We are as independent as the wind. I will admit to this—and I am debarred from suggesting anything about the ruling made yesterday—but I will submit that it was I who asked for the Hansard and it was not the Honourable the Premier as it appeared in the article complained of. There was one other point, which has slipped my memory at the moment, there are anyway a couple of things there which are

incorrect in the statement as read. Mind you, Sir, I have not seen the newspaper and have not read that and therefore I am not competent to judge of the complaint of the Honourable the Premier unless I had read it and studied it. I think, therefore, before any move is made at all to do anything of such a drastic nature as what has been hinted at in the speech of the Premier, I think that time should be taken out to consider as to who should handle it, whether it should be by the House as a whole or whether it should be by a Select Committee, because these statements which were made today, Sir, I deplore them very much. I deplore these statements irrespective of political affiliations of any man in this House or outside this House, to use the terms which have been used. I certainly don't want to be mixed up with them. I don't want to have anything to do with them. As far as the Evening Telegram is concerned, I believe the Evening Telegram has been certainly not in favour of us on this side of the House, not since Confederation. They have been, if we might call them such, our political enemies in that they have not supported us. I think if you don't support a party, you are against it, as the fellow said. Nevertheless the Evening Telegram, Sir, is, and has been for generations, a paper which has been read by all people in this country, respected by everybody. It was one of the first papers I ever read as a boy because my old father always subscribed to it, although even he had a job at times to get the money to pay for it.

Therefore, I suggest we ought not to make any slurs or any charges against the present Evening Telegram because it has hired this or that man. I would say, Sir—it is my suggestion

and I believe my honourable friends will concur—they have the right to expect that time should be taken out to consider the whole matter and at least give the members of this House an opportunity to read the paper in which the article complained of, appears.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which would ordinarily be referred to a Committee of Privileges, but the House is in session and the facts are fresh in all our minds, and the facts speak for themselves, and there is nothing really to investigate between what is our knowledge of what took place yesterday and the report that I have heard for the first time read in the House. I think the suggestion of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition is correct. Perhaps we might just let the matter stand for a short period so that we could best consider it in the light of what is the best thing to do. Certainly the members of this House must be protected. While I am not prepared to make a motion at the moment I do think that perhaps if we do adjourn the matter until a later time today we might have an opportunity to consider it and decide in our own minds what the House ought to do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire in the first place to have any action taken hastily. I have no desire in the second place that any drastic action be taken by the House against the Evening Telegram. I am not suggesting that the House use its undoubted power against that newspaper, its editor or its owners. I am only suggesting one thing, that the moment any citizen is elected to this House and carries the responsibility of membership to the extent of speaking on the floor of this House, no

newspaper nor radio station has any right whatsoever nor even the shadow of a right to misrepresent or to misquote him, no right whatsoever. No such right exists never did nor ever will. Every member of this House on all sides or no sides, Liberal, Tory or Independent, all members of this House are entitled as of right, just because they are members, if for no other reason, to be protected against a newspaper or radio writer or a newspaper or a radio that misrepresents him in his capacity of a member of the House in his speeches in the House or in his statements as a Minister. If the public are to judge a member of the House by his remarks in the House then the remarks shall be truly and accurately portrayed or not at all. It does seem to me, as one who has spent nine-tenths of his working life in the business of newspaper and radio work, that it is not because a man has walked along the sidewalk possessing all the rights of a citizen and suddenly goes to work for a newspaper and a radio station he automatically acquires rights which he did not possess as he walked down the sidewalk as a private citizen.

It is a good many years since this House took drastic action against a newspaper, and perhaps it has been forgotten just what our powers are in that regard. We are the highest court in Newfoundland, we are above all other courts in Newfoundland, we in this House, not the Government, not I, but this House. We are not above the law as someone quoted me as saying, which I never did say or never would say. We are the highest court in this Island, this Province. We make laws and we create courts. We can make courts and we can abolish them, and we can change them. We make laws and we can repeal them and we

can amend them, we can change them. We make laws and we can repeal them and we can amend them, we can change them. We are the highest court in this Province of Newfoundland although we too are bound by the law. As I said: it is quite a long time since there was any occasion for this House to exert its undoubted power in a matter such as the one I have raised this afternoon—and I am the last one in the House that desires that they be used. But I am the first one in the House that desires that every member of the House be protected against calumny, against misrepresentation, against lying and falsehood.—So I am willing to have the matter stand for some hours while we all give some thought to it in between the rest of our duties for the day.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the suggestion offered by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable the Attorney General?

On motion the matter will stand at the pleasure of the House.

#### Orders of The Day

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act,"

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was presented to the Department of Education by the Board of Regents of the Memorial University. It was checked thoroughly by the members of that Department and recommended to the Cabinet for approval.

This is a very important Bill to a certain extent, inasmuch as at the present time all actions of the University are subject to the approval of the Minister of Education. This Bill will amend all those sections, which will mean that the approval of the running of the University will be left in the

hands of the Board of Regents. Of course the Government still retains control of the finances and the appointment of the various members of the Board. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Government are very proud of the present administration of the Memorial University, now running the University, and we have every faith in them to continue to do so, inasmuch as we are standing behind this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Pensions Act".

MR. CHALKER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill was brought to the attention of the Department of Education similarly to the one just mentioned. It deals with the Memorial University Pensions Amendment Act. The pensions scheme now active in the University is not a compulsory one inasmuch as various professors and members of the staff do not have to join up with this present scheme. This Bill will make it mandatory for every person working on behalf of the University to belong to this scheme. It also will take into account, Mr. Speaker, a professor coming from any other University would not be forced to join this scheme but the amount that the University would set aside if he had joined the scheme would be placed to the credit of the scheme to which he belonged in any other University and retain his pension rights in a University where he is established, and we would pay our proportion of that share.



It also takes care of the pension scheme for the President of the University. This scheme was part of his contract when he agreed to act as President of the Memorial University. It states that upon his retirement he shall receive two-thirds of his salary and in the event of his death his wife shall receive one-half of the basic salary.

There is nothing special in this, Mr. Speaker, and I move the second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity of studying the Bill which amends the Memorial University Pensions Act. In some respects I had to do with the original drafting of the pension scheme for the Memorial University. I notice here that the President is to receive a pension and in the case of his death the widow of the President will get a pension equal to one-half. I wonder whether any consideration will be given to the past President who has served for such a long time and gave such faithful service in the pioneering days of the college. It seems to me that President Hatcher by his faithful attention to his duties throughout the years deserves consideration of a similar kind. I would recommend to the Minister of Education that he take steps, if such are necessary, to bring to those responsible a consideration of something of that kind in the case of President Hatcher.

There does not seem to be anything else of very great importance involved in this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before Your Honour calls the next item of busi-

ness I wonder if I might be permitted to keep a promise I made to the House. I am delighted to have it so soon. I frankly did not expect to have it so soon.

MR. SPEAKER: This is an answer to a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House give leave?—There is a rule that no questions may be asked or answered after the Orders of the Day have been entered upon.

Leave given by the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, it concerns Question 108, expenditure for the month of March is shown as \$220,897. The account had been queried on the grounds that this expenditure exceeded the total in the estimates for the year which were given. The explanation is the current account estimate contained no provision in respect of the refunding of interest paid by various new industries, and the revised estimates on current account did contain such provisions. The revised current vote of this department was set at \$363,600, an increase of \$193,200 for the refund of interest. The issues on this account amounted to \$195,514 which were made in March and are included in the total of \$220,000 for the month. In other words all interest repayments for the years were apparently made in that one month of March, and apparently, furthermore, were made in my department, the Department of Economic Development, which accounts for the rather startling figure that appeared in the answer to Question 108.

Now in reference to the supplementary agreement for the construction of the Birch Plant. The Deputy

Minister of Finance sent me this written memorandum: "The only agreement recorded in the Department of Finance has been copied and tabled. It is the original relating to the construction and operations of the plant. Queried all possible sources for agreement at the time copy was made. We must assume no supplementary agreement is in existence." Mr. Marshall informed me orally the only agreement there was is the one which was tabled. Now I must confess, I have a vague idea that there is a supplementary agreement which was discussed but never effected, I suppose. But I don't keep these agreements. They are kept either by the Attorney General or by the Department of Finance. We don't keep them in the Department of Economic Development. Mr. Marshall has informed me that no such thing exists in the Department of the Attorney General nor in the Department of Provincial Affairs nor in the Department of Finance, and he is virtually of the belief, he tells me, that no such second agreement exists.

Finally I promised to give the exact breakdown of the Gypsum Plant. If the honourable gentleman will take down the figures:

The total cost of the plant including the purchase of the equipment and machinery, construction of the building, setting up of the machinery, etc. as per Public Accounts 1952-53 the figure is \$2,599,008.73. Cost charged in 1953-54, \$214,755.50. With the capital expenditure added to that it makes a total of \$2,813,764.23. Let us now deduct customs refunds of duty \$40,919.59, leaving a figure of \$2,722,844.64. Now another table:

Capitalization for the  
purpose of shares \_\_\_\_\_ \$100,000

Initial working capital ----- 400,000

Apropos of these figures the House may remember that I said the total working capital was five hundred thousand dollars. The figure I had in mind meant these two together, the purchase of shares \$100,000 and \$400,000 additional working capital, the two together totalling \$500,000.

Then below that again add to these figures; restoration of loss on operation \$283,175.76. Now add all that up and it amounts to \$3,566,020.40, or three and a half million dollars. That is the entire capital cost of the plant, entire purchase of the shares, entire working capital, entire losses, the whole thing: \$3,566,020.40 to date.

MR. BROWNE: That does include the \$490,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is all-inclusive. That is the complete story to this moment, so the Controller of the Treasury tells me. But I am sure the House will appreciate that I do not carry the figures around in my mind. He tells me that is the story to this moment, and that is all I can say.

Statement tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Deferred Orders of the Day:

Second Reading of a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952":

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment incurred by various municipalities. It amounts to an addition to the schedule under the Act. The first makes provision for a little difficulty in connection with making provisions for the Town of Botwood issuing a bond issue of \$30,000 for the extension of water services in that locality. The

other two amendments make provision whereby Stephenville can raise a bond issue of \$600,000 for the installation of water and sewerage on which they have been engaged for the last few months. Thirdly, the Town of Deer Lake to raise a bond issue of \$120,000 in order that they may expand their water and sewerage facilities. Finally a small amount of \$4,600, a loan received by the local Government Council at Bear Head, Port au Port that they might install a water service, the loan to run for a period of three years.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I understood, from what the Minister has just said, the Minister of Public Works, if this Bill goes through, would have the authority, acting on behalf of the Crown, to guarantee a bond issue of \$80,000 for the Botwood Water Corporation.

It says "Where any bond or debenture issue is guaranteed under this Act and if the Lieutenant-Governor in Council so directs, the signature on the guarantee of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply or of the Minister of Finance, as the case may be, the signature on the bonds or the debentures of the appropriate mayor or chairman and the signature on the coupons, if any, attached to the bonds or debentures of the appropriate officer of the Local Authority or of the Botwood Water Corporation, as the case may be, may be lithographed or otherwise mechanically reproduced."

What I would like to know when the Minister replies, Mr. Speaker, is if that is a new thing that has come up? Have we heard of this before, wherein the Minister of Public Works

has, acting on behalf of the Crown, to guarantee the bonds of municipal corporations? It seems to me to be curious. May I suggest we change that to Minister of Finance. I understand the Minister of Finance must do that, because he is the direct financing officer of the Government. But it would be very unfortunate if the Minister of Public Works, of all people, has to do that, because he is the representative of the district.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is only an error. We will change that.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad to know that. Another thing, are these amounts here additions? I myself did not hear all the Minister had said. He has some difficulty in hearing me and I have some difficulty in understanding him. Perhaps when he replies he might refer to that again.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, the primary part of the Bill is really an addition to the schedule already attached to the Act, the Government Guarantee Act of 1952. Stephenville is new, \$600,000, Deer Lake is for an extension of what they have already, and I believe they have a bond indebtedness of \$100,000. Bear Head is new. They have had the loan. The work is done, and they want to regularize it under this schedule.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would move that Item 12 on the Order Paper be stricken out as it is a duplication of Item 13, and I would ask that Item 13 be called.

On motion Item 12 on the Order Paper discharged.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, it has been found that the provisions of the present Accident Insurance (Licensing) Act enacted in 1939 are absolutely inadequate in this day and age to enable the Minister of Finance to deal satisfactorily with the various types of insurance companies applying for licenses from time to time to incorporate in Newfoundland. Examination of the Act will show (a) that it contains few safeguards in respect of the screening of companies prior to licensing so as to insure that only reputable and financially sound companies are permitted to operate in the province (b) it imposes inadequate primary qualifications and requirements for licensing and (c) the Minister is practically helpless in the matter of the incorporation of companies under Newfoundland law and their subsequent licensing. It will be remembered, a few days ago we passed an amendment to the Companies Act saying that any company incorporated for the purpose of carrying on insurance should first have the approval of the Minister of Finance before the incorporation takes place.

The inadequacies of the Act have caused and are causing the department some concern and have proved to be a great handicap in the efficient supervision and control of companies. There has been a considerable increase in insurance activities since Confederation and it is so imperative that the Minister of Finance be provided with the necessary power to enable him to insure that the interests of the public and of the province are protected at all times.

The proposed amendments set forth

in this Bill have been discussed with the All Canadian Insurance Confederations of Montreal, an organization representing a majority of the other than life insurance companies operating in Canada. The Federation is of the opinion that the amendments are necessary and that they will impose no hardship whatsoever upon any reputable corporation.

I will be glad to discuss the details, section by section, in Committee. In the meantime I think the House will be prepared to accept this Bill.

I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think that you will certainly appreciate the difficulty that the Opposition are confronted with when speaking to a Bill which we have just been presented with for the first time and having no opportunity whatsoever to examine it. Now it seems to me that most of the legislation being brought in here this session has been of such a character that it could very well have been considered by a special committee of the House, if I may be pardoned for saying so. In Nova Scotia they have a special Committee on Legislation that considers all minor matters of amendments to legislation already enacted. I believe that we have enough lawyers in this House, under the direction of the Attorney General, to form a suitable committee to examine these Bills, and if any other of the members were interested at any time they could attend as well. I believe it would be most suitable, and I think they would get down to business promptly, and could examine the thing easily and bring in their recommendations to the House. Then they would go through, I think, in most cases, practically automatically. But it is very difficult

now for us to pick up a Bill and while the Minister is giving an explanation try and run our eyes over it and see what it is all about.

Now I have not been able to gather all the intentions that are embodied in this Bill, but I do notice one that I feel calls for some comment, that is, the provision contained in Section (5) which changes the license fee for the said license to \$50 to be paid before the issue of the same. That is repealed and the following substituted therefor: "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order direct the fee payable for license or renewal of license and the fee shall be paid before the license or renewal is issued."

Now unless there is some very good reason for giving to the Government power to fix fees I think the fees ought to be fixed right here, the same as income tax. The biggest fees fixed on people are settled in Parliament so the license for the insurance companies ought to be settled here in parliament and not that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order fix the fees payable for licenses or renewal of licenses. I would suggest that when we get in Committee that matter be considered. I believe it may be considered that the House could fix the fee here instead of having it left to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there is considerable merit in the suggestion of my honourable and learned friend. Unfortunately when the rules of this House were drafted there were only two lawyers in the House, the then Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself. And we did not want to create ourselves a Committee such as is suggested. But these Bills I must say are really non-partisan Bills. They have no political significance in

them, as we are all interested in the same thing, and this type of Bill might well, if we had such a Committee, have passed such a Committee—and I do think the House might well give some thought to that matter of having some such committee as my honourable friend suggested.

As regards his other suggestion, I think that is a matter we can deal with in Committee. I move second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole later on today.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Civil Service Act."

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has not been distributed.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot entertain the motion for second reading.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, we might defer that order.

On motion order deferred.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four, and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

MR. CURTIS: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is a Supplementary Supply Bill, and I don't think there is any debate.

On motion Bill read a second time.

MR. CURTIS: This Bill was discussed in the resolution stage, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the House may be prepared to have the Bill read a

third time, unless there is a wish to have it go into Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: I think for the purpose of the record if the House only went into Committee of the Whole and rose again.

MR. BROWNE: Is it the practice here to go into Committee of the Whole now on this Bill?

MR. CURTIS: I understood, Mr. Speaker, the practice was, if a Bill had been discussed in Committee and Resolution form we sometimes dispense with Committee of the Whole. However, it is only a suggestion—There is no ulterior motive, just that it is the practice we have followed if a Bill has been discussed as resolutions by way of Committee stage.

On motion Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the privilege of members when the motion is before the House to go into Committee on Supply to raise any particular grievance they may have.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a grievance now in respect to the petition put in to the Government several weeks ago to which I got an acknowledgement and no further information except for a very unenlightening one that it may be considered within the next six months or the next twelve months.

Now I have received complaints as to what is going on in at the Old Mill. I have been told that the place does not seem to be bound by any regulations. It is open from early Sunday morning to late Sunday night with crowds of trucks and cars around there before it is open and there very late. It is open week nights later hours as

well. The people in there consider that it is a nuisance the way it is being operated now. There are six or seven hundred people of the neighbourhood of Mount Pearl and Kilbride who protested in the first place to the Board of Liquor Control. They then put in a petition to the Government asking that a plebiscite be held in the area. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, they are following the laws as laid down in the Alcoholic Liquors Act, which gives them that privilege, the privilege to petition the Lieutenant-Governor in Council for the holding of a plebiscite.

Now it is true the Old Mill, as it is called, is located in an area where there are not many houses in the immediate vicinity. But today with the traffic the way it is it can cause a considerable annoyance and does cause a considerable annoyance in the place, immediately surrounding this particular location.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I put it forward seriously, the Government is not carrying out the law or is not seeing that the law is properly carried out when it permits a commercial establishment such as this is, a purely commercial establishment, that has no other purpose except the making of money, to be erected there under their auspices, with their full knowledge, and contrary to the wishes of the people who live around there. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Government are not treating the public concerned fairly when they refuse to give consideration to their honest petition which has been put forward. I know that the great majority of the people there don't want this institution there, and they have protested on several other occasions against the establishment of it, and in that locality were previously successful but this



time they have not been. They protested to the Board of Liquor Control before it was advertised that application was to be made for a license. The law, I say, is not being carried out in that respect. The club is not a club. It is just a joint for the sale of liquor to make money out of people who desire to get liquor, and the Government, Mr. Speaker, ought to take a decent step and give the people the privilege of voting on it by means of a plebiscite.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I here know for the first time that the place in question is not conducted in the most decent and orderly fashion, and hearing it I will certainly take steps before this day is over to check on the allegations to see whether in fact the honourable gentleman is right or correctly informed. If he is correctly informed and if the place in question is being conducted in a disorderly fashion, I will personally request my colleague, the Minister of Finance, under whom the Board of Liquor Control comes, to take immediate action to see that the law is carried out. If the place in question does not conduct itself in a perfectly decent and orderly fashion I will request my colleague to request the Board to close it down. I address myself only to the allegation that it is not being conducted in an orderly fashion.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committees, in the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think, Mr. Chairman, I must agree I have never seen this done before. When the resolutions have passed and a Bill is reported to give effect to them then I have seen it given, first, second and final reading but not put into Committee of the Whole ever. However—

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, that is quite true—I have never seen it. But there are one or two points that remain to be cleared up in respect to the total. It seems to me this amount is not in addition to the estimated expenditure last year, it is only part of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is correct. This amount is included already in the total amount of expenditure for last year. This is the budget.

MR. FOGWILL: In the budget speech, yes. In one sense, Mr. Chairman, only part of this amount is really supplementary supply in addition to the estimated expenditure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By far the greater portion though.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

Motion reported to Mr. Speaker. On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to suggest to the House—Wednesday is private members' day and the procedure, therefore, to see that we do meet tonight is a little different.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no private members' business on the Order Paper, therefore the rules apply as usually exist.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same rules? The House can move tonight—I do move the House do not adjourn its sitting at 6:00 o'clock.

Motion carried.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move the House into Committee of the Whole on items 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21.

Motion carried.

Committee of the Whole on Sundry Bills:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, might we start on Item 10?

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister tell us the extent of our Crown Lands at the present time, in miles or acres or what?

DR. ROWE: No, I could not off hand. It is a very considerable number of square miles. I could get the information for the House probably tomorrow. You must remember this point: People might have the rights of mineral exploration or timber rights, but that does not mean the land has been alienated.

MR. HOLLETT: What I mean is, to what extent do we have Crown Lands on which no leases have been granted?

DR. ROWE: I would have to have some time to answer that question.

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Is that the only thing included in timber?

DR. ROWE: There is no defini-

tion of timber in the old Act. That same definition is in the Saw Mills Act.

Clause 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: What is the reason for that sub-section—Subject to the Approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council any license issued, etc.

DR. ROWE: There are certain conditions which may arise whereby through no fault of, or perhaps through Acts of God, geography and other things—I take it the honourable and learned member has read the full section in the parent Act?

MR. BROWNE: I have it here now.

Clause 3 carried. Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5:

DR. ROWE: The only thing in there is the words "and the Regulations."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister to explain just the situation in regard to Crown Lands within the three mile area from the sea. You don't grant permits, I believe, to cut logs in that area except for domestic and fishing purposes. No other logs are permitted to be cut—Is that correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not on Crown Lands, the three-mile-limit lands, not Crown Lands, Bowaters for instance and the A.N.D. Co and Bowaters in Bonavista Bay and Reids.

MR. BROWNE: To what extent has the three mile limit been taken—I only know one area, Baie Verte.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Baie Verte so

much, all down White Bay, sections of my district, Gambo, Terra Nova, but that is not on the coast, it is inland, but around that Gambo section a lot of the three mile limit is gone.

MR. BROWNE: That has been gone a long time.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Reids had it when the AND or Bowaters.

DR. ROWE: The Transportation of Timber Bill coming in tomorrow has to do with the three mile limit.

MR. BROWNE: What, another Bill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is a hard-working Legislature, the hardest working in all Canada.

Clause 5 carried.

Clauses 6, 7 and 8 carried.

Clause 9:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that last section seems to involve something new. This is a case where on the three mile limit the Government are going to put up for tender the rights on Crown Lands and Section 9 says, no person shall cut or remove any trees except that he has obtained a permit from the Minister in accordance with this Act. So that the Minister can sell by auction or by tender the right to cut wood on the three mile limit as well as on any other Crown Land.

DR. ROWE: No. There is a clause before that, earlier in the Act, which prohibits giving a license—Section 59 of this Bill, which says: "Any such license may not be granted on land situated within three miles of tide-water.

MR. BROWNE: Then in Section 9 by giving the permit to cut trees,

that is not a license, it is a permit to cut.

DR. ROWE: A commercial permit.

MR. BROWNE: A lease may not be granted on such lands but a permit to cut trees. It seems to me a different phraseology—Why not have the same phraseology used throughout the Act?

DR. ROWE: I may say there—This is not meant for general application but for special cases to get the department out of a difficulty, although not perhaps as crude as that—It is best illustrated by explaining what happened last year. The Government opened the Bond Estate. The Bond Estate had part of it over-matured with too much timber on it. We were advised by technical men it should be opened up and thinned out, and some areas should be well cut because a lot of the timber is being lost. We must keep in mind all the time that timber is a crop and has a life span of sixty-eight or a hundred years, and that there is a certain amount of damage by storms etc. Although trees are blown down they are still sound for a period of probably three years. While there is only a limited amount, as the Bond Property is not very big, but there must have been at least fifty mill owners, and other people who wanted to go in there and cut. Clearly we could not do that. There was only room there for five or six at the most to operate. What then could we do. How were we to select the five or six, In a case of that kind the thing could be handled economically by one operator, and it would have been a good thing if we were able to put it out on tender. We are getting less revenue from timber than any other province of Canada. There is a great contrast between

what we are getting and what Quebec is getting. This would enable the Government in certain instances to ask for tenders. This has no relation, for example, to cutting firewood on the three mile limit or for fisheries, but in such special cases as the one just cited.

MR. BROWNE: Will the Minister tell us, Mr. Chairman, how many cut the timber on the Bond land? I am still concerned—Under that temporary arrangement are you going to use this principle or would it all be cut now?

DR. ROWE: What we did was to draw up a plan out there for the management of that area and then recommended what should be done, where the roads should be cut in which vicinity. We should divide it in five lots and the saw mill owners of Whitbourne were given contracts, small contracts.

MR. ROWNE: Is the Government getting any return, and how much?

DR. ROWE: I have not the scale, but they obtain a license.

MR. BROWNE: So much per thousand feet?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Would that be logs—How do you estimate that?

DR. ROWE: I have not the scale, but possibly a small amount on which he saws.

MR. BROWNE: I notice that some birch has been taken from there and brought to the Birch Plant. Has the Government been paid for that, do you know?

DR. ROWE: Whether we have been paid as yet or not I don't know.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Government supposed to be paid?

DR. ROWE: Oh yes for every commercial tree that comes off. We brought in a scale two years ago—Not by the Birch Plant but the cutter. We get paid for things like ties and wharf sticks, fencing material, any kind of a log cut out.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us how much stumpage or royalty is collected?

DR. ROWE: Not off-hand. Incidentally that material will be made available in the next few weeks.

MR. BROWNE: How do you assess it?

DR. ROWE: I don't recall off-hand—There are different ways. We have a scale for lumber so much a cord, on raw wood for example \$2 a cord—I am not sure. I shall be very glad to bring the scale along to the House sometime this week.

Clause 9 carried.

Clause 10:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister how many of these areas are in existence at the present time?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, this is a new section. My honourable and learned friend will see that under the old Act we did have power to set aside a reservation but it was all very vague and confused and nothing ever came of it. But this, I may say, has been done in consultation with the Royal Commission on Forestry. We have had requests from certain areas in Newfoundland—I just recall we have had a request from the Southern Shore and other areas as well.

MR. BROWNE: What part of the Southern Shore?

MR. MURRAY: As the honourable member across knows, the timber lands on the Southern Shore have been burned for centuries. There is a report in Prowse's History where a chap who came out with Calvert reported a forest fire. If there were some sort of protection system set up the trees would reproduce, somewhat like a checker-board system, one protective block and one that could be used. I have had some technical advice on the matter and it is felt the forest would reproduce itself in a few years.

DR. ROWE: In certain areas in Newfoundland we have to prevent a repetition of what happened in history where whole areas were decimated. Like, for example, when I was at Wesleyville the people had to go fifteen miles in order to get firewood, over what once was forest land. Under this, that would be prevented, only the crop would be removed. That is something being done increasingly in British Columbia and Alberta and the Maritime Provinces as well—To set up a forest management.

MR. BROWNE: That is a ten mile area?

DR. ROWE: No, I believe it is three square miles. It could be applied to any area where there is a need at a local level. The people have a right to move in on the three mile limit and take firewood and wood for fishery purposes. But there is nothing to prevent a man going in a small area and cleaning it right off, which may be what did happen in our history. Now we intend to set up some forest management plan which will prevent that sort of thing.

MR. BROWNE: These are very strict rules. I suppose they will protect the Government. What is the purpose of (k)?

DR. ROWE: Well this spells out what we do. As far as (k) is concerned we have been doing that for years: For every person in Newfoundland who cuts, other than the man who cuts for local consumption and domestic needs, firewood, fishery purposes or fencing or anything of that kind, has to have a permit, and he has to make a report on it. We had the regulations but this defies them more clearly. I must say we have done it following a conference of all our field men. We brought them in here sometime last year. They told us some of their troubles and worries. Of course we discussed these matters with the Royal Commission on Forestry. We also had the benefit of our own foresters and a new man from Scandinavia, a highly skilled man. All put together, we have come up with this. Even this however —

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if I may interrupt to ask you a question now? Has the Committee consulted with this Commission as to whether there was any value here in Newfoundland in a process of reforestation?

DR. ROWE: I have asked the Chairman of the Commission to go into that. In fact that is in their terms of reference.

Clauses 10 through 12 carried.

Clause 13 read:

13. Section 117 of the said Act is amended by deleting the word "June" and substituting therefor the word "March".

MR. BROWNE: What does that mean?

DR. ROWE: We have tried to make it correspond to our financial year, that is all.

MR. HOLLETT: Usually the reports are tabled in the next session. Your amendment will mean once the end of March is passed the Minister is liable to produce it and we can ask—"When is the Minister going to bring down the report." If it was made some other time, say, 31 December that would be reasonable because it would not be rushed. What time of the year are most of the licenses and permits given out?

DR. ROWE: It is going on all the time, permits to cut and mineral licenses could be any time. Again it is not intended to be over a year. The Minister presents to the Legislature a report of what has happened up to the end of the preceding year, the preceding June. That is nine months before. That would mean June 1953 in this case.

MR. BROWNE: In other words the statement would be a year behind time.

Clause 13 and 14 carried.

Bill passed without amendment.

MR. CURTIS: I move the Committee now rise and report having passed these two Bills and ask leave to sit again on the others, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

Report received. Committee ordered to sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. SPEAKER: With the permis-

sion of the House it is now 6:00 of the clock. I shall now leave the Chair until 8:00 of the clock.

House recessed until 8:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, June 16, 1954.

### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given for this Committee to sit again and I now leave the Chair.

Mr. Courage (Chairman of Committees) in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act";

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Paragraph (k) of Section 2 of The Social Security Assessment Act, Chapter 41 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(k) "sale price" or "purchase price" means a price in money, the value of services rendered, the actual value of the thing exchanged and any other consideration accepted by seller or person from whom the property passes as the price or on account of the price of the thing covered by the contract, sale, or exchange, and includes

(i) the charges for municipal tax, for customs, for excise and Dominion Sales Tax and for transportation to the port of entry into Newfoundland; and

(ii) where the Minister so provides, the charges for installation or servicing of the thing sold."



MR. HOLLETT: On the definition of sales prices or purchase price. Does it mean the price in relation to the value of services rendered? Does that apply when you ask a man to put up a fence for you? Do you mean there is a sales tax on a service of that kind?

MR. CURTIS: No, that is a contract for services. I explained that very fully when I was introducing the Bill on the second reading. For instance the installation of a washing machine where the services rendered are included in this tax where and if they are added to the price, but if they are separate, so much for the machine and so much for installation, you don't pay for installation, but if the cost of installation is included in the price and it is too difficult to break it up, you pay a tax on it.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to know the principle on which the Government charges sales tax on a charge for municipal tax. It is only payable where there are municipalities. A person outside St. John's gets oil delivered to him but he does not pay any municipal tax and he does not have to pay the three per cent tax on that. So the Government is discriminating between people who live inside and outside the city and only a short distance between. One on either side of the boundary and the person in the city pays three per cent on Municipal Tax which is one cent on oil and that one cent is put on by the Municipal Council. And they pay the coal tax which the city formerly got. It does not seem to be fair for the Government to put three per cent on that.

MR. CURTIS: Let us take it out.

MR. BROWNE: I move that the words "Municipal tax" be deleted.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: "For transportation to the Port of Entry into Newfoundland." Does that refer to the Excise and Dominion sales tax of imports from separate ports of sending and for transportation to the port of entry into Newfoundland? Sometimes goods are landed into one port which is not always the port of entry. Does it mean we have to pay the tax between the two ports? One is the port of entry and one is not. If so, you are discriminating. Is that not putting a burden on the person who had to purchase such goods. I just ask for an explanation on it.

MR. CURTIS: There is no tax after it gets to the port of entry. A purchase is made in St. John's which is to be delivered to Harbour Grace where there is no tax on freight here to Harbour Grace. It is a St. John's tax. If Harbour Grace resells the tax is on it then.

MR. BROWNE: Suppose the merchant in Harbour Grace imports goods as they come to St. John's, and that is the port of entry?

MR. CURTIS: There is a sales tax up to that.

MR. BROWNE: And suppose it has to be delivered in Bay Roberts. He does not have to pay a tax from St. John's to Bay Roberts?

MR. CURTIS: No.

MR. BROWNE: Is there not going to be difficulty in estimating the tax there? Where there is a through shipment from St. John's to Montreal, won't there be some difficulty there?

MR. CHALKER: If you purchase goods from the Dominion of Canada your price is laid down, St. John's Corner Brook, Grand Falls.

MR. BROWNE: Port-aux-Basques and St. John's.

MR. CHALKER: The price is still laid down C.I.F. St. John's. The goods delivered to St. John's at say three cents a pound, to Port-aux-Basques would be two and a half cents. That would not interfere with merchants in St. John's. He would have to pay on cost delivered to his port of delivery. Anywhere on the Avalon Peninsula you can bring the goods in for the same price from Montreal. East of Bishop's Falls the price is the same, west of Bishop's Falls the price is almost the same.

MR. BROWNE: There are two methods by which small parcels are sent. Express and parcel post. Parcel post from Montreal is only liable to three per cent at port of entry which would be Port-aux-Basques. If it came by air, where is the port of entry? It might go to Stephenville. That transportation would be difficult.

MR. CURTIS: That would apply to goods shipped direct from Eatons to the customer. The majority of stuff would be valued at sales price as sold in St. John's. It is the sales price in St. John's. If you bought an item from Eatons you only pay three per cent on the price you pay for goods plus the freight on the first port it reaches in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: Why put in the freight?

MR. CURTIS: I doubt if they did. I think that is put in probably to cover cases where there are resales by the firms. For instance, included in their costs.

MR. HOLLETT: Supposing somebody brings a load of coal to St. Ant-

hony, LaScie or some place further north from Sydney. Is that three per cent levied on the freight of that load of coal?

MR. CURTIS: Not unless it is resold at St. Anthony.

MR. HOLLETT: If we do that we do something to make it heavy on the people who live further north. You charge them three per cent on transportation.

MR. CHALKER: That is the way it is now.

MR. HOLLETT: I do not care what it is now, but is it right? The freight rates to St. Anthony or further north—there is quite a difference on the freight. The man down there has to pay three per cent over and above what the man here has to pay. I don't think it is fair.

MR. HEFFERTON: I do not think that can be changed at all. If a person in Bay Roberts brings in a cargo of coal say \$18.00, the retail price is based on not only cost of the coal but freight and overhead and the rest of it and three per cent is on that. A merchant in St. Anthony finds his price is \$20.00 and he has to charge three per cent on that. That is going on all the time.

MR. HOLLETT: Why make it harder on these people down there?

MR. CHALKER: It is just as much a hardship on people in St. John's when things are brought in to Corner Brook and have to come to St. John's.

DR. ROWE: Take a vessel taking freight from St. John's say, to Nain, the freight rates would vary, so much for Seldom and LaScie and Cartwright. I think it would be confusing to

make allowances in getting the articles to the merchants.

MR. HOLLETT: Why have 3 per cent on the freight? You have it on the cost of goods?

MR. CHALKER: It would be an awful job to take it off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This discussion illustrates the point made here some days ago. This is a tax on consumption. It is the worst kind of tax there can be. The more expensive the article of consumption the more tax you pay on it. The higher prices go the higher taxes you pay. It is the very opposite of a tax on income. The higher prices go the less taxes you pay. It is the least desirable kind of a tax, a tax on consumption because the difference between a man with an income of \$20,000.00 a year and a man with an income of \$10,000.00 is the difference between a man who spends all his income on consumer goods and therefore pays his tax on all his living and the man with \$20,000.00 who spends \$10,000.00 and pays three per cent on half his income and none on the rest. It is not an ideal tax, it is anything but. I know of no other tax you can adopt in substitution for it that will bring in half or quarter of its revenue. If anyone can tell the Government of another kind of tax that will bring in the same amount of money and will be more easy on the people of Newfoundland I will be most happy. I have racked my brain and can't think of anything but others may. It is the kind of tax that bears most unfairly than other taxes except customs duties which go up when values go up and again bears unfairly on the toiling masses whose income and outgo nearly always meet. They are lucky if their income

meets their outgo. We might as well face it. It is not a good tax. It is the best we can find and we are hoping for suggestions to find another one that will give us five or six or seven million dollars a year. We have to carry it out until we get a better one.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier kind of insinuates we don't pay customs duties in this country. We pay them indirectly. To say we don't pay customs duties is kind of ridiculous. The goods in Newfoundland today are the same kind of article imported into Canada. If we imported goods from U.S.A. and pay some of the duties the price would not be any higher than they pay in Canada.

What I am pointing out is the difference in charges to the man, and I am thinking especially of coal—a man has to pay three per cent tax on the freight and that freight would be much lower than the freight on similar cargoes of coal to a place like St. Anthony or Labrador. That is a discriminatory tax against the man who lives far away from the source of supply. Being a far eastern province of Canada we are many miles from the scene of things and it costs us more to live. By the imposition of this tax you make it more difficult for people in this province to live and that is what I want to point out.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill what is the meaning of that clause, "Where the Minister so decides, etc." Is it not dangerous to leave things to the Minister to decide? He can decide one way in one case and another way in another case. What he decided today he can alter tomorrow. Is not this a new principle being introduced to give the Minister

the power to decide when the charge should be made?

MR. CURTIS: I take it those are rules made by the Minister which will be of general application once they are made.

MR. BROWNE: It does not say that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister does not personally intervene in these matters. The Minister of Finance would probably know least of all about these matters and in matters of taxation the Ministers interfere least of all. Ministers of the Crown probably know least about the dealings or collection of taxes. I was Minister of Finance for one year or a year and a half and I went to my office there quite frequently and I know that what I am saying of myself is true of every Minister of Finance we have had, Mr. Quinton and the present Minister. It is true of them as it is of me. Take income tax. All the records of the income tax are there in the department. I refused to look at them, did not want to see any details, did not want to know and refused to know who owed what and why. I said that these are matters for permanent officials who will be here after we are gone and who were here before we came. A politician ought not to have that kind of knowledge of the personal intimate business affairs of such firms in Newfoundland, so I realistically declined and the Minister of Finance did likewise. These matters are sometimes referred to Cabinet by the Deputy Minister for final decision, not in any detail, not with any of the confidential detailed information in these cases. We have taken that stand from the beginning. It is the only honourable and honest stand for a government to take.

MR. BROWNE: That does not relieve the Deputy Minister of his difficulty because the obligation is put on him to decide—Where the Minister so decides—can be read into it, whether it is an agent or the Deputy Minister or Assistant Deputy Minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is true of all assistants of the department, virtually always vested in the Minister, I say, in most departments, the Minister just does not do it, does not even see it, merely ratifies what is officially recommended to him.

MR. BROWNE: With all due deference to the opinion given by the Honourable the Premier—On the next page it speaks of the Deputy Minister.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The carrying out of this Act is put into the hands of the Deputy Minister.

MR. BROWNE: I don't think it is right. I don't think it is a good idea to leave it like it is now. I can understand the regulations, but the regulations would have to be published and would be the same for everyone. But as it reads now it gives the Minister latitude I feel he should not have. A friend of his, I won't say contestant but a supporter comes along and says: "Look here, I am getting a refrigerator installed or an electric washing machine and want to get some wire. Don't charge me for installation or for service." He is told, "No, that is all right, I will fix that up." Then somebody else comes along and he does not like the look of him—I am not saying he would do that—

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the subtitle it is the Deputy Minister, but even they would not do it. There is a division and it is the division that actually does it. The authority is

nominally in the Minister, nominally in the Government in the beginning, but it comes all the way down to the heads of the division.

MR. BROWNE: Is there a kind of board there, a group of people, is there anything like that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: Who would take these cases and make a general rule?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: It seems to me there should be. This is a most important source of revenue for the Government now, and it seems to me they would be justified in having some group of officials constituting a board to deliberate different points likely to arise from time to time and give a decision.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is a division—Mr. Frank Hue is the head of the division. As a matter of fact the Committee is aware of the fact that, as in the debate on the estimates it was pointed out, a new post was created and provided for in the estimates that we have passed, that of a person immediately under the Deputy Minister of Finance. The duties of that post are to carry out the collection of revenues. Under him will come the collection of arrears in income tax, under him will come the collection of the SSA, but that in turn will in fact be done by the SSA Division, under Mr. Hue. But this chief revenue clerk will be responsible for the collection of this and all other revenues, and he in turn will be answerable to the Deputy Minister. So this sets up the administrative machinery. The Minister knows that there are such persons, but a Minister is primarily a member of the Cabinet, pri-

marily he is a member of the Council. He sits in council with the other Ministers. He does not interest himself in the ordinary business administration of the department because permanent officials who are there and have grown up with it and who will be there after the Minister is gone are obviously the ones to carry it out. So I suggest it is in all well-organized departments. There is no need for ministerial intervention in details of administration in that way, most particularly you don't with matters of the collection of revenue, that is left strictly to the permanent officials of the department.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask the Minister what he had in mind when putting in the words "Where the Minister so decides"? He must have had something in mind when he added "Where the Minister so decides."

MR. SMALLWOOD: This Act was drafted by the SSA Division plus the Controller of the Treasury, the Minister of Finance and Deputy Minister of Finance, went to the legislation department and then came to Cabinet. Not even the Cabinet decided these words were to go there. That was decided by the administrative machinery of the department.

MR. HOLLETT: I am asking the question—Why are the words there?

MR. CURTIS: Somebody must decide in case of doubt.

MR. HOLLETT: The tax has to be paid anyway. Why leave it open that some Minister may decide that John Jones may not pay the 3%. I wonder what effect it will have.

MR. CURTIS: Well—"Where the regulations so provide."

MR. BROWNE: That would be satisfactory.

MR. CURTIS: I mean to substitute the words "Where the regulations so provide."

MR. HOLLETT: That will satisfy everybody.

Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask—Why 1950?

MR. CURTIS: That is the drafting of the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words, are you going to collect all the arrears under that particular section?

MR. CURTIS: No, that is the procedure being followed.

MR. HOLLETT: I see.

Carried.

Clause 4 read :

4. Section 5 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor

"5. A person purchasing stock through a sale in bulk from a vendor is liable for payment of any assessment collected or due and payable but not remitted to the Deputy Minister by the vendor, unless the person obtains from the vendor a copy of a certificate issued by the Deputy Minister to the vendor to the effect that all assessments collected or owed by the vendor have been received by the Deputy Minister."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I don't understand why this clause (h) is put in, because the practice here has been to exempt purchases less than 17c.

MR. CURTIS: 15c. it is now.

MR. BROWNE: I asked a shop-

keeper tonight just after I left here at 6:00 o'clock and he said he charged the tax on 17c. When I saw 15c, here I was surprised. I went out and asked what he was charging a tax on and he said 17c. I know that from other shops also. I don't know how the impression got about, but I think everyone understands that.

Clause carried.

Clauses 5, 6, 7, 8 carried.

Clause 9 read :

9. Section 26 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"26. Any person appointed by the Deputy Minister may enter upon the business premises of a vendor or any other person during ordinary hours of business or at any other reasonable time in order to inspect or examine the books of account, records or documents of the vendor or other person, or for the purpose of ascertaining the quantities of tangible personal property on hand or sold or consumed or used by the vendor or other person and that the assessments collected or payable by the vendor or other person have been remitted or paid to the Deputy Minister, and the vendor or other person shall answer all questions pertaining to these matters and shall produce for inspection such books of account, records or documents as the person appointed may request."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Attorney General could explain what is meant by "every other person." This Act applies only to sales and therefore applies only to vendors.

MR. CURTIS: I was just looking it up to see what the interpretation



was. The vendor means any person who in the ordinary course of business in Newfoundland—There might be a vendor who sells not in the ordinary course of business and it must be to cover a vendor not normally a vendor. It might even apply to a private person who sells furniture and stuff privately at a sale or over the radio or something like that.

MR. MURRAY: Or a man who sells his own car.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is not a vendor as defined in the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister tell us what, if any, action has been taken relative to the collection of over-due assessments? Or could the Minister inform us as to what steps have been taken as outlined here where the Deputy Minister may enter upon any premises — Just what has been done—I remember a statement being made some time back about millions and millions not being paid. I believe the Premier made that statement. Would the Minister make a statement on that?

MR. CURTIS: The Department employs inspectors, Mr. Chairman, who go around from place to place. Time after time we have taken action, but we have really been waiting for these amendments.

MR. MURRAY: As Solicitor General I went to Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Bell Island and took whatever actions were passed along to me by the Department: issued summonses and took them before the magistrates in these towns. I think there were over sixty in Corner Brook and thirty in Grand Falls and about twenty on Bell Island.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister give us any idea as to the

amount collected by that particular process?

MR. MURRAY: Well, the thing was fairly badly in default. I think it was principally a propaganda campaign. Afterwards the amounts in default or arrears started to stop. I think it went in one month from three hundred thousand dollars to four hundred thousand.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: No, I am not satisfied with that explanation. It does not seem to be logical. It is only a vendor who sells. Now the Solicitor General cites the case of a person selling his own car, but I don't think the section applies there. "Any person appointed by the Deputy Minister may enter upon the business premises of a vendor or any other person during the ordinary hours of business or within a reasonable time." I think it reads "the business premises of a vendor" and "The business premises of any other person." But the section assumes the man has a place of business. Now what kind of business is there except a vendor where you would be concerned about his having paid the tax. For instance there would be a movie theatre, or a printer's shop or a shoemaker's shop. But there would be no vending done in those places.

MR. CURTIS: There might be.

MR. BROWNE: Could you think of anything they might be vending, if they were?

MR. MURRAY: If we go back to Clause 4 there might be a possible explanation. That would mean an ordinary person who does not ordinarily do that sort of thing, a person other than a vendor, and surely it

would be right for an inspector to enter upon his premises.

MR. BROWNE: I can understand the explanation given now, seeing that section. It means that if a person sells out his business the purchaser must see to it that the person selling out his business has paid his social security assessment, or he goes to the Deputy Minister and gets it in writing to go ahead and buy.

MR. MURRAY: When we get to Clause 9—a vendor or any other person—would he be such a person?

MR. BROWNE: I don't think so.

MR. CURTIS: Would that be an auctioneer. He is "such other person." He only sells for somebody as his agent.

MR. BROWNE: I think an auctioneer may sell articles that are new apart from things they pick up second hand, job-lot. Some of them sell job-lots.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not all, one or two of them—Mr. Fitzgibbon does not, and he is an auctioneer or he was.

MR. BROWNE: And still is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But he does not sell new stuff and does not hold stuff for sale. He goes in and conducts an auction.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell us how many inspectors are employed by the Department in the enforcement of this Act? While he is doing it could he tell us if they discovered many cases where proper books were not being kept? I don't want any names, of course.

MR. MURRAY: I would like to make it clear that I am not the Min-

ister who administers this Act. I was merely acting as Solicitor General. I cannot tell you how many inspectors there are. It is not my Department. I know there were a lot of people in the beginning who did not make returns. But I think the thing is pretty well under control now.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend is referring back to a section which has already been passed, section 6. We were stymied on that because the word "and" was there. In other words it was not an offence not to keep records. It was not an offence to fail to make returns. The offence was to fail in both. That is the reason we could not prosecute under that section, but from now on we may.

MR. HOLLETT: Could anybody tell me how many inspectors there are?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty dozen and sixteen.

MR. BROWNE: We were told there were six the other day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It depends on what is meant. There are three classifications. One is a chartered or certified accountant, a man with a pretty high classification in accountancy. Then secondly men with qualifications in accountancy but not nearly so high and finally there are people who have been taken on but not as established civil servants, but have been taken on for a relatively short time. Some of these are ex-policemen and some of them are men who have good common-sense, practical men with enough experience and intelligence and background to be able to go into a shop and ask to see the entries, the system of recording their collections and their sales. Now all

these number, I believe, sixteen for the whole province. Between twelve or fourteen or sixteen.

MR. MURRAY: Six officers Grade VI, six officers Grade V and one Grade VII.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was not far out.

MR. BROWNE: That makes it thirteen.

MR. HOLLETT: I meant, Mr. Chairman, the people who represent the Department in the section.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now the honourable gentleman knows.

Clause 9 and 10 carried.

Clause 11 read:

11. Section 30 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"30. Every person who makes a false statement in any form or return under this Act or the regulations is guilty of an offence."

MR. BROWNE: I wonder what that means there "Every person who makes a false statement is guilty of an offence." He is guilty already. He has not been tried nor given any hearing. He is stated to be guilty in the Act. This court which is above all courts decides he is guilty. It should be "is liable to prosecution for the offence", or something like that. But to state he is guilty. There may be some explanation. It is not always the individual owner of a shop who makes out the returns. It may be that a clerk could make a mistake, or it may be a typographical error. It is here laid down that every person who makes a false statement—

MR. HOLLETT: Why not say every person proven.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You don't have to say every person who is proven guilty of murder shall be hanged, but everyone guilty of murder shall be hanged.

MR. BROWNE: But "everyone who makes a false statement."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Everyone who kills a person under certain circumstances is guilty of murder—That is what it says.

MR. BROWNE: It says "Anyone who makes a false statement in any returns is guilty."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is he not?

MR. BROWNE: He has to be proven so. But this says "guilty".

MR. SMALLWOOD: This creates the assumption. Carried

MR. BROWNE: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was about to ask for more order in Committee. I was about to ask that parliamentary rules be adhered to.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I submit a statement like that, without any recourse at all, a man is guilty before he goes to court—I don't know what you can charge him with, but he is certainly stated here to be guilty because he has made a false statement. Now he may have a very valid explanation. We cannot at this moment dispose of all conditions and circumstances likely to arise. But after the thing happens then get an explanation from the man. But here it states—"He is guilty".

MR. CURTIS: Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any answer?

MR. CURTIS: No, a matter of opinion.

Carried.

Clause 12 read :

12. Section 31 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor :

"31. The Deputy Minister may, in addition to any other penalty imposed by this Act, impose a penalty of not less than ten dollars nor more than one hundred dollars upon every person who fails to make any return required by this Act or the regulations in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor."

MR. BROWNE : Here is the trial. We had the trial and now we have the judge, I object to the Deputy Minister being given power to put penalties on people. I consider that is very bad law. If a man is to be tried and found guilty and punished it should be done in open court. A man can go in to the Deputy Minister's office who will say to him, "You are guilty of an offence and fined one hundred dollars." That has happened. A man came to me to defend him. He was caught smuggling liquor. He was working in the United States and came here as a tourist and he brought a bottle of gin in his pocket and as he was going ashore, the customs officer stopped him and he said to me, "My father is a very prominent citizen. I would not like to go before court. The law permits me to go before the Finance Minister. Will you see that I do?" I went to the Minister of Finance and Customs and he said, "He is fined one hundred dollars." If he had gone before a magistrate he would have been fined much lower, if anything. A judge is supposed to be fair and hear the evidence and say "Now my fellow what would you like to say,

have you got any witnesses, is there any explanation for your conduct?" The Deputy Minister is not going to all that trouble, he is interested only in building up the revenue. I draw to the attention of the Attorney General, and I feel sure that he and the Solicitor General knows it is true what I say, that a man is entitled to a fair trial and where he goes before the Deputy Minister how can he be given a fair trial? I suggest that provision be stricken out.

MR. MURRAY : How can my learned friend explain the situation obtaining in Finance, when he collects our own income tax? Does he not have the same power, the Minister of Finance?

MR. BROWNE : I do not know, but people have been brought before the courts. A person who fails to make his return is liable. I remember now and if my honourable friend, the member for St. John's East, was here he would tell you that he and I have defended people who have been brought before the court who have failed to bring in their income tax.

MR. CURTIS : But hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of people were dealt with by the Assessor and we are still collecting from them. The case never goes to court.

MR. BROWNE : Is not my honourable friend referring to pre-Confederation debts?

MR. CURTIS : Yes. The Federal Government also today has power and imposes fines without taking people to court.

MR. MURRAY : The income tax is a man's own money and if he can get away with it, God bless him, but this is the Government's money which

he holds in trust and he tries to conceal it. He should not be entitled to much consideration.

MR. BROWNE: That attitude has come to mean that people who are likely to be charged with offences do not deserve much consideration. Is not every man innocent until proven guilty? What are the courts for, the Attorney General here? Are not the courts here to try cases?

MR. CURTIS: Not in this type of case. The courts have as many different types of sentences as there are judges. I have seen judges release people who should have gone to goal and other judges for the same offence fined three times as much. I know fellows who say, "I was fined ten dollars in Harbour Main but in St. John's I might have been fined ten times as much."

MR. BROWNE: I am surprised to hear the Attorney General make remarks like that on magistrates in this country. Justice should be tempered with mercy and sometimes it is more beneficial to fine a man ten dollars and five dollars and in some cases no fine at all. British justice has always been administered like that. If you have one hundred dollars for everyone, rich or poor, you get grave injustices. The Deputy Minister is prejudiced against a person appearing before him and anyone who appears before him charged with this Act will not get the justice he deserves as if he goes before a magistrate.

MR. HOLLETT: In making laws I think, I am only in civilian life but I was a magistrate for twenty-five years and I had all sorts of people before me, men who were convicted and merchants who knew little about bookkeeping. I do remember there

are still a lot of men in this country carrying on businesses and keeping books who have not had sufficient training in this respect. They are liable to make false returns. They do not mean to make false returns. They make a mistake and it is called false returns here. The Deputy Minister is not going to haul over these files. He could delegate his auditors and they go into a store and discover something wrong, the man has not made a correct return, a false return and he says, "You are guilty, I fine you \$10.00" and so on. He fines him right there and then.

MR. CURTIS: Is that not better than dragging him before a judge and having the publicity?

MR. HOLLETT: No, certainly not. Not in the interest of justice. If you have the Deputy Minister or somebody on his behalf go into a store and fine a man \$10.00 and put it in his pocket and turn it in or forget to turn it in, you open the road to graft and corruption and lots of people would only be too glad to turn over \$50.00 to keep the thing quiet. I think the man should go before a magistrate or a judge. If you delegate all such things as that to the Deputy Minister or the Minister you can do without the courts eventually. My learned friend has made a good point and I think the Government should give it some consideration and make some amendments which would make it a little more like civilized law. I would ask the Minister to allow it to stand over until given more thought.

MR. MURRAY: I do not think you have read the section. A person who has to make a return is an agent. He gets a vendor's license and becomes the agent of the Deputy Minister. It is not to be an obligation to impose

on anybody. If he does not make his return the Deputy Minister may put a penalty on him. There is no question of lack of justice. The penalty a Minister may impose is for not carrying out the section, not for making a false return.

MR. BROWNE: Here is what that section repeals, "Every person who fails to make any return required by this Act or the regulations in the manner and within the time prescribed therefor is, in addition to any other penalty imposed by this Act, liable to a penalty of one hundred dollars." He is liable to a penalty of one hundred dollars. It can be seen that in addition to the punishment before the Magistrate he is also liable to punishment before the Deputy Minister and unless there is good reason given for it and I do not know of any, I know it was the practice for the officer to impose penalties, it was the practice here for the Minister of Finance to do it, but I think it is a practice that should be discontinued if it exists now. I do not think it is a good practice. A man should be considered innocent until he is proven guilty. I would like to see the Attorney General who is responsible for carrying out this—

MR. JANES: The honourable gentleman for St. John's West should also add that it is the practice of the Assessor of Taxes here now, I mean income tax—Most of the vendors who are making this return to the Government, for Social Security Assessment, are also liable to fines of five dollars or ten dollars by the Assessor himself. They are also subject to penalties if they do not file by the end of the year. There is nothing strange about this.

MR. BROWNE: You will find the law says that any person who fails to

make a return of income tax shall be liable to a penalty of such and such but I do know there were several prosecutions in the Magistrate's Court last year for people who failed. I defended some of them. I know they were brought up and liable to twenty-five dollars a day penalty. They were brought up by the R.C.M.P. before the magistrate. They were not fined by the Assessor.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There were many who were.

MR. BROWNE: These were not. Why was there a difference made? I know they were brought up before the magistrate. I do not know if any were fined by the Assessor.

MR. JANES: I know people who were fined by the Assessor for failure to file employment assessments if they were not submitted by the 15th of the month. They are fined just by the Assessor.

MR. CURTIS: Is it not silly to bring a case like that before court when a man is a day late?

MR. HOLLETT: Two wrongs do not make a right. It is wrong anyway for any person on behalf of the Deputy Minister to fine for making what they call—or neglected to make a return? You will notice by the next clause, "Every person who feels aggrieved by any penalty or interest imposed under Section 29 or Section 31 may appeal to the Minister . . ." First he must appeal to the Minister. The Minister can say, "You are right and you do not have to pay it." If he is dissatisfied with the decision of the Minister he may appeal to a judge or to a District Court. I point out to you that that is all very well in the city where we have judges galore. If I am a shopkeeper and am fined by the



Deputy Minister or one of his deputies I can go to the Magistrate, or to the Minister first and then to the Magistrate. There are places along our coastline where you would not see a magistrate for six months and even he is not allowed to hear the case. How is he going to get justice? They have to write to the Minister first and ask what he thinks about it, and how does he know about the circumstances? He can only write back to the man and tell him he is sorry but he can't do anything for him. He can then appeal to the Supreme Court. He has to come in here and hire a lawyer, like my learned friend or any lawyers on the other side and get them to bring the matter before the Supreme Court.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has to do that. The case begins in the first instance in court.

MR. HOLLETT: I maintain it should be heard before a magistrate or two J. P.'s. Legislation of this sort ought to be so framed as to not appear dictatorial on the part of any government or any body.

MR. CURTIS: The fact acknowledged by my honourable friend prevents it being heard immediately before a magistrate. He admits there are shopkeepers here, three or four miles from a magistrate, and instead of having a Deputy Minister assess him ten dollars he would have him go before a court or the court in St. John's.

MR. HOLLETT: The magistrates in this country travel around the coast.

MR. CURTIS: You said he goes every six months.

MR. HOLLETT: When he is re-

quired he goes. If a case arises then off he goes.

Clause carried.

Clause 13 read:

13. The said Act is further amended by inserting therein immediately after Section 31 as Section 31A the following:

31A.—(1) Every person who feels aggrieved by any penalty or interest imposed under Section 29 or Section 31 may appeal to the Minister, and if he is dissatisfied with the decision of the Minister he may appeal therefrom to a Judge of the Supreme Court or to a Judge or a District Court within the territorial limits of which the appellant resides or carries on business.

(2) Section 14 and 15 apply mutatis mutandis to appeals under this section.

MR. BROWNE: I would like to ask a question here. This is a new procedure and there is no time set out. A man is fined by the Deputy Minister and he appeals to the Minister. How is he going to get a decision from the Minister? There is no time limit. There is no way to force a Minister to give a decision. He must be dissatisfied with the decision of the Minister before he can appeal to the court. Is there no answer from the Attorney General. He thinks this is good. I am not so satisfied. Then again the Minister is not here. He is not going to take much interest in appeals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Minister is in Clarendville attending the launching of a new ferry. He thought it more important to do that than being here attending the passing of this Bill. He knew he had intelligent col-

leagues on this side of the House. He felt it was safe, that he might take the afternoon off and go and attend the launching of a boat in which he has been tremendously interested. He asked me to apologise for his absence from the House on his inability to be present on this notable occasion of passing this Bill through the House.

MR. BROWNE: I am glad he is presiding over the launching of a boat when the people of Placentia expect a bridge over the gut.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The votes as cast in Placentia show how the people of Placentia feel and how they are likely to continue voting. My honourable friend opposite has good reason to know how the people feel.

MR. BROWNE: The people of Placentia have changed and will continue to change.

Clause carried.

Clause 14 read:

14. The said Act is further amended by inserting therein immediately after Section 33 as Section 33A the following:

"33A. A complaint may be laid and all proceedings may be taken thereon in respect of any breach of this Act or the regulations without limitation of time."

MR. BROWNE: "Without limitation of time." Is there any provision of this kind in the previous Act? I do not think there is. This seems to be a new thing. There used to be a provision in some of the Acts that prosecution had to take place within six months under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, depending on the offence. Within six months. Here there is no time limits in proceedings, either civil

of criminal. In regard to civil proceedings it is not so important there is no time limit, but in criminal proceedings there should be some time limit.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to say that perhaps it would react very well when the time comes, sometime in the future. There are some of you who may have the pleasure of appearing before the courts for breaches of this Act. I think we can get along with that one year from now or five years or ten years.

Clause carried.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies Act."

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Section 2 of the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act, chapter 236 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by adding thereto immediately after subsection (2) the following as subsection (3):

"(3) The Minister of Finance shall not issue a licence under this Act to an insurer, other than an insurer incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland, unless that first mentioned insurer is registered and holds a certificate of registry under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act (Canada) or the Foreign Insurance Companies Act (Canada), as the case may be, or is an underwriter or syndicate of underwriters which is a member of the society known as Lloyd's, incorporated by Imperial Statute, Lloyd's Act, 1871."

MR. BROWNE: Does the Attorney General know if that will include

any company doing business in Newfoundland?

MR. CURTIS: I think not.

Clause carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the sub-clause there to which I would ask the Attorney General to give some attention is No. 5, "Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Minister of Finance may refuse to issue a licence to an insurer or to renew a licence without stating or assigning any reasons for his refusal." I wonder if the Minister would explain the reason why that is put in there?

MR. CURTIS: This clause is the result of experience with companies which tried to get registered here. There is reason to suspect, or there are obvious reasons why they should not be given a licence but it would be better not to explain because it might mean an action for libel or something like that. This Act is an Act to protect the public. Sometimes reasons cannot be given for a refusal particularly if these reasons are such that it might be slanderous to repeat them, and the Minister might get secret information sometimes which it would not pay him to divulge.

MR. BROWNE: That does not apply to renewal of licences does it?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, if something has happened during the previous year. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend knows it is not the intention of the Minister to unfairly discriminate against any company, but sometimes information comes to him in his official capacity as a Minister which he just cannot disclose. Therefore the safest thing to do is to en-

able him to be able to refuse to give a licence, without assigning any reason.

MR. BROWNE: A man is doing an insurance business and is told—We are very sorry but we can't renew your licence. There is no appeal to anybody at all. It seems to me a very high-handed provision, and I am sorry to see it appearing so often.

MR. CURTIS: It is requested by the companies.

MR. BROWNE: By the companies themselves?

MR. CURTIS: They have asked for it.

Clauses 3 and 4 carried.

Clause 5:

5. Section 4 of the said Act is amended

- (a) by renumbering that section as subsection (1) and by striking out therefrom the words "The fee for the said licence shall be fifty dollars, to be paid before the issue of the same"; and
- (b) by adding thereto as subsection (2) the following:  
"(2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order fix the fee payable for a licence or a renewal of a licence and the fee shall be paid before the licence or the renewal is issued."

MR. BROWNE: How long has that \$50 licence been in there? I can see a purpose in this section being changed. A licence is going to be more than fifty dollars in the future.

MR. CURTIS: I will have to look it up and see what it was.

MR. BROWNE: "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order

fix the scale of fee payable for a licence or a renewal of a licence and the fee shall be paid before the licence or the renewal is issued." Now that seems to imply that the licence is not the same for everybody. It seems to vary.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, we could let that one stand.

Clause 5 stand.

Clause 6:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, is there a supervisor of insurance in this province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Mr. Marshall, Deputy Minister of Finance.

Clause 6 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 5 was allowed to stand.

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we skip into another Bill; and query the point raised by my honourable and learned friend that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council should fix a scale of fees—I move the Committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the honourable and learned member should be docked by the House for losing his Bills, costing the Province of Newfoundland a lot of money. He has to get a new copy of every Bill. They must be sent out to his constituents or something.

MR. BROWNE: I don't know where they go. I don't suppose there is any Legislature in Canada that has so many Bills.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are a hard-working Government.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952":

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman: What Act are we amending? I can't find it. We must know what we are amending. It is not in the revised statutes under that number.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know why this Act did not get into the Consolidated Statutes unless it is one of the Acts not brought into it. I see it is a money Bill, which I think the Consolidating Committee left out because they presumed it was a Bill which would expire. I think there is a section in the Consolidated or Revised Statutes where it lists Acts which are not repealed but are just not printed. I think that is Volume 4.

MR. BROWNE: It says here "The Minister of Public Works."

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the words "Minister of Public Works" be stricken out and the words "Minister of Finance" be written in.

MR. BROWNE: If the Attorney General will bear with me; Section 3 of the Local Authority Guarantee Act speaks of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply acting for and on behalf of the Crown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In places where they have town councils. This is a place without.

MR. BROWNE: Has not Botwood?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it has a Water Committee. It was quite deliberately decided not to put it under that.

MR. BROWNE: Then under Section 3 and 3 (a) the Minister of Finance would be substituted for the Minister of Public Works.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I move that amendment.

Clause as amended carried.

MR. CURTIS: Just to clarify the point made by my honourable and learned friend. If we look at page 287 of the Consolidated Statutes, Volume 4 it will be noted that the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952, is still in force—Just not printed.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Town of Deer Lake is down here for \$120,000 under the 1952 Act. Does this mean another \$120,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Would the Minister tell us how many have been guaranteed under this particular Bill altogether in Newfoundland?

MR. HEFFERTON: I cannot tell right off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Four or five million—Maybe five million.

MR. HOLLETT: Could we get something definite on that?

MR. HEFFERTON: Approximately five million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Four hundred thousand under the original Act and seven hundred and twenty-four thousand under this Act.

MR. HEFFERTON: And amendments last year. \$375,000 was loaned to St. Lawrence.

On motion Bill ordered reported passed with some amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill

"An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Act, 1953":

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is a very big change. Before for church entertainment, charity and recreation — Now are these objects less worthy than the ones for which taxes are being collected. Religious and charity, I think were the principal things contained in the previous Act.

This section gives the Minister power to settle any dispute arising as to whether an entertainment is to be exempt, and there is no appeal, but the tax shall be paid or not in accordance with that decision. I understand from the Minister who introduced the Bill that there were so many exemptions made last year that a good deal of anticipated revenue was lost and now it is hoped to get it back again.

MR. FORSEY: About fifty per cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I give a word of explanation which may save my honourable friends opposite some time. Last year the Act, before it was an Act and while it was still a Bill, came into this House and in the course of the debate on it here in this Chamber it was amended drastically to effect a loss to the Crown a tremendous amount of money running perhaps into the best part of a quarter of a million dollars. Now on second thought it was amended here in the Chamber on the authority of the House after the Bill had been printed, and it was done in a flush of sentiment and some little emotion on the part of all of us, and without too much hard thinking. The hard thinking had been done in the preparation of the Bill, but the amending was done in

that flush of sentiment that overcame us here at that time, on both sides of the House. Subsequently we did some hard thinking about it again. Now the tax is not a tax on churches. Clearly it is not a tax on religious entertainments. It is not a tax on entertainments given by churches or by religious bodies. It is not a tax on entertainments (period). It is a tax on individual persons of five cents each time they go to an entertainment. It is not the entertainment that is taxed, it is the public. Now when a man or woman (children are exempt) shall go to any kind of an entertainment they shall pay to the Government five cents—A meeting would not be classed as an entertainment, of course, but it would depend on who held the meeting—or some sessions of this House—Yes at some sessions we might well be able to charge an admission fee and five cents a head tax—But everyone over sixteen attending any kind of entertainment shall pay a tax to the Government of five cents, with the exceptions that are noted here. Except for these all other entertainments are included, not the entertainments themselves but the persons who attend the entertainments. If a person should go tonight, for instance, up to the wrestling matches that are on, he pays five cents to the Government. If he goes to a movie he pays five cents to the Government, if he goes to a ball game he pays five cents to the Government or to a hockey game or to any form of entertainment he will pay five cents to the Government. Now this is the lowest rate of entertainment tax across Canada. It is the lowest. It will bring in per capita the lowest amount of any Province of Canada. In some Provinces the tax is quite a revenue getter. In Montreal for instance, go-

ing into the Shrine of St. Andrew, the Province of Quebec, and they have the welfare of the religious bodies at heart—Quebec and Newfoundland have that in common, we have the same school system. Neither of us has any difference. In each there is a strong family feeling, in each of the two Provinces there is a strong religious loyalty, and in each Province we have that intense loyalty to religious bodies and then in a Province such as Quebec to find as you go into a shrine, a famous shrine, you pay your tax to the Government of Quebec, seven cents. We charge five cents to go to a movie or a ball game. We have no shrine, I am glad we have not. It would be a bit embarrassing to tax persons going to a shrine.

MR. HOLLETT: What do you call it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They call it an entertainment tax. An amusement tax, imposed on people going to a shrine, that is what they do.

MR. HIGGINS: Are you sure that is not the museum attached to it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, the Government of the Province of Quebec taxes the shrine of Brother Andrew.

MR. BROWNE: Not a museum attached to the shrine.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it is attached to the shrine.

MR. HOLLETT: We could go to the museum tomorrow.

MR. HIGGINS: I am still not happy about this thing. I remember quite clearly we discussed this matter last year. There are certain leagues which operate in the city here and I refer particularly to the baseball and football and basketball leagues and I



hope next winter the hockey league which are operated by groups of individuals, none of whom derive any payment, direct or indirect. These people perform a very definite service to the community. They are very valuable assets to the Government. The form of entertainment they provide is one of safety valves we have. It is a very minor tax but a small league like the football where the admission is twenty cents, a five cent tax makes a twenty-five per cent surtax on that and I honestly can't see it. I can understand on movies where we have a regular clientele and I can understand the Government wishing to charge a tax on bingo but for the people whose only entertainment is this type of athletic outlet, the Government is not so badly off that it needs that amount of money. The amount is not sufficient to justify the imposition of that tax. It is a nuisance tax. I doubt if in the run of a year the gross amount might come to \$3,000.00. The amount the Government would collect is surely not going to make or break it. I remember last year we were in accord that regularly constituted leagues, not an outfit such as professional wrestlers, but for amateur sport, I think the House might well consider to exempt such sports and give them the consideration that has always been given them. I do not feel we should tax sport, people who are doing this at no profit to themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are not taxing the leagues or the players or the employees of the leagues. We are taxing the public every time they go to entertainment. Is there a less onerous way or less severe way to tax people than on their smoking or liquor entertainments?

MR. HIGGINS: I accept the

Premier's opinion on practically everything but on what the sporting public will stand. I will go on my own opinion on that.

A few short weeks ago one of the leagues intimated they were going to up the price some small amount. The howl was such that the idea was dropped. If this five cents goes on the very leagues would suffer and it would mean a sizable decline in attendance which might mean the decline of athletic sport in this community which would be a much more serious matter than the loss of a few hundred dollars to the Government Treasury. This is not merely a sentimental appeal and I urge on the Government for the sake of amateur sport that some consideration should be given preservation of sport in this Province. We are, perhaps, the last bastion of purely amateur sport in the whole North American continent. I should urge upon the House to give support to amateur athletics. You will hit this sport.

DR. ROWE: I am sure we all appreciate your great interest in sport and athletic activities. I doubt if sport means more to any man than it does to him. In making any taxes there is the danger of making exemptions. Any activities conducted by a church is one exemption and any activity conducted by a school, in which churches and schools participate, is another. If we start making other exemptions, and while my honourable friend has put forward a very good case, there are other people engaged in other forms of sport and entertainment who could put forward just as good a case. When we start making an exemption when somebody else wants one.

MR. HOLLETT: I agree with my

friend on the left regarding the tax on athletic sport. It is very unfortunate. If we read our history we will find athletics are really at the basis of civilization. The Premier said that taxes are the basis of civilization. I do not agree. I do not know why he said that. But athletics are at the basis of good sound manhood and womanhood. It is unfortunate we have to tax them ever so little. Permission was given to put a tax on the upkeep of the stadium and now we are going to tax people who go there. I agree with every remark he made. I want to take advantage of this occasion. I received this letter yesterday from the president of the St. John's Stadium Council. It says—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know whether that is in order.

MR. HOLLETT: If the Chairman objects I will do it some other way. It has to do with the tax and the stadium.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The stadium was not mentioned here.

MR. HOLLETT: And neither was the shrine mentioned here. We were told about the tax and going to a shrine in Quebec and I talk about a tax to go to the stadium.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Letters and newspapers should not be read in the House. The time of the House or the time of the Committee should not be wasted.

MR. HOLLETT: If the Honourable the Premier brought in a chapter of scripture he would be allowed to read it. I should say it in the press and over the air.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a reflection on the Chair.

MR. HOLLETT: If it is unfair

I take it back. I think it is unfair that I should not be allowed to make a recommendation on behalf of the St. John's Stadium Council. I am not allowed to do so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have sympathy with the Leader of the Opposition. I think if he raises the question tomorrow he will have every opportunity to raise the matter.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the word concerts there is drawn up to cover every entertainment which can be held in the schools? Does it cover every form of entertainment such as dramatics?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It says such as.

MR. BROWNE: Would that cover operas and plays?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Unquestionably, yes.

MR. BROWNE: Card parties?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They may not be taxed but people who attend them will.

MR. BROWNE: In addition to church sales there are school sales. Mercy Convent have an annual tea and school sale?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not an entertainment.

MR. BROWNE: There would be teas.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no desire to tax school and church functions.

MR. BROWNE: The fact that school children participated would render it exempt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: Before the Bill goes through, has the Minister any break-down of revenue received from this taxation of the movies and any other forms of entertainment?

MR. FORSEY: No, I have no break-down for the grand total of \$160,000.00, and I would say of this approximately twenty-five per cent came from the city or town.

MR. BROWNE: Only \$160,000.00 came from that tax and \$250,000.00 was estimated.

MR. FORSEY: The Bill was only in force for six months. The tax was imposed in June and it was in August before the personnel began to collect the tax.

MR. HIGGINS: Might I ask one question. Let us assume the football league opens tomorrow night, where do they get the tickets?

MR. FORSEY: It is not in effect yet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the tax on sports or other activities turn out to be detrimental we will be the first to come in at the next session and amend it.

Clause carried.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act."

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. —(1) Sub-section (1) of Section 36 of the said Act is amended by striking out therefrom in the second and third lines the words "subject to sub-section (2)".

(2) Paragraph (i) of sub-section (1) of the said Section 36 of the said Act is repealed.

(3) Sub-section (2) of the said Section 36 is replaced.

MR. BROWNE: This sub-section 1, some words have been taken out.

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: It would be unusual for a liberal arts college to be all under the jurisdiction of the Minister and it should be left to the faculty.

MR. BROWNE: The liberal arts college. This power was given to the Board by the Act and the President of the University and two members elected by the Government. The Board has the power.

MR. CHALKER: They asked to pass it back to the faculty.

Clause carried.

Clauses 4 to 8 read and carried.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

Clause 1 read and carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. The Memorial University (Pensions) Act, chapter 110 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, is amended by repealing Section 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"3.—(1) Subject to sub-section (2), this Act applies to every person appointed by the Board under paragraph (f) of Section 36 of the Memorial University Act who is employed on a full-time basis upon an annual salary paid wholly and directly by the Board and who was appointed by the Board before attaining the age of fifty-six years, unless, at the time of his appointment by the Board he was

(a) serving in employment at the Memorial University College,

(b) an established civil servant within the meaning of The Civil Service Act, or

(c) a teacher who was making contributions to a pension scheme for teachers in force in Newfoundland.

(2) The Board may, if it deems fit, exempt an employee from the operation of this Act.

(3) Any person to whom this Act is applicable who, before his appointment by the Board, was contributing to a pension plan and who elects to continue his contribution in order to qualify for a pension under that plan instead of under this Act shall so advise the Board and the Board may contribute to the plan an amount not exceeding that which it would have contributed to the Fund in respect of that person in accordance with paragraph (n) of Section 36 of The Memorial University Act."

MR. HOLLETT: On this, the Board may if it deems fit exempt an employee from the operation of this Act. What is meant by that?

MR. CHALKER: From what I have been informed, the old Act did not make it mandatory for all these people to become part of this Pension Act. This amendment does make it so but the Board still can, under certain cases, make it possible for somebody to stay out.

MR. HOLLETT: It states "From the operation of the Act."

Clause 2 carried.

3. The said Act is further amended by inserting therein immediately after Section 13 as Section 13A the following:

"13A.—(1) The President of the Memorial University of Newfoundland shall be retired

(a) on reaching retirement age, or

(b) if he is unable to perform his duties effectively owing to physical or mental incapacity medically certified to the satisfaction of the Board to be likely to be permanent.

and, subject to sub-section (3), the Board shall award him a pension equal to two-thirds of his pensionable salary.

(2) Subject to sub-section (3), when the President dies the Board shall award to his widow an allowance equal to one-half of the pension being paid to the President at the date of his death, or, if he had been retired at the date of his death, an allowance equal to one-half of the pension that he would have been entitled to had he been retired at the date of his death, but this allowance shall terminate on the remarriage of his widow.

(3) Sub-sections (1) and (2) do not apply unless the President contributes to the Fund annually as from July 1st, 1952, six per centum of his salary fixed by the Board."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, what is the salary of the president?

MR. CHALKER: Fifteen thousand plus one thousand living allowance.

MR. BROWNE: So he is going to get a pension after ten years of ten thousand dollars, and if he should die his widow gets a pension of five thousand dollars.

MR. CHALKER: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: This, I understand, is by contract.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is what he already had on the salary scale from the Canadian Government, salary and pensions, both the same.

MR. BROWNE: Is he getting a pension from the Dominion of Canada?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He lost it all, and gets nothing.

MR. BROWNE: He gets back his contributions. Could not an arrangement be made for the Government of Canada to carry his pension—But he would not have gotten anything like that for his pension.

MR. CHALKER: He is an exceptionally fine man—We had to pay.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister in a position to say how much President Hatcher gets?

MR. CHALKER: Nothing like that amount. But, as I said, negotiations are going on with the Board of Regents to try and rearrange President Hatcher's pension.

MR. BROWNE: I hope so because President Hatcher served over twenty-five years if not thirty years there.

MR. CHALKER: Twenty-seven years.

MR. BROWNE: The Minister knows better than I do the interest which President Hatcher took in the Memorial College—There are other professors there too.

MR. HEFFERTON: He was retired on full salary for one year and after that two-thirds of his salary.

MR. BROWNE: But the salary was very much less.

MR. CURTIS: On the other hand he made no contributions such as the present man has to pay.

MR. CHALKER: That is right—6% of the fifteen thousand.

MR. HEFFERTON: May I point out that the president cannot retire in ten years unless he is incapacitated, he has to serve more than ten years.

MR. BROWNE: What is the retirement age?

MR. CHALKER: Age 65.

Clause 3 and 4 carried.

On motion Bill ordered reported passed without amendment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, having passed this Bill without amendment and having made progress on certain other amendments.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed a Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" without amendment.

On motion report received. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952", with some amendment.

On motion report received. Said amendment read a first and second time and concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend

the Social Security Act," with some amendments.

Report received. On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed a Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act", without amendment.

On motion report received. Ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act", without amendment.

Report received. On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Pensions Act", without amendment.

On motion report received. Bill ordered read a third time tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and on various other Bills in Committee have made some progress and ask leave to sit again tomorrow.

Report received. On motion Committee of the Whole ordered to sit again tomorrow.

Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to financial assistance to be given to certain undertakings:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour leaves the Chair I would move that this House do not adjourn at 11:00 p.m. I thought we might go on for half an hour.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, I object. I think we have had a very strenuous day and we went through a lot of legislation. I think until 11:00 is long enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Committee of the Whole:

Clause 1:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we are now considering a clause in connection with resolutions which have to do with seventeen firms to which the Government has advanced money or provided money by means of a guarantee and the total amounts to nearly seven and a half million dollars. I think the public and the House is entitled to some detailed information from the Premier on each of these items, and I am going to ask now if he will give it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can do that on the second clause.

MR. BROWNE: That is the schedule.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am prepared to do it either way. Incidentally before we go on I would like to have an item added to the list. The name of the company I have not got in full. I have not the completely accurate name, but The Union Light and Power, or The Union Electric Light and Power. The Attorney General has gone outside to get the full and exact name. If the Clerk will add it to the bottom of the list, that will make the list complete. Union Elec-



tric Light and Power Company \$1,100,000.

Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited, \$125,000; That is a loan made to the company under the Bank Act, by the Canadian Bank of Commerce under Government guarantee at a rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}\%$  interest. The loan was arranged for a period of one year, commencing on the 18th of October last. In other words; on that date the Canadian Bank of Commerce made Andrews Labrador Limited a loan on the guarantee of the Newfoundland Government, and we now ask for legislative confirmation of the amount owing under the loan as of 31 March 1954, \$60,000. Against this there is a security of approximately \$68,000. The purpose of the loan was to enable the company to pay for a substantial quantity of salt-bulk fish. The company, as the Committee knows, is equipped with artificial dryers capable of curing fish throughout the winter months. Perhaps the primary reason for the great need of assistance was the situation which had come about under the new methods of fishermen advances of prices last year under the price agreement. Normally the company would not be required to make prompt settlement in cash when they bought the fish. In fact the accepted system was cash advances and a balance over a projected period. A fixed minimum advance meant that the fishermen accepted payment to within a few dollars on the delivery of fish. It was to enable the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Industry that we guaranteed that loan at the Canadian Bank of Commerce for them.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I have here a reply to a question asked by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition which states that, as of

the 20th of February the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited had then a loan outstanding of \$40,000 and that they had borrowed \$160,000 in addition to that on which \$80,000 was outstanding and a guaranteed amount of \$125,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the item referred to now.

MR. BROWNE: Of which \$80,000 is outstanding?

MR. SMALLWOOD: As of the 31st of March there was \$60,000 outstanding.

MR. BROWNE: And the others are still outstanding?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, This guaranteed bank loan was made by the bank on our guarantee. The others are actual cash loans made by the Newfoundland Government some two or three years ago, which they had been reducing by payments back to the Government.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister tell us how much has been reduced on the \$40,000? I don't think there has been anything reduced on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think anything has been recently.

MR. BROWNE: What is the situation of that company at the present time? How does it stand insofar as security for these loans is concerned?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think the security is excellent. We are quite happy with that. Incidentally the administration of this loan to this company has been taken over by the Fisheries Development Authority, and it is entirely in their hands.

MR. HOLLETT: On that first \$40,000 loan, I am not sure if anything has been paid back on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know either. I am asking now if the Minister could find that out for us?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I can indeed.

MR. HOLLETT: On the other amount of \$160,000, the amount owed on that on the 28 February 1954 was \$80,000. Then the Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited were guaranteed a loan for \$125,000. Apparently from what I can see now it seems the loan at the bank has not been made good and the Government has to pay over to the bank \$125,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, The banks are not permitted to make long term loans. Their loans are in every instance for a period of less than a year. Therefore they made the loan on the guarantee of the Government for a period of less than a year. Now as the period in each instance expires the Government has to replace the loan, and the Government then makes it for a much longer period. The banks are limited by the Canada Banking Act.

MR. HOLLETT: The total amount as of now owed by Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited would be \$125,000 plus \$40,000 or \$165,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think that is the amount exactly.

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to know is, on what does the Government take security?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a chattel mortgage on everything they have, their property at Labrador and their

property at Bay Roberts and their property at Coley's Point—They have the former James Baird Limited premises.

MR. HOLLETT: That was the \$40,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is more than covered.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that that particular company has had an excellent year, I have been informed they have had great success, so that I fail to see why something has not been forthcoming on these loans?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have been extending and plowing back and building. We prefer to see them expand and improve rather than just getting the money back. We felt the money in their hands and plowed back into the fishery would be better than just paying back the loans. We could have insisted on having had it, but we did not, as a matter of deliberate decision.

MR. HOLLETT: I know, deliberately—They are in the supply business of these vessels?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are in the supply business, the salt cod fishery business of supplying fishermen to prosecute it, and in the business of drying fish themselves in their dryers.

DR. ROWE: I would just like to add—I imagine that company has bought more salt codfish in Labrador than any other. Certainly in one section of Labrador there would have been most distressful conditions had that company not operated in the area as it did.

MR. BROWNE: I wonder if the interest is charged on these loans?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it is.

MR. BROWNE: Well, why does it not appear in the Act? It just appears here as \$40,000. Is the interest being paid?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think so. I don't think there are any arrears on interest.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Honourable Minister bring in the information?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I could indeed, but I am virtually certain of it right now.

Item carried.

Atlantic Films and Electronics Limited: \$50,000.—

MR. SMALLWOOD: This one is also guaranteed at the bank to provide for the company working capital which they just did not possess. They are operating on not only insufficient working capital but grotesquely insufficient working capital, so we lent them an additional \$50,000.

MR. HOLLETT: That is in addition to the \$150,000 cash loan, in other words \$200,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right, and we have a mortgage on all their property, worth the best part of half a million dollars, including their big building on Prescott Street.

MR. HOLLETT: I take the Premier's word for that. I do notice from this the shareholders and directors, that they have some excellent men on the board of directors. Whilst I have no objection to the Government lending money to assist industries such as the fishery I am very doubtful as to the advisability of this Government going into the moving picture busi-

ness to the extent of even \$200,000 particularly when I see from the estimates, I believe last year, an order in council was made for \$500 to purchase films and pictures from this company. So that the Government capitalizes the company to the extent of \$200,000 to make pictures for the Government for which they pay them. I am inclined to think this company cost, I am trying to think, one hundred or two hundred and fifty thousand dollars including the amount paid out for pictures and for capital outlay. It is very doubtful as to how far the Government ought to go in that. Here they had a loan from the Government of \$150,000 just recently and now it is overdue and the Government has to pony up. I just bring that to the attention of the House. Certainly I do not approve of it myself.

MR. BROWNE: Is the Minister familiar with their affairs, and is he shown their accounts?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We get a financial statement, each month.

MR. BROWNE: How are they doing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Very well, splendidly, going ahead very rapidly. Their sales in that retail store where they take in films to be developed and printed, coloured mostly, and black and white, are growing with remarkable rapidity. Then in addition they have all kinds of electronic equipment for ships, theatres, etc. They are going ahead very, very rapidly. I see their monthly sales and they are quite encouraging.

MR. BROWNE: I can imagine that. I know it is a profitable business. But I also know they have not paid anything on this \$150,000. Have they paid interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are included in the firms we are this year amortizing.

MR. HOLLETT: How many people do they employ?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sixty or seventy.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier stated they deal in developing film and that sort of thing, coloured films. Were they not developed by others here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is the first time east of Montreal in fact. People send film from the Maritimes here to be developed and printed.

MR. HOLLETT: This is something else for which the Government can take credit?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I look upon it as one of our new industries, yes.

Carried.

Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited, \$603,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: We cannot now cover that. I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matter to them referred, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

Report received. On motion Committee ordered to sit again tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Thursday at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

On motion the House adjourned un-

til tomorrow, Thursday, June 17, at 11:00 a.m.

THURSDAY, June 17, 1954

### MORNING SESSION

The House met at 11:00 of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

### Presenting Petitions

HON. L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Rev. Mr. Lewis Head of Virgin Arm, Mr. Boyd, J.P., of Summerford, Mr. Hall and others of Newstead, Mr. Leslie Rideout and others of Western Head, Mr. Edgar Anthony and others of Cottell's Island, Mr. A. Green and others of Twillingate, Rev. C. Emely of Herring Neck and other residents of Carter's Cove and Comfort Cove, asking for the completion of a road from its present end to Comfort Cove.

Now this area, Mr. Speaker, is a very good farm area, and completion of the road to Comfort Cove will enable people of Comfort Cove, Summerford and vicinity to ship their products to Lewisporte and to Gander and St. John's and to the markets of the Province.

I have very great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition, and in supporting it, and I would ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House could I raise a point on a question of privilege?

MR. SPEAKER: Permission granted.

MR. HOLLETT: It is a matter of

not very great moment. I attempted last evening, and was apparently out of order, in connection with an item which appeared in one of our newspapers in connection with something that I said, relative to this item here: May I read that particular section, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: "He maintained moreover that the tax was unnecessary and that it was unfair since it was levied on people who had already made generous contributions to the stadium fund through the one per cent fund. Also argued that there must be some laxness or inefficiency in the management and carrying through of the project since it started out at \$400,000 and is now estimated at a million and there is no assurance it will not run into more millions before completed especially if the council handles the tax money as badly as the Government has handled its consolidated revenue fund."

That is an article in the Evening Telegram of June 10. That is more or less as I made the statement. This is the part which I think causes some concern: "If the council handles the tax money as badly as the Government handled consolidated revenue." That infers I was referring to the Municipal Council. But there was another council, a Stadium Council of which I had no knowledge or had forgotten. I received a letter from the Chairman, Mr. O'Leary, saying I would like to call your attention to the enclosed. "As many members have devoted much time and great effort and suffered headaches during the last few years to provide a stadium for St. John's —

I want to point out here, Sir, the remarks which I had made and which

were correctly quoted in the Evening Telegram referred to the Municipal Council, and was not intended to injure anybody, I think maybe a political government, I believe the Honourable the Premier, who by the way I want to thank for reminding me this morning of the opportunity to make this statement, I want to thank him for that, but it was more or less a crack at the Government, Sir, and not at the Municipal Council at all, at least not at the Stadium Council at all. I was referring to the Municipal Councils, and particularly it was a crack at my honourable friend on my left in our own party, as I think everybody in the House recognized at that time. Apparently it was taken on the outside, particularly by members of the Stadium Council to be a crack at them, a disparaging remark at them. It was not so at all and I thank you, Sir, for being able to make this explanation.

MR. CURTIS: It just misfired.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will at a later hour this day ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission." I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill, with the one of which my honourable friend will now give notice constitutes, as far as I know, all the legislation to come before the House, except such Bills as may arise out of the budget.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will ask leave to introduce at a later hour this day a Bill

"An Act Further to Amend the Timber License (Reversion to Crown) Act.

### Answers to Questions

Question No. 109 :

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): On the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, may I say now formally, officially, I would hope finally, but probably not finally, that the Government bought no cement from W. J. Lundrigan or from W. J. Lundrigan Limited. Therefore there was no number of bags. There was no purchase of cement. There was no number of bags. There was no price in connection with (a) the cement plant construction nor (b) the gypsum plant construction. Now I will endeavour to explain the matter with great simplicity:

The Government entered into a contract with William J. Lundrigan Limited, under which that firm was to erect the buildings of a cement plant. The Government entered into another contract with the same firm but this time for the erection of a number of buildings for the gypsum plant. In each contract it was provided that the contractor should erect those buildings at his own expense, according to the specifications and plans and blue prints that were provided to him, in the case of the cement plant by MIAG who designed the plant and in the case of the gypsum plant by the firm of Benno Schilde who designed the plant. Lundrigan was to provide all cement for any of the concrete work, supply the aggregate and was to supply the reinforcing steel, he was to provide the forms and build the forms, he was to pour the cement, he was to insert the reinforcing steel, he was to take the forms

away after the cement, the concrete, had set, in fact he was to erect the buildings. Now it is pretty obvious that cement had to go into that concrete. You cannot make concrete, I understand, without cement. Indeed Mr. Lundrigan informed me he used almost sixty thousand bags or getting up towards sixty thousand bags of cement on concrete work he did on the cement plant, not one hundred and sixty-eight thousand bags but something less than sixty thousand bags, which he bought. The Government did not buy it. He bought it.

The Government made progress payments to the firm. I think they were made monthly, each month the firm of Lundrigan would furnish to the Government an estimate. No. 1 was called the first one, and the next estimate No. 2. Each month the firm submitted to the Government an estimate of what progress it had made in fulfilling its contract. It was certified by the resident engineer of the Government Mr. Leja. It showed how much concrete had been poured. The estimate in each case showed how many cubic yards of concrete had been poured and how much cement had gone into that concrete, how much aggregate and steel had gone into it; and how much cement was on hand not used up, how much aggregate, sand, crushed stone, was on hand and how much steel, and how much other material for the job was on hand, and the value of these materials. All this was certified by the resident engineer. On the basis of that a progress payment was made to Lundrigan each month in respect of the total amount due him under the contract. A portion of the total price of the contract was paid to him each month in proportion to the progress he made in the performance of his contract. That



proportion was shown by these monthly estimates he submitted showing the work actually performed, the proportion of the contract of this or that foundation actually completed and showing the value of the materials he had acquired and whether they were on the job available for use. On the basis of these monthly estimates he was given a progress payment.

I can only assume that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, having gone over these vouchers, invoices or statements (the proper word is estimates) if he looked closely would have seen in the top right-hand corner the title Estimate No. 1 and Estimate No. 2. There were seven or eight or more of them, having gone through these and wrongly assumed—he honestly, quite honestly believes, quite honestly but wrongly assumes that it was a case of the Government buying cement from Mr. Lundrigan or from the firm of William J. Lundrigan Limited.

Now the Government bought no cement from Lundrigan. Therefore the answer to part (1) of this question as to the purchase of cement is—None—showing the number of bags—None—the prices charged—None. Now that is in connection with the cement plant.

What I have had said about the cement plant applies equally, I believe, to the gypsum plant. The same arrangement was followed.

Now as to the second part: I have this morning been shown this very account by the Controller of the Treasury, Mr. Marshall, and his Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Channing. They got out these and showed them to me. They turned out to be merely the final payment claimed by Mr. Lundrigan in respect of the whole

series of transactions I have just been describing. But these will be tabled. These are all being copied and will be tabled here in the House for the honourable gentleman.

Now I do hope—but if the honourable gentlemen opposite are not disposed to accept my explanation—I would honestly like to find some way of convincing them completely and through them convincing the public of the complete and literal accuracy and truthfulness of what I have said here this morning. I would like to—One way would be to ask the Auditor General to submit a report, for him to look into these statements and get a transcript of my statement just made here this morning, and for him to report to the House on the truthfulness and accuracy of my statement.

MR. HOLLETT: That is what the question asks for—I am not doubting your word.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does no such thing.

MR. HOLLETT: It says—to table a report—there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But they have not made a report.

MR. HOLLETT: Table a report to this House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have never understood that to this moment. I assumed the question assumed the existence of a report.

MR. HOLLETT: If the Honourable the Premier will read that question I think that is what it said.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If that is what the honourable gentleman wanted it ought to have been put in the form of a question, not in the form of a

motion—Resolved the Auditor General be requested to furnish to the House a statement showing (a) (b) (c) or whatever it is. I would prefer that that be done. I would like that very much so as to put it beyond the realm of debate and political discussion.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all I want.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wish the honourable gentleman had made it clear in his notice of question. But it is anything but clear. He knew in his own mind what he wanted, and I have therefore left it unanswered.

### Orders of The Day

#### Third Readings:

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulations of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act":

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal explanation: Last night when this matter was in committee I pointed out it was inadvisable and undesirable to leave the Deputy Minister the powers of imposing the variable penalties. The member for Fogo said the income tax department was doing the same thing. I did not think they were because of

my own experience. Today I got in touch with the manager of the Income Tax Department, and I have here an Income Tax Return saying the failure to file income tax imposes a penalty of 5% of income tax unpaid at that date, and the interest will be 6% per annum. That is a fixed penalty, not variable, and the taxpayer knows beforehand what he is up against. In the other case it is a variable penalty, and I am sure the Deputy Minister himself can hardly desire to have thrust upon him the responsibility of graduating the amounts and of acting in the nature of a judge imposing sentence. That is the point I made last night, and I see now I was correct in what I said and that the member for Fogo was wrong. Perhaps the Attorney General or the Minister in charge, in view of that, might consider it desirable to have a change to \$10 or 6% and not give the Deputy Minister the responsibility of declaring the punishment.

MR. CURTIS: I am quite agreeable, Mr. Speaker, to have third reading stand over to check the point. I might say I knew they did have a penalty for income tax. I received one myself about a week ago, fining me a certain amount because my tax returns were two days late in arriving. Actually they were there in time, but I don't know what happened to them.

MR. MORGAN: I think both the honourable member for St. John's West and the honourable member for Fogo are right. I notice he has a personal income tax from there, on which the penalty is 6% on unpaid tax. On the large form, which I believe has to be in by the end of February there is a penalty of \$50 if they are not in on time and for the deductions on

employees forms there is a penalty of \$10 if they are not filed by the 15th of the following month, so that both the honourable members are right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order: I am afraid when I permitted the honourable member to make what was purported to be a personal explanation but really was a discussion—Perhaps if the honourable members would stop fidgeting in their chairs—and I can show parliamentary precedent for honourable members being asked to leave the room for doing that when Mr. Speaker is trying to explain something to an honourable member.

I said I permitted the honourable member to explain some part of his speech. That does not mean that a full-fledged debate can take place on the honourable member's explanation. There is no motion before the Chair, except a motion for third reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Might we let that stand, Mr. Speaker?

On motion third reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act", deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say the Chair would like to hear—might not like to hear but does want to hear what is said—How is the Chair to hear with a continuous racket going on?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952":

On motion read a third time, order-

ed passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act":

On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions in Relation to Financial Assistance to be Rendered to Certain Industrial Undertakings:

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given yesterday for this Committee to sit again today. I do now leave the Chair:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, on this motion for you to leave the Chair, I wish to bring up another matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think the honourable member can, not on a motion to leave the Chair, but to leave the Chair in a particular sense of the word—On Supply—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is not a personal grievance but a public grievance.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand.

MR. BROWNE: It is customary in other parliaments, and the same rule would prevail here, on motion

for the House to go into Committee on Supply all members have the right to bring up grievances.

MR. SPEAKER: I am well aware of that rule. But I am not quite so sure it applies when leave was given for Committee to sit again, and I ask "I do now leave the Chair" but permission was given last night for this Committee to sit again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The motion was made and carried yesterday that we go into Committee on this, and is not being made this morning.

Committee of the Whole:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee read the schedule, and we had come to Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited, \$603,000.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, before we go on—the Honourable the Premier promised to give us the name there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Union Electric Light and Power Company of Port Union, \$1,100,000.

Before we go on could I crave the indulgence of the Committee to have the Deputy Minister of Finance do what he and other deputies do on the estimates, sit up near so that I can consult him.

Agreed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Last night, I think, Your Honour called Atlantic Hardboard Industries, Limited:

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable the Premier allow me now—Yesterday there was some little doubt about the exact amount owed now at this moment by Andrews Labrador Fisheries Limited, and Atlantic Films and Electronics Limited, and as he now has the Deputy Minister—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I promised to have that today, and I will, but suppose we don't hold things up now on it? We are now at Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited, \$603,000. \$285,000 of that is by way of cash advances from the Board and \$318,000 of it by way of guaranteed bank loans. The total amount was advanced by the Government or by the bank on the Government's guarantee, to enable them to double their output, to double the productive capacity of the plant. That was done in the Fall. They installed a second dryer, which is a very large piece of mechanical equipment, almost identical with the first one. The Committee is possibly aware of the fact that the process consists of taking green logs and chipping them into chips in one building and blowing the chips underground, by underground conveyor into the main building and then returning them through a dryer and evaporating the moisture so as to have perfectly dry chips. These chips are then made into pressboard or fibreboard.

They have doubled up their productive capacity by getting another dryer, exactly similar to the one they had before, a very large piece of equipment about the length of this room, not as wide nor not as high. Then they have a third dryer not nearly so big as these two. The chip from that is a very white and thin chip and very much smaller. It is run through hammer mills and knife mills and reduced to exceedingly fine white chips which have to be dried in this new third dryer. Then again this was to pay for new chipping machines, three of them, of entirely new design.

MR. BROWNE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, how many is a quorum?

MR. CURTIS: Ten.

MR. BROWNE: You settled on that?

MR. CURTIS: Well according to the Act.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are certain other pieces of mechanical equipment. Then having decided to double the productive capacity of the plant because they are on a three shift day, (they work 24 hours a day, three shifts) it became imperative that they build a warehouse for their finished products prior to shipping. So they have erected a huge new warehouse, built at the railway siding. It is of asbestos cement and with a steel frame and concrete floor. So, Mr. Chairman that was the purpose of these loans.

I am sure that my honourable friends are going to ask the total now outstanding and perhaps we can give that—About one and half millions, I would say.

MR. HOLLETT: I thank the Honourable the Premier for his explanation. My figure is \$1,563,000 and that is probably correct.

Relative to the statement made by the Honourable the Premier I believe that the Atlantic Hardboards would be entirely dependent upon the operations of Newfoundland Hardwoods for its supply of material. I am not sure that is correct, but that is the impression I get.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Upon whom?

MR. HOLLETT: The Atlantic Hardboards are dependent on Hardwoods?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: Where do they get their chips and other things?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have bought their wood from approximately one hundred persons around and near St. John's, within a radius of fifty miles of the city, over one hundred persons. Nearly four hundred persons have been involved in cutting and hauling the wood. The largest collection of pulpwood type ever assembled on Avalon is now I suppose assembled in there on the grounds of Atlantic Hardboard Industries Limited, covering many acres of neatly piled pulpwood for chipping and drying into this fibreboard.

MR. HOLLETT: I have been told that that industry is one that should really be a success. I feel more inclined to think that too if it is not dependent on the other.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is not.

MR. HOLLETT: They can get their own raw material. It is not a by-product of the other?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They can use some of the birch, of course, for a birch surface on their fibreboard and plyboard.

MR. HOLLETT: I have seen some of it, and must say it looks very attractive. I do hope they will succeed. But they have to remember that they now have one million, five hundred and eighty-three thousand dollars. Of course they are a private company, and we have been told no interest has been paid. We don't know what they are doing. I will maintain also, of course, that the people of this country have the right from time to time to have progress reports relevant to a concern in which they have invested money. I think any shareholder of any company is entitled to know that. In fact all private companies do that. They make reports from

time to time as to the standing of the company, and not only its financial affairs, but as to its output and various things which the shareholders should know. Now we don't know, and the House of Assembly even, does not know just exactly where this plant is situated as far as its output is concerned, as far as its sales of products are concerned, and what success or otherwise it is having. I must say right here, that is important. If the Government wants to get the goodwill of the people, and after all it is their money which is in these things, they ought to take the people into their confidence from time to time. I don't mean to say any time any company has a little up-set or set-back they have to go and herald it all around the world. But from time to time there should be a report, I will not even say record, as to the conditions of an industry into which the people have put their money, in this case where they have put a million and a half dollars. Would the Honourable the Premier tell us how many employees are working at that plant?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In and around that plant there are about 120, in and around the plant itself.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to my honourable friend (1) the company is operating in the black.

MR. HOLLETT: Good!

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are the first of all the new industries to get in the black.

MR. BROWNE: The only one so far?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think so. (2) In regard to this company, indeed in regard to all the new industries the Government receives

monthly a balance sheet of each of them. We have received a monthly balance sheet from every one of them, although we don't make that public. It is delivered to me monthly, a balance sheet of every one of these new industries. So that the Government do know how they are getting along.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the Honourable the Premier think it is against the interest of these companies to let the House know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, most certainly, by all means, obviously, I don't think it is even arguable that the monthly affairs of a new industry be published to the world. They have enough disadvantages as it is. The disadvantage of selling from Newfoundland in Ontario and Quebec in competition with the firms established up there. Then on top of that to have all their affairs published monthly or even annually or even semi-annually.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Premier comes back every once in a while to advance money to these companies, without even allowing us to talk about it. In this particular industry here they have made a cash loan of \$285,000 and then a guaranteed bank loan which they now have to make good of another \$318,000, and the Honourable the Premier tells us that is to double the output. I hardly think that the House is justified in voting a large amount of money like that on the mere say so. Why could not the figures be produced here or the reports be produced here to give us some idea and some reason for voting this.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether my honourable friend on my left, the Leader of the



Opposition, asked the Minister for information as to the amount of the investment which the promoters of this company put in to it themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: From memory, I think it is four hundred thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE: That means to say the Government of Newfoundland have invested about 75% in it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, excuse me, they have not four hundred thousand but six hundred thousand dollars in it.

MR. BROWNE: That is not exactly a fifty-fifty basis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is the first that was not.

MR. BROWNE: It is nine hundred thousand by the Government towards six hundred thousand by them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Now the Minister does not wish to give the details of the operation of the plant. At the same time there is certain information to which I think the House is entitled—I would like to know the date on which it was agreed that they would not have to pay interest, and how long the amortization lasts for?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same date as all of them, and the same amortization as to all of them, on the same terms.

MR. BROWNE: Does the interest charge pile up, or is there none being charged for the two years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That goes on the interest. It is only postponed.

MR. BROWNE: When the two-year period is up will there be any

such thing as an accumulated period, or is that a two year period without interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. If it is a ten year agreement and in each of the ten years they have to pay interest, if for two years they don't pay it.

MR. BROWNE: How many years have they paid this amount?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All this was debated when the Bill itself was presented. It is in the contract. The contract is statutory, available to all of us.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Honourable Minister tell us who are the directors?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Dr. Weiss, a Swiss. Dr. Valdmanis was but is not now. They recently had a directors' meeting. The directors are all here now from Switzerland at this moment. There may be one or two others whose names I don't remember.

MR. HOLLETT: Any Government directors?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. But they are asking that a Government director be appointed. They feel it will keep them in close and friendly touch with the Government. The Government are considering now appointing Mr. Pushie, the Director of Economic Development, who is a director now in several of these and is to be on more of them.

MR. HOLLETT: On that point—It used to be a practice to have a member of the Government and I certainly approve of it, even if the Government has to pay the director, and even if the Legislation is required to be brought in to make that lawful. I think it should be done. As I see it

somebody must be on that Board of Directors responsible to the Government for a million and a half dollars. I think the Government would be justified. I don't know what my colleague think, but that is my thought on the matter. Any company in which the Government has invested the people's money should have a director from the Government on that board of directors in order to keep the Government in touch with what is going on.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason we did not put on a Newfoundland Government member. We would be afraid we would be criticized for that.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't think the Government should be afraid of that. I believe you should have responsible men there from the Government. Mind you I am not saying anything derogatory to any Deputy Minister nor staff, but I say there should be a member of the Government, and I don't care where in the Government, but the Government is responsible to this House and that director would be able to tell us something about it, if it were in the public interest, and I say, only in the public interest. If I want to criticize the Government on a political platform that is another matter. But here in this House I say, definitely it is the Government's responsibility, and therefore the Government should be represented on the board of directors. I suggest if it is possible you should have a man, and it is immaterial to this House what these companies have to pay that director, except I know it would be a reasonable amount. I believe a director should be paid for careful attention to the matter of these industries. Until they have paid off all their indebtedness to this Gov-

ernment, the Government ought to have a director on the boards. That is my opinion.

MR. HIGGINS: I agree entirely with my honourable Leader. It appears to me if the Government has a representative on the directorate of Bowaters, which sometime, I presume, did have Government assistance, in the case of these particular industries where there has been so much talk, loose talk, perhaps, it might perhaps not be an unfair activity if there were a Government director. I do feel that the Government would be more reassured and certain it is that this House would be quite satisfied. At least then we would not be dependent on reports that are transmitted to the Minister from time to time. If there were a Government director, the House could say to him: "Mr. So and So, what is the position of the particular industry?" I feel that the Government, even at this stage, might give some thought to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have already thought about it seriously, but find I don't like the idea. I will, however, think about it anew in the light of the suggestions. I am informed there is an Act which gives the Government the power to nominate one or more directors for each assisted company. I did not know that. But apart from the power, we can always get the power by bringing in a new Act if this did not exist. I just wondered whether we should make these industries political by appointing a politician on the board. My whole idea was to make these independent politically.

MR. HIGGINS: Will the Honourable Minister explain why there is a Government appointee to Bowaters?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That hap-

pened twenty-five years ago. Perhaps at that time it was used as a political football.

MR. HIGGINS: At the time, in fact, it was so regarded.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was so looked upon, and Coaker seized upon it at the time as a good way to get jobs for his followers. Why I remember when Mr. Clyde Lake was appointed a director the welkin rang with: what a scandalous thing it was, this rotten government finding jobs for supporters, and dipping their hands in the chest again. That was the talk. I wanted to keep these industries away from that, although I was probably wrong.

MR. HOLLETT: It is rather late in the day to try and keep them out of politics now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I tried to do that from the beginning.

MR. HOLLETT: I think perhaps it would have been better if they entered a little more into politics.

MR. CURTIS: There are none on the A.N.D. Company nor Buchans Mining Company.

MR. HOLLETT: There was a guaranteed loan to Bowaters, and it was under that Act a director was appointed.

MR. CURTIS: No, because that Act, Mr. Chairman, calls for one Government director for every two others. That Act does not apply.

MR. HOLLETT: It is definite—There must be. I rather think the Government should not fear whether it enters politics or not, they should do what is right in the matter. After all you did have Mr. Russell on the Hardwoods one. He was there three

months, I believe, I see nothing wrong with that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There has always been a Government director on that from the beginning. Mr. Russell was the first one and I was the next.

MR. BROWNE: Has it been any good? Mr. Chairman, here is what I would like to get at, the Government originally loaned, I believe, advanced, \$920,000 (odd thousand) which they called a loan, and then gave a Government guarantee of something like six hundred thousand. And the company is not able to meet its obligations of \$600,000 on which \$285,000 had been taken in cash and the balance due to the bank. This procedure is to turn it into a full-fledged loan, and add it to the other.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exactly. When it was advanced the loan was made, one by us and one by the bank on our guarantee. It was made after we had decided to expand their loan by that amount.

MR. BROWNE: Now is there a mortgage?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, on everything.

MR. BROWNE: Now if between the time the House prorogues and the next session of the House the company comes to the Government and says it would like another half million dollars, the Government has power to guarantee another half million dollars, is that right? Is there any limit put on in regard to Government assistance?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the only limit is what the Government honestly feel the Legislature will ratify subsequently. The honourable gentleman

knows that. That is constitutional practice. That is constitutional precedent.

MR. HOLLETT: Will the Minister tell us what is the interest rate on the bank loans for these?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They pay the interest on the bank loans, we do not. The interest on the bank loan is paid by the borrower and not by the guarantor.

MR. HOLLETT: After you have to make good the cash?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then it is all over—You see?

MR. BROWNE: You paid the interest though on that six hundred thousand dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was in two amounts. Part was paid by the Government out of the Treasury and part paid by the bank on the Government's guarantee.

MR. BROWNE: Who is paying the interest on that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are—The borrower pays.

MR. BROWNE: On the \$285,000, that was cash from the Government, and there was no interest paid on that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No that was within the period of the moratorium.

MR. BROWNE: I see. Is the company making provision for depreciation in its account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: The normal depreciation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Normal depreciation.

Carried.

Bonavista Cold Storage Company Limited \$1,650,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This company is, of course, the company controlled by Mr. Hazen Russell. It consists of a plant at Bonavista, a large plant, and it consists of a plant about to be built or actually commenced construction at Grand Bank. The Government agreed to finance for that company a new plant that they proposed to put up at Grand Bank. The Government agreed to put up \$1,050,000 for that purpose. That was the Grand Bank plant \$1,050,000. That plant was to be completely modern including a fish meal plant. Now in addition to that \$1,050,000 the Government has agreed, and this was a subsequent undertaking, to advance another \$600,000 to enable them to replace Northlantic Fisheries as the operators of certain trawlers and druggers that the Government had previously financed for that latter company. Is that clear?

MR. HOLLETT: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: To put it this way: They took over the loan but at a lower rate, as I will explain in a moment. Under the agreement dated 1 August, 1952, a loan was arranged to Bonavista Cold Storage Limited for a million and fifty thousand dollars through the Bank of Nova Scotia at a rate not to exceed five per cent, to be paid to the bank by the first of October 1954. In other words it was a short term loan on the Government's guarantee.

MR. HOLLETT: That was the \$1,050,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

Now I ought to go on a little fur-

ther to explain that not all of the \$1,050,000 was to be spent on the Grand Bank plant. In connection with the Grand Bank plant the amount to be spent was \$700,000. The remaining \$350,000 was to be spent on the enlarging and extending and improving of the company's plant at Bonavista where they were to provide additional freezing and additional storage facilities and also cold storage facilities for holding baited gear for long-liner fishermen, as well as to provide facilities at Bonavista for the handling of vessels and for additional wharf space for fishermen and their boats. Now that explains the total of \$1,050,000.

Now as to the \$600,000: The Committee will note the total is \$1,650,000. Under an agreement dated 5 May, 1951, the Government guaranteed a loan of \$675,000 to the Northlantic Fisheries Limited at the Bank of Nova Scotia at an interest rate of  $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ . That loan was to cover the estimated cost of purchasing three draggers. Repayment of the loan was to be made in fifteen equal instalments, to commence in the second year after the issue of the loan. Subsequently, a loan which had been reduced to \$100,000 was refunded, and under an arrangement with the Bank of Nova Scotia a new loan was guaranteed to Bonavista Cold Storage Company Limited for a like amount of \$600,000 to purchase the draggers whose names were "Blue Mist", "Blue Foam" and "Blue Comet." The values of the draggers were set up in the accounts of the company as at \$130,000 for the "Blue Comet", \$260,000 for the "Blue Mist" and \$210,000 for the "Blue Foam", a total of \$600,000.

Early in the present year the "Blue Comet" was lost, and the proceeds of the insurance claims are now coming

through. The loan will thereby be reduced by \$130,000. In other words of the \$1,650,000; we have guaranteed at the Bank of Nova Scotia to Bonavista Cold Storage Company Limited and which the bank has advanced to them a loan of \$600,000, is for the purposes I have mentioned; (1) to enable them to put in a completely new plant in Grand Bank and to enlarge and extend their plant and facilities at Bonavista, and (2) to acquire these three new draggers.

MR. HOLLETT: May I ask why the Northlantic Fisheries should want to get out from under and get rid of these draggers? Is there any particular reason?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have my opinion, I would prefer not to give it.

MR. HOLLETT: I must say the situation with regard to the Company is very cloudy to me at the present time but the Honourable the Premier gave a good explanation of it. Now we know where we stand as far as Bonavista Cold Storage is concerned. We wish them all the luck in the world. Can the Premier tell us who are the directors of that firm?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Hazen Russell and his two sons, I believe. I can't say I know of any others. If my colleague, the honourable member for Burin, were here he would probably know who were the directors at Grand Bank. I believe there are some Grand Bank people who have invested, people in the community who are represented by one or even more directors.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he knows how much capital stock has been taken up by the shareholders themselves? What is the proportion,

in other words, of Government loans and private money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid I don't know. But I can find that out.

MR. BROWNE: I am concerned with the assets, and with the value of the assets.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can get my colleague to phone and get the information immediately.

MR. BROWNE: I take it the loan now to Northlantic Fisheries has been paid off.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. BROWNE: Now in connection with the assets of the company, is the Government satisfied with the mortgage they have?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Completely satisfied.

MR. BROWNE: This loan of \$1,650,00 is to be let out on progress report, I take it, and not all loaned at one time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have only drawn up to the end of May an amount of \$456,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Towards the plant in Grand Bank?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, towards the whole loan except for the draggers, towards the \$1,650,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the Minister tell us the present state of construction at Grand Bank?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid I cannot.

HON. P. S. FORSEY (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, the site for the plant was furnished last year, and

the dredging is completed in the harbour. The actual construction of the plant has been started about three weeks, I would say; the buildings, which I understand are steel buildings, have been purchased, and the equipment for the plant is either here in St. John's or at Grand Bank.

MR. BROWNE: It will go into operation, I suppose, sometime this year?

MR. FORSEY: In September.

MR. BROWNE: In view of the big investment being made in the fisheries it is very important to know what the attitude of the United States is going to be in regard to the petitions from New England Fisheries. I suppose you have no information on that at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: In regard to these three draggers, they will operate out of Grand Bank when that plant is completed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is no assurance that they won't take an occasional load to Bonavista if in the inter-play of economy that is the thing to do. It is all the one company.

MR. BROWNE: There is just one point; I was informed this morning that the fish are running. I don't know where they are running. But that the fish plants threw away a great quantity of fish yesterday and they were not able to handle it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Here?

MR. BROWNE: Here in St. John's.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There must have been an awful lot if they could not handle it.

MR. HOLLETT: Before we leave



that—Is there any encouragement the Premier could give relative to the fresh fish industry. There are conflicting reports. I was of the impression that fresh fish filleting was one of our greatest hopes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I remember that here in the National Convention there was quite a debate on that whole question of frozen fish. We discussed the question of American Tariffs and the like. I remember that I left here one morning, or left my house, and went to the American Consul General and went through all his statistics. I came here to the Chamber that afternoon fortified with a great quantity of statistics and papers and figures which I proceeded to give to the members of the Convention. Now from that moment and before that and ever since that up to now the frozen fish industry has fluctuated between periods of fantastic prosperity and periods of less than fantastic prosperity and even periods of no prosperity. It has fluctuated rather violently, rather jaggedly. It is not an industry that has just moved steadily forward. It has moved forward with great jerks and moved backward sometimes with great jerks. But looking at it over a period of the last ten years it is incredible the amount of progress that has been made. Right now there is a little bit of gloom, although the markets right now are really excellent. It will be up and down. There will be gloomy talk and optimistic talk. But a high-protein food such as fish, if put up palatably will be in demand. Who can doubt it? It is a high-protein food, and when it is put up in palatable form it will sell.

MR. HOLLETT: There is one thing concerns me, and that is the difference in price fishermen receive for

this product such as rosefish and had-dock. If we look at the prices paid to our fishermen here at Ramea and Burin and the prices paid in North Sydney and Halifax we must all be impressed by the difference in prices paid. It makes all the difference between prosperous and happy fishermen and poverty-stricken fishermen. Now that has been indicated to us over the past winter months when many of our fishermen in these draggers were not able to maintain their families on the prices paid. That was in January of this year when our people were getting  $2\frac{1}{4}$ c. and  $2\frac{1}{2}$ c. per pound for codfish while they were getting  $4\frac{1}{2}$ c. up to 5c. in Sydney and Halifax. Now therein, Sir, lies something which I think the Government ought to interest itself. I see no reason why a strict watch cannot be kept in the interest of the fishermen relevant to the prices being paid in the fishery. I know it may cost more to produce here. I have already said it costs more to produce in Bonavista and LaScie, and the further you go north it costs a little more. On the other hand I don't see how the cost from Ramea and St. John's and Burin is so terribly much more than in Sydney and Halifax. Yet our fishermen starve on  $2\frac{1}{4}$ c. a pound whereas the fishermen in North Sydney and Halifax are prosperous on  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 5c. per pound. I believe there is some field for investigation by the fisheries department of this newly set-up fisheries committee. I think they should be instructed to make a thorough investigation. We must give the producer a good profit as the overhead is high and the wear and tear terrific. On the other hand we have to look after the fishermen. I would suggest to the Government that one of the first duties this FDA should have is

to do something about that, and then they would justify in some small measure these salaries which we are paying them. I am quite sure the Premier will agree with that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I were sitting on the opposite side of the House I could indeed too, turn on that. But as I am bound to have some sense of responsibility whilst I am on this side of the House, which the members on the opposite side don't always feel they must have—But on this side I must have dealings with these companies and try to get other companies to come into Newfoundland. We are negotiating now with an American company to establish in the fishing industry here and are negotiating with a tremendously big Canadian Company, a Mainland Company. I don't think it would be very strategic of me to say anything other than that. The more plants the better. Perhaps in the end the competition, perhaps, who knows, will produce the results that my honourable friend and I would like very much to see.

MR. BROWNE: Where does the FDA come in in regard to this loan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It comes in to administer it. In fact they are in charge of the administration of the loans right now.

Carried.

Gold Sail Leather Goods Limited, \$50,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is a thing which happens to be very close to my heart, personally. This is the fancy leather goods plant in Harbour Grace. We have financed them almost entirely. Mr. Schaefer, the man in charge, came out here himself from Germany over three years ago. I told

him just straight business-like of that fifty-fifty deal. You put up half and we lend you half, match your investment. He just could not get the necessary permission. He went back to Germany, had his picture published in all the papers telling how he was moving to Newfoundland. The German Government just put its foot down, and would not give him permission to export one dollar, and he did not get it. Subsequently, in Germany, I visited the plant and the famous Offenback exhibition of which he is the head.

I made up my mind we just had to have that little industry in Newfoundland. I believed in the crafts and skills of these men and in our tannery making the leather, especially our own sealskin leather. It seems a little fantastic to have all our seal-skins exported to England and there turned into beautiful leather goods. I determined that had to be done here in Newfoundland. Dorn is doing it. He is making absolutely beautiful leather of all kinds including Newfoundland sealskin leather. The Newfoundland sealskin leather turned into women's handbags is really something to see. Well I wanted that little company to turn that leather into handbags, brief cases, attache cases, wallets and purses and all kinds of fancy leather goods. These attracted enormous attention at the Trade Fair in Toronto, I would say candidly that in North America today, the United States of America and the Mainland of Canada, the one firm turning out the most beautiful quality of leather goods is this little plant at Harbour Grace. Any of the honourable gentlemen opposite who wish to go in and see them—that reminds me of what I said here in this Chamber a short time ago: The members of the

Opposition ought to go in and see these plants, visit them and see what they are doing. That was published in the newspapers. Mr. MacLellan, head of the Bus Company which recently put the new bus in operation for the CNR, telephoned me and extended his invitation to all members of the House, if they wanted to go around the bay and visit all those plants, he would put his bus at their disposal.

MR. HIGGINS: Who will feed us?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps we will feed ourselves. But we would see Koch Shoes and Leather Goods. They have a beautiful cafeteria where they eat their own meals. The whole staff eats there. I am sure we would get a lunch there.

MR. HIGGINS: That sounds enticing.

MR. HOLLETT: The total amount on this particular item then, I believe, is \$100,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I believe the Minister said they found it impossible to get any money out?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Perhaps because Mr. Schaefer was too prominent a man. He is the President of the Leather Goods Manufacturers of Germany. He is the President of the Fair and Exhibition. He is the advisor for the Leather Goods Association of Germany. He is a very prominent man.

MR. CURTIS: There was one other reason, which the Honourable the Premier forgot to mention. If he had brought any German money he would have to return all his profits to Germany. Of course we wanted him to

use his profits here in expansion. We thought it would be much better to have the money kept in this country.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, while on that point, did any of them bring out any German money?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not a cent.

MR. HOLLETT: Of course we can't investigate that here—I don't know if I ought to say the thing in my mind now. I would have to consider, I think, pretty seriously, but—Is this the same company that made Joseph's coat?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not even the same town.

MR. HOLLETT: Were they in competition?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, one makes clothing, and the other makes leather goods.

MR. HOLLETT: They could make clothing?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, they never made leather clothing.

MR. HOLLETT: I see—A hundred thousand dollars now we have put out on that, a small amount relatively.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister where this is located and how many people are employed?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is located in what was the big fish building of Crosbie and Company at Harbour Grace, on the property that was once the shipyard. The best industrial property on the East Coast of Newfoundland, without any doubt. It has a wharf with 32 ft. of water at the head at low tide, several acres of land, a railway siding of its own, high transmission lines pass immediately by

it, the highroad passes immediately in front. It has a very large staff house, which the Germans have remodelled so that it is absolutely beautiful on the inside. They have taken away the big board fence running along in front and are putting flowers in there now. The other building runs at right angles down at the back, the large fish stores that have been rebuilt completely. That is the home of the Gold Sail, here it is called Canadian Leather Goods, Limited. The name had to be changed, by the way, and I don't see how we can leave in that name, as the name is now "Gold Sail." There was a Canadian Leather Goods Company already registered in Canada; and they had to change the name. They employ at the moment, I think, about twenty people. They began with one person, one girl, a Harbour Grace girl. They are building it up. They have to train them. It is a very skilled trade this fancy leather goods, principally a handicraft. They have now up to twenty. Incidentally Koch Shoes are now up to eighty. I was in there on Sunday and went through it. The footwear they are making there is as good as Hart ever made. It is beautiful.

MR. HIGGINS: They don't do custom work, do they?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, but I dare say they would.

MR. HIGGINS: I can't get a pair of shoes to fit me.

MR. BROWNE: Did the Government buy this premises from Crosbie?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: How much did the Government pay for it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually the transaction is not consummated there.

I would be more inclined to say if there were no reporters here. It is a contra-account between the Department of Finance and the company. It is the result of a contra-account.

MR. HIGGINS: You mean the Gold Sail?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Crosbie and Company and the Department of Finance, under which we will acquire this property. I don't think the deal is actually completed yet. I don't think the purchase or exchange of contra-account has been consummated as yet. But in the course of a very short time I believe the actual details of the purchase of the property will have been completed. Certainly by the time the House meets again we will be able to table more details on that.

MR. BROWNE: Did the Government sum up the value of the property?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, it did.

MR. BROWNE: Now when the Government acquired that for a certain period. But is the Government renting this to these companies?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No selling it to two companies, to Koch Shoes so much.

MR. BROWNE: The same premises?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the same, so much to Gold Sail, so much to Koch, the rest we hold for someone else.

MR. BROWNE: Have you sold to Koch already?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: How much?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About a third.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know the price?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't remember exactly.

MR. BROWNE: I am sure the Government did not make a profit.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did not want to make it.

MR. HOLLETT: The price paid the Government for this property, is that included in that advance of \$100,000, or is that something special? The money which the Government will have to pay for the premises, is that part of this advance of \$100,000 to this firm?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: That is over and above?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is apart from it.

MR. HOLLETT: You will then sell it to Koch Shoes and Gold Sail?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, that is right, and to any others who come along with any project we approve of we can sell the remainder.

MR. BROWNE: It is not easy in business to build up. I know they have some goods on exhibition down here at the hotel. Is the Minister in a position to say whether any contacts have been made outside of Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the vast bulk of the stuff will be sold across Canada, Morgan's, Ogilvie's, Hudson Bay Company and Birks (Fancy Leather). They are in competition with everyone and they can compete.

MR. BROWNE: How do they stand, or is it too early yet?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is too early yet. They only started this winter, two or three months ago.

MR. FORSEY: Mr. Chairman, apropos of the question relevant to the Bonavista Cold Storage; Mr. Russell was not in town. I was speaking to his son. They have their original contingent liability at the bank paid off, and also liquidated the liability, the insurance on one dragger which was lost. They have some \$600,000 in capital in Bonavista Cold Storage. The directors are: Mr. H. A. Russell, Mr. Paul Russell, Mr. Frank Peck, Senator Gordon Bradley, Mr. Gordon Elliott, Mr. R. Russell, Mr. R. A. Russell, Mr. W. M. Buffett—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I might remind the Committee of the time.

Item carried.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again presently.

On motion report received. Committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 1:00 o'clock I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 of the clock this afternoon.

---

THURSDAY, June 17, 1954.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION

The House resumed at 3:00 of the clock.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Honourable the Premier if he is tabling certain documents which he promised to table this morning?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Does that include these at the Finance Department? The reason I ask is because a most disparaging remark, this time regarding myself, has come out of Corner Brook.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I stood with a view to tabling this very document, and gave way to my honourable friend. As I understand it the document came in from the resident engineer, in duplicate, one set to the Deputy Minister of Economic Development, Mr. Short, and the other went to the Department of Finance. What I have I now table. These received at the Department of Economic Development I would hesitate to table. These went to the Department of Finance. They are identical, I understand. I believe, the Deputy Minister tells me they are identical to the best of his knowledge. So that there would not be much point in tabling the complete set. Now if there is anything the honourable gentleman wants in these files he has only to ask, although that is all I have got. He has only to ask, or he has only to go to the Department of Finance and/or the Auditor General and he could get anything else not here which is in either of these Departments.

Mr. Speaker, could we go into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions on Financial Assistance to be rendered to Certain Industries?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given earlier that this Committee sit again, at a later hour this day. I shall now leave the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Resolutions:

MR. SMALLWOOD: I may say, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Marshall has made

all his plans to fly today to Ottawa. I believe he is going at five or six o'clock. I don't know what time this afternoon he has to leave and go home and pick up his bags and go on to the airport. He will remain here, I understand, until it is absolutely necessary for him to leave to catch his flight.

I think we have come to Fishery Products Limited: \$3,187,000.

Mr. Chairman, this large amount of \$3,187,000 is all of it to enable the firm of Fishery Products Limited of which, as the Committee knows, Mr. Arthur H. Monroe is the active head, to greatly expand in this Province. In fact this very large sum of money represents quite an important part of the Government's fishery development programme for this year, and last year, and this coming year.

Under an agreement dated 16 July 1953 it was agreed to make a direct loan to the company of \$1,687,000. Of that \$937,000 was paid when the agreement was signed. The balance of \$750,000 was committed to be paid in monthly instalments of \$50,000 continuing—The loan of \$937,000 is payable on the first day of December, 1973. During its currency it is to pay  $3\frac{1}{4}\%$  interest per annum. The \$750,000 is repayable on or before the 31 December 1978 and bears interest at the rate of  $3\frac{1}{4}\%$  per annum. The balance of the instalments to be paid to the company monthly under the later agreement is \$300,000, i.e. of the \$750,000, of which, as my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition said, I believe correctly, a certain amount has so far been paid.

MR. BROWNE: Eleven months, about \$550,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now in ad-



dition to that there was an agreement dated June 1, 1954, under which an additional loan of \$1,500,000 is to be advanced to the company. This bears interest of 4% per annum, payable annually. The principal sum is to fall due for repayment at the end of 22½ years. Now, Sir, this large sum of \$3,187,000 is lent to this company to enable them to proceed with fishery development in the fishery plant at Greenspond, St. Anthony, Long Harbour, Trepassy, Burin, Change Islands, Joe Batts Arm, Catalina, Bay de Verde, Twillingate. Virtually all of these plants are recommended or are being recommended or are to be recommended to engage in the processing of block frozen fillets, block frozen fish. But the loan in respect to Trepassy is to enable the company to increase its facilities in Trepassy to take care of the block frozen, exclusive of block frozen fish that will be provided in these plants around the island. The block frozen fish will be moved to the plant at Trepassy and from there shipped to market. But Trepassy is the central plant of this greatly ramified system of fish plants scattered around the Coast of Newfoundland. In the central plant at Trepassy the hope is, and the plan is, to bread the fish fingers, fish sticks, and to cook them. But the materialization of that hope and plan depends, of course, upon the outcome of the recent negotiations and discussions and talks and representations in the United States.

MR. BROWNE: It does not depend only on that, because the American fish dealers themselves seem to object. Even those who are anxious to get the fish don't want us to cook them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite so, Mr. Chairman, this is pretty well

the story of the amount for which we seek sanction now for advances to Fishery Products Limited.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that is a tremendous amount of money, and I suppose there is no precedent for it in any other Province in the Dominion, of a Provincial Government lending a company such a large amount of money as that at such a low rate of interest. The Government seems to be going into the business and taking the risks without getting any share of the profits.

Now I would like to know, if the Minister would tell me, what is the capitalization of this company or what it was before they received this first loan. Could he tell me that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I speak from memory, Mr. Chairman, I think it was of the order of four million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Do you know how much of that is paid up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All of it. Four million dollars worth of shares—four million dollars worth of assets.

MR. BROWNE: You don't know the liability?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not at the moment. I have the balance sheets of the company running back for seven, eight or nine years.

MR. BROWNE: I understand that is a company affiliated with another company in the United States with headquarters in Cleveland, which is controlled by Mr. Monroe as well—Is that correct?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Monroe has in Cleveland a central sales office from which he operates to market his products throughout the mid-west and southern west of the United

States, and indeed, other parts of the United States. It is a sales company. In addition to that the laboratories there working by the way of experiments and testing new ways, including fish fingers and fish sticks. But not including that, the property here is worth around four million dollars. It is probably one of the biggest fishing companies in the world, in the whole world. In the United States, there are one or two bigger; B.C. Packers in British Columbia, would be as big as Fishery Products. But they are an immense concern. They are really one of the biggest fishing companies of the whole world. After all they have a fleet of ten druggers. In addition to that they have a fleet of three if not four refrigerated boats, carriers. Mr. Monroe or his company is one of the biggest ship-owners of the world. Not the biggest nor anything like it, but one of the biggest. They have a huge plant at Burin. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of the tremendous plant they have at Burin. Then in addition they have these plants up the coast, four plants up the coast, and in addition they have all these others scattered around throughout the northeast coast and on the coast of Labrador. It is astonishing what a ramified, widespread concern this company is. To me, if ever anything out of the way happens to Mr. Arthur Monroe in the next five, eight or ten years, it will be a terrible calamity to Newfoundland, and I may say a calamity to the Government, because the Government have gone in behind him financially, as the Committee can see, to a very large extent. We look to Mr. Monroe with his drive and energy and the whole staff he has built up, which is quite an organiza-

tion. He brings men in from all points of the compass, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Holland, wherever he can find a good fishery technologist. He gets them and he has built up quite a fisheries organization. It is through him that the Government are hoping to see quite a bit of fishery development taking place. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we don't apologize for the largeness of this amount. If anything we would apologize, if we felt like apologizing, for the smallness. We are very pleased Newfoundland has an Arthur Monroe. We are sorry Newfoundland has not more Arthur Monroes.

MR. BROWNE: He is the exception to the fish merchants?

MR. SMALLWOOD: There are a number of exceptions. He is not the only one.

MR. BROWNE: But the chief exception.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the chief exception.

MR. BROWNE: Now the Premier has told us how much depends on Mr. Monroe, and if anything happened to Mr. Monroe the Government might suffer. I wonder what security or protection the Government have in case anything should happen. It is customary in many businesses to have a man like that, on whose life and health depends the success of the undertaking, insured. I don't know whether the Government has given any consideration to that. It seems to me so much depends on Mr. Monroe it might be advisable to have his life insured.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In favour of the Government?

MR. BROWNE: The other thing

I wish to mention is in regard to the time. This money has been given, all this money has been loaned or is being loaned since July 15, 1953. In other words in this last period of less than a year, three million dollars has been loaned to the company. Now when the Premier replies again, I wonder if he would tell me if the company themselves are putting any extra capital into these new plants. Or are these new plants, all of them, being entirely financed by funds furnished by the Government? Then I would like to know what security the Government are going to get for the money put into this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The company, from the date it began operations, has never declared a dividend. It has never taken any profits out of the business. Every dollar they have ever made has gone promptly back into the business for expansion. That is why not too many years ago they began small and built themselves up without any Government loans to be a very big fishing company. It was always because they reinvested in themselves, in their own expansion, the profits they made instead of accumulating surpluses. Consequently they have always been short of working capital, always, from the moment they were formed to this very moment. So much so that when it came to this quite extra-ordinary expansion of the past two years they were entirely unable to finance it because every dollar they have ever made then existed in the form of ships and factories and plants and fishing property, fishing assets. Therefore all of their expansions during the last two years have been financed by the Government through loans, all of it, I think, without exception, in fact, I know, without exception. I think,

without the exception of a single dollar all of it has been financed by Government loans. I anticipate that much more of it will be financed over and above this \$3,187,000. The only reasonable limit or limits that we would wish to impose or that we see any necessity to impose upon advances to this company for fishery development will be the limitations that would be dictated to us by market conditions and prospects in the world, especially in the United States, and by the success Mr. Monroe would have in building up a competent staff to replace himself some day. In other words if he can train young men of energy and native ability such as Cam Eaton, if he can continue to drill and train men, bright intelligent young Newfoundlanders, clean-cut, energetic, ambitious, dynamic, if he can continue to gather men like that about him, train them in his business, he can build up one of the world's great fishery companies in Newfoundland. In that Newfoundland, of course, will benefit, the locality of it will benefit, the fishermen will benefit, Newfoundlanders generally will benefit.

Now as for security: Our security is mortgages. We take a mortgage on every asset these loans create. We think we are pretty well covered. We think we are pretty well secure on these loans.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, the Premier has indicated to the Committee that this company in its operations has been making a profit. I wonder could the Premier indicate to the Committee in any way, or express an opinion, as to the amount of profit which they have been making and plowing back into the business, so that the Committee would be aware of it, and the amount of success or other-

wise which they have had through their operations in the past few years?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would say that is an ingeniously worded question. I think on reflection the honourable gentleman does not expect me to indicate to the Committee the nature of the profits the company made. The Government knows because we have the balance sheets. The private members of this side of the House do not know, but the members of the Cabinet do. We have reviewed the balance sheets of the company, and we know just as their bank manager knows, but private members do not know, on either side of the House and the public do not know. And I flatly don't think I should, certainly not without asking permission of the company. I doubt that they would give that. I doubt that they would want to do that. I might say the profits they made were much greater during the late war than they were since. I think that was probably true of all the frozen fish companies during the war. As is well known, they operated on behalf of the British Government. Every pound produced was produced for the British Government, and was almost like Government to Government, fixed guaranteed prices. I think the profits were much more substantial than they have been since.

MR. FOGWILL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Premier would go as far as to tell us in the Committee if in the opinion of the Government the profits are substantial, sufficiently substantial as to assure, Sir, that we really have a sound investment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid I could not go that far. I remember that I recently read a balance

sheet, and I would have to remember earlier balance sheets to stack up against this latter one. In the post-war period, if we just forget the war period, I could not say their profits have been of an order to make us feel absolutely cock-sure, cocky about this three point eighteen million dollars. No, to be quite candid and honest about it it may boil down to this, the Government are taking a chance on backing this energetic and progressive Newfoundland firm in its programme of fishery expansion.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, that being so I wish to assure the Government as far as the investment of the Government in this fishery production is concerned that I wish it success. But it is very difficult for the Opposition to really express an opinion on it without having information which is sought. But I hope there is not too much of, we will say, a gamble or of taking a chance in this.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure whether my colleague asked or whether the Premier has any idea as to really how much the Fishery Products has plowed back into the industry. I remember the Premier said they had not declared any dividends for some time but that they plowed back every cent into the industry. Would the Premier wish to say to what extent money has been plowed back into the industry by this Fishery Products Limited?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is now asking what profits have been made, as I said they were all plowed back. The only fresh capital the company got was its profits. I cannot conscientiously say what the profits were, I cannot do that.

MR. HOLLETT: Assuming they

had profits and plowed them back into the industry; what I am trying to get at is, what right has any company to plow back into the industry any profits or excess profits which they may have had when the fishermen who are fishing from day to day on the Grand Banks, jeopardizing their lives, working day and night, when they cannot be paid a reasonable wage but a wage bordering on starvation. I referred this morning to 2½c. or 2¼c. paid here in comparison to 4c. and 5c. paid in Halifax and in North Sydney. I maintain if it were possible for Fishery Products to plow back profits into the industry they might have been well advised if they paid their fishermen a little more and plowed less back into the industry; and then come to the Government and look for a loan. I say yes, give them all they want, if they are going to pay the fishermen a living wage. But they are not doing that now. None of the fresh fish fishermen are getting enough to live on properly. I say that because it has been told me by proper authorities. I know probably they would be much better off than people who prosecute the salt codfishery but they are not living well enough on 2½c. a pound for their fish. So I feel if Fishery Products are going to continue in this policy of plowing back into the industry every last dollar they get, and call it a profit, as a matter of fact, I say, since the Government have such interest, if there are any profits at all they should be plowed back to the fishermen and not into the fishery. That is the point I want to raise.

Now I take it that \$3,187,000 is the full amount that Fishery Products are indebted to us at the present time or is it not five millions including all the details at the present time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am unable to state at the moment.

MR. HOLLETT: The way I read it, since this Government came into power: The loan of \$937,000 has to be paid back in 1974. \$750,000 will not be paid back until Dec. 1978. Some of us won't be here, at least not on this side of the House, then. In addition to that there was a guaranteed loan of \$110,000 on 2 February this year, \$44,000 was owed on that. There was another guaranteed loan of \$350,000 and on that on 28 February this year Fishery Products Limited owed \$279,500. Then there was another guaranteed loan of \$350,000, and they owe that fully. Now am I to add the \$3,187,000 to that? If so then we get the full amount of the loan as over five million. Before we talk further I would like to know approximately the amount which they owe us. Possibly we will get that when the Deputy Minister comes back.

While I am waiting for that, Sir, there was one statement the Honourable the Premier made just now, in good faith I have no doubt, about Mr. Monroe being a sort of a genius, an exception to the rule amongst merchants, he and a few others. We were told of his ability to turn out men in the industry, and he spoke of Mr. Eaton. Now I would like to inform the House that Mr. Eaton was connected with the salt fisheries long before Mr. Monroe had him in his employee. I am reliably informed that when Mr. Monroe discovered Mr. Eaton, he had what it takes in the way of business ability. I was told he more or less robbed the Salt Fish Association of Mr. Eaton and gathered him unto himself and put him in charge up in his office here in St. John's. Not only did Mr. Monroe do this but he was smart enough to en-

deavour to take from the fish trades Association their present secretary, Mr. Harvey, so I am informed on reliable authority. So I would suggest that Mr. Monroe is almost a dangerous sort of person around if he is going to take all the men from other fish merchants and allocate them to himself, and then perhaps on account of that be able to come to the Government and get loans of the order of this one now being discussed. I maintain, Sir, very few men are of the type that the Honourable the Premier speaks of. We are more or less all alike. Some of us have a little more aptitude for one thing than another. For instance the Honourable the Premier has an aptitude for politics. I don't suppose there has been a slicker—No, I won't say slicker in the derogatory sense—I should say smarter politician in this country than the Honourable the Premier. He has an aptitude for that. But I hesitate to say that there have not been smarter men as far as dollars and cents and financial affairs are concerned, although he appears to have some ability in regard to that. As a matter of fact we were blessed, I suppose, to have had him with us the last five years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A little off the subject, I believe.

MR. HOLLETT: This is not a eulogy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is not feeling well—He does not sound like himself.

MR. HOLLETT: I am saying no particular man has an excess of brains. As I pointed out, if Mr. Monroe more or less, I say, steals almost from the Salt Codfishery Association and from

the Fresh Fish Trades Association and gets these men, then naturally he is smart enough to come here and get these loans from this Government and add them up until he finally has gotten an awful lot of money from the Government. I would say it is not so much a Fishery Products industry as it is a Newfoundland Government industry. Now I wonder if we could have the exact amount, or the approximate amount owed by way of loans, cash loans and guaranteed loans to Fishery Products?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman will allow me I will bring that later on today.

HON. W. J. KEOUGH (Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives): Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, I think I can help there. I have some figures here I gave to the House during the debate on the estimates for the Fisheries Development Authority. The figures that I have from them was that there has been loaned or will have been loaned to Fishery Products after this final amount provided in the budget this year, there will have been loaned to Fishery Products Limited altogether \$3,676,000 of which there has been repayments in respect of \$110,000 and \$350,000 and in respect of another loan, altogether roughly \$57,266 repaid. Subtract that and you get the amount.

MR. BROWNE: That does not seem to cover the loans that we know of. The Minister speaks of a \$350,000 loan and a \$110,000 loan, that is \$460,000 on which \$57,000 has been paid. That leaves \$403,000. What about the \$937,000 loan in existence or is that still in existence?

MR. KEOUGH: That is still in existence.



MR. SMALLWOOD: One was absorbed into another, Trepassey Fisheries.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, in that \$3,187,000, we now find the amount of \$1,687,000.

MR. KEOUGH: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Also the amount of \$1,500,000?

MR. KEOUGH: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I see.

MR. FOGWILL: All cash?

MR. KEOUGH: Will be.

MR. HOLLETT: Now the guaranteed—\$44,000, that is still owing I take it.

MR. KEOUGH: That is the balance of the \$110,000. That \$44,000 is still outstanding.

MR. HOLLETT: \$350,000 as of the 2nd of February, is that in addition to these large amounts of \$1,500,000 and \$1,687,000. Anyway if the Honourable the Premier is going to present the figures I don't see why we should rack our brains about it.

In regard to the whole idea of the fishery, Mr. Chairman, we should do nothing which would in any way hamper the Government or Fishery Products or any other fishery concern if they are trying to develop the fishery. But I would want to impress on all the people getting loans for the fishery that a lot depends upon how well the men who work in that industry live in this civilization which was talked about the other day, this new civilization. Incidentally would the Premier tell me how many people directly get employment from the operations of Fishery Products Limited here in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, not at the moment, I cannot, but I have got all that information.

MR. HOLLETT: It seems to me it would be very helpful if we had that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Roughly half of all in the whole Province in the frozen fish industry in Newfoundland.

MR. HOLLETT: They have fifty per cent?

MR. SMALLWOOD: And possibly a bit over.

MR. HOLLETT: Over fifty per cent of all the people employed in the fresh fish industry in Newfoundland are employed by Fishery Products Limited?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I will bring in the additional information.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I asked a question there and was not sure the Premier answered it: Have we got mortgages?

MR. SMALLWOOD: To cover all our advances, yes, chattel mortgages, fixed mortgages.

MR. BROWNE: He is going into new places like Long Harbour and Trepassey. As each function occurs is there a mortgage to cover that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, each individual one.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I am sure, on all the new places.

MR. BROWNE: Any mortgage on the plant at Burin?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, on the new plant, on the things which the loans create.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, but that is a 100% risk we are taking there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. If we take mortgages on their former plant we cripple all their hopes of ever being carried by the bank, we upset their bond position.

MR. BROWNE: Have they yet other loans besides?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have bonds.

MR. BROWNE: What type bonds, do you know?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know.

MR. BROWNE: Any loans from the Federal through the industrial banks anywhere?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: What sort of bonds?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Private bonds.

MR. CURTIS: Mortgages issued through industry, I think for about four hundred thousand.

MR. BROWNE: That is a first mortgage, I take it, on their plant. In other words we lend them, say, \$350,000 and they put a plant in Trepassey for instance, and we take a mortgage on a 100% financing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is either that or not getting it at all or doing it ourselves. The choice is plain enough. Let us do without fishery development or do it ourselves as a socialistic Government or lend the money to private enterprise to do it in that way.

MR. BROWNE: Well you did all this without the Fisheries Development Authority, before that authority was

organized. This has been under consideration, I suppose, for some time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The latter parts have emanated from the fisheries development scheme. All the latter ones, one half million to two millions, are projects that have reached us via the FDA.

MR. BROWNE: The Government is taking a chance with Mr. Monroe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

MR. CURTIS: You also have the guarantee of the company to repay plus the specific items created by our investment. It is not a hundred per cent security. I understand the company has a little over two million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Well I am glad to hear an authoritative source on that. The Premier a few minutes ago said four millions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not in capital, in assets. The honourable gentleman asked me if they had that much shares, I said, no, not shares, assets.

MR. BROWNE: Has the Government seen to it that all this property is fully insured?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes the FDA does that.

MR. BROWNE: Any mortgage on any of the ships?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All mortgaged, all we have financed.

MR. BROWNE: How many?

MR. SMALLWOOD: About three, I believe. They lost one fully covered by insurance and we allowed them to spend the same money to replace that ship.

MR. BROWNE: I noticed by the newspaper this morning—Incidentally in Ottawa the fishery officials believe that General Eisenhower is likely to give a favourable reply to the companies protesting. I noticed also that several of the Gloucester firms, or at least one of them, has sold its draggers to people in Halifax or Lunenburg as they are leaving the business—So they are really dependent on Canadian fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the item is carried may I make just one point, a declaration of faith. The investment in fishery development is well protected provided it is invested in good companies, good concerns. If it is not safe then what is safe in Newfoundland? If we cannot gamble on fishery development had we not better in Newfoundland just fold up and all hands emigrate? If we cannot build an economy on developed industry, Sir, there is nothing else worth backing. I am sure that is the feeling of the Opposition as it is of all Newfoundlanders. We got to gamble. We have got to take a chance. The whole fishery from the beginning of Newfoundland's history has been a gigantic gamble. The fishermen gambled on the weather, on the markets, gambled with the very elements. It is all a gamble, the whole fishing industry, the whole fishery economy has been a gigantic gamble. Well the Government said, either Newfoundland is going ahead or she is not—she is or she is not. She is if there is fishery development, and she goes back if there is not. Because what in God's name are fifty, sixty, seventy, one hundred and fifty thousand people going to do in Newfoundland if there is not employment in the fishery for them? What are they going to do? They are going to get

out. That is all there is for them. You can create this, that and the other thing which will absorb some of the growing population but gamble, by all means gamble.

The total amount, by the way, is \$3,859,000 — four million — It is not exactly four millions, it is one hundred and fifty thousand less than four millions.

MR. HOLLETT: The Honourable the Premier speaks of gambling—Yes, we know that the fishery is a gamble in one sense of the word, all life is a gamble as far as that is concerned. But nobody agrees with dealing the joker to the same individual continuously, and it is continuously here in this instance. Four million dollars has been loaned to Fishery Products. Now there are, I have no doubt, other fish firms, fish merchants, who are also interested not only in their own welfare but are interested in the fishermen amongst whom they live.

MR. CURTIS: We have never turned down one.

MR. HOLLETT: You have never turned down one—I suppose the fault is they don't ask for enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or not enough of them come and ask, that is right.

MR. HOLLETT: That is very strange. I was talking to a man only two days ago. He endeavoured to get a loan of \$40,000 in connection with fisheries, to increase his potentials. He was turned down. And I know various other people from the fisheries who were loaned money and I know those who tried to get loans and they did not get them. They were turned down. I know it is a gamble but the point is, I hope you are gam-

bling in the right direction. I have pointed out the prices going to the fishermen,  $2\frac{1}{4}$ c. to  $2\frac{1}{2}$ c. for codfish whereas in Nova Scotia, Halifax and Sydney they get 4c. and 5c. a pound. Now I say, instead of Fishery Products plowing all their profits, and nobody tells us what the profits were, into the industry and building and building and building it might be a little wiser if they plowed some of them back to the fishermen who catch the fish. I am reminded of a report in here not many years ago, I believe on fishery prices and I believe it was Fishery Products who refused and did not pay the extra dollar a quintal to salt fish fishermen on the northeast coast but it was paid by all the other merchants who dealt in salt fish. That Fishery Products Limited who had lots of money said; no, we are not going to pay it. I want to know, if we are going to gamble and deal the joker out, let somebody else see the joker occasionally. Let it not all go into one hand.

I am entirely behind loaning money to re-establish the fishery. But let us be reasonable. Let us not dish out this money in such a way that it will be impossible for Fishery Products' competitors to operate. That is the main thing, I think.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one other observation in regard to the Premier's statement, a very important statement he made when he said we have to gamble, the fisheries being a gigantic gamble, and either Newfoundland goes ahead or she does not go ahead, and where are many, many going to go if they have to get out. Now it does not seem to me to be sound practice for a Government to be gambling, and gambling such huge amounts of money. It is not the Government's

money. It is the money of this country. I don't think the people of the country, if they realize what is going on, want to see it gambled. It seems to me that is what they are doing at the present moment. They are taking quite a chance. This money is paid out, invested, before the decisions come from the American Government as to what they are going to do about the fishery. If their decision is favourable then it is all right and we stand a good chance until something else turns up. But there are a good many ups and downs, and nobody knows that better than Mr. Monroe, in this business. From a distance I have watched Mr. Monroe carry on for many years, and his father before him. His father told me how he worked up from a thousand to half a million dollars, then Mr. Arthur Monroe seemed to be losing even his father's gain. Now he seems to be in a pretty safe position and can come to the Government and get a loan up to four million dollars, which only Governments or the biggest companies in the world can get. This Government is certainly showing great faith in Mr. Monroe, and I hope it will be well placed. But I don't like to hear the Premier talking about gambling with the funds of this country. I think we have to get as much security as we can, and we have to be sure the Government is going to get back this money again. If there is a gambling element in it the odds should be in our favour that it is going to be returned to us and not the fifty-fifty chance we are told about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Honourable gentleman to tell me, if he is capable of doing it, and if he is not I would like his Leader to tell me, if he is capable, and if neither one is capable

I would like a challenge to go out all over the Island of Newfoundland for someone to come and tell me or send me a letter or telegram if he can't come, to take up the telephone, but by whatever means he might adopt, even to sending a carrier pigeon, I would like somebody to convey to me this piece of information; which I have not got at this moment, I lack; how do you develop the fisheries of Newfoundland without gambling?

MR. BROWNE: Do you want me to answer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, in fact we do—How can that be done? It never was done since Newfoundland began. It never has been done up to this moment. They could never develop the fisheries without gambling. The merchants had to gamble, the fishermen had to gamble. The fishermen gambled their lives. They gambled their boats every day they went out. They gamble their fishing gear, don't they? Look how often their fishing gear and traps are swept away, wrecked, lost. Their salmon traps, the salmon may not come, the salmon nets may be swept away. The results of hard labour may be swept away in a night. Is that not gambling? A fisherman gambles when he goes in debt for gas and oil, for gear, for rubber boots, for oilskins. He goes in debt on his company's account. He goes in debt on his personal account. Before he catches a codfish he has gone in debt, every fisherman in Newfoundland. The merchants go in debt to the bigger merchants, and the bigger merchants go in debt to the banks. That is the pattern. There has never been any other pattern in our fishery from the dawn of our history.

MR. HOLLETT: That is true of everything.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it is particularly and more especially true of our fisheries. It is also true of agriculture but not nearly so true as it is of our fisheries. It is like the story: A fishermen was asked—Which would you rather be in an airplane accident or blown up with dynamite? He said he would rather be in an airplane accident. When asked why he answered: "Well, in an airplane accident there you are but in a dynamite accident where are you?"

So it is in fisheries: In agriculture you are on the land. You are reasonably safe. Oh, a man could fall in a hole and break his leg, yes. But out on the ocean there is not only the gamble of getting fish or not but there is the gamble of taking your life in your hands virtually every day.

I would like the honourable gentleman to tell me how to get fishery development without gambling.

MR. BROWNE: As the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, there is a gamble in everything. We don't know but the chandelier will fall down on the Attorney's General's head as he walks along there. There is always a certain risk. The Queen while in Montreal stood in front of the St. Mary's Memorial Hospital then stepped into a car. As she did so a big piece of cornice stone fell from six stories up to where she had been standing two or three seconds before. I do wish to point out there is such a thing as an element of risk and such a thing as a gamble, something which we cannot afford. Now the Premier has challenged the whole country to tell him some way or other of carrying on this business.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I did not.

MR. BROWNE: That is what it

amounted to. He read the fisheries report and spent five days illustrating, but seemed to over-look or at least, did not stress what benefit it was going to be to Newfoundland if Mr. Arthur Monroe controlled the whole fishery 95% or 100%. Where are the fishermen then? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition pointed out now they get much less for their fish than Nova Scotia. I would say they get probably much less than in Quebec.

One of the reasons the fisheries are still not organized, and I think which the Fishery Development Committee remarked upon, and the previous Fishery Committee set up under Judge Kent, was the Development of Co-operatives. As I said before, the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives was asleep in that regard, and the Government is asleep today. What is it doing to set up Co-operatives?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are a little bit away now from this loan.

MR. BROWNE: The Honourable Premier asked for a challenge—Is not this problem fundamental? Did not the Premier tell us that all down through the ages the fisheries have been a problem, a gamble always. They received assistance from the Government and still receive assistance from the Government. You are giving four million dollars to Fishery Products Limited. You are gambling at less than you can borrow. You are losing 1¼% on that loan. The Premier is inconsistent when he speaks like that. There was no one ever heard criticizing the merchants as much as he did. Yet he is putting four million dollars in the hands of the biggest of them. Now, Sir, without elaborating, because I know it is a little beside the point, but the chief thing is that any Government should get it in its head, that

it is the fishermen we want to build up in this country. We can only do that by doing it as they do in Nova Scotia. The pattern followed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Quebec is to build up the Co-operative movement and help to make the fishermen prosperous. There is a picture in the Canadian Fisheries Annual of an exhibit of fish by the United Fishermen of Gaspé Bay and Montreal. That is what they are doing down there. I know it is not as big there as in Newfoundland. But I said from the moment that the Fishery Federation was formed it would never do any good unless it copied the ideas of Co-operative teaching and the people went into it co-operatively. Now there is the answer to the Premier's question as to how to get away from gambling; and to reduce gambling to the lowest level we have to get the fishermen in charge.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I happened to be the one who invited Monsignor Coady down here.

MR. BROWNE: On my recommendation made in the House of Commons February 6, 1951. Further than that he could have been brought down here at the expense of the Federal Government and the Co-operative movement could have been assisted with finances from the Federal Government and would have made more progress if the recommendations I made had been accepted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I would be the last one, I think, in this House, even after my honourable and learned friend has done so and even after the Honourable Minister of Co-operatives has done so, I would still be later than they in saying anything against the Co-operative Movement. Before anyone in this House advocated it I did.



Before the honourable gentleman did I did. I began in 1925.

MR. BROWNE: Advocated it here in Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I advocated it right here prominently and publicly. I was an active member of the Grand Falls Society in 1920 and am still a member.

Going back to what I said—We will gamble to develop the fisheries or we won't develop them (period): So far from agreeing that people of Newfoundland don't want the Government to gamble on the fisheries I think they do. I think anyone who wants to make an issue of that in the forthcoming election in November of this year, or at any time—Should the Government gamble upon the fisheries—the party that says yes will win and the party that says no will be ignominiously defeated. We say yes because it is the proper thing. We are not only paying lip-service, we are asking the Committee to vote here now today three million dollars. Earlier in the estimates we asked the House to vote around four million or three to four million dollars for Fishery Development. That is not lip-service. That is actually taking our political life in our own hands and risking it on Fishery Development. We are prepared to do that. We do that gladly. We are not doing it unwillingly. We are not being driven to do it. No weight of public opinion is forcing us to do it. Not even Mr. Arthur Monroe nor all the others to whom we have lent money have persuaded us to do it. It is because we ourselves believe in it. Indeed we lead the forces that believe in it in Newfoundland. We are in the vanguard. We are, if anything, inducing and persuading people who are a little reluctant in their faith.

Now that is a gamble. This will bring our investment in the fisheries by the end of the present financial year to about ten millions of dollars. That, I would say, is probably around half the capital of B.C. Packers, one company, admittedly a big company. I was talking in Vancouver two or three weeks ago with the head of the company, H. R. MacMillan, who was good enough to call up to see me at my hotel. His company is B.C. Packers, a huge concern which has a capital of ten million anyway. Incidentally it was founded by a Newfoundlander, who died a pauper, the great Captain Gosse. I did not know that until I was in Vancouver the other day. He died a pauper, a man whose name even in Newfoundland was a household name. He was the founder of B.C. Packers, today in the world the largest of all fishing companies. Yet this Government, the whole of Newfoundland, will have an investment only of ten millions. That is the capital of one company. When Newfoundland gets an investment of one hundred million dollars or a couple of hundred million dollars or say a quarter of a billion in an utterly up-to-date, utterly modern, stream-lined fishery then perhaps our fishermen will make a civilized living out of the fishery. Then perhaps we will have a little stability in the fishing industry, our fishing economy.

Is there anyone in this House who can give me a logical reason why in the whole world Newfoundland should not be in the vanguard in Fishery Development? God knows that except for Iceland and the Faroe Islands there is no country on earth in which fish means so much to the economy as fishing means to the economy of Newfoundland. God knows a prosperous fishery means more to Newfoundland

than it can mean to any other part of Canada. Why should we not be in the lead? Why should we not be in the vanguard, never being afraid to spend millions, and if we have not got the money we have to borrow. We have got to invest actually. Although I admitted it before, I say this now; I am going to give the Opposition a nice handle to hang on me.

MR. HOLLETT: What handle is C. D. Howe supposed to have—brushed aside a million dollars—He said once in the House of Commons—What is a million or so here and there — Was not that the remark? Possibly my honourable friend was there and heard him.

MR. BROWNE: "What is a million?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now I am going to give the Opposition some satisfaction. I am going to say; "What is three million dollars?" What is four millions, five millions, what is it? What is it stacked up against the need in Newfoundland for raising the standard of living of good people, good hard-working people, God-fearing people, people who had never had a break until Confederation. They got a break then, but they cannot live on that break forever. Good, hard-working, God-fearing people who for four and a half centuries have clung to the rocks on our coast and tried to grapple with their fingernails a living, just enough to stay alive, to keep body and soul together. They never had much of a break. Now you talk about four million dollars to give them a little better living.

Now just one final point—The Honourable Leader of the Opposition talked of the fishing companies making profits and the fishermen not get-

ting enough for their fish. True, absolutely right. But surely it is not until now that he has learned that. He is a Master of Arts in economy. He must have learned at Oxford University, surely, that all capital in the world that ever was capital, as Abraham Lincoln said: "All capital comes from labour." Does he suppose any firm was ever built anywhere or any other firm without profit? I would say that the frozen fish industry which has become a rather important thing, quite sizable, has been financed by three classes of persons (1) the fishermen by getting a lower price than could have been paid. They subsidized the upbuilding of these companies. (2) the Governments which lent them capital and continues to lend them capital and (3) they themselves who put in some initial capital. Even this initial capital, where did that come from? It came from the fishermen. Where did the capital the Governments lend come from? Where? Say it!

MR. HOLLETT: The same answer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mainly on taxes? On whom? Mainly on the fishermen.

MR. HOLLETT: Certainly not Monroe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Largely fishermen. So that all the capital in these fishing industries now came from the owners who got it out of the fishermen in the first place, who now patronize them by getting less for their fish than could be given them, and from the Government who got it largely from the fishermen. There is nothing new about that. That is the story of economics. That is the story of private enterprise throughout the world. There are people who oppose that and people who like it. I am in

between, somewhere in between. But this is not an occasion for raising all these social questions. There must be a better occasion than this for that purpose.

**MR. HOLLETT:** The Honourable the Premier has turned the matter into a political argument, and has made a political address. I think the Honourable the Premier is ready to say, more or less, that we are opposed to investing money in the fishery. I also stated we favoured the investment in the fishery by the Government. But one of the points we are concerned with is that one or two men in the country are monopolizing all the Government money being invested, Bonavista Cold Storage, Limited, or Mr. Russell, Fishery Products Limited or Mr. Monroe. It is quite true they are able men, I think. I don't know them all. But when I look at the loans which the Government made, I think, seven million dollars has gone into the fishery and this man, Monroe, got practically four million dollars, and that other man got two millions. That is six million out of seven million which has gone to two men. I am asking the Government to beware and to be careful that they do not make a monopoly out of it, nabobs of the fishery, so that they can say to the fishermen—If you want to live go and fish in my boat.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** The honourable gentleman's followers wanted these men here in this House, nabobs.

**MR. HOLLETT:** No, some of the salt fish merchants in here, the despised ones, the scavengers of Newfoundland according to the Honourable the Premier. It illustrates and bears out the argument put forward by my honourable and learned friend that the salvation of any people, here

particularly, the salvation of the fishermen must start with the fishermen themselves and must build up from that. I think any member in this House who had gone into the Co-operative Movement or any movement must admit the uplifting of any people starts from below. We must start below and build up and not start at Arthur Monroe and Hazen Russell and pour the revenue which the Government collects into their hands and let them dispense it. No, it must come from the people. I grant you we will support every move made by the Government to build up the fisheries, but I do not want it to be said or thought that we of the Opposition or any man in this House is opposed to spending money in regard to development of the fishery. I do maintain, however, that caution has to be exercised.

**MR. JANES:** I don't know what the fishermen of Fogo Island would think of this discussion. They had two of Arthur Monroe's plants operating in Fogo District. He was there operating at Joe Batts Arm, a large fishing community, and for reasons best known to Fishery Products Limited, I suppose, they had to withdraw. They have gone back again now. I don't know, Sir, if the fishermen of Fogo or Change Islands have any particular interest in Arthur Monroe. I don't know if they have any particular interest in seeing Arthur Monroe make any profit on fish. But I know they have a particular interest in living themselves, getting enough to eat and a house to live in.

If any of the honourable members on the opposite side of the House think these fishermen through co-operatives are capable of doing that, Sir, then they should go down and tell the people there how it should be done. I have worked with the co-

operative movement myself, and I would make this observation: It depends on the day and age in which we live. We have fishermen in Newfoundland who worked as hard as any fishermen in the world to try and build co-operative organizations and failed, failed, failed miserably. I would remind the honourable members for St. John's West, what might be idealistically possible is not always financially possible nor is it always practical. Many of the factors which operate in Quebec and in Nova Scotia, the factors which help the co-operative movement, do not exist in Newfoundland, never did exist and I don't suppose ever will exist.

If we must have fishery development the plants must be built, the plants must be managed, and they must not only be financially managed and have general management but there must be technical management, which cannot be provided by the fishermen today. Over a period of years I see a possibility for them to do it. But they are not prepared to wait that long. There is no fishing community in Newfoundland today, Sir, which does not want a plant which is going to take the fish out of their hands for processing in whatever manner it might be processed. Whether the plant is owned by the Government or by Arthur Monroe they are not one bit concerned. They have their hands full in trying to maintain their fishing equipment and fishing gear and trying to get new boats and engines. They have their hands full. Yet we talk about imposing upon them the financial costs and responsibilities of building plants, of finding technical management for these plants, of building up market organizations. It cannot be done, Sir, there is no fishing community in

Newfoundland can do it, and no group of fishermen. It is unjustified, and I would be the last person to ask them to do it because most of the fishery development going on today is largely experimental. Are we going to ask the fishermen of Newfoundland to get themselves involved in experimentation directly? I know they are involved indirectly. I know they are involved every time a loan is made to fish companies by the Government. But it is quite another matter if we are going to involve them directly, quite another matter, Sir. As I said before, what could be idealistically practical is not always practical nor always financially possible. That is the problem which faces the Government and the fisheries of Newfoundland. If the methods which are employed at this moment to build up the fishing industry should twenty years from now prove wrong, surely there will be answers to right that wrong. Arthur Monroe is being asked to be the great octopus as the Leader of the Opposition recognizes him to be.

MR. HOLLETT: Nobody said that. Would the honourable member permit me to ask a question? Will he explain to me why Arthur Monroe did not pay the extra dollar increase in 1953 when other merchants did?

MR. JAMES: Mr. Chairman, that has nothing whatsoever to do with the discussion. As I say, if Arthur Monroe or Fishery Products, Limited, is the great octopus, the great monopoly the Opposition sees, surely there will be legislative powers in the Government of the day when that happens to remove that octopus. Until that day comes let us get development however we get it.

Carried.

Hanning Electric Limited \$120,000 :

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, Hanning Electric Limited, Newfoundland Asbestos Limited, Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, Superior Rubber Company Limited, United Cotton Mills Limited are all in the same category, in the same position of needing additional working capital and needing it because the estimates upon which the original loans to them were made proved to be optimistic as to the costs of construction in Newfoundland. Therefore more of the total loan in each case was eaten up on their construction than was anticipated leaving them in each instance short of working capital. So therefore these are loans of additional working capital. In the case of Hanning Electric Limited the amount asked is \$120,000. The original loan to them was \$325,000, bringing it now, with this amount if agreed on, to \$445,000. The company is just now going into production. They were delayed for some time through the absence of a very, very special type of floor they needed that had to be completely acid resistant. This floor is now laid. They brought a man in from Germany, I believe, to do it. I believe they had to bring the tiles and some other chemicals in also. They now will take people on steadily in increased numbers.

Incidentally, the storage batteries they made are admittedly excellent quality. I have talked with various garage-men and battery dealers and car and truck owners and they all speak very highly of these batteries. Mr. Heyson, the General Manager, at my suggestion, called recently upon Imperial Oil in Toronto. They sent some of their people into the plant to examine it. They have taken some of the batteries of Hanning Electric and have put them under test.

Mr. Heyson is now visiting them in Toronto with a view to getting some substantial orders for Atlas Batteries. My understanding is that they have to make and sell thirty thousand batteries a year to enable them to pay all expenses, to amortize the loan and pay themselves a small profit.

MR. HOLLETT: Car batteries?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Any kind of storage batteries, not merely car batteries but ship batteries, marine, all kinds, some almost as big as that table. They are really very high-class batteries these people manufacture. There is one thing about it that the Committee will agree on, these Germans, if before they come here are successful operators in this, that or the other thing, then they are amongst the ablest and most resourceful industrialists of the whole world. If Mr. Hanning is a successful manufacturer of batteries in Germany, as he is, it is likely that he will be a successful manufacturer of batteries here.

MR. BROWNE: That is \$425,000—What is the value of the plant that they bought with them? They could not have bought very much machinery to go against this \$425,000?

MR. SMALLWOOD: If only my honourable friends opposite would accept my invitation to visit these plants. The honourable gentlemen opposite are elected representatives of the people of Newfoundland and not just of their own constituents. The people of Newfoundland through the Government, through this House, have advanced considerable money to create these industries. Now I hold it is the duty of the gentlemen opposite, if they have ever had any feeling that they are alien and strangers to these plants, which I doubt, to abandon

that feeling and to visit and see the plants. If my honourable friends did that and went into this battery plant they would see a very fine little plant. It is not one of the bigger ones. But they would see it is a very fine plant with the very latest machinery one will find anywhere in the world in plants of that kind, and it is a very, very fine building, probably the only one of its kind in North America. It is a concrete building prefabricated and built indoors during the winter and assembled afterwards. The foundations were laid the previous fall, and the building fitted together like a jigsaw puzzle. There is not a scrap of wood in the whole building and it is virtually indestructible as far as fire goes.

MR. BROWNE: I have been inside that, where I made the observation: "Where is the machinery?" Did they buy \$325,000 worth of machinery to put against this \$325,000 the Government loaned them? I understand here they were supposed to put up fifty-fifty or fifty per cent of the investment. Have they got that amount there?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not the figures here now. As far as the original deal was concerned they have lived up to their part as we did.

MR. BROWNE: Fifty-fifty?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have done that.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to say very much on this, but we are all a bit worried about this company continuously coming back year after year and month after month requesting more money. The total investment in the first place was \$325,000 to put the plant there and start it going, and the Hanning Electric Company would buy all the

machinery. Now there is another loan of \$120,000 and next year I hope there won't be another \$125,000. We have as directors there Max Braun-Wogan, Gertrude Braun-Wogan. I have no doubt they have good people there, very efficient. I can assure this House we have heard of Max Braun-Wogan. He has done good service. He was one time employed by the Department of Economic Development, if I mistake not, and was sent out to Gander to collect Dr. Sennewald, and he made a good job of it. The Premier has to smile every time that is mentioned because he attributes that move to his own ingenious mind, I am quite sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No? It was election time.

MR. HOLLETT: Braun-Wogan went out and captured and brought in Dr. Sennewald by an RCAF plane. He brought home the bacon or brought it to that plane, the eye-glass man. But there was nothing we can do about it. I hope he is just as successful in bringing home the money.

Newfoundland Asbestos Limited—  
\$90,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Attorney General who is in another part of the building for a short while, I will give the best explanation I can on that amount.

There was an amount of a quarter of a million dollars advanced to this company a year and a half or two years ago. Now the company needs another \$90,000 and tells us that is the end.

In the absence of the Attorney General for a short while perhaps we had better pass over that and let it stand for the time being and come back to



it. He is, I believe, a director of the company and represented the Government in all negotiations.

Stand.

Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited,  
\$550.00.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is an amount that was lent to the company by the bank on the Government's guarantee. It was lent to them to provide additional working capital to restore lost capital, lost in actual operations from the day the company started production in the Hardwoods Plant, that is to say the birch plant. They have steadily lost money, never broke even, never got in the black. They have been in the red from the day they commenced production. For a while they got within sight of being in the black, or of breaking even. For several months they were actually operating just barely below the breaking-even point. Then they ran into great difficulty in connection with logging. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that is really one of the greatest difficulties that has plagued Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, the birch plant. They have had tremendous difficulty in assuring the plant a continuously adequate supply of suitable logs, birch logs, for the purpose of making veneer and plywood. The birch is our Newfoundland hardwood. Except for portable mills going in to the birch and sawing out railway ties from birch our Newfoundland people have not had very much experience down through the years in the handling of hardwoods. It cannot be floated. It can actually be floated all right under certain conditions, but not under conditions that would be practical. If you bark a birch tree you can float it or if you dry it. But either renders it unsuit-

able for the purposes of the plant. So practically speaking you cannot float birch. It is especially heavy and difficult to handle, and difficult to lift, difficult to move. It is a clumsy heavy wood which our people have never been accustomed actually to handling to move it any distance, except as I say, they have had considerable experience in taking portable mills in to good stands of birch and cutting down the birch and then chopping it into slabs and shipping it to the nearest railway head. So that under the best of circumstances our plant has had great difficulty and would have great difficulty in supplying it with an adequate supply of suitable logs. But to make a difficult situation much more difficult we have had terribly difficult winters. Take this past winter—it was very bad from a logging point of view and the winter before was just as bad. In the months when logging ordinarily ought to have been practical and reasonable the great thaw set in with no frost and no snow. When you have that kind of thing happen you have the greatest difficulty handling even soft woods. But when you get that sort of thing it is really terribly difficult and almost impossible to handle a much heavier and much more difficult hardwood. So for two winters running they have had great difficulty in keeping the plant supplied with an adequate quantity and an adequate number of birch logs.

Now I am not in a position to acquaint the committee fully of recent developments except to say that at this moment the Government are in negotiation with a view to an entirely new arrangement being made for the operations of the birch plant. If these negotiations succeed, and I would say that I am rather hopeful

of the outcome, then there will be brought to the operations of the plant highly experienced, highly experienced personnel in the matter of hardwood logging, in the supervision of logging operations in hardwoods in the province of Quebec, practical experience gained in the Province of Quebec in the cutting and hauling and handling and shipping of hardwoods, of birch. Now that is precisely, as I have been pointing out, the thing above all others, I believe, that has been lacking in the operations of our birch plant, really efficient logging operations for hardwoods. These have been lacking from the beginning to this moment. It seems to me from a very close association with the plant from the first pouring of the concrete that no matter how efficiently you operate the plant as a plant you will not have the success you need until the logging operations, the cutting, the moving, the shipping of the birch logs is conducted with absolute efficiency. I can give as my firm opinion that it is not because of the freight on the logs from the site to the mill. That is a very serious obstacle, but it is rather by the absence of efficient logging operations in the birch to the point of the railway head, to the point of placing the logs aboard the train.

Then secondly they are still lacking in Newfoundland in a really efficient method of shipping birch logs by water, by boat. The ordinary type of vessel in Newfoundland is not constructed with a view to the quick, economic and efficient movement of birch logs by water. Now that has got to be solved. May I say this, Mr. Chairman. We have enormous quantities of birch in Newfoundland, many thousands of miles. We have undoubtedly the greatest stands of healthy birch left now in North America except for

British Columbia, the greatest, biggest stands, hundreds of millions of feet of birch. We have the birch. It is excellent in quantity and quality. It is not as big in diameter as you will find elsewhere in North America. It is on the average an inch to two inches smaller in diameter but it is healthy, it is not diseased. We have the birch. We have the plant. It is a good plant. It has excellent equipment. The layout of the plant is excellent. All engineers have agreed on that. And I am in strong hope that negotiations that are going on this moment, going on today and went on last night when we left this House here—I went from here straight to my office for a meeting with certain people presently in the Province with whom we are negotiating—I am in strong hopes that as a result of these negotiations the birch plant and the whole operation will get a great new lease of life which will enable it to benefit from the mistakes that have been made up to the present time. I have great faith indeed in the possibilities, the practical possibilities of our birch industry becoming a real giver of labour, a real giver of employment in Newfoundland. Up to now I will admit frankly it has not been conspicuously successful. It has never yet succeeded in getting in the black although until logging difficulties came as a result of bad winters we were in sight of getting in the black or breaking even.

That is the position, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure we were all impressed by the hopes expressed by the Honourable the Premier relative to the hardwoods plant, the birch plant. I am not familiar with the manufacture of birch. I have seen birch trees growing. I have seen this birch plant. Incidentally before I go further I want

to raise a point on that. I believe the directors of the company are Chester Dawe, Sybil Dawe, the Premier and Mr. Mercer. I was reminded no later than today by the Premier that we were at liberty to go and visit these plants. As a matter of fact on a number of occasions the Premier has suggested that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I interrupt? One of the plants sent a letter to all the members of the Cabinet asking them please to visit them.

MR. HOLLETT: Why did not the members on this side receive a similar letter, in view of the Premier's invitation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: These letters were sent to the Cabinet four or five months ago, before I extended this invitation.

MR. HOLLETT: I want to say this—Arising out of questions we were invited to visit the Finance Department. In connection with the birch plant there was certain information which the Finance Department did not have. They had some of the vouchers. The suggestion was made that myself and my honourable friend on my right visit the birch plant. On the 14th I think it was or the 15th of June we did just that, and we went out to that plant. We stopped at the gate and went to the office. We were met by Mr. Greene who was in charge, I believe he is one of the head officials out there, and was at one time a manager of a bank I think, Mr. Thomas Greene. At any rate it was suggested that we might see the plant. So we took advantage of that, and Mr. Greene showed us through the main building of the plant. We looked at some of the machines. It was the first time I had been there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Were they operating at the time?

MR. HOLLETT: No nothing operating unfortunately.

We went through—There were two or three men around there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was lunch hour.

MR. HOLLETT: Whatever the hour they were not there anyway, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West and myself were conducted around the building. We saw some of the machinery etc. Now we did that because in the first instance we had been invited by the Honourable the Premier to do so, and secondly because we had been invited to do so by a responsible official of the company. It was the next day I received a letter, addressed to Mr. Malcolm Hollett, 18 Maple Street, St. John's, dated June 15. "It has been brought to our attention that you recently visited our premises on Topsail Road. Please be advised that this is private property and that unauthorized persons are not permitted to enter the plant without express permission. We must therefore ask you to refrain from entering the premises at any time in the future otherwise an action of trespass will be instituted against you—Yours very truly, R. C. B. Mercer, Secretary, Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I must say I was greatly surprised. I was not at home when the letter arrived. It arrived by hand. I wondered what time the RCMP would be after me, but they have not turned up yet. Now there is the position. We have been asked on many occasions in this House by the Honourable the Premier to visit these plants. We did visit this plant

in all good faith. We were shown around by a responsible official of the company. We did not steal anything. We did not take away any of the machinery. And lo and behold! I get this letter next day threatening me if I put my head inside the door of the Newfoundland Hardwoods Plant an action for trespass would be taken against me. It was signed by the secretary who is also one of the directors.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where we stand if we accept the invitation of the Premier. He has extended an invitation no later than today that we visit these plants. I would like to know what is the explanation. Why were we ordered not to? I might say my honourable friend on my right received a similar letter, word for word, signed by the same individual. We are on the Opposition and we represent a certain number of people in the country, indeed represent all the people in this country as much as any member on the opposite side. Into that plant has gone millions of dollars of Government money. Yet Mr. Mercer had the audacity and indecency to direct a letter like this to the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition after we had been expressly invited by the Honourable the Premier himself, who is also a director, to visit not only this plant but all the plants in the country of this nature. I don't know where we are getting—"We must therefore ask you to refrain from entering the premises at any time in the future otherwise an action of trespass will be instituted against you." I want to find out from the Honourable the Premier if my honourable friend on my right, myself or any of us are likely to be sued for trespass on these premises. I take it some explanation has to be forthcoming, and

I was wondering if the Honourable the Premier could explain?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I surely hope the honourable gentleman does not think I extended the invitation with any hope or thought he would be sued for trespass if he accepted the invitation. I am a director of the company, but I knew nothing of the letter until the honourable gentleman read it. I was not consulted in the matter. It seems to me the kind of a letter called "a lawyer's letter" than a director's letter. It might have some faint connection with recent events in this Chamber, recent statements and the like. Perhaps the honourable gentleman is too big a man to take a letter like that too seriously. Perhaps he would be willing to agree that if I invited him to visit these plants, and if he accepts, anyone who stands in his way better watch his toes before they get trod on by the Premier of Newfoundland. When I invite anyone to visit any of these plants that public money has financed, in which Newfoundland has a direct stake, I think the invitation stands.

Now on the other hand I don't think I have a right to invite anyone to enter any private property casually or unannounced or unexpectedly. I think that ordinary courtesy has to be shown in these matters if we are going to visit them. I personally presume to go to these plants, any of these plants, day or night, whenever I feel like it. I do frequently. I often go at 1:00 in the morning to a plant to see how it is.

MR. HOLLETT: Did you ever get a letter like that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No I never did. I hope I never do. On the other hand maybe I presume to take liber-

ties that other members don't presume to take. Maybe if I accompanied you this afternoon or after dinner tonight that might be better. Because these plants frequently just leave orders to the personnel that no strangers are to be admitted. Then we have the embarrassing position of a member of the people's House, a member of the Legislature, being debarred by somebody at the gate or the door of some plant in which Newfoundland has invested a considerable sum of money.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand I am not to go there and my honourable friend on my right is not to go to this plant again under penalty of punishment. This private property with three million, six hundred thousand dollars of Government money, and we go there on the express invitation of the Honourable the Premier, and then we get that. Sir, I would add to what I have already said if any people who are on the directorate have no more courtesy than indicated in that letter I would suggest the Honourable the Premier do his utmost, as soon as possible, to get rid of any entanglements he or the Government may be in in regard to that individual. I hope I have made myself perfectly plain on that.

I wonder if we could have now the exact amount which has gone into that plant by way of Government funds.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three and a half million.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the total amount? This \$550,000 now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Included in that.

MR. HOLLETT: For running expenses.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Premier if this is a private company why he could not hold them responsible under their agreement—In accordance with their agreement they are supposed to pay full normal depreciation to the Government on this plant, and were to keep the Government free from operating losses?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well we faced reality. The money was being lost in actual operations and we did not insist on their paying. We knew they could not pay it, not these amounts. It was either we paid it or the company would be sued for debt because most of these were debts due for wages, for supplies, for commercial wood payments, logs etc. We paid it to keep the plant running. We are in strong hope that we won't have to continue doing that.

MR. BROWNE: I am very glad to hear that. It is very good to know and to hear the admission come from the lips of the Premier this afternoon. I know it must be hard for him to make that admission. It is good to see he is prepared to face the situation now in regard to the position of the Newfoundland Hardwoods. Was there any money invested by the Dawe family at all, any real money put into this?

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$25,000.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I have not any doubt.

MR. BROWNE: I have, I won't say why. I have considerable doubt about their putting real money into it. Does the Premier know whether Mr. Dawe received any salary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, never a cent. In fact I may say that so far from receiving a salary Mr. Dawe himself claims that he is out scores of thousands of dollars by his connection with it.

MR. BROWNE: I know what he claims, but I don't credit that. Mr. Dawe built the plant at the expense of the Government. I suppose it is not very much good re-hashing what went on in connection with that. But, as I have said before, in my opinion it was a very loose agreement which was made between Mr. Chester Dawe and the Government. I hope the experience which the Government has gained will keep them from ventures of this kind again. I hope that the experience which the country has had and the loss it is likely to suffer will prevent an agreement of this kind again.

Now, Sir, in view of the fact that this plant is in the market and that negotiations are taking place at the present time for its sale I think I will have to forgo the remarks which I had intended to make.

Carried.

Northeastern Fisheries Industries Limited, \$50,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, we made a loan to the company owned by Mr. Si Moores, that is the plant at Harbour Grace and the one at Fermeuse. We made a loan of \$350,000 to enable him, or them, to purchase two draggers, two new draggers, to serve their plants. It turned out that \$350,000 was not enough and they needed an additional \$50,000. It was July 11, 1951 that we arranged this loan of \$350,000 through the Bank of Nova Scotia, bearing interest at the rate of 4% and guaranteed by the

Government for the building of three draggers. It was found this amount would not meet the cost and so we increased it. The repayment is to take place over a period of fifteen years in equal annual instalments of which the first instalment is payable on 23 July 1954. That is the explanation of that \$50,000.

MR. BROWNE: \$400,000 is the total.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But it is only \$50,000 now. The \$350,000 was taken care of before.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: On the bank guarantee do you pay interest?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They pay the bank. They have not used all their guarantee and are not likely to, although we are guaranteeing it. They will pay interest only on the portion they have used.

C. F. MacLellan: \$45,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, Mr. MacLellan is the head of the bus company. He is the gentleman who bought the ferry that is to be put in use between Portugal Cove and Bell Island, and the Government lent him some of the money with which to buy it. The story is this: It all happened at a time when Bell Island was left without any ferry service at all, a very serious situation, as at that time they were two or three weeks without any ferry service, and were completely marooned. One boat was laid up getting its engine repaired and something happened to the second boat. At all events the people of Bell Island hurriedly formed a citizens committee led by the honourable gentleman who represents the district, particularly the Bell Island part,



led by him and by the mayor of Bell Island. They came to see me and we talked over the matter. I did discuss it with two companies operating ferries over there and nothing satisfactory came out of it. I called on Mr. MacLellan. He is a go-getter, a progressive type of man and not nearly all of his energies are absorbed in the bus company. His surplus energies could be used, I thought, to Newfoundland's benefit. I called on him and asked him why he did not take hold of this ferry situation. He did look around for a ferry, he said. I told him if he found a ferry then come and see us. He found a ferry and took Captain Jack Whelan up to see it and he took others to see it and he finally came back and told us he had the ferry all right, but did not have quite enough money to buy it, so we lent him this \$45,000.

MR. HIGGINS: It was \$30,000 this time last year. Just before the House closed he was allowed \$30,000. Somewhere in the interim it became \$45,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has hypothecated his controlling stake in Capital Coach Company as security for this loan. We have got security. He controls the company. I believe he has the major shares. He has hypothecated those to us for this advance, and also the ferry is there, so that we are pretty well protected.

MR. HOLLETT: I have a reply to a question saying that the amount guaranteed Mr. MacLellan was \$75,000. He borrowed \$75,000 and the amount owed, as of February 28th this year was \$75,000. That information was given me by the Department of Finance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He has paid \$30,000 back.

My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works whose interest in Bell Island is so well known to this House, as he spent so many years of his life over there, has been pursuing actively the job of arranging to have a ferry wharf built, or two ferry wharves, one on each side. He has succeeded brilliantly in getting one done and he is now busily engaged trying to get arrangements made to get another one built on the Bell Island end. A certain type of dock is required where the ferry fits right into the landing which will enable traffic to drive through. He will succeed, I believe, and with a little help from the Government, Mr. MacLellan will get that ferry service to Bell Island. That ferry is already here and there is to be a second one, a second boat.

MR. BROWNE: In the meantime I wonder if the Minister of Public Works will tell me whether there is a wharf built at the present time for the ferry?

HON. E. S. SPENCER (Minister of Public Works): Not at Bell Island. At Portugal Cove it is completed.

MR. BROWNE: I did not notice it there on Sunday.

MR. SPENCER: It is attached in a sense to the old pier, that section to the side. There is one stub of it out there that has to be extended a bit further out around the nose.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Minister what is going to happen? He says there is to be another ferry go on. Does that mean the two companies now operating are to go out of business?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't see that unless they choose to go out.

MR. HIGGINS: Are we in the

position now that the Government is subsidizing Mr. MacLellan, (who is a fine man, and I say that advisedly, as I know him) at the expense of two local companies to put them out of business there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Frankly I do not know. I do know this; both directly and indirectly I appealed strongly to the other two companies to put something decent and modern on that run, and they did not and would not. Then I asked Mr. MacLellan, but only after the others had refused. I feel the interest of the people of Bell Island and the Mainland who travel back and forth is paramount to those companies who would not keep up with the times.

MR. BROWNE: How big is the boat?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't remember the details. It is a fine big boat. She is across the harbour over at the Government wharf. It is worth going over on board her.

MR. FOGWILL: Is she ready to go into service?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the run is ready for her she will be ready for the run.

Carried.

Northeastern Co-operative Fisheries Society Limited, \$22,733:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a bit of a sad story, a little story I am a little ashamed to have to tell. That is a co-operative society in Change Island that got into difficulties. It is a long story and some of it can't be told here and some of it does not concern us at all but is an internal matter down there. My honourable friend, the member for

Fogo, knows the story pretty completely, and my honourable friend the Minister knows it completely, far more than I do. The Loan and Guarantee Act of 1951 authorized a guaranteed bank loan for this society of \$35,000. The purpose of that loan was to enable them to acquire certain premises at Change Islands for the erection and installation there of buildings, machinery, and equipment for the purpose of drying codfish, in other words, a fish dryer. In fact they did put in a fish dryer somewhat similar to the one put in at Lourdes and the one put in at Fortune, three of them in Newfoundland of a design, I think, which was controlled by Quebec Maritime Fishermen's Co-operative Movement of Quebec, the Quebec United Fishermen. Well it did not work, that is about the size of it. Subsequently the society was unable to pay this amount which was guaranteed through the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the Government made it good. On July 10, 1953, two payments were made to the company of \$22,733 and \$4,914, the latter \$5000, roughly being an unconditional grant, a liquidation of the society's commitments on appointment of a liquidator. On the 30th of June the liquidator passed over to the Minister the following assets: General stores and supplies, mechanical stores and electrical supplies, building, machinery and tools, office equipment, wares, general equipment and tools, a total of \$50,000. The Minister then found himself the owner of fifty thousand dollars worth of a co-operative plant, wharf, equipment, machinery, dryer and all the rest of it. In addition to this amount there were certain other assets valued at approximately \$400 but not mortgaged to the Government were listed. The Government lent them this

amount to pay their debts, and now asks the House to confirm it.

MR. HOLLETT: There was an Order in Council for that? Altogether you have advanced to that concern, as far as I can make out—

MR. SMALLWOOD: \$57,000.

MR. HOLLETT: Then \$35,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No the \$57,000 includes that. Here it is—guaranteed bank loan, paid in full \$35,000.

MR. HOLLETT: That is paid off—I see.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, that \$35,000 was paid by the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am afraid so. I don't know. Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case I am right in the first instance.

MR. BROWNE: I have the loans here \$57,733, February 28, that is one. The other one is an amount of \$35,000 but is not mentioned as being owed. I take it it is included in the \$57,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We lent \$35,000 finally paid off and \$22,000, which brings it to \$57,000. They owe us now \$57,000.

MR. BROWNE: That was lent a long time ago?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Lourdes cost us about the same roughly.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask what is the situation at Change Islands as far as the co-operatives are concerned now.

MR. JANES: The original society was the Seaway Co-operative Society

which was a joint consumers-producing organization. In 1949-50 they decided to split their operations and the Seaway took over the consumer end to be purely a consumer society and Northeastern now became a producer.

MR. BROWNE: A gambling society.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They went into the fishery.

MR. JANES: While the Northeastern Co-operative Society Limited has gone into liquidation the consumer union is still standing and have a very good credit union there. But in regard to the Northeastern, in all fairness I think I should point out, apart from the small amount of money due the fishermen for fish that had been spoiled in the process of drying the only creditors of the society were people who had advanced them material from the society for the construction of the plant and for the installation of equipment. It is all tied up in equipment.

MR. BROWNE: They have not been paid?

MR. JANES: I think some, yes.

MR. BROWNE: By the Government, Mr. Chairman, the Premier stated or hinted that that dryer was responsible for this as it did not work well. Now are there any other dryers of that kind in use at the present time? The reason I ask that is that a couple of years ago I went to see the experimental station of the Federal Government in Halifax. There they explained to me the work they had been doing on dryers and showed me a pilot plant they had there in the station suitable for small fishermen. I have always been surprised that that knowledge has not been passed

on here and has not been taken up. Why did they go to Quebec to get the plant and not to Nova Scotia?

MR. KEOUGH: I think I can help out a bit there. In the days when most of the Change Islands people had their own schooners and went to Labrador and produced a heavy salted fish and used a heavy salt fish dryer, overnight the fisheries changed so that by the time the plant was completed there were very few going to Labrador bringing back heavy salted fish, so they were actually trying to get light salted fish from a heavy salt fish dryer.

MR. BROWNE: You mean that after 1950 the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa told the people who went to Labrador they went at their own risk, and then they stopped going. I believe that is a fact.

MR. KEOUGH: Whether they stopped on that account or not, they stopped.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, full stop.

Carried.

St. John's (Newfoundland) Stadium Company Limited—\$100,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: That one I suppose requires no explanation.

MR. FOGWILL: That was the money paid over to the stadium?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

Carried.

Superior Rubber Company Limited—\$150,000:

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is additional working capital. As a matter of fact they had very little working capital at all when they got the plant finished. The amount advanced

was a million dollars and by the time all of it was advanced and spent the company was reduced to the position of having very, very little working capital indeed. We have advanced them \$150,000 and believe we will have to give them another \$150,000, not completely for working capital, however, as part of it is to get another piece of equipment. They have decided to go into something not done in Newfoundland and not done in the Maritime Provinces, a completely modern recapping of tires, where tires can be completely retreaded. That is quite a profitable industry. They are going to do that. Got the equipment on order. I may say in connection with this company it is rather interesting to see the speed with which they are going ahead. Max Braun Wogan nearly died and was, I think, months on his back—he was three months in hospital. He was down there in the General Hospital and they could not diagnose his case. He had seven or eight or nine doctors, I think. They took him on a stretcher to Germany where a famous German doctor diagnosed and treated him and cured him. Four or five weeks ago he came back here. The following day the owner of the plant who could speak no English and could not do anything about him anyway, arrived. That was five, maybe six or seven weeks ago. It took them a week or ten days to get going. They began with a staff of some fifteen or twenty and are now up to nearly a hundred. They began making rubber boots. They began producing forty pairs a day and they are now up over two hundred pairs a day, seven hundred pairs a day is their capacity, and they are going swiftly towards a production of seven hundred pairs a day of rubber boots, men's, women's, and

childrens', including thigh boots, right up and ordinary knee boots as they call them.

This is another plant that I would like the honourable gentleman to go and visit. The honourable member for that district, who is not here, has tremendous interest in it, and has great faith in it, as I have myself. I want the Committee to know that in my opinion that \$150,000 is not going to be enough. There will have to be an additional \$150,000 before 1954 is over. I believe we will have to give them another amount of working capital.

MR. BROWNE: The Government has already put a million into this—I know the Premier said: "What is a million dollars?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: In connection with the fisheries.

MR. BROWNE: What did Mr. Braun Wogan and his associates put into it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The same.

MR. BROWNE: We don't know that. The reason I mention that is that I have been told that some of the machinery in there is over thirty years old.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some may be much older and some would not, some of it but not much of it.

MR. BROWNE: So that it is second-hand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A lot of it is second-hand.

MR. BROWNE: Well then surely machinery in a small plant like that does not cost a million dollars?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is a very big plant.

MR. BROWNE: Now I have also heard they don't follow the Canadian standard in regard to electric wiring.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They follow the German code.

MR. BROWNE: But is the German code permissible in this country?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know. But I would say it is a perfectly good code. I would say also that of all the plants that exist in Newfoundland, English, American, Canadian and native Newfoundland, if you want to see high-class installations go to some of these German plants.

MR. BROWNE: It is a different one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right it is perfectly good. I will admit it is not stylish looking, but at Atlantic Hardboards, that is artistic looking, that is classic looking. These Germans are not bad at electrical stuff.

MR. BROWNE: I know that. But bearing on what I said before about second-hand machinery that went into it. Who valued that plant? Have they really got a million dollars invested in this plant or is our investment very much higher in proportion to the German investment?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have it in there. May I say this about the old machinery. Virtually all of that machinery in that plant is second-hand, virtually all of it. In fact there are only two plants of all our industries, or three plants of all our new industries whose equipment was not all brand new. One of them was Atlantic Films, the second one is the Tannery at Carbonear. They removed a plant from Germany. They removed the plant and moved it bodily out of Germany to Carbonear. It

was a second-hand plant. The third one is the rubber plant. Now as to the rubber plant it is not entirely but mainly second-hand. But the honourable gentleman will see when they go to visit that plant that the equipment might be a hundred years old, as it is not, but it could be, and be just as good as it was when it was made. I will give an example: In the plywood building in Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited there is a steam engine that went into use. It was made in England 90 years ago. It is in there today at the Newfoundland Hardwoods turning over just as smoothly and efficiently as in its first year in operation. It was brought in second-hand for the Harvey Bread and Butterine Factory. It is the one that operates the lathes. The honourable gentleman must have seen it in the plywood building. It is delivering just as much and more and does not cost one cent to operate, not one cent, because it burns waste and it delivers the steam power not only for the lathes but it delivers the vapour to steam the logs. That is a machine that is 90 years old and 90 years hence will be just as good as it is today.

MR. BROWNE: Like Grandfather's Clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, there is no stopping it. When you see the large roller in the Superior Rubber Company bring the raw rubber that is put in huge machines that just kneads it as you would dough —

MR. BROWNE: Needing a lot of dough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They take the raw rubber and put it in one of these great machines and that machine seventy or eighty years from now will be kneading raw rubber. It does not

get old, and will be working just as efficiently as it did the day it was made.

MR. HOLLETT: What is the name of that machine?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is an old English machine.

MR. HOLLETT: Watt?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, since Watt.

MR. BROWNE: I am rather surprised, Mr. Chairman, because I had heard stories about a lot of machinery in some of these plants being second hand and rusty and have just laughed it off, thinking, that is not possible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why did not the honourable gentleman ask me? I would have told him.

MR. HOLLETT: We did not think it was necessary. I did not think there was any second-hand machinery there. I have seen the places and some of these machines, and I am surprised that they are second hand. I am more mystified than ever now about these new industries. I thought we were getting perfectly new, stream-lined machinery right up-to-date, the last word in machinery. Now I find out some of it is 90 years old. I wonder if the Premier would tell us if there is any second-hand machinery in CMIC?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, none. I told the honourable gentleman, in three plants.

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion carried.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have con-



sidered the matter to them referred, have made progress and asks leave to sit again, at a later hour this day.

On motion report received. Committee ordered sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock tonight.

Motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock I shall leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

THURSDAY, June 17, 1954

#### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions in Relation to Financial Assistance to be rendered to Certain Industrial Undertakings:

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given earlier for this Committee to sit again I do now leave the Chair.

Superior Rubber Company Limited:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, the Premier stated in answer to a question that a good deal of the machinery in this Superior Rubber Company is second-hand and that some of it is quite old. Now I wonder if the Premier could let us see a list of the machinery which was imported and placed against the million dollars given by the Government? I understand that company is one of those which had to put up fifty per cent of the capital against the Government's fifty per cent. If the machinery in that plant or a great deal of it is second-hand then it must have been bought at a considerably depreciated price.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was already owned by the owners of the present plant.

MR. BROWNE: Do you mean it belonged to Mr. Braun Wogan?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me put it this way—The owner of the plant at Holyrood is the owner of a very large plant on the Continent of Europe, and in connection with that large plant on the Continent of Europe he had a very large amount of equipment which he shipped to Holyrood.

MR. BROWNE: From Hamburg?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, that was the Tannery. In the case of the Tannery, this William Dorn was a Czechoslovakian and was able quite freely without hindrance or obstacle to remove himself and anything he had to this side of the Atlantic. Actually in fact what he did was to dismantle an operating factory and remove it to Carbonear.

MR. BROWNE: We are not talking about Mr. Dorn but the Superior Rubber Company owners. Would the Premier let us see a schedule of the machinery imported which must have been valued at a million dollars against the million dollars put up by the Government.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I would be glad to let the honourable gentleman see a list of the machinery. I have not got it with me, but I will certainly bring it.

MR. BROWNE: That is no good. Why is it not here tonight. I thought you had it here today.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Channing did not have any lists of machinery with him in any case, he had only the general factual background of these loans.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister of Economic Development tell us who the person was who valued the machinery as it was landed here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The customs people did that—The Federal Customs people.

MR. BROWNE: Could the Minister tell us what the value of the machinery was in the customs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The machinery and all else imported was about a million dollars.

MR. BROWNE: What is meant by "all else"?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Machinery, equipment, supplies, raw material.

MR. BROWNE: Did they bring raw material in?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, before they began production. That is all part of that million dollars put up by them.

MR. BROWNE: When was the million put up by the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: From time to time throughout the whole period.

MR. BROWNE: Did the Government actually invest it or give it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Lent it.

MR. BROWNE: The whole million?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable members would forgive the interruption—It does seem to be a rather strange way of conducting a debate in Committee, one honourable member standing up to speak and holding the floor while another honourable member sits down and an-

swers, so the conversations go on back and forth. Nobody addresses the Chair. Now I must call this to order:

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was about to draw your attention to that.

I am wondering if the Honourable the Premier, Mr. Chairman, would give us something of the history of this man Braun Wogan. Is it a fact that he came out here as a civil servant to the Government. How did he arrive and in what capacity?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think not on his first visit but on his second visit he came as a temporary assistant in the Department of Economic Development. It was at a time when we arranged it in Germany. I, at the time, invited some fifteen or eighteen quite important German industrialists to come to Newfoundland. I did that in Germany. I invited them to come here within the next few weeks or months thereafter. I got so many coming that it was more than Dr. Valdmanis who spoke fluent German, could cope with, and we needed a German speaking official who spoke good English and German as well and who was active and energetic for a few months in that department so that he could meet all the German industrialists that arrived and converse with them and act as liaison between them and the Government. Max Braun-Wogan accompanied me on my first visit and indeed accompanied me and such men as went with me on our various trips in Germany. I knew him intimately, quite well, in fact had become close personal friends with him. He knew our programme, our policy and knew the way we operated. He was, therefore, a valuable man for the two or three months we had him. It was during that period

that he went to Gander on the very notable occasion about which my honourable friend knows.

MR. HOLLETT: That being so, we are up-to-date on his history to that point: How comes it then that he suddenly becomes a director (as far as I know he may be an owner) of two of these industries, Superior Rubber Company, to whom we have loaned one million dollars and now an extra \$150,000, and to Hanning Electric to whom we have loaned some \$537,000? That is nearly two million dollars. How come that he suddenly transformed from a civil servant with the Department of Economic Development to an industrialist to control two large plants on which, in my opinion, the Government's fate really hangs today as to the success or otherwise of these various industries? That is what I would like to know. How could that individual suddenly become a great industrialist and a director on the Board and actually control the fate of these two industries? I wonder if the Minister could tell us why he was so chosen?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't think he controls the fate of any industries. He is a director of Superior Rubber. I don't know if he is a director of Hanning Electric. I only know he is a director of Superior Rubber, and he does not control the fate even of that industry. I think the owner controls the fate of that industry.

How did he happen to become a great industrialist?

I have some doubt of the accuracy of that description. I don't think he is a great industrialist. I think he is a very able, competent and very affable and friendly person who makes friends wherever he goes. He has a good many friends in Newfoundland.

How did the transformation come about?

Well, after he had worked here for several months he went back, as his period of service had ended. The summer of the following year he returned here and set up in business. He set up an agency business, I believe he had some local directors including Mr. C. A. Pippy for a while. He was an importer and exporter but principally an importer of goods for which he had agencies here and on the Mainland of Canada. While he was in that business several of the German industrialists, notably Hanning Electric and Atlantic Harbours Industries, Limited, and Superior Rubber, these three industries (it might be only these three, but it certainly included these three) needed a man here who knew English and German, who had entry to the Government, who had entry to me. So they appointed him, one after the other, as their representative, their resident representative in Newfoundland. In that way he became the local and indeed for a while the only resident representative of these companies. Now subsequently one of these companies invited him to become manager, Superior Rubber Company, because the owner spoke no English, and is only now beginning to learn English. The others, the owners of Atlantic Harbours Industries Limited and Hanning Electric Limited, both spoke excellent English, but the owner of Superior Rubber Company does not speak any English at all. I am reminded of the fact that he was once a fairly substantial industrialist in Europe himself when he was personally the owner of a cement mill, before the war, in Poland. At one time in Latvia he was managing director, I think, of a company which owned and operated a

cement mill, and a gypsum plaster board and plaster lathe mill, in which British Plasterboards were substantial shareholders. His father, I believe, was a banker in London, in a German bank there.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that was very interesting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He is quite an interesting fellow.

MR. HOLLETT: A story out of the pages of a storybook. He came out here as a civil servant with the Department of Economic Development, got to know people and went back to Germany. I won't go into details. There were a number of German industrialists who thought they would like to start in business in this country. Then the Government started to pay out loans to various industrialists. I take it, this Max Braun-Wogan who is a director of Superior Rubber Company, Limited, is also in all probability a director of Canadian Machinery Holding Trust?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. HOLLETT: He is not. I take the Honourable the Premier's word for that, but he does have great influence with them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: None.

MR. HOLLETT: None whatever? I have heard that as of November 13, 1952 the directors were Grube, Max Braun-Wogan and Dr. Thormahlen. I take it that is pretty good German.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just an amateur.

MR. HOLLETT: I have not visited Germany in a long time.

Max and Gertrude Braun-Wogan and Buckhardt, these are directors at

least, as of November 1952. The Premier has great hopes for this Superior Rubber Company, and there is no reason why we should endeavour to cast any new doubts on this company. I do hope they succeed. It is very difficult for us to see, Sir. We remember the way in which these new industries were introduced to this country and to us by the Honourable the Premier. We remember the high hopes that were held out in 1951-52. It is therefore a bit disappointing tonight to find that we have to vote for these several industries extra amounts ranging from \$150,000 to \$298,000 and \$387,400. It is a bit disappointing and really heart-breaking. I wonder if the Honourable the Premier could tell us how many people are employed in Superior Rubber Company at the present time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: They began about six weeks ago, I think, with some eight or ten people and were making forty pairs of rubber boots a day. They are now up to over two hundred pairs of rubber boots a day and they are up around eighty people. Their capacity is seven hundred pairs of rubber boots a day, towards which they are working quite rapidly. Mr. Grube told me in Holyrood on Saturday last, when the Attorney General was with me, that a year from now the plant would employ four hundred people. They would then be up to capacity in rubber boots, seven hundred pairs a day of different sizes and grades and qualities, of course.

MR. HOLLETT: Do you mean long rubbers?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Knee boots and thigh boots for men, women and children, and also foam rubber products, and they would be in tire re-capping long before that.

MR. BROWNE: Can the Premier tell us if the land was purchased by the Government?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe it was.

MR. BROWNE: I heard it was not purchased and that the owner was looking for a very high price for it. Do you know if the sale has gone through?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The land was bought by the Government in several parcels of course. One was owned by the Honourable John S. Currie, and on it was a nice bungalow since used for a while, I believe, for offices, and now by the chief chemist of the company. Then there was the site underneath the hill on the level. That was purchased from somebody else there. There was some, I believe, belonging to the family of Furey. There are several parcels of land there, all bought and paid for. I believe there is some question about one parcel, but not the one upon which the plant stands.

MR. BROWNE: I also heard the Minister of Public Works in this case did not observe the rule about putting the fence back 33 feet from the centre of the road. I don't know if that complies with the law or not, but their fence is out there very prominently.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I have not as yet asked my honourable colleague, or I don't think I have, but they have asked me to ask him (they asked me as Minister of Economic Development) if he would fill in the far-off corner of the road and widen the road at the far-off side below the bank, so that they would perhaps be further back from the centre of the road. In other words they had to dip out the

bank a long distance in, and every four or five feet into that big bank as high as this room cost money. So as a matter of fact I was the one who took the responsibility, and I said, all right go ahead, don't go in any further as that must be costing a lot of money to dig out. We will fill in the road across from you, and widen the road at that point, which will bring the corner of the building further back relatively from the centre of the road. Where the fence is I do not know.

Superior Rubber Company Limited  
—Carried.

Terra Nova Textiles Limited—Carried.

United Cotton Mills Limited—Carried.

Union Electric Light and Power Company:

MR. BROWNE: What is the capacity of the plant now controlled by Union Electric Light and Power Company and what is the demand that they expect to be able to supply and the number of customers, the distance and so forth? That seems to me to be information we should have on a proposition like this, after all it is a million dollars.

MR. CURTIS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, in the next session we will have to bring in a Bill giving this company a franchise on a connection for Port Union area. We will be given a mortgage on what they are building now plus what they have so we will have an additional mortgage covering a guarantee on their existing outfit.

Frankly the position is a very fortunate one in that neighbourhood. We have to either develop electricity or lend them the money to develop it. So we are killing two birds with

one shot, getting electricity and instead of financing it one hundred per cent we are financing it about 65% to 70%.

MR. BROWNE: Who is going to build the plant for them?

MR. CURTIS: The Power Corporation of Canada.

MR. HOLLETT: Now that we have come to the end of these loans or guarantees, cash or otherwise, I wonder if I may ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the total amount now of cash and guaranteed loans outstanding, including these we are passing tonight? Would the Minister be able to tell me that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I promise to have it here tonight before we rise. I will table the complete information. I have asked the honourable gentleman to go off and get it for me. I could give the honourable gentleman that—as a matter of fact, find it in the Public Accounts.

MR. BROWNE: Fifteen months out of date.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is easy to see what has been added since.

MR. HOLLETT: There are others besides there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I promise to have that information here tonight. It must be around twenty-five million or thirty million dollars contingent liability.

MR. HOLLETT: The point I want to make is that we ought to know just how far we can go with guaranteeing loans for payment of interest. We will have to borrow the money and pay interest on that loan and service it, and it is going to cost a con-

siderable amount of money, two or three million dollars a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, if we have to pay it.

MR. HOLLETT: Most of it is cash loans.

Item carried.

Newfoundland Asbestos Limited—\$90,000:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, that is a guarantee asked for in connection with the Newfoundland Asbestos Limited plant at Lewis Brook, Port-au-Port Peninsula. The position is this: The Government some years ago, upon the recommendation of an engineer, Mr. Rukeyser, who is supposed to be an outstanding engineer in Canada for asbestos, decided to put \$250,000 into the development of an asbestos mine or potential mine at Lewis Brook. Last year we had to ask for further amounts of \$40,000 and this year we have to ask for \$90,000. It was understood originally that \$280,000 would be sufficient, but due to the fact that the road is not finished and due to the fact that Mr. Rukeyser had an injury to his leg which made it difficult for him to get back and forth over the bad road I am afraid he let us down a bit. In any event the figure that was fixed for the cost of the construction of the mill was underestimated. I am not sure the present vote of \$90,000 will complete the proposition, but it will go a long way towards it. I may say the company concerned is very co-operative with the Government and is prepared to do anything in reason. The company realizes that it is in default and that we can wipe them out tomorrow, but they are prepared to make any arrangement at all. The idea of this vote is to enable us to negotiate furth-



er with a view to getting this mine producing. It is thought beyond question it will be in production this fall, but, as I say, they want the money before they can do anything further. I might say this was examined by a sub-committee in Cabinet consisting of my honourable colleague the Premier, the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Minister of Public Works and myself. The company, as I say, is willing to co-operate in every way, is willing to operate on our terms or even if necessary get out of the picture and make room for someone else.

MR. FOGWILL: This company had a cash loan of \$250,000 plus a guarantee of \$75,000 last year.

MR. CURTIS: \$40,000 last year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is included in this amount.

MR. FOGWILL: Then there is another amount, I understand, in respect of shares purchased by the Government in the company—\$75,000.

MR. CURTIS: That was in the \$250,000, I understand.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, how much money have they invested themselves in this proposition?

MR. CURTIS: They carried out the development purely at the request of the Government. The Government is perfectly satisfied there is enough asbestos there and they acquired the property. We agreed to find the working capital to build the mill and operate it, on our own terms. First we had preferred shares which not only gave 6% but carried with it a ten per cent of all income, in addition to 5% mining tax. The Committee just referred to will shortly be negotiating a new arrangement. I can

assure the House that we will do everything we can to get as much as we can for the Government. If we put up a state balance, I think, another \$100,000 or \$90,000, Mr Seibert, one of the large shareholders is willing to have his own company in St. Lawrence enter into an agreement whereby if that is not sufficient they will undertake to put it through themselves. They offered to withdraw from St. Lawrence a manager there and put him in charge of operations, and offer him as an inducement some of his own shares to get the proposition underway.

MR. FOGWILL: That has been up there quite a long time. We have reports from time to time that are very encouraging. What I would like to know is the mill in operation on the site?

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

MR. FOGWILL: Would the Attorney General tell us something about it. How much has been proven?

MR. CURTIS: Over a million dollars worth of ore is proven up. The machinery is either on the site or at the end of the good road, waiting to get the road finished.

MR. FOGWILL: How long would the road be?

MR. CURTIS: Eight miles, but it is pretty bad.

MR. HOLLETT: Do I understand the Minister to say four or five directors are a committee?

MR. CURTIS: A committee of the Cabinet to make final negotiations.

MR. HOLLETT: What are the conditions required—Another \$100,000 in addition to this?

MR. CURTIS: I don't think this is going to see the job through. I don't think it can. I think the estimate we had originally either was too fine or else the cost turned out to be much higher than expected. Certainly the expenses of getting in there were much higher than anticipated because of the road?

MR. HOLLETT: Just how far are the Government prepared to go? That outfit is up there a long time, and they are not yet in production. I do hope the Committee set up will look after it. Mr. Chairman, I think possibly while the Attorney General has given the details regarding the finances of this property it might be helpful to the House if they knew that a proportion of the tunnelling had been done there to prove up a certain amount of ore, and following that that an asbestos mine could be brought into operation. Would the Minister tell us how many tons of ore has been proved up, approximately?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is over a million dollars in value, we have not got the figures.

MR. FOGWILL: You must know the tonnage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but one does not carry around that information.

MR. BROWNE: I think it is rather dangerous for the Government to go so deeply into those ventures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We get the money back handsomely, and what is more we start an industry.

MR. BROWNE: It is more of a gamble than the fishery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentleman had read the report he would think differently.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any report on the operations up to the present time, if so, I would be glad to have it—if the Minister has any report to show us now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would be glad if the honourable member would remind me to produce it. If the honourable gentleman does not remind me I may remember it. I have a good memory. Look at all I produced today.

MR. HOLLETT: After two and a half years they have only proven up a million dollars worth of ore. We have to ask ourselves whether it is a good venture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is over a million dollars proven and blue-printed but indications are for millions of dollars worth in addition to that in reserve.

MR. HOLLETT: There are lots of places in the world where asbestos is found. Whether it is out there or not is another matter.

MR. CURTIS: It is an excellent quality.

MR. HOLLETT: If that is the case why not prove up more than that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I agree that hope deferred maketh the heart grow sick.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had the floor—if I have not I will sit down.

MR. BROWNE: At the same time I would recommend that as soon as possible the Government get out of it.

Carried.

Preamble carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. Report received.

On motion said resolutions read a first time, ordered read a second time. Read a second time and concurred in.

On motion a Bill based on said resolutions introduced. On motion read a first time, read a second time.

MR. CURTIS: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, would the House prefer to go into Committee on that Bill right away.

MR. HOLLETT: As long as the sections are read.

On motion Bill now referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 carried.

Clause 4:

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I feel I must draw attention again to the fact—I am not rising to object at all—but I must draw attention to the fact we have year after year for the past five years been making cash loans and guaranteeing money in very high amounts, and this particular section, of course, makes it lawful to do so. I cannot let this opportunity pass without pointing to the fact that we are saddling posterity, our children and children's children with a debt that has to be paid, particularly on these guaranteed loans, and the cash loans also. We have to borrow money from the public in order to meet these loans and make payments of yearly interest and for servicing. It already involves ten million and we have to borrow twelve million which makes it \$22,000,000. Some of the money we borrow this year will go into that eight and a half million dollars here,

but we have jumped from three million dollars up to twenty-five millions in these five short years. We must not forget we are a small Province and that one time our people came near starving in the country because we had a debt and had to find five million dollars a year interest when at the time we only collected a revenue of about seventeen millions, and had to borrow five millions in order to pay our interest on our debt. Now we are a Province of Canada it is true, we are now in the arms of Canada, but that is not going to help us when it comes to paying interest on debts and servicing these bonds. We have to collect the money from our people to pay the interest on our debt, and if it went to twenty-five millions in five years what will it go to in the next four years should the people of this country see fit to re-elect the present administration, which I hardly think they will. Another four or five years of this borrowing and we shall be up to forty million dollars or perhaps more, a national debt on which our people will have to pay the interest, and they will also have to pay for public services which have to be improved if our people are to be satisfied to live in this country. One of the honourable members on the opposite side the other day stated that we have now almost reached the limit of taxation. If we continue borrowing, I say, we have not even started to approach the amount our people will have to be taxed in order to service these bonds.

So I want to point out to the Government now that any further borrowing after this year on the part of this or any other administration should be given very careful consideration because it is destroying whatever chance this Province has of coming

in to a better economy. A check, at any rate, has to be placed on excessive borrowing for capital expenditure on certain industries. Fisheries, yes, we all believe the fisheries have to be improved, they have to be improved to the extent that our fishermen can live by the amount of returns for the number of quintals of fish. If we put the money in that we are getting it back from the fishermen who will be benefited thereby and the revenue will benefit. I hope that the revenue will benefit by the moneys going into all these new industries. We have heard it said today that the cement plant was to be sold or the birch plant, rather, is to be sold. We have put four and a half million dollars, I believe, into that, and we have to find money to service that and to keep it up. I say sell it, yes, sell it by all means. I don't see—of course I had better not refer very much to that—But I do think that that was one plant where they should have been so hopeful of success on account of the fact it was based upon a native product of our own. But anyway, get away from that. I merely want to raise a voice against careless spending, about wastefulness, and I think it is about time the Government got down to hard economic facts that our people can only be taxed relatively small amounts in excess of what they already are being taxed if they are to reach that full life we hear of.

HON. G. J. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a word to say on this business. I think I was one of the people, or probably the one person in the Cabinet who believed at the beginning there was something wrong with this idea of borrowing. I believed we should not do it, and that it was an indication we were in bad circum-

stances. Well, I have been convinced otherwise since, and I think anyone who looks at the matter intelligently will be also. For instance if we are going to spend, say we are going to build schools and hospitals and do all the things in public service and the additional public services which need to be done this year. Is it fair that the people who work and pay taxes in Newfoundland this year should have to pay for that? Should not a loan be raised and have that spread over ten or fifteen or twenty years and let the people who will enjoy those benefits during that period take their share of the burden?

MR. BROWNE: That is fair.

MR. POWER: And I think too that the fact that every Province of Canada goes into the bond markets every year and raises a bond issue. I don't know now if Alberta does every year but I know all the Provinces raise bond issues from time to time and the American Government raises bond issues. What is wrong with Newfoundland doing it? It is good financial practice and in the other Provinces of Canada and also good financial practice for the Federal Government. Then what can be so wrong with it as far as Newfoundland is concerned?

MR. HOLLETT: I have to point out on that, Mr. Chairman, the Eckhardt Mills, for instance, is not hospitals and schools and it is not a road. The same is true of United Cotton Mills and Superior Rubber. We have borrowed money to finance them. But that is the business of commerce and banks. They should be able to borrow money from banks. There is no reason why we should saddle our people with loans to finance these things. Yes, saddle the people with debt for the public services, hospitals and

schools. Nobody has said anything about that. I don't think we have the right to borrow and put the money in such ventures as Superior Rubber, Eckhardt Mills, Koch Shoes and all the rest. Mind you they may be a good thing, may be successful, and may give employment. That is not the point. It is not the duty of the Government to enter into business. I think we have had that made abundantly clear in the discussions which we have had on this particular Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think we are all out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me I have allowed too much latitude. I allowed the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to make a second reading speech and then had to allow the Honourable Minister of Finance to reply.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, if I might finish?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is perfectly all right if the Honourable the Premier wishes to express himself.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I just want to extend the line my honourable friend has followed. He will be prepared to support too the idea of borrowing money to build hospitals, schools, roads. But I would be very much more prepared to borrow for economic development because with economic development you raise your money with which to build roads, hospitals and schools etc.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid all this is out of order in Committee, very much out of order.

MR. BROWNE: What is the purpose of Committee if we cannot make some observations? Mr. Chairman, I do not want to say very much, but to deal with some of the details here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Should have done that on second reading.

MR. BROWNE: We are on Clause 4 dealing with guaranteed bonds and debentures. The Minister of Finance referred to building schools and hospitals and roads and that sort of thing. Certainly there is no doubt about that. Nobody disputes borrowing where it is necessary, but this is a function which the Government should not be doing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why?

MR. BROWNE: The Minister of Economic Development has got ideas.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Tell us, why not?

MR. BROWNE: Because the Government has not the facilities for carrying on business and observing and keeping track of those things for which they advance the capital and funds of the Government to do it. The Government is not intended to do that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are doing it all over the world. Has the honourable gentleman heard of the RFC? Does he not know that thousands of business firms in the United States are financed by the United States Government?

MR. BROWNE: So what? This is not the United States. This Government is a Government of three hundred and seventy-five thousand people, and the Premier should remember that he has not the revenue of the United States behind him in the reckless, or perhaps that is too strong a word, but in the offhand way in which he talks about lending money. I suggest to the Premier to go easy. See how these things get on. He is in deep now. And all the time he is giving these guarantees etc. he is giving these

charges against this country and limiting our own powers to borrow. So that when you go into the bond market you are faced with a picture of twenty-five million dollars you have guaranteed. There is no doubt about it, a guarantee is a liability. Now the Premier is so optimistic about these things, and there is never going to come a rainy day.

HON. J. R. CHALKER (Minister of Education): What is the amount in Prince Edward Island?

MR. BROWNE: I know in Nova Scotia I don't think they do this sort of thing. I don't know any Province except Saskatchewan, where they tried and failed.

MR. CHALKER: Ontario.

Carried.

MR. BROWNE: Under 6, there is a provision which gives the Government power to defer interest and the commencement of amortization of a loan. Now why is the Government taking power to do this sort of thing? Not only are they lending money but they are taking the power now to defer payment of interest. I don't see that this country can afford to go into business to such an extent as that.

MR. CURTIS: This is a section to justify what we have told the House has been done all along. That is a retroactive section to enable us to defer interest in the first two years and extend it over a longer period. It is not the intention to do that with regard to any of these loans we have here now.

MR. BROWNE: You have power.

MR. CURTIS: I know, but don't intend to exercise it. This is just a section to ratify what we have done.

MR. HOLLETT: I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but how far can the Government carry that idea? It seems to me bad enough to have to borrow money to loan to anybody particularly to people who come in from outside to set up business. We as a people have to borrow money to lend to these people and we also have to borrow money to pay the interest on a loan which we raised to give to these people.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't—Not at all.

MR. HOLLETT: We do, Sir, there is no question about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, all the questions in the world. It is just not so.

MR. HOLLETT: It is so. We borrowed the money to give them and we have to borrow another twelve million dollars now. You could get away from it by taking it out of current account.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is how we do it, exactly how we do it.

MR. HOLLETT: But have to pay interest, would you not? For interest on a twenty-five million dollar loan, this twelve million dollars involved there and previous loans, and you won't get rid of it at a cent less than 7% interest and servicing these loans. That is a rate of \$750,000 or thereabout on twenty-five million dollars—I think that is right. That you have to get somewhere. If you don't borrow if you take it out of the peoples' pockets to pay the interest on the loan, which you had to borrow in the first place to give these people. That to me is crazy financing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not true.

MR. HOLLETT: It is true.



MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is the twenty-five million dollars? Account for the twenty-five millions given to these people.

MR. HOLLETT: I did not say given but lent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Where is it? Account for it. Add it all up.

MR. HOLLETT: All right you are going to bring in figures—Let me now—I am not a moron, but according to the papers I am hardly able to open my mouth but somebody says I lie. I referred to another of these industries, the Hardwoods, Newfoundland Hardwoods, involved here, I referred to that and also to another which is not here and unfortunately I cannot now say anything about it. I was told I was telling lies. Now I see there is a retraction in the newspapers in Corner Brook saying I am not a champion of truth and honour. The House will be glad to know certainly that I am not a champion of truth and honour or of anything else merely because I said that the Corner Brook people sold cement to the Government, and I have the document here, the proof of it given to my by the Government—But that is another matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—I think that is out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is another matter. That is all I have to say, Sir.

Carried.

Schedule carried.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. "An Act to Provide for Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans."

On motion report received, Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill whose natural effect will be to increase the membership in the House of Assembly from twenty-six now to thirty-three.

My first recollection of the House of Assembly is of a House that had a membership of thirty-six members. I think that for all the first part of the present century, after the year 1900 and for perhaps a decade or more prior to 1900 the membership of the House was thirty-six. Sir Richard Squires increased the membership to forty around the year 1928 or 1929, somewhere around there, after he came in in the election of 1928.

MR. BROWNE: The Monroe Government made it forty.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Monroe Government between 1924 and 1928 increased the representation from thirty-six to forty members, and he made all constituencies, I think, one man constituencies. But Sir Richard Squires, after the election of 1928 and before the election of 1932, for reasons of financial urgency and for the purpose of economy reduced the number from forty to its present number of twenty-eight, or rather he reduced the number to twenty-seven. Then as one of the Terms of Confederation the number was increased by one from twenty-seven to twenty-eight. That was to include Labrador for the first time as a constituency entitled to return one member to the House of Assembly. So that today we have a House of twenty-eight members. The population of Newfoundland today is about 380,000 souls. When it was

about 200,000 the membership in this House numbered thirty-six yet today with 380,000 we have only twenty-eight. The present Bill would raise the number to thirty-three and would make all constituencies one man constituencies, each of them electing one member to this House.

Now the additions are, and I begin in the far-north—first in Labrador—We divide Labrador into two constituencies, Labrador North and Labrador South, each of them electing one man. On the west coast we divide Humbermouth District into two constituencies, each of them electing one member. We do that by splitting the present Humber District into two with a line running roughly north and south in the vicinity of the town of Corner Brook, and naming the two constituencies Humber West and Humber East. Again on the west coast we divide the District of St. Georges-Port au Port, which is presently one constituency electing one member to this House, into two separate constituencies, one of them being the Peninsula of Port au Port and part of the mainland of the Island of Newfoundland to the east of the isthmus and including Harmon Field and Stephenville. The rest of the District will be the District of St. Georges. Coming east we divide the District of Grand Falls into two. We run a line almost exactly north and south between Grand Falls and Windsor to the west and Botwood to the east. West of that line we include the Town of Grand Falls and the Town of Windsor and the Town of Bishop's Falls and the Town of Badger and the Town of Millertown and Buchans—But not Bishop's Falls, excuse me, that is the District of Grand Falls. Now east of that line are Bishop's Falls, Botwood, the settlements out the bay

and Notre Dame Junction, Northeast Arm, Lewisporte and Gander. That is the constituency of Gander. In connection with the District of Gander, one small settlement of Gander Airport, that is the Terminal and also Union East, that one section is in the District which I have the honour to represent in this House, that is Bonavista North. But in the new Bill we have put all of Gander in the District of Gander and removed it from the District of Bonavista North.

I may say here a purely personal thing—I am personally very sorry to have lost part of Gander in Bonavista North. I have sentimental attachments to Gander, and I regret seeing it, even the little bit of Gander presently in my district of Bonavista North leaving my district and going into the new district of Gander. No I admit that logically it is the right thing to do.

There are then no other changes until you get eastward to the District of Harbour Main-Bell Island. In that district we have separated Bell Island from the District of Harbour Main-Bell Island so that the mainland part of the district that is out here in Conception Bay becomes one district electing one member and Bell Island itself becomes one district electing one member. That is not an increase because it is presently a two-man district electing two members. It will now be two separate districts with each one of them electing a man, so that the same area will elect the same number of men now but in a different way.

Then a slight change is made in the District of Ferryland. The southern boundary of Ferryland District is pushed a little to the west to come around to Peter's River—The northern boundary is shifted a little in the area

of the Goulds—I will come back to the District of St. John's. Then the District of Placentia-St. Mary's has been made into two separate districts, one the District of St. Mary's and the other the District of Placentia East. No change is made in the District of Placentia West nor in the District of Burin. But in the District of Fortune-Hermitage and again in the District of Burgeo-LaPoile we have made a difference in the boundary. We have pushed the boundary further north to take in part of the area of the island which was not in any district. There was actually an area of Newfoundland which did not belong to the district at all. So we have extended the boundaries of these two southwest coast districts to include those unoccupied and unclaimed areas of Newfoundland.

Now coming to the District of St. John's. We have divided the districts—Presently St. John's is in two districts, St. John's East and St. John's West. Each of these districts elect two members, in fact all four of them are sitting opposite me at the present moment. St. John's West is one constituency and elects two members. St. John's East is one constituency and it elects two members. What we have done is to divide St. John's into four districts each of them electing one member, St. John's North, St. John's South—These are, speaking approximately, the externs of the city, the northern extern and the southern extern. Then there is the city itself, which is divided into two, east and west, each of them electing one member. Thus we get St. John's North, St. John's East, St. John's West and St. John's South.

I have here a map of the whole Province showing the new districts. I will table it especially for the benefit of members on the other side. At the

same time I will table copies of all the constituencies, or maps of all the constituencies for the benefit of my honourable friends opposite. They will see here Humber District as it stands today. What we have done is run a line north and south through Corner Brook West and Curling and all of both is in Humber West, Corner Brook Townsite and Corner Brook East and Humbermouth and everything east of that is in Humber East. In Grand Falls District which was all of this, we run a line north and south and this is Gander District and that Grand Falls District. St. Barbe is left the same and White Bay is the same. All these constituencies are the same except Bonavista North where this section is made here to take all of Gander into Gander District and take it out of Bonavista North.

Then again the House will see here in Harbour Main District, Harbour Main is one district by itself and will see Bell Island as a separate district. There has been a slight change made here on the northern end of Ferryland District but on the southern end no change. St. Mary's District consists of all St. Mary's Bay and Cape Shore northward up to but not including Point Verde. That is the District of St. Mary's. The northern boundary remains the same. Here in Fortune-Hermitage and Burgeo-LaPoile we simply brought the boundary a little north to take in unoccupied and unallocated territory which existed in the old maps.

This is a map of Humber District East, which I table. This is St. Barbe and White Bay; Bonavista North showing Gander or a section of Gander to be taken out of it. This is the District of St. George's showing Port au Port taken out; this is the District of Port au Port; this is the District of Lab-

rador North and Labrador South; this is the District of Burgeo-LaPoile; Fortune-Hermitage, Placentia West, Placentia East, the District of St. Mary's, District of Ferryland. Here is the District of St. John's North; the District of St. John's East; the District of St. John's West; the District of St. John's South. Here is the District of Gander. Here is the District of Bell Island with Harbour Main left off and the District of Harbour Main with Bell Island left off. Here is the District of Grand Falls.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that is the explanation. In Committee of the Whole on the Bill I have no doubt whatsoever that members of the House on all sides will want more detailed information. We will, of course, be glad to give all the information we have affecting this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would consider moving the adjournment. We certainly have seen nothing. I have seen the Act, but the voters' list, anything at all—I wonder if the Premier would adjourn the debate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, Mr. Speaker. There is no desire in the wide world that when it is introduced for second reading it has to be debated before the honourable gentlemen on the opposite side are ready to proceed—all that is appreciated and I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable the Premier would indicate what time he expects this to get through?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Whatever time it takes. There is no time limit on it—any amount of time.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair appreciates it would be impossible for the Opposition or the back benchers to discuss such a Bill without having seen the maps, neither has Mr. Speaker himself seen the maps.

MR. HOLLETT: May we have a ten minute recess, Mr. Speaker.

On motion the House adjourned for ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act":

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, one of the most important amendments in this particular Bill is—originally in the Civil Service Act, section 9 said no person not a British subject shall be appointed to an established post. Within recent years we have had occasion on several instances to engage professional people, particularly in the Department of Health, who have come to us and stayed with us some considerable time. So that there is an amendment proposed here whereby a person who is not a British subject yet may be appointed to an established post within the Department of Health or other departments as well. For instance in the Department of Public Works amongst others.

Again, Sir, we have had several instances where teachers after spending a number of years at their profession, contributing to a pension, have left the teaching profession to enter the civil service. Provision is made in the Civil Service Act where teachers' pensions—where it is possible to carry forward the pensionable years from

one to another. But we have instances where a teacher, spending as many as fifteen years in the teaching profession and four or five years subsequently as a civil servant, and then for some reason or other leaves the civil service and goes on to Federal employment, in one particular instance, at the request of the Government, has come back to the provincial service—A provision here in this Bill makes it possible for the years of service as a teacher provided his pensionable payments are still there and his years as a civil servant can be counted as pensionable years, but not the years, of course, in which he was a Federal employee.

Another section makes it possible for teachers and civil servants who had put in a considerable number of years of service and have left either the teaching ranks or the civil service in order to enter public service, that is to say, to contest seats for the House of Assembly, should political fortune deem it possible that they are not able to hold on to that public service, or for some reason or other they wish to re-enter the civil service, they may count as years of pensionable service the years which they had either as teachers or civil servants prior to their entering public life, but their years of service as public servants of the Crown shall not be counted as pensionable years.

There are a few changes in the sections dealing with gratuities, making a distinction between the gratuities to persons who have only put in ten years of service and those who have put in a much longer period. In addition to that there is another amendment to this particular Bill which has been circulated. The new amendment is not in the hands of the members of the House, but I shall endeavour to

have the copies circulated tomorrow morning.

MR. BROWNE: You mean there is an amendment to that already?

MR. HEFFERTON: No not an amendment but an additional section. We have had several instances where people in professional and technical capacities have been taken on on a contractual basis for a term. Under the Civil Service Act people cannot be contracted for a term, they can only be contracted during life. Consequently we have added to the Bill before the House now a further amendment, so that people in professional and technical capacities can be under statutory legislation engaged for a definite term of service and not during life.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, like so many other Bills this is just thrown at us. We have no time to study it, no time at all. This Bill embodies principles which are unique. I don't believe there is any province in Canada has provisions like the Minister has just tried to explain. This Government is being run for the benefit of the Liberal Party. That is why they have those provisions in it. Now there is a new provision that a foreigner can become a member of the civil service. Where in the world will you find a provision where a foreigner can become a member of the civil service? Dr. Sennewald could be appointed immediately to the civil service as soon as this Bill passes; Germans, Latvians, people of any nationality have the same privileges as any citizens, without having to go through the five years which the Department of Citizenship and Immigration requires.

Then—Then this delightful section, section 6. I am sure the Minister was ashamed when he read it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to Your Honour that is entirely unparliamentary, and the honourable gentleman ought to be required to retract it.

MR. SPEAKER: I have already called—Order—It is unparliamentary to say the Minister ought to be ashamed —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that statement—I think the Government ought to be ashamed, if that is not unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid it is.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will read it and people can understand themselves. I withdraw the statement—but let me read it.

"Where an established civil servant retired for the purpose of (a) contesting an election or a by-election for the return of members or a member to the Parliament of Canada or to the Legislature of the Province."

Now then, when he retires for that purpose and within two years after he contested the election, if he was not elected, or within two years after he ceased to be a member of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature of the Province, if he was elected, he applied in writing to the Minister to be reappointed, and before the expiration of three months next following such application is re-appointed an established civil servant, all services done before by him count for him.

In other words my opponent who ran in the Federal Election in August

last retired from the civil service with about ten years of time served which entitled him to a pension, if he should retire from the position he now has as a member of Parliament he can go back to his job just the same as if nothing had happened. And the Premier tomorrow, if he has an election this year, or if he has an election any year, can go around to the civil service and say—"Won't you go to the District of Port au Port or to the District of St. George's, Placentia West or St. John's North," all these new constituencies—"I want you to go, you need not worry if you are defeated, you can go back to your job." That is something new. That is a beauty I wonder who cooked up that one? I think that is either attributable to the fertile mind of the Premier or the Minister of Finance. I can't imagine who else would have thought that up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Thank you!

MR. BROWNE: You are welcome! I wonder if the members of the Civil Service Organization or of the Provincial Employees were consulted in regard to this provision. The Minister did not say anything about them when he was introducing the Bill.

MR. HEFFERTON: Why should it?

MR. BROWNE: Because when the Act was passed in 1947 I was president of the Civil Service Association, and we spent months considering with the Commission of Government every clause that was in it before it was introduced and passed. Now you throw it at us and say, here it is, put it through all its readings tonight and tomorrow and it becomes law without giving any consideration to the implications. That is not the only Bill that that has been done with, it is done



with twenty-five Bills on the Order Paper today which are expected to go through.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty difficult to stand up here on the spur of the moment and discuss a measure as far-reaching as the provisions of this Bill. I can't say from listening to the Minister's explanation what is involved in this. I think we should have time to study it and consult with the officers of the Civil Service Association. I don't think this should be rushed through like that. Certainly since I am on my feet I suppose I have to do something. I am going to move that this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time six months hence.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Speaking to that, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is out of order, a simple negative vote would get the same effect exactly. I would speak now to the main motion.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, surely the Premier should wait until you have given a ruling. Is it out of order to move a six months hoist for a Bill? I suggest it is perfectly in order, and it is the only thing to be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, it is in order.

MR. HOLLETT: In that case I rise to second the motion of my honourable and learned friend for a six months hoist for this Bill, Sir. The statement made by the mover of this motion, Sir, sums up the general complaints which anybody should have against a Bill such as this. It states "a person who is not a British subject shall not be appointed to an established post." But it provides that a person who is not a British subject may be appointed in a professional capacity to established posts. So they can syphon off all the foreigners in

this country to the Department of Health not only as civil servants but we can make the jobs pensionable for them. I don't suppose that is any hanging matter really. Still it seems to me rather strange that a person coming into this country who has spent most of his life in another, a foreign country, can become a civil servant in the Department of Health in an established post, and from there can go—As a matter of fact I presume can have an established post.

MR. CHALKER: They are doing that all the time.

MR. HOLLETT: Not as civil servants?

MR. CHALKER: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: Foreigners in established posts?

MR. CHALKER: No, not established posts. But we have many Irish doctors coming in here and they wish to become civil servants or they are not going to come. We have had great difficulty in getting sufficient doctors.

MR. HOLLETT: Irish doctors are civil servants, are they not?

MR. CHALKER: Not when from Southern Ireland.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not quite so terrible as it sounded.

MR. HOLLETT: Bad enough. As a matter of fact it is worse, I expect, than we can see at first sight. After all we have not had an opportunity of reading it. These doctors can come out of the Department of Health and go as teachers or go into any other job afterwards becoming established.

MR. CURTIS: The word professional is there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Medical doctors going to leave and become teachers?

MR. HOLLETT: They might under the Department of Medicine they are going to set up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is wrong with that?

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure this should not be rushed upon this House at this particular time of the night, when we of the Opposition, particularly ever since 11:00 o'clock this morning—and to bring in this Bill without anybody having an opportunity to study it and expect us to talk on second reading. I think the member on my right is perfectly in order to move to give it a six months hoist. We have enough legislation now, if the Premier is going to get to Labrador, north or south, wherever he is going.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Both.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope the Premier will take a copy of this Bill down there and talk about it down there. It is a good spot to talk about it. Certainly this is no spot to talk about it tonight. I don't know—We are all quite civilized here tonight after having seen certain documents brought in, which I can't refer to at the moment—I don't feel civilized after certain matters which I will talk about on another occasion. A six months hoist I suppose would mean they would just have to postpone it until after the election. Then there would be time to study it and it might be passed upon. I don't see any particular reason to rush this thing through nor that particular section where an established civil servant retires to contest an election. As my honourable friend pointed out all the Premier has to do

is select a good slate. He threatened here one time not long ago when he turned around to a member and said—"I could take the whole lot of you and get a new crowd to go out and win the country"—That is a doubtful matter. But if he is to be allowed to get the best men in the civil service to run in various districts, I strongly suggest it would be a good opportunity to bring back a good majority here. I don't think that is fair. Certainly he is going to take Liberals, and I expect good men in the civil service. If they happen to be defeated, or if they are elected and serve out a term, they can go back to their jobs, and get their pensions rights from the very date of their appointment twenty years ago or what not. I put it to you, Sir, that looks to me to be rather strange, that the Premier or any man who is the Leader of the Government should be able to go to the civil service and pick out the best men there to run. It might be for the betterment of the country, I grant you, but not as I see it. It is not clean politics because we of the Opposition or any opposition would not be able to go to the civil service and take out the good men.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Why not?

MR. HOLLETT: Because you would proceed to fire them immediately after the election if they were not elected.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nonsense.

MR. HOLLETT: I suppose they would be taken back with open arms by the present Government. There is no question about it you might get good persons. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources was a civil servant for a good many years. He did run for an election and was elected and is now a Minister of the

Crown. I don't know if under this Act he would, after he gets defeated next November, if he could go back to his job.

DR. ROWE: I have no intention.

MR. HOLLETT: I don't know which particular section he is going to take this time. I would advise him to go as far north as possible. Mr. Speaker, that has not been explored down there. There are probably lots of mines and minerals down there.

I do think there is no particular reason, and no reason has been given, why this particular piece of legislation is to be brought in here. I presume we would be told sometime. I am quite sure that my honourable friend here is quite justified in moving a six months hoist. Without talking unduly on this, Sir, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The original motion was that this Bill be now read a second time, to which an amendment has been moved and seconded that the word "now" be deleted and the words "six months hence" be substituted. Any honourable member who speaks now will speak to the amendment and will not be considered to be speaking to the main question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may be a little difficult to distinguish between the motion and the amendment to the motion. The reasons why the amendment ought to be defeated are, of course, the reasons why the motion ought to be carried. It is a little difficult to distinguish between them. I think that on sober reflection, careful, calm reflection, by the honourable gentlemen who are now disturbed by other matters will show that this is very wise legislation, very wise. A large part of it came directly from

the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom a member of the teaching profession may and often does enter public life and if he does his pension rights as a teacher are fully protected by law. So we propose to do the same thing. Similarly, I believe, in the United Kingdom if a member of the public service goes into public life any pension rights he had earned as a member of the civil service are protected and preserved, and we wish to do the same thing.

MR. BROWNE: Are you sure of that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am certain about teachers.

MR. HOLLETT: Nonsense.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman likes that word. We are not often wrong in a matter such as this. Now, we think this is a very wise piece of legislation, very wise. Take, for example, the honourable gentleman who is Minister of Mines and Resources. He was a school teacher for many years in Newfoundland, not a great many years, but for many years. Then he was a civil servant for some more years, and as a teacher and as a civil servant he undoubtedly qualified himself excellently to be a member of this House. There is no question of that. Other honourable gentlemen who are here—The Deputy-Speaker came out of a school straight into this Chamber as a member of the House. He is undoubtedly qualified, indeed qualified himself very well to be a member of this House by his training and work as a school teacher. As did the Honourable Minister of Public Welfare, who is absent, the Honourable Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives.

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to

rule the Honourable Leader of the Opposition out of order when he made reference to the Minister of Mines and Resources on the grounds that it could be considered a personal reference. I regret I did not do so. Now I have to allow the Premier to make references also to honourable members. I would ask it be borne in mind such comments as these are really personal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be personal. I wish only to illustrate the point. Take the honourable and learned member for St. John's West who for many years was in the public service of Newfoundland, and in a very distinguished position.

MR. BROWNE: Very low, very low.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will say a very distinguished position. I don't know if he was pensionable or not—Frankly I do not know. He resigned.

If the Honourable Minister of Finance were here I wonder would the honourable member say what he did about him while he was out of the House.

MR. POWER: What was that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: He said this legislation originated in the fertile brain of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. POWER: This one here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know if the honourable member was pensionable or not. This legislation, I should imagine, would preserve any pension rights he had. Now I ask this question? If there is a magistrate in Newfoundland anywhere or a judge or a teacher or a civil servant who has

the honourable ambition to become a member of this House, if he is elected, should he be discouraged or encouraged to do so? Should he be called upon to sacrifice twenty-five or thirty years of pension rights earned? Because if you are a civil servant and you voluntarily pay towards your own pension rights, and if you quit to become a public man from being a public servant, should you be required to make that sacrifice? We think not. That is what the legislation is about. On second thought: While it is true that some members on this side of the House will benefit from it, that is true, I would suggest that for many years to come men on both sides of the House will benefit. If any political party has difficulty in getting good types of men as candidates this legislation if it passes into law makes that task easier for all parties because the very Opposition itself will have it easier to find magistrates, civil servants, teachers to become candidates for their party, if the pension rights of these persons are protected by law, by statute. That is what this statute is.

Now on the other point, foreigners: I was a little startled, I admit candidly, when this legislation came before Cabinet, that we were going to start making foreigners established civil servants, I was startled. I admit I have had to send the deputy or assistant-deputy now and then across the water to recruit doctors, nurses and the like, not only nurses but doctors for public health services, not as institutional workers but as departmental workers. Just as often as not he would come back without success, without having recruited anyone. Now we want to make it easier for him to recruit, to be able to offer civil service status to doctors and nurses

and dentists. They won't all be Germans. They won't all be Latvians. Here we have another instance. We have brought in an outstanding man as a forester, a Mr. Finn Frost, a Swede, as chief forester for Newfoundland. As the law stands we cannot make him an established civil servant. We have to engage him by contract. My colleague, the Minister of Public Works has got to scour North America for roads engineers. He has got Germans, Latvians and Lithuanians, and I don't know what. And what we have to do is take each one by contract. Now these men when they get in their jobs they judge the thing that we did was to entice them away from where they worked. So as they have been enticed by us so others begin to entice them away from us. Now we cannot offer them established posts so they have succeeded in enticing them away. We can hold them and must hold them or our road building stops. The only way to do so is to establish them as civil servants in which case at the end of a proper period of time they become eligible for pensions. That is the way to hold them, doctors, dentists, nurses, road engineers, professional men who are very difficult to get and for whom there is tremendous competition in the effort to get them. I think that the honourable gentlemen on calm reflection will agree that this is good legislation.

But there is one other point—We will vote against this amendment. We did not bring it in to have it debated six months hence which means it will not be debated at all, as the House will not be in session six months hence. Therefore it is a way to kill the Bill, a well-known way, a good parliamentary scheme.

MR. HOLLETT: Bring in another after next fall.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We don't want to bring in another. We don't want to do it now. Possibly the honourable gentleman does not want us to do it because, we think we should have done it long ago. We will vote against the amendment.

On the other hand I don't know where the honourable gentleman got this thought of rushing. Who has been suggesting rushing through? He is the only one who spoke to it. The honourable member of the Opposition was the only one who spoke to the amendment. I don't remember his saying anything about this having to be rushed through. It merely went through normal procedure. When the order was called the Minister moved it. Now it is open for debate. If the honourable gentlemen opposite are not ready to debate it, we have never yet in five years refused an adjournment of a debate. If the honourable gentlemen are not ready to debate it, well and good, we will wait until they are ready. I don't mean to say if they are not ready for a year, but within a reasonable time.

MR. HOLLETT: Six months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we don't wait six months.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the infrequency of such occurrence as this matter I feel it my duty to point out now that both honourable members for St. John's East may speak to this amendment and still speak to the main question, provided the amendment is lost. If the amendment is carried, of course, there is no question left. Any other honourable member may speak to the amendment without forfeiting

the right to speak to the main question.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I will speak to the amendment. It has been pointed out by the Premier that at no time has any request by the Opposition been refused to adjourn any debate. Now that may be so. However, Sir, this legislation, as far as I am concerned, must be something the Government has had in mind for a long time. I don't see any reason why more time could not have been allowed to study this Bill, not only by the Opposition but the Government members too, the ordinary members on the Government side, just as well as many of our citizens who perhaps may be vitally concerned with this kind of legislation.

Speaking to the amendment, Sir, I know the amendment will be lost. I don't see any reason why we should be here now at 11:00 o'clock in the night in the month of June. We may be here the day of the races as far as I am concerned, I don't care. Mr. Speakers I am not going to say any more. I think it is wrong to hand a small opposition legislation of this sort in the middle of June at 11:00 o'clock in the night. I support this amendment. I think there should be men on the opposite side, if they have any common sense—

MR. SPEAKER: That remark is out of order.

MR. FOGWILL: I withdraw it then, Sir.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment. I know I am only wasting my time too. It seems to me that legislation that is known to certain of the executive for a long time, because they don't draft up an Act like that out of a clear

sky—I don't know whose fertile brain originated it. I am not going to decide that. Certain it is that the probabilities are that the back benchers on the other side of the House are just as ignorant of this Act as we unfortunately are on our side.

MR. COURAGE: No.

MR. HIGGINS: I very nearly, Mr. Speaker, fell into error and said, "Speak for yourself young men" (the poetic quotation).

But I don't see the great necessity for proceeding with this legislation. It is quite obvious that the amendment is going to be lost. I formally record my support of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill be now read a second time. The amendment will be put in the form "that the word 'now' do stand part of the question." Therefore honourable members who vote aye will be voting against the amendment and honourable members who vote nay will be voting for the amendment.

Motion put.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it.

MR. HOLLETT: Divide.

MR. BROWNE: Divide.

Division.

MR. SPEAKER: The "ayes" will stand and honourable members as called will resume their seats:

Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources, Hon. Minister of Provincial



Affairs, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Button, Mr. Janes, Mr. Norman, Mr. Courage, Mr. Mercer, Mr. Canning.

The "nays":

Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill, Mr. Higgins.

Motion carried seventeen to four.

MR. BROWNE: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker: Was that the main motion which has been put? If the amendment were put it should have been the other way and those in favour of the amendment should stand.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the honourable member will find the procedure to be correct. The main motion stands. It is now before the House that this Bill be now read a second time. Is the House ready for the question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour puts the question, if the honourable gentlemen opposite are not ready to go ahead, two have spoken and two have not, and there is another honourable member not present.

MR. SPEAKER: I though I made that quite clear. The honourable members for St. John's East may speak to the main motion as may the Honourable the Premier himself.

MR. HOLLETT: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I was informed after I spoke that I would not be allowed to speak again. I suggest I might in courtesy have been told that before—I should have known the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I am almost inclined to resent the use of the word "courtesy". It is not my duty to tell honourable members when they may speak to the motion. They are supposed to know the law. I think I

went beyond my scope even to point out that the two honourable members might speak and how you may vote. I assure honourable members if this House wants the full rigor of procedure carried out it can be done but it won't be nearly so comfortable a House.

Now the main motion is before the House—if no honourable gentleman wishes to speak I will put the question.

Motion carried. Bill now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister in charge of the Bill is to tell the Chair when he wants the Bill to go to Committee of the Whole House else the Chair presumes that the House is not going to refer it to a Committee of the Whole.

MR. CURTIS: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952":

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, this Act is merely an amendment to provide for the addition of a Government member who may be added to this Botwood Corporation. Honourable members will know in the original Bill there shall be a corporation consisting of seven members which shall be called the Botwood Water Corporation, and such members may be appointed as may be necessary to conform with the provisions of the Subsidized Institutions Act, chapter 46 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952. The Subsidized Institutions Act provides that two members may be members of the Government. This cor-

poration is operating at the present time with seven members appointed in their community and has been conducting the business of the Corporation up to the present time it is true. However, for the information of the House I might say, in connection with this Bill, that they were assisted by the members of the Government whom they requested. The Public Works Department assisted them in the organization. Now this provision is merely to provide and legalize the appointment of two Government members on the corporation. I move second reading.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when the Minister is replying he might give us some information as to who the people are, who will be designated to be members. I gathered from him that it was an official of the Department of Public Works who helped them organize, and there are two members of the Government, I think, he said.

MR. SPENCER: I meant of the Government service, the civil service who were assigned the duty of sitting in with this corporation to assist them, I presume, in carrying out their duties. The Government is trying to assist now and this is part of the policy of helping finance, and the Government has a stake in the proposition and we require that somebody will be there to watch the interests of the Government and see the thing is carried out properly.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the Government is trying to do too much in all this legislation, giving assistance, trying to run before we can walk. Local Government should be built up like everything else from down to up and not start at the top with big propositions. The people in Botwood, it seems to

me, should study out the proposition themselves and be in a position, with guidance of course, to be able to carry out the proposition such as this, as should other communities as well. I forget what the amount is that the Government is going to advance in connection with this.

MR. SPENCER: We are not advancing anything—We are guaranteeing a loan.

MR. BROWNE: Well, a Government guarantee of \$30,000. That reminds me of a chap who came to us and said, look here, I was just down to the bank to get a loan, but they could not give me a loan unless I got some friend of mine to put his name on the back. I just want you to put your name on the back, that is all. That is all the Government is doing. It is a good thing to encourage the communities to organize but I take it this is only just a water corporation just for the mere purpose of bringing the water to the community. I don't know what steps the Government took to encourage them to form a community council or a town council. They have not done it. Would it not be better to do that? We have the machinery there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman does not know Botwood, I can see that now.

MR. BROWNE: Well, as my honourable friend here knows it, but it seems to me a community like Botwood so close to the progressive community of Grand Falls—

MR. SMALLWOOD: I tried to get a town council in Grand Falls once.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Windsor has one.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The very first in Newfoundland outside the city.

MR. BROWNE: There does not seem to be any reason why Botwood should not do the same thing. But there is an educational job to be done there in encouraging these communities to form these councils. This seems to be the end result and not the proper way to go about it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to say very much on this. Whilst I agree with some of the things said by my learned friend, that we have to be careful about the backing of notes and guaranteeing bonds and that sort of thing, I said that before tonight—I agree with that part of it. I do also think that the matter of forming this water corporation in Botwood is something which I believe will redound to the welfare of the people there. The Premier said something about not knowing Botwood. I do know it. I have visited it many times, and I think we can do some little thing towards assisting the people there to get a clean supply of water. We will then at least have done something and put some money in the right direction. I am quite sure that my honourable friend on my right will not vote against the principle of that at all, but merely the principle of backing notes here, there and everywhere.

I do agree that this Bill is a good Bill, at least in my opinion it is a good Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act":

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I would not introduce this Bill at this hour but it is a purely formal one. Under the provisions of the Summary

Jurisdictions Act as provided in Section 115, chapter 117, volume 2—Whenever any building or property shall be injured or destroyed by fire, the magistrate or justice nearest to the place in which the fire occurred shall make an investigation to ascertain the cause or origin of the fire and such magistrate or justice may enforce the attendance of such persons, to give evidence before him as he may require, by summons or warrant and examine them under oath, and the proceedings and all depositions connected therewith shall be returned to the Attorney General for such further proceedings as may be prescribed by law.

The object of this amendment is to make it unnecessary for magistrates to hold such inquiries in the event there already should have been an inquiry made under the Fire Prevention Act. In other words it would be foolish to have two inquiries into the same fire. Therefore it is proposed to add at the end of the section the following:—Provided the magistrate, shall not be required to make an investigation into a fire, where the Attorney General has notified him that an inquiry into that fire has been or will be held under the Fire Prevention Act, 1954.

I think this is obviously necessary and obviously desirable and I think there can be no possible objection to it, and I move the second reading, Mr. Speaker.

On motion Bill read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow Friday at 1100 a.m. of the clock.

The House then adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 18, at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

FRIDAY, June 18, 1954.

### MORNING SESSION

The House met at eleven of the clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Notice of Motion

HON L. R. CURTIS (Attorney General) : Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will, before the House goes into Committee on several bills, ask leave to have the Third Reading of the Bills :

(1) An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act.

(2) An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish.

To have the third reading of these two bills rescinded and that these two bills be recommitted with a view to making minor amendments. This is in accordance with the Rules of the House as amended last session.

#### Answers to Questions

MR. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) : Mr. Speaker, before we leave answers to questions I wonder if the Honourable the Premier received the answers from the Finance Department?

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister) : The Finance Department is busily at it and asked me if it would

be all right to have them this afternoon. I told them it would. They will, they told me, have it ready this afternoon. It is quite a job they are doing.

### Orders of The Day

#### First Readings :

A Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission":

On motion read a first time—Ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses, (Revision to Crown) Act".

On motion read a first time, ordered read a second time at a later hour this day.

MR. W. J. BROWNE : I wonder when the Attorney General is likely to bring in a bill, An Act to order only a certain amount of Bills to be brought in in each session?

MR. CURTIS : I would have great pleasure in doing so.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas":

MR. SMALLWOOD : Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

MR. BROWNE : Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have a copy?

MR. SPEAKER : I am about to hold the motion as the Bill has not yet been distributed.

MR. CURTIS : Mr. Speaker perhaps the order might stand and we could go ahead with items 13 and 14.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act", 1953 :

HON S. J. HEFFERTON: (Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply) : Mr. Speaker, there are a few relatively minor amendments, yet one of them an important amendment to the Urban and Rural Planning Act passed in 1953. The first amendment calls for the substitution of the preposition "to" for the conjunction "or" in the original Act. It was a typographical error.

The second and more important amendment—In the original, section 6 (2) refers to section 11, but section 11 deals only with an interim development plan. An amendment is put in so that could be carried out not only by an interim Government but also in the final plan. In section 32 and 33 some reference is made to section 11 so that we can take action by interim Government for final plans for rural and urban planning.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion Bill read a second time and ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act"

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, we have a curious anomaly in this legislation dealing with town councils and incorporated areas. It is proposed to revoke an order incorporating a municipality by order of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, but apparently being legally appointed cannot be dismissed from office except on certain grounds such as imprudence or irregularity of some kind. This amendment to the Receivership Act empowers the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to appoint a receiver and wind up the affairs of a council.

I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would mind telling us if such an experience has already happened, and if there is occasion at the present time for the use of the legislation which he now proposes?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had occasion to look at this. I take it this is meant for the special purpose that municipalities may be disbanded by order in council when in default or in danger of defaulting. This would cover a multitude of sins, when they deem it in the best interest of the municipality and its creditors that the municipality be disbanded and its affairs wound up. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a peculiar piece of legislation. For instance we pass legislation empowering the electors in a certain area to elect their own town council. As we all know the establishment of town councils in this country has been the aim of the Commission of Government and also of this Government for a number of years. Our passing into Confederation demanded rather that impetus be given to that matter of establishing local Government in various populated areas. Now we find where the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has reason to believe it is desirable when the majority of the electors in a municipality desire that the said municipality be disbanded then the Lieutenant Governor in Council may by order disband the municipality and appoint a fit and proper person to act as receiver.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that that is just a Bill brought in to clean up the mess which came about by the

complaints which were made in the area of the Town of Bonavista and the subsequent statement that the Honourable the Premier made relative to what would be done in that area following the Federal Election, I believe it was. We all realize, of course, if the majority of people in any area are not in favour of a town council it is going to be very difficult to establish one there. But once having established it and once it has been established by law, passed by the Legislature I fail to see how we can consistently pass legislation which would upset or affect the establishment of such a town council without repealing it altogether, repealing the parent Act which gave the people the power to set up the town council.

We have been told that in that particular area a town council was established by fraud. We are told in this House that the setting up of a town council by fraud particularly when done under an Act of Parliament and under the supervision of the departmental officials is a mere act of fraud on somebody's part, either one of the electors or one of the officials. Does that nullify the setting up of the town council, I think the legal members of this House would be better qualified to decide on this question than I am. I just raise the point. I don't think, Sir, we are going to get anywhere with town councils in this country if as a matter of expediency this Government or any other Government is going to disband a town council because they have reason to believe the majority of the electors are not in favour of it. I bet there are many other areas where the majority are not in favour of town councils. In all these cases where the Government have reason to suspect that

they have a right—it does not say “shall” but “may” by order—they may do it—in this case it was very expedient. Now, I happened to be in the Bonavista area while the controversy was on, and I was told by people that it was a most peculiar manner in which the elections were held. I was told—how truthful or correct it is I do not know but it sounded very funny to me—I was told that it was the idea of the Government to set up a town council. It was the wish of a good many reputable citizens in the area to set up a town council. I was told that the method of electing it was somewhat in this manner: People who were appointed to take the ballot—mind you they did not come to a place and vote — they did not come to an established place where there was a returning officer and vote. But people were appointed to go around with tin cans with a little string and a hole in the lid, and give a ballot to a man or a woman, who came to the door and they voted wherever they were and brought out the ballot and put it in the can which the man carried. Here is where the fraud reputedly came in. The people appointed to go around with tin cans to accept the ballots went to those people in favour of town councils and got their ballot but neglected to go to the people they knew were opposed to it. Now that is the story given to me. Whether it is correct or not I have no reason to know. Probably the Minister would be able to tell us.

What I want to point out is that the returning officer and people appointed to go around were, I am informed, appointed properly, went around and they did their work. If they did not do it correctly I maintain that is no reason why the town council would have to be set aside simply



on the whim of some person in authority or some members of the Government just as a matter of political expediency. The people of Bonavista were promised, after the election is over we will fix it all up. This is the Act which will fix it up. I don't like the Act, Sir, I think it is the people themselves who have to decide whether they want the town council, and the people themselves, once they have established the fact they want local Government then have to grin and bear it like the people of the whole country of Newfoundland who have to grin and bear, this Government if you like, or any Government we get down through the ages for governing in a Province or a country. We got it—does some higher power than take it away from us? The British Government took away from us our Responsible Government away back in 1932-33 and the right to vote in years gone by, but that was another matter. But here is a place, Sir, where this Government has written into the law of this country, any area which so desires and so expresses its desire may set up a town council. They go ahead and do that. What I want to know it this: Is the mere fact that some officials neglected to do their duty perhaps in the taking of the votes, does that nullify the election and nullify the town council which was set up?

Now I don't know what is best for Bonavista. I have left that to the people themselves. I am thinking only of the country as a whole, and thinking only of the danger of this thing. You might have the same thing apply in Burin today, where I believe there is a town council. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may suddenly get the idea that the majority of the people in the Burin area don't want

a town council any longer. Then the Lieutenant-Governor in Council without any more ado may go ahead and disband it and wind up the whole thing and say; very well that is all there is to it. I don't believe, Sir, that is the right and proper way to do it. I don't know how it can be done. I quite see it is a problem. I quite see that if the majority of the people in any area don't want local Government then it is too bad. But I say once having accepted the rule of law as to local Government then the people in that area, not only Bonavista but every other area all over Newfoundland—must accept, hold on to and see that the local council goes all out to improve conditions in the community or area in which it has been set up.

I am certainly opposed to the principle of the Bill whereby the Government or the Lieutenant-Governor in Council merely on suspicion or merely on the fact that it has reason to believe that the desire of the majority of the electors in a municipality is against local Government, that municipality must be disbanded and order the whole thing wound up. I am opposed to it wholeheartedly. I say once we have accepted local Government and once we have established a local council then I believe it is the duty of this Government or any Government to back up that local council. Because there are means, Sir, in the parent Act whereby the Government can assist the local councils and back them up and help them improve conditions. As a matter of fact they do it every day. We did it yesterday when we made a loan to a town council. So this Government ought not to disband it but see to it that it does its job in the best interest of the community in which it is established.

That is my feeling about that, Sir, and I am opposed to that Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker—What is this? — The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order disband the municipality and appoint a fit and proper person to be and act as receiver—Where, when and why? Well, in the case that any municipality is insolvent or is in imminent danger of insolvency and that it is in the best interest of the municipality and its creditors that the municipality be disbanded and its affairs wound up; or that it is the desire of the majority of the electors in a municipality it be disbanded and its affairs wound up; and the municipality is not indebted to the Crown in right of Newfoundland and there is not outstanding any bond, debenture loan or other indebtedness of the municipality which has been guaranteed by the Crown.

In case any municipality is insolvent—is there anything wrong with that? Is there anything wrong with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council disbanding it and appointing a fit and proper person to act as receiver if the municipality is insolvent or is in imminent danger of insolvency? There is nothing wrong then with an Order in Council disbanding it. Would the Opposition strike out this Section 2 which is already in the Act?

MR. BROWNE: All right in that case there is no objection to that—

MR. HOLLETT: Yes there is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the Opposition object to that—If there is insolvency there should be no receiver appointed?

MR. HOLLETT: You gave them a loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We are talk-

ing about a council being insolvent or in imminent danger of insolvency, and the Opposition tells us not to appoint a receiver. We are talking about (a). Certainly, if the City Council went insolvent don't think we would not take it over. Did not the Government have to step in more than once and take over the City Council when they were insolvent or for some other reason?

MR. BROWNE: When?

MR. SMALLWOOD: On at least two occasions the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had to take over the City Council. Gosling was Chairman of the Commission on one occasion.

MR. HOLLETT: Did they disband it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course they did—on two occasions the council was disbanded.

So, as the Opposition said, they are against (a).

Now we will take (c)—The municipality is not indebted to the Crown in right of Newfoundland and there is not outstanding any bond, debenture, loan or other indebtedness of the municipality which has been guaranteed by the Crown—

Now if the people in any place with a town council wish to disband it we are not doing it, I say right now, we are not doing it if we have guaranteed a bond issue. That has to be made absolutely clear now.

Now we will take (b)—that it is the desire of the majority of the electors in a municipality that the municipality be disbanded and its affairs wound up.

If the majority of the electors want to disband, the Opposition say we

should say no. The people of Bonavista in a secret ballot vote to undo what they had done in connection with a town council, and vote to abolish it—we should say no. The Opposition says no, do they, but we don't. This Government said; if you had a secret ballot properly conducted and a clear majority are opposed to having a town council we will abolish the town council. We are going to do it. That is that. We are going to do it. We don't care who likes it. The people don't like it so we abolish it. They proved they don't like it in a secret ballot, so we are winding it up. That is democratic, very democratic.

MR. C. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one word. It is a well known fact that all who ever attempted to create a town council in Bonavista met with dismal failure. I remember when the local Government agent went down there to ascertain the wishes of the people on this town council movement, I remember he held at least two public meetings of the residents of the town, and it was later decided to hold a secret ballot. That, for some reason, could not be arranged at the time. I think a Committee decided it would be better to bring the ballot boxes to the peoples' houses so that every citizen of voting age in Bonavista would be given an opportunity to vote on the town council question. My honourable colleague, the member for Labrador, and I attended the first meeting they had down there. I assure you his lot was anything but pleasant. Apparently some of those who volunteered down there to take the ballot boxes around the town missed certain houses and the ballots were not deposited in those boxes. There were other reasons of course for that. The people themselves at the time were not at home

or refused or they did not mark their ballot paper for the clerk when he came around.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation and will get the Government out of a very uncomfortable situation.

MR. HOLLETT: Hear! Hear!

MR. BROWN: I think the sooner the council is legally dissolved the better. I assure you, Sir, nothing was done deliberately to defraud the people of Bonavista. That is something I would like to make clear, because every honest intention was expressed, and the methods carried out were the best that could be carried out at the time the council was organized. I think if the voting was not done in the proper and democratic manner that some democratic amendment should be made, and this is democratic legislation as I see it. There was no suspicion as far as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council was concerned or any grounds for suspicion, if everyone knew the situation just the same as I know it.

Mr. Speaker, I give this piece of legislation my whole-hearted support.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Speaker, may I make just one or two comments? Disbanding a municipality that is insolvent or in imminent danger of insolvency or in merely taking what is already in the parent Act, and the very wording is reason enough to believe it is taken from the parent Act. I don't believe for one moment it can be based upon any off-hand statement made by any individual. I merely mean the Lieutenant-Governor in Council would take steps to ascertain just what were the wishes of the people within the municipality. Now (b) provides for steps to be taken

once the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has reason to believe that the people have decided they do not want to continue. In the case of Bonavista there was a very large percentage of people who voted in a plebiscite on this particular subject, and some 80% of those who voted against incorporation. Now, as I said just now, under existing legislation we can revoke the order of incorporation and we leave there a council, if no longer desired by the people, in the position where it is unable to function or to function with any degree of success. Consequently there seems to be no other resource but to invoke some legislation whereby the council can be dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

On motion read a second time—  
Ordered referred to a committee of the whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for schools in Certain Areas."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this bill, I should like to explain at the very outset that this I do at the urgent request of the Humber Municipal Association. That Association has been pressing for more than a year for legislation that will enable town councils to impose a school tax if they wish to do so.

The Humber Municipal Association is a federation made up of town councils in the Humber Area as well as other organizations. They held at least one very largely attended public meeting in Corner Brook where resolutions were unanimously adopted advocating this legislation. They then appointed a very large deputation to come to St. John's to interview the

Government on the matter. They did so. They came to my office where I had the Minister of Education; the member for the district, the Honourable Minister for Labour; and perhaps one or two other ministers of the Crown. We discussed the matter. I pointed out to them then it was not as simple as it might appear to them to be. That there were great and even grave constitutional issues at stake as they are written into the terms of Union between Newfoundland and Canada. I told them that before I would even dream of acceding to their request, that is the request to introduce to this House this legislation of today, before I would dream of acceding to that request I had to be satisfied personally, in my own mind, absolutely satisfied beyond all doubt that the introduction of this kind of legislation would in no sense nor degree conflict with that great principle incorporated in the Terms of Union, and if the ecclesiastic authorities of Newfoundland approved, I made that very clear to the deputation. They assured me on that occasion that the public meeting in question had been attended by people of all classifications in and around Corner Brook including clergymen of various denominations who took prominent positions.

MR. BROWNE: All of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say of all the denominations, who took a prominent position on the platform they assured me of that. I told them that re-assured me, but that I would need to satisfy myself much more particularly on the matter than that mere fact was likely to do. So I did take all proper steps to ascertain from all, I repeat, all ecclesiastic and church authorities and denominations, the major denominations, what denom-

inations are recognized in law for school purposes, what their attitude would be. By direct approach and through various ministers of the Government I had these approaches made and for nearly a year there have been conversations back and forth, and I am able to say now, I am able to assure the House that this legislation does not meet with the disapproval of any major religious body in Newfoundland. The fact is, I am bold enough to say, it meets with the approval in general of all the major religious bodies, I will not say that every last dot and syllable of the bill inevitably meets the approval of the ecclesiastical authorities but I do say that nothing in this bill meets with their disapproval and the overwhelming bulk of it meets with their approval.

It is purely permissive. It says merely that if a town council wishes to impose a school tax it may do so under conditions described here. It says also, and I invite the attention of the House to it, Page 9, Section 12: "This Act shall be construed to the end that all moneys raised thereunder shall be allocated to School Boards in the manner prescribed, by Term 17 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, set forth in the Schedule to the British North America Act, 1949, for the allocation to schools of public funds of the province provided for education." That is to say that all public moneys appropriated on the basis of non-discrimination between the denominations. So it is provided in this bill. Funds raised under the Bill shall be appropriated on the same basis exactly as provided in Term 17 of the Terms of Union. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the principle that public monies shall be appropriated as between the major religious de-

nominations for school purposes. That principle is carried into this bill so as to provide that any money raised by means of a school tax shall likewise be distributed amongst the denominations on the basis of non-discrimination as between one denomination and another of those that are recognized in law in Newfoundland Law as being denominations for the purpose of schools and education generally.

The details are set forth here and can, of course, in Committee of the Whole be discussed at such length as the committee may desire, that honourable members may desire, and as they may need. The principle is that we in this House of Assembly shall permit municipal areas to impose school taxes if they so desire and if they do so they shall do it in accordance with conditions described in this bill. Secondly that this ties in with the principle that the money raised shall be expended on the basis of non-discrimination within the major denominations as provided in Term 17 of the Terms of Union.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this bill could lie over for the week end?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let us say, let it lie over, and not say when. We are not going to rush it, not going to railroad it. Yes, let it lie over. Honourable members may inform me privately when they are in a position to proceed with it and when they have satisfied themselves my statements are correct in connection with it.

MR. HOLLETT: We are not disputing your statement.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. — No.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases."

HON. M. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely the extension of a principle adopted —

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman would wait until we find the Bill.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, honourable members were told when the Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act was introduced, it was explained under Clause 6, when an established civil servant retired for the purpose of contesting an election he would be re-instated in the civil service. The Bill which I am talking to now asks to make provision for what is merely an extension of that principle adopted last night, it applies the same principle not alone to established civil servants but also to employees of the Board of Regents of the Memorial University, members of the constabulary and rangers of the old Newfoundland Ranger Forces and teachers. It carries the principle, Sir, along to its logical conclusion. Where under Section 6 of the Civil Service Act a person could apply for re-instatement and as such retain all previous rights and previous liabilities. Suppose a person dies or attains the age which could have retired him before being re-established or would suffer a mental or physical incapacity the pension rights already built up for him would not also die with him and these pension rights would be kept alive.

Under Sub-clause 2 of 3 such a person has a right to re-enter the civil

service two years after being defeated or retiring from Parliament when he could apply to the minister of the department from which he retired for re-instatement at the rate and salary at which he retired. It is merely, as I said, an extension of the principle adopted in the Civil Service Bill to keep alive the pensions earned by people who resigned to enter into political life.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, it is very hard to just listen to an explanation and see all the implications. I wonder if the minister would agree to let it stand for a while and give us a chance to read it?

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House might now go into committee on items 3 through 7 and items 8, 9, 13 and 14. Before making that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave and move that the third reading of two bills be rescinded.

(1) A Bill, An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish.

(2) A Bill, An Act Respecting the St. John's Municipal Council.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the proper procedure would be for some other minister to move the bills be recommitted or ask leave of the House that the bills be recommitted for the reasons cited.

MR. CURTIS: As a matter of fact I was not the minister who brought in either of these, so that I ask that third reading be rescinded and that the bills be recommitted.

On motion third reading of bills rescinded and ordered recommitted.



MR. BROWNE: I don't know whether such a motion is debatable, I suppose it is. It has never been considered before. I do wish to point out that rushing through legislation as we are at the present time is bound to cause errors to be made and omissions. On our part we cannot really cover all the work, and there is an enormous pile up of work at the present time and it is impossible for any legislature to give it the proper attention.

On motion Bills item No. 3 through 7 and 8, 9, 13 14 on the Order Paper of today and A Bill, An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish, and a Bill, An Act Respecting the St. John's Municipal Council referred to a Committee of the Whole House:

Mr. Speaker left the Chair. Mr. Courage, Chairman of Committee:

A Bill, An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish:

MR. CURTIS: We agreed between ourselves to take out the word "knowingly" and reduce the fine from \$100 to \$10. It think that has been accepted and I recommend it to the Committee.

MR. BROWNE: I am satisfied with that arrangement. That is what I had in mind from the beginning.

On motion Clause 12 was amended by striking out the word "knowingly" and striking out \$100 and substituting therefor \$10.

On motion Bill passed with some amendments.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act":

MR. CURTIS: When this Act came before the House, Mr. Chairman will remember I informed the Committee of the Whole House that I had been in

touch with the Mayor and there was, what I considered, an offensive clause therein in as much as it gave the council the right to collect a poll tax on people who not only lived outside the city limits and within a mile—but who worked outside the city limits and within a mile, I did not think that was fair to tax a man who both lived and worked outside the city limits. I agreed they might tax a man who lived outside, within a mile, and worked in the city or who lived inside the city and worked outside. But I did not think a man living and working outside this one mile limit should be taxed. They agreed. But in making the amendment here we just strike out the words "or within one mile thereof". But the effect of cutting out is that, if we let it stand like that, people who lived in St. John's and worked at Fort Pepperrell won't have to pay the poll tax. So that there has been a new draft made, and the new draft has been circulated around. I would ask that my honourable friends would just take this typewritten clause submitted by the solicitors of the city.

13 (1) The Council is empowered by resolution of the Council to levy and impose on and collect from every person (other than those expressly exempted from payment under this Section) of the age of twenty-one years or upwards who, at any time during the twelve month period preceding the 31st day of December in any year, resides in the City and is gainfully employed, or resides within one mile of the City and is gainfully employed in the City, an annual Poll Tax not exceeding twenty dollars (\$20) per annum payable on the 1st day of July of the year 1954 and in each year thereafter in respect of the annual period January 1st to December 31st in each year.

Mr. Chairman, I think that makes it abundantly clear. The effect is that if the tax payer resides in the city and is gainfully employed anywhere, or if he resides within one mile of the city and is gainfully employed in the city. I think that is very clear. I would move that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Is it now agreeable to the Municipal Council?

MR. CURTIS: Yes. The Council drafted this.

MR. FOGWILL: Before we go off the section—the taxation as it now exists is \$20. I was wondering if they are going to have a scale of rates and amounts for different people and what would that be based on?

MR. CURTIS: I understand the intention is to have it based on the income of people, in other words, if a person earns less than two hundred dollars a year there is no Poll Tax. The ladies will pay less or a lower rate than the men. The idea of the Council is to grade it down and have no tax imposed on those getting less than—

MR. FOGWILL: In other words it is going to be scaled on income? In other words an income tax.

MR. CURTIS: No—The only thing is they want to exclude domestic and charwomen and people who really cannot pay. I understand this is a tax the Council accepts full responsibility for levying. We don't have anything to do with levying it. I understand there are some groups, feel, should not be obliged to pay. It is not a tax on income but it is based on people of certain income brackets.

Carried.

On motion committee passed this Bill with some amendments.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act":

MR. BROWNE: We had gone as far as Section 5, which was allowed to stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That section was not passed but allowed to stand.

MR. CURTIS: I think we made an amendment, a scale of fees, payments for licenses on page 7.

Carried.

On motion committee passed this Bill with some amendments.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act", 1952:

MR. BROWNE: I presume that is the one we are dealing with where two officials of the Department of Public Works may be appointed.

MR. CURTIS: Yes that Act in the revised statutes calls for the Government to appoint one out of every three members of the corporation. In this case if there are several they want to retain, rather than ask them to resign they appoint the Government members in addition.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Representatives of the Department of Public Works for the last forty years have sat as directors on various water company boards, Placentia, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, for instance Mr. Manning, for the last twelve years was a director for the Government on some water company until the water company was recently absorbed by the town council, and I think the idea is to have a representative.

On motion bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act":

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act":

Clauses 1 carried, 2 read:

2. Section 9 of the Civil Service Act, chapter 22 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland 1952, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"9—(1) A person who is not a British subject shall not be appointed to an established post: Provided that persons who are not British subjects may be appointed in a professional capacity to established posts.

(2) This section shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, 1950."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I took exception to that clause last night. I believe the Government could get over the difficulty they have in connection with doctors that come here from Ireland, as a great many of the doctors who came out here in the past four years have been Irish doctors and belong to the Republic of Ireland are not British subjects. I don't know how many of them are anxious to take out British Citizenship, and I am not sure if any of them are. But under the Citizenship Act of Canada which I think was passed a year or so ago, the citizens of the Republic of Ireland have been granted Canadian Citizenship without having to go through any formality whatsoever. Therefore I would suggest, as a beginning, this section be read as follows: "A person who is not a British Subject or Canadian Citizen or

rather not a Canadian Citizen nor a British Subject shall not be appointed to established posts." I believe that would get over the difficulty of the Irish doctors. If that is the only difficulty. I take it there are other doctors concerned. I take it that persons of other nationalities are being considered at the present time as well. That was not explained to us last night. I wonder would the Minister elaborate on it.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I might say this particular section came from the Department of Health, dealing largely with doctors whom they have engaged in recent weeks and months, particularly Irish doctors, although among them are several others. We have had several persons during the last three or four years not only in the Department of Health but in other departments and this particular amendment should not necessarily be tied down to that particular department. For instance we mentioned last night here a Norwegian engaged by the Department of Mines and Resources—If he stays, why should he not become a civil servant?

MR. BROWNE: This won't assist a person not a British Subject—That is the same as the law now and only deals with the Department of Health. You are not considering anything else at the moment? It seems you want to amend it to read now, a person not a Canadian Citizen nor a British Subject. That is the way out, and the way it ought to read. Now we had that Canadian Citizenship described to us in the Election Act which was passed to us the other day. Why distinguish between Canadian Citizen and British Subject? A Canadian Citizen is a British Subject, but a British Subject may not be a Canadian Citizen. A person born in South Africa is a

British Subject but not a Canadian Citizen. So that if it is the wish to include all British Subjects I would suggest you certainly should exclude those persons not Canadian Citizens nor British Subjects. The Honourable Minister of Health is now here and perhaps he might explain. Other than Irish doctors is anybody else affected by this in your Department?

HON. P. FORSEY (Minister of Health) : Yes, all over the British Isles, and from Europe and Germany, no.

MR. BROWNE : The next section says a Civil Servant, if required, shall take the Oath of Allegiance to Her Majesty. While there is no objection to the civil servants taking the oath, certainly it is customary they should do it—I don't remember if I had to do it. I think it would be a bad precedent to go beyond the Act. What is the matter with having contracts with men. We have them for men in higher standing, the three men in the Fishery Authority are contractual and the President of the University and the same with people on the Agricultural and Forestry Commission.

MR. CURTIS : Actually Mr. Chairman, we are going to try and cover that by adding a clause to the present Bill because at the moment the situation with regard to the contractual civil servants is extremely unsatisfactory. I understand unless a contract is made and ratified by the Legislature it is not binding. The Government actually cannot contract for civil servants, and have had several supreme court cases to that effect. Of course we want local people if we can at all get them. We want Canadian Citizens if we can get them at all and English Citizens. But we cannot let the services fail just because our style

is cramped. Now I can quite see it would not be wise to have them in the Department of Justice and no sensible Government would consider for a moment bringing anybody into the Department of Justice who is not a Canadian Citizen, but in the case of health or building needs when they are professional help I really can't say that I can see any objection to our being permitted to engage foreigners, and that is really the object of this amendment. We have found that the position of bringing foreigners and having them under contract is not satisfactory, the first thing they want to do is move out and we can't hold them. So this is a clause to aid us in getting the type of men we think we ought to get for the public services. We maintain the Justice Department is a little sanctum sanctorum. I think my honourable and learned friend will agree on that.

MR. BROWNE : Mr. Chairman, I think the matter is fundamental—A person who becomes a civil servant becomes an established servant of the state and a servant of Her Majesty and should be a loyal citizen. A person who is a citizen of another state is not ordinarily eligible to become a civil servant or at least an established civil servant and occupy an established post in another state unless they come to this country from another British Country. It seems to me to be going very far. I don't know of any precedent. I know that in the United States you cannot become a member of the civil service and get an established post if you are not a citizen. I feel that is also the way it is in regard to the Federal civil service. I am wondering if there is not some constitutional objection.

MR. CURTIS : Our old friend we

have been talking about so much lately was in the civil service in Canada.

MR. BROWNE: Dr. Valdmanis? No, Dr. Valdmanis was employed in the Department of Immigration, I believe, largely as an interpreter, helping people of his nationality coming to Canada as displaced persons. He held a very minor position, I believe, and his salary was only \$100 a month. He was a part-time and not an established civil servant. I don't know of any person in fact, and I feel quite sure that is so.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know—By the way secrets are leaking out, I think they must be a lot more slack than we are.

MR. HOLLETT: That is the basic case of MacCarthyism, the fact they put all kinds of persons in the civil service right up to the State Department, and they are paying for it now. I hope we are not laying the foundation for MacCarthyism here. Although he is undoubtedly a fine man. He is a product of the times in the United States and is brought about by the very sort of thing we are doing now by putting into the various Departments of the Government people who are not British Subjects and who are not Canadian Citizens.

MR. CURTIS: Really it is not the situation here. All these people intend to become Canadian Citizens and it is only a matter of time. They must within a year file their intention of becoming naturalized. This is just a case of improving the civil service.

MR. BROWNE: I understand that it is a matter of expediency on the part of the Government. But from a constitutional angle has it been examined and compared with the civil service requirements of the Federal Gov-

ernment? It seems to me we should hardly make a departure from established practice. This Act was drafted, as I said last night, between the Civil Service Association and the Commission of Government. Mr. Wilde acted in its behalf and submitted drafts to us. We went over every clause and had consultations and went back and forth for several months before it was finalized. So I feel quite sure this is a copy of the provision in the British Act.

MR. HEFFERTON: Look at this thing again from a health angle for a moment, or take the Department of Public Works where they have to establish posts or resident engineers and they find themselves unable to get them for these established posts in Canada or Britain. But suppose they are able to find two from the United States or two from Europe and they come. Now what are they going to do? Either they appoint them to established posts that are there or create other posts to put them in which are exactly similar. That is what this is for. To allow a person not a British Subject to be appointed to an established post. I can't see any difference.

MR. HOLLETT: They are thereby pensionable.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mind you if they are contractual or unestablished and serve a number of years they are entitled to gratuities. So why should they not be established and entitled to pensions if they are there the required length of time?

MR. CURTIS: There is another point there—We have more control of them as established civil servants than on a contractual basis. If they are contractual we may be tied up to their contract whereas if they are es-

tablished they may be removed at any time. It might be an advantage from another point.

MR. BROWNE: The Attorney General mentioned a few minutes ago that we should insert some sort of a provision as to their becoming citizens or if they don't become citizens they should lose their positions. Why not consider the opposite angle and grant them established posts once they have become citizens. I feel a good many would want to become citizens. If we make it so they can get these posts without becoming citizens then there is no need for them to change their nationality. If there was a term here providing that they should become citizens—Persons other than British subjects appointed to established positions should become citizens within five years from the date of their entering into those posts—Then they shall be entitled to be considered as established civil servants from the date of their appointment. Would you consider that?

MR. CURTIS: In the meantime I would like the section to go through. I certainly think the point raised by my honourable friend is one the government would consider. We all want to do what is right.

MR. HEFFERTON: With the deletion of within five years.

MR. BROWNE: That would certainly make it wiser still.

MR. CURTIS: We just want to cover Public Works.

MR. BROWNE: I just want to record my objections to this. I know it is no use doing it. I made a suggestion I think is reasonable in a case like that. As the Attorney General knows, we have not had any time to

consider other such legislation in the other provinces nor in England, comparative legislation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that the words in the last line of sub-clause (1) "in the Department of Health" be deleted.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, any department it would mean then. That makes it wider. In other words a person not a Canadian Citizen can be appointed to the civil service in any department of the government even the Department of Justice now.

MR. CURTIS: In a professional capacity, yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder where we are tending now. I think there is plenty of time to look over it. There is no particular rush—You are not going to these countries looking for new industries any longer. Now you are going to have them flooding in looking for jobs in the civil service. I don't blame them. I would do the same thing myself. We have to consider our own people who are Canadian Citizens and Newfoundlanders. We have heard a lot about specialized skills and skilled workmen and skilled architects and skilled everything. Eventually we will have to get a MacCarthy here to clean out some of these departments. I am very much opposed to making it wider now other than in the Department of Health. I agree I don't care who is to be brought into this country to do something for the people in regard to health. But for any other department of the government I see no reason why we should extend the privileges to that degree. The Attorney General mentioned the fact that the Justice Department would not like to have such people in the department. Now his wish is being



overruled by this Act. We may even have a minister down there now who is not a Canadian Citizen under this Act, as far as I can see. I think some consideration should be given to this. We are not opposing it simply because we are in Opposition, I assume the honourable minister—but it is a serious thing, and I think it should be compared to similar legislation in other provinces and in Canada as a whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Opposition voted nay. Motion carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: What does that mean, Mr. Chairman? In other words a person brought in to the service over the age of fifty years in December 1947 may on appointment to an established post, be credited with not less than ten years of pensionable service—right off the bat. This reserves some explanation.

MR. HEFFERTON: In the first place sub-section (a) is self-explanatory and is the same as in the parent Act, and sub-section (b). Suppose a man had gone out some years and comes back to an established post and had served for fourteen years or more he could be credited at the most with ten years of pensionable service for that period served.

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the minister says this isn't the same as the Parent Act.

MR. HEFFERTON: It is exactly the same only it has been changed around a little in the wording—That is how it is interpreted by me.

MR. BROWNE: What about (b)?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is the

one I just explained—A person may, after some years out, come back into the service to an established post.

MR. BROWNE: There is a difference, is there not, in that clause (b)? The first one applies to provisions that have been in the Act since the Act was first introduced in the country in 1926 and has only been carried forward—That is if a medical man or a professional man has ten years' experience outside and is appointed to a position and he is over the age of forty he would get consideration for the time spent practising. But this is a new one, is it not? Being appointed to an established post after the age of fifty years may on appointment to an established post be credited with not less than ten years of pensionable service—Why is that being brought into this?

MR. HEFFERTON: It says any person who is engaged in an established position any time since 1947 and shall have put in not less than ten years of pensionable service before that time.

MR. BROWNE: It does not say that.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is what the lawyer explained to me.

MR. BROWNE: A lawyer may have explained to you, but I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I have a very high opinion of the minister's intelligence and I am sure he can read that section but cannot read that into the section. With deference therefore may I be permitted to read it?

"A Civil Service Certificate shall not be issued in respect of any person who shall after the eighteenth day of December, 1947, be appointed to an established post after having attained

the age of fifty years, but where any such person

(a) is appointed to an established post in a technical or professional capacity, a Civil Service Certificate may be issued to him; or

(b) may, on appointment to an established post, be credited with not less than ten years of pensionable service, a Civil Service Certificate may be issued to him, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

MR. HEFFERTON: That is where any person has put in not less than ten years service which he put in prior to 1947.

MR. BROWNE: It does not say that.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is how it goes. I argued the same point with the legal men in the Department of the Attorney General.

MR. BROWNE: There must be some authority to create it when he comes back. If a person is employed in the civil service and leaves then he is out. I know later on in this Bill there are provisions to put him back again. But there must be some directive contained in an Act which says when he comes back he shall take up the credit of what he had already earned years ago.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable and learned friend has something there.

MR. HEFFERTON: Oh yes, I know he has something there.

MR. HOLLETT: I am going to read that now.

MR. HEFFERTON: I wonder

would it make the position clear, although it is perfectly clear to me, with the substitution of the words "can" for "may". That where it can be shown he has ten years already in.

MR. BROWNE: This embodies something new. A person resigns from the civil service and comes back and takes up where he left off again.

MR. HEFFERTON: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: It is certainly a new thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: When he resigned for a purpose.

MR. BROWNE: We are not dealing with that now. This deal with persons over fifty years who have been out perhaps fifteen years and come back and having worked more than ten years in the civil service can get back the time already put in and be credited with those years. Supposing a person resigned from the civil service say in 1941 when salaries were low, and now he comes back in 1954. On what basis is he going to get his pension?—If it is to be based on the last years of service he comes back into a very nice position. He has not worked all through these years yet he is credited and gets a pension under this Act on the last years. It seems to put him in a very favourable position. What is the idea of doing that? What is the Government doing this for?

MR. HEFFERTON: I move the committee rise and report having made progress, as it is nearly 1:00 o'clock, and ask leave to sit again.

On motion the committee rose and reported the following.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole have consid-

ered the matters to them referred and have passed a Bill, "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish", with some amendments.

On motion amendments read a first and second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act", with some amendments.

On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act", with some amendments.

On motion said amendments read a first time and second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act", 1952, without amendments.

On motion report received. On motion Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have consid-

ered the matter to them referred and on certain other Bills in Committee have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received. On motion Committee order to sit again at a later hour this day.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 1:00 of the clock I do leave the Chair until 3:00 of the clock this afternoon.

---

THURSDAY, June 18, 1954

### AFTERNOON SESSION

The House resumed at three of the clock in the afternoon.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I think we could go into Committee of the Whole on the same bills.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave was given earlier for this committee to sit again today. I will now leave the Chair.

Mr. Courage Chairman of Committee of the Whole:

"An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act":

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee was considering Clause 3 of the bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I am more or less mystified about that section. A civil service certificate shall not be issued in respect of any person who shall after the eighteenth day of December, 1947, be appointed to an established post after having attained the age of fifty years —

MR. CURTIS: But in the case of technical or professional capacity there is an exception.

MR. HOLLETT: But there is an

exception somewhere else. I don't think I can hold this bill up very much longer, but I do not like the whole bill. I am worried about the civil service, definitely worried. You won't have a civil service worth talking of over the years if you carry on the practices contained in this bill. Civil servants who entered elections can go back again and be reinstated in the job, etc., etc. You can put them out in the next election and put them back in again. I wonder if the minister would tell us if there is any precedent in any other province in Canada for such an Act as this?

MR. HEFFERTON: That I could not say.

MR. HOLLETT: Does the minister know or does the Premier know? That is what I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, is there any precedent on the Mainland of Canada in any of the provinces for such provisions as contained in this particular bill or this particular section? Could the Attorney General inform us?

MR. CURTIS: No, Mr. Chairman, we don't copy any other provinces—If we copy them it is only to get past the Opposition.

MR. J. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I find that reply rather disturbing but also rather unconvincing in the light of amendments of other Acts. In other discussion we are told the story that they do it in British Columbia. I still can only see in this legislation something entirely novel, something which the government has not yet justified other than to explain the reference.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, nine times out of ten every amending Act since 1949 we are told it is like they have in other Provinces or like on the Mainland, or copied word for word.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman also complains when we say it is copied from other Provinces and now when it is not he complains just the same, so we are damned if we do or if we don't.

MR. HOLLETT: The copy should be produced. I would say this was never copied from any Province on the Mainland of Canada or anywhere else in the British Commonwealth. I think we ought to copyright it.

MR. CURTIS: I think the honourable member is right, we ought to copyright it.

MR. HOLLETT: No, not here, the civil service under the British Constitution is one of the finest institutions ever set up or ever established, and Great Britain is proud of the civil service and the civil servants are all proud of Great Britain, and we as a part of the Dominion belong to that great Commonwealth of Nations and should endeavour to keep our civil service out of politics absolutely. There is no place in politics for the civil service. Sir, this is going to create all sort of jealousies if you are going to pick a man from this Department and put him down in Labrador and from that Department and put him somewhere else and then because he did not win the election put him back in the job again and he gets his pension. I have no objection to his getting his pension, no objection to his leaving his post and going into politics, but I do have objections, when he comes out of politics, to his going back into that position again.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are we on Committee of the Whole or second reading? Are we arguing the principle of the bill or the details?

MR. HOLLETT: I am still opposed to the principle.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it in order for the honourable gentleman to say he is opposed to the principle?

MR. HOLLETT: Well I must say, I must answer, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I asked if it was in order to say in Committee Stage whether he is or not.

MR. HOLLETT: In order or not, I am opposed to the principle of that Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I got the honourable gentleman off his feet, did I not?

MR. HOLLETT: I can get up again.

Clause 3 and 4 carried.

Clause 5:

MR. HOLLETT: That, Mr. Chairman, refers to a teacher, not only a Newfoundland teacher but people who have taught school in other parts of the world. I take it—is that correct?

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, this particularly applies to those who put in fifteen years as teachers in Newfoundland schools and some three or four years engaged as supervisors or then as principal of one of our schools, and then accepts employment for three years in some federal post. What we want to do is to allow the years he served as a teacher and a provincial civil servant to be carried on to the years of service.

MR. HIGGINS: It is only for one individual?

MR. HEFFERTON: Well at the moment it did come up for one particular individual.

MR. HOLLETT: That explanation causes me to say there is no objection.

The point is we are not fully acquainted with the reasons for some of these.

MR. HEFFERTON: I gave that last night.

MR. HOLLETT: I probably did not catch it.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I can understand in the case of a teacher such as the Minister referred to in the previous sub-section—But in the case of a man who elects to try his luck and go into politics who is defeated or who may if he is elected and is out of his particular branch in his Department for five years, depending on how often an election is called, even if he is re-elected for ten years, then if he is unfortunate enough on his third time around to be defeated or if he decides to retire and go back to the peaceful calling of the civil service, automatically he goes back without losing his seniority or pension rights. It does not seem sensible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Seniority" is that there?

MR. HIGGINS: No, I read that into it—No harm trying—As I have said, these things do seem to me to be unfair. I move that sub-section (a) be stricken and the rest of it stand.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment suggested by my honourable friend. We have a civil service now, I believe, quite free and clear of politics for a long time. The Commission of Government, I think, put the civil services on a fairly decent standard regarding politics, and I believe they are better for it. Now this thing here will tend to put those employees in the civil service more or less on a political basis and it possibly may be the cause eventually of patronage. Mr. Chairman, anybody in

the civil service if they wish to leave their jobs can do so like anybody else and give it up. If they wish to enter political life I think the same should apply to the civil service. But this section here does not protect the civil service from the political aspect of the Newfoundland life, not the way it is now.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I think that my honourable and learned friend on my right would like to have a few words on this, so I will proceed to talk until he arrives.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who is the leader and who is the follower?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, that injection, may it be commented upon?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the Premier is definitely out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: The Premier is out of order! I think that is highly unusual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the greatest evil this will bring about is that some of the finest men in the civil service will be drafted by the powers that be, the Leader of the Government, to go out in politics and contest a district because of his appeal as a civil servant to the electorate. I will be fair to one honourable member on the opposite side and say that by reason of his going into politics the civil service has lost one of the finest men they had and one who was doing one of the most important jobs

that could be done in this country and doing it in a most excellent and efficient manner until he got mixed up in politics; and he was mixed up in politics quite a little while before—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order—Has not the principle of this clause been adopted?—Is it now debatable in Committee of the Whole?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that would be the principal part of this clause and possibly the whole Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: I was not speaking to the principle of the Bill. "Where an established civil servant retired for the purpose of contesting an election or a by-election for the return of members or a member to the Parliament of Canada or to the Legislature of the Province"—I do not like that particular section because of the fact that it will tend to take some of the finest men in the civil service away from the jobs they know best.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Can the honourable gentleman express his general opinion of this general principle—It is not out of order to express his opinion of the general principle which has been adopted? This principle has been passed by the House of Assembly—Can the Committee of the Whole now debate what has been adopted by the House of Assembly?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must sustain that as a point of order. I believe the same argument and almost the same words were used in the debate on second reading.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and will be used after we are dead and gone, I am afraid. One hardly knows just what one must say



in a case like this. When one attempts to give a reason why the section should be deleted from the Act one is said to be out of order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there an amendment before the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I won't be able to accept that amendment according to the rules given here by Mr. Speaker a few nights ago, according to that rule by which I am bound. I am afraid that I find it impossible to accept that motion because it will interfere with the principle of the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, do I understand one cannot make an amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: One can make an amendment, but this amendment seems to strike at the very root of the Bill. If the honourable member will allow me—That is exactly a parallel case to the case we had here a few nights ago. In that case the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the honourable members of the Committee will remember Mr. Speaker gave a ruling which was sustained by the House, that the amendment could not be accepted. Therefore, in this case, I think the honourable and learned member for St. John's West will have to agree with me on that point. I am afraid I cannot accept the amendment as they are exactly the same.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, it is no harm to try.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not carried and it is not going to be carried yet. I do maintain there are various things involved here and particularly one that would strike at the very heart of the

civil service. I think this particular section is the one that could do the most damage to our country. I am not going to talk about the principle, but this section will take from the civil service men who are most valuable where they are today. But how far is this going to go? The Government can depend on its civil service, depend on the integrity and honesty and ability of the civil service. In great measure it does not depend largely upon the elected members but the Government depends upon the permanent civil servants, and it is up to any country or Province of Canada to endeavour to build up a civil service which will be beyond reproach, will be above politics. It does not take a lot sometimes to get above politics—but the civil service should be definitely above it and there should be no way whereby any man or any Government should be able to draft men from the civil service.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order—Is the honourable Leader of the Opposition going to defy your ruling just as though you had not spoken? Is he going to go right on completely ignoring your ruling and having the second reading stage in Committee of the Whole? I ask Your Honour for a ruling, and I ask Your Honour if the honourable gentleman or any other honourable gentleman is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will have to uphold that point of order.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I shall not get out of order again on this particular section. I don't like it and I think it should come out. I was a civil servant myself one time—But there it is again—You can't touch this thing at all—This is the most peculiar thing. We will have to

get somebody to amend our rules, I think, so that the rules will allow one to bring up the merits or demerits of any particular section or sub-clause. On this particular clause, (6) I think I have shown as my colleagues have shown it is a dangerous one in the hands of any government.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, with reference to your explanation as to the ruling on the suggested amendment, might I be perhaps permitted to say that an earlier amendment suggested by me was not complete because further perusal of the sections would indicate it would mean not only the deletion of (a) but also paragraph (d) because both are integrated. But I do, Sir, with all respect, suggest that you can delete one of these objections without affecting the rest—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have made a ruling that this particular amendment the honourable member suggested does seem to strike at the very root of the principle.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not here when we began the discussion of this section. I presume this is the one to which objection has been made before—When an established civil servant is retired for the purpose of contesting an election—Consider what is involved in that—He does not retire because he considers that he should contest an election, I mean to say, the leader of some party, very likely the leader of the Government party comes along and says—We want a man for a certain district, St. John's West for example or Ferryland—we want you to go and run—

MR. MURRAY: It would be no use for him to go to Ferryland.

MR. BROWNE: That is not what I heard today.

MR. MURRAY: What did you hear? Tell us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. BROWNE: If the person says; "No, I don't feel like it. I have been here ten years and have built up a pension and my promotion is coming up with a higher salary." He is then told he need not worry about that. We just passed a Bill. We can put you back again, put you at the head of everything. You don't need to worry about that. Why these boys who are the favourites of the Government will get all the privileges if they are eligible candidates over men who are not political minded and who have been in the civil service for years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—I suggest the honourable and learned gentleman is now discussing the principle of the clause which has not only been debated but has been adopted in second reading. He is therefore out of order. It ought to stop, any further discussion of the principle of this clause—I put that to Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—There was some discussion on this matter before the honourable member came into the Chamber on an amendment which I would not entertain because of a ruling which was given recently and this seemed to be a parallel case. This clause here does seem to be the root of the whole matter and the principle of the whole Bill. As a matter of fact it was discussed, I think, quite fully in second reading. It does seem to me that belabouring the point in Committee is not in order.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I be permitted to answer the point of order raised. We are discussing the matter now not in a gener-

al way but clause by clause. Does the Premier wish to say that every clause of this bill should be passed as is and is not susceptible to any change except to put in a comma or a semicolon or leave out a comma? Does the Premier mean that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, we got this Bill last night after 11:00 o'clock and were expected to deal with the whole principle and all sections of it—how could we possibly do that? Now we are in committee dealing with it clause by clause and the Premier objects to doing that. What can we deal with on this particular section?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is now being inferred by the honourable and learned gentleman that I am taking an unreasonable attitude in demanding second reading debate when they were not ready and therefore they have been deprived of the opportunity of debating the principle at second reading and they are forced to debate it in Committee of the Whole. I submit to Your Honour that is entirely unfounded and entirely unfair. At no point has any Bill been forced upon the Opposition nor have they at any time been forced to debate a thing at second reading when they were not ready to debate it. The honourable gentlemen have only to ask at any time that any Bill submitted for second reading be deferred, and we have yet to refuse to do it. But if the honourable gentlemen wish a second reading to debate and take advantage of the opportunity presented at second reading then when it comes to Committee of the Whole I submit that they, as we, are bound by the Rules of the House and the rules of parlia-

mentary practice and procedure, and they are not permitted, (not by me and not by Your Honour) by the Rules of the House to discuss the principle of any clause of a Bill in Committee of the Whole when that principle has been adopted at second reading. There would not be a Committee of the Whole if it were not adopted at second reading. I submit the whole thing, Your Honour, is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would hardly say, any principle of a clause, but I would say any principle of a bill which goes to the root of the matter, and this does seem to be a very strong principle.

MR. BROWNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, what does this mean, in Beauchesne, 3rd. edition—In Committee the Bill is considered clause by clause—Each clause is a distinct question and must be separately discussed. Now then the Premier says; don't discuss it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Premier does not say any such thing nor anything even remotely approaching that. I said we cannot discuss the principle once the principle is adopted by the House of Assembly, which it may do only at second reading, and thereafter there is no discussion of the principle. Now I did not make that rule. That rule was made before I was born.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I submit there is a general principle to every bill, but in every section there may be some sort of an adjunct as far as the principle is concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: His Honour the Speaker ruled on that already within recent days.

MR. HOLLETT: It does not matter—you missed the point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot agree

with the last remark of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. A Committee Chairman is bound by the ruling of the Speaker supported by the House. I am afraid I cannot rule otherwise.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, according to the Premier's argument we are not allowed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, Mr. Chairman, that is not my argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose the honourable member continues, then the Premier may speak.

MR. BROWNE: This is an entirely new section and has nothing to do with any other section in the Civil Service Act—31A states that a person in a post established and pensionable shall retire for the purpose of contesting an election for the return of members or a member to the Parliament of Canada or to the Legislature of the province or upon entering the Civil Service of Canada; and he was not eligible for the award of a pension on retirement—Where he retired for any of the purposes referred to in paragraph (a) and within two years after he contested any such election, if he was not elected, or within two years after he ceased to be a member of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature of the province, if he was elected, he applied in writing to the Minister to be re-appointed, and before the expiration of three months next following such applications is re-appointed an established servant; or where he retired for the purpose referred to in paragraph (b) and is re-appointed an established civil servant immediately after he ceased to be employed in the Civil Service of Canada, all service done by him before such retirement which if

he was eligible for the award of a pension on retirement would have been counted as pensionable service shall be credited to him as pensionable service on his appointment.

In other words, if he is elected for five years and two years after that, which is seven years, after leaving the job can be re-appointed if he applies in writing. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was puzzled last night when I saw that, and was not sure what it meant. Now I would like to ask the Premier to explain what the last few lines mean—where an established civil servant retires for these various purposes—Suppose he had ten years service in the civil service, and if he were eligible for award of a pension on retirement, would it be counted as pensionable? If he has been a certain number of years in the civil service and then becomes a member of parliament or a member of the House of Assembly and then after five years, or ten or twenty-five years he goes back into the civil service of this country again, the time he spent in the civil service previous to his retirement and becoming a member of parliament or of the House of Assembly shall count for him as pensionable service or be credited to his pensionable service on his retirement.

Now, Sir, how can we discuss that except by reference to the rules of the civil service as they exist here and in Canada? How can we? I don't see what we can do about it unless we were to consider if it should be half the time spent or three-quarters of the time or some variation in that part of it. It seems to me it is up to us to point out that we have a Civil Service Commission here now who are supposed to have to do with appointments. Surely it is up to the members to point this out and to ask

to what place in the civil service should the man come in. Supposing a man is an assistant-deputy when he retired and after five or ten years he comes back and looks for a job again—is he eligible to become an assistant-deputy or deputy minister or should he take a position over those who have been in the service during his absence? At what scale should he go in if that is going to be allowed? That man can go in over the heads of people working during his absence. It seems to me here that the government is going to create a great deal of jealousy and dissatisfaction in the civil service, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, they are going to do a lot of harm to the efficiency of the civil service. Everybody will be coming to the government and hoping that they will be asked to stand for an election because they know that they risk nothing when they do. If they are elected they are all right—They can go back after their term expires, and if not elected they can go back right away. Why, Mr. Chairman, this is almost the same as it was thirty or forty years ago. We are going back. We are going backwards and not moving ahead at all. Now if a man was laid off a job because his job was done away with it should be a different thing. But when he resigns from his job he can't expect to go back where he was when he did resign. It is a very bad situation.

Clause carried — (Opposition voted against the motion).

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder would the Minister explain to us the difference between this and previous sections?

MR. HEFFERTON: The difference is between persons who put in a total of fifteen to twenty years and persons

who put in more than fifteen. There is a distinction made between ten and fifteen as laid down here. We put in over fifteen years when they get what is laid down in the Act.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that that is the limit which retired persons under these sections get—one fortieth of his average monthly salary or wages during the last thirty-six months of his service for each completed month of service?

MR. HEFFERTON: That is gratuity and not a pension.

MR. HOLLETT: I see. He is entitled to some sort of pension also?

MR. HEFFERTON: He is not—gratuity is different altogether from a pension.

MR. HOLLETT: Is that multiplied by the number of years' service?

MR. HEFFERTON: It is multiplied by 36 months.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words less than a month's salary.

MR. HEFFERTON: That is what it was in the original Act.

MR. HOLLETT: That is not very much. If there is any use in doing so I would like to suggest to the Government to reconsider that amount in gratuity of less than a month's salary after fifteen years of service.

MR. HEFFERTON: No, it is a little more than that, after fifteen years it gives him one and one-third.

MR. HOLLETT: It is not very much in any case, after spending all these years in the service of the Government and then becoming incapacitated or sick or something and unable

to go on any longer, he is given a month's gratuity and then Good Bye. Well, I must say this government is very charitable in many cases but in that they are not very charitable. I am not blaming this government any more than those heretofore. I really think they ought to consider something a little better than that for civil servants.

MR. BROWNE: There are two grades now instead of one—A person who has completed ten years now gets one-fortieth of his average monthly salary during his last thirty-six months of service. In other words if his average monthly wage was, say four hundred dollars a month—I don't think that is a very big sum for ten years of service, about \$1200—After he has served fifteen years he gets one twenty-sixth, which is the same as it was before.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, the next one was circulated this morning—The amendment says—the Act is further amended by adding thereto immediately after Section 48 as section 48A.

MR. BROWNE: Now, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—What may we discuss in regard to this, which was not passed last night? Should this go through all readings? How can we discuss the principle involved here. We are not having the second reading on it.

MR. HEFFERTON: Do you want an answer? It is getting beyond me. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the section.

MR. HOLLETT: I would say we could go ahead with the section. I think the minister should be upheld in his efforts to increase the value of this Act, certainly they should go ahead.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the honourable gentlemen would like to stay until seven or eight o'clock tomorrow morning we are quite willing to adapt ourselves to their convenience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—might I suggest this clause has not been put. It was just read by the Clerk.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the clause.

MR. BROWNE: Can an amendment proposed by the Minister be withdrawn, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: It was not moved. No motion was before the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Is it not assumed that it is moved when it is read—I wish the Honourable the Premier would keep quiet.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I wish the honourable gentleman would keep quiet.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, do I understand that was not moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was not moved. It was read and objected to and then the committee got completely out of order. I asked the Honourable Minister if he wished to move that clause and he said no. Therefore there is no motion now, apart from the preamble.

On motion the bill was passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953":

Clause 1 and 2 carried; Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Has there been a problem of this kind arise?

MR. HEFFERTON: We have two at the present time.



MR. BROWNE: In St. John's?

MR. HEFFERTON: No, Corner Brook.

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, "An Act to Amend the Local Government Receivership Act":

Clause 1 passed. Clause 2:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister how he proposes to get reasons to believe it is desirable for a municipality to be disbanded and its affairs wound up? How is he going to get a reason of this kind? I can understand a plebiscite.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The only instances in which we intend to abolish is as a result of plebiscites held by secret ballot. That is the pattern of that procedure.

MR. BROWNE: Would the honourable gentleman tell me who was in charge when a plebiscite was held?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we appointed Mr. Hubert Fisher, a very reputable citizen of Bonavista to be returning officer. He conducts the plebiscite according to regulations and procedures—That is to say he opened a series of election booths throughout Bonavista Town, appointed deputy returning officers and poll clerks and policemen, and on the day in question all eligible to vote did so.

MR. BROWNE: All?

MR. SMALLWOOD: All who were able to do so, and eight per cent of these voted against the town council. Now, that, we believe, is enough to make the Lieutenant-Governor in Council believe that there is a desire of the majority of the electors in that

municipality, that the municipality be disbanded, its affairs wound up and—where we get equally good reason to believe that in the case of any other town council except those envisaged in Section (c) of this clause, we will do likewise, wind them up.

Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill, An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act.

MR. CURTIS: My honourable friend the member for St. John's West did not like the wording of section 9. I might say that the department has considered it and we feel that the wording is perfectly understandable and that there is no object in changing it. Under the interpretations Act there is no question but that means sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. It may not be worded the way I would like it worded but I am prepared—

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of correction there—would you look at the side note of sections 2 and 6. Not to come in force until January 1955.

MR. CURTIS: That is a mistake because the side note is not part of the Act—I think, Mr. Chairman, that should be section 2 to 9.

In connection with sections 10, 11 and 12. —I suggest we take section 11 as it is now and call it section 10 and bring it up to where section 10 is—Then we have the new clause 10 and then take out section 12 altogether.

Now there is one other point. On section 26 my honourable friend raised the question as to section 26 with regard to perpetual liability to prosecution. I would suggest if you would refer, Mr. Chairman to the fourth line following (a) and (b) that section 26 is

liable to penalty—Now then I would add after that—"And any such complaints may be made any time within six years from the time the matter of such complaints arose. Mr. Chairman, I think that answers all the points raised by the honourable member.

On motion clause as amended carried.

Bill passed with some amendments.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, this too was held up at the suggestion of my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West. I believe Section 6 was allowed to stand. The position is this: under existing law if a car is parked and someone else runs into it your license is held up. Why an innocent person should be held up in that way does not seem satisfactory to me. So I have had a new section drafted, and I wish to submit it to my honourable friends opposite.

"(1) Subject to this Act, where bodily injury to, or the death of, any person or damage to property in an amount apparently exceeding one hundred dollars, results from an accident in which a motor vehicle is in any manner directly or indirectly involved, if the motor vehicle is, or is required to be, registered under this Act the Minister, after receipt of notice in writing of the accident if he is satisfied from reports of the accident submitted to him that the owner or driver may be liable or responsible for the accident, may suspend the license of the driver and the license of every other motor vehicle registered in the name of the owner and of the driver, but, notwithstanding

anything in this Act, where the driver's licence or car licence of any person is suspended under this section that person may, upon notice in writing to the Minister, appear before a magistrate in the district in which the accident occurred for a certificate that he is no way liable or responsible for the accident and if the magistrate is satisfied that that person is not liable or responsible for the accident he may give him a certificate to that effect, and the Minister shall on receipt of the certificate reinstate the driver's license or car license or both of that person."

Mr. Chairman that takes the place of the Clause 6 at the top of page 4.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is a point there I want explained. My honourable and learned friend said there was a very good reason for that amendment. I will quote a case in point myself. Last year I was parked by the side of the road and a car came along and ran into me. Naturally we called the police. It was in the daytime, at noontime.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It was not during the election, was it?

MR. HOLLETT: No—I ran into a telephone pole then. I am not ashamed to admit it.

MR. CURTIS: We took away the licence of the pole, that is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is very nice to see the committee in a pleasant mood, but I suggest the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I agree, the members on the opposite side are very rude—As a matter of

fact on the verge of being objectionable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I must remind the Honourable Leader of the Opposition of the rule about personal remarks, and personal reflections.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I was parked by the side of the road. The damage was about \$100 to me and about \$400 to himself. We called the police, of course, and went on in our cars. It looks to me that under this Act the police could come along and hold up a car, under this section, until such time as the minister would absolve us from crime.

MR. CURTIS: This remedies that.

MR. HOLLETT: Could the police give permission to go on if they consider you are not to blame?

MR. CURTIS: I think so. I think this makes it fairly plain.

MR. HOLLETT: What I want to know is can the police hold the car?

MR. CURTIS: No, they have no authority to hold your car.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to sub-section (3) of Clause 5:

MR. CURTIS: Yes, that is a bit harsh. I directed that it be revised and the new draft I submit would be this: "No action or other legal proceeding shall be taken or brought against the Minister, constable or officer in respect of anything done under this section where the action or other legal proceeding is not based on malfeasance or misfeasance.

Clauses as amended carried.

Bill passed with some amendments.

On motion committee rose to report having passed this Bill.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act to Amend the Saw Mills Act with some amendment.

Report received—On motion first and second reading of said amendments.

Amendments concurred in. Bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion order rescinded.

On motion bill ordered read a third time now, read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act with some amendments.

Report received. On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in. On motion bill ordered read a third time now.

On motion bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act, without amendment.

On motion report received. On motion bill ordered read a third time now. Read a third time, on motion ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953, without amendment.

On motion report received—On motion Bill ordered read a third time now. Read a third time. Ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act, with some amendments.

On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in.

On motion bill ordered read a third time now. Read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

Honourable the Minister of Finance to move the House into Committee of Ways and Means.

HON. G. POWER (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if no other member wishes to speak in the budget debate I think I shall go on now. I won't keep the House long because everyone here is sick of speeches as I am and won't want to hear very much. But there are a few points I would like to make, and I will be very brief.

Incidentally I notice that the Opposition did not like the budget. I could see that they would not. It was not the kind of a budget an Opposition would like. In fact in my three years' experience of budget speeches I have come to the conclusion that the members of the Opposi-

tion seem to be allergic to the kind of budget speech we produce on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West, whom I think spoke first in the debate, charged that I delayed the budget speech in order to include certain figures of revenue shown to be due in March, before March 31. Now I think that remark was a bit unworthy of the honourable gentleman because by virtue of his experience I think he knows that such a thing would be impossible under the auditing system that we have today. If the budget speech had been delivered on the 31st of March the figures would be the same as if we had delayed it until Christmas. Any payment due from Ottawa before March 31, even if the actual cash were not in hand, would be included. So that there is no point whatsoever in delaying the budget speech for that reason because that reason did not exist.

Also the honourable gentleman quoted certain figures that puzzled me considerably. For instance he said the waterpower survey cost the government \$600,000 and he also said that the IBEC Report cost \$250,000. The actual figures, Mr. Speaker, are \$80,000 for the IBEC Report and \$250,000 for the waterpower survey. Now I wonder if the honourable gentleman would tell me where he got these figures he quoted? I don't know where they exist. I have never seen them. I have never seen any reference anywhere to \$600,000 as being the cost of the power survey nor have I seen any figure anywhere of \$250,000 for the IBEC Report. So that the only conclusion I can come to is that the Honourable gentleman just plucked these figures out of the air. Well now, that is not the kind of thing that I would

expect the honourable gentleman to do, because in doing that he informed the House to that effect and through the medium of the press and radio he informed the people of Newfoundland he was actually misinformed. Since that figure does not exist anywhere to my knowledge I propose that he was quite intentionally misinformed.

**MR. BROWNE:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest the minister is not entitled to impute motives to me. I confess I made an error in regard to the costs of the power survey, I have seen since, and know it is a big error, since the figure, I believe, is \$271,000 in the estimates. In regard to the IBEC Report I think that was about \$80,000. But I had heard the reference to it on platforms and, I believe, in this House by other honourable members, and that is where I got the figures.

**MR. POWER:** The honourable gentleman is too conscious of the value of heresay, I think, to just accept the figures that he heard someone mention as the actual cost of the power survey or the actual cost of the IBEC Report. There must be tens of thousands of people in Newfoundland right now who believe that the power survey cost six hundred thousand dollars and that the IBEC Report cost \$250,000. Certainly since there is that misconception in the minds of the people I think I am entitled to say the honourable gentleman is responsible for putting it there, at least I heard him say so, I heard it go out over the radio.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if he is so terribly wrong in these two quotations anything else he would mention in the way of figures would certainly be suspect as far as I am concerned anyway.

Now he also said my estimate of the income the people would have in 1955 was a way out and grossly exaggerated. I think he said that the figures were fantastic. Well, Mr. Speaker, anyone at all can get up and say a figure is fantastic. But he must have some grounds for saying so. The honourable gentleman, I think, by his own admission, did not have any grounds for saying so. He did give some reasons which were not statistical reasons. It took quite a lot of time and work to get these figures, and Mr. Speaker, I will say here again; these figures were as honest as we could make them. I believe the people of Newfoundland will earn \$230 million this year. I am glad that they will earn it. It reflects the great level of prosperity here in Newfoundland, a level of prosperity which has never been excelled in all our history.

Now he also said that my argument with regard to unemployment insurance was a bit of a joke—if five million dollars were paid out in unemployment insurance that was an indication, in his estimation, there was unemployment and therefore depression. But, Mr. Speaker, we all understand that most of the work that goes ahead in Newfoundland is seasonal work, and if people get enough seasonal work during the appropriate seasons to qualify for unemployment insurance that certainly indicates, if they took five millions in unemployment insurance, they were doing very well during these seasons.

Now he also doubted my statement that there was prosperity in Newfoundland and hopes of prosperity in the coming year. The reason that he gave for his doubting that was that certain motorcar factories on the Mainland had been curtailing their operations and, I believe, laying off some

of their staff. I investigated that and I found that the General Motors Corporation in Canada had just finished a five million dollar expansion programme and they were raising their production of cars this year from two hundred and nineteen thousand cars last year to three hundred thousand this year, and they were raising their employment level from eleven thousand to fourteen thousand. That does not look as if any depression were starting there in that industry. As a matter of fact I don't know of any industry all across Canada, except textiles maybe, which shows any evidence that there is a recession brewing on the North American Continent.

Now the honourable gentleman in his remarks made some suggestion that no one knew how many horsepower existed in Swift Current, and he said it would not cost \$600,000 to find out. Well, it did not cost \$600,000 to find that out. There were three watersheds surveyed under the water-power survey, and these waterpower surveys must be necessary otherwise great corporations such as BRINCO would not engage in such surveys and spend huge amounts of money paying for them. Now the English Electric is the big electric company in BRINCO and they have announced that they are going to spend a million dollars in development of Grand Falls. Well there must be some value in determining how much horsepower is in a certain place otherwise they certainly would not spend a million dollars to find out. If the Government of Newfoundland spent two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to prove the power potentialities of three watersheds in Newfoundland I think they were perfectly well entitled to do so. It was a good thing to do, good for the people of Newfoundland to know

what we had. Too long we have been listening to this romanticism—Newfoundland has wonderful natural resources. We have this and we have that. I have heard that all my life, yet no one knew what it was. It was all very vague. Everyone believed it. But actually when we came to examine the matter no one knew what we had in Newfoundland. We are the first government who has ever made a concentrated effort to find out what really exists in Newfoundland as far as natural resources are concerned.

Now I thought the honourable gentlemen were a little bit contentious against BRINCO. That is explained because I remember when it was introduced here first the honourable member for St. John's East referred to it as "Bunco." Well he was different in his opinion from Sir Winston Churchill because he thought it was a good idea. I remember when the House of Rothschild was mentioned here there were smiles from the other side of the House. But the House of Rothschild is head of the greatest financial empire in Europe, and the companies that they have brought into that great "BRINCO" altogether make up the greatest concentration of development capital that was ever brought together. So I maintained when I said it was a great achievement for the Premier to have formed that great company. I think he was fully justified and I believe that history will justify his achievement in years to come, and that BRINCO will be the one thing he did that was the biggest of all his achievements for Newfoundland. I am not flattering him now, because privately, I think, I am his severest critic, and I do not flatter anyone, as people on this side will know. I believe great things will grow from BRINCO, the great com-



bination of English companies motivated with the idea of regaining the great place England once had. They will obviously put effort and money into this thing, and if there is anything worth while developing in Labrador and Newfoundland I think those people will do it—If they don't find anything we might as well forget it.

There was some criticism, I believe, from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, no it was from the Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's West, with regard to the locations of the industrial plants. Well, the most of them are located in Conception Bay. Conception Bay, I think is the most populous place in Newfoundland, and it would be a place that would be struck hardest, I believe, if we had a recession. If there are plants in Conception Bay I do not think that the rest of the country resents it very much, I know the people where I come from have said nothing because the plants have gone to Conception Bay. They don't care where the plants go so long as people get a job, and as long as the economy of the country is built up, and the future of Newfoundland children a little better assured.

Now the birch plant, in my opinion, is the best of these industries because it has the greatest potential as far as wages are concerned. In fact during the past year there were over six hundred and fifty people working in the birch industry in the woods and in the plant. Now when we consider that the great development at Buchans only employs about eight hundred men you must admit the birch industry we have started, even if it is only going at about quarter capacity, has great potentiality, if it can hire 680 men at that stage. When it gets in full production, which it will in

time, I believe a couple of thousand people will be working in the birch industry in Newfoundland.

MR. BROWNE: It is to be sold.

MR. POWER: They are not going to take it away I hope. If the birch plant is sold it will be operated here in Newfoundland for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland just the same as if the government operated it or if Newfoundland Hardwoods operated it.

MR. BROWNE: Better.

MR. POWER: Maybe—But I will say this—A lot of criticism has been launched against Newfoundland Hardwoods. It seems a lot of it was highly unjustified. They had to take an entirely new industry and take people who knew nothing, workers who knew nothing about the mechanics of that industry and had to train them. The turn-over in employment over there was terrific at times, and they had to change over and change over and that has delayed the full development of that industry, I suppose, a year or a year and a half.

Another thing I am going to say which will probably come as a shock to people is that these industries have been under-capitalized. I know very well the birch plant can hire 680 people when it is in quarter or half production and that it would hire probably twice as many in full production, and that many would be far more than are engaged in the mining industry at Buchans. I know very well the amount of money that went into the development of Buchans must be far greater by millions and millions and millions than has gone into the birch plant, about twenty-five millions, I believe.

Well, as you can see, Mr. Speaker, this Government has not been so crazy and extravagant in spending three million eight hundred thousand on the birch plant, and if six hundred men alone, and even if it never gets any better than 680 men it will be a great step forward in economic development in Newfoundland.

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition goes back again to the Icelandic Boats. Now my honourable colleague on my left here and I have listened to the talk about the Icelandic Boats until it grows pretty nauseating. Nobody has ever defended this thing as it should have been defended. In fact, if my colleagues would agree, I would put millions of dollars in the estimates this year to follow the same idea as was followed in these Icelandic Boats. Actually on the West Coast of Canada and the United States billions of dollars have been spent tracing the migration of the herring, also in Norway and Iceland as well, with the result that at a certain time of year they can tell approximately where the herring are. In the first day of fishing, I think, in the Norwegian Herring Fishery this year they sailed out to the point where they knew the herring were, and put down their nets and took three hundred thousand tons of herring in one day fishing. There are just as many herring in Newfoundland, but no one knows where they are.

MR. MURRAY: The man from Ship Harbour knows.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The shadow knows.

MR. POWER: The honourable member for St. John's West told a story about a man from Ship Harbour fishing near the Icelandic Boats, and

he got the herring and they did not. Now I have thought about that and examined it. I have never been a sort of trustful soul, but I do know that the Icelandic outfit were not equipped to fish in shallow waters. They did not have gill-nets or these things to fish in shallow waters, and I do not know anyone in Ship Harbour equipped to fish in deep water. Therefore they could not be fishing in the same place. That is No. 1, and No. 2, the herring that could be caught by equipment the Ship Harbour fisherman had could not be caught by the equipment the Icelandic Boats had and vice versa. So that, Sir, is a story like a good many others, just an old wives' tale.

MR. HOLLETT: The Sweetest Story Ever Told.

MR. POWER: I don't know what that means! Now, Mr. Speaker, you remember that during the National Convention Mr. Cashin presented a budget in which he forecast a revenue and expenditure for Newfoundland under Responsible Government for three years ahead, I think. In that budget he informed everyone, he was very very vehement about it, that the prosperity we were enjoying in Newfoundland was not the result of the war, it was our natural expansion. Well, Mr. Speaker, an awful lot of people did not believe that. But there were 28 other men in the convention who got up and agreed with him. I heard the Honourable Leader of the Opposition reiterate that the prosperity which we were enjoying was not the result of war—And Lo and Behold! Here the other day I heard him argue with the Premier that the prosperity we had since 1940 was due to nothing else but the war.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I

must rise there to a point of order—That is a statement I never uttered in the National Convention nor supported in the National Convention nor felt I ought to. Every country when it is not directly engaged with war within its own borders profits by a war. I don't think anybody in the National Convention, particularly not twenty-eight, ever said that. I would like to make that correction—The Minister of Finance is a little astray in his facts.

MR. POWER: I think I heard the whole 28 say —

MR. HOLLETT: You think—You think a lot of things.

MR. POWER: In fact it did not suit them then to say it was the war that brought prosperity. They argued then that Newfoundland should carry on and that wars made no difference. All we had to get was Responsible Government and customs duties in vogue again and everything would be built up. Now we have some prosperity and they try to detract from that by telling us that; well we might have done some things, but if it had not been for the war we would not have had anything new. Actually the prosperity enjoyed during these years prior to the war and during the convention was not prosperity but a reduction of profits to a more tolerable level and a standard of living the people now know compared to then is vastly different. No, all we have to do is to send our minds back to Sunday afternoon on Military Road in 1943 and remember how the children were dressed, and go out and walk along there on Sunday afternoon now.

MR. BROWNE: It is not so good now.

MR. POWER: The honourable gentleman must have been blind in these days.

MR. BROWNE: They were well dressed then.

MR. POWER: I know the honourable gentleman might have been doing well. A great many people were, and it is a common human fault to forget how other people are living—Anyway I saw plenty of poverty around Placentia in these years, and I saw a little of it myself, I know. I got my living from the land in some of the hardest years that ever came in Newfoundland. Now it was not much of a living it is true, but it was sufficient and enough that I could sometimes share a little with those who were less fortunate than I. I can tell the honourable gentleman that I know there was plenty of poverty in Newfoundland in the years 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45. I know very many old people who got their five dollars each month who did not die from starvation but died as a result of the weakness of their system by a sort of slow starvation that existed over a period of years. Anyway if the war did not do it in 1941 and 1942 I don't see how the honourable gentleman can argue the war has done it now.

MR. HOLLETT: The war had some effect on it naturally, did it not?

MR. POWER: I don't think so, and did not think so then. Now I remember the honourable gentleman talking about taxing the people's stomachs. I really don't know what he means, but he did say we were taxing the people's stomachs.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable gentleman does not know what it means?

MR. POWER: Then I remember

the honourable gentleman making speeches advocating a return to Responsible Government as he knew it in 1931. Well now if he went back to—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order—Is the honourable member referring to my speech on the budget speech?

MR. POWER: I have heard the honourable gentleman say—

MR. HOLLETT: In the budget speech? I am asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member may not rise with the hackney phrase—A point of Order—The honourable member is out of order. There is no point of order. If he wishes to make an interruption that may be done.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt to say I was about to ask a question and was getting around to it when the Honourable the Premier interrupted me.

MR. POWER: Then we are to assume the honourable gentleman did not want Responsible Government as it existed in 1932. I thought he did. It is my mistake.

MR. HOLLETT: Did I say that in the budget speech?

MR. POWER: It does not matter where—did you want it or did you not? It seems to me you did. Anyway—tax on the people's stomachs—he said—but if we had to go back to 1933 what would he find—that is what he wanted—it would not be taxing but that would be kicking the people in the stomach—fifty per cent duty on bread, canned meats, fruits and things like that. I would be horrified to think what would happen in Newfoundland if tonight you could apply

fifty per cent ad valorem duty such as existed in 1932 to everything that comes into Newfoundland today. No one in Newfoundland would be able to live above the level of poverty.

Now the honourable gentleman does not like the idea of raising a loan. As I mentioned last night, it is accepted practice that every Government in the world follows. It seems that therefore we are allowed to do what every other Government does — The Honourable Leader of the Opposition said, I think, that we would be twenty-five million dollars in debt when we raised this new bond issue.

With the limited experience I have had when you talk about the financial position you must consider your assets as well as your liabilities. The honourable gentleman forgot that we are about eleven million dollars in credit in Ottawa, have nineteen million dollars invested in industrial programmes and, I think, we have around seven millions invested in the Fishery Programme. So that actually, if you take our assets against our liabilities, after we have raised this twelve million dollars loan we will be still very much in the black. As far as loans are concerned, as I mentioned last night, I think it would be unfair to ask the people who live and work in Newfoundland today to pay for all the improvements that we are going to make this year in the public services or money that we are going to invest in Economic Development of the country. In either case it would be wrong to ask those who work in Newfoundland today, this year and pay taxes to pay the full cost of that because generations to come will enjoy these facilities and the jobs that are made available. So that I think it is undeniable that the costs of these things should be spread as far as

possible. The only way we can do that is by raising bond issues for the longest period.

I have heard a lot of discussion here, and I have heard the Premier wonder about the policy of the Opposition. Do they have a policy or do they not? Well, the Opposition have never said they had a policy, at least I have never heard them say. At one time I thought they did. I remember many sleepy afternoons here when the honourable gentlemen were tearing into mouth wipes so that one would think there must be some policy there.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the Honourable Minister to ask a question? Could he inform the House whether or not he has been paid back the ten thousand dollars on mouth wipes?

MR. POWER: The ten thousand dollars on mouth wipes. As far as I remember in respect to mouth wipes, they were of better quality. I think that was proven here one afternoon by the Honourable Minister of Health. Then for some mysterious reason these mouth wipes were not mentioned for, I suppose, about six weeks. Some honourable gentleman had gone off on a new tack. Well there still was not anything that you could get your teeth in, in so far as the Opposition's policy was concerned. So we were wondering and wondering, myself and my honourable colleague on my left, then I heard the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West go over the entries. He had a good many doubts to express about the cement plant. But I think he knew we were trying to sell the cement plant—the gypsum plant I mean—and I feel it is going to be much more difficult to get a good deal now, more than before

the honourable gentleman made his speech. The honourable gentleman should not be so unkind. It belongs to him as well as to others. As far as I know the honourable gentleman would like to have it understood that he goes around suggesting good things to do. Well, the fact that he did not suggest the building of the gypsum plant is his hard luck and not mine.

Anyway, after hearing their talks and their plans and their dire predictions we came to the conclusion that there was a policy — That the Opposition did have a policy—and the only kind of policy it could be was a scorched earth policy — because it seemed that everything we are trying to do for the life and betterment of Newfoundland—the gypsum plant—that is a joke—the cement plant—Ha! Ha! the birch plant—well everything was wrong—all down the line the same thing. All over the country people who otherwise would feel there was some hope for Newfoundland being developed economically and industrially have come to think that the place is hopeless.

If these things cannot succeed, Mr. Speaker, and if Fishery Development cannot succeed then Newfoundland cannot succeed and will eventually be abandoned. If it is abandoned because it can't be developed, what does it matter what was spent. At least those who are satisfied to make a try at it should not receive the cruel and twisted criticism that I have heard voiced here in this House—because in shedding doubt on these things you can only do them harm—I have not heard one word of praise for all the efforts and all the work that has been put into these things by the Premier and by the Cabinet—Now I would not expect—

MR. HOLLETT: Not in the whole country?

MR. POWER: I mean not in this House. Oh yes! the honourable gentlemen have reported at very great length both on the radio and in the press, and when they shed doubt on these things there are people in Newfoundland who think that what they say is true.

Now I am one who believes in the future of Newfoundland, and not for any foolish reason either. I know that as far as the Fishery is concerned I have never seen a live codfish, and I don't know anything about the mechanics of catching fish. But I do know that because of the development of medical science and because of the improved sanitation around the earth the population of the earth has increased and is increasing at a tremendous pace. In fact, in North America in ten years time the population will be sixteen million higher than it is today.

Well, as everyone knows, the production of meat proteins has not at all kept pace with the increase in world population. Everyone knows that people must have proteins to live. The only alternative to meat proteins is fish proteins. Since Newfoundland is undoubtedly richer in fish, I suppose, than any other place on the earth, the time must surely come soon when these proteins will be sought after by the hungry millions of the earth. In fact the meat proteins that are now produced for the most part by commercial feed, contain from 16% to 20% fish proteins. In poultry business I know that all poultry feed contains 17% to 20% fish meal. So that however you look at it, whether the population of the earth is fed by meat protein or not,

there will be a great demand for fish and fish proteins, and an ever increasing demand as time goes on. I have the feeling in my heart that you will see before twenty years time a great and prosperous fishing industry in Newfoundland. The historical time has come for that, in my opinion. not alone have we got great prospects because we have a rich fishery, but we have other very great resources as well.

We have in the Province of Newfoundland the greatest deposits of iron ore in the world. We have the richest deposits of lead and zinc in the world, and, according to the American Mining Authority, we have the greatest deposits of fluorspar in the world, rich fluorspar. Besides that we have, I think, the greatest untouched coniferous forests in the world. As everyone knows, as the populations of the world have risen, the demand for wood products has increased to such an extent that even great countries like the United States have had their forests denuded. Here we are 380 thousand people, and that is a lot of firsts, Mr. Speaker, for 380 thousand people. It is a lot of firsts for a few—a great rich fishing potentiality, great coniferous forests in a world hungry for lumber, pulp and paper great deposits of iron ore, lead, zinc, fluorspar and other great possibilities that I will not speak of now because of my association with NALCO, and of which I have some knowledge.

I am one of those, Mr. Speaker, who believes that Newfoundland's prospects are bright and that the prospects of our children who will live and work here in Newfoundland will be much better than our prospects were. I believe that if we live another twenty or twenty-five years we will see Newfoundland rates, if not the richest per-



capita then one of the richest of the Provinces of this Nation of Canada. I feel that the Liberal Government of Newfoundland will have contributed a great and indispensable contribution to the uplift and betterment of this place we all love so well. That is not foolish sentimentality because when you say you love a place — I think everyone loves the place where his roots are down—If he does not there is something wrong with him. In spite of all the criticism and all the jeers and all the rest of it, we are going to go on trying to make Newfoundland a better place for our children and for our children's children.

Motion that the House now go into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means carried.

Mr. Courage Chairman of the Committee.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know who is looking after this gasoline. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how much is being collected in gasoline at the present time?

HON. E. S. SPENCER: (Minister of Public Works): \$2,000,000.

MR. BROWNE: What is the rate now?

MR. SPENCER: 14c. a gallon.

MR. BROWNE: Is there any other tax levied on it besides that 14c. the Minister gives us? Does the Minister know the landed cost of gasoline?

MR. SPENCER: No.

MR. BROWNE: Because when we come to consider the costs of gasoline in the United States compared to here.

MR. SPENCER: That is a matter for Imperial Oil or the importers, we don't know that.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, why is it being increased a cent a gallon, if there is a surplus already in the budget?

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the present tax is 14c. and, I think, subject to a Federal 10% tax too, and that would bring it to approximately 15½c. a gallon and this will bring the total to about 16½%, over 50% on the cost of gasoline, and the tax in Newfoundland, I believe, is the highest in any Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. FOGWILL: Very few any higher or even equal to it. I believe it is higher than any in the United States.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, the resolution says that it is expedient to bring in a measure to collect an extra cent. Can the Honourable Minister tell us why it is expedient?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: It is all very well to say it is expedient. My honourable colleague on my left says there is about a 50% tax on gasoline in this country. I am reminded of something which the Honourable Minister of Finance said relative to certain taxes prior to Union, very high customs duties and all that sort of thing. I wonder if he would consider we are taxing like that in the present day, prices for instance on gasoline or tinned beans or fruit juices.

MR. POWER: Just imagine 50% ad valorem.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes, just imagine, but not as much as you pay for it now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I think

the honourable members should keep the debate relevant.

MR. HOLLETT: I was trying to draw out from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if it is expedient for some particular purpose. For instance we have a tax for the support of cancer control and we are going to bring in some sort of an educational tax on people for education. Now what is that particular tax for? Very shortly it will be seen that all we are doing here is authorizing the Minister to collect that tax, an extra cent on a gallon of gasoline—I wonder if the Honourable Minister would tell us the expediency for a cent a gallon on gasoline now. It is a tax on travel. I am inclined to think the tax on gasoline is already fairly high in this Province where there are so few roads over which to drive. If the tax on gasoline is to be devoted to improvements of the roads well and good I am happy to agree with the principle involved.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the amount actually collected last year and the Minister of Public Works said it was two million dollars. Now is that correct?

MR. SPENCER: That is about correct.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In round figures.

MR. BROWNE: We must know the exact figures.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Give notice of the question and the exact figures will be produced tomorrow. Does the honourable gentleman think we all carry these figures, hundreds of them, around in our heads? The round figure is two million dollars.

Carried. Preamble carried.

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to raise a loan upon the credit of the Province in the sum not exceeding twelve million (\$12,000,000) dollars.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is not much to be said here now. The Minister has given us, I think, a pretty good idea of where it is to be spent; between roads, fisheries—\$3,000,000 to fisheries, to the Fisheries Authority for distribution. I wonder if he could supply the figures, if he has them in his head—Between five and six million for roads, is it? Over five million on roads. Does the Minister remember what the balance is for?

MR. POWER: Mr. Chairman, all this is in the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is to finance the coming activities of the Government in so far as surplus earnings do not do it.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise us just what the rate of bond interest now might be, approximately? The last one, I remember, was 4%.

MR. POWER: It will be less now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Considerably less.

MR. HIGGINS: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, is the market for this loan assured now?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Our last loan is selling at precisely 106 and we expect this one will be sold at a much better rate than the last one was sold, and I expect a very ready demand for it.

MR. HIGGINS: Have you picked out the broker?

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have been in touch with various financial authorities on the Mainland. At least they have been in touch with us. We were asked by about some half dozen business houses in Canada, each of them, to allow them to handle the issue for us—We can pick and choose between them.

MR. FOGWILL: I understand then it is the intention to float it on the Mainland of Canada. If I may be permitted, Mr. Chairman, to ask a question—When they floated the last ten million dollar loan was not an attempt made to sell that in the United States at first?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. NALCO made an attempt, yes.

Carried.

On motion committee rose to report having agreed to certain resolutions.

On motion said resolutions read a first time; read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance asks leave to introduce a Bill based on said resolutions.

On motion Bill read a first time—"An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Loan on the Credit of the Province" and read a second time.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax"—On motion read a first time.

On motion read a second time.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to go into Committee of the Whole on those two Bills as the wording is rather different than the resolutions—

Motion carried.

Mr. Courage Chairman of Committees.

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money By Way of a Loan on the Credit of the Province", passed without amendment.

On motion a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax", passed without amendment.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bills without amendment. On motion report received. Bills ordered now read a third time. Read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the order paper.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.

---

THURSDAY, June 18, 1954.

#### NIGHT SESSION

The House resumed at 8:00 of the clock.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber Over Streams and Lakes and For Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands".

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines & Resources) Mr. Speaker, originally back in the Reid Contract when Reids were given large tracts of land, and unlike the practice of the present Government were given in fee simple—This Government does not give land in fee simple. Reids were given all these large tracts of land in fee simple. Shortly afterwards, as all the world knows, a great number of disputes arose regarding rivers, passage-way through rivers and particularly

with regard to the three-mile-limit and the traditional rights of Newfoundlanders to cut on that three-mile-limit. As a result of this dispute, quarrels and what not, an Act was passed in 1904 called the "Transportation of Timber Act". It was called that because amongst other things the chief thing in it was that people were given the right to pass through the rivers which were on Reid's tracts even though Reid's were supposed to own the rivers. Also in that Act it was declared legal for citizens generally to cut timber off the three-mile-limit of Reid's blocks, where Reid's blocks went right to the seashore, as they did in many cases. The 1904 Act provided that citizens of the country could cut timber and wood for their own domestic requirements, for fuel and fisheries. However that 1904 concession, valuable as it was, was never very clearly worded and as a result, especially within recent years, some misunderstanding has arisen about it. In this amendment we have here, we state definitely and clearly what the rights of the Crown are on this three-mile-limit. In other words we assert and define the rights of Crown Lands on this Reid's timber. Nevertheless in asserting such a right we have, at the same time, to protect certain interests of the Reid's. For example: Their right to go through the three-mile-limit to get to the hinterland of their blocks.

This amendment then defines and asserts the Crown's rights to timber on the Reid's blocks where those blocks are part of what we call the three-mile-limit.

I move second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

I might say, I have here the 1904 Act, in case any honourable members would care to have a look at it.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, not having seen the original Act and not having seen this amending Act honourable members will appreciate how difficult it is to make any comment on it or the observations of the Honourable Minister. But taking them as he stated them—I believe what they really involve is a declaration on behalf of the public that the three-mile-limit where it conflicted with the areas claimed by the Reid's—that the three-mile-limit belongs to the Crown.

DR. ROWE: The timber on it.

MR. BROWNE: And that the public have the same rights in respect of that as they have on any other Crown Lands within the three-mile limit?

DR. ROWE: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: That is the declaration the Crown is making. Has there been—the Minister can tell me when he answers—any negotiations with the Reid Newfoundland Company on that score? Because these rights, as the Minister well knows, were given the Reid's in consideration of their building the railway many years ago, and were similar to those which were given in Canada to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies when they were built. But remember in those days there was no sentiment for great stretches along the railroad and only small sections were occupied. So it seems to me that all we would have to criticize in the Bill would be if it were an infringement of any rights which have been acquired—

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, there is no schedule to this Bill. There is a schedule here but it does not happen to be in the Act, for some reason or other. I can quite see it is a good Bill. It makes law what is already law, of course, that timber on the

three-mile-limit belongs to the Crown. Is there any schedule to this Act, I wonder, Mr. Speaker? If there is I should like to have a look at it.

MR. CURTIS: I have the original Act here before me, Mr. Speaker. The areas are all set forth in the schedule, and consist of about forty areas of land.

MR. HOLLETT: In what parts of the country?

MR. CURTIS: Mostly on the West Coast although there is some at Gambo and some at Clode Sound and Dunville, Random Island, West of St. John's, North Harbour, Come-By-Chance, and certain land on the West Coast. The original Act is dated 1904 and was not brought into the consolidation of 1914. I think there was always some question as to whether or not it was a private or a Public Act. Because the Act says: Whereas the Reid Newfoundland Company is entitled to certain lands—it immediately begins to cut down their rights. So far as I can see it looks to me the Reid's still own the land but did not have the right to cut timber on it—It is a most unusual Act—It came up recently in the Supreme Court in a case involving the floating of logs in Salmonier River.

MR. HIGGINS: And is coming up in another case.

MR. CURTIS: Because it is a general Act and seems to make reservations around lakes—Nevertheless I think that has been interpreted by the Courts as a Public Act. In any event the position is that in that original Act it said that the areas of lands marked down and described and set forth in the schedule — In other words it shall not be lawful for the company to sell, lease or use or cut or

permit to be cut thereon wood or timber for any purpose.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, may I just ask the Attorney General this question—We had, I understand, alternate blocks of so many square miles—Was not that the way it was granted? Where the railway ran close to the shore then he would be on the three-mile-limit, is that the position?

MR. CURTIS: I have really never seen the plan. I suppose it is up at the Department of Mines and Resources now. But apparently the Reid's owned the freehold although they had no right to cut the timber nor use the timber on it. This Act just defines the right of the Government with respect thereto. I might say the Department has been in touch with Mr. Gordon Stirling, representative of Bowaters, who I think actually owns most of the areas in question. I understand that the Act which we have before us has been amended in accordance with their agreement, and they have accepted this Act with the amendments. So that I don't think the House should have any hesitation nor any feeling that any private interests are being disturbed. The only reservations that Bowaters wanted was the right to cut roads through the property to get to their own property inside. This Bill gives them that right, and also provides what is to be done with the wood cut down in such cases.

DR. ROWE: Some of Reid's property was far from the railway and somewhere in the area lying between Cape Freels and Gander Bay. As the Attorney General said, we do respect the rights of Reids in this—For example: Nobody is allowed to put up a log cabin without the consent of the Reids. Also if they want to develop a mine or anything like that on

their land they have the right then to do that.

On motion Bill read a second time—On motion referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act":

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, two years ago this House passed a Timber License (Reversion to Crown) Act, bringing back to the Crown large numbers of tracts of timber land. Last year an amendment to that was made which excepted certain areas for reasons which we explained then. Now this amendment merely states that where such exemption was made the land may not be transferred nor disposed of without the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That, I think, is the essence of that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I think we will have to agree with this one because, like the other one, it is most peculiarly written. I understand the Minister of Mines and Resources much better than I do this.

On motion, Bill read a second time—On motion ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour this day.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, when the House was in Committee on Ways and Means I submitted some resolutions which increased the salaries of the Auditor General and the Controller of Finance to ten thousand dollars from nine thousand dollars a year. The House in Committee on Ways and Means did not consider these

resolutions because they felt they were resolutions for Committee on Supply. But as supply had been voted and as the amount of \$10,000 for these two officials appeared in the estimates I take it that perhaps the House would give leave to introduce them as a bill to Amend the Audit Act, to fix these two salaries which are statutory. If my honourable friends will look at the estimates, Mr. Allan was put down at \$10,000 and Mr. Marshall also. But the Act dealing with the appointment of these two officials says they are not to be paid more than \$9,000. Therefore I would ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act" so that we can carry out the actual amount and pay them the amount that has been voted—If the House is prepared to do so?

MR. HOLLETT: We could move to go into Committee.

MR. CURTIS: I do that Mr. Speaker,—I move we go into Committee on Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of Supply is on the Order Paper—I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. Courage Chairman of Committee.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply I wish to bring up another matter, which I wished to raise the other day and could not do it because the Committee had already been sitting.

This, I think, is a very important matter. As it may be the last opportunity that I shall have of bringing it up I would like to do so now. I think when honourable members hear it, if they don't know the facts, they will think it is incredible that such



a thing as I am going to describe should happen here.

For a long time I have heard various rumours about it, and the way that the Board of Liquor Control has been granting licenses to applicants and the juggling that has gone on in connection with the issuing of these. I have heard that they are not being fairly and impartially administered and given out, and that friends of the Government are preferred to other people when it comes to the question of issuing licenses. Recently I was informed by a prominent citizen representing a group renting a building known as the "Avalon Club" situated at Long Pond, Manuels, and carrying on the business of a club, so called, there for about three years. They were accustomed to engaging some person to act as manager. Now I might say it was not a club within the meaning of the Act but a club such as those other clubs we have heard so much about, like the "Old Mill". It sold liquors. In February 1953 they engaged a certain gentleman to act as manager. I believe they let it to him for carrying on the business there, and they supplied the liquors, which were delivered, and the club was opened. The license was paid. They were operating two days only when it was suddenly closed by the Board of Liquor Control. The gentleman who told me of this transaction told me he had received two letters successively. One letter was to the effect that the manager he had engaged was not qualified to act as an operator, and was not qualified to hold an operator's license, and therefore he could not conduct the club. Then he received a second letter cancelling his license, and returning his cheque for \$200.

The gentleman who informed me said he interviewed the manager who

said: "That will be all right, I will clear that up." He arranged an interview with the Attorney General and went to the office of the Attorney General, as it was only a matter of discussion. The Attorney General suggested to my informant that he send a letter to the Board of Liquor Control saying he wished to have that other party appointed and that he would get an operator's license. He could not believe he had received from the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control a letter stating the manager was not qualified. Then he went to the Chairman, and the Chairman told him the same thing—"You write me a letter and the matter will receive immediate attention." He wrote the letter and delivered it at 4:00 o'clock in the afternoon, when the Chairman was not present in the building. Monday morning he telephoned and said that the Board had met and had given the matter serious consideration and the license would be granted, to send in the \$200 and he would get his license.

So he did send in the \$200, and he got the license and opened the business and carried on for another year. They paid the renewal of the license this year, 1954, and he was talking to the Chairman of the Board, telling him all the expenses he had been put to and how he had a new manager engaged this year and had spent some money getting fixed up etc. He left the Board of Liquor Control and went out on the street. There he was accosted by another citizen who said to him: "I want to see you a minute, I have a license for Manuels." He said, "What do you mean, you have a license for Manuels?"

"We got the license for Manuels. We are going to operate in your club, the Avalon Club."

He answered, "No you are not. You must be crazy!" "We sent in our cheque and have been carrying on now since the first of the year."

So a day or two later he went back to the Board of Liquor Control and saw an official of the Board, Mr. Vincent, and said to him:

"I met a person on the street here a day or so ago, and he told me he had a license for Mannels and that he is going to operate in our club. This is a strange thing to happen. This is not right. This is wrong, because we have spent hundreds of dollars to fix it up and we are all set to go."

"Well," Mr. Vincent said, "Did you not get the letter we sent you?"

"No," he answered; "I did not get any letter."

"Well, a letter was sent to your office by hand."

"Well, he replied, perhaps you can look up your files and tell me the contents of the letter."

Mr. Vincent looked up the files and said; "I am sorry to have to tell you your license was cancelled and is going to another party. Another party got it."

So this gentleman was referred to the firm of Mercer and Mifflin and he conducted negotiations with Mr. Mifflin, and had to sell out his interest in the business.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that this is a very strange occurrence and deserving of investigation. The Board of Liquor Control is a public body. I know the appointments are political, but they have certain duties laid down which are supposed to be carried out

and they are supposed, like everybody else to administer the law without fear or favour. They are not doing it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that all the words after the word "that" be stricken out in the motion and the following inserted instead:—"In the opinion of this House consideration should be given to the question of setting up a commission of inquiry, under the Public Inquiries Act, for the purpose of investigating the manner in which functions of the Board of Liquor Control have been administered during the past two years."

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I second that motion.

MR. SPEAKER: There is an amendment offered to the motion "I do now leave the Chair."

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support that motion. I think the motion is to set up a board of inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act to investigate the Board of Liquor Control. Let me say right now, Sir, I have great admiration for the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control. I have known him for a number of years. I am not what you call friendly or not a particular friend of his or he of me. But I do know his reputation, and I say right here now, I have every respect for him. So that nothing I may say will be taken, I trust, to cast any aspersions upon the integrity of the Chairman. There are vicious rumours or stories coming to the ears of the Opposition. It is known of course that we as an Opposition do receive complaints from people, and we have seen enough to know that a good many of these complaints are unfounded. Some of them probably are from people who are disgusted etc. We take that into con-

sideration. But I do know there are various cases of either mal-administration in the Board of Liquor Control or some lack of proper administration in regard to carrying out the Liquors Act. I mentioned the fact here a day or so ago of a complaint having come to me, as Leader of the Opposition, from a group of people in another district, not my own district at all, in which they stated they had some months ago forwarded a petition to the proper authorities for presentation to this House and that that petition has not yet been presented to this House. This petition came from Burin. I myself have spoken to the member for Burin on that matter. He informed me that he did not receive the petition in the first instance but only a copy, and that the petition went in to the Board of Liquor Control. We can all see therefore that it was somebody's duty to see that the petition arrived into this House and was presented. I think sufficient thought should have been given to the feelings of the several hundred people who signed that petition in the District of Burin, to be presented to this House, sufficient thought should have been given to their feelings to have the petition at least read and referred to the proper authorities. That was not done. Now there is one instance where the wishes of a large number of people have been either overridden or ignored in a manner which I don't think is correct. I don't believe the Honourable the Premier, who is the Leader of the Government, would be satisfied to have that happen, if he knew it had happened.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member is speaking strictly to the amendment now.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I

am citing some cases that would indicate there should be a necessity of an inquiry. If I have overstepped the bounds, Sir, I apologize. Would I be correct, Sir, in referring to one other instance where I deemed it—I want to give one which would justify the remarks I am making in support of the measure, if I may, Mr. Speaker, without overstepping the bounds. I want to make reference once again to a petition which was presented on behalf of a number of people in the district of my honourable and learned friend on my right and myself from St. John's West. That was in connection with the opening or closing of a certain club, so called, in the district of St. John's West. No apparent attention has been given to that petition although we are informed that some seven or eight hundred people living in the area or in the vicinity of that club expressed their desire by petition and sent it either here or to the Board of Liquor Control. No action has been taken in the area or in the vicinity of that petition, although that may have been done. I had no knowledge of the petition. I had nothing to do with it coming in here. But I think, Sir, any petition coming in to the Government should be presented here, particularly on this important question of petitions coming in relevant to the Administration of the Board of Liquor Control. The Board of Liquor Control can only do the best they can to carry out the Act, and I know that in a few instances the Act under which the Board is set up has clauses therein which may be interpreted very widely. Even on the definition of a club, there seems to be quite a latitude. I think there is a case for investigation as to what constituted a club or how far the Board of Liquor Control may go in giving a license to a club to sell hard

liquors in certain areas in this country. The advisability, Sir, of having agents here, hither and yon all over the country to sell the products or at least the goods of the Board of Liquor Control is another matter which might be gone into. We know that everybody now is looking for a beer license. Only tonight when I went home from this House a letter was on the table awaiting me from a man in another district, a man I don't know, complaining he had applied for a beer license to the Board of Liquor Control and to his member, one of the Northern Districts, and he had not even received the courtesy of a reply. He was written to me to ask if I could get the license for him to sell beer. Whilst I don't think I would have any success even if I tried to get a license for that poor man—But there is something lacking, Sir, when the Board of Liquor Control is coming under the criticism of people who even in some cases themselves are anxious to have dealings with that Board.

I strongly support the motion made by my honourable and learned friend from St. John's West for the setting up of this Royal Commission of Inquiry, and I hope that, if the Government feels so disposed that they will put it into the hands of the Minister, and I know they will all be fair-minded and will give the whole thing favourable consideration. Let me repeat here again that the Chairman of this Board, in my opinion, even though some mal-administration may have gone on, is one of the finest, most decent of Christians the Government could have had when they took over the Board of Liquor Control from the Commission of Government.

Thank you, Sir!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

the selection of the Chairman, of the Board of Liquor Control was my own personal choice, and my colleagues in the Cabinet agreed with my choice, so the appointment was made. The choice of members of the board was my choice—My colleagues agreed with me—So the appointments were made. The first Chairman was the honourable gentleman who is now the Minister of Finance. He was replaced by a very close and intimate personal friend of mine in the person of Mr. Anthony Mullowney. Mr. Mullowney and I together in his home at Gander launched the Confederation Campaign in Newfoundland. Tony Mullowney and I, just the two of us, in his home and in his office. He was then Superintendent of the works at the building of the Royal Air Force Transport Command at Gander and had a suite of offices in his own building. That was the building belonging to that one Department. He had an apartment there. We virtually lived together in the sense that I spent a great deal of my time in his home at night and in his office in the day time. It was in his office and on his typewriter that I wrote the first letters of the series of letters on Confederation I published in the Daily News. So that when my close friend, the present Minister of Finance, resigned his position as Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control I thought at once of Mr. Mullowney, because he is a man of undoubted integrity, of outstanding ability. From the moment he went in there as Chairman of the Board I have never heard a single whisper suggesting he was not operating the Board with great efficiency and great objectivity and great honesty. I am not satisfied from anything that has been said here tonight that that is not still the case. I see no reason in the world,

not the slightest hint of a reason for appointing a public inquiry into the administration of the Board of Liquor Control. There has never been a board of any kind in Newfoundland associated with the Government that has been so honestly and so efficiently operated as the Board of Liquor Control. To suggest that a public inquiry be made into it is simply ridiculous, and I shall vote against it.

**MR. HIGGINS:** Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding characteristics of the Honourable the Premier, and an admirable characteristic and one for which I must say I have always honoured him is his loyalty. But a serious charge has been raised here if the statements made by my honourable colleagues are based on facts. Then I suggest the assurance of the Premier that he is personally satisfied and personally confident—

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Will the honourable gentleman yield? I don't want to speak again. But I ought to have added that I will personally investigate this with Mr. Muldowney and have him explain to me personally all the circumstances surrounding the cases alleged by my honourable friends. My honourable friend knows himself, and I understand, it is the Treasurer of the Tory Party, Mr. Claude Hall who is the person concerned.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Claude Hall has no official position whatsoever with the Progressive Conservative Party. Now if there is a Tory Party in the town perhaps he is, but I know he has no connection with us, Sir, I want to correct that.

**MR. HIGGINS:** As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the Premier's assurance that he himself is prepared to go into this matter. I have no doubt he will. I am prepared to ac-

cept the honesty of his statement that he is himself perfectly satisfied of the integrity of the Chairman of the Board. Indeed whilst I cannot claim acquaintanceship with Mr. Muldowney what little I do know of him certainly leads me to believe he is everything we have been assured he is. Certainly he is a most courteous gentleman with whom to deal. That is not the point, Sir. The point is that the Premier asks this House to accept the fact that he is satisfied that there is nothing wrong. We have been told on other occasions about another person whom it is unnecessary to name, that this man is beyond the shadow of any suspicion. Later it was found out that confidence so generously given was found to be misplaced. I cannot speak with any certainty as to the truth of the statements made by my honourable and learned friend. I can speak with some knowledge of the fact that the statements have been made and made openly within the past year, not only to me but to many people who have repeated, second-hand though it may have been, and in the retelling they may have been distorted. It may be perhaps that an injustice may have been done. But, Mr. Speaker, as long as statements like these are made openly by people who, to the best of my knowledge, are entitled to believe that an ugly feeling persists and there may be some basis in fact for them, if there is even the slightest basis for believing anything is wrong, then I think to apply the principle raised by the Honourable the Premier himself with reference to other matters, it should be investigated. For that reason, Sir, knowing as I do some of the statements, not vouching for the facts but only to say I have heard that same story in various circumstances, I will support the motion.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word to that. I have some knowledge of what went on up to a while ago in that place called the Avalon Club. Now I don't think the party under discussion has much to complain of by way of discrimination because he already has another premises. But as far as I remember he got that during my term of office with the Board of Liquor Control, and they operated the place for a few months and it was closed half the time and open sometimes. Anyway the next thing we knew they had rented the whole thing, license, building and all to another party, I think, by the name of Doyle, without any consultation whatsoever with the Board of Liquor Control, which, of course, is highly irregular. We called them in and had a talk about it, and let that go. Then there was another operator. I may say that the condition of the place was anything but satisfactory under him. I know that the inspectors closed it up several times. Anyway there were a lot of things happened. I heard some of them, people phoned me about it. But I do know that Mr. Hall has not been persecuted in any way. He has, as I say, another license in St. John's. The very fact that he can continue his license would not be regarded as persecution. Even if he were refused, as the Act goes, there is no appeal against the decision of the Board, and I don't see what there is to investigate.

MR. MERCER: Mr. Speaker, it is very rarely that I rise to speak on an occasion of this sort, and I would hesitate to do so this evening, Sir, if it were not for the fact that, in my

opinion, the honourable and learned member for St. John's West has deliberately tried to malign my firm, and I have no intention of taking it.

MR. BROWNE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable and learned gentleman is imputing a motive to me. I did not deliberately try to malign his firm. That is, not deliberately. I suggest he is out of order in saying that.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman ought not to make that remark that the honourable member had deliberately tried to malign his firm.

MR. MERCER: All right, Sir, I shall withdraw the word "deliberately" and proceed to explain how the honourable gentleman came into possession of these facts and it is then up to this House and the public in general to deduce from what I say now whether he did or did not.

Well, Sir, the company which operates the Avalon Club at the present time, the principal shareholder of that company, is a client of mine and has been for some fifteen years. So that it was not a case of his being told on the street by Claude Hall or anyone else to go up and see Mercer and Mifflin and get your license. I want you to understand now, Mr. Speaker, I had nothing absolutely nothing, to do, no dealings whatsoever with this tavern or club. I do know what went on. I also understood that for some months this club was closed and the last manager put there by the owners, one of which was the person who told the story of the honourable and learned gentleman from St. John's West, had been before the Supreme Court on several occasions



by writ, so that they finally had to get rid of him, and the Board of Liquor Control had to close him up. That was done some months before. I believe, Sir, that I have just as good a source of information on this as and perhaps better than the honourable and learned member from St. John's West. The owners were trying for some time to sell the club or to sell the furniture and finally the man who had been a client of mine for several years told me he was going to get a license there and asked me if we would incorporate his company. He was held up for about ten times the amount that the club property was worth and finally it was sold for about five times what it was worth not because he was trying to get rid of it, because of the gentleman who was manager of that club against whom several writs had been issued and if somebody had not taken over and paid up the same, the informant of my honourable and learned friend would have had to pay it out of his own pocket. He was trying to get rid of it as best he could. I can tell my honourable and learned friend right here and now, regardless of my honourable and learned friends being quite incensed or not that it is absolutely false and distorted in every way.

MR. BROWNE: Surely it is a matter of record—If I may answer the honourable gentleman. It is a matter of record this license was taken away on February 1953 and restored and they operated for a whole year afterwards and then it expired, as far as that man's operations were concerned—

MR. MERCER: They carried on several months without anybody being there because several writs had been issued against the manager, and they

could not get anyone to go there and were losing money. Then he comes along and gives these false, distorted facts to the honourable and learned gentleman. I can assure this House that if we have an inquiry the honourable and learned gentleman will be ashamed of himself for taking that information and bringing it into the House.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, as a person living in this town I hear lots of rumours in connection with how the licenses are issued by the Board of Liquor Control, but I don't generally pay any attention to such rumours which I hear every day and every week, as the case may be, as to how you should go about getting a license to operate a tavern or a club, I pay no attention to it. But, Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by my honourable friend and learned member for St. John's West of this matter and how the method is used to issue licenses. It is on those grounds, Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this motion that a commission of inquiry be appointed to look into this question. I have no reason at all to disbelieve my honourable and learned friend, in fact I do believe him. I don't think he would bring forward this motion unless he had some valid reason and facts which he had on hand are true. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do support this motion that a commission of inquiry be appointed to look into methods of issuing licenses to clubs, etc. I thank you very much, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable and learned member for St. John's West cannot speak again. Let me say here—He did not say he was producing facts. He made it quite clear he was reporting what had been said to him.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I don't as a rule speak on this matter either. In fact I cannot claim to have any particular knowledge of these affairs for reasons that are fairly well known. I do submit, Mr. Speaker, there are some grave and serious problems connected with the whole business of liquor. That has been well enunciated here by both sides of the House this year. Now after what I heard here tonight on this matter and particularly after listening to the remarks made by my honourable and learned friend from Port de Grave it would seem to me that it might be very well for the honourable member who has made that amendment to suggest now that an investigation be made into his friends who supplied him with the information, and I don't know them—I don't know any of them.

MR. BROWNE: He is willing to come in.

MR. SPEAKER: Order—Is the House ready for the question?

MR. CURTIS: —

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable minister will close the debate. The motion to leave the Chair was made by the honourable the Attorney General.

MR. CURTIS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say my name was brought into this. I have a vague recollection of these people coming in to see me as does, it seems to me, practically everybody who has a grievance against any department in the government. These people came to me, and if my recollection serves me right, I got in touch with the Chairman of the Board and found out what the difficulty was and advised them how to settle it. As far as I am concerned that is my only interest in it.

MR. SPEAKER: To the motion that I do now leave the Chair an amendment was offered. The motion is now that the words "I do now leave the Chair" shall stand part of the question. Those who vote "Aye" will therefore vote against the amendment. Those who vote "Nay" will be voting for the amendment.

Motion put.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the "Ayes" have it.

MR. BROWNE: Divide.

On division:

"Ayes"—Hon. the Premier, Hon. Mr. Curtis, Hon. Mr. Keough, Hon. Mr. Power, Hon. Mr. Murray, Hon. Mr. Ballam, Hon. Mr. Hefferton, Hon. Mr. Spencer, Hon. Dr. Rowe, Mr. Brown, Mr. Bulton, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer.

"Nays"—Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill, Mr. Higgins.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, before that question is put—There is a matter to which I would like to revert, and I am not quite sure if I am in order. This is by way of a grievance. Yesterday in committee in reply to a question addressed to the Honourable the Premier when I asked him if the loan to Mr. MacLellan meant that in effect the Government were subsidizing him to the detriment of local companies operating the present ferry service, the answer I was given was to the general effect that neither of these companies had shown any interest in improving their service.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not say quite that. I said—and I repeat now—I asked them if they would under-

take a really modern, streamlined service on that tickle and neither of them was willing to do it. The company that came nearest to it is the firm that is controlled by George Neal Limited, but the other firm would not. As a matter of fact the other firm refused point blank the repeated request of the Public Utilities Board to lay the necessary information before it.

MR. HIGGINS : On this point, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I was this morning contacted by the operators of the "Kipawa", at least one of the operators, who had seen in the "Daily News" some reference to the question and the answer made by the Honourable the Premier. He advised me that as far back as the Autumn of 1952 the question of ferry operations was discussed by his company, the company operating the "Maneco", the company controlled by the Neals, and the Premier; and that the Premier felt it was essentially a matter for private enterprise, and, so I am informed, suggested to them that amalgamation might be the best way of ensuring a good service.

Mr. George Crosbie was the one who told me that from that time onward the two companies gave continual attention to the matter especially as regard to the new vessel for the run, one designed to meet the conditions peculiar to that tickle. They told me they consulted a shipbuilder in the Province of Nova Scotia and they referred them to the builders in the United Kingdom. Indeed he told me that he had sometime ago contacted the Public Utilities Board and submitted to them a plan or plans, I am not quite clear on that, of the type of vessel they proposed. Of course before the company could go ahead and build or buy, I am not quite sure of that, or acquire, we will say, and have the

vessel made available they wanted some guarantee that they could get a franchise. Up to this morning they had received no definite answer one way or the other.

The reason it is important, Sir, is that as a result of that information he referred me to an agreement which he said existed, a copy of which I subsequently obtained from the Department of the Registrar of Deeds in our court house here. Here it is, an agreement made November 19, 1953, between Mr. MacLellan and a company known as the Newfoundland Transportation Company Limited, a company duly incorporated under the Law of the Province of Newfoundland, etc., dated, as I say, November 1953, whereby Mr. MacLellan as vendor agreed to sell 64 shares of the vessel to this corporation and also agreed, in the words of the agreement, the vendor will obtain for the purchaser an exclusive franchise to operate a ferry service between Portugal Cove and Bell Island in the Province of Newfoundland for the purchase price or consideration of \$175,000. Now that was the vessel and the franchise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly concerned with whether Mr. MacLellan made money on this deal, or whether it was our money used to finance it. The point I do make is this, Sir: if there is anything to this undertaking on his part to provide an exclusive franchise I do feel, Sir, that our local interests seem to have been sadly neglected more particularly if there is any truth to the statement made by Mr. George Crosbie that they have, in fact, both companies been actively pursuing this matter some time past, and have gone to the expense of executing the plan or plans of the proposed vessel and submitting it to the Department of Public Util-

ities. I do feel, Sir, that matter having been brought to my attention, it was duty to bring it to the attention of the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr, Speaker, on that point—I stated here the other day and earlier tonight, and I repeat it now, all of this arose at the time of the almost complete breakdown of the ferry service between Portugal Cove and Bell Island, when the whole population of Bell Island were up in arms, held a public meeting and appointed a public committee, a very representative committee, of somewhere between ten and twenty members; all of them came over and interviewed me and asked if I could do something to remedy the situation. I began at once interviewing the two companies concerned, one of which is George Neal Limited, which I did on the telephone, the other being the firm headed by Mr. George Crosbie, whom I approached through intermediaries, as we don't happen to be on the best and most intimate personal terms. So I got a very close friend of mine and a close friend of his to approach him and deal with him on the matter. Nothing came of any of it, nothing, positively nothing. It ended in a complete vacuum, nothing, emptiness, nothing. Much more, after six or nine months I got the present deal lined up through Mr. MacLellan by merely asking him to come to see me about something else. He did not occur to me as a man who could solve the problem. He came in to see me about some business problem, and I said: "You are the very man to take over a headache I got." He asked what that was. I told him the ferry system or lack of one for Portugal Cove - Bell Island. I asked him if he would tackle it and see what he could do. He told me, if you want me to

I will. A few weeks later he came in and said: "I got your problem solved. I got the boat, everything, but I have not quite enough money to buy it. He asked if the government would lend him some money. I said: "I believe we will." That was months after I had ceased to hear a single syllable—I will say this: George Crosbie was stubbornly and determinedly refusing point blank to have anything to do with the Public Utilities Board. He defied them. He refused information which they felt they had a perfect right under law to demand. He refused it quite point blank and continued ignoring them and virtually told them to "go to Hell."

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The words are in quotations which I am using, Mr. Speaker. Although I think in the end he did back down, I believe the Public Utilities Board threatened the full law on him, and in the end the Board either went in to examine the accounts of the company or at that point they caved in and gave the information required. But the deal with MacLellan came about long after all attempts had failed completely to get anything done by these two companies. Now the one of the two companies which appeared to be most willing was George Neal Limited. Mr. W. R. Neal himself, with whom I talked, did seem to be interested in the matter and anxious to do something about it, but in the end he had to give up. Now I am most interested but not too terribly impressed to hear that the two companies had been working like trojans ever since to try and work up an amalgamation. I would like to know how long after all this happened they submitted this plan. I think this has been going on about two years.

MR. HIGGINS: Only last year you voted the loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is so, but two years I think—I am speaking from memory, and a lot of things have happened—but I think it is about two years, since the situation arose first.

MR. HIGGINS: If I remember correctly the "Kipawo" was out of action and there was only one boat.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was in 1952.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. MacLellan only appeared on the scene about twelve months ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. Therefore, as I said, it was months and months after this thing cropped up first. I approached these two companies while the deputation was still in here in St. John's from Bell Island. They came in here while the trouble was still on. I approached the two companies and for five or six months after that before I was able to find a solution in the person of Mr. MacLellan. I think it is excellent. Cutting passenger rates and freight rates and giving an up-to-date service, and I am not too worried about the two companies concerned, not worried at all.

He authorized me to announce a 20% reduction right off. I have announced publicly that the rates are going to be cut by 20% for passengers and freight rates. Whereas the other two companies were demanding an increase. Now where should our sympathies lie?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Perhaps it was because of the extremely, I will say, parliamentary conduct of the

Honourable and Learned Member for St. John's East that I did not interrupt him in his so-called grievance. I want to say this though: in the opinion of the Chair it is not a grievance but merely a renewal of the past debate in which the honourable member brought new evidence to support a question raised last night. I think his question in that matter might more properly have been taken up when questions were called on the Orders of the Day.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I can say it won't happen again. I was afraid I might not have the chance later.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Certain Resolutions—

On motion Committee rose to report having passed the resolutions without amendments. On motion report received. On motion the Committee asked leave to sit again.

On motion said resolutions read a first time, read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney General asks leave to bring in a Bill based on certain Resolutions—"An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act".

On motion read a first time, read a second time.

MR. CURTIS: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether you intend to have this Bill go through Committee. It has been discussed already. I move that the bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading on Bill, "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases":

MR. SPEAKER: The debate on second reading of this bill was continued by the honourable and learned member for St. John's West.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I think you will appreciate that ever since the Minister of Provincial Affairs moved the second reading of this Bill that we did not have much time to give it any prolonged consideration. In fact we did not have time to give it any attention at all.

I know that this Bill when it becomes law will be read with the Civil Service Act, the Memorial University Pensions Act, the Education (Teachers Pensions) Act of the revised statutes, and as one reads it one sees that it is intended to apply to persons who have been formerly employed as civil servants or employed with the Memorial University or employed as members of the teaching profession generally, and it also applies to members of the Constabulary, and who were once members of the Constabulary, and members of the ranger force who retired from their positions and contested an election for the return of members to the Parliament at Ottawa or to the House of Assembly. Now since 1949, going back to that memorable day, at any time from that day on, a person, it says, I presume, has been or will be employed in the various capacities which I have mentioned, and is not eligible to receive a pension or a gratuity on his retirement. Such a person, when he attains the age when he would have received a pension, if he were still employed or if because he became ill mentally or physically would have been retired, would become eligible for a pension just the same even

though he had left the services of the Government fifteen or twenty years ago.

Now there is a provision, of course, in this Bill that determines whether a pension, allowance or gratuity may be awarded to such persons, the only service which may be taken into account, i.e., to say, if he had put in ten or twenty or fifteen years he will get credit for that. It might not amount to a lot of money but a man serving in the police force or at Memorial University or the Department of Justice or any other department and goes into political life and stays until he reaches the age of 65 can then come back to the Government and say; about that little retirement gratuity or pension to which I am entitled, for which the Minister of Provincial Affairs has brought in a bill in 1954. I think I have a little sum there—I think you should give me interest too. I don't know if there is any provision for it, but it would be nice. If there is not such a provision I think when we get into committee an amendment will be made to provide for interest at the normal rate of say 3%, the same as in the Savings Bank.

This bill seems to fit in with certain amendments made to another bill which is before the House in regard to the civil service. Now I have never heard of anything like this. I wish when the Minister is replying he would tell us if there is any precedent for it. We are living in such a strange new world now that anything is likely to have happened, and it may be that the Minister can point to some precedent. I have never heard of it before. I don't believe it is in the English Act, in fact I feel sure it is not nor in the Canadian Act because once a person leaves the service, if he resigns, then he is finished.



I believe this bill too also provides a pension for his widow if he should die. In other words even though he is not a member of the civil service or of the teaching profession or of Memorial University or anything else he is building up a certain royalty which will be tardily rewarded. I don't know—perhaps the Minister can tell me whether I will be entitled to that myself. I spent fifteen years as a judge, a very small judge, the Premier told me.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A magistrate.

MR. BROWNE: No a judge—ex-officio magistrate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A sort of a courtesy title.

MR. BROWNE: No, Mr. Speaker, a position in which a long line of distinguished men preceded me. I did my best to live up to it at a time when the amount of business was very much greater than it was when my predecessor was there. I might say the position of judge of the District Court was a very old position. Originally there were two of them. Perhaps my honourable and learned friend, the Attorney General, can remember there were two there, Judge Conroy and I believe Judge Knight. I don't know whether Judge Little was. Back in the old days anyhow the original position in St. John's was to have two judges, and there was one judge of the district court at Harbour Grace. I am sure there will be many people in the civil service now, although I suppose there were not many, who would have gone into politics to be members of one Legislature or the other—I don't know what is going to happen if they get defeated sometime.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On this side?

MR. BROWNE: On either side—You know, "the fortunes of war." The Premier is too well acquainted with the history of political life in this country not to know that the pitcher that goes to the well, etc., will some day be broken.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is the old school.

MR. BROWNE: Yes—And though he may have learned a lot from the mistakes of others he must remember that still stands true, no matter how popular a man may be, the time will come when people will weary of him and look for someone else. However, the point I was making was this: Where a person has gone into politics and does not win, in the two years mentioned in the Act he has to be re-appointed. I think he would have to be a humble soul or a person assured of sympathetic ears when he appealed to go along for reinstatement. I know encouragement has been offered to some people to do that, but the people I am thinking of did not feel humble enough at the time to do it.

This is an interesting bill. It is a pity the Minister did not tell us more about it, how he came to think it up and what was the origin of it because I am sure it is deserving of an article in some of the humorous magazines.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, just a word or two.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that a promise?

MR. HOLLETT: I did not get the remark. I shall remember when we adjourn to pick it up. I said a few words about a similar Act referred to by my honourable and learned friend. In my opinion this Act and the other Act are the first beginning of the

undermining of the civil service in this country, when a man, like the Premier if you like, can go into some office in some departmental setup and say, I want you to go to Green Bay, all right, get ready—Your pension is all taken care of, go and represent the Government, and if you don't get elected that is taken care of too. That, Sir, is something which any Government, not referring particularly to this Government, will hold over the head of good and reliable men in the civil service who have probably spent ten or fifteen or twenty years in the civil service. I think they should have written across the face of it, Sir, "For service rendered" a bill for services rendered since 1st April 1949. As I look across at the opposite side of the House I see men who at that time and since were members of the civil service. I look to Ottawa and see them. I see men there, two of them, who come under that, Professor Fraser and Mr. Power, both members of the House of Commons.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three.

MR. HOLLETT: They are here being looked after for services rendered. And Ranger Stick.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No Stick is out.

MR. HOLLETT: Who is the other? You are only upsetting me. You see I get upset very easily lately. This is for services rendered and it should be written across the face of that bill. Because we do know there are people who since the 1st of April 1949 and prior to the 1st of April 1949 worked hard to try and carry out the plans of the Premier on the opposite side of the House, the Government side of the House—He also paid off a man last year, but that man is not here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is very pleased about that.

MR. HOLLETT: He was paid off last year, Sir. Well I have no objection to it, Mr. Speaker, no great objection to the Bill. I believe a man who works hard in the civil service or in the teaching profession and is misguided enough sometime in his life to get out and go out into politics, I think he should be really looked after, I almost think he should be taken out of circulation all together and put somewhere where they do put people. It is not an easy life in politics, and I think some of them are going to be very disappointed if they think that by going into politics they are really going to enjoy life, because I assure them they won't enjoy it too well if we continue to put this country in the state of debt that we are getting in at the moment. Sir, I will dub this bill now, and this will be known hereafter as the Act passed by the Legislature in the year of Our Lord 1954 at the request of the Honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs for services rendered by teachers, rangers, professors.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And judges.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable member who occupied that seat, does he come into that too?

MR. SMALLWOOD: You don't suggest that would make any difference to the honourable and learned member.

MR. HOLLETT: The honourable member who sits here?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I grant he does not sit over here.

MR. HOLLETT: There are others over there now who won't be sitting

over there after November. Anyway I hope they will be taken care of for services rendered. They were taken out of the teaching profession, ranger force, out of Memorial University, out of I don't know where—I don't know whether there were any taken out of the constabulary?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, we have an ex-policeman.

MR. HOLLETT: That is all I want to say. I am not particularly opposed that these poor misguided people should be taken care of some way, as I am quite sure they won't be able to take care of themselves when they finish the job they are in at present.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member for St. John's West has pointed out, this bill should be read in connection with sections of the Act to Amend the Civil Service Act which passed this House. In that Act the principle was established that if a person left the civil service or having been a member of the staff of Memorial or a policeman or ranger, if he left his position and entered public life it was established that his pension rights would be preserved. The honourable member for St. John's West wanted to know if he were an established civil servant at the time he resigned to go into public life, well if he were not of course the Act does not apply.

The present bill, Sir, is purely to carry out that principle which was established to its logical conclusion, if a man can remain in the public service until he is 65 and if he were defeated by an ungrateful populace after terms, it might take him two years to get around to applying for reinstatement, but in the meantime if

he should happen to die or become mentally or physically incapacitated his pension rights still stand.

MR. HIGGINS: Don't you think that is enough.

MR. MURRAY: Once having established the principle that a man can enter the public service, enter public life, I think it is only logical to add this measure. When we look across the House and see former civil servants carrying out their duties so splendidly we think it is a pity that people should be denied so we give certain authority under this Act which applies both ways. A person, after all, Mr. Speaker, might wish to enter public life to save the country from dictatorship or to become a watchdog or even to become a Tory, and as such it is only right that his rights should be preserved.

MR. BROWNE: You are joking of course?

MR. MURRAY: Oh yes, of course.

On motion bill read a second time—Ordered referred to a committee of the whole House later.

Seconding Reading of Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission:"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak to the motion that this motion be read at this present time, but to suggest rather that we have a recess for ten minutes. In the meantime I would like to invite the attention of the House to the very distinguished company we have present in the Chamber tonight, in the person of the Chairman of the CBC, Mr. Dunton, accompanied by two members of the Board of CBC, one of whom is the Newfoundland represen-

tative on the Board, Mr. Gordon A. Winter, a former Minister of Finance of this Province. I am sure that I speak for all of us when I extend to Mr. Dunton, the Chairman of the CBC, a cordial welcome not only to this Chamber but to the Province on the occasion of his first official visit here since he became a manager of that great broadcasting organization. It is one of the most responsible of all positions in all Canada. I am quite sure that all Newfoundlanders and particularly all members of this House are proud to have him come to Newfoundland at this time. We hope that his stay and the stay of his colleagues will be most pleasant. It is a pity he did not come in good weather. These last two or three days, as the House knows, are not at all typical of good summer weather. If he would remain a while until our summer really unfolds in all its glory and riches I am sure that he would carry back with him to other parts of this great Canadian Nation an even better impression than he will of the climate of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, if the House is agreeable we might have a recess and I could resume my speech after the recess — Would that be in order?

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, before we recess I would like to join the good wishes of the Opposition to those already expressed by the Premier in extending a welcome to the Chairman of the CBC, Mr. Dunton. I am very glad to hear, and I am quite sure we of this side are very glad to have him here. The Premier said he has responsibilities. I am quite sure the word "responsible" would not have the same meaning for our honoured guest as it would have for some of us here. But he did use the word quite a lot — "Responsible Government" of course

I am referring to, Sir. We have "Responsible Government" now I suppose — But we are very happy to welcome Mr. Dunton, and I might properly offer this suggestion to him, through the Premier, that it might be advisable sometimes to get a mike in here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We had one.

MR. HOLLETT: I am quite sure we could enter the whole world through a channel of the CBC. I have known some cases in the immediate past when it would have been wonderful, and I am quite sure Mr. Dunton could charge a fee so that the whole world could listen in sometimes — Sir, we are very happy to welcome him.

House recessed for ten minutes—Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill, "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission". Ever since we have been in office we have given continual thought and continuous consideration to the problem of an adequate and efficient supply of electricity in Newfoundland. As a party we stand for the establishment of a hydro-electric commission similar to that of Ontario and of other provinces of Canada. Shortly after we took office I approached a very distinguished Canadian hydro-electric engineer, asking him to come to Newfoundland and organize a hydro electric commission and head it up. He would not come. He was willing to come as a consultant but not to remain here and to organize and to become the permanent head of the Newfoundland Hydro-Electric Commission. That was a great disappointment to us.

Since then however, and on further reflection, we were not so sure that it

is a hydro-electric commission we want. That is to say we are not so sure now as we were that we want to nationalize the production and wholesale of the hydro-electric as they do in most of the other Provinces of Canada. But we are quite sure that we have got to do something to take control and take the right to regulate hydro-electric matters. Last year the Government invited or requested the Ontario Hydro-electric commission to recommend to us two men, each of whom was to do a certain piece of work. One of these was quite distinguished in Ontario, a hydro electric man himself, Mr. Jeffery. Mr. Jeffery came here and did a notable piece of work for us and submitted a very notable and very capable report. In it he recommended strongly that the time had now come when we must delay, at our peril, we must set up some control to see that what hydro potential we have in Newfoundland is used to the maximum public advantage. For instance, when he was here we had an application from the Union Electric Light and Power Company of Port Union to guarantee a bond issue of 11 million dollars to enable them to develop part of the Trinity Pond Watershed on the North Side of Trinity Bay to enable them to serve the whole of the Bonavista Peninsula with power. We submitted that request to Mr. Jeffery. Now at the same time we submitted to him certain data and certain information in connection with the tentative proposals of the Newfoundland Light and Power to develop at Swift Current, and we submitted to him also certain demands that had been made upon the Government that we should compel United Towns Electric Company to give better service than they were giving, notably on the Burin Peninsula and on the Southern

Shore, that is to say, the District of Ferryland; and in the District of St. Georges-Port-au-Port because in these three areas of Newfoundland they have a franchise, and in the case of the Burin Peninsula an exclusive franchise to sell hydro-electricity to the public. We laid all these before Mr. Jeffery. He told us if we were not prepared to establish a hydro-electric commission that would take over this production of power and the sale, or the wholesale of the hydro-electricity to utility companies who would retail it to the public, then certainly we ought to be prepared to set up at least a central body that would co-ordinate the activities of existing companies, and companies that may come, to take active charge of a programme of rural electrification.

Now the House is aware that we have a Public Utilities Commission. The Public Utilities Commission is set up particularly to regulate the public utilities companies. But I doubt that the Public Utilities Commission is likely to be adequate to deal with the matters set forth in this bill, which will be the responsibility of the new body we are now proposing. They will of course be closely associated and there will have to be close co-operation between them. But they will be separate bodies with separate functions.

I mentioned rural electrification: We have been giving a great deal of thought to that matter. I asked Mr. O. L. Vardy to interest himself particularly in this whole matter of rural electrification. For that purpose he visited most of the Provinces of Canada where he made an on the spot study of what is done in the other Provinces of Canada to provide electrification in sparsely populated areas

generally known as rural areas, thereby giving it the name of rural electrification, the farms, the fishing villages and farm villages.

He has gathered a great deal of data which I have in my office. The Board that will be set up by this bill will be charged with the particular duty, amongst other duties, of taking charge of the whole matter of rural electrification in so far as the government is concerned or will be concerned in that field.

The whole purpose of the bill is pretty well set forth in Section 72 on page 6, where it sets forth that there shall be a commission. It sets forth how they are to be constituted, how they are to act and the like. It is in two sections (a) and (b);

The Commission shall

(a) investigate existing and potential developments for generating electrical power and energy from water power, coal, peat, gas, oil, or any other source and for transmitting such power and energy with a view to supplying electrical energy and power wherever needed throughout the province and increasing where necessary the existing supply, and towards that end shall

- (i) undertake research and investigations of any kind that may be necessary;
- (ii) make special research and investigations with a view to ascertaining and recommending the measures to be undertaken to secure rural electrification in the highest possible degree; and

(b) make recommendations to the Government for the development of electrical power and energy and the transmission thereof to those parts of the province where a supply is neces-

sary and for the necessary increase of any existing supply, with particular emphasis on the supply of electricity in rural areas.

So that, Mr. Speaker, both parts of this section sets forth the functions and duties of the commission.

Now, Mr Speaker, I would not suggest to the House that the prime purpose, let alone the only purpose, of this power commission is to be handling rural electrification. I would not suggest that. But I do suggest that rural electrification will form a major part of the work of this Newfoundland Power Commission. It may be asked if we have any one in mind for the positions. I have to answer frankly that we have not. It is a board of three to five as provided here. It is also provided that we may appoint one member of the House of Assembly. In most of the provinces or in some of the provinces at least across Canada the practice is to appoint a member of the Cabinet to a power commission, to have a cabinet member in the body that controls electricity and hydro-development within that province. We will probably do the same thing, and have a member of the Cabinet serve as a member of that commission, and if not a member of the Cabinet then a member of the House of Assembly supporting the Government, to maintain, if not a direct connection, an indirect connection through the intermediary of a Member of the House.

Now I must confess frankly that I have no one in mind.

MR. BROWNE: But lots of applicants.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I imagine there will be no great difficulty in



filling that part of the commission, i.e. a member of this House. The greater difficulty, I should think, would be to get able and competent men to do the technical work, professional members of this board.

Mr. Speaker, it is a most important piece of legislation. I regret that it comes later rather than early in the session, because it is one that deserves more debate than we are likely to give it at this late stage of the present session. I move the second reading of the Bill Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the lateness of the hour, I feel I must speak briefly to this measure and give it my full support. Because, Sir, there exists in the district which I happen to represent a situation which I think it unparalleled anywhere else in Canada. In the District of Ferryland there is generated practically all the electrical energy which is used on the Peninsula of Avalon. If you go out the road there, Sir, you will see huge transmission lines, big modern transmission lines bringing electrical energy out of the district. Still people up in the district are living by the light of kerosene lamps and using batteries for their radios. That Sir, seems to me a situation which does not exist anywhere else in Canada.

We have up there in Fermeuse one of the most modern fish plants in North America, and in Trepassey the most modern fish plant in the world. Yet these plants have to be supplied with what electrical energy and power they require by diesel engines. The district which is, I say, producing about 75,000 h.p. and supplying all the rest of the Avalon Peninsula—it does not even make economic sense,

Sir, I think you will agree, and it does not make for moral justice.

Now, Sir, since I came into this House I have been bawling this out in season and out of season. I had promised the people up there to do what I could to see they get lights and telephones. I think it is only right that my district should have these things in this day and age. But Sir, I made very little headway in arguing the thing for two years. I have gone to the people up there operating in charge of the electrical energy and in charge of the distribution who had an exclusive franchise, but they stood behind their franchise and we were powerless to do anything about it. Now, Sir, I think, as the Premeir has said, the time has come to do something about it, and the people with a franchise having exclusive rights over our waterpowers should be made to realize they only hold that franchise for the benefit of the people and for the public.

Sir, I hope this bill we are about to put through will be the means of rectifying the situation which exists in my district. If it does not then we should go the whole way and introduce a hydro-electric commission in Newfoundland, and take over concessions altogether. If people don't live up to their obligations which they assume where they get exclusive rights over our waterpower.

I have great pleasure, Sir, on behalf of the people of my district in supporting this bill and I hope it will be the means of bringing about the moral justice they are entitled to.

MR. SPENCER: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House very long in my remarks on this bill. Since my association with the government I

have learned, and have known for some time, that the policy of the government has been to provide hydro-electric power as extensively as possible, to really electrify, if I might use that word, literally electrify Newfoundland.

It is unnecessary for me to repeat what has already been said by my colleague, the Honourable Minister for Provincial Affairs. My district does not exactly suffer in quite the same way that his does, but I agree with him that it is an absolute injustice to generate the power in the district and then export the whole thing without giving the people of the district the services which they should be entitled to by virtue of the natural product in their own area.

In sections of my district we have electricity. In other sections we have water power and the people in the district, particularly in the area of Lewisporte, have been stressing and making their desire known to the Government with a view to further development. I am happy that the Government is about to bring in this bill which is really something to spur the business of providing electricity for the whole of Newfoundland. Certainly, Sir, I sincerely hope that in the not too distant future the people in the district which I have had the honour to represent for the past four or five years will have their desired hydro-electric power.

I support this bill with everything I can put behind it, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief word to say in support of this bill. This morning I had a conversation with the general manager of the Iron Ore Company of Canada. He told me that his company has invited

the Premier of this Province to press a button in, I believe, the first week in September, that would set in motion a great power development in Labrador, the power that will keep the wheels of the great iron development on the Labrador turning. The Premier announced here a few weeks ago that BRINCO, the British Newfoundland Corporation, will be spending \$1,000,000 this summer on an investigation of the power resources of the Hamilton River Watershed. Again this is to be in my constituency. I think this development together with this bill and the statement of policy enunciated by the Honourable the Premier here tonight indicates that this Province is now perhaps for the first time really grappling with the tremendous need for power which indeed has increased out of all proportions during the past ten or fifteen years. We have areas in Newfoundland—my honourable colleague referred to my own home town of Lewisporte, where many people a few years ago built themselves up, one could say, by their own boot straps, and brought in their own diesel system and electrified every home in that great and progressive community at, I believe, three times the cost of what we are paying today. Nevertheless they made up their minds they were going to have the amenities of life. Other communities have done likewise. Within a few miles of that town we have a potential there, I believe, of twenty-five thousand horse power if it were developed. In conjunction with other waterpower resources in that area it would not only give the people of the Northeast Coast an easier living and an easier means of living but it might mean the economic salvation of part of that coast which up to now has not been too optimistic for the future.

I support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. C. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this legislation now before the House. The need for electricity on the Avalon Peninsula is a great one, but I am sure the House will agree that we who represent the districts off the Avalon Peninsula and different sections of Newfoundland and including Grand Falls and Corner Brook and other sections know the need is tremendous. I for one have been flooded with requests that something be done to supply power and electricity for the District of Bonavista South.

I support the legislation, Sir, and look forward to the day when the whole of Newfoundland will be supplied with power necessary for her requirements.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, since I will not have the opportunity of speaking to this bill in committee, I would like to say a few words now. This is a very important bill, and I have much pleasure in supporting it. I note that the duties of the commission are to investigate potential development. In that respect I would like to reiterate what has been said by various other members of the House of Assembly, and I hope this commission will undertake the electrification of Newfoundland. What I mean by that is the development of our waterpower to bring light to our people. I hope also that they will investigate existing and potential developments to generate electric power.

In connection with this point I would like to inform the House that I could not let this bill go through without saying a few words because of the fact we have a great deal of potential development for generating

electricity in the district which I have the honour to represent, the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage. There is some 600,000 horse power that is capable of being developed in Bay D'Espoir besides the considerable developments that are possible in other parts of Fortune Bay, Bay Du Nord River for example; Long Harbour River; Grand LePierre River, all these are capable of development of anywhere from sixty-five to one hundred thousand horse power each. I hope, Sir, that something for Newfoundland in general and that a great deal for the South Coast in particular will come out of that appointment of this commission. I have much pleasure in supporting the bill.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, now that the Government side has exhausted—

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, No—Not exhausted.

MR. HOLLETT: The gaseous matter of power! I would like to say a few words in connection with this bill. Now I don't expect to be appointed to the chairmanship or anything of this commission. It is amusing to me you know, Sir, the amount of work which has been done by this government by way of commissions. There is a commission for everything. Since 1949, I think, there has been a commission on every avenue of life in existence in this country, a different kind of commission, of course, Sir—a commission on fisheries, price inquiry on food, forestry commission, all the ills of this country as far as forestry is concerned will now be taken care of, an agricultural commission, a fishery authority, and I could name a half dozen more. In every case, Sir, it seems to me that there has been considerable delegation of work and

authority which usually is vested in the government being transferred to some other body, but work which should in a good many cases be done by the government itself. After all, we are not such an immense province although we do have some territory in the Labrador. But I don't expect we shall have much to do with the development of hydro-electric power down there. Then again we have had all sorts of investigations. I note the first thing this commission has to do is to investigate existing and potential developments for generating electrical power. Well, I think, we had a hydro-electric survey in this country, which I believe cost considerable money. I take it the government now have obtained the necessary information to indicate just where lies that potential power. So that I take it along that line this particular commission which is to be set up won't have a big job to do, they know right where they are going to put their finger on the power and almost on the button to press the switch to bring electricity to various parts of our land.

We are not of course against the bill at all. We are not opposed to it. But I must say I am rather amused with the sort of come-uppance of the members of the Government on this bill, everyone wanting it in his district. I am quite sure whoever is appointed chairman of this commission is bound to have it in his district, I hope he does. I know we need electrification in this country. But of course electrification like everything else depends upon the ability of the people to pay for it, particularly over a widely extended area. The thing has to be done in an economic way. I take it if there are certain areas, for instance on the Ferryland Coast

that have not got electricity, there must be some cause for that other than just cursedness and stubbornness of the operating company up there, particularly when that is where they get all the water power from which they develop their electricity transmitted to us in here and elsewhere over the country.

It is nice to know however, that we have another commission, a power commission. There are one or two objections which we must deal with in committee of the whole. I think it is hardly worth while wasting time over it at this late hour of the night. But I would point out that the government intends to give to this commission the power to borrow money, and the Minister promises to guarantee any loan which they may make. Only yesterday, I think, we had a bill brought in here in connection with Union Electric Light and Power Company, and a loan of over a million dollars was given to these people. I am wondering as to why we were in such a rush to grant that loan if we knew this commission was coming so soon? I should think we should have these investigations on the part of the commission into the advisability or otherwise of voting a million dollars to this concern, whom I believe have assets of about \$130,000, and last years, I believe—

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, is this in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Not strictly so.

MR. HOLLETT: Was it not power for these companies we were talking about or was it something else? Light and power—At any rate I think it would have been advisable to delay the giving out of that loan, if we had known that so soon we were going

to have this all-powerful commission which is to investigate the potentialities, undertake research and investigations and examine all proposals—Exactly the same thing was done by the power survey made some years ago, and of which, I think, we have had no report tabled here as yet.

Now, Sir, we are not against this Bill. As I said, there are one or two paragraphs in it that need a little attention.—For instance: There is one there where the commission may from time to time borrow money for the purpose of this Act.—That is an interesting way to bring it in, I know, because it always leaves it open, and they can fill in the numbers of dollars at will.—And to secure the repayment of money borrowed, issue bonds, debentures or other securities of the commission in such form and containing such terms and conditions and at such a rate of interest and at such times as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council determines.

I suppose it is essential to have a power commission. I don't know. We have been getting along a long, long time without it. But as I say, this will be a sort of effort to lighten our darkness in this country—"Oh Lord We Beseech Thee"—I do hope the commission will flourish, and that they will electrify the darkened areas of our land as quickly as possible. We support the bill, Sir.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two things said by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to which I think we should make a reply. Because he has drawn attention to the fact that the amounts have not been filled in, I would like to say the Government proposes to suggest they be bounded by a million dollars there.

MR. BROWNE: Just a million?

MR. CURTIS: Yes, just one million, not that the million will be needed or used because there are many places which can get electricity after investigations by this power commission, but it is not the plan of the Government at the moment to set up a commission which will start to develop water powers, generate currents and make it available to the people. Rather, it is the present idea that the new commission will investigate such sections as have been suggested by my honourable friend, the Member for Ferryland. Down there, as he said, you have water power being used everywhere but in the location of its origin. The duty of the power commission will be to find out why the power does not go to these unlighted places, and to find out what department of the Government, Mr. Speaker, can look into that.

MR. BROWNE: Economic development.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What authority have we got?

MR. BROWNE: That would not stop you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I must admit there is something in that—where development of Newfoundland is concerned very little stops us.

MR. CURTIS: Nevertheless, I think Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.—The commission can investigate and find out just why electricity is not being brought into these places, these settlements on the Southern Shore, and just why St. George's area is not lighted, and consider a district such as the one I represent which has no benefit of electricity. Unfortunately it is an island and has no water power. There-

fore the power commission will have to consider other means of providing electricity. But the idea of the power commission primarily, Mr. Speaker, is to find out the circumstances. Perhaps all that is needed is supplementary lines to these little areas. There is about fifteen miles between Old Perlican and Hant's Harbour. In that area of about fifteen miles the electricity goes up one Bay and up the other Bay and a little area in between is without electricity. Perhaps the power commission may say it is not economic to join on these two circuits unless the government gives a subsidy. The government might well turn around and say: well we will build the transmission line and rent it to you until it is self-supporting, or the Government may lend the money for the transmission line. But this Government at the moment, Mr. Speaker, has not the authority, and nobody knows just what they should do, nor how far we should go in order to aid these people to get electric lights. But it seems to be ridiculous for settlements to be without electric lights when electric wires run within fifteen miles. If the government has to go in and help these people to get electric lights they will do it. But before we do it let us have a body who knows what to do and how far we ought to go, and let that body investigate. Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion debate on second reading adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move the House do not adjourn at 11:00 o'clock, this night.

MR. HOLLETT: I object, Mr. Speaker. Is that a debatable motion? I presume it is. Because if it is I would suggest that the House do not

support it. We have been sitting here every night now until 11:00 o'clock and one night it was nearly 12:00 o'clock, from 11:00 o'clock in the morning. The government who are in favour of a five day week and a forty hour week for other people should practise what they preach. Certainly as far as the Opposition is concerned I think they should remember we have been under a tremendous handicap to have new bills such as this one we were discussing a moment ago placed before us for the first time today, and do all the other work we have been doing, and at the same time trying to take in the discussions of such important measures. We have not had time Sir, to look at a new bill since about two weeks ago. We had a very important bill passed to this House in connection with redistribution, and I for one had not had time up to about 4:00 o'clock this morning to even look at that most important bill. It is absolutely nonsense to sit here from 8:00 to 11:00 o'clock every night. Certainly we oppose that. After all we have another day tomorrow, at least I hope so. I don't see any reason why the members of this House should be rushed to death simply because the Honourable the Premier wants to go to Labrador next week. That apparently is the case, and I register my opposition very strongly against staying here after 11:00 o'clock in the night.

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my disapproval of staying any later than 11:00 o'clock tonight. I can assure the people we are doing enough. We have only a few members on this side, and some of the bills I know — but perhaps the government thinks we should not look at them or study them — perhaps we are not supposed to—At least we do



try to give some study to them in the time at our disposal. But we have not had time to give any study whatsoever to many of them. I for one don't want to sit after 11:00 o'clock tonight. We are here for quite a long time every night and in the morning, and I don't see any reason at all why we should continue after 11:00 o'clock tonight. There is another day coming. We can get through the work of this House even if the Premier is not present. He could go to Labrador if he needs a rest, if he works any harder than us, I don't know, at least he has intimated that to us. He is a hard worker, and I don't disbelieve him. He could go on to Labrador tomorrow, and we could attend to the business here without any rush and without him around to tell us he thinks we should work later hours, like the government has been trying to do with the Opposition this week.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, for the sake of solidarity if nothing else I must support this objection. It seems to me a strange anomaly that the government which from the moment of its inception has proclaimed itself the champion of the toiling masses, this government which has magnificent legislation for the protection of the workers from exploitation, should now exploit the members of the House. It seems to me a monstrous injustice. Indeed, Sir, words practically fail me. I can only say that I am against it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, just to close the debate, as it appears to have been a debate—We are not at all anxious that the Opposition should work one iota harder than we do ourselves. Long before this House comes in session the members of the Cabinet,

at least, have done a day's work. Besides we want to make up for some of the time Mr. Claude Hall used up on us tonight. He used up an hour and a half of our time. We want now to do some of the province's business.

MR. HIGGINS: Of course if the government had been here instead of Jamaica.

Motion carried — That the House do not adjourn at 11:00 of the clock this night —

Second Reading of a Bill. "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission"—adjourned debate:

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate. I have nothing else to say.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Honourable the Attorney General adjourned the debate. He should have left it open. Then we would not have had to work after 11:00 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say once again that it is an unpleasant thing to have to take up a matter so important as this when we have only seen it for a few minutes, and upon which we heard the address of the Premier and then the chorus from the party supporters on his side, which gave us very little light upon the subject.

Now, Sir, I am sure we all recognize the importance of the development to the greatest possible extent of electrical power in this country, and the extension of transmission lines to every section of the country. I was interested to learn that the Premier, very early in his career in office as Premier, had invited Dr. Thomas Haig here. Because Dr. Thomas Haig was a lecturer in hydrology at the University of Tor-

onto when I was a student in civil engineering and he was my lecturer, and what little I learned about the development of electrical power I learned from him. He was a very good teacher. He was serving there under another very admirable person who was responsible for the development of the great plant on the Niagara River, which developed three hundred thousand horsepower. It seems strange that the government which started out with such good intentions five years ago should wait until the eleventh hour on the last day practically of the session in 1954 before they introduced this bill which gives expression to their hopes. I don't know whether they are serious about what they are saying or not. It does not seem to me to be very convincing to introduce this here like they have done tonight when none of the members, I suppose, outside the Cabinet have had the opportunity to study the measure. Certainly as far as we are concerned they don't know anything about it yet, and the public does not know anything of what they propose to do. I think before this measure should be gone through with, it should be published so the press and the public generally should have an idea of what it means.

Now, Sir, the Attorney General in his remarks said that this commission did not intend to do any tremendous thing at the present time. They could investigate certain areas where one would wonder why there was not electricity, where there was electricity on one side of a peninsula and electricity on the other side, and yet within a short distance there was no electricity. Now I know the Attorney General is an excellent businessman. I know that he understands that a company that is in business for making money will sell to anyone who will buy where he can

sell at a profit, and if they can't make a profit then they don't sell. That is the reason, and he knows that is the reason and every member of the government knows the reason the electricity is not extended further than it is, is because it does not pay.

Now all the members are naturally very anxious to have electricity, I know the Southern Shore better than my honourable and learned friend, the Minister for Provincial Affairs.

MR. MURRAY: I don't think you do.

MR. BROWNE: I have been going up there a lot longer.

MR. MURRAY: Once every four years.

MR. BROWNE: No I can say I have been many more times on the Southern Shore than my honourable friend.

MR. MURRAY: Perhaps that explains the results last fall.

MR. HIGGINS: They did not know you well enough.

MR. BROWNE: I did not have the opportunity that my honourable and learned friend had of being able to spend such a long time there at the public's expense and to visit every house in the district. I would have liked to have been able to do that, but that was not possible. But I did spend a lot of time up there and I know the district fairly well and I know what the needs are as far as electricity is concerned. I would like to see electricity up there. I am quite sure all of us have wondered like he has why it is that here the potential power sits and here there is power development and why is it that people have not get electricity. On the Southwest Coast the Honourable the De-

puty-Speaker said here tonight that there is a big potential development down in Bay D'Espoir of 600,000 horsepower. But what will they do with it if they get it? Supposing some investors came along tomorrow and said here are two hundred million dollars. You can develop the 600,000 horsepower down there and get electricity. What are you going to do with it? Who is going to buy it? Who is going to use it? The reason that power is developed to such an extent on Avalon is because that is where the industries are concentrated and in Corner Brook and Grand Falls, and Buchans.

MR. SPENCER: Must we keep it that way?

MR. BROWNE: No. Of course we must not keep it that way. The honourable member knows I don't wish to see it kept that way. I would like to see it expand. They might not be able to do an awful lot, and I don't expect they will without government subsidies, as the Attorney General said. There may be a little gap here and there they will fill in to bring electricity to certain hamlets and settlements which would not otherwise get electricity without some sympathetic body like this which is prepared to help and encourage expansion.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. BROWNE: Now generally speaking we must all remember that it costs money to build power lines, and that it costs three times as much today as it did only four or five years ago.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Nearly twice as much.

MR. BROWNE: I think it would cost more than that. Now I don't want to go into detail in connection

with this Union Light and Power Company, but taking that development as an illustration there is a plant down there at Port Union and one little plant at Clarendville which originally was a very, very small development. Now it is proposed that they are going to enlarge it and the government, in my opinion, have been very optimistic that such a small organization can carry through such a big financial reorganization. They have only got about 70, 80, or 90 kilowatts at the present time and their assets are only \$130,000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not so. This is the Power Corporation of Canada's report here. I did not see this yesterday.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, \$138,319, and the government are going to give them a million dollars. It seems to me the government ought to be careful about things like that. As my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, said, it is a pity they should do that before the power commission or some organization is there to see that if loans are given or funds are extended to any companies that there is a certain proportion of their own investment. I think there is a recognized percentage between bonds and common stock. It is supposed to be 60-40 whereas according to figures given it is about 90% bonds and 10% common stock. That is not a sound investment. The thing is too fine with not enough margin. It would be very difficult for them with the capital they have to carry out such a big development and leave a margin over for safety, and I believe we would be in great danger unless that proposition is watched.

The Honourable the Premier in his interesting remarks — I must say I

found them very interesting and there are some things upon which we probably agree once in a while—I found his remarks very interesting, and I am sure we all would like to see an expansion of the development of electricity. He mentioned the report of Mr. Jeffery. I don't know if that has ever been tabled. But if it is available I would suggest to the Premier that he allow the members of the Opposition to see it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is confidential. I would be quite happy to provide it if it is not published.

MR. BROWNE: I would be very glad to see it. I don't suppose anybody in the whole of Canada has more experience than the high officials of the Ontario Hydro-electric. The Premier spoke about sending Mr. Vardy away to see what is going on up in the Canadian Provinces. They have a tremendous number of industries who are clamouring for power. They want power and they got to have it. It is a matter of life and death to some of the industries there to get the St. Lawrence Seaway fixed up so they could develop a million horsepower on the St. Lawrence River. They got to have it for the industries that won't be born unless they get the power. We here are only dealing in small units. The largest we have is situated at Deer Lake. That is the place where industry is concentrated in its greatest form in this country. Here on Avalon we have a great demand for electricity, and a big domestic demand. But once you leave the Avalon Peninsula or even go to sections like my honourable friend speaks of down on the Southern Shore, with at least three miles between each section as you go along and sometimes perhaps eighteen miles over which transmission lines have to be carried, and it would cost

thousands of dollars a mile to bring it there. Now then every thousand dollars invested must bring in a certain amount of returns a year. If not they will not put the money in. If they put it in this Government must be prepared to subsidize it. As far as the Government is concerned they have to work it out and see whether they can afford it or not.

There is no question at all, we would like to see water power development. Of course it is the combination of water power and industry we would like to see. The Premier certainly deserves recognition for the ambition which he has to harness the two together and have the water power harnessed to the industries. Of course it is heavy industry which takes the most power really, the paper plants, big iron industries, and iron making, a large amount of heavy equipment, which use up large amounts of energy. The small plants do not take very much, even cold storage, the amount consumed at Bonavista for example, the second largest plant in the country is insignificant when you think of a big development. So that these are problems which have to be borne in mind.

My honourable and learned friend, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, thought very hard of a company which has a franchise up there—it must be remembered they did not develop any electricity up there. They had to bring electricity from Seal Cove or Topsail miles and miles away.

MR. MURRAY: Not in the past year or so.

MR. BROWNE: Yet the Newfoundland Light and Power, if they have to bring it on to the settlements, have to figure on transmission lines

and figure out what the demand will be. I notice the Union Power here with their proposals say the Public Utilities Commission have given them the right to increase their rates 37½%. My honourable and learned friend was not aware of any hearing in connection with that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was a hearing. The Commission went down and held a hearing on it. It was a public hearing.

MR. BROWNE: Well 37½% is a tremendous increase in rates. If other companies were given such encouragement as that I am quite sure that they would be expanding. If that is the figure they feel would bring them the necessary return, I hope that the Power Commission after it is appointed will watch this development.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said all that I have to say in regard to this matter. But I do wish to point out why it is a good thing that members should be anxious and impatient to get electricity and put as much pressure as they can on the Government to speed the development and try and bring about conditions where there can be further expansion of electricity. At the same time we have to remember there is a practical difficulty to be overcome. I don't think in this modern age that we should put any obstacles in the way of bringing to the people as much light and as much power as we can with the great resources which we have in this country.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two words in respect to this bill. I think the main point at issue is to try and give some assistance to people living in rural areas where they may have the use of elec-

tricity for lighting and electrical appliances etc. Now of course the Government realizes just as well as I do that is a costly undertaking, and as it has been pointed out by some of the clauses in the Act, it will have to be subsidized by the Government or by the taxpayers. Yesterday when we discussed another bill — perhaps we should not make any reference to it — the Premier did mention a figure, I think, in respect to some hydro-power which was going to be laid down in connection with the Port Union Electric Light Company. I think he mentioned the figure of \$100 per horsepower. I did not want to question the Premier at that time. I have a pamphlet here and the estimate of costs of laying down the turbines and generators is \$250 a horsepower. That is quite a different figure than the Premier quoted yesterday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite high.

MR. FOGWILL: It is a reasonable amount today. Besides that, Mr. Speaker, the cost of distributing that horsepower runs about \$400,000 and the income is not so great, particularly when you are serving rural areas, as is expected to be done under this Act. It is going to be very costly. I think the Power Commission, I do not know a big lot about it—but I think the Power Commission and the Government also should consider all the factors in respect to laying down electric horsepower, and consider the question of laying down steam or diesel, because it is much cheaper to lay down diesel and steam than hydro-power.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In some cases but not all.

MR. FOGWILL: Always the initial cost of a steam plant is much less

than hydro, of course steam and diesel cost much more to operate. I have not much more to say, but to make this suggestion—Yesterday I was under the impression that the Premier said \$100 which I thought was wrong. My honourable friend who has just finished speaking pointed out that where the use of electricity is at its peak is in the industrial areas and in the places where there are large numbers of people like Corner Brook, Grand Falls, St. John's and perhaps the larger towns in Conception Bay. Therefore if the Government is going ahead and is going to electrify and bring electricity to all rural areas it is going to cost a lot of money, a considerable amount—I have no objections to the bill, but I would like to point out the fact that it is going to cost a lot of money. I hope that when this commission gets underway and begins to do its work that they will be well advised in what they are about to do, and that it will be done as cheaply as possible, particularly when we take into consideration that it is going to cost the taxpayers of Newfoundland quite a considerable amount of money to electrify the rural areas.

MR. HIGGINS: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say of this bill except to say I am behind it. It certainly deserves the support of the House. It is rather an idealistic concept. It seems to me to be creating an authority which is going to be almost a NALCO of light and power. I notice the provision is made that the Electricity Distribution Act is not going to apply. I do hope that that is not going to mean—and I believe we had the assurance of the Premier—a good camping ground for members of this House. Because the idea behind this legislation is sufficiently good to ren-

der the thought of anything of that nature repugnant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear! Hear!

MR. HIGGINS: Well, I hope we will have the money to do this. I can only say the idea is worthy of support of the whole House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House long. I should like with real sincerity to thank and congratulate the honourable gentlemen opposite. It appears that the way to get them to make good speeches is to make them stay behind after school closes. The honourable and learner member for St. John's West delivered what appeared to me to be the best speech he has delivered as yet since he came back into this Chamber. I was genuinely interested in it, and I am pleased by it. But then that is not surprising because I understood the honourable gentleman is a civil engineer or some kind of graduate engineer, and he would be interested. My greatest regret is that our people in Newfoundland have not done what they have done on a pretty considerable scale in the Province of Quebec where there must be hundreds of small local electrical co-operatives. It is an interesting development. I don't know if that development exists anywhere else in North America or anywhere else in the world.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, Czechoslovakia, thousands of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In Quebec Province the people of many communities form co-operatives under which they build a transmission line from their villages to the nearest high-tension or larger transmission line, and they supply themselves with the electricity from the generating company at cost—it is in the end at cost. Now



they are subsidized because subsidizing these little electric co-operatives is part of the rural electrification scheme in the Province of Quebec. I suppose it is too much, at least in our time, to expect our Newfoundland people to form electricity co-operatives or for that matter very many other kinds of co-operatives. They just don't seem to go in for it very readily or very voluntarily. I must say I appreciate the remarks of the honourable gentleman opposite especially the honourable and learned member for St. John's West and the honourable member for St. John's East.

If we are going to subsidize we might as well face that. You cannot expect a company to run a line from its main transmission line for two or three miles down to that cove down there to serve some twenty people. They would have to charge so much for the light that the people would not pay it. So that it is quite out of the question. What is done across other Provinces is that the Government subsidizes the transmission line that runs from the main transmission line down to the villages. Possibly that has to come—if it makes the difference between making it economical to run a little branch line down to a village or not. When we think of here in Conception Bay, in Trinity Bay North and South Side of Bonavista Bay, the central part of Bonavista Bay and up the northeastern shore and possibly right around by Peter's River, right around and come up that shore there, you cannot expect a commercial company to do that on its own. They would lose their shirts. We have to subsidize them if the people are going to get electricity. This Government are going to pay a large part of it. We are prepared to do it and I believe the Opposition will agree with

us in that it will be the unanimous wish of the House to do it. I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to see the support there is for the bill.

**MR. HOLLETT:** Mr. Speaker, if you would accept a motion to adjourn I would like to make the motion.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I think honourable members would like to set a date for committee stage on this bill, otherwise it will die.

On motion ordered bill be referred to Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

**MR. SMALLWOOD:** Mr. Speaker, I move the remaining orders of the day do stand adjourned and the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, at 11:00 a.m. of the clock.

On motion House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 19, at 11:00 a.m.

---

SATURDAY, June 19, 1954

### MORNING SESSION

The House met at 11:00 a.m. of the clock, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions:

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees:

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Question:

**HON. L. R. CURTIS** (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I give notice I will at a later hour this day, with the consent of the House, ask leave to

introduce a Bill, "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons".

### Answers to Questions

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister) : Mr. Speaker I promised the day before yesterday that I would on yesterday table the answers to that last question directed at me. When I promised it I meant the promise. But I regret to say that the Auditor General and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance were still at it at midnight yesterday and I don't know how long beyond, and are meeting again this morning to make the report. I hope to have it by noon today. I told them if they did not have it until this afternoon it might be tabled. They will get it as quickly as they can. I may say in advance that the report will confirm completely the statement I made that there was no purchase of cement whatsoever. That is the report from the Auditor General himself. He is working on compiling it. I won't anticipate the answer any more than to say that I hope to table it before the day is over. If by any chance we should not be meeting throughout all of the day then I will deliver it to the Leader of the Opposition and he can have it published or anything he cares to do with it. I am anxious to have it tabled.

MR. M. M. HOLLETT (Leader of the Opposition) : If I may, Mr. Speaker, I am just as anxious to have it. If there is any error in the statement I made I would like to have it cleared up. The indications are that there seems to be something in this matter where I found thousands of bags of cement were charged up to the construction of the plant over and above what was called for, charged up in the bills. To any lay reader, I will call it that, it is quite apparent

from that it was—Anyway I am prepared to accept any report from our very fine Deputy Minister, and the Auditor General.

### Orders of The Day

#### Third readings :

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" — On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

A Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act"—On motion read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas."

## Adjourned Debate:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, like so many other Bills the Opposition have not had the time to study this one with any thoroughness. We read it through, of course, and we have here the explanation given by the Premier. As far as I am personally concerned I realized this was inevitable once we went into Confederation and the chief sources of revenue were taken over by the Federal Government it was impossible with the provisions, with power left, to raise sufficient moneys to carry on provincial finances certainly in the same fashion as 1949. Therefore I foresaw, and other people, I suppose, foresaw the same thing, it would be necessary for municipal authorities, soon as established to seek means to augment the grants they are going to receive from the Provincial Government. That is what is happening now. Although there should be a little disposition on the part of many people to tax themselves and want to tax themselves—Yes in prosperous communities such as Corner Brook and Grand Falls, Bell Island and a few other places there may be a desire on the part of the people to improve their educational facilities, and they can see before them an opportunity of raising from the great industrial enterprises in their midst substantial amounts of funds necessary for the improvement they desire.

We have the assurance of the Premier that this matter has been briefed with the heads of the various religious denominations in the country and that they have not expressed any disapproval of the measure. As far as I can see myself I think it is covered and protected in a provision of the Terms of Union which has to be respected. On that account we have no complaint

to offer in this matter. The period in which we live, in which there is such a demand for education and all facilities of education expansion particularly of materialistic kind is a great departure from the practice that was in vogue for a long time. Education was looked upon in two ways; that it was a charitable thing to provide for the education of people not able to provide it for themselves—One of the first schools established here in St. John's and in Newfoundland too was by the Benevolent Irish Society, of which my honourable and learned friend here is an officer. That was done for the purpose of educating the children of poor people. The other function of education was to provide for the brightest students so that they could go on and become leaders in the community. But times have changed, and there is now almost universal demand that education and the advantages of education should be instilled into everyone. One, I suppose, of the most pronounced proponents of this idea in this country was the late Senator Vincent P. Burke. I always remember him as advocating that the poorest boy in the country, the son of the poorest fisherman, should have the same advantages as the son of the richest person in getting a university education. That applied, of course, where the disposition is there, and where the talent was there to be developed. But in every country, and especially in Canada, there has been continuous and new provisions made for the advancement of scholars.

The National Research Council of Canada every year gives seventy or eighty scholarships to enable students from Canada to go to other countries to pursue their studies in higher branches of learning. At the present time in Europe there must be nearly

a hundred students sent abroad by the National Research Council of Canada. I don't think Newfoundland gets many advantages under that system. I remember bringing the matter up to the National Research Council and saying that Newfoundland should get a certain share. It cannot be expected that Newfoundland would be able to compete with various advanced educational institutions in Montreal and Toronto and the bigger societies in Canada. Well, they say, we can't do that, Newfoundland might win all of them. I told them they knew perfectly well when they were saying that they did not mean it.

However, this is a step towards providing better educational buildings and institutions and enabling the schools in some of the sections of the country to get better teachers, and to get as much of the modern facilities which schools ever seem to desire and demand now. In Ottawa there have been some marvellous buildings erected, very modern in every respect, and gymnasiums. I don't know whether we can hope to compete with institutions that have been erected there because Ontario is a very wealthy province and Ottawa is a very wealthy city. At the same time this Bill will enable the municipal councils and other community councils and organizations to assist in, and the communities themselves, to assist in improving their schools under their jurisdiction. Therefore, Sir, we do not oppose this Bill — In fact, finding it inevitable, we have to support it.

MR. HOLLETT: I have just a word or two Mr. Speaker — I could go on for days on this Bill. I think the Honourable the Premier quite understands there are quite a lot of things I could say. He would understand that I would be perfectly justified in

saying, because my memory goes back to some years ago, certain things and statements about taxes. But it is not my intention to do that. As my honourable and learned friend said, it is inevitable.

There is something which I see there — The Lieutenant-Governor in Council is given the authority to put what is called taxation authority in every area practically in Newfoundland. There is a danger in some cases. Of course there is a new tax authority — a taxation authority can impose a tax of not less than five dollars on all members of a community who are owners of property in a school tax area. I take it the Lieutenant-Governor in Council before setting up a taxation authority will of necessity consult the people in any particular area or have a sort of request from that area before they would dare put in such a tax. There are places of course where they have to insist they tax them for the support of education and other things. There is no question about that. But I believe the Bill is based on a request to have the tax instituted. I take it various authorities in these areas have been consulted and their consent has been more or less received. When I say authorities I mean municipal and not the religious bodies at all. I think education is something everybody has to be concerned with. And whilst religious bodies ought to be consulted I believe the communities as a whole are the ones to say whether or not they shall have a fresh and new tax put on them for anything, in fact that is what the people do when we here in the House of Assembly bring in a new taxation Bill. There is certainly nothing here we can oppose at all. It is in the interest of the people that they have education and

we can't have education unless we tax ourselves to pay for it. So that we do not oppose the Bills, Sir.

HON. S. J. HEFFERTON (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply): Mr. Speaker, may I say first of all in answer to something which the honourable and learned member for St. John's West said about the urgency of this matter and Union with Canada. Some of us who were interested in education were arguing for this sort of legislation long before the Terms of Union with Canada were consummated in 1949. We argued it because, although under the Education Act of 1916 boards of education were enabled to make loans they were only able to do it on the security of their board members. There was no systematic method whereby they could collect and pay off the loan which they might incur. Even the pledge system for the building of schools was used here at least thirty odd years ago. I remember when Bishop Feild College was built we had a pledge system whereby contributors pledged themselves for five years. Now even that is not too secure a system for raising money. More than that during the last twenty years or a little longer than that the population trend of concentrated large numbers of people in certain industrial centres has increased and it is from there we are getting the requests for some ways of financing for larger and more expensive schools than were built in one and two room schools around the out-ports.

Now that brought up another problem — Under the system which we had and still have the building grants had to be distributed on per capita school enrolment basis. The amalgamated schools may have 1/16 of the total population of the island, and

they are the ones who find the pinch most, yet if we take the larger denominations they are able to distribute their proportions of the building moneys according to their own needs. For instance the Church of England, the largest single unit, not as large as the Roman Catholic, is divided into dioceses. Now then in a school in White Bay and in Corner Brook, outside an amalgamated area, they can divide the money and on can be done this year and the other next year. That is not so with amalgamated schools. Their first amount was so small and consequently the problem was very very acute indeed. This matter has been given considerable attention by school authorities and by people who have been keenly interested in trying to develop a better school system long before 1949. Now the demand has been accelerated during the last two or three years not by the Act of Union but by the trend of education, for regional schools, which are far more expensive naturally, than the ordinary schools which we have been accustomed to. And people knew they just could not be built out of current moneys for school buildings such large and modern school buildings, which would give to the children a better education than we have been accustomed to. But the problem has become more and more urgent as we become more and more of an industrial people. For that reason the question of trying to find some way of raising moneys which would allow such schools to be built now and paid for over a period of years has been given considerable attention by all those interested. It is as the result of this consideration that this Bill has been introduced here in this session. Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, there are just one or two points.— One is in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. That is whether we consulted the churches in this matter. We did not consult the churches to find out whether they were in favour of giving authority to the municipalities to impose school taxes. We don't consider that to be any of the business of the churches. We did consider it to be very much the business of the churches to see that all public funds whether they be raised directly by this legislature or by the authority of this legislature delegated to municipalities or to anyone, all public funds devoted to school purposes, shall be spent on the basis of absolute non-discrimination as between these religious denominations that have been recognized for school purposes. In other words, that the denominational rights that existed at the date of union should continue unimpaired. Now the churches had, right at the date of union, a very great stake in seeing that these rights were preserved. And as this legislation infringes directly upon that question we did consult with the Ecclesiastical Authorities for that. That I think is common justice and common sense. And we will always do that as long as we remain in office. We will make no move affecting the basic rights of the denominations in education without first consulting these religious bodies.

Now the second point that arises requires a little more emphasis than it has received in the debate—the fact that this is entirely voluntary. This legislation is not enacted to impose upon the municipalities any requirements that they shall tax people for school purposes. Rather are we acceding just a little unwillingly to an urgent request expressed by the Hum-

ber Municipal Association that we give them the right to impose a school tax. They asked for it. Not only did they ask for it but they importuned us. Not only did they hold a great public meeting where the matter was fully discussed and ventilated and agreed upon, in Corner Brook; not only did they appoint a large deputation that came to St. John's to see the Government and did see the Government on this matter, but since that moment they have by letter and by telegram continually importuned the Government to bring this legislation to pass.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? When the Honourable the Premier said "they" to whom does he refer?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Humber Municipal Association to which I referred at the outset. That is a sort of a federation of the municipalities of the greater Corner Brook area and possibly other organizations, perhaps service clubs and the like. At any rate, I think, they must be accepted as being thoroughly representative of the citizens of that area in certain matters, not in all, but in certain matters.

The Bill is brought in here by us only because it is urgently and repeatedly requested by the Humber Municipal Association. The Bill itself is not one that obliges any area or any group of people in Newfoundland to impose a school tax. Rather it is one which authorizes any such area to impose it if it wishes to do so. The initiative lies entirely locally in each area concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that whereas in the ordinary outport the people will continue to do what they have done from time immemor-



ial, that is to say, they will with their physical labour assist in the building of their own denominational schools and thereby make a great contribution to the school system, a great and valuable contribution, taxing themselves for the upbuilding of their school systems by their own physical labour.

MR. HOLLETT: They always did that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not only will that continue as from time immemorial, but in the newer and more industrialized, and shall I say, more unionized, communities that has become impractical. You could not imagine the great school buildings of Corner Brook being built by voluntary labour. It is just not practical.

MR. BROWNE: There is a pretty big one in Freshwater, Placentia.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was that built by voluntary labour?

MR. BROWNE: It was built under the direction of Father Penney.

MR. SMALLWOOD: With unpaid, voluntary labour?

MR. BROWNE: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But even between Freshwater and Corner Brook there is a very great difference. Freshwater is not what you would call an industrial town. It is a large place but it is not a Grand Falls nor a Corner Brook nor a Bell Island nor a Buchans. In such communities as I just indicated it might indeed be more practical if the people's contributions be made in the form not of their own personal voluntary labour but rather in the form of a modest tax paid by all on a basis of general application. At all events that is what they think, and it is they who have asked for this

legislation, it is they who wish to impose that taxation. All we ask this House to do is to pass this Bill to authorize them to impose their own school taxes if they wish to do it. It is entirely voluntary.

On motion Bill read a second time.  
On motion ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, I move we go into Committee of the Whole on items 9, 10, 11, 12 and 14.

Mr. Courage (Chairman of Committees) in the Chair.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands":

Clause 1 carried.

Clause 2 read:

2. Section 4 of the Act 4 Ed. VII, Cap 13, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for other purposes in connection with Crown Lands" is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"4. The areas of land set forth in Schedule A to this Act and marked, numbered and described on plans signed on behalf of the Government and R. G. Reid respectively and now on deposit at the office of the Minister of Mines and Resources shall be held by the Reid-Newfoundland Company, Limited, subject to the reservations and conditions that all trees growing or situated on any portion of any such areas which is coloured green on such plans are the property of the Crown in right of Newfoundland and shall be held by the Crown and dealt with and

disposed of in all respects in accordance with The Crown Lands Act, Chapter 174 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, and regulations made thereunder as if such trees were growing or situated on Crown Lands, and all such trees may be removed therefrom, and all logging camps and other installations necessary for the cutting, removal or sawing of the trees may be constructed, erected and placed thereon or thereunder, and in respect of any such portion licences and permits to cut timber may be issued under The Crown Lands Act, and Crown licences may be issued under The Saw Mills Act, Chapter 188 of The Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952, as if that portion was Crown Lands, but the owners or occupiers of such portion may construct and maintain roads thereon and for the purpose of such construction or maintenance cut and remove trees from that portion, where the Minister is satisfied that the cutting and removal are necessary for those purposes or either of them, and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by the Minister respecting the disposal of any trees so cut: Provided that logging camps or other installations necessary for the cutting, removal or sawing of trees may not be constructed, erected or placed on any such portion without the consent of the owners or occupiers of that portion, if such consent is not unreasonably withheld, and provided further that upon the bona fide sale of any portion of any such land for settlement, or upon the bona fide sale, lease or use of any portion of any such land for mining purposes, the portion sold for settlement, or fifty acres of the portion sold, leased

or used for mining purposes, as the case may be, shall thereupon be freed from such reservations and conditions, and the Minister of Mines and Resources shall, upon the application of the Reid-Newfoundland Company, Limited, grant a certificate with plan attached that such portion of land or part thereof is freed from the reservation and condition."

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could the Attorney General say whether there were mining rights which were given?

MR. CURTIS: Fee simple, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BROWNE: Does not that carry with it the timber on it?

MR. CURTIS: It does, Mr. Chairman, but as I pointed out, under the Transportation of Timber Act 1904, by agreement they lost these timber rights.

MR. BROWNE: What does the fifty acres mean?

MR. CURTIS: That is the usual amount they allow mining companies.

MR. BROWNE: Yes, when they do a certain amount of work they get fifty acres.

That is absolutely fee simple? You can't touch that?

MR. CURTIS: No.

MR. HOLLETT: The right then in land still lies with Reid-Newfoundland Company or their assignee, and the wood on it and the mineral underneath?

MR. CURTIS: They still have the mineral, but the trees are in right of the Crown.

MR. BROWNE: What I want to get at is this. Take fishermen, for instance, who want to go in on that, they still have a right, by getting a licence from the Crown, to go in and get necessary wood.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They have also the right they have in respect to any timber on any Crown Land.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Honourable the Attorney General what did bring this up now?

MR. CURTIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is not here and I don't really know what did bring it up. But I believe it was brought up because, I think, that cutting there was getting out of control. The idea is to control it and find out just how it can be utilized to the best advantage.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe it is an interim recommendation from the Royal Commission on Forestry.

Clause carried. On motion Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Make Provisions for the Award of Pension in Certain Cases":

Clauses 1 and 2 read and carried.

Clause 3 read:

3. (1) Where at any time from the first day of April, A.D., 1949, a person who is employed as an established civil servant, an employee of the Board of Regents, a teacher, a member of the Constabulary, or a Ranger retires for the purpose of contesting an election or a by-election for the return of members or a member to the Parliament of Canada or to the Legislature of the province and he is not eligible for

the award of a pension or a gratuity on retirement and thereafter he

(a) attains the age which if he was then so employed would render him liable to retirement;

(b) suffers a mental or physical incapacity which if he was then so employed would render him liable to retirement; or

(c) dies,

a pension, allowance or gratuity shall subject to this Act be awarded to or in respect of him under the relevant statute as if he had not retired from such employment and was so employed upon the happening of any of the events referred to in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c): Provided that in determining whether a pension, allowance or gratuity may be awarded to or in respect of such person and the amount thereof the only service which may be taken into account is service which would have been counted as pensionable service at the date of his actual retirement, if he had been eligible then for the award of a pension.

(2) A pension, allowance or gratuity may not be awarded under subsection (1) unless within two years after he contested an election, if he was not elected, or within two years after he ceased to be a member of the Parliament of Canada or of the Legislature of the province, if he was elected, the person to or in respect of whom it is proposed to make the award notified the Minister in writing that he desired immediate reinstatement in the employment from which he retired and was not within three months after the date of such notice offered reinstatement in such employment not lower in rank, salary and emoluments than the post from which he retired, but this subsection shall not apply to any person in respect of whom any of

the events referred to in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) occurs before the expiration of any such period of two years.

(3) The award of a pension, allowance or gratuity under subsection (1) to or in respect of any person who retired from employment, as a member of the Board of Regents, or as a teacher is subject to the condition that all premiums payable in respect of any pensionable service counted for the purpose of determining whether a pension, allowance or gratuity should be awarded to or in respect of him and the amount thereof were paid by that person and have not been refunded to him or, if refunded, have been paid by him again with interest to the date of payment at the rate of three per centum per annum.

(4) Where a person referred to in subsection (1) referred from the Constabulary or the Ranger Force the question whether a pension or gratuity shall be awarded to or in respect of him, shall be determined, and the amount of the pension or gratuity, if awarded, shall be calculated, in accordance with The Civil Service Act.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very special piece of legislation designed to provide pensions for a great many members on the opposite side of the House, and members supporting that political party—It seems to me they are all there —

MR. SMALLWOOD: "All there"?

MR. BROWNE: I won't say anything about their being all there mentally—But they are all there physically—I can see there established civil servants who retired for the purpose of becoming members of the Legislature, employees of the Board of Regents of the University, teachers, members of

the constabulary—but I cannot see any rangers.

HON. M. P. MURRAY (Minister of Provincial Affairs): Oh yes! He is not here.

MR. BROWNE: So this is a special Bill. And, Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order than anyone interested in this legislation should not be present when it is being discussed and voted on. I don't think it is in order for persons to vote pensions to themselves.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How can the House of Commons do it?

MR. BROWNE: They contribute to it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They voted it to themselves. How did they do it?

MR. BROWNE: They did it by legislation. But this legislation is a special reward for persons who went into politics at the request of the Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are not pensions to the members of the House of Commons a special reward for their having gone into politics?

MR. BROWNE: But not a special award in regard to services performed elsewhere.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We vote ourselves pay and expenses, don't we?

MR. BROWNE: That is slightly different —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order—I would suggest that the honourable member continue his speech and other honourable members refute his argument when he sits down.

MR. BROWNE: Now the only one I see left out of here is Mr. Picker-

skill. I don't know what is going to happen in his regard. He was very obliging, and stood for the District of Twillingate, or whatever it is in the Federal Election, last year on the nomination of the Premier of this Province. I don't think the Civil Service Act can make any provision such as this. I think we ought to make some gesture for the great friendship that exists and the high regard that exists between the Premier and the Secretary of State, and the high regard he has for him. I think we ought to make an ex-gratia grant to that gentleman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the honourable gentleman move it

MR. BROWNE: I leave it to someone on the other side of the House to move it. But I put it forth as a very worthy suggestion.

MR. CURTIS: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pickersgill will be needing any pension for many, many years to come and subsequent legislation may take that up.

MR. BROWNE: I think it would make the Bill more general. It applies to about 80% of the candidates of the Premier and the Liberal Party so far. I think it ought to cover them all. And if some arrangement could be made with private employers perhaps we could have them included here in this section. I don't know, but it is worth investigating—My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition suggests the fish merchants should be included.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They will provide it for themselves.

MR. BROWNE: Now there is a question I would like to ask here in regard to the third last line in Clause 3. I don't think gratuity or service is

granted for less than ten years' service under the Civil Service Act.

MR. MURRAY: That is correct, yes.

MR. BROWNE: What is the meaning of that—Anyone who has less than ten years' service.

MR. MURRAY: May get a gratuity but not a pension. Women civil servants may get a gratuity on marriage.

MR. BROWNE: We are not considering any women at the present time—But in regard to men in the civil service with less than ten years' service to their credit —

MR. MURRAY: They have no pensionable rights.

MR. BROWNE: Have they gratuities? Gratuities should be regarded in the same light as pensions—However perhaps some other member may have a question to ask.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I agree with what my honourable and learned friend has said. I think I learned yesterday, but I am not so sure I did—I will say now this Bill in my mind writes the epitaph of the present Liberal Administration. They realize, I am quite sure, at last they are dying, fading out of the picture.

MR. SMALLWOOD: "Darling, I am growing old."

MR. HOLLETT: So like all sensible men, I take it, they decide it is about time they make some preparations for the future. So they prevail upon the Premier, who is one of the softest hearted men, I suppose, in this world.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Honourable Gentleman does not believe that?

MR. HOLLETT: His heart is so soft it can be kneaded in almost any shape. And they got after him saying; "We have had the reactions from our various districts and it is about time we decided to do something about it." So they prevailed on the Honourable the Premier to bring in this Bill to take care of a good many of them. I have a list here of ten members of the present Provincial Government who will or could or may at some time in the near or perhaps distant future benefit from this particular piece of legislation which is designed to give pensions to those who were in the teaching profession and those who were in the Ranger force—at any time from the 1st day of April, 1949. That in itself confirms what I have already said.—Whether he is defeated or not defeated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is getting involved in the principle there.

MR. HOLLETT: I think that concerns me most.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Honourable member knows, this is the committee stage.

MR. HOLLETT: I was forgetting that, Sir. It was unintentional, I assure you. But may I say this Sir, and I say it with all sincerity, I am not interested at all with the perhaps very small amounts, in some instances, which will or may accrue to any individual of these ten people on the Government side whom I see now, and I don't see them all there, who will benefit. I am not worried about that. The point I am worried about is the very thing I am not allowed to speak of now, Sir, the very thing which tends to make the Civil Service beyond re-

proach. I can look at ten or eleven and I see four who are in the Senate. There is not much else I have to say except to say that the repercussions of this Bill will not be felt for many years to come, will not be felt immediately. That is why I am a bit concerned about it. Be that as it may, it is written in the Bill and we will have to accept it that way.

MR. BROWNE: The Bill then only seems to apply to persons with ten years service, or if after they were in the service they enlisted in some branch of the military service. Now in regard to the Constabulary, they had a special arrangement with the Attorney General regarding their pensions. They were retired after twenty-five years service.

MR. MURRAY: There were two systems of pensions applied to the Constabulary, one created by Order in Council, but in 1947 a member was given the right to elect either to come in under the Civil Service as far as pensions were concerned or stay under the old system. What this section does is this: Suppose a Constable goes into public life, he does not have any choice and must come under the Civil Service Act.

Clause 3 carried.

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission."

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 read and carried.

Clause 4 read:

4. A member of the Commission shall hold office, subject to good behaviour, for a period of five years from the date of his appointment, but



a member whose term of office has expired shall be eligible for re-appointment.

MR. BROWNE: "Subject to good behaviour" does not mean to say they can be removed only by an address of the House of Assembly to the Governor—

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that—"A member of the Commission shall hold office during pleasure, for a period.

Clause 4 as amended carried.

Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 carried.

Clause 9:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, could we let that stand for the present time?

Clause 9 stand.

Clauses 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 carried.

Clause 15:

MR. HOLLETT: I wonder if it would be advisable to have a council bring the matter up before the Assembly. I know they have wide powers in all matters. That is every-day work as far as the Government is concerned. Up there they can make contracts, construct, maintain and operate works for generating electrical power and energy from any source, acquire by purchase, lease, expropriation or otherwise any land, waters, water privileges, water powers, works developed, operate, use or adapt for generating electrical power or energy from water power and for the transmission thereof in the province. That might cost millions of dollars. Of course there are restrictions following after.

Clause 15, 16, 17 and 18 carried.

Clause 19:

MR. BROWNE: Should the minutes of the Commission be eligible for inspection by members of the Legislature when the House is in session?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but not to be published to the press, but open to members.

Carried.

Clause 20 carried.

Clause 21:

MR. SMALLWOOD: On this, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion is "one million dollars" to be inserted in the blank space in 21(a) borrow money for the purposes of this Act but the aggregate of the amounts borrowed and outstanding shall not at any time exceed one million dollars.

Now, if in the course of four or five years they come to that amount and have need for another million we could amend the Act.

Clause 21 as amended carried.

Clause 22 read:

22.—(1) Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Minister of Finance may from time to time

- (a) make loans to the Commission out of money in the Consolidated Revenue Fund; or
- (b) guarantee the repayment of the principle of and interest on money borrowed by the Commission,

but the Minister shall not make or give such loans or guarantees in any financial year except to the extent that the Legislature has authorized him to make or give such loans in that year.

(2) The Minister of Finance shall make or give a loan or guarantee under this Act only in such manner and subject to such terms and conditions as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall approve.

MR. BROWNE: There has been no provision made this year for any loan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No.

MR. BROWNE: In an enabling Act it is not likely.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It will take a little time to find the right persons to constitute the Commission.

MR. BROWNE: It may take a year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It may take all of this year to get them set up, and after they are set up they will want to take their time and not rush but carefully review the situation, making a careful study of the whole gamut of the situation. I should imagine that we would be fortunate if we came in here in the next session to ask the House to vote some money to that.

MR. BROWNE: You won't have the Royal Commission appointed next year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I doubt it.

MR. BROWNE: I was concerned there how far that clause 9 (5) would go.

Clauses 22 and 23 read and carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, may we turn back to the clause having to do with salaries being paid. "Shall pay such salaries or other remunerations as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may determine." I suppose I could not ask if any set salaries have been thought of?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, we have not the foggiest idea. That I should think would depend on the men we could get. It is no use in doing it at all without an outstanding man to take charge, and to get that we would probably have to pay him a good salary. It is a very highly skilled specialist field. We hope to get Newfoundlanders, and get one probably recommended by the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission and trained by them. This is big stuff, and deals with big costs.

MR. HOLLETT: Only one million dollars.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well at one time. There probably will have to be amendments. It is big stuff. It is the stuff of which a country is made, power, the basis of virtually everything. And we should not have this at all unless we have an outstanding man to take charge of it, and to get such a man, I don't think we will get him for less than \$12,000 or \$15,000 a year, frankly.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope he is a Newfoundlander, that is all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I hope he is.

Bill passed with some amendments.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Amend the Timber License (Revision to Crown) Act":

On motion Bill passed without amendment.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas."

Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

Clause 3:

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if any

other places besides Corner Brook have put in any request for this legislation?

MR. HEFFERTON: I could say that Bishop Falls talked about it, and Grand Falls, I believe, so there is some report although there is nothing official on it.

MR. BROWNE: As the other Minister is a business man, I should like to ask the Minister of Education if any other locality besides Corner Brook expressed any desire for this legislation?

HON. J. R. CHALKER: (Minister of Education): No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There was a hint from Grand Falls, I believe, and Deer Lake and Gander.

HON. DR. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Mines and Resources): And I happen to know that is so of the people of Lewisporte, and they are very much interested in this. It is also a very prosperous place.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And fast-growing.

MR. HOLLETT: I notice the Lieutenant-Governor may declare any municipality or any portion etc., to be school tax areas. I am wondering if it is wise to put in a clause there indicating that a request had been received from such an area by the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I am a great believer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is covered in sub-section 5. We are most definitely not going to give it unless the people want it.

MR. HOLLETT: You still have your authority to declare — That is

only by-the-way sort of. I suggest it be amended. You cannot force education down peoples' throats, the move must come from the people themselves on a request to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to impose this tax. I would suggest something should be inserted there to indicate a request had been made from the municipality or area.

MR. CURTIS: I think that could be assumed.

MR. BROWNE: Can we not put it in there, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, upon the request—

MR. CURTIS: Yes, there must be something to start it.

MR. HOLLETT: I think it should be — a request based upon the opinion of the people in the area.

MR. MURRAY: Human nature being what it is, I think the act would become absolutely inoperative if one were to wait for a number of people to request taxation. You have to have leaders in the community who can realize the full implication and to set it in motion — "before an order is made to subsection (1) the Minister of Education shall give three months' notice, by publication in a newspaper circulating in the area which would be affected by the order, or by such means as he may consider adequate. It is the same method as is followed in the local councils set up. Then he gets the reaction of the people in the area. If it were thrown open I don't think any attempt whatsoever would be made to evoke it.

MR. HOLLETT: You still have the right to put it in even though the people protest.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, the right is there.

MR. HOLLETT: You may.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We may get suicidal impulses.

MR. HOLLETT: Some people would rather commit suicide than die a natural death.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman must not hope too strongly. We are not going to do that.

MR. HOLLETT: I think that it would make the Act more palatable to the general public. I am only raising the point. Go ahead and cut your throat.

MR. HEFFERTON: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the point is too important at this particular juncture. I do know that in one particular instance the requests which have come in have been backed up by a majority of the people, largely because they have been accustomed for many years to payroll deductions for education in one or two communities in the area where that is so. But, Sir, I rise not particularly to answer that, but to move in sub-clause 2 — the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may, under this section declare (a) any municipality or (b) any two or more municipalities, in order that there may be a majority of two or more, as in the Humber District.

MR. MURRAY: It may be easier to put it in as sub-section (d). Carried.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Chairman, I may be a bit old-fashioned but I do remember back to the days in some of the outports, and my own younger days, when schools were built by the people not because some nabob or some premier of some government said they had to build a school. No, they got together and called a meeting and decided they wanted a school.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The nabob was the clergyman.

MR. HOLLETT: Easily the clergyman, but not always — Well what is the Church if it is not the people?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The honourable gentleman is getting into a very fine theological argument.

MR. HOLLETT: I am now very anxious to get out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no — Theology fascinates me.

MR. BROWNE: In sub-section (3) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may by order and under sub-section (2) the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may declare any municipality to be a tax area. Then under (5) "Before any order is made under sub-section (1) the Minister of Education shall give three months' notice." Well then does he have to give three months' notice under sub-section (2)?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surely.

MR. BROWNE: In other words if the people of the municipality ask for one or the people of an area are not of a municipality — the same conditions ought to apply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order — I am quite sure the stenotypist cannot take down the proceedings now.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest the way to solve this would be to have it read—The Lieutenant Governor in Council may under this section (a) by order declare any — and then in (5) (1) before any order is made under sub-section (1) or (2).

MR. CURTIS: Yes.

On motion clause as amended carried.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I don't like that amendment, quite frankly. I think the purpose is clear enough as it stands under (1)—sub-clause (2) just says municipality.

MR. BROWNE: But the point is it is not in two, it is not referred to.

MR. MURRAY: It does say this sub-section shall not be deemed to limit the general—

MR. BROWNE: But sub-section (5) does not apply to (2).

MR. MURRAY: By implication (2) must be included in (1).

MR. CURTIS: I think the Minister is right. Sub-section (2) deals entirely with (1) and an order will be made under (1)—(2) just amplifies it. I think section (1) is all right.

MR. BROWNE: All right.

On motion amendment stricken out (Clause stands as is).

Clause 4 carried.

Clause 5:

MR. HOLLETT: Duties of what council?

MR. MURRAY: Any council set up under the Local Government Act.

MR. HOLLETT: In other words the school tax authority would assume the duties of a municipality.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Actually the municipality will probably be appointed the school tax authority.

MR. BROWNE: This is only under the Local Government Act there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. HOLLETT: I am not quite sure on that—I am sorry to delay the proceedings. We shall be giving to the

school tax authority all the powers and duties etc.

MR. MURRAY: Keep on reading.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All the mighty power of a town council converted into a school tax authority—But it is only for the purpose of collecting the tax.

MR. HOLLETT: Some of these do collect a poll tax—And this is a poll tax. I think this is a duplication of effort.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The School tax authority will probably be in every instance the town council.

MR. HOLLETT: Yes but if they have not a town council?

MR. MURRAY: A school tax authority must have a representative of a school board of every board which operates within the area, which means denominational representation.

Clause 5 carried.

Clause 6:

MR. FOGWILL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question—There is a qualification here in regard to taxation on females. They don't have to pay the tax unless they are earning \$600. What about the male? I think the same qualifications should apply in both cases. A male person could be working and only earning \$200 and is subject to the tax and a female may be earning \$590 and would be exempt.

MR. BROWNE: I think that is a very good point.

MR. MURRAY: We had in mind domestic servants when we put in the provision. But I don't see why it should not apply to males also, Sir.

MR. BROWNE: It says here employed three months. They might not be able to make very much in three months. I think it should be the same.

MR. HOLLETT: I hope by that you are not trying to limit the yearly income of the male to \$600.

MR. BROWNE: This \$600 applies to single persons only, does it?

MR. CURTIS: No, taxpayers.

MR. BROWNE: The point is, Mr. Chairman, it is a tax of not less than \$5 on owners of real property and then in addition a tax of not less than \$5 on all adults over the age of 21 years. But it can only be imposed as one or the other?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

If the word "male" were stricken out it would mean all persons — and then strike out sub paragraph (3).

Clause as amended carried.

Clauses 7 through 14 carried.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, I see no provision here for the regulations being tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: There should be.

MR. BROWNE: Clause 11 says they may be made, but does not say whether they should be published or tabled in the House. I take it all regulations should be tabled.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. BROWNE: I think I suggested this before, but I would suggest it again to the Attorney General: Regulations ought to be kept like the Acts and put together in some kind of book form. I don't know whether

it could be done in the Department of the Attorney General. As it is it is very hard to locate them. It is a terrific job for a lawyer to locate these regulations to all the Acts—One must go through all the Gazettes to find the regulations.

MR. CURTIS: We will give some thought to that.

On motion the Committee reverted to Clause 11.

Amendment (2) "Regulations made under sub-section (1) shall be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and shall have effect from the date of publication or from such later date as may be stated in the regulations and shall be laid before the Legislature within fifteen days after they are made, if the Legislature is then in session and if it is not, then within fifteen days after the commencement of the next ensuing session."

On motion amendment carried. Bill passed with some amendments.

On motion Committee rose to report progress:

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill, "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber Over Streams and Lakes for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands," without amendment.

On motion report received. Ordered read a third time now.

On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to



Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases," without amendment.

On motion report received. On motion ordered read a third time now.

Read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission", with some amendment.

Report received. Said amendments read a first time, read a second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill read a third time — Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Timber License (Revision to Crown) Act", without amendments.)

On motion report received. On motion Bill ordered read a third time now. Ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. COURAGE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matter to them referred and have passed the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas."

On motion report received. On motion Bill read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. CURTIS: Mr. Speaker, there is one small item outstanding. I

wonder if the House would take a motion to not leave the Chair at 1:00 o'clock?

Motion carried.

MR. CURTIS: A short time ago, Mr. Speaker, I gave notice I would ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons". I now ask leave to introduce this Bill.

On motion Bill read a first time.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to Provide for Pensions for Disabled Persons":

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in June past the Parliament of Canada or at all events the House of Commons passed a Bill, No. 642, entitled "The Disabled Persons Act". This Act in its third section says: "The Minister" (meaning the Minister of National Health and Welfare) "with the approval of the Governor in Council may, on behalf of the Government of Canada, make an agreement with a province to provide for the payment to the province, in accordance with this Act and the Regulations to the Act, in respect of allowance paid by the province, pursuant to provincial law, not exceeding in respect of any recipient forty dollars or fifty per cent of the amount of the allowance paid by the province monthly to the recipient which ever is the lesser, Payment to a province, pursuant to this section, shall be made only in respect of a recipient who has attained the age of eighteen, and has resided in Canada ten years immediately preceding that date, is totally and permanently disabled, as prescribed by the regulations, and is not in receipt of allowances under the Blind Persons Act nor under the Old Age Assistance Act nor an allowance under the War

Veterans Allowances Act, nor a pension under the Old Age Security Act, etc."

That Bill which has now become Canadian law, requires that any province desiring to benefit under it shall enact its own legislation, hence this Bill today. The Federal Act enables the Minister of National Health and Welfare to make an agreement with the Minister of Public Welfare of the Province. Our Bill as of this moment enables our Ministers to make an agreement with the Canadian Minister of National Health and Welfare covering the reimbursement by Canada of half of the pension up to \$40 a month for disabled persons who are not otherwise taken care of.

I may say this is nothing new to us. We have our own legislation under which we make this payment to disabled persons. But we are not being reimbursed to any extent whatsoever for our expenditure. Under that agreement we will be reimbursed for half or probably more than half of what we are presently spending. No, it cannot be more than half of what we are presently spending. I move the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, we are thoroughly in accord with the principle of this Bill. The principle is to give the Government power to enter into an agreement with the Federal Government. I believe the province will save an amount of money by entering into this. I don't know exactly what is paid out at the present time — We are thoroughly in accord with this, Sir.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Speaker, when I was a member of the House of Commons, each year we used to have a series of inter-office visits. On

several occasions I was very interested to know that Newfoundland was doing this sort of thing when they were not doing it federally. This is, I think, the outcome of negotiations which they carried on for several years. There is one question I would like to ask the Premier — Does the disabled person get this as a right? Will he be entitled to it under that Act as a right?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I think it is not mandatory—Our own disabled persons allowance —

MR. CURTIS: There is no appeal from it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I don't know — If the Minister were here he would give the answer. I just plainly do not know.

MR. MURRAY: If he were incapacitated within the regulations he would have a right.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know, but I presume the answer to this question is that regulations and provisions will be laid down, and if a person applies and meets with the conditions he gets his right, if he qualifies.

MR. HIGGINS: In the same way as a man who attains the age of 65?

DR. ROWE: In the same way — If he meets the conditions and qualifies then it becomes his right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A person gets the right if he meets all the qualifications of the Act. Then it becomes mandatory on the Minister to pay it, provided also the Legislature votes to him the money with which to do that.

On motion Bill read a second time.  
On motion referred to a Committee of the Whole House now.

Mr. Courage (Chairman of Committees) in the Chair.

MR. BROWNE: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the administration of the Act. I wonder will steps be taken at an early moment to publicize this.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As soon as this is signed, which may take some little time, a complete explanation will be issued. What is more to the point these welfare officers, of whom there are upwards of one hundred, I believe, are thoroughly well aware of all the details, and it is through them really that the people get to learn more about it than by any other means—It is the personal contact, the welfare officers meeting all kinds of people and spreading the information more so than the newspapers and radio in matters such as this.

MR. HOLLETT: I can't understand my honourable colleague asking that question. I am quite sure it will be publicized.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We will try to make it known.

MR. BROWE: Mr. Chairman, in the Old Age Pension Act there are provisions covering payments if a person should die. It seems to cause a great deal of confusion in the minds of the persons concerned whether they should return it or not, or whether they are entitled to it. I wonder if that will be provided for in the regulations or should it be included here?

MR. CURTIS: That will be in the regulations.

Clauses 1 through 11 carried.

Clause 12: Regulations:

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I think really this clause also ought to provide that regulations be tabled in the House, and I would suggest the insertion of the same clause as we discussed in an earlier Bill today—That regulations made under this Act should be published in the Newfoundland Gazette and tabled within fifteen days, etc.

On motion new clause, No. 13 added, to cover the amendment.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed this Bill with some amendments.

Report received. On motion said amendments read a first and second time and concurred in.

On motion Bill now read a third time, ordered passed and title be as read.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move all remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred.

DR ROWE: Mr. Speaker, with permission of the House, I would like to present a report of titles issued by the Department of Mines and Resources, we are required to do that, also a list of sawmills which are operating in Newfoundland at the moment.

With your permission also, Sir—I was asked a question, informally, with regard to royalties and sawmill rates etc. I promised to bring it along, I would like to table it too. It will be here then if any Honourable member wishes to get any information from it.

**SAW MILL LICENSE to Operate in Province of Newfoundland From 1st  
April, 1953 to 31st March, 1954.**

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
18	Theo. Stuckless	Pt. Leamington	\$ 15.00
54	Est. Andrew Strickland	North Arm, La Poile	15.00
63	Francis and Thomas Brake	Meadow's Point	25.00
70	Cameron Bros.	Carbonear	10.00
98	Wm. Hiscock	Manuels	15.00
103	Lewis J. Pritchett	Middle Brook	50.00
115	K. S. Aitken	Botwood	300.00
121	Mark Gosse & Sons.	Spaniard's Bay	25.00
135	Edgar R. Brown	Trinity, B. Bay	25.00
137	Wm. J. Smith	Brookside	25.00
149	W. & F. Drover	Whiteway, T.B.	25.00
165	Raymond Adams	Hillgrade, N.D.B.	10.00
194	A. Mitchelmore	Green Island Cove	10.00
207	Hezekiel Stead	Musgravetown	25.00
231	John E. Hancock	Portland, B.B.	10.00
246	Edward Newhook	Old Shop, T.B.	25.00
247	W. R. Mercer	Blaketown	5.00
253	Bowman Skiffington	Musgravetown	15.00
254	T. J. Matthews	Springdale	25.00
263	F. R. Reid	Heart's Delight	25.00
285	Darius Pond	Middle Brook	22.50
315	Charles & T. Fry	Southern Bay	10.00
318	Eli Humby	Musgravetown	25.00
326	Alphaeus Russell	Musgravetown	15.00
334	Job Osmond & Sons.	Dark Cove	25.00
343	Elijah Blundon	Hatchet Cove	10.00
372	Wilson & E. Stoyles	Hillview, T.B.	20.00
381	James E. Renouf	Robinson's	12.50
392	Herbert Adams	Milton	15.00
399	D. Jacobs & E. Menchenton	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
400	Arch Adams	Milton	10.00
1	J. W. Batstone	Silverdale	15.00
2	A. B. Boone	Corner Brook	10.00
4	J. E. MacKenzie	Miles Cove, Bonne B.	110.00
13	C. E. Adams	Sunnyside	25.00
41	Thomas St. George & Sons.	Heart's Desire	50.00
60	Farrell Bros.	St. Alban's	25.00
95	George Sheppard & Bros.	Botwood	15.00
102	John Norris	care of E. Fitzgerald, Coachman's Cove	35.00
116	James R. Dodder	Creston, P.B.	15.00
142	Norman Holloway	Bloomfield, B.B.	15.00
166	Est. Wm. Monk		
	Per G. F. Monk	Monkstown, P.B.	75.00
182	Solomon Eveleigh	Newstead, N.D.B.	105.50

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
197	Howard House	Bellburns	\$80.00
213	Lewis Harnett	Campbellton	50.00
216	Arthur Bennett	St. Pauls	10.00
227	Victor Russell	Princeton	25.00
235	James B. Holloway	Bloomfield, B.B.	25.00
251	James Smith	Norman's Cove	25.00
261	Elijah Trickett	Spout Cove, C.B.	10.00
272	O. Matterface	Boat Hr., P.B.	10.00
275	Wm. J. Emberley	Davis Cove, P.B.	15.00
286	Bert Williams	Woody Island, P.B.	15.00
288	Salmonier Farms & Forests Ltd.	Salmonier Line	500.00
291	John Little	Bloomfield, B.B.	80.00
292	Manuel Holloway	Bloomfield, B.B.	15.00
301	Wm. F. Goobie	Goobies	15.00
313	Wm. Cranford	New Harbour	15.00
321	Raymond Chatman	Canning's Cove	15.00
326	Alphonsus Russell	Musgravetown	15.00
334	Job Osmond & Sons	Gambo	25.00
36	Andrew Smith	Lobster Cove	10.00
38	Harry R. Woolfrey	Lewisporte	80.00
46	S. G. Andrews	Pt. Leamington	50.00
68	Martin Small	Summerford	25.00
75	Eric Major	Needie's Hr.	80.00
78	Wilson H. Brown	Kingwell, P.B.	10.00
80	Hubert Toms	La Scie	30.00
83	John Dollimont	St. Joseph's	25.00
94	Geo. Sheppard & Bros.	Botwood	125.00
97	Robert Spence	Port au Choix	80.00
101	Samuel J. Reid	Norris Point	25.00
124	J. Thoms & Sons.	Carbonear	10.00
132	Arthur Nicholle	Rocky Harbour	25.00
140	James C. Beaton	Norris Arm	75.00
141	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
146	Chas. H. Freeborn	Hr. Mille	10.00
172	Joseph J. Penney	Holyrood	10.00
196	A. T. Woolfrey & Bros.	Carmanville	600.00
199	Reg. & Frank Eddy	North Hr. P.B.	10.00
202	Martin Ryan	St. Vincent's	10.00
394	Harold Bartlett & Bros.	Trouty	10.00
401	Uriah Adams	Milton	25.00
411	D. Pelley, Ltd.	Port Blandford	5.00
415	Eli J. Robbins	Hatchet Cove, T.B.	15.00
417	Sidney Pelley	Somerset, T.B.	25.00
433	Ellis Reid	Foster's Point, T.B.	15.00
449	Robert Osmond	Burton's Cove, W.B.	25.00
458	Edwin Smith & Co.	Britannia	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
477	Reuben March	Lady Cove, T.B.	15.00
481	Aaron Smith	Elliott's Cove, T.B.	25.00
484	Robert A. Luther	Waterville, T.B.	25.00
492	Richard Hancock	Jamestown	15.00
501	Kenneth & Arthur Short	Monroe	25.00
502	J. W. Reid	Monroe	25.00
530	Herman Roberts	Northern Arm	10.00
538	Ray Renouf	St. David's	5.00
545	Edward Gale	South Branch	7.50
557	Gerald Lavers	Port aux Choix	10.00
577	Michael Pittman	Petit Forte	
579	Henry J. House	Port Saunders	80.00
583	Norman Hutchings	Laurenceton	15.00
590	Frederick Cornick	Port aux Choix	80.00
595	Elijah Boyd	Summerford	5.00
612	Wm. Corcoran	St. Mary's	10.00
615	Benj. Parsons	Rocky Hr.	50.00
618	Garland Goosney	Glenburnie	200.00
629	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	125.00
648	Elam King	Little Hr., T.B.	160.00
678	Arthur Brown	Summerford	10.00
687	Thos. M. Gillis	St. Fintan's	5.00
701	John Harnum	Brown's Arm	15.00
704	Andrew Ellsworth	Rocky Hr.	50.00
706	Clyde Shears	Rocky Hr.	25.00
707	Gordon Shears	Rocky Hr.	50.00
712	Russell Moulton	Burin	75.00
714	Alfred T. Vey	Long Beach, T.B.	50.00
725	Josiah Noel	Bridgeport, N.D.B.	10.00
747	Porter Bros.	Porterville	25.00
759	Lewis Fudge	Head's Hr., N.D.B.	15.00
780	Lionel Biggin	Daniel's Hr.	50.00
792	Guy H. Eveleigh	Comfort Cove	110.00
796	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
806	Reuben Adey	Foster's Point	50.00
809	Bryant Shears	Rocky Hr.	25.00
826	Robert Parsons	Rocky Hr.	15.00
837	Joseph Goosney	Glenburnie	100.00
841	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
1269	Steadman Young	Birchy Head	80.00
1324	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
1328	James Hobbs	Springdale	25.00
1339	E. J. Burton	Georgetown	80.00
1361	Bennett Warford	Paradise	80.00
1369	Reuben Hostins	S. E. Arm	25.00
1375	P. J. Dwyer	Heatherton	7.50
1376	Leslie Barnes	Frenchman's Cove	15.00



No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1379	Robert Churchill	Bay Roberts	25.00
1385	Norman W. Noseworthy	Bay Roberts	25.00
1392	Geo. Brown	Heatherton	5.00
1407	Walter Heale	Comfort Cove	25.00
1410	Bert Morris	St. George's	7.50
1422	Mark & Leo Norman	Long Hr.	10.00
1439	Selby J. Evans	Northern Arm	25.00
1468	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
1473	Ronald Lannon	S. E. Placentia	25.00
1506	Gabriel Chaffey	Maidstone Valley	15.00
1507	Ernest Dunn	Witless Bay	17.50
1509	Jerome Rumboldt	Bonne Bay	150.00
1514	Jermiah Bonia	North Hr., St. Mary's Bay	15.00
1518	Henry J. Patey	River of Ponds	25.00
1519	Buchan's Mining Co.	Buchan's	15.00
1520	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	200.00
1526	Wm. Hamilton, Jr.	Fortune Hr., N.D.B.	15.00
1524	Mac Peyton	Peter's Arm	100.00
1528	Stephen Lainey	Fox Island River	25.00
1541	Wesley Philpott	Laurenceton	25.00
1556	R. Young	Glenburne	140.00
1579	Robert Pryor	Cottle's Island	15.00
1581	Philip Decker	Sally's Cove, W.B.	15.00
1587	Ambrose Hollett	Norris Arm	125.00
1590	Stanley Lavers	Port aux Choix	140.00
1615	Gerald Raymond	Goulds	15.00
1617	Joseph Drover	Upper Island Cove	15.00
870	H. Robert McDonald	Cartwright	15.00
882	Phillip March	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
892	Geo. E. Parsons & Sons.	Woody Point	10.00
900	Terrence Martin	Boyd's Cove	80.00
920	Walter Chaulk	Stanhope, N.D.B.	50.00
940	Halfward Bros.	Woody Point	80.00
965	Newton Burton	Port Anson	50.00
969	S. J. Wells	Glenwood	7.50
972	Wm. R. Parsons	Port aux Choix	15.00
975	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	7.50
983	Philip Hynes	Little Burnt Bay	80.00
998	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
1002	Albert Goosney	Birchy Head	85.00
1029	Burlington Stores	Burlington	250.00
1040	T. J. Hewlett	Port Anson	300.00
1043	Chas. B. Bartlett	Petries	5.00
1053	Hayward Brake	Meadow's	47.50
1067	Felix Ryan	Port Saunders	25.00
1089	Thomas Peddle	Port Blandford	75.00
1090	Eric L. Warr	Springdale	150.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1115	A.N.D. Co., Ltd.	Grand Falls	10.00
1151	Adam & Clyde Gill	Sally's Cove	10.00
1153	Lloyd Ralph	Traytown, B.B.	10.00
1154	Wm. C. James	Glovertown, B.B.	350.00
1159	Isaac Way	Windsor	10.00
1198	Sandy Ryan	O'Regan's	25.00
1206	Raymond Boyd	Bridgeport	10.00
1219	David Goulding	Pt. Leamington	150.00
1228	Bowaters P. & P. Mill	Corner Brook	12.50
1232	Everett Foss	Salt Pond, Lewisporte	50.00
1233	Thos. Luscombe	Loon Bay	25.00
1239	Clifford Osmond	Birchy Head	150.00
1255	Arthur Layte	Lewisporte	10.00
1259	James Shears	Rocky Harbour	40.00
1263	Jonas Noble	Springdale	900.00
1618	Frank Chynn	Botwood	25.00
1645	Wm. D. Jesso	West Bay	5.00
1646	Geo. Ellis	George's Brook	150.00
1655	John Bennett & Bros.	Wild Bight, N.D.B.	50.00
1666	Arthur Lidstone	Brown's Arm, N.D.B.	80.00
1668	John R. Bownes	St. Veronica's	50.00
1677	Gordon Simms	Triton, G. B.	25.00
1703	H. B. Acreman	Battle Hr.	10.00
1706	Joseph Breton	Port aux Choix	10.00
1709	Lot Ropson	Hr. Deep	27.50
1720	H. B. Dwyer	P.O. Box 92, Corner Brook	10.00
1721	Archibald March	Lady Cove, T.B.	25.00
1724	George Flemming, (of John)	Bonavista	250.00
1744	Eli Diamand	Lethbridge, B.B.	200.00
1745	Notre Dame Stores	Baie Verte	12.50
1747	Victor Winsor	Triton, G.B.	15.00
1751	Patrick Vale	St. Mary's	10.00
1754	Arthur Hobbs	Card's Hr.	10.00
1758	David Stoyles	Hillview, T.B.	10.00
1759	Fred Rowsell	St. Mary's	25.00
1769	Henry Hutchings	Cow Head	5.00
1770	Pat Walsh	Mt. Carmel	10.00
1775	Simeon Vivian	N. W. Brook, T.B.	40.00
1779	Wilbert Cluett	Frenchman's Cove	10.00
1782	Samson W. Humby	Summierville	25.00
1785	John Hayse	Marysvale	10.00
1796	Simon Aucoin	Stephenville	40.00
1817	Baxter Rice	Botwood	25.00
1820	Francis Rose	Stephenville	7.50
1847	Charles Peckford	Phillip's Head	30.00
1869	John W. Greening	Port Blandford	25.00
1871	Albert Coffin	Come By Chance	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1873	Samuel Russell	Lethbridge, B.B.	\$80.00
1878	Becil Simmons	Peter's Arm, via Botwood	22.50
2220	Heber Chatman, Jr.	Canning's Cove	25.00
2035	Wallace Reid	Lady Cove	15.00
2010	Gilbert Philpott	Jamestown, B.B.	15.00
1860	Abraham Simmonds	Canning's Cove	25.00
2030	Hedley Hancock	Roddickton	10.00
1725	Levi Hancock	King's Cove, B.B.	25.00
1544	Lorenzo & Baxter Noseworthy	Shoe Cove Brook	10.00
1308	A. G. Chippett	Head's Hr.	7.50
1419	Dorman Miles	Birchy Bay	400.00
919	R. & P. Bridger	Brighton, N.D.B.	10.00
1034	Carl Kendell	Morrisville	115.00
1000	Fred Maidment	Windsor	7.50
296	John Sullivan & Bros.	Brent's Cove, W.B.	50.00
393	Wm. K. Adams	Milton, T.B.	15.00
573	Henry Moss	Jamestown, B.B.	50.00
145	H. C. Haines & Sons.	Portland, B.B.	15.00
82	Adolph Simon	Cape St. George	50.00
183	Job Elliott	Loon Bay	15.00
64	Granville Bros.	Little Hr.	10.00
2101	S. Crocker	Trout River	25.00
2103	George Gould	Charleston, B.B.	80.00
2111	Alphonsus Hancock	Brooklyn, B.B.	15.00
2116	Thomas Baker	Hodge's Cove, T.B.	10.00
2121	Ellis W. Crocker	Trout River	15.00
2130	Elezer House	Hillview, T.B.	15.00
2142	John Breen	Canada Hr., W.B.	15.00
2149	David James Benson	Hillview, T.B.	15.00
2151	Thomas Byrne	Lark Hr.	15.00
2156	Hubert Sacrey	Ming's Bight	5.00
2170	Hubert Tremblett	Southern Bay	25.00
2171	Bleman Avery	Hillview, T.B.	15.00
2179	Kevin Crockwell	Bay Bulls	10.00
2189	Daniel Diamond	Lethbridge, B.B.	15.00
2190	Watson Budden	Sop's Arm, W.B.	25.00
2192	Allan Green	Green's Hr., T.B.	10.00
2199	Max Sheppard	Sunnyside, T.B.	80.00
2200	Archibald Penney	Lethbridge, B.B.	15.00
2207	Randell Loder	Sunnyside	5.00
2211	S. J. Hann	Trout River	25.00
2217	Wm. Collier	St. Alban's	15.00
2225	Jacob Osmond	Jackson's Arm	10.00
2228	Thos. W. Johnson	Jacques Fontaine	15.00
2231	Peter Walsh	Little Hr. East, P.B.	15.00
2240	Harrison Wentzell	Parson's Creek	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2259	Bowaters P. & P. Mills	Corner Brook	\$25.00
2270	Chesley Pardy	Benton, B.B.	5.00
2271	Wm. B. Sooley	Heart's Delight	10.00
2278	Dominic Leonard	Southern Hr.	10.00
2285	James King	North Hr.	5.00
375	Moses & Fred George	Whiteway	25.00
1535	Adolphus Benoit	Marche's Point	50.00
1937	Allan Steele	Horwood	15.00
2014	Warrick Boone	Cottrell's Cove	25.00
2181	Wm. Pynn	Bond Street, Windsor	15.00
1216	Harold Wilton	Wiltondale	75.00
1279	Stedman Gould	Spirity Cove	25.00
1281	John H. Upshall	Kingwell, P.B.	10.00
1296	Wm. Tapper	Frenchman's Cove	10.00
1306	Gregory Cook	Leading Ticks	50.00
1321	Joseph L. Lockyer	Isle au Valen	10.00
1322	John C. Russell	Winter Brook	105.00
1359	John H. Pardy	Monkstown, P.B.	15.00
1365	D. G. Knight	Jackson's Cove	15.00
1367	Bert Organ	St. Alban's	15.00
1381	Snook Bros.	St. Alban's	25.00
1386	Wm. Seaward	Deer Lake	300.00
1409	Leslie Pilgrim	Wigwam Cove	
		Via Port Saunders	135.00
1501	Riley House	Bellburns	80.00
1560	Chesley Fillier	Clarke's Beach	80.00
1543	Leonard Hutchings	St. Paul's Bay	25.00
1591	Peter L. Benoit	Lourdes	25.00
1622	Ed. Hobbs	Bunyan's Cove	150.00
1625	Donald Torraville	Victoria Cove	15.00
1638	Absalom Short	Cape Ray	5.00
1653	Gorman B. Payne	Daniel's Hr.	60.00
1657	Stewart Keats	Bunyan's Cove	15.00
1665	Stanley Benoit	Stephenville	45.00
1691	A. Rees	Bell Island	5.00
1696	Maxwell Hayward & Sons.	Musgrave Hr.	15.00
1710	Harry Max Whelan	Traytown	10.00
1712	Peter Williams	Goulds	80.00
1716	Roland Evans & Sons.	Harry's Hr., G.B.	25.00
1723	John Regular	Ming's Bight, W.B.	7.50
1739	Daniel Jones	King's Pt., G.B.	10.00
1762	Alex Ford	Island Hr., Fogo	10.00
1772	Alexander Payne	Parson's Pond	50.00
836	James P. Keough & Co.	Plate Cove, B.B.	15.00
854	Wm. H. Pittamn	Bellburns	80.00
856	Gordon Caines	Port Saunders	15.00
862	Christopher Smart	Lethbridge, B.B.	50.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
864	Cecil Dominey	Little Hr., via Gaultois	\$15.00
866	Herbert Reid	Deer Lake	5.00
875	Benjamin Guy	Arnold's Cove, P.B.	10.00
884	John Blundell	Hickman's Hr., T.B.	15.00
891	A. G. Gale	Great Codroy	7.50
899	George Philip Nicholle	Rocky Hr., St. Barbe	80.00
904	Nathan Gregory & John Noble	Goobie's Siding	50.00
913	Robert G. Smith	Chance Cove, T.B.	10.00
921	L. B. Williams	Woody Island, P.B.	10.00
932	Robert Smith	Island Cove	10.00
947	R. F. Bartlett	La Scie	35.00
967	Herbert Caines	Bellburns	80.00
971	Ellis Hukan	McKays	7.50
977	John Cooper	Inglewood, T.B.	25.00
978	Carl Legge	Robinsons	7.50
979	Gerald Samson	Monroe	10.00
981	Cornelius Biggin	Daniel's Hr.	10.00
989	Kenneth Bradley	Sandringham	10.00
1007	Freeman H. House	Daniel's Hr.	50.00
1014	Clarence Laing	Norris Pt.	25.00
1018	R. S. Branton	Thornlea	10.00
1025	Frank Penney	Hawke's Bay	5.00
1041	Kenneth Mills	Burlington	15.00
1068	Elijah Gould	King's Cove	80.00
1101	M. J. McDonald	New Bridge	10.00
1107	Howard Payne & Co.	Cow Head	25.00
1111	Hedley Penney	South Brook	12.50
1121	Nicholas Whelan	Conche	15.00
1158	Frank Hodder	Creston, P.B.	10.00
1182	Wm. B. Moulton	Winterland	10.00
199	R. & F. Eddy	North Hr., P. B.	10.00
202	Martin Ryan	St. Vincent's	10.00
220	James Parsons	Bloomfield	60.00
226	Arch Burt	Fairbanks	10.00
229	W. Cross	Port Blandford	10.00
236	P. Marrie	Mt. Carmel	10.00
242	C. G. Linfield	Loon Bay, N.D.B.	200.00
248	Humphrey Peddle	Port Blandford	25.00
259	Ron. S. Reader	Bloomfield	25.00
271	Kenneth Harnum	Dildo	15.00
282	Terrence O'Brien	Topsail	15.00
283	Oliver Warr	Purcell's Hr.	10.00
293	T. Smart & Sons	Lethbridge	25.00
310	Wm. J. Burgess	Whiteway, T. B.	10.00
322	James Wiscombe	Marystown	25.00
324	Wm. E. Penney	Canning's Cove	40.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
325	James Hodder & Sons	King's Cove, B.B.	\$50.00
346	Wm. Robbins & Sons	St. Jones Within	15.00
348	Peter Shaw	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
352	George Martin	Little Heart's Ease	15.00
361	James Butler	Shoal Hr.	30.00
362	H. Pelley & Bros.	George's Brook	15.00
370	J. G. Goobie	Queen's Cove	25.00
391	Israel Adams	Milton, T. B.	10.00
397	Selby Gullage	Catalina	10.00
401	Uriah Adams	Milton, T. B.	25.00
406	Edgar Fry	Charleston, B.B.	200.00
410	Arthur Cole	Point au Bay	50.00
423	Joseph Warr	Little Hr., Twillingate	10.00
424	George Rideout	Middle Arm, G. B.	80.00
444	Donald Saunders	Griquet, W.B.	15.00
358	Wallis & Edward Curtis	Hodge's Cove	20.00
359	Alex Strong	Clarenville	15.00
365	Harold Pelley & Bros.	Hillview, T.B.	10.00
370	Joseph Geo. Goobie	Queen's Cove	25.00
372	Wilson & E. Stoyles	Hillview	20.00
410	Arthur Cole	Point au Bay	50.00
416	Wm. Miller	Trinity	10.00
428	Richard Mercer	Thorburn Road	
		c/o Harvey Rd. P.O.	17.50
434	Joseph W. Vokey	Little Hr.	35.00
467	Ralph Smith	Elliott's Cove	15.00
472	Harrison & C. Blundell	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
479	Hayward Burt	Lady Cove, T.B.	25.00
482	Titus Spurrell & Partners	Little Heart's Ease	20.00
488	W. W. Young	Musgravetown, B.B.	50.00
494	Arch Froude & Bros.	New Burn Cove	15.00
495	Max Goodyear & Azariah Smith	Somerset, T.B.	25.00
552	Edmund D. Hoskins	St. Alban's	10.00
561	Edward Collier & Bros.	St. Alban's	300.00
607	D. H. Simmons	Green's Hr, T.B.	10.00
620	Austin House	Bellburns	150.00
621	Henry H. Crocker	Trout River	15.00
623	Linton Sheppard	Lark Harbor	10.00
639	Thomas Sutton	New Burn Cove	25.00
651	Angus Bennett	Daniel's Hr.	10.00
670	Robert L. Adey	Adeyton, T.B.	25.00
682	Azariah Small	Springdale	10.00
693	Stewart Parsons	Rocky Hr.	25.00
719	Chas. Wm. Payne & Bros.	Cow Head, St. Barbe	25.00
743	W. B. Milley & Son	Pacquet	10.00
753	John J. Blundell	Hickman's Hr., T.B.	15.00



No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
767	Joseph Lidstone	Corner Brook	\$25.00
775	Wm. J. Toms	King's Point, G.B.	250.00
833	Harold Loder	Snook's Hr., T.B.	15.00
1182	Wm. B. Moulton	Winterland	10.00
1193	Henry Walsh	Colliers	10.00
1201	Geo. R. Hodder	Gander Bay	32.50
1246	M. & H. Wilton	Willondale, Lomond	7.50
1252	George Foote	Snook's Arm	80.00
1255	Arthur Layte	Lewisporte	10.00
1256	Robert Murphy	Job's Cove	15.00
1264	Dexter Bridger	Brighton	80.00
1271	C. M. Wiseman	Hare Bay, B.B.	30.00
1273	Hector Reid	Chapel Arm	25.00
1289	William Penney	Little Springs	25.00
1290	Pleamon Sacrey	Woodstock	10.00
1308	A. G. Chippett	Head's Hr.	7.50
1313	Paul L. Hall	Wood's Island	10.00
1328	James Hobbs	Springdale	25.00
1336	Stanley Tulk	Aspen Cove, Fogo	25.00
1349	Raymond Caines	Bird Cove	10.00
1358	Leslie Spracklin	Charlottetown	150.00
1370	Horace Sheppard	York Hr., Bay of Islands	10.00
1371	Thomas S. McIsaac	St. Andrew's	5.0
1376	Leslie Barnes	Frenchman's Cove	15.00
1387	Maxwell Crocker	Trout River	75.00
1392	George Brown	Heatherton	5.00
1386	Hedley Henstridge	Triton West	10.00
1427	Harvey Crocker & Bros.	Woody Point	157.50
1437	Frank McArthur	McDale	7.50
1444	Stanley March	Stephenville Crossing	7.50
1445	Alexander Roberts	Jim's Cove	10.00
1462	Roddie Benoit	Ship Cove	5.00
1474	Cyril C. Pelley	Rattling Brook	225.00
1477	Colinet Lumber Yards	Colinet	150.000
1562	Abram Lee	Round Hr.	10.00
1570	S. J. Brown	King's Cove	80.00
1588	Michael C. Bennett	Stephenville	7.50
1593	Wm. H. Tucker	Cape Onion	10.00
404	Geo. Mercer & Co.	Boyd's Cove, N.D.B.	10.00
405	Edgar Fry	Charleston, B.B.	25.00
456	Robert Verge	Britannia	15.00
463	Frank Stone	Britannia	25.00
474	Samuel J. Penney	Hickman's Hr.	10.00
490	Robert Bros.	Head Bay D'Espoir	900.00
500	J. & A. Prince	Charleston	25.00
517	Edward Stanley	George's Brook	25.00
524	John P. Rumbolt	New Ferrolle	90.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
548	Samuel Wells	Millertown	\$ 5.00
566	L. J. Benoit	Lourdes	15.00
578	M. J. MacPherson	Highlands	5.00
582	W. R. Canning	Roddickton	50.00
642	Saunders Howell Ltd.	Carbonear	1250.00
648	Elam King	Little Hr.	25.00
670	Robert L. Adey	Adeyton, T.B.	25.00
682	Azariah Small	Springdale	10.00
705	Maxwell Duffett	Britannia	25.00
732	J. J. Goobie & A. Butt	Queen's Cove	15.00
746	Fred Murphy	Charlottetown	15.00
768	Hubert Harris	Charleston, B.B.	50.00
778	Baxter Hayley	Charleston, B.B.	25.00
871	Gerald Strickland	Little Bay	10.00
881	Daniel Feltham	Upper Humber	7.50
893	Philip Brown & Bros.	Trinity, B.B.	12.50
913	Robert G. Smith	Chance Cove, T.B.	10.00
937	T. D. Legge	Heatherton	7.50
995	Martin & G. Collins	Hare Bay	25.00
1000	Fred Maidment	Windsor	7.50
1015	Thos. Garland Ltd.	Gaultois	450.00
1021	Thomas Tucker	New Ferröle	80.00
1062	Michael Bartlett	Griquet	10.00
1070	Harvey Wight	Pasadena	25.00
1153	Lloyd Ralph	Traytown	10.00
1894	A. B. Baker	Laurenceton, N.D.B.	50.00
1898	Norman Purchase	Laurenceton	50.00
1902	Frederick M. Thistle	Burlington	80.00
1912	E. W. Ryan	Robert's Arm, G.B.	25.00
1915	A.N.D. Co. Ltd.	Grand Falls	75.00
1916	Scott Penell	Noggin Cove	10.00
1919	Ronald Beaton	Wigwam Point, via Botwood	20.00
1922	Frederick Randell	Williamsport, W.B.	25.00
1926	Charles Toope Sr	New Bonaventure	15.00
1927	Wm. J. Best	Port Blandford	25.00
1934	Temple J. G. Boone	New Bay	25.00
1938	Geo. R. Hiscock	Corbin, F.B.	10.00
1951	Caleb Meadus	St. Jones Within	15.00
1961	Boyd Coleridge	Trinity, T.B.	10.00
1969	Nath Hussey	Paradise, C.B.	7.50
1972	Ernest Rose	Marystown, P.B.	15.00
1997	Isaac Patey	River of Ponds	50.00
2004	Robert Anderson	Birchy Hd., Bonne Bay	150.00
2011	Abram Spurrell	Queen's Cove, T.B.	10.00
2034	Wm. Hibbs	Peter's Arm	15.00
2050	Willis Wiseman	Bloomfield	25.00
2057	Joseph Aylward	King's Cove, B.B.	25.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2058	Llewellyn Rideout	Burlington, G.B.	\$25.00
2070	Dorman Pelley	Phillip's Head	25.00
2074	R. A. Combdon	Jackson's Arm, W.B.	250.00
2084	Albert English	Branch	15.00
2094	Heber W. Young	Birchy Head	15.00
2096	Reuben Samms	Norris Point	25.00
2097	Andrew Porter	Lewisporte	10.00
2105	Thos. Canning	Peter's Arm	15.00
2108	Noah Berry	Bloomfield, B.B.	15.00
2109	Wm. L. Keough	Plate Cove East	25.00
2110	Thos. Endicott	Sally's Cove	10.00
2112	Charles Rice	Point Leamington	80.00
2113	E. W. Hewlett	South Brook, H.B.	10.00
202	Martin Ryan	St. Vincent's	10.00
219	Isaac Caines	Port Saunders	50.00
229	W. Cross	Port Blanford	10.00
236	Patrick Morry	Mt. Carmel	10.00
241	Sidney Cooper	Swift Current	10.00
242	C. G. Linfield	Loon Bay	200.00
247	W. R. Mercer	Blaketown, T.B.	5.00
248	Humphrey Peddle	Port Blanford	25.00
254	T. J. Matthews	Springdale	25.00
260	Michael Gallant	Curling	10.00
282	Terence O'Brien	Topsail	22.50
283	Cecil Earle	Fairbanks	10.00
287	George Dean	North Hr. P.B.	10.00
307	Charles Harnum	Green's Hr. T.B.	25.00
319	Wm. & Jesse Burgess	Whiteway, T.B.	10.00
322	J. W. Wiscombe & Sons	Creston	25.00
246	Wm. Robbins & Sons	St. Jones Within	25.00
347	Allan Tucker	St. Jones Within	15.00
348	Peter Shaw	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
352	Geo. Martin	Little Heart's Ease	15.00
353	Eli Drodge	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
361	Edward Wiseman	Shoal Hr.	30.00
367	Andrew Adey & Bros.	Adeyton	10.00
368	Gilbert Short	Deep Bight	10.00
377	Samuel H. Cooper	Green's Hr.	25.00
390	Arthur T. Drover & Sons	Whitbourne	15.00
3	Frederick Parsons	Bonne Bay	25.00
5	Robert Tucker	Norris Point	80.00
6	James Philpott	Jamestown, B.B.	15.00
12	Patrick Walsh	Coachman's Cove	80.00
19	J. Wright & Sons	Lumsden	15.00
24	Samuel Burton	La Scie	15.00
27	John D. Galliot	Eddie's Cove	25.00
30	Dan. J. Tobin	Ship Cove	25.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2124	Clifford Marey	Miles Cove, N.D.B.	\$10.00
2128	Harold Vivian	Port Rexton	25.00
2134	Frank Taylor	Peter's Arm	15.00
2140	Walter Coombs	Upper Island Cove	15.00
2143	Hedley Phillips	Monroe	15.00
2146	Mark Adams	P. O. Box 168	10.00
2148	Willie Toms	La Scie	10.00
2152	Alexander Harris	Port Blanford	25.00
2175	Nath Padock	Robert's Arm, G.B.	15.00
2178	Edward Mason	Princeton	25.00
2161	Israel Kelly	Trinity, T.B.	15.00
2168	D. Greening	Port Blanford	80.00
2175	Clyde & Leslie Holloway	Monroe, T.B.	15.00
2178	Edward Mason	Avondale, C.B.	10.00
2182	Thos. J. Blundon	Lethbridge, B.B.	10.00
2186	Fred Morgan	Robert's Arm, G.B.	50.00
2191	Geo. Bennett	Wild Bight, G.B.	25.00
2193	James Hollohan	Summerville	10.00
2202	John C. Young	Fishell's	2.50
2208	Ralph Parsons	Robert's Arm, G.B.	10.00
2209	Michael Ryan	Bay Bulls	15.00
2229	Hubert Hibbs	Robert's Arm, G.B.	15.00
2234	Felix Pike	Bellevue, T.B.	10.00
2239	Geo. W. Brake	Trout River	10.00
2241	Ernest Morris	Little Hearts Ease	15.00
2252	Ivan Gallop	Empire Ave. W.	5.00
2256	Uriah Price	Port Blanford	10.00
2258	Wm. Mugford	Hodgewater	10.00
2262	Edgar Wicks	Jackson's Arm, W.B.	5.00
2275	John LeFresne	31 Cornation St., Grand Falls	5.00
2283	Barton Turnbull	Triangle, Labrador	10.00
2292	John Mason	Avondale	10.00
2295	Manuel Barry	Lance au Loop	10.00
2298	W. J. Vaters	Frenchman's Cove	5.00
1698	Ben Powell	Square Islands	50.00
1777	Lewis Bownes	Port Anson, G.B.	75.00
1781	Frederick Hayter	Gander	17.50
1792	Geo. Lane	Bloomfield, B.B.	30.00
1800	David Dalton	John's Pond	10.00
1825	Elihu Greening	Musgravetown	10.00
1827	Dorman Haggert	Leading Ticks	50.00
1842	Reginald Canning	Lewisporte	10.00
1851	Joseph Pittman	Marystown	15.00
1864	Frank Philpott	Plate Cove East	25.00
1888	Fenwick Martin	Hickman's Hr, T.B.	10.00
1891	Jack Quinton	Charleston, B.B.	25.00
1896	Theodore Moss	Jamestown	25.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1900	Manuel Rowsell	Smith's Hr.	\$15.00
1904	Geo. Suley	Whitbourne	25.00
1920	Thomas House	Bellburns	200.00
1936	Frank Ford	Jackson's Arm, W.B.	25.00
1940	Cecil Randell	Williamsport, W.B.	25.00
1948	Geo. Roberts & Sons	Sally's Cove	15.00
1954	Reginald Palmer	Brooklyn. B.B.	25.00
1976	Frederick Fry	Long Beach	25.00
1978	Maurice Butt	Kenmount Road	5.00
1991	Myles Hanlon	Norris Arm	110.00
1999	John Wm. Perry	Daniel's Hr.	25.00
2006	Simon Stringer	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
2007	George A. Langer	Clarendville	25.00
2026	Archibald James	Bryant's Cove	15.00
2016	Edgar Boone	Cottrell's Cove	25.00
2056	James Pittman	George's Brook, T.B.	5.00
2060	Nevil Wiseman	Bloomfield, B.B.	15.00
2071	Donald Bowdridge	Brigus	15.00
2076	Ronald Haynes	West Bay Centre	5.00
2085	Andrew Moss	Jamestown, B.B.	15.00
2087	Pye & Yetman	Cape Charles	25.00
2095	Duncan W. Parsons	Robert's Arm	25.00
2098	Watson Diamond	Lethbridge	15.00
480	Wm. J. King	St. Jones Within	15.00
481	H. Smith & Sons	Elliott's Cove	25.00
484	Robert A. Luther	Monroe, B.B.	25.00
492	Richard Hancock	Jamestown, B.B.	15.00
506	W. B. Belbin	Bay Roberts	25.00
538	Roy Renouf	St. Davids	5.00
541	Leonard D. Haynes	Searston	40.00
543	Richard White	Tompkins	5.00
545	Edward Gale	South Branch	7.50
549	R. G. Butt	Robinson's	50.00
572	J. J. Tetford	Laurenceton	80.00
579	H. J. House	Port Saunders	55.00
583	Dorman Hutchings	Laurenceton	15.00
588	Peter Parsons	Pelley's Island	
590	Roderick Cornick	Port au Choix	55.00
593	Rowell Bros.	Rattling Brook	100.00
595	Elijah Boyd	Summerford	5.00
608	John C. Payne	Parsons Pond	50.00
615	Benj. Parsons	Rocky Hr.	50.00
620	Austin House	Bellburns	150.00
622	Wm. Cornect	Cape St. George	25.00
629	A.N.D. Co. Ltd.	Millertown	125.00
659	James Cross	Deer Lake	125.00
660	A. B. Lovell	McIvers	10.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
665	Edward Penney	Cook's Hr., W. B.	\$10.00
686	George Plowman	Port Saunders	55.00
691	Allan & Clyde House	Port Saunders	25.00
693	Stewart Parsons	Rocky Hr.	25.00
701	John Harnum	Brown's Arm	15.00
704	Andrew Ellsworth	Rocky Hr.	50.00
706	Clyde Shears	Rocky Hr.	25.00
707	Gordon Shears	Rocky Hr.	50.00
708	Bruce Hart	Botwood	25.00
19	Jonas Wright & Sons	Lumsden North	15.00
14	Charles Foote	Sunnyside, T.B.	15.00
27	John D. Galliot	Eddie's Cove West	25.00
28	Denis Ryan	O'Reagan's	5.00
30	D. & J. Tobin	Ship Cove	25.00
38	H. R. Woolfrey	Lewisporte	80.00
46	S. G. Andrews	Pt. Leamington	50.00
48	E. W. Farrell	North Bay, LaPoile	15.00
50	Pius Billard	Port au Choix	10.00
51	Thomas R. Daly	Riverhead, St. Mary's	10.00
60	Farrell Bros.	St. Alban's	25.00
68	M. J. Small	Summerford	25.00
75	Eric Major	Rocky Hr.	80.00
81	Steadman & Brophy	Daniel's Hr.	10.00
82	Adolph Simon	Cape St. George	10.00
90	Lewis Mehanev	Herring Neck	10.00
92	Power Bros.	Chapel Arm	15.00
97	Robert Spence	Port au Choix	80.00
101	S. J. Reid	Norris Point	25.00
104	Hugh Simmonds	Coliner	500.00
116	J. R. Hodder	Creston, P. B.	15.00
132	Arthur Nicholle	Rocky Hr.	25.00
140	Robert Beaton & Bros.	Norris Arm	75.00
141	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	5.00
146	C. H. Freeborn	Hr. Mille, F. B.	10.00
151	Birchy Bay Lumber Co.	Birchy Bay	150.00
164	Obediah Burt	Hillgrade, N.D.B.	10.00
170	Sandy Critch	Hant's Hr. T.B.	10.00
172	J. J. Penney	Holyrood	10.00
175	Alex Burt	Bunyan's Cove	210.00
181	Jeff F. Abbott	Musgrave Hr.	25.00
196	A. T. Woolfrey & Bros.	Carmanville	600.00
197	Howard House	Bellburns	80.00
2243	Maxwell Burry	Glovertown	10.00
234	Andrew Walsh	Bellevue	15.00
494	A. Froude & Bros.	New Burn Cove	15.00
520	Lewis Pritchett	Glovertown	125.00
552	E. D. Hoskins	St. Alban's	10.00



No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
554	H. T. Appleby	Loon's Cove	\$25.00
555	Kyle Inkpen	Loon's Cove	150.00
661	S. T. Manuel	Goose Arm	25.00
673	Wm. Reid	Ireland Bight	15.00
815	Emanuel Payne	Parson's Pond	25.00
866	H. Reid	Deer Lake	5.00
1088	A. T. White	Seal Cove, W.B.	75.00
1150	John Cashin	Port au Port	15.00
1175	Wm. Pottle	Eastport	10.00
1287	Angus Gould	Bear Cove	10.00
1338	Absalom Payne	Rocky Hr.	10.00
1642	Victor White	Cottrell's Cove	150.00
1687	Albert Bailey	Flower's Cove	10.00
1733	Nathaniel Cassell	Hr. Deep	25.00
1758	David Stoyles	Hillview	10.00
1849	Wm. Gillett	Postville, Lab.	50.00
2047	Garfield Tucker	King's Point	10.00
2045	Mark Holloway	Bloomfield	15.00
2086	Mark Clarke	Pope's Hr.	15.00
2262	Edgar Wicks	Jackson's Arm	15.00
2263	Josiah Tucker	Bunyan's Cove	10.00
2264	Thomas Lane	Portland, B.B.	15.00
1832	John C. Beck	Swift Current	25.00
2265	George Pike	Spaniard's Bay	10.00
2266	Garfield Strickland	Little Bay, H. B.	10.00
2267	Leonard Inkpen	Lewin's Cove, P. B.	10.00
4	J. E. McKenzie	Norris Point	110.00
10	Edgar Bowring	Bay Roberts	15.00
20	A. G. Hayse	St. George's	7.50
2101	Steadman Crocker	Trout River	15.00
2209	Michael Ryan	Bay Bulls	15.00
2210	Gilbert Philpott	Jamestown	15.00
2211	S. J. Hann	Trout River	25.00
2212	Abraham Moore	Clarke's Beach	15.00
2213	Charles Decker	Cook's Hr.	10.00
2214	Henry P. Noll	Carbonear	15.00
2215	Anthony Companion	Wood's Island	12.50
2216	Percie Payne	Parson's Pond	25.00
2217	Wm. Collier	St. Alban's	15.00
2218	Wm. Gilbert	Fair Haven	15.00
2219	Emanuel Pearce	New Perlican	10.00
2220	Heber Chatman, Jr.	Canning's Cove	25.00
2221	Gordon C. Cullihall	Cormack	5.00
2222	J. Goodyear & Sons Ltd.	Grand Falls	5.00
2223	James Moss	Salvage, B.B.	10.00
2224	Frank J. Breton	Burin	15.00
2225	Jacob Osmond	Jackson's Arm	10.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2226	Cyril Wareham	Placentia	\$10.00
2227	James Jenkins	Windsor	5.00
2228	Thos. W. Johnson	Jacques Fontaine	15.00
2229	Hubert Hibbs	Roberts Arm	15.00
2230	Bernard Gorman	Searston	12.50
2231	Peter Walsh	Little Hr. West	10.00
2232	Bert Allen	Little River	12.50
2233	Thomas Caines	Bartlett's Hr.	40.00
2234	Felix Pike	Bellevue	10.00
2235	Grant Crocker	Trout River	45.00
2236	William Knee	Jamestown	25.00
2237	Halstead Gosse	Queen's Cove	15.00
2238	J. W. Walters	Petley, T.B.	15.00
2239	G. W. Brake	Trout River	10.00
2240	Harrison Wentzell	Portland Creek	15.00
2241	Ernest Morris	Little Heart's Ease	15.00
1610	Geo. Wiseman	Port Anson	25.00
1628	Arthur & Thos. Button	Silver Fox Is.	15.00
1639	Capt. Geo. Glover	Bragg's Island	25.00
1678	Gordon Hoskins	St. Alban's	15.00
1682	Bernard Clarke	Conche	10.00
1693	Wm. Bartlett	Quirpon	10.00
1717	Rex H. Torrance	Victoria Cove	10.00
1730	Fred Roberts	Card's Hr.	50.00
1755	Stanley Patey	Port Saunders	5.00
1779	Wilbert Cluett	Frenchman's Cove	10.00
1820	Francis Rose	Stephenville	7.50
1823	Nelson Coles	Savage Cove	10.00
1826	Gerald Hollett	Goulds	15.00
1830	Jack Dobbin	St. Marys	15.00
1819	Cyril Cutler	St. George's	15.00
1867	Ambrose W. Osmond	Jackson's Arm	80.00
1879	John Decker	Coney Arm, W.B.	25.00
1900	Manuel Rowsell	Smith's Hr., G.B.	15.00
1907	J. Traverse, Jr.	Coachman's Cove	160.00
1913	Lodrick Reid	Mile's Cove, C.B.	25.00
1924	David Noseworthy	Savage Cove	10.00
1931	Leamon Gale	Robinson's Station	25.00
1943	John Simms	Little Bay Islands	15.00
1949	Michael Foley	Placentia	25.00
1962	R. E. Skiffington	Musgravetown	15.00
1970	Oswald Chippet	Leading Tickle	15.00
1981	John Putt	Goulds	15.00
1988	Ambrose Davis	Grandois	15.00
1997	Isaac Patey	River of Ponds	50.00
2011	Abram Spurrell	Queen's Cove	10.00
2029	John Dawe	Coley's Point	10.00

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY PROCEEDINGS

2095

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2038	Victor Smith	Hodge's Cove	\$10.00
2064	Harold Crocker	Trout River	25.00
2069	W. J. Lane	Summerville	50.00
1026	W. & S. Mercer	Sunnyside, T.B.	20.00
1054	Douglas Gilbert	Lobster Hr.	15.00
1088	A. T. White	Seal Cove, W.B.	75.00
1129	J. A. Campbell	Campbell's Creek	10.00
1169	James T. Hammond	Bell Island	5.00
1280	Clayton Brake	Meadows	10.00
1313	Paul L. Hall	Wood's Island	10.00
1350	Lloyd E. Yates	Summerford	22.50
1427	Harvey Crocker & Bros.	Woody Point	157.50
1476	Clevis Major	Pasadena	5.00
1494	Arthur Collins	Hare Bay, B.B.	25.00
1528	Stephen Lainey	Fox Island	25.00
1662	Eleazer Mitchell	Middle Arm	200.00
1691	A. Rees	Bell Island	5.00
1745	Notre Dame Stores	Baie Verte	12.50
1755	D. J. Gillis	Highlands	5.00
1804	Lionel Cameron	Shoe Cove	7.50
1808	James Gould	Charleston	15.00
1826	Gerald Hollett	Goulds	15.00
1851	Joseph Pittman	Marystown	15.00
1865	Joseph Simmonds	Canning's Cove	25.00
1867	Ambrose W. Osmond	Jackson's Arm	80.00
1879	John Decker	Coney Arm	25.00
1930	A. L. G. Heath	South Brook	10.00
1959	Llewelyn Norman	Western Arm	5.00
1995	La Scie Co-Op. Soc.	La Scie	25.00
2010	Lewis Hefford	Elliott's Cove	15.00
2023	Patrick Keough	Plate Cove West	25.00
2036	Roland Reid	Roddickton	25.00
2078	Isaac Caines	Black Duck Cove	10.00
2091	Joseph E. Penney	Canning's Cove	25.00
2092	Eric Sutton	Burgoyne's Cove	25.00
2098	Watson Diamond	Lethbridge	15.00
2101	Steadman Crocker	Trout River	25.00
1527	Wallace Adams	Milton, T.B.	15.00
1647	Walter Kendall	Ship Cove	5.00
1733	Thos Nolan	Harcourt	10.00
1793	W. J. Maidment	Bonavista	80.00
1802	Cecil Newman	Englee	25.00
2076	Donald Hynes	West Bay Centre	5.00
2083	J. J. Devine	Blackhead Road	10.00
2088	Harold Pitcher	Burgoyne's Cove	15.00
2267	Leonard Inkpen	Lewin's Cove	10.00
2268	John Dyke	Rushy Pond	5.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2269	Absalom Genge	Anchor Point	\$10.00
2270	Chesley Pardy	Benton	5.00
2271	Wm. B. Soolley	Heart's Delight	10.00
2272	James Mahoney	O'Donnell's	10.00
2273	Dominic Leonard	Southern Hr.	10.00
2275	John LeDrew	21 Coronation St.	5.00
2276	Albert Mullins	Cox's Cove	5.00
2277	A. LeDrew	Gander Bay	15.00
463	Frank Stone	Britannia	25.00
467	Ralph Smith	Elliott's Cove	15.00
486	Emanuel Currie	Britannia	15.00
487	Fred & Roy Adams	Milton, T.B.	50.00
610	A. T. White	Seal Cove, W.B.	40.00
648	Elam King	Little Hr., T.B.	10.00
671	Ralph Duffett	Britannia	15.00
677	Wm. J. Sutton	Burgoyne's Cove	25.00
690	Hounsell Bros.	Jackson's Arm	200.00
700	Allan Baker	Snook's Hr., T.B.	
705	Maxwell Duffett	Britannia	25.00
767	Joseph Lidstone	Corner Brook	25.00
810	Romaine Bros.	Port au Port	7.50
833	Harold Loder	Snook's Hr.	15.00
879	James Vokcy	Little Hr. T.B.	10.00
906	Ambrose Scott	Little Hr. T.B.	10.00
1071	Grant House	Bellburns	80.00
1074	A. Pollard	Williamsport	15.00
1084	B. Elliott	Cook's Hr. W.B.	10.00
1101	W. J. McDonald	St. Joseph's	10.00
1089	D. Peddle	Port Blandford	25.00
1094	T. Maher	Bird Cove	50.00
1111	Hedley Penney	Pasadena	12.50
1115	A.N.D. Co.	Terra Nova	25.00
1121	Levi Hodder	Creston, P.B.	50.00
1134	H. Doucette	Felix Cove	15.00
1142	Joseph Kennedy	Norris Point	200.00
1148	John Upshall	Chance Cove, T.B.	15.00
1185	M. Lush	Middle Brook	50.00
1189	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	5.00
1204	S. Parsons	Summerside	22.50
1206	S. Boyd	Morton's Hr.	10.00
1210	A. Callahan	Badger	5.00
1217	T. Walls	Rocky Hr.	50.00
1218	W. & L. Myles	Bunyan's Cove	20.00
1219	D. Goulding	Pt. Leamington	150.00
1232	E. Foss	Salt Pond	50.00
1233	T. Luscombe	Loon Bay	25.00
1237	F. Butt	St. George's	110.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1239	C. Osmond	Birchy Bay	150.00
1257	C. S. Davis	Glovertown	10.00
1259	James C. Shears	Rocky Hr.	25.00
1268	A. Hicks	Peter's River	15.00
1269	Steadman Young	Birchy Bay	80.00
1277	Jesse E. Abbott	Doting Cove	10.00
1278	L. Rowsell	Englee	25.00
1279	Steadman Gould	Spirity Cove	25.00
1288	W. J. Lundrigan	Peter's River	15.00
1292	S. Marrie	St. Catherine's	40.00
1305	Matt Collier	St. Alban's	10.00
1312	Fred Pelley	Twillingate	10.00
1314	D. J. Williams	Card's Hr.	130.00
1324	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	5.00
1316	Edison Halbot	St. Fintan's	7.50
1353	S. Madore	Jeffrey's	5.00
1362	J. H. Taylor	Cupids	25.00
1366	W. McKay	South Brook	30.00
1367	Bert Organ	St. Alban's	15.00
1369	R. Hustins & Sons	New Bay	25.00
1374	Fred Wells	Brig Bay	50.00
1380	J. L. Payne	Cow Head	25.00
1381	Snook Bros.	St. Alban's	25.00
1386	Wm. Seaward	Deer Lake	300.00
1393	E. Hayden	Port Blandford	7.50
1407	W. Hale	Comfort Cove	25.00
1409	Leslie Pilgrim	Port Saunders	135.00
1426	Eli Knott	Sally's Cove	75.00
1432	R. H. Dawe	Bishop's Falls	5.00
1439	Selby J. Evans	Northern Arm	25.00
1448	Fred Barnes	Cox's Cove	75.00
1473	Ronald Lannon	S. E. Placentia	25.00
1486	Reginald Strickland	Little Bay, H.B.	25.00
1504	Wesley Oldford	Windsor	5.00
1506	Gabriel Chaffey	St. David's	5.00
1509	Jerome Rumbolt	Woody Point	150.00
1511	David Power	Colinet Island	10.00
1514	Jerimiah Bonia	North Hr.	15.00
1486	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	5.00
1516	Sydney Boone	Clarke's Beach	25.00
1518	Henry T. Patey	River of Ponds	25.00
1519	Buchan's Mining Co.	Buchans	15.00
1520	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	200.00
1524	Max Peyton	Botwood	100.00
856	Gordon Caines	Hawke's Bay	15.00
865	Guy Payne	Port Saunders	25.00
874	Ernest Mill	Hermitage	10.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
875	Benj. Guy	Arnold's Cove	\$10.00
907	Eli Ellsworth	Carmanville	80.00
900	Terrence Martin	Boyd's Cove	80.00
920	Walter Chaulk	Stanhope	50.00
940	Halfyard Bros.	Bonne Bay	80.00
958	Caleb Patey	River of Ponds	50.00
960	McLain Bros.	Trout River	25.00
967	H. House	Bellburns	80.00
969	S. J. Wells	Glenwood	7.50
972	Wm. R. Parsons	Port au Choix	15.00
974	Isaac Boone & Sons	Cottrell's Cove	110.00
975	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	7.50
983	P. Hynes	Little Burnt Bay	80.00
989	K. Bradley	Sandringham	10.00
996	R. Pardy	Hr. Mille	15.00
998	A.N.D. Co.	Bishops Falls	5.00
1002	A. Goosney	Birchy Head	85.00
1007	F. H. House	Daniel's Hr.	50.00
1018	R. & S. Branton	Thornlea, T.B.	10.00
1024	James Biggin	Port Saunders	50.00
1025	F. Penney	Hawke's Bay	5.00
1028	Mr. Antle	Fleur de Lys	50.00
1043	C. B. Bartlett	Petries, Via Curling	5.00
1057	Bowaters	Lomond	12.50
1059	John H. Coffin	Joe Batts Arm	10.00
1060	James Mahar	Bird Cove	10.00
1067	Felix Ryan	Port Saunders	25.00
1068	E. Gould	King's Cove	25.00
2111	Alpheus Hancock	Brooklyn	15.00
2115	Chesley Coish	Burgoyne's Cove	15.00
2244	Chesley Traverse	South Branch	12.50
2245	Emanuel Hynes	Millertown Jctn.	10.00
2246	Ernest Seaward	Gooseberry Cove	10.00
2247	Clement Brown	Gambo	5.00
2248	James O'Neil	Sweet Bay	15.00
2249	George Osmond	Stephenville	7.50
2250	Ashton Cassell	Little Hr. Deep	12.50
2252	Ivan Gallop	Empire Ave.	5.00
2253	H. Edison	Blackhead Road	10.00
2254	Clayton Bolt	Grand Le Pierre	10.00
2255	Raymond Bennett	Cow Head	5.00
2256	Uriah Price	Port Blandford	10.00
2257	John Parrott	Mt. Carmel	10.00
2258	William Mugford	Hodgewater Line	10.00
2259	Bowaters	Corner Brook	25.00
2251	E. G. Tizzard	Grand Le Pierre	10.00



## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY PROCEEDINGS

2099

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
26	John Caines	Shoal Cove East	\$10.00
41	T. St. George & Son	Heart's Desire	80.00
58	Wilson Vardy	Clarenville	15.00
65	Alfred K. Wells	Campbellton	80.00
84	Adolph J. Benoit	Cape St. George	50.00
94	George Sheppard & Bros.	Peter's Arm	125.00
95	George Sheppard & Bros.	Peter's Arm	15.00
103	Wm. Pittman	Marystown, P.B.	50.00
106	G. W. Hann & Sons	Summerside	10.00
117	Charles A. Butt	Exploits	10.00
124	J. Thoms & Sons	Carbonear	10.00
145	H. C. Haines	Portland	15.00
148	Banfield Bros.	Garnish	10.00
155	C. McFatridge & Sons	Stephenville Siding	17.50
157	Archie McLellan	O'Regan's	12.50
182	Solomon Eveleigh	Newstead, N.D.B.	117.50
193	Nigel Campbell	Black Duck	5.00
1540	M. Power	North Hr.	10.00
1545	Benj. Price	Brent's Cove, W.B.	15.00
1526	B. McCarthy	Bellevue, T.B.	15.00
1560	C. Fillier & Co.	Clarke's Beach	80.00
1664	P. Companion	Benoit's Cove	80.00
1677	G. Simms	Triton, G.B.	25.00
1679	J. Upwards	East Bay, La Poile	15.00
1702	A. K. Sceviour	Botwood	50.00
1694	P. Ryan	Colliers, C.B.	15.00
1722	Wm. Garrin	Bear Cove	5.00
1732	Robert Clarke	Ming's Bight	12.50
1738	Arthur Murphy	Charlottetown	25.00
183	Job Elliott	Loon Bay, B.B.	15.00
1780	Chesley Oldford	Bunyan's Cove	25.00
1787	Leslie Cooper	Elliott's Cove	10.00
1792	George Lane	Bloomfield, B.B.	30.00
1799	Isaac Penney	Lethbridge	25.00
1829	G. W. Brentnall	Dark Cove, Gambo	50.00
1833	Ford Oldford	Musgravetown	25.00
1835	Howard Lumber Co.	St. John's	40.00
1840	Thos. Dooley	Sweet Bay	50.00
1843	Chas. Tucker	St. Phillips	5.00
1853	Eli W. Squires	St. Phillips	12.50
1861	Wesley Holloway	Lethbridge	25.00
1863	Hector Penney	Jamestown	25.00
1864	Frank Philpott	Plate Cove West	25.00
1890	Joseph Tucker	King's Point	110.00
1904	George Suley	Whitbourne	25.00
1908	Robert Dawe	Seal Cove, C.B.	20.00
1917	Ches. Reid	Jackson's Arm, W.B.	10.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1947	Garfield Tucker	King's Point	\$110.00
1961	Boyd Coleridge	Trinity, T.B.	10.00
1973	A. Lainey	Mainland	10.00
1983	Frank Organ	St. Alban's	15.00
978	Carl Legge	Robinson's	7.50
999	James Blackwood	Glovertown	60.00
1034	Karl Kendell	Morrisville	115.00
1041	Kenneth Mills	Burlington	15.00
1045	Wm. Hacquail & Sons	Pool's Cove	15.00
1096	John D. Diamond	Cook's Hr.	10.00
1109	Wm. Hewitt	Westport, W.B.	5.00
1120	Harvey Bishop	Stephenville King	50.00
1131	S. Goosney	Parson's Pond	50.00
1146	Stan Vivian	Heart's Delight	25.00
1154	Wm. J. Janes	Glovertown, B.B.	350.00
1162	H. L. Anderson	Gillams, B. of Is.	15.00
1191	George Keats	Bunyan's Cove	25.00
1202	John Baker	Goobies	25.00
1227	George Sexton	Bloomfield	80.00
1235	James Sparkes	Seal Cove, W.B.	5.00
1297	Peter LeDrew	Kelligrews	37.50
1307	Rupert Bruit	Pt. Leamington	80.00
1321	Joseph L. Lockyer	Isle au Valen	10.00
1322	J. C. Russell	Winterbrook	85.00
1333	Payne Bros.	Cox's Cove	25.00
1345	Fred Wells	Cox's Cove	10.00
1347	M. Gillingham	Noggin Cove	80.00
1348	Alfred Penney	Charlottetown	25.00
1368	V. Elliott	Twillingate	10.00
1372	J. Ollerhead	St. Anthony	10.00
1379	R. Churchill	Bay Roberts	92.50
1418	Wm. J. O'Quinn	Millville	12.50
1422	W. & L. Norman	Long Hr., Plac. B.	10.00
1455	L. G. Pennell	Noggin Cove, Fogo	10.00
1481	L. Fry & Bros.	Southern Bay	25.00
1482	L. Oxford	Little Bay Islands	80.00
1498	J. C. Gosse	Corner Brook	5.00
472	H. & C. Blundell	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
482	Titus Spurrell & Co.	Little Heart's Ease	20.00
485	George Barrett	Harcourt, T.B.	15.00
488	W. W. Young	Musgravetown	50.00
512	W. H. & F. Brake	Meadow's	10.00
526	John Holliday	Britannia	10.00
513	George Allen & Co.	Curling	250.00
528	Lewis Martin	Bunyan's Cove	10.00
540	Justin Downey	Great Codroy	5.00
553	Joseph Walsh	St. Alban's	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
561	Edward Collier & Bros.	St. Alban's	\$300.00
563	William Moss	Jamestown	25.00
592	Howard LeDrew	Laurenceton	32.50
607	D. J. Simmonds	Green's Hr. T. B.	10.00
612	Wm. Corcoran	River Head	10.00
623	Linton Sheppard	Lark Hr.	10.00
641	Leonard Pitcher	Burgoyne's Cove	15.00
644	John Legge	Whiteway, T.B.	10.00
694	Raymond Cole	Point au Bay	200.00
699	N. B. Sparkes	Glovertown	200.00
734	N. Ivany & Co.	Britannia	25.00
735	Strickland Bros.	Milltown	600.00
753	John T. Blundell	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
754	Wilfred Ash	Brooklyn	15.00
763	F. W. Parsons	Middle Brook	25.00
809	Bryant Shears	Deer Lake	25.00
862	Chris Smart	Lethbridge	50.00
878	A. J. & W. Brooking	Petley, T.B.	25.00
891	A. G. Gale	Millville	7.50
892	G. E. Parsons & Sons	Woody Point, B. B.	10.00
926	G Elliott	Raleigh	10.00
928	Geo. Andrews	Leading Ticksles	15.00
931	Roy Penney	Canning's Cove	15.00
932	Robert Smith	Queen's Cove	10.00
935	Wesley Parmiter	Pt. Leamington	200.00
1990	Locksley Little	Bloomfield	15.00
1999	J. W. Perry	Daniel's Hr.	25.00
2024	John Keats	Bloomfield, B.B.	50.00
2027	W. Tulk	Ladle Cove	15.00
2049	Don Earles	Mount Pearl	5.00
2050	Willis Wiseman	Bloomfield, B.B.	25.00
2084	Albert English	Branch, St. Mary's	15.00
2108	H. Marey	Port Anson, G.B.	15.00
2181	Wm. Pynn	Windsor	15.00
2172	S. King	Little Hr. T.B.	25.00
2188	Roy Tulk	Ladle Cove	25.00
2189	D. Diamond	Lethbridge	15.00
2185	C. & W. Temple	Long Cove, T.B.	15.00
2186	F. Morgan	Robert's Arm	50.00
2187	H. McCarthy	Hr. Grace	10.00
2190	W. Budden	Sop's Arm, W.B.	25.00
2191	G. Bennett	Wild Bight, G.B.	50.00
2192	A. Green	Green's Hr.	10.00
2193	J. Hallohan	Summerville	20.00
2194	L. Young	St. Teresa's	10.00
2195	C. Dodge	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
2196	R. Farr	Carter's Cove	5.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2197	G. Inkpen	Loon's Cove	\$15.00
2198	T. Pretty	Chapel Arm	15.00
2199	Max Sheppard	Sunnyside	80.00
29	Thos. Drover	Charlottetown	25.00
64	R. Granville	Little Hr., Twill.	10.00
110	John Dalton	Cape Broyle	10.00
204	L. Pretty	Whitbourne	50.00
289	H. Crocker	Swift Current	15.00
357	J. & C. Drover	Hodge's Cove	15.00
455	Wm. Janes	Britannia	10.00
2134	Frank Taylor	Peter's Arm	15.00
2135	Hubert Sheppard	Embree	25.00
2136	Amos Goudie	Port Anson	10.00
2137	Eugene McDonald	Newbridge	15.00
2138	Maxwell Pollard	Hr. Deep, W.B.	12.50
2139	Jacob Bungay	Newton, B.B.	10.00
2140	Walter Coombs, Jr.	Upper Island Cove	15.00
2141	Aaron Mugridge	Goulds	15.00
2142	John Breen	Canada Hr.	15.00
2143	Hedley Phillips	Monroe, T.B.	15.00
2144	Edgar G. Dycett	St. Jacques	15.00
2145	John Fry	Summerville	40.00
2146	Mark Adams	Corner Brook	10.00
2147	Orlando White	Baine Hr. P.B.	15.00
2148	Wallie Toms	LaScie	15.00
2149	David J. Benson	Hillview	15.00
1720	H. B. Dwyer	Corner Brook	10.00
6	James Philpott	Jamestown	15.00
234	Andrew Walsh	Bellevue	25.00
470	Alfred Martin	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
594	Henry Jesso	West Bay, P. au P.	7.50
603	B. Stuckless	Little Hr., Twill.	10.00
634	A. J. House & Sons	Corner Brook	175.00
651	Angus Bennett	Daniel's Hr.	10.00
703	Henry Genge	Flower's Cove	10.00
826	Robert Parsons	Rocky Hr.	15.00
1000	Fred Maidment	Windsor	7.50
1027	Isadore Halbot	St. Fintan's	7.50
1172	A. J. House & Sons	Corner Brook	300.00
1266	Stanley Dawe	Corner Brook	75.00
1378	Cornelius McIsaac	South Brook	7.50
1390	T. H. Kennedy	Hr. Main	15.00
1395	Laban White	Port Blandford	75.00
1523	Joseph Woodward	Boat Hr.	10.00
1912	E. W. Ryan	Robert's Arm	25.00
1914	Allan Combdon	Jackson's Arm	200.00
1915	A.N.D. Co.	Millertown	75.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1916	Scott Pennell	Noggin Cove	\$10.00
1919	R. Beaton	Wigwam Point	20.00
1920	T. House	Bellburne	200.00
1921	N. Laing	Plum Point	15.00
1926	C. Toope, Sr.	Old Bonaventure	15.00
1927	W. J. Best	Port Blandford	25.00
1932	J. Ivany	George's Brook	40.00
1933	C. House	Bloomfield	110.00
1934	T. J. G. Boone	New Bay, N.D.B.	25.00
1938	G. R. Hiscock	Goblin	10.00
1940	C. Rendell	Williamsport	25.00
1941	L. Morris	Trinity North	25.00
1942	J. M. White	Coal Brook	12.50
1948	Geo. Roberts & Sons	Sally's Cove	25.00
1951	Caleb Meadus	St. Jones Within	15.00
1954	Reg. Palmer	Brooklyn	25.00
1956	A. J. Rowe	Dildo, T.B.	40.00
1972	E. Rose	Marystown	15.00
1812	L. Stuckless	Point Leamington	225.00
1814	W. C. Smith	Elliott's Cove	15.00
1980	J. Earle	Gillam's	15.00
1985	M. Bennett	Flat Bay	7.50
1991	M. Hanlon	Norris Arm	110.00
1996	W. March	Point au Bay	17.50
2004	R. F. Anderson	Glenburnie	150.00
2014	W. Boone	Cottrell's Cove	25.00
2016	Edgar Boone	Cottrell's Cove	25.00
2028	R. Downey	Colinet	25.00
2033	J. Hillier	Arnold's Cove	15.00
2034	Wm. Hibbs	Peter's Arm	15.00
2042	H. Oram	Corner Brook	25.00
1709	Lot Ropson	Hr. Deep	27.00
1710	Harry MacWhelan	Traytown	10.00
1718	Thomas Banks	Gillam's	150.00
1724	George Fleming	Bonavista	250.00
1725	Levi Hancock	King's Cove	25.00
1728	John Humby	Morley's Sdg.	100.00
1729	S. R. Hewlett	S. Brook	25.00
1735	R. J. Cranford & Sons	New Hr.	32.50
1736	Benj. J. Rowsell	God's Hr. N.D.B.	15.00
1744	Eli Diamond	Lethbridge	200.00
1759	Fred Rowsell	St Mary's	25.00
1761	Allan Offrey	Eddie's Cove	15.00
1762	Alex Ford	Island Hr., Fogo	10.00
1765	T. Hipditch	Glattice Hr., P.B.	10.00
1768	Josiah Lundrigan	Upper Island Cove	25.00
1769	H. Hutchings	Cow Head	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1770	Patrick Walsh	Mt. Carmel	\$10.00
1772	Norman Payne	Parsons Pond	50.00
1777	Lewis Bownes	Port Anson	75.00
1781	F. Haytor	Gander	175.00
1782	S. W. Humby	Summerville	25.00
1803	Douglas Bradley	Battle Hr., Lab.	15.00
1784	Douglas Hewlin	Robinsons	40.00
1821	Walter Bennett	Flat Bay	7.50
1828	Arthur Peckford	Phillips Head	25.00
1873	Samuel Russell	Lethbridge	10.00
1888	Fenwick Martin	Hickman's Hr.	10.00
1894	A. B. Baker	Laurenceton	50.00
1895	Walter Gillingham	King's Point	150.00
1898	Norman Purchase	Laurenceton	50.00
1901	Harold Reid	S. Dildo	50.00
1902	F. M. Thistle	Burlington	80.00
1906	Erastus C. King	La Scie, W.B.	50.00
1525	Peckford & Menchenton	Gander	\$75.00
1535	Alfred Benoit	Marche's Point	50.00
1529	Fred Greenslade	Long Pond	5.00
1538	Martin Pitcher	St. Jones Without	
1541	Wesley Philpott	Laurenceton	25.00
1553	Edward F. Payne	Cow Head	10.00
1556	Richard Young	Glenburnie	140.00
1567	Jacob Chambers	Blue Cove	10.00
1581	Philip Decker	Sally's Cove	15.00
1579	Robert Pryor	Cottle's Island	15.00
1585	Cyril & S. Wheeler	Summerford	5.00
1586	John Decker	Parsons Pond	15.00
1587	Ambrose Hollett	Norris Arm.	125.00
1590	Stanley Lovers	Port aux Choix	140.00
1591	Peter L. Benoit	Lourdes	25.00
1599	Patrick J. Meade	Ship Hr., P.B.	15.00
1602	Harry Critch	Torbay Road	7.50
1606	John P. Coady	Jean de Baie	10.00
1617	Joseph Drover	Upper Island Cove	15.00
1622	Edward Hobbs	Bunyan's Cove	150.00
1627	Albert Sutton	Trepassey	10.00
1644	Octave Simon	Cape St. George	25.00
1648	Patrick Breen	Coachman's Cove	25.00
1657	Stewart Keats	Bunyan's Cove	15.00
1663	Fishery Products	St. John's	10.00
1672	Walter Rideout	Botwood	25.00
1673	Robert Smith	Flat Island	25.00
1681	Walter Tetford	Laurenceton	150.00
1684	Stephen Chatman	Canning's Cove	25.00
1698	Ben Powell	Square Islands	50.00



No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
1703	H. P. Acreman	Battle Hr., Lab.	\$10.00
1706	J. Brinton	Port aux Choix	10.00
416	Wm. Miller	Trouty, T.B.	10.00
503	A. Butt & W. Churchill	Hillview	10.00
550	R. J. Wiseman & Bros	Little Hr., T.B.	10.00
562	Harold Pye	Brooklyn, B.B.	15.00
586	Ed. Tobin	Ship Cove, P.B.	15.00
697	S. Gidge	Fairbanks, N.D.B.	2.50
798	George Sheppard	Lark Hr., Bay of Islands	10.00
882	Philip Marsh	Hickman's Hr.	15.00
894	John Wheeler Sr.	Carter's Cove	25.00
971	Ellis Hulan	McKays	7.50
977	John Cooper	Lady Cove, T.B.	25.00
992	H. Warren	Cook's Hr. W.B.	10.00
1032	Freeman Reader	Cox's Cove	5.00
1117	H. Manuel	Cottrell's Cove	25.00
1151	A. & C. Gill	Sally's Cove	10.00
1196	A. D. Wells	Goose Arm	95.00
1229	H. Roberts	Botwood	15.00
1242	Frank White	Tompkins	5.00
1323	F. & W. Caimmie	Benoit's Cove	25.00
1405	N. B. Martin	Leading Ticks	15.00
1512	H. Hann	Port Blandford	15.00
1544	L. & B. Noseworthy	Shoe Cove, G.B.	10.00
1571	H. F. Hackett	Wood's Isle, B. of I.	10.00
1699	Gideon Osmond	George's Cove	15.00
1783	J. S. Wells	Cormack	100.00
1877	Eric Moss	Princeton	80.00
1880	W. H. Rowsell	Leading Ticks	80.00
1893	W. Duffett & A. Ivany	Britannia	15.00
2022	Chas. Martin	Flat Rock	5.00
91	Geo. W. Miles	Pool's Cove, F.B.	15.00
147	Charles H. Freebourn	Hr. Mille, F.B.	10.00
215	Geo. Williams	Current Island	10.00
218	John R. Blundon	Jamestown, B.B.	25.00
298	Geo. H. Lane	Eastport	25.00
317	Jabez E. Evans	Botwood	90.00
347	Allan Tucker	St. Jones Within	15.00
350	Joshua Norris	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
351	Joseph Andrews	Nipper's Hr.	15.00
373	E. T. Barfitt	Long Beach, T.B.	10.00
408	Wm. C. Whalen	Flower's Cove	15.00
440	R. Penney & Bros.	Clifton, T.B.	15.00
451	Donald Benson	St. Jones Within	15.00
462	N. L. Wiseman	Little Hr., T.B.	25.00
469	John Butt	Hickman's Hr.	10.00
491	L. & S. Powell	Happy Adventure	25.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
522	Messrs. Jonas Rice	Botwood	
532	Mark Hollett	Norris Arm	\$25.00
539	W. J. Cook	Cartyville	7.50
556	S. Ivany	Windsor	5.00
569	Alfred Cooper	Old Shop, T.B.	25.00
576	Angus Clarke	Goulds, Ferryland	12.50
587	A. Flynn & Sons	Little Hr., Twill.	10.00
616	Geo. H. Stone	Monroe, T.B.	25.00
617	Wm. Coles & Sons	Flower's Cove	10.00
639	Thos. Sutton	New Burn Cove	25.00
662	Carberry & Lambert	Clifton, T.B.	15.00
664	A. Wiseman & Sons	Shoal Hr.	10.00
702	H. Mills & Co.	Burlington	150.00
716	Thomas Keough	Plate Cove	25.00
787	Albert Parrell	Flower's Cove	10.00
884	J. & G. Blundell	Hickman's Hr.	25.00
896	R. S. Collins	Wellington	110.00
916	Peter Collins & Bros.	Hare Bay, B.B.	80.00
919	R. & P. Bridger	Brighton	10.00
927	E. & E. Coles	St. Margaret's Bay	15.00
941	Gregory Kelly	Gambo	10.00
1022	Ches. Hann	Little Hr. East	10.00
1079	Roland Manuel	Griquet, W.B.	15.00
1095	J. G. Walsh	Flower's Cove	10.00
1119	A. E. Hodder	Creston, P.B.	15.00
1137	Wm. Maynard	Green Island Brook	10.00
1135	Jacob Dredge	Brig Bay	10.00
1168	Wm. Hobbs	Black Duck Sdg.	10.00
1186	R. L. Smith	Aspen Brook	15.00
1341	A. E. Seabright	Wigwam Pt.	20.00
1375	P. J. Dwyer	Heatherton	7.50
1410	Bert Morris	St. George's	7.50
1517	W. E. Legge	Robinsons	5.00
1532	Ignatius Roberts	Upper Humber	12.50
1558	A. Mitchelmore	Green Island Cove	10.00
1612	A. Oldford	Bunyan's Cove	10.00
1670	W. J. Downey	Great Codroy	10.00
1692	Wm. Toope	Brig Bay	10.00
1726	Mark Fry	Jamestown	25.00
1747	Victor Winsor	Triton, G.B.	15.00
1839	L. G. Wiseman	Bloomfield	15.00
1965	N. Gibbons	Current Island	10.00
1966	James Genge	Anchor Point	10.00
1967	Wm. Bradbury	St. Phillips	17.50
2008	D. Dredge	Black Duck Cove	10.00
2026	A. James	Hr. Grace	15.00
2044	Suley & Chislett	Islington, T.B.	15.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
2058	L. Rideout	Burlington	\$25.00
2074	R. A. Combdon	Jackson's Arm	250.00
2080	A. J. Budden	Sop's Arm	25.00
2081	L. Foster & Co.	Rattling Brook	50.00
2105	T. Canning	Peter's Arm	15.00
2200	Arch Penney	Lethbridge, B.B.	15.00
2201	A. M. Hillier	Spread Eagle	10.00
2202	J. C. Young	Fishell's	2.50
2203	W. Taylor & Sons	Raleigh, W.B.	10.00
2043	Leslie Penney	Canning's Cove	15.00
2051	C. R. Wright	Nipper's Hr.	80.00
2062	S. F. Snow	Wing's Point	25.00
2067	Mac V. Budgell	Norris Arm	10.00
2068	R. & L. Greening	Port Blandford	25.00
2070	Dorman Pelley	Phillip's Head	25.00
2087	Pye & Yetman	Cape Charles	25.00
2096	Reuben Sams	God's Hr.	25.00
2097	Andrew Porter	Lewisporte	10.00
2102	Eli Abbott	Summerville	35.00
2103	George Gould	Charleston	80.00
2104	Samuel C. Russell	Southern Bay	15.00
2106	Daniel Miles	Bunyan's Cove	50.00
2110	Thomas Endicott	Lally's Cove	10.00
2112	Charles Reid	Pt. Leamington	80.00
2113	E. W. Hewlett	South Brook	10.00
2114	Hubert Chatmen	Canning's Cove	15.00
2116	Thomas Baker	Hodge's Cove, T.B.	10.00
2117	J. T. Pollard	Hr. Deep	25.00
2118	Henry Meaney	Port Anson, G.B.	10.00
2119	Mansfield Lethbridge	Lethbridge	15.00
2120	Wilson Stanley	George's Brook	35.00
2121	Ellis W. Crocker	Trout River	15.00
2122	Baxter Wiseman	Port Anson	10.00
2123	Heman Hewlett	Port Anson	35.00
2124	Clifford Maney	Mile's Cove	10.00
2125	Abraham Collier	St. Joseph's	15.00
2127	Kenneth Rideout	Cottle's Island	10.00
2128	Harold Vivian	Port Rexton	25.00
2129	J. Tucker & Sons	Bunyan's Cove	25.00
2130	Eleazor House	Hillview, T.B.	15.00
2131	Raymond Phillips	Aspen Brook	10.00
2132	J. S. Harris	Lethbridge	25.00
2133	Joseph Matchem	Sunday Cove, B.B.	10.00
195	Samuel Batten	Humbermouth	17.50
209	Geo. Mitcheckmore	Green Island Cove	10.00
225	T. J. French & Sons	Main Point, Gander B.	500.00
235	James B. Holloway	Bloomfield, B.B.	25.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
232	R. H. Greening	Musgravetown	\$15.00
239	H. D. Beck	Swift Current	10.00
245	Horwood Lumber Co.	St. John's	125.00
250	James Blackwood	Glovertown	15.00
269	D. S. Sceviour	Botwood	400.00
275	Wm. J. Emberley	Davis Cove, P.B.	15.00
280	J. & Arch Barrett	Harcourt, T.B.	15.00
281	Thomas Reddy	Fermeuse	5.00
288	Salmonier Forest & Farms	Salmonier Line	500.00
299	Weldon Brown	Blaketown	17.50
301	Wm. J. Goobie	Goobies	15.00
320	Nicholas Holloway	Bloomfield	25.00
309	Norman Pike	South Dildo	10.00
327	Charles Morgan	Seal Cove, C.B.	15.00
330	Charles Simmonds	Charlottetown	25.00
342	S. March & Bros.	Deer Hr., T.B.	15.00
354	Wm. J. Martin	Little Heart's Ease	10.00
359	Alex Strong	Clarendville	15.00
363	H. Pelley & Bros	George's Brook	15.00
365	James Churchill	Hillview, T.B.	10.00
375	M. & F. George	Whiteway, T.B.	25.00
378	Eli Critch	Cavendish, T.B.	10.00
393	W. K. Adams	Milton, T.B.	15.00
402	Clyde Strong	Harcourt	25.00
415	Eli J. Robbins	Hatchet Cove, T.B.	15.00
432	H. J. Hynes	Fox Island River	15.00
433	Ellis Reid	Foster's Point	15.00
439	Esau Penney	Deer Hr, T.B.	10.00
449	Robert Osmond	Burton's Cove	25.00
714	A. T. Vey	Long Beach, T.B.	50.00
719	G. W. Payne	Cow Head	25.00
715	Wm. J. Payne & Co.	Parsons Pond	15.00
725	Joseph Neal	Moreton's Hr.	10.00
727	A. Maidment	Shoal Hr. T.B.	15.00
747	Porter Bros.	Porterville	25.00
757	Bowaters	Corner Brook	25.00
766	H. H. Locke	Lockstown	5.00
769	John Reid	Winterbrook	25.00
781	Fred Hutchings	Brown's Arm, N.D.B.	22.50
792	Guy H. Eveleigh	Comfort Cove	110.00
796	A.N.D. Co.	Grand Falls	5.00
797	Edgar Pye	Lethbridge	10.00
808	Roland Decker	Rocky Hr.	25.00
813	Samuel Shinnicks	River of Ponds	50.00
829	Absalom Matthews	Jamestown	50.00
837	J. Goosney	Birchy Head	35.00
841	A.N.D. Co.	Bishops Falls	5.00

No.	Name	Address	Amt. Paid
843	Wm. K. Humber	Norris Point	10.00
844	Amaziah Martin	Bunyan's Cove	15.00
845	Arthur Anstey	Cottle's Island	15.00
847	Silas Bird	Cartwright, Lab.	15.00
853	Fred Watkins	Summerford	15.00
854	Wm. H. Pittman	Bellburns	80.00

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday at 3:00 of the clock I might say that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has indicated his willingness to and desire to be present on that occasion to prorogue this House at 3:00 of the clock on Tuesday, June 22.

May I say Mr. Speaker, that this unanswered question from the Leader of the Opposition addressed to me on the report by the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Finance upon certain transactions, if I do not have it to deliver to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition then it will be tabled here in the House on Tuesday, before the Lieutenant-Governor arrives. I repeat what I have said earlier; the Auditor General and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance, as the Deputy Minister has gone to Ottawa, worked all day yesterday and late last night and this forenoon on this report, in the hope that I could table it here today. I am afraid that I am partly to blame for its not being ready this morning. I told them I thought it would be all right to have it by this afternoon, thinking this House would be in session this afternoon. But I assure the honourable gentleman it will be forwarded to him before Tuesday, or else tabled here on Tuesday.

On motion the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 22, at 3:00 of the clock.

TUESDAY, June 22nd, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

#### Presenting Petitions

None.

#### Presenting Reports of Standing and Select Committees

None.

#### Giving Notice of Motion and Questions

None.

#### Answers to Questions

HON. J. R. SMALLWOOD (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker at the last sitting of the House I promised that, unless I was able to do so meanwhile, I would table the answer to a question asked by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, No. 109, on the Order Paper, asking for a report from the Auditor General and the Department of Finance on the question of cement allegedly purchased from the firm of William J. Lundrigan, Limited. I stated orally that the Government had bought no cement from the firm of Lundrigan. The report from the Auditor General and from the Assistant-Deputy Minister and Assistant Comptroller of the Treasury (in the absence of Mr. Marshall) confirms the answer I gave.

## QUESTION NO. 109.

## Part (1)

It is extremely difficult to answer this part of the Question in the form in which it has been asked. The fact of the matter is that in the final analysis, no cement — as such — was included in the cost to the Government of the work done by W. J. Lundrigan Ltd. on construction of the Cement and Gypsum Plants, although up to the time of the final Progress Report, payments had been made on account of materials on hand including cement. This is more fully explained below.

The actual position is as follows :

- (i) Payments to William J. Lundrigan Ltd. were made on the basis of Progress Reports checked and certified by the Resident Government Engineer, Mr. E. Leja. There was a total of 31 such Progress Reports throughout the period of construction — 18 for Cement Plant and 13 for Gypsum Plant.
- (ii) On each report in addition to details of the work performed, there was a listing of "Materials on Hand for Project".
- (iii) In this listing of "Materials on Hand for Project" each month was a varying number of bags of cement i. e. cement which the Company had on hand for use in the construction of these two plants.
- (iv) The quantities of cement shown on the various Progress Reports totalled, in the aggregate, 195,065 bags. This, of course, does not mean either that 195,065 bags of cement were used in the construction of the plants or that this quantity was purchased from the Company by the Government. Each amount of cement shown in the individual Progress Reports represents merely the inventory which the Company had on hand at the end of the period covered by the report. The Progress Reports submitted by the Company were cumulative; that is to say, the first report covered all the work completed as of the date of the report and payment to the Company was made accordingly. The second report covered all the work completed to the date of that report and payment made thereon, less the amount paid to the Company on the basis of the first report, and so on until final report was submitted. Payments, therefore, were also cumulative.
- (v) Reverting to the statement above that in the final analysis, no cement—as such—was included in the cost to the Government of the work done by the Company on construction of the two plants, reference must first be made to its contract with the Government which provides, inter alia, that "payments . . . for materials delivered will be paid by the Government" (Paragraph 3 of Part V of contract). Pursuant thereto, the Company was paid, following each Progress Report, the cost of the cement which it had on hand as shown in such Report but, at the same time, a deduction was made in each report for the amount paid for cement on hand as shown in previous reports. The overall result of this procedure was that, in the final analysis, the Company was paid by the Government only for the concrete work actually done. In



effect. therefore, the Government paid the Company in the first instance for the cement which it purchased for the job; this cement was subsequently converted into concrete by the Company and the Government billed for the cost of this concrete work

less the amount previously paid to the Company by the Government on account of the cement purchased.

- (vi) Statements setting out the position relative to the above are attached hereto.

### Part (2)

- (a) Itemized account of sum of \$177,123.64

#### CEMENT PLANT

(i) Final Payment of 10% Holdback	\$39,529.22	
(ii) Net balance due on completion of contract	41,313.58	
(iii) Extra-contractual payments	42,194.62	
(iv) Transportation costs for Grinding Mill Tube	2,600.90	
(v) Payment in respect of Social Security Assessment	3,153.03	\$128,791.35

#### GYPSUM PLANT

(i) Payment on account of 10% Holdback	22,332.05	
(ii) Extra-contractual payments	2,802.58	
(iii) Payment in respect of Social Security Assessment	1,677.43	26,812.06

#### CEMENT & GYPSUM PLANTS

(i) Payment a/c increased costs of labour and material	21,520.23	
		<u>\$177,123.64</u>

## (b) Itemized account of \$53,468.68

The figure of "\$177,123.64" set out above appears in the supporting document to voucher 15-88D dated 9th August, 1952. This document was prepared on the basis of a statement of account as at 4th August, 1952 submitted to the Comptroller of Finance by Wm. J. Lundrigan Ltd. The full amount of \$177,123.64 was not paid but, instead, the amount of \$132,000 was paid on account as follows :

(i) Cement Plant:	\$100,000.00
(ii) Gypsum Plant:	32,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$132,000.00
	<hr/>

Subsequently on 25th August, 1952 and 2nd September, 1952 advice was received from Mr. E. Leja, Resident Engineer in Charge, that a balance of \$53,468.68 was outstanding on account of Cement Plant and \$9,653.83 was outstanding on account of Gypsum Plant. These amounts were paid by Voucher 15-148A dated 6th October, 1952.

It will be observed from the above, that the figure of "\$53,468.68" was not additional to the figure of "\$177,123.64" but was the actual balance owing on account of Cement Plant after a partial payment of \$100,000.00 had been made on account of the "\$177,123.64".

G. W. ALLAN,

Auditor General.

J. G. CHANNING,

Asst. Comptroller and Asst. Deputy Minister of Finance.

Voucher No. (1)	Progress Report (2)	Work Done (3)	Invoice Materials On Hand (4)	Cement Included in (4)	Payment Made On Basis of Report	Total Payment
		\$	\$		\$	\$
183	No. 1	30,000.00	13,244.96	(15,037 " )	23,325.28	183,332.40
206	No. 2	58,907.27	37,750.00	(2,000 bags)	38,962.76	38,962.76
257	No. 3	106,443.55	38,732.50	(20,000 " )	48,070.69	86,991.45
333	No. 4	124,917.59	44,274.90	(18,000 " )	43,667.00	130,658.45
384	No. 5	133,510.79	44,274.90	(16,623 " )	21,614.79	152,273.24
26	No. 6	149,860.34	53,842.33	(16,623 " )	7,733.88	160,007.12
38A	No. 7	230,403.75	77,224.18	(29,006 " )	93,532.74	276,865.14
108	No. 8	327,465.69	70,390.93	(21,441 " )	81,205.82	358,070.96
172	No. 9	445,725.96	56,412.68	(15,274 " )	93,853.82	451,924.78
221	No. 10	521,742.43	44,649.38	( 8,256 " )	57,827.85	509,752.63
299	No. 11	605,744.34	48,152.83	(14,708 " )	78,754.82	588,507.45
324	No. 12	664,140.60	38,075.05	( 9,500 " )	43,486.63	631,994.08
349	No. 13	714,858.03	13,546.06	( 1,170 " )	23,569.60	655,563.68
397	No. 14	766,438.95	11,423.12	( 1,727 " )	44,512.18	700,075.86
438	No. 15	779,512.33	7,760.00	( 1,600 " )	8,469.24	708,545.10
450	No. 16	789,932.69	5,712.50	( 2,000 " )	7,535.57	716,080.67
60	No. 17	803,675.69	5,712.50	( 2,000 " )	12,368.70	758,449.37
	Final Estimate	855,292.17	—	—	41,313.58	769,762.95
	Payment of Holdback on				34,938.82	
	Completion of Contract				4,590.40	
69A	(i) Authorization by M/C 415—'52				—	
	(ii) Final Settlement				\$855,292.17	\$855,292.17

Voucher No.	Progress Report	Work Done	Materials on Hand	Payments Made On Basis of Report	Total To Date
		\$	\$	\$	\$
24	No. 1	12,500.00	—	11,250.00	11,250.00
38B	No. 2	27,500.00	—	13,500.00	24,750.00
107	No. 3	63,661.90	—	32,545.71	57,295.71
171	No. 4	84,284.41	1,725.00	20,112.76	77,408.47
222	No. 5	108,308.45	21,570.03	48,482.16	125,890.63
298	No. 6	166,411.09	15,977.53	38,259.13	164,149.76
324	No. 7	219,657.89	26,238.97	57,157.41	221,307.17
350	No. 8	317,277.82	22,737.50	84,706.62	306,013.79
396	No. 9	375,496.24	11,101.74	41,924.39	347,938.18
439	No. 10	441,654.00	6,281.00	55,203.32	403,141.50
449	No. 11	485,849.31	—	34,122.88	437,264.38
61	No. 12	513,320.51	—	24,724.08	461,988.46
158	Final Estimate	529,044.42	—	14,151.52	476,139.98
	Payment of Holdback on Completion of Contract			29,000.00	
				23,904.44	
69A	(i) Authorized by M/C 415-'52			52,904.44	529,044.42
	(ii) Final payment			592,044.42	

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to inform you that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has arrived to prorogue this fourth session of the 30th General Assembly:

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of this Province has at its present session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly. I now respectfully request Your Honour's assent:

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bills entitled:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

A Bill "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited."

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish."

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium"

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act"

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act"

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Dog Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act"

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada."

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths"

A Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited"

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association"

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the

Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act"

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952"

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Way of Loan on the Credit of the Province".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance (Licensing) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 4 Ed. VII, Cap. 13 Entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for other purposes in connection with Crown Lands".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission".

A Bill "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

HIS HONOUR: In Her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland to present to Your Honour a Bill for the Appropriation of Supply granted in the present session.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bill entitled:

A Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for



Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service".

HIS HONOUR: In Her Majesty's name I thank her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence and I assent to this Bill.

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to make the following speech:

Mr. Speaker and members of the Honourable House of Assembly:

I am glad to be able to relieve you of the responsible duties of this extended session and I desire to express my appreciation of the zealous manner in which you have applied yourselves to the discharge of your legislative labours.

Many of the measures to which you have given your attention are of paramount importance to the future of Newfoundland. The enactment of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority Act and the generous provision you have made to finance its operation mark the initiation of a policy which cannot but affect the destiny of many thousands of our fishermen and which will, I trust, make their position in the years to come one of greater security.

The complete rehabilitation of our fisheries will require a long and tedious effort, but the destiny of the industry on which so many of our people depend makes any such effort a paramount duty of my Ministers, a duty which they will not shirk. Unfortunately Newfoundland has all too few agencies through which my Ministers can work, but such as there may

be will be utilized by them to their utmost extent and capacity.

For the first time in forty years an attempt has been made to bring the Election Act completely up to date, and this Province can now boast of an Act that contains the best features of the Federal Act and the Acts of the other nine Provinces. While of course, in the final analysis an Act must be judged in its application it is hoped that enactment of this measure will facilitate the holding of elections and speed up the announcement of their final result.

My Ministers are well aware that under the Terms of Union the Government of Canada will appoint a Royal Commission within eight years from the date of Union to review the financial position of the Province and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance, if any, that may be required by my Government to enable it to continue public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of Union. It is the intention, therefore, of my Ministers to raise the standards and levels of our public services and for this purpose large expenditures will be made during the current year. Increased provision has been made for educational and health services and no effort will be spared to accelerate highway construction. The passage of a Loan Act will provide finances for these purposes.

During the present year a measure has been introduced in the Parliament of Canada providing for the granting of allowances to disabled persons. In this respect my Government has led all the Provinces of Canada in enacting "The Social Assistance Act" I have today assented to a further Act which will enable my Ministers to enter into

an Agreement with the Government of Canada whereby that Government will contribute toward such allowances as are paid out by my Government.

For some time past my Ministers have been concerned with the need for rural electrification. There are many areas in Newfoundland where both fishing and development is retarded because of the difficulty of securing power and lighting at reasonable rates. Some of these areas are within a short distance of sources of supply which though developed are still not sufficiently near to justify economical transmission. In other places water powers are available but private industry has shown no disposition to undertake the expenditure necessary to bring about the development of a much needed supply of electricity. During the past year some progress has been made in this connection and the passing of a Power Commission Act will enable my Ministers to get further knowledge to enable them to deal with the situation in places where remedial action can be taken. It will be the hope of all that the

efforts of my Government in this connection will be successful.

I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have provided for the various Departments of the Public Service. These will be expended with due regard to economy and efficiency.

It is very gratifying that the returns of the fiscal year recently closed show the finances of the Province continue in a healthy condition.

In taking leave of you at the close of this session, I desire to express my sincere good wishes for your prosperity and general welfare.

His Honour left the Chair.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform this Honourable House that at 3:00 of the clock this afternoon His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor prorogued this fourth session of the 30th General Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland until Wednesday, the 18th day of August next. This Assembly is prorogued accordingly until August 18, 1954.

Journal and Proceedings  
of the Fourth Session  
Thirtieth General Assembly  
of Newfoundland

Begun and holden at St. John's in the Province of Newfoundland on Wednesday, the 24th day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-four in the Third Year of the reign of Her Majesty our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth the Second, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom, Canada, and Her other Realms and Territories, Queen, Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith.

WEDNESDAY, March 24th, 1954

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor having fixed the hour at which he proposed to open the present Session of the Legislature at three of the clock in the afternoon of this Wednesday, the 24th day of March, the Members of the House of Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at three of the clock in the afternoon, when Mr. Speaker took the Chair.

At three of the clock the Sergeant-At-Arms announced that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor had arrived.

His Honour entered the Assembly Chamber preceded by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

His Honour was then pleased to open the Session with a Speech from the Throne as follows :

Mr. Speaker and members of the Honourable House of Assembly :

Since you last met all the people of the Commonwealth and Empire have been deeply moved by the crowning of a new Monarch as Queen and Head of the Commonwealth. The accession of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second to the Throne constituted a brilliant milestone in the magnificent story of the British race and its partners. The Coronation itself and the many celebrations that marked it drew to the centre of the Commonwealth and Empire tens of thousands of men and women from all parts of the globe to share, as representatives of tens of millions, in the historic crowning of the Queen. My Prime Minister and my Minister of Education shared with me the pri-

vilege and honour of representing you and all the people of this Province in those mighty events.

In conformity with the Government's policy of encouraging the development of the natural resources of the Province, and in keeping with my speech to you of about a year ago, my Government have procured the appointment of a Royal Commission on Agriculture. Distinguished men have accepted appointment to this Commission, and several specialists in particular aspects of agriculture have been brought to Newfoundland to assist the Commissioners. Members and officials of the Commission on Agriculture have travelled widely throughout Newfoundland and have devoted themselves industriously to the task of investigating all the problems of agriculture in this Province. My Ministers look forward eagerly to the receipt of the report and recommendations of the Commission, for they hope that these recommendations will form the basis of a firm and practical policy for the more rapid upbuilding of agriculture in all its branches.

The Royal Commission on Forestry has more recently been appointed, and again my Ministers have been fortunate in securing the services of men who are noted for their experience and ability in this field. My Ministers hope that from the report and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Forestry there will emerge a clear and practical forestry policy that they can follow with confidence and resolution.

My Government holds the view that these two Royal Commissions are amongst the most important bodies ever brought into existence in Newfoundland, and they are sparing no expense to ensure that exhaustive and

thoroughly competent investigations will result. Our forests already are the means of providing a living for a large number of our people, and there is not alone the problem of ascertaining whether larger numbers might be supported by our forest wealth but the even more important question of discovering whether those who at present live by the forests may continue to do so. Agriculture, in the widest possible meaning of the word, and including not merely ground-crops and grasses, but fruits, livestock, poultry and fur-bearing animals, already provides a living for a considerable number of people. My Ministers fervently hope that their belief that agriculture could support many times the present number will be well borne out by the report and recommendations of the Commission. Agriculture, forestry and fisheries (to which I shall refer at greater length in a moment) together support the great majority of our population. While I believe that all will welcome other industries, and other sources of income for our people, I believe also that there will be general agreement that the long-run prosperity of Newfoundland depends mainly upon the continued expansion of her fisheries, forest industries and agriculture.

I feel it unnecessary, in view of the great efforts being made and the great sums of money being expended, to do more than merely mention today the significance of the mines and mineral resources of the Province.

It is a matter of common knowledge that provision is made, in the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada, for the appointment by the Government of Canada of a Royal Commission to review the effect of Confederation upon the finances of Newfoundland as a Province of Canada.

The reasons for this provision, and the governing conditions, are set forth in the relevant Term. My Ministers realize the importance of this matter, and they are resolved to be prepared adequately to present Newfoundland's case in the review. To this end they have invited several well-known citizens to accept membership in a special Commission that will organize and supervise the preparation of Newfoundland's case. I am sure that you have been favourably impressed by the willingness of such prominent citizens to accept membership in the special Commission. They will have the good wishes of all in this Province as they perform this vital service in behalf of Newfoundland.

You will be asked to consider a new Election Act and a new Redistribution Act.

In the view of my Ministers the most important business to be laid before you in this session is a Bill to authorize the creation of a Fisheries Development Authority. Almost one half of our people are more or less dependent upon the fisheries for their livelihood. Due to a number of causes the fisheries are languishing, and the greatest single need in Newfoundland's economy is some plan for the rehabilitation of the fishermen. It was for this reason that my Ministers urged upon the Government of Canada the wisdom of having both Governments join in the creation of a Fisheries Development Committee. This Committee, which worked for about two years, produced one of the most notable economic documents, quite possible the most notable, ever produced in Newfoundland. The report and recommendations of the Fisheries Development Committee constitute a practical guide for the development of our fisheries, and my Ministers have

adopted them for that purpose. It is the view of my Ministers that many millions of dollars will have to be spent this year and next year and for some years thereafter to carry out the recommendations of the Fisheries Development Committee. Great skill and great care will be needed in the supervision of this spending, and my Government are convinced of the need for a board or body of men of first-class experience and ability in this field. They are confident that in the members of the recently created Fisheries Development Authority they have men who possess these high qualifications. The Fisheries Development Authority will be charged with control and supervision of the spending of a great many millions of dollars in fishery development, and at the same time they will be charged with the responsibility of a close watching-brief, in my Government's behalf, in the day-to-day and week-to-week operation of the many fishery enterprises that their supervision and control will have brought into existence. It is extremely doubtful whether a small group of men in Newfoundland were ever before called to exercise personal control over so many affairs of economic and financial importance as will come under the supervision of this body.

You will be invited to make provision for the needs of the Public Service and to grant Supply to Her Majesty.

I am confident that you will give these and all matters that come before you your most careful attention, and I pray that providence will guide and bless your labours.

His Honour left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Hon. the Leader of the Opposition introduced Mr. William J. Browne, member for the District of St. John's West, to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Browne took his seat in the House.

Hon. the Attorney General asked leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act".

On motion of Hon. the Attorney General the said Bill was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker announced that His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor, had been pleased to make a speech to the members met in General Assembly and that for greater accuracy he had obtained a copy.

The Clerk then read the said speech at the table.

It was moved by Mr. Mercer and seconded by Mr. Norman that an address of thanks be presented to His Honour in reply to the gracious speech which he had been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such address in reply.

It was ordered accordingly and the following gentlemen were appointed to such Committee:

Mr. Mercer.

Mr. Norman.

Mr. Higgins.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949".



Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (closing hours) Shop Act".

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951".

Hon. the Minister of Education gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act".

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act".

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953".

Mr. Hollett gave notice of questions.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of questions.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, March 29th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY March 29th, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by the Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs from residents of Trepassey, Re Telephone and electric lights.

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would presently move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the granting of interim Supply to Her Majesty.

Hon. the Minister of Finance informed the house that he had received a communication from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which Mr. Speaker read to the House as follows:

The Honourable the Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, recommend that, pending the tabling of the Estimates for the Financial Year 1954-55, a vote on account of Five Million Seven Hundred and Twenty Two Thousand Dollars calculated on the basis of roughly one-eighth of the total vote for the year 1953-54 to meet essential public services, be provided by the provincial Legislature.

(sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant-Governor.

March 29th, 1954.

Pursuant to notice and with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply to consider certain resolutions in relation to the grant of interim supply to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed certain Resolutions granting Interim Supply to Her Majesty and recommending that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

The said Resolutions being read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year ending the thirty-first day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the said Bill was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Services for the Financial Year ending the thirty-first day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled

"Public Accounts of the Province for the Year Ending March 31st., 1953, together with the Auditor General's Report thereon".

Mr. Mercer on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft a Reply to the Speech of his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, presented the Report of the Select Committee as follows:

To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor,

Sir Leonard Cecil Outerbridge  
Knight Bachelor.

C.B.E., D.S.O.

May it please your Honour,

We the Commons of Newfoundland, in Legislative Session assembled, beg to thank Your Honour for the Gracious Speech which Your Honour has addressed to this House.

(Sgd.) Isaac Mercer

G. M. Norman.

James D. Higgins

Assembly Room

March 29th., 1954.

On motion it was ordered that the debate on the Address in Reply be deferred until a later hour in the day.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Questions.

Mr. Higgins gave notice of Questions.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Questions.

The address in reply was debated.

The following Amendment was moved by Mr. Browne and seconded by Mr. Jackman:

"We respectfully submit to your Honour that this House regrets that the Speech from the Throne contains no reference to the financial condition or progress of the Industries in which so large an amount of the funds of the Province has been invested."

On Motion the Debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned until tomorrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, Tuesday, March 30th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### TUESDAY, MARCH 30th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Education tabled "Annual Report of the Department of Education."

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Amendment to the Address in Reply was concluded.

On the amendment having been put by Mr. Speaker, the House divided. The Amendment was lost.

On Motion it was ordered that the debate on the Address in Reply be deferred until tomorrow.

On Motion the orders of the day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, March 31st., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### WEDNESDAY, March 31st, 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier made a statement Re Anniversary of Confederation.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Courage from Bay d'Espoir, Re Road.

Mr. Drover from Raleigh, Re Road.

Mr. Ballam from Howley, Re Road.

The Sergeant-at-Arms announced that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had arrived.

His Honour took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour as follows:

It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, her faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of Supply granted in the present session.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bill entitled:

A Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.

His Honour then said, "In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill."

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income

Tax Act, 1949", was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare,

the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on Motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, April 1st, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### THURSDAY, April 1st., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier made a statement Re Editorial in the St. John's Evening Telegram of April 1st., 1954.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act."

Mr. Browne gave notice of Questions.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Questions.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Mr. Drover gave notice of Question.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, April 2nd., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### FRIDAY, APRIL 2nd., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Button from Green's Harbour, Re Road.

Mr. Button from Whiteway, Re Electric Lights.

Hon. the Attorney General from Birchy Cove, Re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare tabled: "Mothers' Allowances (Amendment) Regulations, 1953."

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives tabled:

Third Annual Report of Fisheries Loan Board of Newfoundland.

Third Annual Report of Co-operative Development Loan Board of Newfoundland.

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, April 5th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### MONDAY, APRIL 5th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Petitions were presented by Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply from Burgoyne's Cove, Re Road. and from Kerley's Harbour, Re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply tabled:

Pension Plan adopted by the Council of the Town of Deer Lake.

Pension Plan adopted by the Council of the Town of Corner Brook East.

Hon. the Minister of Labour tabled:

Report on the matters transacted by the Minister of Labour during 1953, under the Provisions of the Labour Relations Act.

Report of Newfoundland Labour Relations Board for the year 1953.

Report of the Proceedings of the Minimum Wage Board established under the Minimum Wage Act, 1950 covering the year 1953.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act".

Hon. the Minister of Education gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act".

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, April 6th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, APRIL 6th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives tabled "Fisheries Loan (Amendment) Regulations, 1954".

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare tabled Vital Statistics relating to the Population of Newfoundland.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill: "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

A Bill: "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act."

A Bill: "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire."

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Minerals Areas Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.



Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill: "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act."

A Bill: "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until

Wednesday afternoon, April 7th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Petitions were presented by:

Hon the Minister of Public Welfare, from Carbonear, Re Paving of Street.

Mr. Morgan from Pilley's Island, Re Harbour Law.

Mr. Janes from Carmanville, Re Road.

Hon the Minister of Labour tabled "Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Newfoundland for 1953."

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act." was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act" was read and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, April 8th. at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, APRIL 8th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a communication from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor which Mr. Speaker read to the House as follows:

Government House,  
St. John's,  
Newfoundland.

The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Assembly:

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of The Honourable the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker the Honourable the Premier, the Honourable the Attorney General, and the Honourable Minister of Finance as the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 5 of Chapter 8 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland (1952), entitled "An Act Respecting the Internal Economy of the Legislature, as set forth in the Minute of the Honourable the Executive Council dated the 6th day of April, 1954.

(Sgd.) J. Crawford,  
Private Secretary to the  
Lieutenant Governor.

April 7th., 1954.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowance Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, April 9th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, APRIL 9th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until

Tuesday afternoon, April 20th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, APRIL 20th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier made an announcement re Survey of hydro-electric power of the Hamilton watershed by the British Newfoundland Corporation.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, seconded by Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, it was ordered that statements published by the St. John's Evening Telegram of April 7th, 14th, and 17th, relating to a speech made in the House by Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare on April 6th., be referred to a Committee on Privileges.

Copies of the said issues of the Evening Telegram were tabled.

On motion of the Hon. the Premier, seconded by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, it was ordered that the following gentlemen constitute the Committee on Privileges:

Hon. the Attorney General

Hon. Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Canning.

Mr. Higgins.

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare tabled the following reports:

Report on Steamship service to Labrador.

Report on Rehabilitation of the Eskimos and Indians of Northern Labrador.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

The Debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, April 21st., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21st., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Button from Sunnyside, Re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Labour, from George's Town, re Road.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act," be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the solemnization of Marriages Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the following Bills entitled :

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act."

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

Hon. the Minister of Labour gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Hon. the Minister of Public Works gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill

entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, April 22nd., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, APRIL 22nd., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by Mr. Drover from Westport, Re Three Mile Limit.

Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled "Report of the Civil Service Commission of Newfoundland for the period 1st. July, 1953 to 31st. March, 1954.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949," was read a third time and passed it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Areas Planning Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Re-

sources the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon the Minister of Labour, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Labour, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sol-  
emnization of Marriages Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend  
the Education Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.



Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the said Bills without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday, April 26th., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

#### MONDAY, APRIL 26th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier made a statement, Re Dr. Alfred Valdmanis.

A petition was presented by Mr. Browne from Fair Haven, Re Road.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Hon the Leader of the Opposition asked leave to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

Three members rose in their places to support the motion.

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favour of the motion: Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill, (3); and against it, Hon. the Premier, Hon the Attorney General, Hon the Minister of Public Welfare, Hon the Minister of Finance, Hon the Minister of Education, Hon the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. Mr. Lewis, Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Hon the Minister of Labour, Hon the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Hon. the Minister of Public Works, Hon the Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Button, Mr. Janes, Mr. Browne, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer, (19), so leave to move the adjournment was refused.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until to-morrow afternoon, April 27th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### TUESDAY, APRIL 27th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development."

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act."

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Education Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act", had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act" and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education, the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada" was read a second time and it was ordered that

the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fires" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowances Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and was ordered that the

said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, April 28th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by Hon. the Minister of Education from the Pentecostal Assemblies of Newfoundland, Re Schools.

Hon. the Minister of Health gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act."

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium."

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the

Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

The debate on the Address in Reply was continued.

On motion, the report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to the opening speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor was adopted.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, April 29th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 29th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Honour would be pleased to receive the Address in Reply presently.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and Members of the House proceeded to Government House and being returned to the Assembly Chamber, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Honour had received the Address of Thanks and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly.

I thank you for the Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

A petition was presented by Mr. Drover from Jackson's Arm, Re Road.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills."

A Bill "An Act to amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Evidence Act."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act" was intro-

duced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, April 30th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 30th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported they had considered the matter to them referred and had

passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion, it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. the Attorney General, and with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to order and with unanimous consent, the said Bill was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act"



was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Labour, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Labour, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday, May 3rd., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, MAY 3rd., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by Mr. James from Seldom, Re Road.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, May 4th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, MAY 4th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

It was moved by the Hon. the Premier, seconded by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and unanimously carried that an expression of sympathy be forwarded to the relatives of the late Michael A. Sheca, a former member of this House.

On motion of Hon. the Premier, it was ordered that the name of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs be substituted for that of Hon. Mr. Lewis on the Committee of Privileges and Elections.

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare rose to a Point of Privilege regarding articles published in the Western Star of Corner Brook of April 24th., 1954, and tabled a copy of the said issue.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday, May 5th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and

to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild and Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated on 21st day of May, 1953."

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow afternoon, May 6th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, MAY 6th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources. tabled "Report of the Activities of the Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year ended 31st. March, 1954."

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare rose to a point of Privilege regarding statement made in the St. John's Evening Telegram of May 5th.

Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare moved that the House Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to suspend their sittings upon the matters referred to them until the Courts have ruled on the said matters.

The debate on the said motion was deferred until a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

The motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to suspend sittings, was debated and on motion it was ordered that the said Committee suspend their sittings.

On motion the Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, May 7th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, MAY 7th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by Mr. Brown from Sandy Cove, Re Road.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority, was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty-first Day of May 1953" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion the Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, May 10th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, MAY 10th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rise, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, May 11th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, MAY 11th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General, gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask

leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited".

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that on tomorrow the Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare would ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance",

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act".

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled

"An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twentyfirst Day of May, 1953" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday, May 12th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Education made a statement Re Salary Scale for Teachers.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled, "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon the Attorney General, on behalf of Hon. the Minister of Health, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, May 13th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### THURSDAY, MAY 13th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A Petition was presented by Mr. Janes from Carmanville, Re Road.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until

Friday afternoon, May 14th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### FRIDAY MAY 14th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier made a statement Re Dr. Alfred Valdmanis.

Hon. the Attorney General announced that Hon. the Premier was leaving for British Columbia to receive an Honorary Doctorate of Laws from the University of British Columbia.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act" was read



a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, May 17th, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### MONDAY, MAY 17th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Auto-

mobile Insurance Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation, Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, May 18th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### TUESDAY, MAY 18th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Government Act."

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to

enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild and Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty-first day of May, 1953".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until

Thursday afternoon, May 20th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, MAY 20th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A petition was presented by Mr. Janes from Victoria Cove, Re Road.

Hon. the Minister of Public Works tabled "Local Roads Report 1953 — 1954."

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to

enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act."

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bills entitled:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act"

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act." had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Af-

fairs and Supply the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, May 21st, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, MAY 21st., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothschild & Sons Supplemental to an Agreement Dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was debated and on motion adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act".

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had

passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act".

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bills entitled:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children's Act" had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, May 25th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, MAY 25th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Button rose to a point of Privilege regarding an editorial in the St. John's Daily News of May 25th.

Mr. Fogwill gave notice of Question.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were referred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, May 26th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Labour, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Labour the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being

entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan by the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the house rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, May 27th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### THURSDAY, MAY 27th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier expressed regret at the death of Lyttleton B. P. Gould of New York, Financier, one of the first Directors of the Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said

Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday afternoon, May 28th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### FRIDAY, MAY 28th., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" was read a second time and



it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on tomorrow move the House into a Committee of Supply and a Committee of Ways and Means.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, May 31st., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### MONDAY, MAY 31st., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

On the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means, Hon. the Minister of Finance delivered the Budget Speech and concluded with the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair.

On motion of Hon. the Premier it was ordered that the debate on the said motion be deferred until tomorrow.

Hon. the Minister of Finance informed the House that he had received a message from His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, which message Mr. Speaker read to the House as follows:

#### GOVERNMENT HOUSE, St. John's, Newfoundland.

The Honourable The Minister of Finance:

I, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Newfoundland transmit estimates of sums required for the public service of the Province for the year ending 31st. March, 1955, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, as amended, I recommend the estimates to the House of Assembly.

(Sgd.) Leonard Outerbridge,  
Lieutenant Governor.

31st. May, 1954.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance it was ordered that the message together with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were referred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, June 1st., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 1st., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act".

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to enter into an agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act."

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act."

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited and had passed said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House

concur with the committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act" had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act."

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance."

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday afternoon, June 2nd, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

### WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2nd., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Browne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at 6 of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, June 3rd., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, JUNE 3rd., 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that on to-morrow, Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish."

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs gave notice that he would on tomorrow, ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the estimates of Current Expenditure under the following headings:

I Consolidated Fund Services.

II Legislative.

III Executive Council.

IV Department of Finance.

V Department of Provincial Affairs.

VI Department of Education.

The Chairman from the Committee asked leave to sit again presently.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed estimates of Current Expenditure under the following headings :

VII Department of Attorney General, with the exception of item 703.

IX Department of Public Works.

VIII Department of Mines and Resources, items 801—803 inclusive.

The Chairman from the Committee asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday, June 4th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 4th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Browne gave notice of question.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider Resolutions relating to the Amendment of certain Statutes.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the estimates of Current Expenditure under the following headings :

VIII Department of Mines and Resources, items 804 — 820 inclusive.

The Chairman from the Committee asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed estimates of Current Expenditure under the following headings :

VIII Department of Mines and Resources, item 821.

X Department of Health.

XI Department of Public Welfare, items 1101—1113 inclusive.

The Chairman from the Committee asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the estimates of Current Expenditure under the following headings:

VII Department of Attorney General, item 703.

XI Department of Public Welfare, items 1114—1120 inclusive.

XII Board of Liquor Control.

XIII Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

XIV Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives.

XV Department of Economic Development.

XVI Department of Labour.

The Chairman from the Committee asked leave to sit again presently.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again presently.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at eleven of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the estimates of Capital Expenditure under the following headings:

I Consolidated Fund Services.

IV Department of Finance.

VI Department of Education.

VII Department of Attorney General.

VIII Department of Mines and Resources.

The Chairman asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, June 7th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 7th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.



Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply tabled "1953 Annual Accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed estimates of Capital Account Expenditure under the following headings:

IX Department of Public Works.

X Department of Health.

XI Department of Public Welfare.

XIII Department of Municipal Affairs and Supply.

XIV Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives, item 1440.

The Chairman asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed estimates of Capital Account Expenditure under the following headings:

XIV Department of Fisheries and Co-operatives, item 1444.

XV Department of Economic Development, and under Financial Surplus Account, heading IV. Department of Finance.

The Chairman asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Correction Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the

said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had completed the consideration of the estimates, had passed certain resolutions, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to same.

On motion this report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-Five, and for Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service" was introduced and read a first and second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions in relation to Financial Assistance to be rendered to certain Industrial undertakings.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, June 8th., at three of the clock.

TUESDAY, June 8th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act".

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Licensing of Companies carrying on the Business of Insurance in Newfoundland".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

Hon. the Minister of Public Works gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act".

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Transportation of Timber Act".

A Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited".

Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act".

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills :

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act' and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This Report was received.

The said amendments, having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee

further reported that they had considered the Bills entitled :

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance", had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday, June 9th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 9th, 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills :

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissions to Administer Oaths".

Hon. the Premier gave notice that on tomorrow Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act".

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Dog Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.



Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Licensing of Insurance Companies Carrying on the Business of Insurance in Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Further to

Amend the Local Government Act" and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments, having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance" had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments, having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at six of the clock.

The Sergeant-at-Arms announced that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had arrived.

His Honour took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour as follows:

May it please your Honour, the General Assembly of this Province has at its present session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Interpretation Act",

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Newfoundland Corporation Income Tax Act, 1949".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Undeveloped Mineral Areas Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Rent Restrictions Act",

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Area Planning Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Solemnization of Marriages Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Education Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Mothers' Allowance Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Exploits Valley (Closing Hours) Shop Act",

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation of Greater Corner Brook Act, 1951".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Public Libraries Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court of Canada".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal (Loan) Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act Relating to the Protection of Plants and to the Prevention of the Spread of Insect Pests and Diseases Destructive to Vegetation".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Evidence Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Wild Life Act".

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter Into An Agreement with British Newfoundland Corporation Limited and N. M. Rothchild & Sons Supplemental to An Agreement Dated the Twenty-first Day of May, 1953".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Apprenticeship Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Motor Carrier Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Health and Public Welfare Act".

A Bill "An Act to Empower the St. John's Municipal Council to Raise a Loan By the Issue of Bonds for the Purpose of Financing the Erection of a Stadium Building in the City of St. John's".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Slum Clearance Act".

His Honour then said "In Her Majesty's Name I assent to these Bills".

Mr. Speaker addressed his Honour as follows:

It is my Agreeable Duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland to present to Your Honour Bills for the Appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bill entitled;

A Bill "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-five, and For Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service"

His Honour then said "In Her Majesty's Name, I thank her loyal subjects, I accept their benevolence, and assent to this Bill".

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Budget Speech was debated.

It was moved by Mr. Browne, seconded by Mr. Fogwill that all words after the word "that" be stricken from the motion and that the following words be substituted "This House regrets that the Government has failed to reduce taxation which now rests so heavily upon all sections of the population."

The amendment was lost.

On motion the debate on the Budget Speech was adjourned until tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Morgan took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill as amended be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries used in the Transportation of Persons for Compensation".

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, June 10th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 10th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A Petition was presented by Mr. Courage from the St. John's Butchers Association Re Shop Closing Hours.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act".

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Welfare, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Social Assistance" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health the Bill

entitled "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, on behalf of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Dog Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole at a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Approve and give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the

Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Co-operatives Societies Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal the Ferries Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths" was introduced and read a first time and it

was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act".

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had

passed the following Bills without amendment.

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act".

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act".

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the other Bills to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit at a later hour in the day.

The debate on the Budget Speech was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.



Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Dog Act".

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Approve and give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved

itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the said Bills without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until tomorrow June 11th., at eleven o'clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 11th., 1954

The House met at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to make Provisions for Award of Pensions in Certain Cases".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act".

The debate on the Budget Speech was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On motion the Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday afternoon, June 14th., at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### MONDAY June 14th., 1954

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Premier rose to a Question of Privilege Re a Radio Address made by Mr. Browne.

On motion it was ordered that the matter be referred to the Select Committee on Privileges.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Dog Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Approve and give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, entitled as above, and that it be sub-

mitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On the motion that the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly" be now read a third time, it was moved by Mr. Browne, seconded by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that the said motion be amended by inserting the word "not" between the words "be" and "now".

The amendment was lost.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House

of Assembly" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commisison in Connection with

Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee wished to refer a Question of Procedure to the House.

On motion it was ordered that Mr. Speaker give a ruling on the said Question.

Mr. Speaker gave a ruling, which on motion, was adopted by the House.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday, June 15th, at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### TUESDAY, June 15th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day ask leave to introduce the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act".

The debate on the Budget Speech was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate at a later hour in the day.

Hon. the Premier gave notice that

he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas".

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1913".

Hon. the Premier tabled "Fourth Annual Report of Industrial Development Loan Board of Newfoundland" together with a letter relating thereto.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

The debate on the Budget Speech was continued and on motion was adjourned for further debate on a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Saw-mills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion it was ordered that the House adjourn until 8.30 of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at eleven of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Saw-mills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Ship-building (Bounties) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.



Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries used in the Transportation of Persons or Property for Compensation".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act."

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the other Bills to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider certain Resolutions in relation to the grant of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed certain Resolutions Granting Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty and recommending that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

The said Resolutions being read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Ser-

vices" was read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Wednesday, June 16th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### WEDNESDAY, June 16th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A Petition was presented by Mr. Drover from Coachman's Cove, Re Snowmobile Trail.

Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives tabled :

"Fourth Annual Report of Co-operative Development Loan Board of Newfoundland".

"Fourth Annual Report of Fisheries Loan Board of Newfoundland".

Mr. Hollett gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada" was read

a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act 1952" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Hon. the Premier rose to a Question of Privilege regarding an article in the St. John's Evening Telegram of June 16th., and tabled a copy of the said issue.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

On motion it was ordered that the Order of the Day for Second Reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Licensing of Insurance Companies Carrying on the Business of Insurance in Newfoundland" be stricken from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act For Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first Day of March One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at six of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act" and had passed the said Bill with some amendments.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952" and had passed the said Bill with some amendments.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the other Bills to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the "Certain Resolutions in Relation to Financial Assistance to be Rendered to Certain Industrial Undertakings".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Thursday June 17th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

#### THURSDAY, June 17th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

A Petition was presented by Hon. the Attorney General from Virgin Arm, Re Road.

Mr. Hollett rose to a Question of Privilege regarding an article in the St. John's Evening Telegram of June 10th.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission".

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act".

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Health, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.



Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to Financial Assistance to be rendered to Certain Industrial Undertakings.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again presently.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again presently.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at eleven of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole

to consider certain Resolutions in Relation to Financial Assistance to be rendered to Certain Industrial Undertakings.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain resolutions, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

The said Resolutions having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans" was introduced and read a first and second time and it was ordered that the said Bills be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the House of Assembly Act" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate on tomorrow.

On the motion that the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act" be now read a second time, it was moved in an amendment by Mr. Browne, seconded by Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, that the said Bill be read a second time six months hence.

On the motion that the word "now" remain part of the Question, the House divided and there appeared in favour of the motion: Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. Minister of Public Works, Hon. Minister of Mines and Resources, Hon. Minister of Labour, Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Hon. Minister of Education, Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Button, Mr. Janes, Mr. Norman, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer. (17); and against it: Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill, Mr. Higgins, (4); the amendment was lost.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Af-

fairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Friday, June 18th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 18th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day move that the third reading and passing of the following Bills be rescinded:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act".

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day move that the said Bills be recommitted.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the New-

foundland Power Commission" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate at a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the third

reading and passing of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" was rescinded and it was ordered that the said Bill be recommitted.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the third reading and passing of the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was rescinded and it was ordered that the said Bill be recommitted.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act 1953".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills with some amendment:

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act".

This report was received.

The said amendments having been severally read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bills, as amended, be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act".

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time on tomorrow.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had considered the other Bills to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act 1953".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills with some amendment.

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

On motion this report was received.

The said amendments having been severally read a first and second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time presently.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had passed the following Bills without amendment:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act 1953".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act".

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend the Civil Service Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Af-

fairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 1953" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

The debate on the Budget Speech was concluded and the House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the following Resolutions:

1. That it is expedient to bring in a measure to authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to raise a loan upon the credit of the Province in a sum not exceeding twelve million (12,000,000) dollars.
2. That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Gasoline Tax Act to provide for an increase of one cent a gallon in the tax on gasoline.

The said resolutions having been read a first and second time it was

moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said resolutions were agreed to.

On motion it was ordered that Bills be introduced to give effect to the said resolutions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the following Bills were introduced and read a first and second time :

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by way of Loan on the Credit of the Province".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax Act".

On motion it was ordered that the said Bills be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bills.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the said Bills without amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by way of a Loan on the Credit of the Province" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be

printed being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

On the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, it was moved in amendment by Mr. Browne seconded by Mr. Fogwill, that all words after the word "that" be stricken out and the following be substituted therefor :

In the opinion of this House consideration should be given to the question of setting up a Commission of Inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act for the purpose of investigating the manner in which the functions of the Board of Liquor



Control have been exercised during the past two years.

Mr. Speaker put the motion that the original words remain part of the Question. The House divided. There appeared in favour of the motion: Hon. the Premier, Hon. the Attorney General, Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Co-operatives, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Hon. the Minister of Labour, Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, Hon. the Minister of Public Works, Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, Mr. Brown, Mr. Button, Mr. Norman, Mr. Courage, Mr. Canning, Mr. Mercer, (15); and against it: Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Browne, Mr. Fogwill, Mr. Higgins.

The amendment was lost.

On the motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the following resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for an increase in the salaries of the Auditor General and the Comptroller of Finance.

The said resolution having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolution was agreed to.

On motion it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

The Chairman from the Committee of Supply asked leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion it was ordered that the Committee of Supply have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act" was introduced and read a first, second and third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour in the day.

The second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission" was debated and on motion was adjourned for further debate at a later hour in the day.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at eleven of the clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises, it adjourn until Saturday, June 19th., at eleven of the clock in the forenoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

SATURDAY, June 19th., 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Attorney General gave notice that he would at a later hour in the day ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons".

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance Companies (Licensing) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Cooperatives, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Supply, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills :

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 4 Ed. VII. Cap. 13 entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber Over Streams and Lakes, and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands".

A Bill "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas".

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had passed the following Bills without amendment :

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 4 Ed. VII, Cap. 13 entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes, and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands".

A Bill "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act".

On motion this report was received

and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bills be read a third time presently.

The Chairman from the Committee further reported that they had passed the following Bills with some amendment :

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas."

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bills, as amended, be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 4 Ed. VII, Cap. 13 entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes, and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Premier, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

On motion it was ordered that the House do not adjourn at one of the clock.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons" was introduced and read a first and second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Courage took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

This report was received.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said amendments were adopted.

On motion it was ordered that the said Bill, as amended, be read a third time presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be printed, being entitled as above, and that it be submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor for his assent.

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources tabled "Report of Titles Issued by the Department of Mines and Resources as Required Under Section 117 of Chapter 174 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952".

Hon. the Minister of Mines and Resources tabled :

1. Terms and Conditions of Permit to Cut Timber on Crown Lands.
2. Regulations made under the Sawmills Act, 1949.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, June 22nd, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 22nd, 1954.

The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

The Sergeant-at-Arms announced that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor had arrived.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor took the Chair.

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour as follows:

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its Present Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bills entitled:

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Corrections Act, 1953".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands (Mines and Quarries) Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Prevention of Fire".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Policies of Fire Insurance".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Community Councils Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Automobile Insurance Act".

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Lieutenant Governor in Council to Enter into an Agreement with Dominion Steel and Coal Corporation Limited, Dominion Wabana Ore Limited and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the New-

foundland Fisheries Development Authority".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Welfare of Children Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Provincial Parks Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Social Assistance".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Inspection of Fish".

A Bill "An Act Relating to the St. John's Memorial Stadium".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Public Utilities Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Floral Emblem of Newfoundland".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Co-operative Societies Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Companies Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Dog Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the National Flag Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Alcoholic Liquors Act".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Commission in Connection with Term 29 of the Terms of Union of Newfoundland with Canada".

A Bill "An Act Respecting Commissioners to Administer Oaths".

A Bill "An Act to Approve and Give Statutory Effect to an Agreement Between the Government and New Jersey Zinc Exploration Company (Canada) Limited".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Pharmaceutical Association".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Ferries Used in the Transportation of Persons and Property for Compensation".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Shipbuilding (Bounties) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University Act"

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Memorial University (Pensions) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Cancer Control Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Advance and Guarantee of Loans by the Government and to Amend Certain Statutes Relating to Loans".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Local Government (Receivership) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Botwood Water Corporation Act, 1952".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Gasoline Tax Act".

A Bill "An Act to Authorize the Raising of a Sum of Money by Way of Loan on the Credit of the Province".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue and Audit Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Urban and Rural Planning Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Civil Service Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Social Security Assessment Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Accident Insurance (Licensing) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Act 4 Ed. VII, Cap. 13 entitled "An Act to Provide for the Transportation of Timber over Streams and Lakes and for Other Purposes in Connection with Crown Lands".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Timber Licenses (Reversion to Crown) Act".

A Bill "An Act to Establish the Newfoundland Power Commission".

A Bill "An Act to Make Provision for the Award of Pensions in Certain Cases".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for Allowances for Disabled Persons".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

A Bill "An Act Further to Amend the City of St. John's Act".

A Bill "An Act to Amend the Sawmills Act".

A Bill "An Act to Provide for the Raising of Funds for Schools in Certain Areas".

A Bill "An Act Respecting the Franchise of Electors and the Election of Members to the House of Assembly".

His Honour then said "In Her Majesty's name I assent to these Bills."

Mr. Speaker addressed His Honour as follows :

It is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her faithful Commons in Newfoundland to present to Your Honour a Bill for the Appropriation



of Supply granted in the present session.

Whereupon the Clerk read the following Bill entitled:

A Bill "An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Year Ending the Thirty-first day of March, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-four, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service".

His Honour then said "In Her Majesty's name I thank her loyal subjects and assent to this Bill."

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to make the following speech:

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE HONOURABLE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

I am glad to be able to relieve you of the responsible duties of this extended session and I desire to express my appreciation of the zealous manner in which you have applied yourselves to the discharge of your legislative labours.

Many of the measures to which you have given your attention are of paramount importance to the future of Newfoundland. The enactment of the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Authority Act and the generous provision you have made to finance its operation mark the initiation of a policy which cannot but affect the destiny of many thousands of our fishermen and which will, I trust, make their position in the years to come one of greater security.

The complete rehabilitation of our fisheries will require a long and tedious effort, but the destiny of the in-

dustry on which so many of our people depend makes any such effort a paramount duty of my Ministers, a duty which they will not shirk. Unfortunately Newfoundland has all too few agencies through which my Ministers can work, but such as there may be will be utilized by them to their utmost extent and capacity.

For the first time in forty years an attempt has been made to bring the Election Act completely up to date, and this Province can now boast of an Act that contains the best features of the Federal Act and the Acts of the other nine Provinces. While of course, in the final analysis an Act must be judged in its application it is hoped that enactment of this measure will facilitate the holding of elections and speed up the announcement of their final result.

My Ministers are well aware that under the Terms of Union the Government of Canada will appoint a Royal Commission within eight years from the date of Union to review the financial position of the Province and to recommend the form and scale of additional financial assistance, if any, that may be required by my Government to enable it to continue public services at the levels and standards reached subsequent to the date of Union. It is the intention, therefore, of my Minister to raise the standards and levels of our public services and for this purpose large expenditures will be made during the current year. Increased provision has been made for educational and health services and no effort will be spared to accelerate highway construction. The passage of a Loan Act will provide finances for these purposes.

During the present year a measure has been introduced in the Parliament

of Canada providing for the granting of allowances to disabled persons. In this respect my Government has led all the Provinces of Canada in enacting "The Social Assistance Act". I have today assented to a further Act which will enable my Ministers to enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada whereby that Government will contribute toward such allowances as are paid out by my Government.

For some time past my Ministers have been concerned with the need for rural electrification. There are many areas in Newfoundland where both fishing and industrial development is retarded because of the difficulty of securing electric power and lighting at reasonable rates. Some of these areas are within a short distance of source of supply which though developed are still not sufficiently near to justify economical transmission. In other places water powers are available but private industry has shown no disposition to undertake the expenditure necessary to bring about the development of a much needed supply of electricity. During the past year some progress has been made in this connection and the passing of a Power

Commission Act will enable my Ministers to get further knowledge to enable them to deal with the situation in places where remedial action can be taken. It will be the hope of all that the efforts of my Government in this connection will be successful.

I thank you for the liberal supplies which you have provided for the various Departments of the Public Service. These will be expended with due regard to economy and efficiency.

It is very gratifying that the returns of the fiscal year recently show the finances of the Province to continue in a healthy condition.

In taking leave of you at the close of this session, I desire to express my sincere good wishes for your prosperity and general welfare.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor left the Assembly Chamber.

Mr. Speaker then said :

It is the will and pleasure of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that this General Assembly be prorogued until Wednesday the eighteenth day of August next, and this Assembly is prorogued accordingly.

## NEWFOUNDLAND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

1954

Hon. the Speaker, R. F. Sparkes, L.C.P., M.A.

## CABINET

Hon. Joseph R. Smallwood	Premier & Minister of Economic Development
Hon. L. R. Curtis, Q.C.	Attorney General
Hon. C. H. Ballam	Minister of Labour
Hon. E. S. Spencer	Minister of Public Works
Hon. J. R. Chalker	Minister of Education
Hon. H. L. Pottle, M.A., Ph.D.	Minister of Public Welfare
Hon. W. J. Keough	Minister of Fisheries & Co-operatives
Hon. S. J. Hefferton	Minister of Municipal Affairs & Supply
Hon. P. S. Forsey	Minister of Health
Hon. Myles Murray, Q.C.	Minister of Provincial Affairs
Hon. F. W. Rowe, B.A., D. Paed.	Minister of Mines & Resources
Hon. P. J. Lewis, Q.C.	Minister without Portfolio
Hon. G. J. Power	Minister of Finance

## OTHER MEMBERS

Samuel Drover, Esq.	Member for White Bay
Baxter Morgan, Esq.	Member for Green Bay
Gordon Janes, Esq.	Member for Fogo
Charles Maxwell Button, Esq.	Member for Trinity South
Patrick J. Canning, Esq.	Member for Placentia West
John R. Courage, Esq., B.A.	Member for Fortune Bay-Hermitage
Isaac Mercer, Esq., Q.C.	Member for Port de Grave
Clyde Scammell Brown, Esq.	Member for Bonavista South
George Norman, Esq.	Member for Burgeo & LaPoile
James Higgins, Esq., Q.C.	Member for St. John's East
Malcolm Hollett, Esq., M.A.	(Leader of the Opposition)
	Member for St. John's West
David I. Jackman, Esq.	Member for Harbour Main-Bell Island
Frank D. Fogwill, Esq.	Member for St. John's East
W. J. Browne, Esq., Q.C.	Member for St. John's West